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Preface

Since the appearance of the fiftieth volume of the American Jewish Year Book in April, 1948, its function and contents have been subjected to a thorough re-examination by a number of authorities in the fields of Jewish and general scholarship and Jewish communal affairs, and the editorial and publishing world. These discussions have resulted in a reaffirmation of the primary function of the Year Book as a volume of reference summarizing developments in Jewish life and those larger events of Jewish interest. A number of modifications were suggested, however, in order to make the series even more comprehensive, authoritative, and usable than it has been in the past. In the present volume an attempt has been made to incorporate as many of these suggestions as possible.

To achieve greater comprehensiveness many new topics have been added, particularly in the review of events in the United States. To increase the reference value of the articles the factual information has been presented in as standard and usable a style as the contents would permit. In addition, the statistical material, previously appearing at the end of the volume, has been integrated with the main body of the articles. The articles in the section dealing with the United States have been divided into four principal topics, while the regional arrangement has been continued and refined in the articles dealing with foreign events. Finally, the present volume for the first time contains a detailed index, thus increasing greatly the accessibility of the information.

Though primarily concerned with the events of the year under review, the Year Book continues to present special studies on topics not susceptible of adequate treatment within the limitations of a review of a single year. Of special interest in the present volume are the first two articles, which contain a great deal of unpublished statistical and socio-economic data concerning the Jews of the United States. In the first of these, "The American Jew: Some Demographic Features," Ben B. Seligman, of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, presents the results of his analysis of fifteen demographic surveys of local Jewish communities made during and since the war, and compares the data thus obtained with a number of earlier local surveys published in 1943 in Jewish Population Studies, edited by Sophia M. Robison. In the second article Eli E. Cohen, executive director of the Jewish Occupational Council, presents additional data on the economic position and occupational structure of Jews secured from the files of Jewish vocational adjustment agencies and independent sources. The Editors hope to present in succeeding volumes summaries of whatever data on this subject may be produced through basic research.

The Year Book also continues to publish certain basic compilations, such as
obituaries, directories of organizations and publications, and bibliographies, which are much in demand and deemed useful in rounding out a summary of the year's events. Here, again, volume 51 contains innovations in the use of a classified arrangement for the United States national Jewish organizations, the extension of the directories to include selected national Jewish organizations throughout the world, and a more selective compilation of the obituary notices. These notices are in the present volume introduced by brief biographical appreciations of two distinguished Jewish leaders who passed away during the period under review (June 1, 1948, through June 30, 1949)—Judah L. Magnes and Stephen S. Wise. A number of lists, such as those dealing with anniversaries, appointments, honors, and bequests, are no longer being carried.

The Editor also wishes to call attention to the change in the format of the **YEAR BOOK**, by means of which it is hoped to present more material in a less bulky volume, without at the same time sacrificing readability to any appreciable extent. In connection with this change the Editor wishes to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Meyer Wagman, of Kurt Volk, Inc., who served as typographical consultant; and of Leonard D. Weil and Mrs. Carol S. Diamond of the Production Division of the American Jewish Committee, who have been most helpful in connection with the typography, as well as with all the details of production.

For the past fifty years the **AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK** has been a publication of the Jewish Publication Society—printed at its press and distributed by the Society. With the present volume, however, as the result of a special agreement between the Society and the American Jewish Committee, the latter, in addition to continuing to serve as editor, joins the Society as co-publisher of the **YEAR BOOK** and will also be responsible for the printing of the volume and the distribution of all copies not reserved for the Society’s membership. The Editor takes this opportunity to acknowledge the cooperation of Dr. Maurice Jacobs, executive vice-president of the Jewish Publication Society and Benjamin W. Huebsch, vice-president of Viking Press and a member of the advisory committee of the Library of Jewish Information of the American Jewish Committee, in facilitating this revised arrangement.

In the preparation of this volume the Editor has enjoyed the splendid cooperation of his colleagues on the editorial staff of the **YEAR BOOK**—Jacob Sloan, Irving Kaplan, and Dora Cohen. In particular, he is grateful for the collaboration of Mr. Sloan, who did the major editing of the articles. Thanks are also due to Herbert Poster, Harry J. Alderman, and Esther Frid of the Library of Jewish Information for their assistance to the editorial staff; to Dr. Julius Greenstone for the preparation of the calendars, and to Ernest Maass for the preparation of the index. In addition, the Editor wishes to thank the following persons for their advice in connection with the two special studies: Professor Albert Abrahamson, of Bowdoin College; Dr. Max Baer and Robert Shosteck, of the B’nai B’rith Vocational Service Bureau; Dr. Uriah Engelman, of the American Association for Jewish Education; Nathan Glazer, of *Commentary*; Nathan Goldberg, of the American Jewish Congress and Yeshiva University; Harry L. Lurie, of the Council of Jewish Federations.
and Welfare Funds; Walter Lurie and Samuel Spiegler, of the National Community Relations Advisory Council; Elias Picheny, of the National Jewish Welfare Board; Professor Nathan Reich, of Hunter College; and Dr. Sophia M. Robison, of the New York School of Social Work.

The Editor is also grateful to the advisory committee of the Library of Jewish Information of the American Jewish Committee and to its chairman, Professor Salo W. Baron, for their examination of the contents of the past volumes of the Year Book and their helpful suggestions in connection with this one.

November 15, 1949

MORRIS FINE
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THE AMERICAN JEW: SOME DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES *

COMPRISING the largest Jewish national grouping in the world, American Jews are as yet unable to ascertain with any degree of precision how many persons make up that grouping, where they live, how old they are, where they came from, and how they earn their livelihoods. 1 Full and detailed demographic information comparable to the census data which is available about Canadian Jewry is almost entirely lacking. And in the absence of sufficient and reliable data, the interested person—who may be a scholar preparing a treatise on some special phase of Jewish life or a community leader responsible for certain aspects of local social planning—must depend on well-informed guesses advanced by well-informed observers.

For a detailed discussion of the various devices utilized to arrive at these guesses, the reader is referred to Ben B. Seligman and Harvey Swados, “Jewish Population Studies in the United States,” AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Volume 50, page 663. The earlier article discussed the use of the Yom Kippur, death record, master list, polling, and complete census methods as devices for estimating the size of the Jewish population, but it must be repeated that only the last two offer satisfactory means for obtaining demographic data.

Not only are demographic data needed for the planning and setting up of such services as aged programs, youth activities, and group work, but such information is often required by national agencies operating in special areas.

In fact, the study of almost any problem in Jewish social research must either be based on population data, or needs population data as background. 2 The major problem, then, is one of gathering and refining data which will command the confidence of the local community and national agency leadership and which will also yield statistical indices and precise information on Jewish age distribution, family size, education, etc.

Community Surveys

It is not suggested here that knowledge of the demography of American Jewry is completely lacking. Local Jewish communities have from time to time conducted surveys to ascertain their Jewish population characteristics. In

---

* The writer wishes to express his thanks to Alvin Chenkin for his useful suggestions on analytical method, and to Harvey Swados for his suggestions on presentation.

1 A recent article on Jewish demography emphasized the lack of sufficiently reliable information on the major population characteristics of American Jews. (Sophia M. Robison, “How Many Jews in America?” Commentary, August, 1949, p. 185.)

2 Robison, ibid., p. 186.
1948, for example, it was reported that some sixty-six communities had conducted population surveys during the past decade. But unfortunately it was found that there was "... far less homogeneity, in survey techniques themselves, in findings, or in population estimates founded on the techniques, than we might at first expect." 3 Despite these technical problems, it seems possible to construct some comparative demographic indices, particularly for surveys in which the techniques employed provide at least a partial basis of comparability.

The discussion below should be viewed by the reader as an exploratory effort in this direction. In addition to reviewing here the more recent community population surveys, comparisons will be made at various points with the demographic information as set forth in Jewish Population Studies, edited by Sophia M. Robison.4 It will thus be possible to compare the demographic structure of the Jewish population in the 1930's with that of the 1940's and in this way perhaps to underscore some significant changes by utilizing data directly relating to Jews rather than employing surmises derived from general population statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jewish Population Study</th>
<th>Year of Auspices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>56,800</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>10,217</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, S. C.</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While more than sixty Jewish population studies were made at different times and by different persons since 1939, it was found that not all of these lent themselves to comparative analysis. In many, the gaps in the data were sufficiently serious as to require their elimination from the present survey. From these sixty-six Jewish population studies, fifteen in which the informa-

---


4 Published by Conference on Jewish Relations, New York: 1943. The studies included in this volume covered the Jewish communities of Trenton and Passaic, N.J.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Norwich and New London, Conn.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Minneapolis, Minn.; and San Francisco, Cal. These were all done prior to 1939.
tion and manner of presentation were not so disparate, were selected for
detailed examination. In one, Jacksonville, the data were available in sum-
mary form only. Few of the studies which employed a sampling technique
presented the data in a manner that might permit a test as to their adequacy.
While it is quite conceivable that some of the samples were obtained in an
accidental rather than random fashion, the final data in most of the com-
munity studies are of such a character as to suggest that the former was minimal.
The criteria employed for selecting these studies were based then on ex-
pediency: wherever data were available, the study was chosen for review. On
this basis the Jewish community population studies listed in Table 1 were
included in this survey.
While the bulk of the data utilized below has been drawn from the com-
munity studies listed, an effort has been made to relate this material to other
studies undertaken by independent scholars on such special problems as Jewish
birth rates and fertility. Wherever possible, data on Jewish demography ap-
pearing in general sources have been employed as well.

Age Composition

Most Jewish demographic studies begin, and justifiably so, with an analysis
of the age structure of the population. While the United States for many
years has enjoyed a relatively youthful population, specialists in recent years
have become increasingly concerned with its progressive aging. Jewish com-
munity leaders too have had to address themselves to this question, for more
and more communities have had to face up to the problem of pediatrics versus
geriatrics. It is well known that with shifts in age composition and structure,
there will occur changes in the likes, dislikes, and interests of the members of
the community. But with data on the nature of these population shifts, com-
munity leadership is more apt to anticipate such alterations in tastes.

Tables 2 and 3 present the percentage distribution of the Jewish popula-
tion in the communities listed in Table 1, by age groups (for all communities)
and by age and sex (for communities where such information was available).
As a means of illustrating significant characteristics of a given population, the
age-sex pyramid is clearly unexcelled, and such figures are presented where-
ever possible. Figures 1-5 and 15-19 are bar graphs showing age composition
for the total Jewish population wherever data on distribution by sex were not
available. Figures 6-14 and 20-24 are age-sex pyramids corresponding to the
data in Tables 3 and 5. Table 4 shows the percentage distribution by age
groups of a number of Jewish communities for which studies were made prior
to World War II. Table 5 gives percentage data for age-sex distributions for
several of these communities.

5 For a discussion of urban-rural distribution, see Robison, Commentary, ibid., p. 188, and Selig-
man and Swados, ibid., p. 652 ff. The criteria used by the Census Bureau for distinguishing between
urban and rural places suggest that virtually all American Jews are urban or suburban. Also, analy-
sis of census data indicates that those whose native tongue was Yiddish remain in urban centers in
greater proportions than other groups.

6 In only one of the community studies reviewed here, that for Indianapolis, were single year age
groupings included in the statistical report. Lacking such primary information, it was difficult to
compare the various studies because of the varying age class intervals established by each investiga-
tor. Special local problems apparently motivated the particular choice of an age class interval. Thus,
one investigator might be interested only in those persons under 25 years for purposes of studying
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 and over) 60-64</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65 and over) 65-69</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 and over) 70-74</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 and over) 75-79</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80 and over) 80-84</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85 and over) 85-89</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sources: Studies of Jewish population in each of the communities in the files of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the National Jewish Welfare Board, and the American Association for Jewish Education. For method of derivation, see text.
A perusal of Figures 6 to 14 should reveal to the reader some interesting aspects of the Jewish populations of these communities. Virtually all show significant gaps or “hollow classes” in the young and teen-age groups. That these “hollow classes” exist also in the general population is shown in the Census Bureau’s diagrams for 1945 estimates. Yet for the Jewish communities, the “hollowness” seems more marked and appears to extend beyond the 20-year group. While all eight communities for which such diagrams are presented here exhibit a strong pyramidal base, thereby indicating a larger number of births in recent years, the “hollow classes” often extend to the 35-year groups. This is in sharp contrast to the native-white general population where the largest class percentages occur in the 15- to 19-year and 20- to 24-year age groups.

Does this then indicate that American Jews began to have fewer children sooner than the general population? Or does it show that Jews marry at a later age than the rest of the population and consequently have smaller families? Or do Jews in this country curtail family size as a response to unfavorable economic conditions more quickly than is the case in the general population? While these may possibly be partial explanations for the demographic characteristics described above, they cannot be considered conclusively so without further detailed study. Furthermore, the extent to which wars, epidemics, or variations in births and deaths may affect specific Jewish age-sex patterns is difficult to assay.

Comparison with the age composition of Jewish communities a decade earlier (Tables 4 and 5; Figures 15-24) shows clearly enough that the present “hollow classes” in the Jewish population were predominantly reactions to economic depression. Apparently the middle class, the largest part of the Jewish population included in these surveys, readily restricts family size during severe economic conditions. Thus invariably the age group under five years in the earlier studies was relatively a narrow one; this was true in Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Minneapolis, Passaic, Trenton, New London, Norwich, and San Francisco. The more recent studies (Figures 1-14) show an expansion in the infant-age groups. This, of course, is also characteristic of the general population in the United States, is a result of the wartime spurt in the birth rate, and may be viewed as purely a temporary phenomenon.

For Jewish communities, this relative increase in births may entail continuing responsibilities for such fields as Jewish education and youth programs. Any hasty de-emphasis of these aspects of community planning may prove to be premature, for in the next few years at least, and in the absence of any severe depressions, there may be increasing numbers to whom such programs are addressed. In the long run, however, the younger groups in the population, both general and Jewish, will in all probability continue to decline. According to a statistical report of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, youth activities or another in those persons between ages six and fourteen in order to help analyze a problem relating to Jewish education.

Yet it was necessary to compare the communities on some uniform basis, if even tentative generalizations concerning their Jewish populations were to be offered. This was achieved by constructing cumulative percentage graphs for each community on a scale sufficiently large to permit an interpolated reading back to a uniform age grouping established for all the studies. Where data were available for both age and sex, it was a relatively simple matter to construct age-sex pyramids.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65 and over)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 and over)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 and over)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80 and over)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85 and over)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sources: See footnote to Table 2.
for example, marriages in 1949 declined 12 per cent as compared with the previous year.

A decade or more ago the Jewish population, to judge by the early studies reviewed here, was relatively a youthful one. In Chicago, for example, considerably more than one-third of the Jewish population was under the age of 30. The median age, on either side of which lies 50 per cent of the total, was under 30 in all cases except San Francisco. The more recent studies show median ages ranging from 28.4 for the Newark suburbs to 36.3 for Miami, Florida. This compares with an estimated median age in 1946 for the general white population in the United States of 30.4.\(^7\) Perusal of the figures and diagrams given here emphasizes the continuous aging of the Jewish population, a process which appears to be more marked than in the general population in this country.

The age groups over 25 or 30 are relatively larger in the recent studies; this is true for Newark,\(^8\) Atlanta, Worcester, Portland, Ore.; Camden, Indianapolis, Utica, Charleston, S. C.; Grand Rapids and Erie. Tucson and Miami exhibit similar features, but in these instances the number of middle-aged persons has been increasing through inward migration. In Miami, male migrants apparently have been older than female migrants, while at the same time the latter have outnumbered the men, particularly in 20- to 50-year age groups.

It has also been shown that the almost exclusively urban concentration of American Jewry suggests a smaller average family size and a lower birth rate than in the general population. This, together with the fact that the few Jews in small communities may intermarry more readily or postpone marriage because of a lack of available partners, suggests further an inability of the smaller Jewish population centers to fill the gap created by the desire for smaller families. All this intensifies the aging process in the Jewish population.

This aging carries with it implications of considerable significance for local social planning. Aside from the broader problems such as types of housing, social security, and the effects on national productivity, there are such questions to be resolved as kinds of hospital services, institutional care for the aged, leisure-time programs for adults, and the like.

Comparison with several Canadian Jewish communities would seem to indicate that the American Jewish population is a somewhat “older” one.\(^9\) Yet in Canada, too, the “aging” process was apparent; the teen-age groups invariably declined from 1931 to 1941 as a proportion of the total Jewish population.

**Sex Ratios**

The proportions of males and females in a population are important features of its composition, for these ratios markedly affect birth rates, death

---

\(^7\) The average age for the Jacksonville Jewish population was given as 39, but the type of average was not indicated. See W. I. Boxerman, *Statistically Speaking*, Jacksonville Jewish Community Council, 1945.

\(^8\) In Newark an interesting shift is discernible. The highly productive age groups, 25 to 35, apparently prefer to reside in the city rather than in the suburbs, whereas the 35 to 45 age group exhibit a contrary preference.

\(^9\) See L. Rosenberg, “Age Distribution of the Jewish Population in Ontario,” *Information and Comment* (Canadian Jewish Congress; No. 8, March 1949), especially Table 2. The largest age groups in 1941 were 20 to 24 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65 and over) 65-69</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 and over) 70-74</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 and over) 75-79</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5

AGE COMPOSITION BY SEX: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
JEWISH POPULATION∗

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65 and over) 65-69</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 and over) 70-74</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 and over) 75-79</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

∗ Source: See footnote to Table 4.
rates, marriages and migrations. Where certain age groups are predominantly of one sex, it is conceivable that the character of community activities will be subject to change. In the case of Miami, for example, the proportion of females to males in the 20- to 50-year age groups is on the whole greater than in the other Jewish communities. In fact, for all age groups, except for those over 65, the Miami Jewish population appears to have a higher proportion of females to males. In terms of the total Jewish population, Atlanta and Worcester also exhibit sex ratios below 100, as shown in Table 6. Curiously enough, the high proportion of males in the over-70 groups, which is found in Miami and Worcester, does not at all conform to the general pattern, either for other Jewish communities or for the native-white general population of the United States. Such demographic peculiarities must influence community thinking on social planning questions.

---

The statistical device employed for analyzing this aspect of population structure is the sex ratio expressed as the number of males per 100 females. The sex ratio for the native-white population in the United States in 1940 was 100.1; the ratio for the total population was 100.7. See Census data for 1940 quoted in T. L. Smith, Population Analysis, p. 123 and U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1948, (Government Printing Office, 1948), p. 169.
More detailed data on sex ratios for certain Jewish communities are presented in Table 7. Here information on specific age groups was available in the various studies. These data show that in the main the communities conformed to the general sex ratio pattern, especially in the younger age groups. Toledo, however, exhibited a higher proportion of males in all age groups. The general population (native-white) in 1940 had a larger proportion of males to females in the under-20 age groups, a characteristic consistently true for six out of eight Jewish communities for which data after 1940 were available. In the Jewish communities which had population studies prior to 1940 and for which specific age group sex ratios could be obtained, four out of five conformed to this general pattern. As we move to the older age groups, we find the proportion shifting; the general (native-white, 1940) population shows more women than men in the age groups between 20 and 40. This appears to be currently true in four Jewish communities: Miami, Worcester, Portland, and Camden. The same condition apparently existed also in Detroit, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Norwich. In Indianapolis, Utica, Charleston, and Grand Rapids there appears a more equal male-female balance in this age group.

Beginning with about age 40, virtually all the studies indicate a marked shift in the sex balance toward the male side. This too approximates the pattern exhibited by the general (native-white) population in the United States. In the age groups over 60, however, the general population ratios again shift to the female side. This occurs also in the Jewish population, but for the two exceptions noted above. It is also interesting to note that all but three of the Jewish community studies reviewed (Norwich, New London, and Toledo) have lower sex ratios (and consequently a more even balance between the sexes) than the foreign-born white population residing in urban areas. The Jewish ratios, however, are higher than that for the native-white urban population.

The significance of these figures is emphasized when we realize that any disproportions or unbalance, particularly in the procreative age groups, reduces the possibilities of single people finding a suitable marriage partner. The large proportion of females in the 25-, 30-, and 35-year age groups in such Jewish communities as Camden, Worcester, and Utica can make it difficult for them to find husbands without crossing religious, cultural, and ethnic lines. Such disproportions consequently result in lower marriage rates and in all probability lead to lower birth rates for the Jewish population in the United States.

**Marital Status**

Information on marital status in Jewish populations is unfortunately neither as extensive nor as detailed as is the case with age composition. Investigators for one reason or another have felt that this demographic measure was not nearly as important as age structure or occupational categories. While it is true that the "...married condition is the normal status for the majority of human beings who have reached the age of adulthood," and that this is equally true for the Jewish and for the general population, it ought to be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Charleston</th>
<th>Grand Rapids</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Norwich</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>135.8</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>109.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>103.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>103.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>125.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>119.4</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>107.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>116.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>108.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>113.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>105.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>154.5</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>161.1</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>135.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65 and over) 65-69</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70 and over) 70-74</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 and over) 75-79</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Jewish population studies as described in Tables 3 and 5. Ratios were derived through interpolation from cumulative frequency curves as described in text.*
recognized that variations might yield interesting and perhaps significant statistical facts.

Should there be, for example, an unusual proportion of single and widowed persons such a fact ought to be taken into account by community leadership. This might require certain emphasis on leisure-time programs or adult group activities. Or, if the data on married persons were shown with spouse present or absent, it would be possible to inquire further into certain group psychological problems. But to be most useful, the data would have to be tabulated according to age groups. While most modern censuses have recognized this, the studies examined here failed to analyze this aspect of their demographic problems. Further analysis will demand not only the kind of approach suggested above, but also tabulations of marital status by sex, by community areas, and perhaps by nativity.

Of all the community studies examined here, only six yielded data on marital status, and that in but crude form, as may be seen in Table 8. Yet even these appear to conform to the national pattern, insofar as the majority of the population is in the married class. One might suspect that as in the case of other indices, the Jewish populations would have a higher percentage of single persons than the general population, but such a generalization cannot now be established conclusively. All that can be suggested at this time is that future Jewish population investigations include information on marital status, so that a more complete picture of Jewish demography will be developed and data useful for Jewish community organization and planning will be made available.

Family Size

The average size of the Jewish family has been a favorite item of discussion among population experts in Jewish social research. Prevailing opinion adopts the view that the Jewish family is smaller than that of the general native-white population. If this is so, then further evidence could be adduced concerning the relatively smaller growth of the Jewish as compared with the general population.

While size of family in the general population is important when decisions are to be made on types of housing to be provided or on the location of shopping areas, it is of particular interest for those local Jewish communities which are concerned with such questions as youth programs, leisure-time activities, location of Jewish center buildings, and related communal problems.

Average family size in the United States declined between 1930 and 1940 and probably will have become even smaller in the present decade. For example, both as a proportion of the total number of families and in absolute numbers, six-persons-and-larger families in the general population have decreased. This trend is further emphasized by the fact that the number of persons in the total population per family declined from 4.9 in 1890 to 3.8 in 1940. At the present time, the average family size for the general population

11 Table 8 would indicate that in some communities at least the proportion of divorces in the Jewish population is much smaller than in the general population.
### Table 8

**Marital Status**

**Jewish Populations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Camden</em></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>Indianapolis</em></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>Scranton</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>80.80</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>69.73</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Chicago (Per Cent)</em></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>Pittsburgh (Per Cent)</em></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>San Francisco</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>7,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>13,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Twenty years and over.
* Fifteen years and over.
* Total population. The Scranton study presented data only on a few of the indices analyzed here.
* No absolute figures available.
ranges from 3.6 to 3.8.\textsuperscript{12} Tables 9 to 12 present data on average family size in Jewish populations as revealed in the various studies published in the 1943 Robison volume and the individual community surveys being reviewed here.

A few exceptions to the uniformity of analysis which is being attempted here should be noted. In the Newark survey, the data were presented in terms of the "number of children ever born." Thus, though a child had reached maturity, married, and established his own household, he was still to be counted into this particular enumeration, even though he might now be a parent himself. A similar approach was utilized in the Charleston study; several of the earlier studies also employed this approach (see Tables 10 and 12). The United States Census Bureau also makes use of this classification; it is, however, broken down into age groups and is considered to be suggestive of fertility trends.\textsuperscript{13}

As might be expected, such Jewish communities as Miami and Tucson tend to have smaller families than the others; in each of these the two-persons family represents the largest group. While a community such as Indianapolis, which is less subject to inward migration than either Tucson or Miami, also has more two-persons families than any other group, other Jewish communities, such as Worcester, Atlanta, Camden, Utica, Toledo, and Grand Rapids, have larger family groupings. It might be thought at first that the communities with more two-persons family groupings are younger or have "incomplete" families, but the information on age structure belies this position. On the contrary, these communities are older and probably have a larger number of "completed" families. In these communities the median family size is considerably lower than in both the general population and in other Jewish communities, a fact which underscores a basically different sociological tendency; such a statistic indicates that it is the single-person and two-persons families that migrate to these cities.

The average (median) family size for the general population in the United States in 1940 was 2.65. The only Jewish community of the more recent studies which had a higher median family size was Grand Rapids with a median of 2.82 as shown in Table 9. In all other instances, the Jewish communities exhibit a lower median family size than the 2.65 average for the general population. This would seem to bear out the supposition that Jews tend to have smaller families. If we employ the 3.6-3.8 average suggested by Census Bureau sample studies then it might be stated categorically that Jewish families are smaller than families in the general population.

\textsuperscript{12} Seligman and Swados, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 656. The median family size in the 1940 census was 2.65. Cf. J. F. Dewhurst and associates, \textit{America's Needs and Resources}, p. 38. Statistical Abstract for 1948 gives a national average (population per household) for April 15, 1947, of 3.03. See Table 46, p. 46, in the \textit{Abstract}.

\textsuperscript{13} It has been suggested that this type of enumeration secures a more accurate picture of the average size of the Jewish family. However, to obtain an entirely valid analysis, it would be necessary to distinguish between "completed" and "incomplete" families; otherwise younger families which might still have children in the future would be subsumed into the total picture. Further, this approach excludes the "single person" families, which is a sociological fact of some significance. It does help, however, in giving some idea of fertility in the Jewish population.

It ought further to be noted that differences in the definitions of "household" and "family" as utilized in the various decennial censuses and in Jewish population studies may exaggerate the divergence between the average family size of Jewish and non-Jewish families. For example, grandparents may remain in the same domicile with children and grandchildren in rural and suburban areas to a greater degree than in urban areas, thus markedly increasing the average "household" size. With the Jewish population predominantly urban, and taking into account the urban predilection for small apartments, we may have here a factor explaining in part the ostensibly smaller Jewish family. This, of course, requires further investigation.
### Table 9: Family Size by Size of Family: Raw Data (Surveys Conducted in 1940's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worcester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miami</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Rapids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ulster</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arithmetic Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worcester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miami</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Rapids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ulster</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worcester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miami</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Rapids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ulster</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Children</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>No. of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>3,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,389</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>12,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>7,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>5,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,177</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>35,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arithmetic Mean: 2.19 (City), 1.90 (Suburbs)
Median: 1.53 (City), 1.33 (Suburbs)
### TABLE 10

**Family Size: Raw Data**

(Surveys Conducted in 1930's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>Pittsburgh*</th>
<th>San Francisco*</th>
<th>Buffalo*</th>
<th>Minneapolis*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>No. of Individuals</td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>No. of Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>5,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>6,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>7,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>4,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>10,107</td>
<td>28,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>Passaic*</th>
<th>Trenton*</th>
<th>New London*</th>
<th>Norwich*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>No. of Children</td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>No. of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Families classified by size.

• Families classified by number of children.

• Derived from a table of unattached persons and a table classifying families of two or more by size.

• Families with both parents classified by number of children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
<th>Tucson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
<td>Per Cent of Individuals</td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
<td>Per Cent of Individuals</td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.91</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>26.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>29.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
<th>Utica</th>
<th>Grand Rapids</th>
<th>Erie</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
<td>Per Cent of Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.85</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>30.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>16.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

FAMILY SIZE: PERCENTAGE
(Surveys Conducted in 1930's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Pittsburgh*</th>
<th>San Francisco*</th>
<th>Buffalo*</th>
<th>Minneapolis*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
<th>Passaic4</th>
<th>Trenton4</th>
<th>New London4</th>
<th>Norwich4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
<td>Per Cent of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>22.24</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Families classified by size.
*b Families classified by number of children.
*c Derived from a table of unattached persons and a table classifying families of two or more by size.
*d Families with both parents classified by number of children.
This would of course parallel age composition statistics: American Jewry is becoming older and is replenishing itself at a rate slow enough to cause concern to community leadership.

**Occupational and Industrial Classification: Economic Status**

Although the analysis of occupational status is primarily useful in evaluating economic status, occupation exerts so strong and varied an influence on demography that it is difficult to exclude it from consideration in a population study. The nature of work affects the social and cultural environment of a people; the occupation and industry into which a person enters may be affected by a special system of values; personality traits and, in the long run, marital status, health, and reproduction rates are influenced by working conditions.

The community surveys offer at best but a partial picture of the occupational and industrial patterns of American Jewry, and as is true of many of the indices described here, their data must be cautiously employed. The communities which have conducted useful studies in recent years do not represent a majority of the Jewish population in the United States; as was indicated above, the survey methods utilized varied from study to study, again impelling caution.

The failure, for example, to classify Jewish mercantile and industrial establishments according to the number of workers employed and by volume of business, as is done in the Census Bureau investigations, makes it difficult to assay the relative position of Jewish entrepreneurs in the total business community. Most authorities suggest that Jewish businessmen are to be found largely in small enterprises, a conclusion that might be established without question by data on the number of workers and volume of business. Yet, lacking such information, it is patently unfair to compare the relative number of Jews and non-Jews engaged in industry and trade.

The labor force as usually defined includes persons 14 years old and over who are working or are seeking work at the time an enumeration is made. The 1940 census classified 52.7 per cent of the general population as being in the labor force; this consisted of 76 per cent of males and 24 per cent of females. Jewish population statistics, even where community studies were made, do not yield such detail on the Jewish labor force. Whereas it is possible to say, for example, that 6.3 per cent of the male labor force in the United States is in the age groups, 14-19, no such statement can be made about the Jewish population. Were such information available it might show, for example, whether or not significant differences exist in the ages at which Jewish children enter employment.

Most of the data on labor force in the community studies reviewed here are crude and lacking in sufficient detail to warrant comparative analysis. The only survey in the older group which presented fairly adequate labor force tables were those for Buffalo (gainfully occupied), San Francisco, and Detroit. Of the later studies, only that of Newark offers usable information.14 In the

---

14 It might be noted that Camden, a heavily industrialized city, has a higher labor force ratio for the Jewish population than the other Jewish communities. This is true also in San Francisco and
## TABLE 13
### A—Labor Force—Newark (City) (1948)
**Jewish Population: Age 14 and Over**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>17,188</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>17,764</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>5,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>3,959</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,723</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B—Labor Force—Newark (Suburbs) (1948)
**Jewish Population: Age 12 and Over**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>8,251</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>8,398</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>1,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>9,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,696</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C—Labor Force—San Francisco (1938)
**Jewish Population: Age 15 and Over**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>8,838</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>3,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,478</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D—Labor Force—Detroit (1935)
**Jewish Population: Age 15 and Over**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>6,011</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,911</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E—Gainfully Employed—Buffalo (1938)
**Jewish Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor Force</td>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The data for "Not in Labor Force [Market]" and "Total" were derived by eliminating those under age 15 from the total estimated Jewish population and applying the appropriate over-all sex ratios to the remainder. The given data for employed and unemployed were then subtracted to give the "Not in Labor Force [Market]" estimates.*
### Table 14

**Employment Status**

**Jewish Labor Forces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Employers and Self-Employed</th>
<th>Unpaid Workers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wage Workers</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14A

**Estimated Percentage of Jewish Population in Labor Force**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Fourteen years of age and over.
* Eighteen years of age and over.
* Fifteen years of age and over.

In the absence of more detailed information, it would be difficult to suggest any useful generalizations on this point.

Table 14A shows the estimated percentage of the total Jewish population in the various communities listed, which may be counted as part of the labor force.

New York, both large cities and industrial centers. Also, the data on New York show a smaller proportion of the suburban Jewish population in the labor force. This raises the interesting question whether, for Jewish populations, inclusion in the labor force might not vary inversely with distance from industrial centers.
### TABLE 15

**INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION**

**JEWISH LABOR FORCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Newark (City)</th>
<th>Newark (Suburbs)</th>
<th>Jacksonville</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communication</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale-Retail Trade</td>
<td>7,401</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>38.96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>5,293</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Repair Services</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusements, Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Related Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Not Reported</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22,383</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chicago Male</th>
<th>Detroit</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>Passaic</th>
<th>Trenton</th>
<th>New London</th>
<th>Norwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>53.92</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Not Reported</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Service industries.

* All other.

* Percentages obtained by averaging percentage distributions in age groups 35-55, 45-54 and 55-64. Data derived from death certificates. See Robson, op. cit., p. 131 ff.

* Derived from estimates calculated from sample percentages.

* Includes agriculture.
In a broad sense, then, it might be said that smaller proportions of total Jewish populations are part of the labor force than is the case in the general population. Whether this is due to a longer school period for Jewish children or to more Jewish women being engaged in housework, or other factors, is difficult to say in the absence of more information.

What is required here is an analysis of the age and sex pattern of the Jewish labor force such as is done for the general labor force by the Census Bureau. Such data, too, can clarify the Jewish occupational pattern in relation to the general pattern. We do know that Jews as a group have a higher average age than their neighbors. We also know that the older age groups in this country tend to have higher proportions of professionals, semi-professionals, proprietors, managers, and officials. It seems reasonable, then, to suggest that the failure to take the age factor into account exaggerates to some degree the representation of Jews in such occupations.

Yet it is instructive to analyze occupational status; although not available for all the Jewish communities included here, it reveals some interesting disparities from general population characteristics. When the labor force was classified in 1940 into wage workers, employers and self-employed, and unpaid family workers, the greatest proportion, 77 per cent, of the general population was to be found in the first category. The employing and self-employed group represented but one-fifth of the total labor force. As would be expected, there were more female wage workers in proportion to the total female labor force than was the case among the male labor force. For urban areas the proportion of wage workers was even greater than for the general labor force in the United States. Male wage workers were 87.4 per cent of the male urban labor force; female wage workers were 92.1 per cent of the female urban labor force.

In the Jewish populations for which data are available, only the female labor force approaches the proportions found in the 1940 general labor force. This appears to be the case in Newark (city), Atlanta, Worcester, Grand Rapids, San Francisco, and Buffalo. The Jewish male labor force in most of these communities appears to be much more in the employer and self-employed class; one interesting point to be noted is that the proportion of male wage workers increases as we come closer to industrial and commercial centers, with the highest percentage being found in Buffalo. If one were to attempt a broad generalization with respect to employment status, it might be suggested that in the middle-sized towns the tendency in the Jewish labor force is in the direction of the "employer and self-employed" category.

Classifications by industry, while not always of a uniform character, were made in most of the older studies and in four of the more recent ones. They indicate a predilection on the part of the Jewish labor force for the wholesale and retail trades. Whether any definite geographic pattern underlies the rather wide range of participation in such industries (from 33 per cent in the city of Newark to 63 per cent in Jacksonville) is difficult to estimate at the present time. Yet it has been suggested that the emphasis on the trades tends to decline in the larger population and industrial centers. In the latter type of community (such as Worcester, Newark, Detroit, and Passaic) where some great manufacturing industry dominates the economic and social life of the
### TABLE 16

**OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION**

**JEWISH LABOR FORCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Workers</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Semi-Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors, Managers, Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales, Kindred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman, Foremen, Kindred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, Kindred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service (except</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (incl. farm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Workers</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Semi-Professional</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors, Managers, Officials</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>46.99</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>46.49</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>52.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales, Kindred</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>24.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman, Foremen, Kindred</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, Kindred</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service (except</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (incl. farm)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>432</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Workers</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Semi-Professional</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors, Managers, Officials</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales, Kindred</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman, Foremen, Kindred</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, Kindred</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Service (except</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (incl. farm)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Town, a fairly large proportion of the Jewish labor force, together with general labor, will be found to be part of the community's industrial organization. Examination of Table 15 shows this to be true of Atlanta, Newark, Worcester, Chicago, Detroit, Passaic, Trenton, Pittsburgh, New London, and Norwich.

It has been often remarked that, in addition to the trades, Jews are to be found most heavily in the professions. Yet, in the community studies which
provide such information, the manufacturing group is greater than the professional group in seven cases, while the reverse is true in but four instances (see Table 15). This, taken together with the information in Table 16, indicates that the vaunted occupational emphasis of Jews on the professions as compared with other occupations is considerably less than the stereotype.

There is no denying the fact that the industrial distribution of the Jewish labor force exhibits marked differences from the distribution in the general population. While 20.8 per cent of the general population labor force in 1940 was found to be engaged in the extractive industries (agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining), the percentages for Jewish communities range from .02 per cent to .16 per cent. This particular variation, however, can be ascribed to the urban character of the Jewish population. In many of the Jewish communities, the percentage of the labor force engaged in trade is over 50 per cent; in the general population it is 16.7 per cent. For manufacturing, the percentage figures are much closer: 23.4 per cent for the general population as compared with such figures as 20.8 per cent in Worcester, 33.8 per cent in Chicago (male population), 22.8 per cent in Detroit, 22.7 per cent in Norwich, and 22.5 per cent in Passaic.15

Examining the classification of the Jewish labor force by occupation (Table 16), we find the major clusters to be around “clerical, sales, and kindred workers,” “proprietors, managers, and officials,” and “professional and semi-professional workers.” The other classifications are apparently less significant for the Jewish populations; on the other hand, population data for the United States show clerical work to be fourth in importance and professional positions seventh. Proprietorship ranks second generally, as was the case in four Jewish communities during the decade of the thirties. In more recent years proprietorship has been of first rank in all but one of the Jewish population studies included here, with clerical occupations second and professional work in third position (see Table 17). Kingsley Davis once suggested that Jewish immigrants started in the trades and then educated their children for the professions; this, however, does not seem to be the complete explanation, for it overlooks the relatively high proportion of Jews in the clerical and sales field. Hence, this pattern requires some modification of the usual stereotype.

Aside from some percentage distribution for a few communities, the lack of complete and fully comparable data makes it virtually impossible to develop an adequate picture of trade or professional occupation breakdowns for all the studies included here. What seems to be characteristic, despite the concentration on retail trade as opposed to wholesale trade (as in the Newark suburbs, Worcester, Jacksonville, Portland, San Francisco, Passaic, Trenton, and Norwich) is the smaller ratio for the former as compared with the United States as a whole. In most of the Jewish communities the proportion of those engaged in trade who were in retail enterprises approximated 75 per cent; in the United States the number in retail trades approximated 85 per cent.

15 This by no means implies that the Jewish population exhibits an “hereditary” predilection for certain occupations and industries. It should be obvious that the reasons why Jews follow particular pursuits must be ascertained through economic, social, and political inquiry. Some social scientists have argued that other ethnic groups also exhibit special tastes in occupational patterns. See L. Rosenberg, Canada’s Jews (Canadian Jewish Congress, 1939) chap. xv., p. 151 ff., and W. L. Warner and L. Srole, Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups (Yale University Press, 1945) chap. iv, p. 55 ff.
**TABLE 17**

**Occupational Rank**

**Jewish Labor Forces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional and Semi-Prof.</th>
<th>Proprietors Managers Officials</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Craftsmen, Foremen</th>
<th>Operatives</th>
<th>Protective Service</th>
<th>Other Service</th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| U.S. General Labor Force (1940) | 7   | 2   | 4  | 5  | 1  | 9  | 6  | 3  | 8  |

*Sources: Community population studies; Robson, *op. cit.*, and *Statistical Abstract*, 1948, p. 179, Table 205.*
industry breakdowns were given, it seemed clear that the most popular enterprises were food, clothing, furniture, and dry goods establishments. There are insufficient occupational data, however, to set this forth as a general or usual pattern.16

A few of the studies also classified that part of the Jewish labor force engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries in terms of specific industries (Newark, Miami, Portland, Detroit, Passaic). Again, the food processing, textile, and clothing industries appear predominant. In Detroit, the automobile industry, the major industrial activity, absorbed more than one-third of the Jewish workers who were in manufacturing.

A detailed percentage classification of Jewish professional and semi-professional workers is given in Table 18. This tabulation indicates that the most popular professions are medicine, law, dentistry, and teaching. This is not unexpected in view of the traditional system of values with which Jewish persons have frequently measured these occupations. Aside from teaching, which probably derives its high status value (despite the notoriously low remuneration) from the characteristic respect for learning to be found among Jewish parents, these professions possess certain common features: there are more latitude, more independent action, and more freedom from petty discriminations in these professions than in others, with the result that Jewish students tend to enter them.

Occupation represents but one index of economic condition: To fully describe the position of Jews in the American economy, one would have to know the income levels of Jewish groups, their buying and consuming habits, and a variety of other indices of economic position. Such data, however, are extremely difficult to obtain in a survey; they are the kind of information that only the tax collector seems able to secure. One research expert once remarked in connection with opinion polling: "People do not always give their true opinions even to a stranger who does not know their names and addresses and has no way of checking up on them again." 17 How much more difficult it is, then, to obtain income and other economic data which in this country is considered confidential.18

Only one comparative measure of economic position, and that a rather crude one, is available for some of the population studies: home ownership. For the general population of the United States, owner-occupied dwelling units represent 43.6 per cent as compared with 56.4 per cent for tenant-occupied units. In the nine studies on Jewish population tenant-occupied units range from 27.0 per cent in Camden to 74.3 per cent in Worcester; owner-occupied homes, however, are more than half the reported cases in six of the communities (see Table 19). This information by itself does not lend itself to further interpretation, for one must know mortgage values, rentals paid, size of dwellings, heating, and sanitation facilities, as well as home ownership patterns in the entire community.

16 Cf. Statistical Abstract, 1948, Table 208, p. 193. The only studies which provided such detailed information were those for Newark, Portland, and Charleston.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>City(^a)</th>
<th>Suburbs(^b)</th>
<th>Miami</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Buffalo</th>
<th>Passaic</th>
<th>Trenton</th>
<th>New London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physicians and Surgeons</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys and Judges</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>nc(^b)</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses and Medical Assistants</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbis and Cantors</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists, Pharmacists, Engineers,</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
<td>nc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists, Musicians, Writers, etc.</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Figures given are for male population only.
\(^b\) Not classified.
Education: Secular and Religious

The various studies under review yield less and less information once the reader leaves behind such demographic measures as age, sex, and occupation. The reasons why investigators have not looked into such population characteristics as education, religious preference, and the like with the same thoroughness as with other measures of population, are varied: inadequately designed questionnaires, feelings that certain questions might be considered ill-advised in the enumeration, or simply a lack of funds and time. One investigator, after completing a detailed analysis of age composition and occupation, remarked: "This concludes the analysis of the statistics that were drawn from the schedules. Material of population mobility and length of residence . . . did not yield data of sufficient accuracy to justify statistical analysis." While this in itself might have indicated some weakness in the original questionnaire, the investigator apparently felt that age and occupational information were sufficient.

### TABLE 19

**Home Ownership**

**Jewish Populations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Tenant-occupied</th>
<th>Owner-occupied</th>
<th>No Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
<td>No. of Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark City</td>
<td>9,829 60.7</td>
<td>3,969 24.5</td>
<td>2,402 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>4,166 55.5</td>
<td>3,344 44.5</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>209 44.5</td>
<td>254 54.0</td>
<td>7 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>2,030 74.3</td>
<td>702 25.7</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>89 27.0</td>
<td>238 72.1</td>
<td>3 .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>816 40.5</td>
<td>1,201 59.5</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>112 35.6</td>
<td>203 64.4</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>448 43.6</td>
<td>538 52.3</td>
<td>42 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>117 36.3</td>
<td>205 63.7</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for secular education, some data were available in seven of the more recent studies; none of the older studies yielded usable information. To demographic experts, educational attainment represents a rough measure of population quality; it also indicates in a large measure the efforts a community makes on behalf of its growing generation.

Comparisons of educational attainment between the Jewish populations and the general native-white population in the United States are difficult: the data in the Jewish community studies are seldom set up by age groups, and there often exist inconsistencies in the lower age limits.\(^\text{19}\) It would also have been useful if all the studies set up the information by sex. However, only three studies set forth the data in this way: Worcester, Newark, and Indianapolis. The Worcester study also provided educational information by native and foreign-born persons.

For the general native-white population in the United States, the average

---

\(^{19}\) It is because of this that the columns in Table 20 are not strictly comparable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education: Percentage Distribution</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Education</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Elementary School without graduation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from Elementary School</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended High School without graduation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from High School</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended College without graduation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from College</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Post Graduate or Professional School</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b Does not give age limit.

c Persons 25 years of age and over.

d Persons 18 years of age and over.

e Persons 20 years of age and over.

f Includes junior high school.

* Includes persons in age group 5-24.
(median) number of years of school completed (for persons 25 years old and over) in 1940 was 8.8 years. To judge from the data in Table 20, the average for the Jewish populations is a higher one. While a lack of sufficient data prevents the computation of exact medians, inspection indicates that the average in these studies would fall into the high school and/or high school graduate group. Furthermore, the proportions of the Jewish populations for high school and college are somewhat higher than in the general population. The few cases which show the data by sex reveal nothing that might be interpreted as a notable difference as between males and females. In Worcester, where data were available for native and foreign-born, the median year of general schooling completed for the latter group was from 2 to 3, with a large number reporting no formal general education. However, the data on Jewish education of adults in that community indicate a median age for Jewish schooling of 4.2 years, so that while the foreign groups in Worcester had little formal general education, Jewish education may have served as a substitute (see Table 22 A and B).

With respect to Jewish education of both children and adults there is again a dearth of information. Only the studies for Newark (city and suburbs), Camden, Indianapolis, and Utica provide information on this point (see Table 21). One conclusion is evident: the majority of Jewish children in these communities receive their Jewish education through weekday and Sunday schooling and not through all-day parochial schools. Two of these studies, Camden and Utica, indicated the number of years of Jewish schooling for those over six years of age. The average (median) number of years of Jewish education were 1.2 and 1.6 respectively. For adults also, we find but sparse information on Jewish education. Again, as indicated in Table 22, weekday and Sunday schools were the major means through which Jewish education was obtained; however, the older generation, at least in Camden, appears to have a higher proportion of adults who had attended yeshivot or parochial schools. Also, for two communities where data by years of Jewish education were available—Worcester and Indianapolis—the adult groups, which consisted of persons 18 years and older, had an average (median) number of years of Jewish education of 4.3 and 5.5 years respectively.

What is perhaps most interesting in these statistics on Jewish education, is the large percentage of persons for whom we have information who receive or have received no instruction. Table 22 shows that in Atlanta 11.8 per cent of adults reporting received no Jewish training. For the age group 6 to 16, the Utica study revealed that 23.7 per cent of those reported on received no Jewish instruction; in Camden, this figure rose to 31.5 per cent. In the Jacksonville study it was reported that one out of three children between the ages of six and sixteen did not attend either Hebrew school or Sunday School. If these ratios are indicative of a general pattern, then it might be suggested that perhaps one-fifth to one-third of American Jews receive no instruction in things Jewish.

For a more detailed analysis of Jewish education, see the periodic reports of the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE), especially All-Day Schools in the United States; 1948-1949 by U. Z. Engelman and C. M. Horowitz, March, 1949.

The Camden data were for 6-13 years; in the Utica study the age range was 6-16 years.
This situation was felt to be sufficient cause for further investigation in at least two Jewish communities—Newark and Utica. In Utica it was found that of 363 children between the ages of six and fifteen, almost half did not attend any Jewish school, although 79 of these 165 non-attenders did receive some Jewish instruction. The reasons given by parents for this non-attendance ranged from "had enough" and "child has too much to do" to "don't like present program." In Newark it was found that the vast majority of parents were either enthusiastic or satisfied with the program of Jewish education; critical responses were but 24 per cent in the city of Newark and 17.7 per cent in the suburbs. Here, too, inquiry was also made on the type of Jewish education planned for children in the future.  

TABLE 21  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Newark City</th>
<th>Newark Suburbs</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
<th>Utica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday or Weekday and Sunday</td>
<td>87.58(^b)</td>
<td>54.85(^e)</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>64.98(^f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday School</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>36.07</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>33.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Instruction</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish School</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes persons 6-16 years old.
\(^b\) Includes afternoon and all-day school.
\(^c\) Afternoon school.
\(^d\) Includes persons 6-13 years of age.
\(^e\) Includes persons 5-14 years of age.
\(^f\) Includes 3-day-a-week and 5-day-a-week schools.

Nativity and Citizenship

Although the decennial census makes no classification according to religious denomination, classification of the population by nativity is one of its major subdivisions. For the white population, a division is made into native white and foreign-born white, and in the 1930 census especially, the native-white population was further subdivided into persons of native parentage and those of foreign or mixed parentage. Classifications by country of origin and by mother tongue of the foreign-born population have also provided useful information. 

22 These questions illustrate the tremendous possibilities existing in Jewish communities for opinion polling on specific problems. With the development of demographic data on age, sex, residence, and the like, the necessary control factors for stratified sampling can be made available. This would then make it possible to utilize small samples for the purpose of discovering what the members of the community think about a center program, leisure-time activity, an aged or health program, etc.

### TABLE 22

**Jewish Education of Adults**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A—Years of Instruction</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 or more) 10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Instruction</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unknown) No reply</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B—Type of Instruction: Per Cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instruction</th>
<th>Atlanta</th>
<th>Camden</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Instruction</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday School</td>
<td>25.49d</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>30.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday School</td>
<td>18.19*</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>43.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish School</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva (Parochial School)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Instruction</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>21.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Includes persons 15 years of age and over.

*b* Includes persons 19 years of age and over.

*c* Includes persons 5 years of age and over.

*d* Includes Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Sunday Schools.

*e* Includes Congregational school, Hebrew school, and Talmud Torah.
### TABLE 23a—Classification by Country of Birth, Jewish Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newark (City)</th>
<th>Newark (Suburb)</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>Charleston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent of Foreign Born</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,070</td>
<td>68.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,957b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine and Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8,795</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>3,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,014c</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign Born</td>
<td>17,730c</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,800</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scranton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total</th>
<th>Per Cent of Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>65.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pittsburgh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total</th>
<th>Per Cent of Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>63.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buffalo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total</th>
<th>Per Cent of Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>9,264</td>
<td>64.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td></td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Francisco**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total</th>
<th>Per Cent of Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign Born</td>
<td>9,469</td>
<td>56.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

* Miami presented data by place of former residence of heads of families, showing 120 of 6,093 family heads with previous residence outside U.S.
* Adjusted for error of 19 in computation of total foreign born.
* Adjusted for error of 1.
* Excluding of "No Information."
General data, other than local community studies, on the national origin of the American Jewish population are of course not available. At times, researchers have equated the Jewish population in an area with Russian immigrants. This certainly is not a valid procedure, and in the absence of continued immigration from Eastern Europe becomes even less valid and less useful as time goes on. Also, the mother tongue classification in the decennial census is apparently becoming a less fruitful source of information. The best source of information on this question, then, would be the various community population studies. Unfortunately, less than a third of the surveys reviewed here sought information on nativity and citizenship. However, the data that was obtained (in Newark, Worcester, Charleston, Scranton, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Buffalo) is of considerable interest (see Tables 23 and 24).

In the more recent surveys (Newark—city and suburbs, Worcester, Charleston, and Scranton) the proportion of native born in the Jewish population ranged from 63.7 per cent to 77.8 per cent. As might be expected, the proportions of native born in the three older surveys (Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Buffalo) are smaller, yet in these communities too the native born represented over half the Jewish population. In four of the five studies, the largest proportion of foreign born, ranging from 30.8 per cent in Charleston to 67.2 per cent in Worcester, indicated that they came from Russia; in Charleston, the greatest percentage stated their origin to be Poland. Other major areas listed as birthplaces were Austria, Lithuania, Rumania, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. The three older studies which provided data on this point indicated a similar pattern.

A few of the investigators obtained data on citizenship status of the foreign born. In the three recent studies which gave this information the percentages of foreign born who were now citizens were 82.3 in Scranton, 68.9 in Erie, and 89 per cent in Jacksonville. These figures are considerably higher than the 73 to 77 per cent which were obtained in the older population studies in Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Passaic, and Trenton.

The increasing proportions of native born to foreign born show the effects of lower migration; the recent influx under President Harry S. Truman's Directive of 1945 and the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which amounts to a little over 1 per cent of the total estimated Jewish population in this country, will hardly alter this tendency. And the increasing citizenship percentages together with the declining importance of Yiddish as a mother tongue may be indicative of a high degree of assimilability.

Communal Activity

As indicated in the section on education, not very many of the surveyors took the opportunity made available by a population study to seek responses

---

24 An example of outright identification of persons of Russian origin as Jewish may be found in Social Areas of Los Angeles, by E. Shcvky and M. Williams, published by the University of California Press.

25 Yiddish-speaking groups appear to perpetuate their native tongues to a lesser degree in the second and succeeding generations than in other groups; Cf. T. L. Smith, Population Analysis, (McGraw-Hill, 1948), p. 86.

26 See Table 21. The Jacksonville report indicates that 75 per cent of Jews in that community were native born.

27 See Table 24. In Jacksonville 89 per cent of the foreign born were said to be naturalized citizens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scranton</th>
<th>Erie</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Passaic</th>
<th>Trenton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized Citizen</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>68.88</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen by Relationship</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Papers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alien</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>16.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Persons over 21 years of age.
on attitudes and activities. However, the Newark, Atlanta, Camden, Indianapolis, and Grand Rapids surveys did try to obtain information on certain phases of communal life, particularly on membership organizations and leisure-time activity.

Comparisons between the communities cannot be made, for one cannot be certain that organizational definitions and classifications are similar. It could be suggested however that fraternal and congregational bodies are the kind of organizations to which most persons in the community turn. In some, Zionist organizations are also well represented. Generally speaking, the average (median) number of organizations to which individuals affiliate ranges between one and two, although there are a few persons in each community who have joined as many as ten membership groups. The data on this aspect however is as yet too sparse to yield valid generalizations.28

Vital Statistics: Fertility and Mortality

The central fact in all demographic studies is the rapidity with which a population reproduces itself. While statistics on age composition and changes in age structure lead to the surmise that Jewish population growth in this country is rapidly declining, conclusive evidence on this can be supplied only through specific measurements of births and deaths. Without such information it is virtually impossible to determine the dynamic changes taking place. Unfortunately, data on births are quite faulty; it is a known fact that birth registration statistics are often incomplete, especially in small areas. This makes the ordinary birth rate of doubtful validity. Furthermore, for Jewish populations a birth rate would be even more dubious since the estimates of total Jewish population itself are so often open to question. In addition, registration of births by Jewish communities has seldom been attempted.

A more satisfactory approach at the present time is the fertility ratio, defined as the number of children under the age of 5 per 1,000 women of child-bearing age. An alternative concept is the number of young children per 1,000 persons of procreative age. These indices are easily derived from the data on age structure and are set forth in Table 25. In all but one case (Charleston) the fertility ratios for Jewish populations computed on either basis are lower than the figure for the general white population of the United States. A second outstanding point shown in Table 25 is the fact that the earlier surveys revealed lower fertility ratios than those conducted in the 1940’s. However, we should not conclude from this that Jewish births will continue to increase; the spurt in fertility was but a wartime phenomenon affecting Jewish as well as general populations. According to a recent Census Bureau report, the American birth rate in the last two years has already begun to decline.29 The probability is that the fertility trend in the Jewish population will decline in the coming years.

Some further materials on Jewish population growth are available through
the studies made by Nathan Goldberg. Goldberg employs the data gathered by the U. S. Census Bureau on the “number of children ever born according to the country of origin of the female respondents.” From this, Goldberg suggests that the birth rate for the Jewish population is declining. The younger generation of Jewish immigrants, he says, had a lower birth rate than the native-white population, and the downward trend in the birth rate for younger age groups was more pronounced for the Jewish than for the non-Jewish population. Goldberg states: “In the twenty years to 1940, the Jewish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FERTILITY RATIOS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEWISH POPULATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children per 1,000</th>
<th>Children per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>females age 20-44</td>
<td>persons age 20-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. (white—general) 1940</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>153.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 1945—forecast</td>
<td>470.6</td>
<td>181.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>134.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>189.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>380.0</td>
<td>147.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>120.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>329.9</td>
<td>135.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>387.7</td>
<td>139.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>354.6</td>
<td>138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>399.8</td>
<td>147.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>395.3</td>
<td>142.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>524.2</td>
<td>201.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>381.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>359.1</td>
<td>129.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>283.6</td>
<td>115.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>262.7</td>
<td>107.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>238.9</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>122.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sources: Smith, op. cit., X; Forecasts of the Population of the United States, 1945-75, by P. K. Whelpton and associates (United States Department of Commerce, 1947), and community studies of Jewish populations.

birth rate fell 37 per cent. This decline was more than double the 15 per cent fall in the birth rate of the native white population.”

It is unfortunate that little more than the foregoing can be said about birth rates and fertility of the Jewish population in this country. Mr. Goldberg’s analyses, while valuable, have become less useful with time because the number of persons reporting Yiddish as a mother tongue declines in each succeeding generation. Furthermore, these data cannot be employed to develop specifically Jewish mortality rates because the foreign-born population has now moved up the age ladder to a point where high death rates apply.
The kind of data on natural growth that ought to be developed is illustrated by the brief study of Jewish population increase in Montreal prepared by Louis Rosenberg of the Canadian Jewish Congress. In this report vital statistics were available for Jewish and two other ethnic groups in Montreal; it was noted that the rate of natural increase decreased from 1911 to 1946 among all groups, but more so for the Jewish population. It has as yet been impossible to construct tables of life expectancy for Jewish populations such as was done for Canada by Mortimer Spiegelman, assistant statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. To compute such tables it is essential to have age-specific mortality rates, data which again are lacking for Jewish communities in the United States.

Previous studies of Jewish mortality, aside from Canada, have all had inherent weaknesses which made their conclusions dubious. However, the one general pattern that seems to be characteristic is the relatively lower death rates for Jews as compared with other groups up to middle age, with mortality increasing in old age. This conclusion was arrived at in the Canadian study as well as by Goldberg.

**Internal Migration**

Movements of large masses of population have always been events of considerable meaning for society. The surge across the North American continent by the white man, the migrations of East Europeans in the 1880's, the exchanges of populations after the great wars, have affected social processes as well as individuals. In these gigantic waves in which people sought new homes and escaped old ones there arose problems of status, position, adjustment, and acclimatization. Today there are problems of carry-over from one generation to the next, with tension existing between parent and child, and movement from small cities to large cities, from large cities to suburbs.

However, the largest part of the movements of people consists of “milling around in local areas.” This is probably true also for the Jewish populations. In five Jewish communities in which data on planning to move were obtained, those who indicated a move to some other city ranged from 2.3 per cent in Newark (suburbs) to 17.3 per cent in Camden (see Table 26). By far the greatest proportion moving said that they would remain in their respective cities, although high “uncertain” percentages were recorded.

None of the Jewish community studies offered information on “state of birth,” which can be used to demonstrate internal migration, at least for the native-born Jewish population. A number of the surveys did, however, include data on length of residence. Table 27 shows the median number of years of residence in the Jewish communities which presented such information. In the earlier studies, the average (median) length of residence ranged from 13.2 in Norwich to 24.0 in New London; the more recent studies indicate a slightly

---

30 Information and Comment, No. 7, June 1948, published by Canadian Jewish Congress.
32 The writer suggests that specific death rates for Jewish populations might be arrived at through a population survey by asking respondents for information on recent deaths in the family. This implies, of course, a well-designed questionnaire as well as skillful interviewing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning to Move</th>
<th>Newark (City)(^a)</th>
<th>Newark (Suburbs)(^a)</th>
<th>Camden(^b)</th>
<th>Indianapolis(^c)</th>
<th>Utica(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside City</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information—Uncertain</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>41.16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Planning to Move</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Planning to Move</td>
<td>13,604</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>87.54</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning to Move</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information—Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8,173</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Families.
\(^b\) Planning to move to Newark City.
\(^c\) Heads of families.
\(^d\) No definite number is given for families "not planning to move," so it is assumed that all families not listed as "planning to move" are "not planning to move."
higher average, with the exception of Miami, in which the average (median) is but 5.1 years. About 70 per cent of the Miami Jewish population was estimated to have resided there less than ten years. This may be contrasted with Indianapolis where about one-fourth of the Jewish population has been in residence for ten years or less. Such figures, of course, emphasize the tremendously rapid growth of Miami’s Jewish population in the last decade.

Yet these data fail to tell us anything really significant about the internal migration of Jews in the United States. We cannot say that Jews are moving out of the large metropolitan areas to smaller communities, and if so, whether such persons are young or old, or middle-aged; nor can we say that young Jewish persons prefer the big city. In a general way, it is noted that Miami and Tucson’s rapid growth in Jewish population is probably due to inward migration from other areas. But the character of that migration, an important local question, is unknown. Yet these are the questions which might have important implications for community planning. Internal migration, like the other demographic features of American Jews, remains to be explored.

### Table 27

**Average Length of Residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Median No. Years of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>25.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>25.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>23.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>28.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>21.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>17.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>20.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>23.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>24.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of years of residence of family in Essex County.
* Number of years of residence of family in Dade County.
* Number of years of residence of family in city.
* Foreign born by number of years in city.
* Husbands and wives (excluding those born in San Francisco) by number of years in San Francisco.
* Individuals by number of years in city.
* Native born by number of years in city.

Conclusion

What then stands out in this rather large collection of conglomerate data? It is clear that the Jewish population in the United States is an aging one, and one which probably is replenishing itself at a rate slower than the general population. It is also clear that Jews are predominantly an urban population; those who go to the smaller towns do so for the sake of a greater measure of economic independence. The latter, too, motivates to some degree the urge
to have smaller families; and most of the indications are that Jews do tend to have fewer children.

It ought to be noted that most of the communities for which occupational and economic data are available are the so-called intermediate cities with total populations ranging from 71,000 for Charleston, S. C., to more than 430,000 for Newark. It is in these communities that the Jewish population tends toward commerce and trade. In the larger cities, such as New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia (for which the data on Jewish demography is either too old to be useful or nonexistent, but where the largest number of Jews do reside) the probability is that the occupational pattern among Jews comes much closer to that of the total population.

While it might be said that the foregoing data on age, sex, and occupation are fairly extensive and usable, the same cannot be said of the other demographic measures. Communities are not interested in the same social problems; or if they are, they do not ask the same questions; or if they do, the data are not uniformly presented. Thus, while one survey will inquire about Jewish education, it may fail to relate this aspect to other significant population features, such as age, sex, or general educational levels. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that a uniform, standard approach to the problem of Jewish demography is desirable; this would not only provide more reliable information for national bodies, but would also permit the development of information for local community organizations. These agencies need not only population data; they need information on attitudes and opinions; they need to know what people in local communities are thinking.

Ben B. Seligman
ECONOMIC STATUS AND OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

Information on the occupational structure of American Jews is unfortunately limited to occasional studies undertaken by individual communities, supplemented by periodic national surveys of specific occupations or problems, and by the judgments of informed observers. Whatever conclusions may be obtained in these ways must be accepted with reservations. Community studies, for example, while providing some insight into the economic structure of American Jewry, do not cover all Jewish communities, or enough areas so that a complete picture might be obtained. Furthermore, as is admitted by most authorities, the quality of and methodology in these studies vary.¹

The gaps in our knowledge suggest the need for more serious attention to a comprehensive scientific inquiry into the position of the Jew in the American economy. Defense against the hate-monger’s falsehoods, while important, is not the only justification for such an investigation. It is needed to enrich our own understanding, to improve our programs of service and action in this sphere, and to anticipate and prepare for future trends.

The occupational preferences of the Jews are to a very large extent the result of their socio-cultural heritage, the attitude of others toward them, and the economic development of the countries in which they live. Because of religious considerations, Jews have preferred to live and work in places where they could observe the Sabbath, dietary laws, and other traditions and customs. They consequently tended in the past to patronize their own butchers, bakers, tailors, and teachers. The various laws regulating their domicile, economic activities, sources of income, and property rights have had a definite effect on the development of their economic behavior. They have been forced to enter the peripheral and marginal economic areas, those in which the members of the majority group have not been sufficiently interested either because they were comparatively less lucrative or because of the social stigma attached to them. As “marginal men,” Jews have not infrequently been led to invest in risky commercial and industrial enterprises, as typified by the early days of the motion picture industry in this country. Necessity has taught them to keep their capital fluid and to be on the alert for new economic opportunities, to take chances, to experiment, and to pioneer.

Early Immigration

In Colonial America, the chief economic contribution of the small Jewish community appeared to be in foreign trade, which was a vital necessity in a predominately agricultural economy. Because they were prohibited from engaging in retail enterprises, the Jews in New York were especially active in inter-colonial trade.

¹ See p. 23.
In early America, Jews also played an important role in the sperm oil and candle industry. There were Jews who were bankers, butchers, tailors, shoemakers, braziers, soap boilers, brass workers, goldsmiths, watchmakers, saddlers, and distillers. Others were shipowners and brokers. Some of the Jews in the South were vine growers, while others raised rice, cotton, corn, tobacco, and indigo.

The Jews who migrated to America from 1820 to 1860 were largely of German origin. They sought freedom in a vigorously expanding economy; they were determined to achieve a permanent and secure adjustment for themselves and their children. In terms of economic activity, most spectacular were the Jewish immigrants who began their occupational life in America as peddlers in urban and rural communities on the Atlantic coast, in the South, and in the Midwestern states; others followed the covered wagons headed for the West. Many carried packs on their backs; the more successful used horse-drawn wagons. In time, they opened stores in the settlements in which they had peddled. In addition to their contribution to the development of American commerce at that time, these stores provided the modest beginnings of many of today's leading department stores. Some of these successful merchants subsequently became brokers and bankers. Others became manufacturers of clothing, underwear, cigars, and many other articles. With very few exceptions, Jewish manufacturers and merchants were engaged either in the production or distribution of consumer goods.

However, not all Jewish immigrants commenced as peddlers and graduated to prosperous merchants, bankers, or manufacturers. A good number were skilled, semi- or unskilled workers—not only butchers, bakers, and tailors, but also machinists, metal workers, gold and silversmiths, carpenters and cabinet makers, paper hangers, painters, glaziers, printers, cigar makers, and the like. Few of them were professionals or farmers.

In 1889 a survey of 18,115 gainfully-employed Jewish males, more than four-fifths of whom were either immigrants from German-speaking countries or their American-born children, revealed that most of them were engaged in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail business</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants, bookkeepers, clerks, copyists</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale business</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled and semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesmen and commercial travelers</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers, brokers, and company officials</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors, auctioneers, and agents</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, stock raisers, drovers</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH MALES IN 1889, BY PERCENTAGE

---

commercial pursuits, as shown in Table 1. It is interesting to note that not more than 0.9 per cent of them were hucksters and peddlers and that only 3 per cent were tailors. It is not known, however, whether this group constituted a representative sample.

**Eastern-European Immigration**

The economic situation confronting Eastern-European Jews, who began to arrive here in large numbers in the 1880's, was quite different, however, from that which existed during the earlier period of German Jewish migration. The American economy was at that time undergoing some important changes: the westward movement was coming to an end; large urban and metropolitan centers were beginning to develop as millions of immigrants began to stream to American shores; new inventions were making a larger variety of goods available and changing the habits of American consumers; the output of commodities was increasing at the same time as the cost of production was declining; better means of transportation were facilitating the widespread distribution of goods, while the number of those in manufacturing, trade, transportation, communication, and in clerical and professional occupations was steadily increasing; and department and chain stores, corporations, trusts, and monopolies were beginning to play an important role in American life.

Unlike the immigrants from Germany, Eastern-European Jewish immigrants preferred to remain where they had landed or to settle in some other large city. At the beginning of this mass immigration, the large cities on the Eastern coast in particular already had relatively large Jewish communities. New immigrants apparently felt more at home and more secure among their own, and probably thought that they had a better chance of finding employment in factories and stores owned by Jews. Orthodox Jews actually preferred to work in places where they could observe the Sabbath and other religious customs and traditions and to live where it was possible to observe the dietary laws. Others remained in the large cities because of the colleges and professional schools which they wished to attend or because of their general interest in the arts and sciences.

---

Most of these later immigrants began as wage workers. Table 2 is based on the 1900 census data concerning 143,337 gainfully employed persons classed as “Russians,” virtually all of whom were Jewish, who lived in the seven largest cities (New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis).

About 36 per cent of the total worked in the apparel industry. They constituted 27 per cent of the shirt, collar, and cuff makers, 29 per cent of the tailors and seamstresses, and 34.5 per cent of the persons employed in the hat and cap industries, although the “Russians” accounted for only 3.9 per cent of the gainfully employed in these seven cities. A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants from the other Eastern-European countries worked in the same industries.

Another 25 per cent worked in other industries. Thus, 3.4 per cent were in the tobacco industry; 2.6 per cent were metal workers; about 2 per cent were in the leather industry; 4 per cent were in the building trades. About three-fifths of the entire group were in the manufacturing and construction industries.

Of all the gainfully employed, less than 5 per cent of the total—4.7 per cent—were peddlers; they constituted about one-fourth of all the hucksters and peddlers in these cities. One out of ten was an owner of some retail store. About 4 per cent were salesmen and saleswomen. All of the other occupations combined, excluding manufacturing and trade, comprised about 20 per cent of the total group. The especially light representation in the professions was probably due to the fact that not many immigrants knew English and few of them had had an opportunity to obtain professional training.

The apparent concentration of Jewish immigrants in the apparel industry may be explained by several factors. A relatively large number of these immigrants were originally needle workers; it was also possible to learn this kind of work in a short time. Also, many of the clothing manufacturers were Jews who had successfully entered an industry which happened to be located in the large cities where Jews had settled. But not all were satisfied to remain in the garment industries. Those who were able to save enough succeeded in becoming owners of small stores or shops in a Jewish neighborhood. Others were determined to become physicians, dentists, lawyers, engineers, teachers, or artists. Virtually all tried to improve the status of their children. Thus, even in 1900, according to the United States Census Bureau, the American-born sons of the “Russians,” most of whom were Jews, had six times as many lawyers and seven times as many bookkeepers and accountants, but only one-third as many garment and millinery workers and cap makers, as the Russian-born immigrants. Similarly, there were five times as many stenographers and typists among the native-born daughters of the “Russians,” three times as many clerks and copyists, and about twice as many saleswomen, but only about one-half as many garment workers, as the “Russian-born” women.

Jewish immigrants sent their children to college and to the several professional schools in increasing numbers. In the academic year 1908-1909, according to the United States Immigration Commission, 95 per cent of the

---

5 United States Immigration Commission, Reports, XXVIII, Table IVa-IVb.
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foreign-born students at the College of the City of New York (CCNY), 35 per cent of such students at Columbia University, and almost 30 per cent of the foreign-born students at Harvard University, were Jewish immigrants. Native-born Jews of foreign parentage constituted at that time about four-fifths of the American-born students of immigrant parents at CCNY and about one-fifth of such students at Columbia and Harvard. Many of them were enrolled in medical, dental, pharmacy, and law schools.

Between Two Wars

In the years between the two world wars, several changes occurred in the occupational distribution of the American Jews. The proportion of those in manufacturing declined, while the percentage of those in trade, clerical occupations, public service, and in the several professions increased. Similar changes took place in the occupational distribution of the general population, the trend being from the farm and factory to the office and store.

INDUSTRY

Jews continued to be located primarily in the “light” industries and consumer-goods industries. It was estimated, for instance, that three-fourths of the New York City Jews engaged in manufacturing in 1937 were in the clothing and headwear industries, where they constituted more than one-half of the total number employed in these industries. According to the same estimate, 6 per cent of the New York City Jews in industry were furriers, and they constituted about four-fifths of those in the fur industry; approximately one-fifth of the New Yorkers engaged in the production of food and kindred products were Jewish. However, only 18 per cent of those in the metal and metal products industries, and not more than 4 per cent of those in the machine shop industry, were Jewish. The industrial concentration of Jews in other communities was in many respects similar to that of the New York group.

TRADE

In trade, Jews were to be found engaged in the distribution of consumer and non-durable goods. In New York City, it was estimated in 1937 that Jews constituted about 80 per cent of those in the retail apparel business, almost two-thirds of the druggists, and about three-fifths of those in the retail food business; only about one-third of the proprietors of wholesale establishments and their employees were Jews.

PROFESSIONS

In the professions Jews seemed to prefer those in which they could be self-employed—medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, law. According to one estimate, almost two-thirds of the lawyers in New York City in 1937 were Jews, 64 per

---

6 United States Immigration Commission, Reports, XXXIII, pp. 716, 721-722, 725, 743-744, 758, 672, 780, 781, 791, 792, 793, 800.
cent of the dentists, and 56 per cent of the physicians, but only 34 per cent of the architects, and 29 per cent of the engineers. They constituted 21 per cent of the physicians in Greater Cleveland in 1938, but only 2.6 per cent of the engineers.

The concentration of Jews in the self-employed professions was to a great extent due to the desire to avoid the discrimination which existed in salaried pursuits. Discrimination also accounted, at least in part, for the greater interest of Jews in public service. Some of the Jewish lawyers, engineers, accountants, and other professionals became federal, state, or municipal employees.

It might be indicated as a general comment that since the Jewish population is concentrated in the very large cities, it is to be expected that an insignificant number of Jews would be found in agriculture, fishing, forestry, and mining. As compared with the general population a relatively smaller percentage of Jews was engaged in manufacturing, in transportation and communications, and in domestic and personal services. Jews, however, had a larger percentage than the general population in trade, clerical occupations, and in the professions. In 1930 they had almost three times as many in trade and more than twice as many in the professions as the general male population. About one-sixth of the gainfully employed Jews were in the clerical occupations.

To report a national Jewish occupational pattern, however, obscures variations from locality to locality. In general, a larger percentage of Jews who lived in the large cities were engaged in manufacturing and a smaller proportion in trade than was the case with those who lived in smaller communities. Moreover, a smaller proportion of Jews who lived in centers of heavy industry were engaged in manufacturing than those who lived in cities where they could find employment in the light industries. For example, New York City had a larger percentage of Jews in industry than Detroit, and the latter a larger percentage than Pittsburgh. New York, however, had a relatively smaller number of Jews in business than the other cities. In addition, approximately 70 per cent of the New York City Jews engaged in trade were employees, whereas the proportion in trade was probably less in the other communities.

As in the case of the general population, the occupational pattern of the Jewish males was not the same as that of Jewish females. A larger percentage of the latter were in the clerical occupations and a smaller proportion were either self-employed or proprietors of industrial or commercial enterprises. A relatively larger number of the Jewish women were teachers and social workers. Moreover, the occupational pattern of Jewish women was not the same as that of the total female population. The latter had a larger percentage in manufacturing, domestic and personal service, and in communication.

There were also significant differences between the immigrant and native-born Jews. A larger percentage of the former were in manufacturing and trade; not many of the American-born Jews became garment workers or proprietors of candy and cigar stores, groceries, and similar undertakings. Native-born

---

ECONOMIC STATUS AND OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

Jews were more heavily represented in public service, clerical occupations, and the professions.\textsuperscript{12}

The distribution pattern of Jewish entrepreneurs was presented in the well-known \textit{Fortune} study of 1935 which indicated that Jews had appreciable interests only in textiles, scrap iron, apparel, liquor, and cigar manufacturing. They were represented to a lesser extent in the entertainment industry, particularly radio broadcasting and motion picture distribution. According to \textit{Fortune}, they were also important in the wholesale and retail trades dealing in these goods.

\textbf{World War II}

During World War II, general employment in the United States rose from 47,520,000 in 1940 to 58,960,000 in 1944; during the same period, unemployment dropped from 8,120,000 to an apparently irreducible minimum of approximately 670,000. War industries expanded at the expense of non-war economic activities. With the development of labor shortages, hiring standards were relaxed, discrimination was reduced, and skilled jobs were broken down into relatively simple tasks. Under the circumstances, employment was readily available to marginal and handicapped workers, among whom were many Jews whose sole handicap was their minority group status.

Precise information is not available on the occupational movement of Jews during the war years. It is known, however, that some Jews who had been engaged in small retail businesses or other forms of selling were frequently unable to continue their normal occupations. Gasoline and rubber shortages closed sales-driver routes; rationing of material in luxury lines, soft goods, and other consumer items caused many business firms to close their doors. Reports from Jewish Vocational Service agencies in various parts of the country disclosed a definite trend in the direction of training and employment in war production industries, although the extent of this movement was difficult to measure. In the war centers, the agencies reported that a large number of placements were made in the factories, shipyards, and airplane production plants. Many of these jobs previously considered “closed” to Jews were filled by Jewish salesmen, office workers, and insurance agents. For the first time, a number of non-Jewish employers hired Jewish workers, and learned to recognize that individual Jews were perfectly capable of handling skilled and technical jobs. While Jewish men shifted to factory employment, Jewish women tended to remain in clerical positions; the need for clerical workers became acute because of the war effort.

Thus, because of war production needs and the removal of restrictions upon many employment opportunities, Jews became draftsmen, machinists, physicists, etc. In the Twin Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, more than a thousand white collar Jewish workers—bookkeepers, school teachers, small businessmen, delicatessen clerks, pharmacists, and hotel managers—used picks and shovels, mixed mortar, and carried bricks ten hours a day, seven days a week, to help build a large munitions plant. When the construction job was done, more than half of them found jobs in the new plant and in other war

\textsuperscript{12} Goldberg, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 50-58.
industries. In New York City, the Federation Employment Service, in cooperation with the War Manpower Commission, set up temporary centers in Jewish neighborhoods to recruit workers for war industries. Almost seven thousand Jewish workers responded to a fifty-five-day recruitment program, and more than a thousand immediate placements resulted.

Further confirmation of these trends was contained in a number of community studies conducted under the auspices of the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare during the war years of 1943 and 1944. Cleveland, for example, reported that "there has been a noticeable increase of Jewish women in Federal Government positions; a significant number of Jewish men have gone into war plants; and there has been a marked decrease in the number of Jewish employees in department and chain stores." 

Postwar

When the war ended, the readjustment to a civilian economy was accomplished with a minimum of occupational displacement. The factories stopped producing munitions and transferred with remarkable speed to the manufacture of such items as washing machines, automobiles, and electrical appliances. Consumer demand both at home and abroad kept the American economy operating in high gear. At the end of 1947, when the armed forces were reduced from 11,000,000 to less than 2,000,000, approximately 60,000,000 persons were employed. By the Summer of 1948, the Census Bureau reported employment at 61,500,000, the highest peak in the history of the United States. However, by September, 1949, employment had dropped to 59.4 million and unemployment had risen to 3.4 million, although economic activity continued high.

In the immediate postwar period, some Jews possessing new skills learned during the war remained in mechanical and technical jobs. But the great majority, in common with the trend in the total population, apparently returned to prewar occupations. They shared with their fellow Americans the generally beneficial economic conditions of the first few postwar years. There are indications, however, that Jews may have been affected more adversely by the economic declines which started in 1947. While steel, auto, and other heavy industries—in which Jews were lightly represented—maintained a relatively favorable economic level, the industries in which Jews were heavily concentrated were affected by these declines.

The apparel manufacturing industry, for example, was one of the first to return to the prewar seasonal lay-off pattern. During the first six months of 1949, earnings in the apparel industry dropped 81 per cent in comparison with the first six months of 1948, according to a study made by The New York Times. The declining situation in retail trade—another field in which Jews are concentrated—was reflected in the Federal Reserve Board report that department store sales in July, 1949, dropped 10 per cent below the same month in 1948. The somewhat unfavorable job outlook predicted by the United States

---

Department of Labor for college graduates in June, 1949, may be another indication of the weakening of the economic position of American Jewry, because of the high percentage of Jews in colleges. As a final illustration, approximately 80,000 Jews in 1947 and almost 90,000 Jews in 1948 sought help in finding jobs and in related problems from Jewish Vocational Service agencies in twenty large cities, the largest numbers in the history of these agencies.

These indications are not cited as conclusive evidence of a serious deterioration of the economic status of the American Jewish population. Rather, they show a relative decline which, if unchecked, may assume more serious proportions. Nor is it suggested that Jews as a whole are economically weaker than in prewar days; on the contrary, they seem to be better off in 1949 than they were in the prewar years, but, as was the case with the general population, not as well off in comparison with the war and immediate postwar periods.

**Occupational Changes**

The largest relative increase in an occupational category for the total United States population in the years 1940-48 was in the category of non-farm proprietors, managers, and officials, undoubtedly a reflection of the large number of new businesses established after the war. Other categories which increased relatively during the eight-year period were clerical workers, craftsmen, and operatives (largely semi-skilled workers). Farming occupations, consistent with the trend of the past several decades, declined substantially in relative importance. Other proportionate decreases occurred among laborers and domestic service workers. Professionals, sales persons, and service workers other than domestics were approximately the same proportion of the labor force in 1948 as in 1940.

An examination of data derived from community studies suggests that the prewar concentration of Jews in trade, white collar, and professional occupations is continuing. There also appears to be an increase over the years in the proportion of proprietors, managers and officials, but a decline in the proportion of clerical, sales, and factory workers—the decline in the proportion of the latter being contrary to trends in the general population. However, the fact that recent community studies have not included the larger industrial towns may distort the picture; it is conceivable that the Jewish population in such areas as Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo conforms to recent occupational trends in the general population.

Reports from Jewish Vocational Service agencies seem to confirm the fact that the Jewish occupational distribution in the postwar period approximates, with some exceptions, the prewar distribution. In the larger cities at least, an increased number of Jews—predominantly male—was employed in manufacturing, although it is impossible to determine the exact increase. The number of self-employed also seems to have increased. The demand for college education, particularly on the part of male veterans, seems to have grown. Employment continues in government service at approximately the same level as in the past.

---

15 See pp. 23-32.
Studies of the occupational pattern of Jewish welfare fund contributors in St. Paul (1949) and Minneapolis (1945) indicate that the proprietorship group (probably all of whom were included in the class of contributors) are concentrated largely in the food trades, with substantial numbers in clothing, furniture, and auto accessory stores. Considerable numbers were also clothing manufacturers and in building construction.

A study of the occupational classification and placement of persons registering with the Jewish Vocational Service of Chicago during the first six months of 1949, admittedly not a cross-section of the total Jewish working population of that community, revealed the distribution shown in Table 3.

### TABLE 3

**Occupational Classification and Placement of Job Applicants, January-June, 1949, by Percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Applicants (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Placements (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office and secretarial</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled and semi-skilled</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock-shipping</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data for 1942-48 from the Federation Employment Service of New York City (FES) show a similar distribution. Approximately half of the applicants and placements were in clerical occupations. About 10 per cent applied for sales positions and less than half of these were placed as salesmen. An even greater discrepancy appeared between applicants and placements in the professions—10 to 15 per cent of the former as compared to less than 5 per cent of the latter. Skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers constituted 15 to 20 per cent of the applicants and placements. Compared with the war period, placements at FES in the postwar years increased for clerical workers, sales persons, and semi-skilled workers, while they declined among the unskilled workers and skilled workers and in the professions. These data are not atypical; similar occupational patterns and job placements were evident in other Jewish Vocational Service bureaus.

**Comparison with Other Religious Groups**

Table 4, based on a 50 per cent sample, gives the occupational distribution by religion of the gainfully employed workers in Madison, Wis., in 1944. The distribution of the Jewish group reveals the familiar pattern of concentration in the professional, commercial, and clerical occupations. In comparison with the other religious groups in this survey, Jews have the highest proportion in "business" and the second lowest in "laborer" occupations. Although the Jews rank seventh of the nine groups in the proportion of clerical workers, the differences in this category are slight among all groups. What is surprising about this table is the relatively low proportion of Jews in the professions. Although
15.6 per cent in the professions is a high proportion in comparison with that of the national population, the percentage of Madison Jews in the professions exceeds only that of the Catholics and Lutherans. The probable explanation lies in the fact that Madison is the home of the University of Wisconsin and capitol of the state, and the large number of faculty members and state employees raises the total proportion in the professions.

While the occupational pattern for Jews, according to Table 5, seems to be generally consistent with what is known about the Jewish occupational structure, it is doubtful whether a sample of 515 Jews can adequately represent the group nationally in view of the differences which have already been pointed out between Jews in large and small communities, in industrial and non-industrial communities, and between those who are foreign born and native born.

The significance of both tables, 4 and 5, lies in the fact that other groups besides the Jews show deviations from the occupational pattern of the total population. In Madison, for example, more than half of the Lutherans and Catholics were laborers, whereas the Episcopalians and Presbyterians had twice as many professionals as the Jews. On the other hand, in the national sample almost 50 per cent of the Mormons were either farmers or unskilled laborers. The distribution of the Episcopalians in general paralleled that of the Jews, except that fewer of the Episcopalians were in business, and more in the services and in farming.

### Table 4

**Occupational Distribution by Religion, Madison, Wisconsin, 1944**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denominations</th>
<th>No. of individuals in sample 18 years of age or older</th>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>Business Occupations</th>
<th>Clerical Occupations</th>
<th>&quot;Laborer&quot; Occupations</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No-Church</td>
<td>7,343</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
NATIONAL RELIGIOUS DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATION, 1945 AND 1946 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Per Cent</th>
<th>Professional No.</th>
<th>Professional Per Cent</th>
<th>Business No.</th>
<th>Business Per Cent</th>
<th>White Collar No.</th>
<th>White Collar Per Cent</th>
<th>Service No.</th>
<th>Service Per Cent</th>
<th>Skilled and semi-skilled No.</th>
<th>Skilled and semi-skilled Per Cent</th>
<th>Unskilled No.</th>
<th>Unskilled Per Cent</th>
<th>Farm No.</th>
<th>Farm Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant smaller bodies</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant undesignated</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer or &quot;Don't Know&quot;</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Scientist</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist; Agnostic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECONOMIC STATUS AND OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

Professions

Studies made by the Conference on Jewish Relations and other organizations have revealed that, in general, during the period before World War II Jews occupied a marginal position in the professions. Although a number of Jews had achieved considerable status in such fields as law and medicine, the majority of Jews in the professions were excluded from what were considered the more important practices, specialities, and positions. This relationship did not change basically during the war and postwar periods, but the favorable conditions generally prevailing in the professions naturally benefited Jews as well as non-Jews.

Hence, for example, Jewish engineers found it relatively easy to obtain employment and to achieve promotion and advancement in these positions. Nevertheless, according to a study made in 1948, engineering college professors admitted that Jewish graduates received fewer opportunities and less favorable consideration than non-Jews, although evidently most of the Jewish students were ultimately placed.

In accounting, too, Jews were successfully employed, but for the most part they were not employed in public accounting (especially by national firms) and were instead concentrated in private accounting and government service. In a survey similar to the engineering study mentioned above, college accounting professors testified that it was harder to place Jewish accounting graduates than non-Jews. A survey made in Cincinnati in 1948 revealed that out of a total of 286 accountants only three Jewish accountants were employed in the fifteen largest public accounting firms (including one in Dayton). One of the three Jews was a partner in one of the firms. Exclusive of these three, a total of eleven Jews had been employed in these accounting firms over a period of approximately thirty years.

The legal profession followed a similar pattern. Jewish lawyers were accepted in government service and were successful in tax law, labor law, and general commercial practice, but relatively few Jews were successfully engaged in corporation law and other more lucrative legal practices.

In medicine the pattern was perhaps even sharper. In 1948, Alfred L. Shapiro reported that it was difficult for Jewish physicians to become specialists in surgery, urology, and orthopedics, and, to a lesser extent, in other specialities. According to Shapiro, of the several thousand physicians who had graduated from medical school since 1927, only ten Jewish physicians in Brooklyn were certified as fellows in general surgery; and only two of these had served approved residencies. In fact, "there are less than 40 surgeons duly certified" among Brooklyn's 4,000 Jewish physicians, in contrast to 130 surgeons among Brooklyn's 1,500 non-Jewish physicians. Shapiro estimated

that there were “at least” 20,000 Jewish physicians in this country (which would mean that Jews constitute roughly 10 per cent of all physicians), and that “a minimum of 8,000 and more likely over 10,000” of New York City’s 17,000 doctors were Jewish.  

Social work and teaching—two professions suffering from severe shortages of personnel—have been favorable fields for Jews. In the former, most of the Jews have been employed in Jewish or in government agencies. Journalism, according to college professors queried in 1948, was “one of the professions most open to Jewish college graduates,” although it was noted that “perhaps this is because journalistic success depends so heavily on the ability to write.”

The future status of Jews in the professions is dependent upon a number of factors. Of primary importance to Jews and non-Jews alike is the maintenance of “consumer demand” and the ability to “buy” professional services, a factor largely dependent upon general economic conditions. Related to this factor is that of the future supply of professionals. Shortages in engineering, for example, are expected to be transformed into surpluses; according to the United States Department of Labor, 45,000 to 60,000 engineers will graduate from colleges in 1950, while jobs will be available for a maximum of 17,000. The ensuing sharper competition in this and other fields is unlikely to be to the advantage of members of minority groups.

A final factor is the nature of the future relationship between Jews and non-Jews in the professions. The continued marginal status of Jews in the professions has already been noted. Equally disturbing is the fact that Jewish youth are encountering increasing difficulties in obtaining training for the professions. Three studies in 1946 and 1947 have produced evidence of discrimination in the admission of Jews to college. Despite the higher rate of rejection of their applications for college admission, Jews nevertheless have persisted in their drive for higher education, have applied to more colleges than non-Jews, and have settled for second or third choice schools or courses. In 1946, as a result, 200,000 Jewish students were enrolled in the colleges, according to a census of Jewish college students conducted by the B’nai B’rith Vocational Service Bureau.

Although the vast majority of the Jewish youth desiring a college education have succeeded somehow in obtaining admission to an institution of higher education, the proportion of Jewish youth studying for the professions has been declining. In 67 out of 89 medical schools, Jewish enrollment dropped from 3,179 in 1935 to 2,737 in 1946, despite the fact that total enrollment in these schools increased during this period from 20,039 to 21,575. In 31 dental schools, the total enrollment increased from 6,068 in 1935 to 6,320 in 1946, while the number of Jews declined from 1,715 to 1,196. In pharmacy schools, Jews comprised 27.9 per cent of all students in 1918, 22.3 per cent in 1935,
and only 12.2 per cent in 1946; in 77 out of 160 law schools, Jewish student enrollment declined from 5,884 in 1935 to 2,862 in 1946, while total enrollment over the same period increased from 22,809 to 25,796. Despite the fact that the proportion of all Jewish students to the total college population was approximately the same in 1935 (8.8 per cent) as it was in 1946 (9 per cent), the proportion of Jewish students enrolled in professional schools and departments dropped from 8.8 per cent in 1935 to 7.0 per cent in 1946.23

There is no evidence to support any conclusion that the interest of Jewish youth in the professions has declined. On the contrary, the available evidence suggests a continuing and perhaps greater drive for professional careers on the part of both Jewish and non-Jewish youth. When, for example, Jewish students have had to apply to ten times as many medical schools as white Protestants before getting admitted,24 it becomes clear that there is no lack of interest in the professions, but rather that discrimination is being practiced.

As has already been pointed out, one of the principal reasons why Jews have been attracted to the independent or self-employed professions (medicine and law, for example) has been the fact that they provided an opportunity to avoid discrimination. Unlike the engineer, the dentist in private practice has not had to be concerned that his livelihood depended largely upon the good will of an employer. If fewer Jews are going to be allowed to prepare for the independent professions, obviously fewer Jews will be able to enter these professions. In this sense, the quotas established by professional schools threaten the present economic status of American Jewry, because frustrated Jewish applicants to medical schools, for example, will probably have to compromise their career plans at a lower economic level.

**Discrimination**

The problem of discrimination exists not only in the professions and in professional schools but in other economic areas as well. While the evidence suggests some increase in the extent of discrimination in the postwar period, the generally favorable economic conditions and the establishment of a number of public bodies to deal with discrimination have combined to keep overt manifestations below the prewar level at least. In states and municipalities which have adopted legislation prohibiting employment discrimination, employers have been inhibited from making direct inquiry regarding race and religion. On the other hand, Jewish job-seekers (perhaps because of habit conditioned by unpleasant prewar experiences) have confined their search for work largely to Jewish or friendly employers, and have succeeded for the most part in obtaining employment. In these circumstances, latent discrimination has remained dormant, since apparently a considerable proportion of unfriendly employers have had little or no opportunity during this period to reject Jewish applicants.

To a considerable extent, discrimination has shaped the occupational structure of American Jewry since the turn of the century. As has been noted, self-employment in the professions and in retail trade has been popular with

---
Jews as means, in part at least, for avoiding prejudiced employers. Similarly, Jews in manufacturing have been concentrated in consumer goods factories, such as apparel, which are chiefly owned by Jews. Employment in government service has likewise been attractive because of its relative freedom from bias. On the other hand, Jews have been excluded or have not sought employment in large numbers in industries known or suspected to be discriminatory, such as durable goods manufacturing, banks, public utilities, transportation, communication, and in large corporations generally. The trend in both employment and educational discrimination will be a critical factor in future changes in the Jewish occupational structure.

Recent Immigrants

From the time of the end of the World War II to September, 1949, an estimated 87,500 Jewish immigrants entered the United States. Of these, 22,114 arrived under the provisions of the Displaced Persons (DP) Act of 1948 which required assurances of jobs and housing. The employment of the group of postwar immigrants in general was even more difficult than the employment of those who arrived during the prewar period. In addition to their unfamiliarity with the language and working conditions of the United States, the more recent arrivals were even more destitute; they suffered from the physical and psychological effects of concentration camp experiences and many years of removal from normal jobs or education, with an ensuing deterioration of skills.

Some indication of the occupational background of the DP immigrants is contained in an analysis of the work skills of 170,000 Jews out of a total of 330,000 DP's in European DP camps made in 1947 by the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization (IRO). It was revealed that Jewish males "have an average proportion of professionals, are much less likely to be agricultural workers and have a high proportion of skilled workmen. . . . Jewish women are represented to an average degree in the professions and clerical work, to a lower degree in agricultural work, but to a very much higher degree in the skilled group." 25

Data on the occupational characteristics of the Jewish immigrants who arrived in the United States in the postwar period is provided by a study of 1,800 refugees registered for employment at the United Service for New Americans (USNA) in June, 1947. (It is estimated that 60 to 70 per cent of all Jewish refugees in this country apply to USNA for employment.) The largest number were salesmen and office workers; the next largest number were doctors, lawyers, managers, etc. In terms of their qualifications for work in the United States, 55 per cent lacked well-defined occupational skills. Forty-two and one-half per cent were 40 years of age or over; 22 per cent were over 50. About one in five had not completed grammar school; two out of three were not high school graduates; approximately 15 per cent had attended universities, and slightly more than 10 per cent had obtained professional degrees.

Thirty per cent were Sabbath observers. Eighty-two per cent had been in this country one year or less, and most of them knew little or no English.26

The types of employment that immigrants obtained in this country are reflected in the comparison presented in Table 6 between 454 immigrant placements with 3,060 total placements (including immigrants) made in 1948 by the Jewish Vocational Service of Chicago. Almost three-fourths of the immigrant placements were in skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled, and stock and shipping jobs. In each of these categories, the proportion of immigrant placements exceeded that of total placements. On the other hand, there were three times as many proportional total placements in office jobs and twice as many in sales jobs as there were of immigrants.27 This is not surprising in view of the language handicap of the immigrants. The data from Chicago are considered typical of other communities.

### TABLE 6

**Total and Immigrant Placements, by Occupation, 1948**  
*(Jewish Vocational Service, Chicago)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Classification</th>
<th>Total Placements</th>
<th>Non-Citizen Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office, clerical, and secretarial</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock and shipping</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled and semiskilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports from Jewish Vocational Service agencies reveal an understandably high rate of turnover among DP's as they move up the economic ladder but a generally excellent work adjustment after they have solved the initial problem of orientation to the American job market. Most DP's are placed on jobs within one month or two after arriving in their community of residence. On the other hand, older immigrants or those with serious emotional problems find it difficult to obtain or to continue in employment. In 1948, 21 Jewish Vocational Service agencies registered 9,735 emigres and filled 5,752 job openings with emigre applicants, according to the Jewish Occupational Council; in comparison with 1947, this represented an increase of 16.8 per cent in registrations and 84.7 per cent in placements. Obtaining employment for immigrants became increasingly difficult by the Summer of 1949, as job opportunities decreased and as the influx of DP's to this country increased.

The postwar group on the whole has followed the pattern of its prewar predecessor in accepting menial and unskilled jobs at first, working hard, becoming acclimated to American working conditions, and subsequently achieving individual economic and occupational status approximating that which they had achieved in their native countries.

26 Karp, Wm., *Vocational Adjustment Services for Newcomers*, paper read at United Service for New Americans New York City Regional Conference, October 29, 1947. (Mimeographed).
Summary

There exist two diametrically opposed points of view regarding the security of the American Jewish population's economic position. One contends that its distribution is abnormal because the concentration in relatively few occupations and industries differs from the pattern of the total population. It is argued that this concentration is economically unsound, for in times of economic crisis tradesmen and professionals are less well protected than, for example, factory workers; moreover, being concentrated in a relatively few fields of economic endeavor makes Jews extremely vulnerable to drastic declines in those fields. In addition, it is contended, "maldistribution" exposes Jews to anti-Semitic charges that Jews are "clannish," are "parasites" not engaged in productive work; the concentration of Jews in retail sales, and hence the more frequent contact with consumers, tends to evoke anti-Jewish sentiments, particularly in periods of economic unrest.

The other point of view holds that the Jewish occupational distribution is not abnormal. On the contrary, it is said, the distribution is a natural result of various factors, which include Jewish socio-cultural background, exclusion from many occupations and industries through discrimination, and trends in the American economy away from agriculture and, to a lesser extent, manufacturing, and toward the professions, trade, and service and clerical occupations. In addition, modern economists regard the middleman and service workers (including professionals) as essential to the economy and their increased numbers as a criterion of the higher stage of development of the economy. Moreover, it is argued, Jewish occupational distribution is an effect rather than a cause of anti-Semitism, and if Jews did redistribute themselves, the anti-Semites would seize upon another pretext.

Whatever one's point of view, it is clear that Jews in America have, on the whole, achieved a living standard certainly no lower than that of the average American—a significant accomplishment considering all the obstacles. The fact that the national Jewish community was able to raise very large sums for philanthropic purposes in the past decade testifies to its favorable economic position, even after making allowance for the psychological pull of the urgency of the need for funds.

At the same time, it is equally clear that some threats to the economic position of American Jewry do exist. Discrimination in employment and the apparent drive to limit the number of Jews in the various professions at the very vital point of admission to training are cases in point. In business, industry, and the professions, too many Jews are in a marginal position; where the risk element is great, these enterprises will obviously be more adversely affected than others in time of economic decline.

In a very large measure, the future economic position of American Jewry depends on developments in the nation as a whole. Stable and healthy economic, social, and political relations will result in increased prosperity and decreased discrimination for all Americans.

Eli E. Cohen *

* In collaboration with Nathan Goldberg and Preston David.
Despite the fact that estimates of the numbers of Jews in the different communities of the United States—derived as they are from guesses by informed community persons or from more or less well-constructed population surveys—must often be used with much circumspection, they are nevertheless frequently essential for various communal purposes. An alphabetical listing of such estimates in 720 communities with Jewish populations over 100 was published in Volume 50 of the American Jewish Year Book, together with a list of communities with 1,000 or more Jewish population arranged by region, state, and county. These estimates, it will be recalled, were obtained from the files of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA); from surveys conducted by the Bureau of War Records of the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB); from the files and field reports of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF); and 152 responses to a questionnaire on population estimates prepared by Sophia M. Robison and mailed to member agencies of the CJFWF.

Persons making use of these lists have indicated, however, a preference for an arrangement by city and state. It was felt that this enhances the usefulness of the lists, since so much communal work is organized on state-city rather than county lines. In view of these many requests, the following tabulation has been prepared. Wherever possible, the most recent population estimate has been substituted for the one published in Volume 50. For the complete list of communities with Jewish populations over 100, the reader is referred to Volume 50.

### TABLE 1

**Cities with 1,000 Jews or More (Estimates)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jewish Population 1948</th>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jewish Population 1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>267,583</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>634,536</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>78,084</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>68,157</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Leandro and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>65,414</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>21,337</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>36,818</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>54,714</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>88,039</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>105,698</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>322,412</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>60,685</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>164,271</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>147,121</td>
<td>11,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,504,277</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>22,339</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>302,163</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>166,267</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>81,864</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>39,494</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>105,958</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>26,495</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>203,341</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>New Britain</td>
<td>68,685</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>160,605</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New London</td>
<td>30,456</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Albany, El Cerrito, and Emeryville.

*b Includes West Hartford, East Hartford, Newington, Bloomfield, and Glastonbury.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jewish Population 1948</th>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Total Population 1940</th>
<th>Jewish Population 1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>39,849</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>110,341</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>28,652</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>21,711</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>47,938</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>49,684</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>99,314</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>41,213</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>112,504</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>149,554</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>663,091</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>193,694</td>
<td>9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>173,065</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>172,172</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>108,391</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>33,693</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>302,280</td>
<td>10,217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>95,996</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>159,819</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux City</td>
<td>82,364</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>121,458</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>114,966</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>319,077</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>494,537</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>98,167</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>29,822</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>38,598</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>73,643</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis</td>
<td>13,069</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>859,100</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>770,816</td>
<td>137,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>63,343</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>115,428</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>46,752</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>53,750</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>84,323</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>101,389</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>98,123</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>110,341</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>21,711</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>49,684</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>41,213</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>149,554</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>193,694</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>1,623,452</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>151,543</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>164,292</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>101,065</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>492,370</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>287,736</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>223,844</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>77,585</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>64,094</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>14,617</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayonne</td>
<td>79,198</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>41,623</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>117,335</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Orange</td>
<td>68,945</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>109,912</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>18,966</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Lawn</td>
<td>9,017</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackensack</td>
<td>26,279</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightstown</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoboken</td>
<td>50,115</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>55,328</td>
<td>7,388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City</td>
<td>301,173</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>24,115</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Branch</td>
<td>17,408</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood</td>
<td>23,139</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morristown</td>
<td>15,270</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>429,760</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>33,180</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bergen</td>
<td>55,328</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>64,394</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic and Clifton</td>
<td>64,394</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>139,656</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Amboy</td>
<td>41,242</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>37,469</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bank</td>
<td>10,974</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and City</td>
<td>Jewish Population 1940</td>
<td>Jewish Population 1948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>13,597</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange</td>
<td>13,742</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaneck</td>
<td>25,275</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toms River</td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>124,697</td>
<td>8,233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>56,173</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland</td>
<td>7,914</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West New York</td>
<td>39,439</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Orange</td>
<td>25,662</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>130,577</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton</td>
<td>78,309</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>575,901</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>45,106</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloversville</td>
<td>23,829</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>28,589</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>21,908</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>7,377</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>67,362</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>31,883</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rochelle</td>
<td>58,408</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7,454,995</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>78,029</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Chester</td>
<td>23,073</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>40,478</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>324,975</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockville Centre</td>
<td>18,613</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>87,549</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>205,967</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>70,804</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>100,518</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Plains</td>
<td>40,327</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonkers</td>
<td>142,598</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>244,781</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>108,401</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>455,610</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>878,836</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>306,087</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>210,718</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>282,849</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>167,720</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>204,424</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>142,157</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>305,394</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>96,904</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1949 estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population 1940</th>
<th>Jewish Population 1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>80,214</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>50,190</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braddock</td>
<td>18,326</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>59,285</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>83,589</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>116,955</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>83,893</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>38,009</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td>66,688</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>61,345</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeesport</td>
<td>55,355</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,931,334</td>
<td>245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>671,659</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>110,568</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>140,404</td>
<td>5,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon-Farrell</td>
<td>39,521</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>86,236</td>
<td>5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>75,797</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>253,504</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>71,275</td>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>128,163</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>292,942</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>167,402</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>294,734</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>96,810</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>177,662</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>60,862</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>384,514</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>253,854</td>
<td>6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco</td>
<td>55,982</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>149,994</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>27,686</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>37,067</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>144,382</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>50,745</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>193,042</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>368,302</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>67,914</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>67,447</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>587,472</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Includes Lititz, Mount Joy-Paradise, Columbia, Elizabethtown, New Holland, Manheim, and Denver.
JEWISH IMMIGRATION

Presented in Table 1 is a summary of Jewish immigration to the United States during the period 1908-1943. The figures in this table are based on official figures of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (I&NS). It has not been possible to extend this table beyond 1943 because the I&NS ceased keeping data on "Hebrew" immigrants in that year. However, estimates—of questionable statistical validity—have been made by such unofficial sources as United Service for New Americans (USNA), Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), and the American Jewish Committee for the calendar years 1946 (13,000-14,000), 1947 (23,000-25,000), and 1948 (14,000-15,500). No figures were available for 1944 and 1945, but the number of Jewish entrants was small.

General Immigration: July, 1947—December 31, 1948

A total of 170,570 immigrants was admitted to the United States during the fiscal year 1948 (July 1, 1947-June 30, 1948), and 88,157 during the first half of fiscal year 1949 (July 1, 1948-December 31, 1948). During the calendar year 1948 (January 1, 1948-December 31, 1948), 170,420 immigrants were admitted.

Of the 88,157 admitted during the period July 1-December 31, 1948, 38,055 were quota and 50,102 non-quota immigrants. The two largest groups of non-quota immigrants were wives of American citizens (23,547)—mainly war brides, many of them natives of Germany—and natives of non-quota countries (19,322), principally from Canada, Mexico, and the West Indies.

Of the 88,157 immigrants, the numbers and country of birth were: 14,987, Germany; 11,778, Canada; 10,170, United Kingdom; 6,669, Italy; 4,345, Poland; 4,111, Mexico and 3,540, Ireland.¹

DP Immigration: July 1, 1948—June 30, 1949

As of June 30, 1949, the end of the first year of operation of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, 55,631 visas were issued to DP's. (The act provided for the issuance of up to 205,000 visas during the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1950.)

Of the visas issued, 24,468, or 44 per cent, were assigned to displaced persons of the Catholic faith; 15,676, or 28 per cent, of the Jewish faith; 14,639, or 27 per cent, of the Protestant or Orthodox faiths; and 511, or 1 per cent, of other or unknown faiths.²

Of the 55,631 DP's who received visas under the 1948 Act, 40,435 had arrived in the United States by June 30, 1949. As the operation of the displaced persons program, which did not get under way until October, 1948, pro-

² This breakdown by religion does not include visas issued to displaced orphans.
| Year       | Admissions | | | Departures | | | Net Increase | | |
|------------|------------|---|---|------------|---|---|------------|---|
|            | Total      | Jews | Per Cent of Jews to Total | Total | Jews | Per Cent to Admissions | Total | Jews | Per Cent of Jews to Total |
| 1915-1920  | 1,602,680  | 79,921  | 4.99 | 906,538   | 3,470  | 56.56 | 4.34 | 696,142   | 76,451  | 10.98 |
| 1921       | 805,228    | 119,036 | 14.70 | 247,718   | 483    | 30.76 | 0.41 | 557,510   | 118,553 | 21.20 |
| 1922       | 309,556    | 53,524  | 17.30 | 198,712   | 830    | 64.20 | 1.50 | 110,844   | 52,694  | 47.50 |
| 1923       | 522,919    | 49,719  | 9.50  | 81,450    | 413    | 15.57 | 0.52 | 441,469   | 49,306  | 11.16 |
| 1924       | 706,896    | 49,989  | 7.07  | 76,789    | 260    | 10.80 | 2.83 | 630,107   | 49,729  | 7.89 |
| 1925       | 294,314    | 10,292  | 3.50  | 92,728    | 291    | 31.51 | 2.83 | 201,586   | 10,001  | 4.96 |
| 1926       | 304,488    | 10,267  | 3.30  | 76,992    | 314    | 25.20 | 3.30 | 227,496   | 9,926   | 4.30 |
| 1927       | 335,175    | 11,483  | 3.40  | 73,366    | 224    | 21.80 | 1.90 | 261,809   | 11,259  | 4.30 |
| 1928       | 307,255    | 11,639  | 3.80  | 77,457    | 253    | 25.21 | 2.17 | 229,798   | 11,386  | 4.95 |
| 1929       | 279,678    | 12,479  | 4.46  | 69,203    | 189    | 24.74 | 1.51 | 210,475   | 12,290  | 5.84 |
| 1930       | 241,700    | 11,526  | 4.77  | 50,661    | 299    | 20.96 | 2.59 | 191,039   | 11,227  | 5.88 |
| 1931       | 97,139     | 5,692   | 5.86  | 61,882    | 319    | 63.70 | 5.60 | 35,257    | 5,373   | 15.24 |
| 1933       | 23,068     | 2,372   | 10.28 | 80,081    | 384    | 347.15 | 16.19 | -57,013   | 1,988   | — |
| 1934       | 29,470     | 4,134   | 14.03 | 39,771    | 319    | 134.96 | 7.72 | -10,301   | 3,815   | — |
| 1935       | 34,956     | 4,837   | 13.84 | 38,834    | 330    | 111.09 | 6.82 | -3,878    | 4,507   | — |
| 1936       | 36,329     | 6,252   | 17.21 | 35,817    | 308    | 98.59  | 4.93 | 512       | 5,944   | — |
| 1937       | 50,244     | 11,352  | 22.59 | 26,736    | 232    | 53.21  | 2.04 | 23,508    | 11,120  | 47.30 |
| 1938       | 67,895     | 19,736  | 29.07 | 25,210    | 255    | 37.13  | 1.29 | 42,685    | 19,481  | 45.64 |
| 1939       | 82,998     | 43,450  | 52.35 | 26,651    | 176    | 32.11  | 0.41 | 56,347    | 43,274  | 76.80 |
| 1940       | 70,756     | 36,945  | 52.21 | 21,461    | 150    | 30.33  | 0.41 | 49,295    | 36,795  | 74.64 |
| 1941       | 51,776     | 23,737  | 45.85 | 17,115    | 186    | 33.06  | 0.78 | 34,661    | 23,551  | 67.95 |
| 1942       | 28,781     | 10,608  | 36.86 | 7,363     | 117    | 25.58  | 1.10 | 21,418    | 10,491  | 48.98 |
| 1943       | 23,725     | 4,705   | 19.83 | 5,107     | 88     | 21.56  | 1.93 | 18,618    | 4,617   | 24.80 |
| Total      | 13,051,959 | 1,252,847 | 9.60 | 4,504,704 | 57,207 | 34.51 | 4.57 | 8,547,255 | 1,195,640 | 13.99 |

*The figures in this table are based on official sources of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.*
gressed, it gained momentum, as indicated in Table 2 in a month-to-month breakdown of the number of arrivals. As the number of general DP immigrants rose, the number of Jewish entrants among them increased, representing almost 30 per cent of the total.

### TABLE 2

**DP Immigration to the United States, October, 1948-June, 1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October, 1948</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 1949</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>1,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>6,432</td>
<td>1,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>11,190</td>
<td>2,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>10,499</td>
<td>2,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,435</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,861</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interpreter Release, XXVI, No 31, July 18, 1949*

b These estimates of monthly Jewish arrivals were derived from a report by the Institute of Overseas Studies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York, August 19, 1949.

From the time of its establishment in 1948 until June 30, 1949, the Displaced Persons Commission validated more than 100,000 assurances covering an estimated total of 190,000 persons.

In July, 1949, a record monthly total of 3,200 Jewish DP's entered the United States, bringing the total since October, 1948, to 15,061, and since January, 1949, to 14,218. The total number of Jews who arrived from the Spring of 1946 through June 30, 1948, under the directive issued by President Harry Truman on December 22, 1945, was 28,000.

At the time of writing no usable estimate of non-DP Jewish immigration for the same period was available.

SIDNEY LISKOFSKY
Civic and Political

CIVIL RIGHTS: THE NATIONAL SCENE

The problems of freedom and equality engaged the attention of the American public on a major scale during much of the past year. In many respects, they presented themselves with a quality of urgency far greater than that to which the country was accustomed. On the whole, however, problems were raised and discussed, rather than resolved.

Legislation

For the first time since Reconstruction days, federal civil rights legislation became a major political issue in a national campaign. The President's special message to Congress on this question called forth the intense hostility of major sections of the Democratic party in the South, and by the time of the 1948 Democratic National Convention the party was well on its way toward a split. An attempt was made at the convention to secure the adoption of a compromise civil rights plank which, like that of 1944, would endorse equality in principle but not in detail. But the President's message, and the controversy which it aroused, had made the issue too important to be thus avoided. A group of delegates, headed by Andrew Biemiller of Wisconsin and Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, forced to the floor a resolution specifically endorsing the President's proposals. With the support of the delegations from most of the Northern states and despite the opposition of those delegations closest to the President, it was adopted.

It is doubtful that the "compromise" resolution would have appeased the rebellious Southern Democrats, since some of the electors nominated in the Democratic primaries were previously pledged to oppose the nomination of President Harry S. Truman. Nevertheless, the adoption of the stronger resolution made a split inevitable. The Mississippi delegates, along with half of the Alabama delegates, walked out of the convention hall. After President Truman's nomination, the bolters, together with representatives from the other Southern states, organized the "States Rights," or "Dixiecrat," party and nominated Governor J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina for President and Governor Fielding Wright of Mississippi for Vice-President. While the Dixiecrats succeeded in carrying Mississippi, South Carolina, Louisiana, and Alabama (where President Truman's name was not permitted on the ballot), they failed in their avowed purpose of preventing a Democratic majority in

1 See AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, p. 204.
the Electoral College. For the first time since the Civil War the Democratic nominee for President was elected without the votes of the "Solid South."

While the administration was now thoroughly committed to pressing for its civil rights program, and bills embodying its various aspects were introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, no substantial progress was made in the legislative field. The Southerners—including those who had not bolted—remained steadfastly opposed. In both houses, the Southern members had a disproportionate number of key committee posts, owing to the seniority rule. And in the Senate, the right of unlimited debate gave them an opportunity to filibuster any bill to death. To be sure, the Senate did have a cloture rule which permitted the limitation of debate by a two-thirds vote on petition of sixteen members. Yet the senators have always been reluctant to vote for cloture. Moreover, the effect of the cloture rule was vitiated by a ruling of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, president pro tem of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, who, on August 2, 1948, announced that according to his interpretation there could be no cloture on a motion to take up a bill (in this case the anti-poll tax proposal). The interpretation not only effectively blocked civil rights action in the Eightieth Congress, but also removed the sole protection afforded by Senate rules against a filibuster, for unlimited debate on a motion to take up a bill could effectively prevent it from reaching the cloture stage.

Hence, in the Eighty-first Congress, administration leaders in the Senate sought to remove this obstacle by amending the rules. But the proposed amendment faced the same obstacle: A filibuster could be as effective against a change in the rules as against legislation. However, the new presiding officer of the Senate was Vice-President Alben W. Barkley, who had disagreed with Senator Vandenberg's 1948 ruling. When a petition for cloture on the motion to take up the change in rules was brought in, he ruled it in order. An appeal was taken from his ruling, and on March 11, 1949, the Senate voted to overrule him by 46 votes to 41, a majority of the Republicans and a few Northern Democrats joining with eighteen Southern senators. The victorious coalition then amended the rules to provide that cloture could be voted on any measure—but only by a "constitutional" two-thirds of the entire membership. There was now no chance for enactment of the President's civil rights program except by defeat of a filibuster through sheer endurance.

The first two months of the session had passed; little of importance had been achieved, and major appropriation bills, as well as such measures as the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Pact, were awaiting action. An attempt to beat down a filibuster on the civil rights issue would have endangered these measures; it was therefore not attempted. Since major appropriation bills were not all passed until October, 1949—by which time the administration leaders were as anxious as the rest of the senators to go home—no serious attempt was made to revive the civil rights question in the Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Administrative Action

If the cause of civil rights made little progress in Congress, it fared better in the fields of administrative and judicial action. Although an attempt by
Senator William Langer (Rep.-N.D.) to amend the Selective Service Act of June, 1948, to include anti-discrimination provisions was unsuccessful, notable strides were made toward racial equality in the armed forces. On July 26, 1948, President Truman established a seven-member Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces. Three days later he told reporters that segregation in all the armed forces must eventually be eliminated. This was followed, on August 30, by Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal's abolition of all racial quotas for the various branches of the services. On April 6, 1949, Forrestal's successor, Louis Johnson, ordered that qualified Negroes be assigned “to any type of position vacancy in organizations or overhead installations without regard to race.” He gave the services until May 1, 1949, to work out the details of “what forward steps can and should be made toward greater equality.” On May 11, he announced his acceptance of the Air Force plan for the elimination of segregated units, while giving the Army and Navy until May 25 to “clarify” their proposals. On June 7 he approved the Navy's supplementary pledge that “All personnel will be enlisted or appointed, trained, advanced or promoted, assigned to duty, and administered in all respects without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. In the utilization of housing, messing, berthing, and other facilities, no special or unusual provisions will be made for the accommodation of any minority race.”

The Army, however, still held to the position enunciated by its Chief of Staff, General Omar Bradley, on July 1, 1948, when he declared: “The Army is not out to make any social reforms. . . . The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the nation as a whole changes it.” Secretary Johnson again rejected the Army's proposals, and ordered it to submit new ones. The deadline for these was repeatedly extended. Finally, on September 30, 1949, the Secretary announced his acceptance of an Army plan to remove existing restrictions on the posts for which Negroes were eligible in order to provide equal promotional opportunities and eliminate segregation in certain very limited fields. However, the Army proposals involved continuation of segregated units—the principal point which had been at issue—and they were therefore condemned by many leaders in the fight for civil rights.

Meanwhile, the President also sought to eliminate discriminatory practices in the other branches of the government. For this purpose, he set up a Fair Employment Practices Board under the Civil Service Commission. In December, the Civil Aeronautics Authority ordered an end to segregation at the National Airport, located across the Potomac River in Virginia—a state whose laws prescribe segregation. The airport authorities, however, refused to comply with the order; the issue was pending in the federal courts at the time of writing. Another gain in the administrative sphere was the action of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) in removing from its handbook provisions designed to prevent the insurance of mortgages on Negro housing in predominantly white areas.

The federal courts, which in recent years have been responsible for much

---

3 See Housing, p. 84.
of the progress made in the field of race relations, made several decisions of
importance in this field in the course of the year. In July, 1948, Federal Dis-
trict Judge T. Waites Waring enjoined the Democratic party of South
Carolina from barring Negroes from its primary. During the following month,
a federal statutory court ruled that New Mexico’s Indians were entitled to
vote, despite a provision in that state’s constitution denying them the ballot.
Federal court action also forced the states of Arizona and New Mexico to
grant their Indian citizens federal social security benefits.

By refusing to review an appeal, the Supreme Court in effect upheld the
decision of a Birmingham federal court outlawing Alabama’s “Boswell Amend-
ment,” which was intended to bar Negroes from voting by means of a dis-
criminatory literacy test. Several decisions in lower federal courts upheld the
rights of Americans of Japanese descent to preserve their citizenship, which
the Department of Justice had attacked on such grounds as their remaining
in Japan during the war, voting in Japanese elections during the occupation,
and renouncing their citizenship while they were detained at the Tule Lake
“Relocation Center.” In the last of these cases, which may serve as a precedent
for several thousands of others, the court held that the renunciation had taken
place under duress.

Civil Liberties

In the more general field of civil liberties, a number of problems arising
from the existence of totalitarian movements provoked considerable dis-
cussion. Here, too, Congress was less active than the executive and judicial
branches. The principal Congressional action consisted of attaching riders to
various appropriation bills banning the payment of salaries under them to
any person belonging to the Communist party. A case which aroused wide
protest among scientists was the rider attached to the Atomic Energy Com-
m ission’s appropriation, requiring that the Federal Bureau of Investigation
(FBI) check on all recipients of Commission scholarships, even for study in
non-restricted fields. This followed the disclosure that the recipient of one
scholarship was a Communist.

Aside from the field of public administration, however, Congressional
activity was represented mainly by the House Committee on Un-American
Activities. As in the past, this committee continued to conduct hearings on
subversive forces in American life. The most notable feature of the hearings
during the past year was the struggle of the Committee to compel recalcitrant
witnesses to testify or to produce records which it desired to inspect. Some
witnesses were especially reluctant to answer inquiries as to their member-
ship in the Communist party. In general, the Committee attempted to compel
the testimony of those whose refusal was not based on the plea of self-in-
crimination. In this it had been upheld by the courts, at the time of writing.
Another aspect of the Committee’s activity was its sponsorship of the Mundt-
Nixon bill, which provided that the Communist party as well as Communist

4 Some provisions went further. Thus, the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) was
debarred from employing any person who had ever been a Communist, whatever his current
beliefs.
front organizations register with the Attorney General. It sought to make illegal any movement to establish a dictatorship. The bill was permitted to die in the Senate after passing the House.

If Communists were not legislatively outlawed, however, they were subjected to attack by other organs of government. The Attorney General, implementing the President's "loyalty order," continued to add organizations to his list of subversive groups. One case which attracted wide attention was the dismissal of James Kutcher, a legless veteran, from a non-sensitive position as a clerk in the Veterans' Administration, because of his membership in the Trotskyist Socialist Workers party. The dismissal was upheld by the Loyalty Review Board, which appeared to have little discretion in applying the President's loyalty order in the case of admitted members of organizations on the Attorney General's list. The case was being appealed to the federal courts, which also had before them a number of other cases involving the right of the Attorney General to declare groups subversive without a hearing. Many who did not question the right of the federal government to protect itself by refusing to retain potentially disloyal employees in posts where they might do damage, nevertheless felt that the procedures adopted were destructive of basic liberties without being essential to the purpose for which they were designed.

The government also moved against the Communist party by instituting deportation proceedings against large numbers of its alien members, and by prosecuting its leaders under the Smith Alien and Sedition Act. This act, which made doctrine a ground for prosecution, had been used only twice previously. In the first case, a group of Trotskyites was sent to prison in Minneapolis. (An effort by a broad group of liberal leaders to secure the restoration of their civil rights, lost as a result of their conviction, appeared unsuccessful.) The second was the year-long trial of so-called native Fascists, which resulted in a mistrial when the judge died. The Communist leaders were convicted on October 14, 1949. An appeal challenging the constitutionality of the Smith Act was filed, and would undoubtedly be carried to the Supreme Court.

A number of other cases affecting civil liberties also came before the Supreme Court and lower federal courts during the year. One of the most controversial was that of Father Terminiello, whose conviction for disorderly conduct was reversed by a 5-4 decision of the Supreme Court. While the technical ground on which the justices divided was the right of the Court to examine an issue which had not been raised in the lower courts (the character of the judge's charge to the jury), it appeared from the language of the majority and minority opinions, that they differed on the limits of free speech.5

Several cases affected citizenship and related questions. The Supreme Court remanded for rehearing a case in which a California federal district court had denied citizenship to an applicant named Wixman, on the ground that he believed in "collectivism." Two district courts admitted conscientious objectors to citizenship over the opposition of the Department of Justice. And the Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting in New York, ruled that an alien who had

5 See also Anti-Jewish Agitation, pp. 114-15.
applied for citizenship could not be deported until his application had been denied. The courts also handed down a number of decisions articulating the rights of defendants to a fair trial and immunity against illegal search and seizure by federal officers acting without "probable cause." On the other hand, the Supreme Court upheld the use of evidence illegally obtained by state officers and of evidence obtained by federal officers without a search warrant, where probable cause existed.

Several major issues were currently before the courts for decision. The constitutionality of the non-Communist oath requirement of the Taft-Hartley Act was before the Supreme Court on an appeal from a lower court decision upholding it. The courts were also faced with a number of cases involving the rights of aliens and admission to citizenship, the rights of conscientious objectors on other than religious grounds, and the right of individuals to advise others not to register for the draft.

MAURICE J. GOLDBLOOM

HOUSING

The nationwide housing shortage reached a high point during the year under review, with competition for dwellings keen. In August, 1949, a long delayed federal housing bill was enacted authorizing 810,000 low-rental dwelling units in six years for low-income families. By the same legislation, $1,500,000,000 in federal loan funds and subsidies were made available to cities for redevelopment of their blighted neighborhoods. During the year, states and cities also increased their aid to housing through local loans and subsidies. Government therefore burgeoned forth as one of the main economic factors and influences in the dwelling market.

The greater intervention by government in the housing field placed an increasing emphasis upon the attitudes and policies of public officials with respect to minorities living in slums. They were faced with making and carrying out policies either to benefit slum-residents by subsidies or to displace them in the interest of neighborhood betterment. Administrative and judicial decisions as well as legislative safeguards assumed a growing importance.

Those aspects of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947 which emphasized the inequality of housing for minorities were therefore of particularly timely importance. The report projected its influence into the housing market and protagonists of minority causes, who up to 1947 had been fighting a rear-guard battle against discrimination in housing, began at last to reap the dividends of their persistence.

The civil rights report had emphasized the growing problem of housing bias and pointed up significantly the responsibility of federal and local governments to help assure a better distribution of housing facilities to minorities.

"Equality of opportunity to rent or buy a home should exist for every American. Today, many of our citizens . . . encounter prejudice and discrimination based upon race, color, religion or national origin, which places them at a disadvantage in competing for the limited housing that is available." The report then singled out for special mention the existence and spread of racial
restrictive covenants. These covenants, written into deeds or leases, bound property-owners not to sell or lease to certain "undesirable" tenants, who included Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, Syrians, Japanese, Chinese, Indians, Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, and Hawaiians, and "non-Caucasians."

In pursuit of the principles enumerated in the report, the federal government in 1948 set a precedent by intervening on behalf of the minority position in the restrictive covenant cases.\(^1\)

"The Government is of the view that judicial enforcement of racial restrictive covenants on real property is incompatible with the spirit and letter of the Constitution and laws of the United States," said the government's brief.\(^2\)

While the restrictive covenant decisions were a historic victory in the sense that they banned judicial enforcement of private restrictive practices, racial restrictions between private parties were not outlawed. "The restrictive agreements standing alone," said the opinion, "cannot be regarded as a violation of any rights guaranteed to a petitioner by the Fourteenth Amendment. So long as the purposes of those agreements are effectuated by voluntary adherence to their terms, it would appear clear that there has been no action by the state and the provisions of the amendment have not been violated."\(^3\)

Thus, through the medium of club ownership, for example, minorities could still be prevented from buying into a neighborhood except upon approval by the club's overseers. The system of long-term leaseholds continued to prevent the occupant from leasing or selling the lease without consent of the community trustees. So, too, agreements among real estate brokers could bind them through "codes of ethics" not to rent or sell property to certain races.

In a few areas, resistance to minority infiltration slackened. But in the main the effect of the decision was simply to increase the pressure upon the "gentleman" to stand by his "gentleman's agreement." Since it was social pressure as much as the written covenant which restrained minority infiltration, the gain might be regarded more as the advancement of a principle than as the practical broadening of housing opportunities.

This gain in principle was not negligible however, and its effect began to penetrate the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), an agency which was one of the most notorious and effective instruments for creating and enforcing racially-segregated neighborhoods.

In a letter dated November 19, 1948, Assistant FHA Commissioner W. J. Lockwood had indicated that no loans would be made for mixed cooperative projects: "The Federal Housing Administration has never insured a housing project of mixed occupancy," said Lockwood.\(^4\) He then ventured "the unofficial and informal statement that we believe that such projects would probably in a short period of time become all Negro or all white."

Explaining FHA's "underwriting philosophy," Lockwood emphasized FHA's sensitivity to "local real estate market reaction. . . . If infiltration will

---

1 Shelley v. Kramer (334 U.S., 1) and Hurd v. Hodge (334 U.S., 24). (See also American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, p. 210.)
3 Shelley v. Kramer, Supra.
4 Letter to James Cassels, Executive Secretary, National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association, Chicago, Illinois.
be unacceptable to the local real estate market and desirability of properties will be reduced in the market's mind, [FHA must] recognize the conditions. ... [It must have due regard] for the influence of such conditions not only upon a certain parcel of realty but also ... the reflection of those conditions upon properties owned by other citizens."

In a letter to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), dated November 1, 1948, FHA Commissioner Franklin D. Richards said his agency would continue to insure properties subject to racial restrictive covenants. Thus the federal agency not only continued to enforce segregation on its own projects, but also abetted and cooperated with owners who practiced racial segregation. As one result, such projects as the Levittown development in Long Island, New York, expressly excluded Negroes from buying or renting.

Continued protest against FHA policy during the year by NAACP and other agencies, however, brought about further concessions. After pressure by such groups, the written covenants in Levittown were removed, but in practice the segregation continued in full force. On February 18, 1949, the FHA finally modified its ruling of refusing to insure mortgages in areas threatened with racial infiltrations. In a directive to its underwriters, Commissioner Richards stated: "No application for mortgage insurance shall be rejected solely on the grounds that the subject property or the type of occupancy might affect the market attitude toward other properties in the immediate neighborhood."

The FHA also announced that it would insure mixed cooperative housing acceptable to the community and considered a safe risk. When questioned on the point, Commissioner Richards cited the insurance of the Bell Park Gardens Cooperative Project in Queens, N. Y., as evidence of the FHA's new policy. Bell Park Gardens, however, though subject to a local ordinance banning discrimination in tax exempt projects, had no Negro cooperators; it claimed that none had applied.

There was no direct evidence, however, that modification of the written policy in the FHA Manual meant modification of policy in the field, and for all practical purposes segregation continued to be the practice in FHA projects.

**Urban Redevelopment Legislation**

By the middle of 1949 thirty states had urban redevelopment laws of one sort or another. Because a project of this nature is dependent upon government aid or power, it was felt that racial discrimination should be prohibited regardless of whether the project be ultimately owned publicly or privately. The legal test, it was thought, should be whether the project was made possible by state action. Moreover, inasmuch as city slum areas usually house minorities, it

---


6 Urban redevelopment is a program to clear the blighted areas of cities and rebuild them with more wholesome improvements. Whether the urban redeveloper is private or public, he needs the assistance of government to acquire land. Subsidies are usually necessary, too, to write down the land cost, and sometimes tax exemption or other subventions are extended as well.
was feared that urban redevelopment might eventuate into a legalized method for ousting them from their homes. Some observers saw in urban redevelopment schemes a potential successor-weapon to the restrictive covenant and the racial zoning ordinance, and one that was many times more menacing. There was ample basis for this fear, particularly for the minorities who were now threatened with eviction from the old areas and were deemed unqualified for the new private projects.

The first project to face judicial scrutiny was Stuyvesant Town, a $93,000,000 undertaking of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in the heart of New York City, which accommodated more than 25,000 persons.

An action was brought in 1947 by three Negro veterans of World War II who applied for admission into the project and were turned down, admittedly because they were Negroes. A second action was brought by a taxpayer to enjoin the city and the Stuyvesant Town Corporation from discriminating in the selection of tenants. Both actions were supported by the American Jewish Congress, the NAACP, and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

In July, 1949, the New York Court of Appeals, by a 4-3 decision, upheld the right of the Stuyvesant Town Corporation and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company to discriminate in the selection of their tenants.

Prevailing and dissenting opinions emphasized the gravity of the issue. Stuyvesant Town benefited from the three government powers: It received more than $50,000,000 in tax exemption from the city; it acquired land when the city invoked its power of eminent domain and thousands of families were dispossessed to make way for Metropolitan's development, while streets equal to 19 per cent of the area were conveyed to Metropolitan.

Metropolitan nevertheless claimed that its Stuyvesant Town undertaking was private and free from the restraints against racial discrimination to which government is subject.

As the majority opinion in the Dorsey case, written by Judge Bruce Bromley, posed it:

The increasing and fruitful participation of government, both State and Federal, in the industrial and economic life of the nation—by subsidy and control analogous to that found in this case—suggests the grave and delicate problem in defining the scope of the constitutional inhibitions which would be posed if we were to characterize the rental policy of respondents as governmental action. To cite only a few examples: the merchant marine, air carriers and farmers all receive substantial economic aid from our Federal Government and are subject to varying degrees of control in the public interest. Yet it has never been suggested that those and similar groups are subject to the restraints upon governmental action embodied in the Fifth Amendment similar to the restrictions of the Fourteenth upon the States.

The dissenting opinion maintained that Stuyvesant Town was a creature of state action and was subject to the restraints of the Fourteenth Amendment. In his opinion Judge Stanley Fuld declared:

\[\text{Supra.}\]
As long as there is present the basic element, an exertion of governmental power in some form, as long as there is present something "more" than purely private conduct, the momentum of the principle carries it into areas once thought to be untouched by its direction. ... A private individual who practices discrimination under the constraint of the state power violates the equal protection clause while it performs a function of governmental character, or while it acts in a matter of high public interest with the sufferance and acquiescence of the State ... even the conduct of private individuals offends against the constitutional provision if it appears in an activity of public importance and if the State has accorded the transaction either the panoply of its authority or the weight of its power, interest and support. ... As an enterprise in urban redevelopment, Stuyvesant Town is a far cry from a privately built and privately run apartment house. ... As citizens and residents of the City, Negroes as well as white people have contributed to the development. ... Stuyvesant Town in its role as chosen instrument for this public purpose may not escape the obligations that accompany the privileges accorded to it. ... It is impossible to balance the essence of democracy against fireproof buildings and well-kept lawns.

The Dorsey case was being appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision in the Polier case was final and no appeal was taken.

**Anti-Discrimination in Federal Housing Legislation**

When the national housing bill came before Congress in 1949, an effort was made to ban discrimination and segregation in projects benefiting under the act. This led to a sharp division of opinion among minority groups on strategy. One view, sponsored by the NAACP, was that future social legislation should contain anti-bias protections, regardless of the consequences to the legislation. Even the motives of the sponsors in pressing such legislation should not be questioned, it held. On the other hand, the position taken by the National Council of Negro Women and other groups was that public housing in itself was breaking down segregated patterns in many Northern cities. Because dwellings were being assigned on the basis of need rather than racial proportion and because minorities were therefore receiving subsidized housing as much as three times the amount they would be entitled to on the basis of their numbers, public housing legislation, it was felt, should not be endangered by the injection of civil rights issues. The application of these two approaches was brought into sharp relief with the introduction of an anti-bias rider to the national housing bill.

Senators Harry P. Cain (Rep.-Wash.) and John W. Bricker (Rep.-Ohio) conceded they were introducing the anti-discrimination amendment in an effort to defeat the housing measure. To the surprise of the minority groups, the Cain-Bricker proposal sought not a ban on racial discrimination or segregation in urban redevelopment, where such legislation was justified and needed, but in public housing, where it was least needed.

Liberal senators, led by Paul Douglas (Dem.-Ill.), Hubert Humphrey (Dem.-Minn.), Wayne L. Morse (Rep.-Ore.), and Glen Taylor (Dem.-Ida.), opposed the nondiscrimination amendment, claiming that it was proffered in bad faith and that it was designed to alienate thirty votes from the housing measure
rather than to advance the cause of civil rights. By a vote of 49-31, the Cain-
Bricker amendment was defeated.

After passage of the housing bill by the Senate, Congressman Adam C.
Powell, Jr. (Dem.-N. Y.), introduced a bill in the House to give priority to
residents dispossessed from urban redevelopment sites. The amendment passed
the House, but it had no administration support and was deleted in con-
ference.

That the Douglas position was justified was evidenced in the fact that when
the housing bill came before the House, the public housing provisions won
by only five votes.

Local Statutes

Efforts to ban racial discrimination in urban redevelopment projects were
made at the local level, but little progress was evident up to 1948 except in
New York City which had barred discrimination in projects receiving tax
exemption since 1944. Laws prohibiting discrimination in public places were
in operation in only a minority of the states. New York, the first state to
pioneer in banning discrimination in employment, was unable to have an anti-
discrimination provision included in its state urban redevelopment law.

In Chicago, Ill., the “Carey Ordinance” sought to outlaw racial discrimina-
tion in urban redevelopment projects but after a warm argument and approval
in committee in March, 1949, it was rejected when Chicago’s Mayor Martin H.
Kennelly flatly opposed the legislation.

In St. Louis, Mo., a move to outlaw racial segregation in urban redevelop-
ment projects was tabled and remained dormant. On the other hand, a similar
proposal in San Francisco, Cal., won approval in May, 1949, after an un-
relenting fight captained by the Council for Civic Unity. A resolution
authorized the city’s urban redevelopment agency to negotiate with a re-
developer to end discrimination on his project, and to enjoin him by court
action if his discrimination persisted. Of all the states with enabling legis-
lation, only Pennsylvania forbade racial and other discrimination in urban
redevelopment, while Minnesota barred discrimination based on religious or
political affiliation.

As the first organized effort of its kind, the New York State Committee on
Discrimination in Housing was created in January, 1949, to outlaw discrimina-
tion in urban redevelopment projects throughout the state and to minimize
racial and religious discrimination in housing generally.

Racial Policies in Public Housing

Public housing continued to point the way in successful interracial neigh-
borhoods. The racial patterns were not uniform, and variations in assignments
included token minority representation in some projects, others where the
racial groups were about evenly divided, some in which one racial group formed
a substantial minority of the whole number and some in which it occupied
most of the dwelling units. The most successful projects continued to be those
in which the minority was well represented but did not dominate the project in
numbers. However successful it proved where tried, mixed occupancy was still not the general rule in public housing. In the Southern and border states, separate projects were developed for Negroes and whites and even in many of the mixed projects in the North segregation was maintained.\textsuperscript{10}

The Chicago Council against Racial and Religious Discrimination reported that Negroes were living in eight interracial projects under the city’s emergency housing program. The threat of repetition of the violence which accompanied Negro admission into the Fernwood and Airport projects subsided. In New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, and other cities, mixed projects have been in effect with success. Connecticut in 1949 joined the states barring discrimination in public housing projects.\textsuperscript{11} Every project in New York City, except the small “First Houses” project, had Negro as well as white tenants, and the continuation of that policy in the new program for families paying up to $17.50 monthly per room had not halted the rush of applications for the 21,000 available apartments. In fact, in 1949, 30,000 such applications were received in a single day.

\textit{Privately-owned Developments}

Though the successful operation of interracial public housing projects in the North should have influenced large private projects, progress in breaking down discrimination in privately-owned developments was slow. Racial restrictions varied with the area and the racial groupings in a community, and depended also upon whether the sponsorship was public, cooperative, or private.

Many cooperative projects endeavored to bar racial discrimination as a policy, but localities often obstructed their efforts by failing to modify zoning or building ordinances or by imposing new obstructive zoning laws.

Restrictive policies operated in private housing against Negroes almost everywhere, against Mexicans in the Southwest, against Orientals in the West. Restrictions against Jews continued in many resort hotels and in some “restricted neighborhoods” under construction at the time of writing. No minority was immune, and the discrimination seemed to ascend with the increasing pressure of the infiltrating minority for dwellings.

In New York City, where the mixed public housing pattern had become accepted, mixed private housing made initial headway and was regarded as an important experiment which was under observation throughout the land. More than $30,000,000 was invested by leading financial institutions in urban redevelopment projects, and more than $16,000,000 in limited dividend projects, all of which were subject to the nondiscrimination ordinance, though not all were of mixed tenancy. Curiously, the problem that seemed to emerge was rather one of attracting enough members of the minority to join in the cooperative venture.

\begin{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{10} In New Jersey, a lower court ruled in \textit{Seawell v MacWithey} (2 N.J. Super. 255) that segregation in a public housing project was discriminatory, but the case was reversed subsequently on other issues. \textit{Seawell v MacWithey} (2 N.J. 563).

The past year was important in the overcoming of minority barriers in the field of education. Elmo Roper's study, *Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College*,¹ released on March 17, 1949, revealed what was already known to some extent: that throughout the country an application filed by a Jewish student had considerably less chance of being accepted than one filed by a Catholic or Protestant student. This knowledge spurred civic groups to take steps to remedy the situation, generally through legislation. In addition, there was great public interest in the complex problem of the relationship between religion and the public schools.

**Fair Educational Practices Legislation in New York State**

On the heels of the publication of the report of New York's Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University, the state legislature enacted the Quinn-Olliffe Fair Educational Practices Law, barring the practice of discrimination in New York's colleges. The bill was signed into law on April 5, 1948.

In revealing discrimination in colleges and recommending legislation to overcome it, the Temporary Commission became the fourth legislative group to reach these conclusions. The President's Committee on Civil Rights, the President's Commission on Higher Education, and the Special Investigating Committee of the New York City Council had previously made the same findings. Noting that the procedure under existing New York State law was ineffective in eliminating discrimination, the Temporary Commission recommended that "the state should provide an administrative process which will eliminate discrimination in the admission of students." Accordingly, the Temporary Commission advised, and the Quinn-Olliffe bill provided for, the supervision of the admission practices of colleges and universities by an administrative agency which was empowered to act on its own initiative.

**The Quinn-Olliffe Act**

The Quinn-Olliffe act made it an unfair educational practice for a post-secondary school "to exclude or limit or otherwise discriminate against any person or persons seeking admission as students . . . because of race, religion, creed, color, or national origin." Any other criteria could be used in the admission of students. Religious or denominational schools were expressly permitted to select students exclusively or primarily from members of their own denomination, to give preference to such members, or to select students in a manner "calculated by such institution to promote the religious principles for which it is established or maintained." In order to claim exemption, a school had to be operated, supervised, or controlled by a religious or de-
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¹ The study, published by the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., was sponsored by B'nai B'rith.
nominational organization, and to be certified as such by the Commissioner of Education.

The act thus recognized the right of religious and denominational schools to discriminate on the basis of religion; but not on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Since it was unlikely that any religious school would claim that racial discrimination was calculated to promote its religious principles and only such a claim could bring such discrimination within the exemption provision, the act appeared effectively to bar racial discrimination in religious as well as in other schools.

The act also contained a provision prohibiting schools from penalizing anyone, "because he has instituted, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceedings under this section."

Although the legislation contained no express condemnation of quotas or other discriminatory policies, the intent of the law was to cover such conduct. Any doubts on this point were eliminated by statements on the floor of the assembly on March 11, 1948, by the sponsors of the bill.

The bill had been subject to many pressures and changes, and thus contained certain weaknesses which many critics noted. They pointed out that the exemption given religious schools could have been narrower; that its limitation to "post-secondary educational institutions is a substantial drawback"; that there was no requirement that schools were to keep records of their admission proceedings and supply specific information concerning the criteria adopted in selecting applicants.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULINGS

The objections to the legislation were met, in part, by the administrative rulings adopted by the Board of Regents on October 15, 1948, a month after the law went into effect. The rulings outlined procedures in the filing of complaints, specified the conditions under which a college was to be certified as a religious or denominational institution, and ordered educational institutions to preserve all data relating to admission of applicants for a period of at least three years following the date of admission or exclusion.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

On May 20, 1949, a number of interested organizations met with the Board of Regents Committee on the Administration of the Fair Educational Practices Law for the purpose of discussing procedures adopted. At the meeting, Frederick W. Hoeing, whom Governor Thomas E. Dewey had appointed administrator of the law, reported that he had been about 90 per cent successful in eliminating questions pertaining to race, religion, and nationality from college application blanks. The Regents were urged by some of these organizations to secure a published statement from each college of its criteria for admission and its admission procedures.

The Regents were further told of the need for continued study of the ethnic, racial, and religious composition of college classes in order to determine the effectiveness of the Quinn-Olliffe law.

The Regents Committee announced that no petitions alleging discrimination on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin had been filed
against any institution in the state during the first nine months of the law's operation. A pamphlet explaining the rights of applicants under the law had been widely distributed by the administrator of the Quinn-Olliffe law. It was further stated that the Regents had instructed Hoeing to work closely with the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York with a view to further revision and improvement of application blanks.

Legislation in Other States

Fair educational practices bills were introduced in the legislatures of Connecticut, Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, but they failed of enactment.

The New Jersey legislature on March 16, 1949, passed the Freeman Law amending the Fair Employment Practices Act to include educational institutions. In addition, the act brought under the jurisdiction of the State Division Against Discrimination such places of recreation and public accommodation as hotels, restaurants, taverns, theaters, swimming pools, bathhouses, boardwalks, gymnasiums, and bowling alleys. The law also increased the penalties prescribed previously by the law which was passed two years earlier. On March 3, 1949, Indiana passed a law prohibiting segregation in public kindergartens, elementary schools, and high schools, but failed to establish administrative machinery.

Massachusetts also passed a Fair Educational Practices Act modeled along the lines of the New York statute but of greater scope. The legislation applies to secretarial, business, vocational and trade schools as well as to primary and secondary schools, and every university "which accepts applications for admission from the public generally and which is not in its nature distinctly private, except that nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent a religious or denominational educational institution from selecting its students exclusively from adherents or members of such religion or denomination . . . ." The bill passed the Massachusetts State Senate on August 15, 1949, and within a few days was signed by the Governor.

Education of the Negro in the South

A survey published by The Journal of Negro Education in the Summer of 1948 revealed the following higher educational facilities provided for whites through public funds in the seventeen Southern states: fifteen medical schools, sixteen law schools, seventeen engineering schools, fourteen schools of pharmacy, eleven schools of library science, four schools of dentistry, nine schools of social work, and at least one graduate school in each of the thirteen states which offered work leading to the doctorate. This was an incomplete listing. In contrast, the provisions for Negroes included six law schools, one school of library science, and only ten schools in eight states offering graduate work leading to the master's degree.

The Supreme Court as early as 1896 in Plessy v. Ferguson ruled that segregated facilities were legal, provided that they were equal. However, the "separate but equal" rule had not been obeyed in practice and this constituted the basis of a suit brought by Ada Lois Sipuel to compel the Law School of the
University of Oklahoma to admit her. Under the constitution of Oklahoma, Miss Sipuel was entitled to a legal education equal to that provided for white students. However, there was no law school for Negroes in Oklahoma and Miss Sipuel demanded admittance to the white law school. Her plea was sustained on January 12, 1948, in the United States Supreme Court, which directed the state of Oklahoma to provide a legal education for Miss Sipuel equal to that of whites. The court, however, did not rule on the constitutionality of the state's segregation laws.

To comply with the ruling, the state of Oklahoma hastened to establish a law school as a branch of its Negro college—Langston University. Miss Sipuel and other Negroes declined to enroll in this school, claiming that the facilities were far from being equal to those provided for the whites. Another suit was promptly instituted by Miss Sipuel and was in the courts at the time of writing.

Oklahoma also had no graduate school for Negroes. Again a suit was brought, and on September 29, 1948, a three-judge federal court ruled that the University had acted unconstitutionally in denying a Negro candidate admission. This time the state did not create a separate graduate school. Instead, the Negro was admitted on a "segregated basis" and he attended lectures sitting somewhat apart from the white students. A month later, the same federal court refused the Negro's plea to prevent the segregation. The court ruled that the Negro was receiving equal educational opportunities with those of the white students and added that it was "within the power of the state to recognize racial distinctions between its citizens and to classify them."

This issue was scheduled to come before the Supreme Court in the case of Heman Marion Sweatt, Negro citizen of Texas, who had been unable at the time of writing to obtain a writ of mandamus ordering the University of Texas to admit him to its law school. Sweatt's attorneys argued that there could be no such thing as "separate but equal" education and that discrimination was an inevitable and necessary consequence of segregation.

The issues of the Sweatt case were dramatized by the mass protest on April 28, 1949, of thirty-five Negro college students who asked—and were refused—admission to the Graduate School, the Dental School, and the Medical School of the University of Texas. They took their appeal, en masse, to the legislature and to Governor Beauford H. Jester. They made representations to the effect that there were no graduate facilities available to them in Texas, and that they were therefore applying for admission to the all-white University of Texas.

In Florida, on May 13, 1949, the State Board of Control turned down the applications of five Negroes for admission to the University of Florida. While rejecting the Negro candidates, the Board offered to give them scholarships to out-of-state institutions of equal or higher rank than the University of Florida. The Negroes, however, were determined to reject this proposal and sue for their educational rights within the state of Florida.

On March 30, 1949, United States District Judge H. Church Ford ruled in Louisville, Ky., that Lyman Johnson, Louisville Negro and a teacher of the social sciences, was entitled to admission to the University of Kentucky Graduate School on the grounds that the defense had failed to prove that facilities at Kentucky State College for Negroes provided equal opportunities. In his decision, Judge Ford made it plain that his ruling in no way affected
the principle of segregation which, he explained, was not an issue in the case.

Dr. H. L. Donovan, president of the University of Kentucky, stated that the school would comply fully with the federal court order to offer instruction to any qualified Negro in its professional colleges, where the same courses were not available in Kentucky State College, the Negro institution. But at the same time, M. B. Holifield, Assistant State Attorney General, stated that Kentucky's segregation law would be invoked to prohibit whites and Negroes from attending classes together.

In Missouri, a writ was issued by Federal Circuit Judge James F. Nangle ordering Harris Teachers College to admit a Negro woman, Marjorie Vanderbilt Toliver, in accordance with the "substantially equal educational advantages" ruling of the Supreme Court. Miss Toliver was upheld in her contention that Harris College offered superior educational advantages not afforded by Stowe Teachers College for Negro students.

It was clear that as a result of these lawsuits the old makeshifts employed by the states for the purpose of establishing a semblance of equality were bound to be found wanting in further federal tests. The suits which were begun in the relatively liberal border states would in all likelihood be extended into states of the Deep South, where the practices of their educational institutions would be scrutinized by the courts.

Public Schools

On May 17, 1949, a group of local Negroes filed a complaint in the United States district clerk's office in Texarkana, Texas, against what it termed illegal discrimination against Negroes in the Texarkana Independent School District. The complainants wished the court to determine whether the alleged practices of the defendants in adopting and maintaining markedly unequal facilities for white and Negro children constituted a denial of the rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Some indication of the difficulties of bringing such a suit in a community hostile to federal intervention was apparent from an editorial in the Texarkana Gazette (May 22, 1949). Admitting that the merits of the case were for the federal court to decide, the editorial went on to state that "this suit, if prosecuted to its conclusion, will be a most damaging influence upon the harmony which has heretofore existed between the races. . . ."

Similar suits were filed during the past year in other Southern communities. Discrimination against Negroes was alleged in a suit against the Pleasant Grove (Tex.) Independent School District, as well as in a suit brought against the school board of Durham, N. C. In Virginia, a campaign was begun against unequal facilities and unequal pay for teachers in 124 divisions of the public schools, after a federal court had ordered an end to disparities in the state. Movements for salary equalization were under way in other parts of the segregated South.

The Fraternity Crisis

The problem of discrimination in college fraternities became acute early in 1949. The constitutions of certain leading college fraternities contained dis-
criteriatory clauses which either excluded or could be interpreted to exclude Negroes, Jews, Catholics, and members of other minorities.

**AMHERST COLLEGE**

The problem assumed national prominence in the course of events at Amherst College. At the close of the war, an Amherst faculty committee recommended that fraternities be abolished. An alumni committee made the same recommendation. The Amherst Board of Trustees ruled in April, 1946, that fraternities were to be compelled to take discriminatory language out of their constitutions or remove from the campus. The deadline for compliance with this ruling was February, 1951.

The action by the trustees found considerable support among the graduates of Amherst, but the reaction of national fraternity organizations was hostile. When the local Amherst chapter of Delta Tau Delta asked permission to re-establish the Amherst chapter at the end of the war, the national organization ordered the chapter to stay closed until it would “conform to the established customs, rules, and standards of the Delta Tau Delta fraternity.” This ultimatum proved unacceptable to the local Delta Tau Deltas, who withdrew from the national organization and formed their own local fraternity, Kappa Theta.

Another Amherst fraternity, Phi Kappa Psi, pledged a Negro student. The Amherst chapter informed its national organization that it intended to accept a Negro as a member. The Phi Kappa Psi National Executive Council thereupon expelled the Amherst chapter from the national organization for “unfraternal conduct.” This did not prevent the initiation of the Negro boy into the fraternity, which was reorganized as Phi Alpha Psi.

**NATIONAL INTERFRATERNITY CONFERENCE**

The National Interfraternity Conference, comprising fifty-eight fraternities, held its fortieth annual meeting in New York City in November, 1948. The Conference voted 25 to 13 against the proposition that it was “desirable that fraternities having discriminatory clauses in their constitutions with respect to color eliminate them.” However, no vote was taken on the question as to whether national organizations should alter exclusion rules against Jews and Catholics.

**The Knickerbocker Case**

There was considerable interest in alleged discrimination against Negroes and Jews in the College of the City of New York (CCNY) developed during the period under review. Particular attention was directed to the “Knickerbocker and Davis cases.”

The Knickerbocker case began in April, 1945, when four faculty members charged the head of the Romance Languages department, William E. Knickerbocker, with “continual harassment and what looks very much like discrimination....” The Board of Higher Education asked the president of the college and the general faculty to hold a “prompt and complete investigation.” This investigation, as well as one which was conducted by the Board of Higher Education, exonerated Professor Knickerbocker of anti-Semitism. On the other hand, the New York City Council conducted an investigation of its own and
found Professor Knickerbocker guilty of "reprehensive" behavior and suggested that he retire.

The Board of Higher Education refused on September 27, 1948, to institute formal public proceedings against Professor Knickerbocker on charges of conduct unbecoming a member of the staff, and to take appropriate action to remedy the elimination of the names of complainants who were opposed to Knickerbocker from the Romance Language department's list of recommendations for promotion. The American Jewish Congress, which had been acting for the plaintiffs in the case, lodged an appeal, which was heard by the New York State Commissioner of Education on April 29, 1949. At the time of writing there had been no decision.

At the same time that the issues of the Knickerbocker case were being debated, William H. Davis, administrator of Army Hall, a campus dormitory, was accused of anti-Negro bias. Davis had admitted making an error of judgment in assigning Negro students to the same rooms without asking them if this was what they wanted. After a faculty investigation, he was removed from his post and reassigned to teaching economics.

The Knickerbocker and Davis cases were joined on March 8, 1949, when Judge Hubert T. Delaney resigned as chairman of the special Alumni Association committee to investigate discrimination charges against Davis and Knickerbocker. This resulted in a much publicized strike of students.

**State University**

During the period under review, New York's State University made considerable progress. Creation of a State University was recommended in the report of the Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University presented to the state legislature on February 16, 1948. After the legislature had acted favorably on this recommendation, on August 15, 1948, Governor Dewey appointed a fifteen-man board of trustees for the new institution, headed by Oliver C. Carmichael. This group named Alvin C. Eurich to the presidency of the State University.

Within a few months after its establishment, the trustees became engaged in a controversy with the Regents over the control of the new institution. The Temporary Commission had recommended that a state university be set up "under the general supervision of the Board of Regents," and that "for the initial development and over-all operation of the State University the Legislature should authorize the Governor to appoint a board of trustees to serve for a term of six years."

In pressing for an amendment of the law, the Regents argued that the law had divided the educational system into two parts: one consisting of the grammar schools, the high schools, and the private colleges and universities, which were placed under the supervision of the Regents; the other consisting of the state-aided institutions of higher education, which the law placed under the control of the State University trustees. The Regents also felt that because university trustees were to be appointed by the Governor, "political control" would enter the educational system.

The trustees replied that their reduction to a planning and recommending
body would destroy their initiative and hamper the development of needed educational facilities; that the removal of the operation and administration of state-aided higher education from the function of planning and expanding would be a form of "dual control" more dangerous than that threatened in the present law; and that the Regents, usually nominated by county political bosses and elected by the legislature, were as subject to political influences as the University board of trustees.

On March 23, 1949, the state legislature acted in favor of the trustees by defeating the Condon-Barrett bill, which would have halted the transfer of existing state teachers' colleges and other state-aided higher educational institutions to the trustees of the State University.

Religion and the Public Schools

The decision of the Supreme Court in the case of People ex rel McCollum v. Board of Education of Champaign, Ill., on March 8, 1948, which held unconstitutional a system of released time under which classes for religious instruction were conducted within the public school building, heightened interest in the already controversial sphere of church-state relationships. The fact that four separate opinions were written by the judges, although Justice Stanley F. Reed alone voted to uphold the Champaign system, tended to encourage discussion of the subject and in the period under review numerous books and magazine articles of comment appeared.

Once the McCollum decision was promulgated, released-time practices were brought into conformity. The International Council of Religious Education, representing the religious education interest of forty Protestant denominations and thirty-three state councils of churches, observed at its annual meeting on February 7, 1949, that weekday religious education was still legal for public school children on released time. It therefore recommended that the churches refrain from using public school buildings or public school machinery for released-time classes; and, in addition, that the churches refrain from participating in any plan under which school authorities shared in the certification or selection of teachers or curriculum, in the supervising of teaching, or in the disciplining of the pupils. The May 18, 1949, meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention endorsed the decision of the Supreme Court in the McCollum case. The 161st General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church urged its 8,500 local congregations throughout the country to continue weekday classes of religious instruction, "so long as there be no violations of the law." Other religious denominations, while awarding the majority decision in the McCollum case a mixed reception, nevertheless brought released-time practices into conformity with the ruling of the court.

There was some division of opinion among public school educators. The regional conference of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association, on March 1, 1949, witnessed a sharp division on released time. Dean Ernest O. Melby of the New York University School of Education called the program "divisive" and "harmful"
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2 For the position of Jewish religious bodies on released time, see p. 155.
in its effect, while Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University, was of the opposite opinion. At the convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, held in Chicago on March 4, 1949, John W. Wilson, principal of the David Starr Jordan High School of Long Beach, Cal., urged the introduction in the public schools of religious education of a non-sectarian, secular type. On the other hand, Gabriel R. Mason, principal of Abraham Lincoln High School in Brooklyn, N. Y., called the introduction of religious teaching, even of a non-sectarian type, both dangerous and illegal.

In New York City the released-time issue assumed added significance with the commencement of two suits to end the practice. The first was brought on May 4, 1948, by Joseph Lewis, president of the Freethinkers of America, who charged the New York City Board of Education with violating the state and federal constitutions in permitting children to be released from their classes for religious instruction.

The second suit was brought in Kings County (Brooklyn, N. Y.) early in 1949 by Tessim Zorach and Esta Gluck, who contended that the released-time program had resulted in the "exercise of pressure and coercion upon parents and children to secure attendance by the children for religious instructions." This case was supported by the United Parents Association, the Public Education Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and the American Jewish Congress. The Court of Appeals gave its consent on April 11, 1949, for withdrawal of the case brought by Joseph Lewis. Lewis explained through his attorney that the Gluck-Zorach case was more factual and that the petitioners in that case had children in school and were members of religious organizations.

Factual information about the operation of the released-time system in New York City schools was contained in a report which was prepared for the Public Education Association under the direction of Dan W. Dodson of the Center for Human Relations Studies of New York University. Released on June 14, 1949, the thirty-four-page report, entitled Released Time in the New York City Schools, 1949, pointed to an increase in truancy, an increased consciousness of differences, and an intensification in group antagonisms as some consequences of the operation of the program.

**Federal Aid to Education**

By far the greatest controversy centered around the issue of federal aid to education, on which divergent points of view were held by the Protestant and Catholic churches. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church, at the "National Convention on Church and State" which was sponsored by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State in Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1949, accused the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church of launching a full-scale attack upon the principle of separation of church and state by pressing for the allocation of federal funds for parochial schools. Bishop Oxnam was promptly answered by the Rev. Msgr. John S. Spence, director of education in the diocese of Washington, and other Catholic spokesmen.
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The rival Catholic and Protestant viewpoints clashed over the bill which Representative Graham Barden (Dem., N. C.) introduced into the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives on May 11, 1949. The Barden bill strictly prohibited the states from using any of the projected federal aid for education for the benefit of private or parochial schools. In this respect, it differed from a bill which the Senate had passed by a bipartisan vote and which included parochial schools in a separate school-health program. This would enable states which in the past had aided parochial and private schools to continue to do so.

A sharp difference of opinion concerning the virtues of the Barden bill developed. The issues were debated in both religious and lay organs of opinion. As a consequence of the controversy aroused by the Barden bill Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in her syndicated newspaper column, “My Day,” on June 23, 1949, stated that in her opinion the granting of federal funds to non-public schools might be a violation of the traditional separation of church and state. In a statement issued on July 23, 1949, she was accused by Francis Cardinal Spellman, Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, of anti-Catholicism and “discrimination.”

On August 8, Mrs. Roosevelt and Cardinal Spellman both issued additional clarifying statements. Cardinal Spellman asserted that public funds were requested only for transportation, health services, and non-religious books. The Cardinal denied that the use of such funds for auxiliary services undermined the principle of separation of church and state.

Commenting on this point Mrs. Roosevelt said, “There has been a feeling among many citizens that the use of federal funds for ‘auxiliary services’ might lead to a change in the interpretation of the constitution. The Cardinal’s statement is clear on this constitutional point.” Mrs. Roosevelt reiterated that she was without bias against Roman Catholics.

It became apparent that the Federal Aid Bill to Education would not be passed during the current session of Congress. On August 2, 1949, the House Committee on Education and Labor shelved federal-aid-to-education proposals. On August 5, a conference between President Truman and Democratic leaders in Congress on the Thomas bill, which had been given senatorial approval, failed. The conferees were unable to agree on those provisions of the bill which would leave to states the option of using federal funds for auxiliary services to non-public schools.

Local Manifestations

Church-state also became an issue on state and local levels during the past year. On March 13, 1949, District Judge E. T. Hensley of New Mexico filed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the effect that there had been widespread violation of the separation of church and state in the tax-supported schools of New Mexico. Thirty-one schools in eleven New Mexican counties were involved in the decision as were some 200 Catholic nuns, brothers, and priests who served as teachers. The distribution of free state-owned textbooks to parochial schools and free transportation of church school children in
EMPLOYMENT

THE PERIOD under review witnessed a sharp decline in economic activity. Although employment remained at a high level, the number of unemployed at the beginning of 1949 reached 3,500,000, the highest level since the prewar years. Data released by the Bureau of the Census appeared to substantiate the hypothesis that discrimination in employment is intensified during the troughs in the economic cycle. While unemployment among whites increased 176.4 per cent between July, 1945, and April, 1949, there was an increase of 280.0 per cent in unemployment among non-whites during the same period. The Census Bureau concluded that because of the tendency to lay off Negroes before whites, and because of the relative lack of skill required in jobs usually assigned to them, Negroes would suffer an increasingly higher percentage of unemployment in a recession. Other studies conducted in various sections of the country by governmental and private agencies disclosed discrimination in employment to be widespread and growing.

Surveys: Federal, State, and Municipal

A survey of the Illinois labor market by the Illinois Interracial Commission revealed that private fee-charging employment agencies did not even list non-white applicants. Ninety-five per cent of the private employment agencies reported that Jewish applicants faced serious discriminatory barriers in attempting to qualify for jobs; substantial percentages reported similar difficulties facing Catholic workers. The survey also revealed that over 100,000 discriminatory "help wanted" ads were published annually in newspapers in the state of Illinois; that of 1,600 Illinois business firms polled, more than half reported no non-white employment; that 70 per cent of all financial and 75 per cent of all accounting, advertising, and other service firms in the state had no non-white employees; that only 3.6 per cent of the employees of the public utilities of the state of Illinois were non-white.

In Missouri, a special committee of the House reported to the General Assembly on March 2, 1949, the results of its investigation of violations of equal rights under the Missouri constitution. Among the violations the committee enumerated discrimination against colored workers in job placement in the metropolitan areas of St. Louis and Kansas City, and exclusion of Negroes from membership by certain building trades and other craft unions.

A Minneapolis (Minn.) self-survey conducted by the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations found that Jews, Negroes, Japanese-Americans, and other minority group members were widely discriminated against by employers. Of 523 Minneapolis firms whose reports were tabulated, 63 per cent hired no Jews, Negroes, or Japanese-Americans while 37 per cent hired one or more Jews, Negroes, and/or Japanese-Americans. Of the latter, 13 per cent hired Jews only; 5 per cent hired Negroes only; 2 per cent hired Japanese-Americans only; 9 per cent hired Jews and Negroes; 3 per cent hired Jews and Japanese-Americans; 1 per cent Negroes and Japanese-Americans. Only 3 per cent hired members of the three minorities studied.

The Ohio State Employment Service reported that two out of every five job openings referred to its offices bore openly discriminatory specifications.

A survey of employment opportunities for Jews in public accounting in Cincinnati revealed that the fifteen largest public accounting firms, which employed a total of 286 accountants, had only three Jewish employees, and had employed a total of only eleven Jews over the past thirty years.

According to an official publication of the United States Employment Service (Labor Market Information, August, 1948), "One of the key factors limiting expansion of Detroit's [Mich.] industrial machine has been the inability to achieve maximum utilization of labor reserves. While the total number of job seekers appears adequate to meet the labor demand, hiring specifications have cut sharply into the 'employability' of certain workers' groups."

Reports from the Colorado State Employment Service (CSES) contained the following observations:

No openings in professional or managerial jobs were found for minority applicants registered at the Denver office of the CSES in January, 1949. Nationality is a factor explaining unemployment among persons under forty. Race stood in the way of jobs for one-fifth of all Denver veterans receiving unemployment compensation under the G. I. Bill of Rights.

A survey by the Salt Lake City (Utah) Council on Civic Unity disclosed that 61 of the 167 employers who responded to a questionnaire excluded colored citizens from certain types of employment. Forty-seven out of 162 employers said they were unwilling to give colored citizens the same seniority rights as other citizens. Twenty-seven out of 178 employers were unwilling to pay the same wages to colored people, even though the colored employees had equal skills with whites.

In a report entitled Segregation in Washington (November, 1948), the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capitol revealed the extent of all forms of racial discrimination in the seat of the national government.

---

Negroes are excluded from most skilled trades by the craft unions, and from whole industries by management policy. In retail trades, utilities, communications, and transportation, they have little chance. The telephone company employs no colored mechanics or linemen. The big department stores deny Negro women a chance to become clerks—even the one large bargain store at which two-thirds of the customers are Negro. Even in the city government, a Negro cannot get a job as a water-meter reader, a building inspector, a weights and measure inspector, or as a guard in a jail.

Fair Employment Practices (FEP) Legislation

Against this background of discrimination in employment there developed on the one hand an increased demand for fair employment practices laws on the federal, state, and local level, and on the other, an intensified opposition to such legislation.

Campaigns for FEP were better organized, better financed, and more widely supported than ever before. Included among the proponents of such legislation were virtually every major religious denomination, the large labor bodies, and numerous civic, welfare, racial, ethnic, and veterans organizations. Many of these groups went so far as to declare FEP “the number one objective” in the entire civil rights program. At a meeting with Presidential Adviser Clark Clifford in June, 1949, spokesmen for the American Federation of Labor (AFL), Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); and the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), coordinating body for national and local Jewish community relations agencies, united in urging that top priority be given to FEP among all civil rights measures.

FEP: THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Similarly, opposition to the civil rights program crystallized around the FEP movement. During the Presidential campaign in the Fall of 1948, FEP was attacked by the Southern Dixiecrat party as “a Communist-inspired conspiracy—designed to destroy our republican form of government,” and there were dire forebodings that enactment of a federal FEP law would lead to “bloodshed” and “violence.” Even such Southern liberals as Ralph McGill, Ellis Arnall, and Jonathan Daniels, who supported other civil rights proposals, joined the anti-FEP camp. Following the election of President Harry S. Truman in November, 1948, and his renewed demand for civil rights legislation in his “State of the Union” message, Southern legislators offered to “compromise” on all items in the civil rights program except FEP. Senator John L. McClellan of Arkansas suggested that a filibuster against other parts of the program might be avoided if the President would abandon FEP, and Representative Percy Priest of Tennessee, majority whip in the Eighty-first Congress, stated that “the Southerners might be willing to let some kind of anti-poll tax and anti-lynching bill pass,” if the administration did not press for concurrent enactment of FEP.

Northern opposition to proposed state and municipal FEP bills was no less determined. Despite growing support for such legislation among many liberal businessmen, most of the trade associations and chambers of commerce
remained inflexibly opposed. Charging that FEP bills were "Communist-inspired" and represented "bureaucratic interference" with management's prerogatives, these organized business groups expended large sums of money in a concerted effort to defeat such legislation. Thus, FEP became one of the most bitterly fought issues not only in the Capitol, but in state legislatures and city councils as well.

FEP IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Immediately upon the opening of the Eighty-first Congress on January 5, 1949, Senator Irving M. Ives (Rep.-N. Y.), on behalf of himself and Senators Dennis Chavez (Dem.-N. M.), Sheridan Downey (Dem.-Cal.), Wayne L. Morse (Rep.-Ore.), James E. Murray (Dem.-Mont.), Francis J. Myers (Dem.-Pa.), Leverett Saltonstall (Rep.-Mass.), and H. Alexander Smith (Rep.-N. J.), introduced a bill (S. 174) "to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry." By the end of the first week of the Eighty-first Congress, no less than seven separate FEP bills had been introduced in the House of Representatives: by Emanuel Celler (Dem.-N. Y.), William L. Dawson (Dem.-Ill.), Helen Gahagan Douglas (Dem.-Cal.), James G. Fulton (Rep.-Pa.), Jacob K. Javits (Rep.-N. Y.), Mary T. Norton (Dem.-N. J.), and Adam C. Powell, Jr. (Dem.-N. Y.).

These bills were virtually identical with one another and with the bills introduced in the Eightieth Congress. All sought to prohibit discrimination by employers having fifty or more employees, by labor unions, and by government agencies, and to establish administrative agencies which would receive and investigate complaints, attempt to eliminate discrimination by "conference, conciliation, and persuasion," and, if unsuccessful, hold hearings and issue orders enforceable in the courts.

On April 29, 1949, an administration measure was introduced by Senator J. Howard McGrath (S. 1728) and Congressman Adam C. Powell, Jr. (H. R. 4453). The McGrath-Powell bill differed from earlier measures only in minor details. These included the reduction of the proposed commission from seven to five members, elimination of the provision permitting Congress to disapprove of commission regulations, application of the act to government contracts exceeding $10,000 instead of basing it upon the number of employees, and omission of the phrase "or ancestry."

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, to which the Senate bills were referred, failed to take any action. In the House, extensive hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee consisting of Congressmen Powell, chairman; Thomas H. Burke (Dem.-Ohio), Carl D. Perkins (Dem.-Ky.), Walter E. Brehm (Rep.-Ohio), and Richard M. Nixon (Rep.-Cal.). Spokesmen for more than a score of national religious, labor, and civic organizations, including the major Jewish community relations agencies, presented testimony in support of the bill. Opposition testimony was confined to the Southern Congressmen. On June 2, 1949, by unanimous vote (Congressman Nixon was absent) the subcommittee reported favorably on H. R. 4453, and further amended it so as to make it applicable to discrimination because of ancestry. No further action had been taken when the period under review came to a close.
The emergence of FEP as a major political issue was also evidenced by the number of state party platforms which included FEP planks, and by the many governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, who urged enactment of FEP in their messages to their legislatures. Among the advocates were Governors Luther W. Youngdahl of Minnesota; Adlai E. Stevenson, Illinois; G. Mennen Williams, Michigan; James H. Duff, Pennsylvania; John O. Pastore, Rhode Island; William Lee Knous, Colorado; Henry F. Schricker, Indiana; and Frank J. Lausche, Ohio.

Northern legislatures, most of which met only biennially, were all in session in 1949, and comprehensive FEP bills were introduced in nineteen of them (Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia). All of these bills, while varying in some respects, followed the pattern of existing state FEP statutes and of the pending federal bills. In two states, Oregon and Indiana, the bills were designed to strengthen existing laws which contained no enforcement provisions, while in Wisconsin, a bill was offered to strengthen the investigative powers without providing for the addition of enforcement powers. In North Dakota and Iowa, measures were introduced prohibiting discrimination in employment but containing no administrative machinery, and in Missouri a bill was submitted to prohibit discrimination by the state and its political subdivisions.

Four states (New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington) succeeded in enacting comprehensive FEP laws. Added to the statutes previously in effect in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, this made a total of eight states with effective legal prohibitions against employment discrimination. Kansas established a temporary commission to investigate employment discrimination, and Minnesota appropriated $5,000 per year to its interracial council for an educational campaign against employment discrimination.

In both Colorado and Ohio, effective FEP bills were passed by substantial majorities in the House of Representatives, only to be rendered ineffective in the Senate by elimination of enforcement features. In Colorado, a joint conference committee of the two houses could not agree on a compromise before the legislature adjourned. In Ohio, a conference committee reported a bill in which some of the usual enforcement provisions were omitted but which might nevertheless have been effective if passed. A motion to bring this report to a vote in the Senate was defeated, and the bill was thereby killed.

In Illinois a bill introduced by fifty-seven representatives was passed in the House by a vote of 81 to 43, only to be voted down in the Senate by a vote of 25 to 23.

In these and other states (i.e., Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania), FEP was among the most hotly debated issues of the legislative session. The narrow margin by which many of the bills were defeated and the broad-based representative movements which were organized in their support augured well, however, for the enactment of additional statutes in the future.
Richmond became the first city in California and the seventh in the country to enact a municipal FEP. The Richmond ordinance, adopted by unanimous vote, forbade discrimination in hiring by the city or by holders of city contracts and franchises, and provided a misdemeanor penalty of $500 fine or six months in jail for violations of the ordinance. A proposed ordinance in Cleveland, Ohio, was shelved by the City Council and one in Los Angeles, Cal., was under consideration at the end of the period under review. Chicago, Ill., the first city to adopt an FEP ordinance, included a clause in the franchise of Commonwealth Edison forbidding racial or religious discrimination in employment.

Administration of FEP Laws

While the merits and demerits of FEP were being hotly debated in the halls of Congress and in the state legislatures, the existing commissions continued to provide a convincing demonstration of the effectiveness of fair employment practices legislation.

During the period covered by their 1948 annual reports, the agencies administering the laws in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut handled a total of 869 cases. As in previous years, all cases were settled by conciliation without resort either to public hearings or court proceedings. The reports were unanimous in declaring that Negroes and other minority groups were being employed in industries and occupations previously closed to them, that questions about race and religion had virtually disappeared from employment applications, and that workers from minority groups were increasingly being admitted to membership in unions from which they had formerly been excluded. The reports stressed that these gains had been accomplished "without confusion or recrimination," and without a single complaint that compliance had resulted in a loss of efficiency, customers, or revenue. In March, 1949, the Division Against Discrimination of the State of New Jersey wrote to 158 representative employers requesting their frank appraisal of the New Jersey FEP law. Of 65 replies received during the first week after the mailing of the inquiry, not a single one expressed any negative or unfavorable reaction.

A number of independent surveys provided substantial corroborative evidence for the claims of the administering agencies.

The United States Bureau of the Census in a study published on October 4, 1948, revealed a marked shift in the Negro labor force in Greater New York from menial labor and non-skilled work to sales, clerical, and semi-skilled jobs.

A survey of Negro white-collar workers in twenty-five selected cities made public by the National Urban League on October 20, 1948, showed that of a

---

3 Other cities with FEP ordinances were Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Phoenix, Ariz. The ordinances of Chicago, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia applied both to public and private employers, while those in Milwaukee and Phoenix applied to the city and to agencies contracting with it. The Cincinnati law applied only to city employees. Philadelphia and Minneapolis established Fair Employment Practices Commissions to administer their ordinances.

4 New York 453, New Jersey 210, Massachusetts 142, Connecticut 64.
total of 7,734 such employees, more than half were working in four cities—and these were in states with FEP laws. Another third was in Chicago, which had its own anti-discrimination ordinance.

In November, 1948, the Jewish Occupational Council published a survey describing the job-seeking experiences of 4,142 applicants to Jewish vocational agencies. While 26.2 per cent of these applicants were asked about their religion in states without FEP laws, only 4.3 per cent were asked for such information in the states having such legislation.

Customer resistance to the integration of Negro sales personnel in New York City department stores was found to be minimal in a study by Gerhart Saenger which was published in September, 1948. Forty per cent of the customers interviewed failed to show any prejudice; a similar number approved of Negro sales personnel but showed stereotyped notions concerning Negro inferiority; 21 per cent approved of Negro sales clerks except for the more “intimate” departments such as clothing, lingerie, or food; the remainder—19 per cent—opposed the hiring of Negro sales personnel generally.

It is especially revealing that of the customers who objected to Negro clerks only in “intimate” departments, those who had seen Negroes in the food department never objected to their handling food, but did not want them in the clothing department. And those who had seen Negroes in the lingerie and clothing departments objected only to Negroes handling food.

Furthermore, fully one-third of all customers talking to a white clerk standing beside a Negro salesperson, and one-fourth of all customers talking to a Negro clerk, stated within an hour after this contact that they had never seen any Negro clerks in department stores.

Inconsistencies in the attitudes of the respondents were explained as follows:

In the average American, prejudicial attitudes co-exist with his belief in the fundamental right of equal opportunity for all. The prejudiced person, if confronted with the presence of Negro sales persons, believes that others must have accepted the fact of these Negro clerks. The existence of a law against discrimination will further reinforce his reluctance to object and run counter to what he believes to be public opinion.

In November, 1948, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress published a comprehensive study giving the historical background of FEP laws as well as the arguments for and against such legislation. “In the early stages of development,” the report states, “there were many—even some who were favorably disposed towards the idea—who doubted whether such legislation could be made to work. Today, with three years of experience on which to judge—there is ample evidence to support their most sanguine hopes.”

Despite the gains detailed in the study, however, discrimination was far from eliminated. In April, 1949, the American Jewish Congress conducted a survey of Manhattan employment agencies supplying white-collar personnel. Although the proportion of agencies accepting discriminatory job orders had declined 24.2 per cent as compared with a similar study made in December,

---

1946, fully two-thirds of the agencies were still willing to fill an order for a "white Protestant" stenographer in violation of the New York law. A partial explanation for this widespread violation and for the relatively small number of complaints filed with the State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) was suggested in another study by the American Jewish Congress showing that only 8 per cent of New York City residents were aware that there was a state law prohibiting discrimination in employment and a state agency to which they could bring their grievances.

Experience with municipal FEP ordinances paralleled that of the states: those cities whose ordinances provided administrative machinery (Minneapolis and Philadelphia) showed a record of constructive achievement, while the others showed no appreciable activity.

During the first nine months of operation (June 1, 1948, to March 1, 1949) the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) processed 147 complaints, 96 of which were settled, while the remaining 51 were still under investigation. As in the case of the state laws, all settlements were achieved by "conference, conciliation and persuasion." The report of the Philadelphia FEPC cited increased employment of Negroes in sales and clerical positions in department stores, public utilities, and insurance companies.

The Minneapolis experience was virtually identical: a decline in the traditional exclusion of Negro clerks and office workers, and the adjustment of all complaints without resort to the courts. In October, 1948, the City Council broadened the scope of the Minneapolis ordinance to cover employment agencies and made it unlawful for an employer, union, or employment agency "to elicit or record information concerning the race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry of an applicant."

Executive Order 9980

Perhaps the most significant development on the federal level was the issuance by President Truman on July 26, 1948, of Executive Order 9980 governing fair employment practices in the federal establishment.

The order did not initiate any new public policy. The Ramspeck Act of 1940 revising civil service procedures had specifically directed: "There shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race, creed, or color" (Public Law 1881, Seventy-sixth Congress, Third Session, Title 2, Section 3E). There was no effective implementation of this directive however, with the result that members of racial and religious minorities were conspicuously absent from certain government agencies and in others were confined to segregated units or menial categories. Thus, approximately one-fourth of all the cases handled by the wartime FEPC related to discrimination in government employment.

Executive Order 9980 set up administrative machinery to realize the public purpose clearly set forth in the Ramspeck Act. The order provided first, that all personnel actions taken by federal appointing officers were to be based solely on merit and fitness, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin; second, responsibility was placed with the head of each department in
the executive branch of the government to develop an effective program for
the observance of fair employment policies in all personnel actions within
his department; third, provision was made for the designation of a Fair Em-
ployment Officer by the head of each department, and for this officer to have
full operating responsibility for carrying out the fair employment program.

The Fair Employment Officer of each department was empowered to
appraise the personnel actions of the department at regular intervals; to
receive complaints or appeals concerning alleged discriminatory actions taken
in the department; to appoint departmental control or regional deputies,
committees, or hearing boards to investigate or receive complaints of dis-
crimination; and to take necessary corrective or disciplinary action in con-
sultation with, or on the basis of delegated authority from, the head of the
department.

The order also established a seven-member Fair Employment Board to
entertain appeals involving discrimination and to advise with and assist the
departments in carrying out a fair employment program.

On October 7, 1948, the Civil Service Commission appointed the seven-
member Fair Employment Board, naming as chairman Guy Moffett, former
White House aide. Other members included: Fred C. Croxton, former special
commissioner of the United States Conciliation Service; Daniel W. Tracy,
president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, American
Federation of Labor, and former Assistant Secretary of Labor; Jesse H.
Mitchell, president of the Industrial Bank of Washington, D. C.; Ethel C.
Dunham, former director of the Division of Research in Child Development,
United States Children’s Bureau; Eugene Kinckle Jones, general secretary
of the National Urban League; and Annabel Matthews, former attorney in
the Chief Counsel’s Office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Even before the FEP Board was appointed however, the executive order
was put to a test when Mortimer Jordan, internal revenue collector for
Alabama, announced that he would refuse to comply with its provisions.
Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder acted promptly. “I construe your
contumacious action,” he wrote, “to be a tender of resignation from the posi-
tion now held by you.” A new collector was then appointed who pledged to
abide by the President’s directive.

Effectiveness of Executive Order

The period under review did not provide sufficient basis on which to
evaluate the effectiveness of Executive Order 9980. To be sure, Fair Employ-
ment Officers were appointed in sixty-two agencies and procedures were
developed for the redress of individual complaints. On the other hand, no
positive program had as yet evolved, no decision had been reached as to
whether segregation necessarily constituted discrimination under the terms
of the order, nor had any reports been issued on complaints and adjust-
ments, despite the fact that such reports were to have been submitted by
April 15, 1949.

Whatever procedural or administrative weaknesses might ultimately be
revealed, however, the very issuance of Executive Order 9980 was of profound
and continuing significance. For unlike any previous order of this kind, it was not issued in a "national emergency" but within the scope of the normal peacetime authority of the President. In practical political terms, therefore, it was not likely to be repudiated by any succeeding Chief Executive. It thus represented a condition to which every government personnel officer in the foreseeable future would be forced to give heed and within which the equitable administration of the civil service code could progress.

**Armed Services**

One other action on the federal level which merited mention, and which ultimately might prove to be extremely significant, was the announcement that, effective July 1, 1949, all armed services procurement contracts would be required to include a non-discrimination clause. The specific clause which would have to be written into future contracts was as follows:

In connection with the performance of this contract, the contractor agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin; and further agrees to insert the foregoing provision in all subcontracts hereunder mentioned, except subcontracts for standard commercial supplies and for raw materials.

**Voluntary Anti-Discrimination Actions**

Spurred by the growing demand for legislation to curb discriminatory employment practices and by the narrow margin by which so many FEP bills were defeated, employer groups began to advocate "fair employment practices through voluntary cooperation." The most comprehensive program of this kind was that submitted to the Cleveland City Council by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce in a frank—and successful—move to prevent the adoption of an FEP ordinance. Entitled the "Cooperative Employment Practices Plan," the Cleveland program declared:

The Employer accepts his responsibility, as a part of the community, to assist in the improvement of economic opportunity for all. Accordingly, he will (if he has not already done so) adopt the following procedures to improve employment opportunities:

1. Take steps to educate his employees and supervisors in their obligation to work harmoniously with all groups of people.
2. Declare that persons with equal training, experience, and other qualifications shall have equal opportunities for employment.
3. As the need arises, permit any qualified persons to be employed in or advanced to the economically more desirable positions.

To assure the effectiveness of the plan, a Committee on Employment Practices was established, consisting of sixteen members, one-half of whom were appointed by the Chamber of Commerce and the rest by the mayor. An extensive educational program was initiated, including the production of a manual entitled *How to Apply Cooperative Employment Practices*. A report covering the first four months of the plan (December 15, 1948, through April 15, 1949) claimed acceptance of its principles by more than 150 com-
panies, a decrease in discriminatory advertisements, and "several instances" in which members of minority groups were placed in positions not previously open to them. At the close of the period under review, a number of cities in Ohio, as well as communities in other sections of the country, were exploring the possibility of undertaking similar programs.

**Pilot Placement Projects**

The "pilot placement project," aimed at integrating qualified technical, professional, and administrative workers from among minority groups into American industry, was employed in several cities. The National Urban League reported increasing success in its "pilot" project for Negroes, citing progress in Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; St. Paul, Minn.; San Francisco, Cal.; and Washington, D. C.

The General Cable Corporation in Perth Amboy, N. J., was the site of another "pilot" experiment in industrial group relations. Sponsored jointly by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, in cooperation with the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University, the experiment consisted of a series of weekly seminars with a group of employees on the supervisory level of labor and management. These seminars aimed at "taking the term race relations out of its academic context and showing how it influences work, production, and community relationships." It was anticipated that similar experiments would be conducted in a number of major industrial concerns.

**Professions**

The professions, too, reflected the broadening base of employment opportunities for minorities. Allison Davis of the University of Chicago became the first Negro ever to hold the rank of full professor on a permanent appointment in a non-Negro university, and the well-known Dr. William Hinton became the first Negro to hold a professorship in Harvard University when he was named Professor of Bacteriology and Immunology at the Harvard Medical School. The Missouri Medical Association opened its membership to Negro physicians, and the American Nurses Association voted to give direct membership to the 3,000 Southern Negro nurses who were barred from membership in district and state associations. Efforts of the Medical Society of New York to deal with a similar situation by amending the constitution of the American Medical Association to provide that "no constituent association shall exclude from membership any physicians for other than professional or ethical reasons" were defeated when the House of Delegates voted to continue the policy of local autonomy. Thus, Southern states were permitted to continue their exclusion of Negro doctors from local medical societies and, consequently, from the American Medical Association.

**Government Service**

The problem of employment discrimination continued to be inextricably tied to all other forms of discrimination. This truism was dramatically illus-
trated when Ralph Bunche declined an invitation to become Assistant Secretary of State, the highest government post ever offered to a Negro. Although the ostensible reason for refusing the position was his inability to take a pay cut, Bunche let it be known that he had no desire to submit to the indignities which he had previously experienced in Washington. "Frankly," he said, "it's a Jim Crow town and I wouldn't relish exposing my family to it again."

Arnold Aronson

ANTI-JEWISH AGITATION

Organized anti-Semitic activity, which began to decline after the war, continued at a low ebb during the year under review. Anti-Semites, however, were far from dormant. There was a greater tendency of individual agitators to combine operations, as well as increasing stress on the distribution of inflammatory literature as the principal form of overt activity, in preference to the holding of meetings and demonstrations.

Propaganda Line

The principal theme exploited by anti-Semitic agitators was the identification of Jews as Communists and as conspirators for world control. Topical subjects and issues, such as the United Nations, atomic bomb control, the Presidential campaign, the DP problem, and the events in Palestine, were labeled as instances of "Jewish communism and conspiracy." At the same time, the pleas of the anti-Semites for more tender treatment of the Germans, and their denunciations of the alleged brutality of the Western powers were more frequent and vehement than at any other period since the war's end.

Gerald L. K. Smith

The most active campaign was conducted by Gerald L. K. Smith under the name of the Christian Nationalist Crusade (or party). Although he maintained headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., Smith resided at Tulsa, Okla., and after October, 1948, made most of his rabble-rousing appearances at Los Angeles, Cal., where his many meetings were bolstered by the following of Wesley T. Swift. Also assisting Smith as members of his staff were Jonathan E. Perkins of Los Angeles, preacher of "Anglo-Saxon" race-supremacy doctrines, Emory C. Burke, convicted leader of the defunct Columbians of Atlanta, Georgia, and John W. Hamilton, of Boston, Mass. In December, 1948, Perkins broke with Smith, and in February, 1949, published a book "unmasking" Smith as "America's No. 1 Hypocrite." During Smith's demagogic excursions, the staff at St. Louis held periodic CNC meetings. Attendances, however, seldom exceeded fifty. Besides the conduct of Smith's publishing activities, the St. Louis staff busied itself with the widespread distribution of petitions for a city ordinance segregating Negroes at all places of public

1 The Cross and the Flag, monthly (circ. approx. 20,000); more than forty pamphlets, leaflets, brochures.
accommodation and amusement. In February, 1949, the St. Louis Board of Elections denied an application of the Christian Nationalist party to be placed on the ballot for municipal elections.

In an attempt to capitalize on the Presidential campaign, Smith on August 21 to 23, 1948, staged a “national convention” of the Christian Nationalist party at St. Louis, Mo., where he had himself nominated for the presidency. The attendance at the various sessions consisted mainly of the local lunatic fringe. Among the score of anti-Semitic “delegates” who addressed the sessions were keynote speaker General George Van Horn Moseley (ret.), manager of George W. Armstrong’s propaganda ventures at Fort Worth, Tex.; Wesley T. Swift; Catherine V. Brown, Philadelphia, Pa., leader of an anti-Semitic “mothers’” group; Joseph Stoessle, Buffalo, N. Y., Coughlinite and money-reform propagandist; Stephen Nenoff, Denver, Colo., “anti-Communist” publisher; Harry A. Romer, of St. Henry, Ohio, leader of the United Farmers of America, and Ernest Elmhurst, pamphleteer and international liaison for many anti-Semites. Newspapers, and civic and other pro-democratic groups and leaders applied the “quarantine” (silent) treatment to the convention; the event received a minimum of publicity, and was poorly attended. During the Democratic national convention at Philadelphia, Smith attempted to exploit the civil rights issue. His lieutenant, Donald Lohbeck, set up headquarters of the CNC in that city in the hope of attracting dissident Southern delegates. Though some of these delegates attended a small CNC meeting on July 13, 1949, none accepted the invitation to align themselves with Smith. At the same time, Smith was in Birmingham, Ala., in advance of the rump Dixiecrat convention, hawking his support among the leaders with the assistance of Jonathan E. Perkins. On July 19, 1948, South Carolina’s Governor J. Strom Thurmond, Dixiecrat presidential nominee, publicly stated: “We do not invite and do not need the support of Gerald L. K. Smith or any other rabble-rousers who use race prejudice and class hatred to inflame the emotions of the people.” At the close of the period under review, Smith was conducting a series of “rallies” at Los Angeles, and on June 1, 1949, had announced another “national convention” to be held at St. Louis September 28 through 30, 1949.

Religious Area

In the religious sphere, there was a large exploitation of the Anglo-Saxon cult as a springboard for anti-Semitic propaganda. The extremist wing of this movement held that only the “Aryan” English-speaking peoples were the true Israelites, and not the Jews. Most vitriolic and effective in injecting anti-Semitism into his sermons was Wesley T. Swift, leader of the Anglo-Saxon Christian Congregation of Los Angeles, who held many meetings and “conventions” in that city and in other cities along the West Coast. Swift, whose collaboration with Gerald L. K. Smith has been discussed, and who delivered hate-inciting sermons in dynamic fashion, was head of the bigoted Great Pyramid Club in Los Angeles, and an apologist for the Ku Klux Klan. Others active in the dissemination of hatred within the movement were Millard Flenner of Dayton, Ohio; J. A. Lovell, of Fort Worth, Texas, publisher of
The Kingdom Digest; William L. Blessing of Denver, Colo., publisher of the monthly Showers of Blessing, and Howard Rand of Haverhill, Mass., Eastern leader of the movement, whose magazine, Destiny, increased in venom as the Israeli army won victories in Palestine.

Gerald Winrod of Wichita, Kan., Harvey Springer of Denver, Colo., and Lawrence Reilly of Detroit, Mich., and Del Rio, Tex., continued to mingle bigotry with their evangelism. Winrod’s monthly magazine The Defender devoted to religious topics as well as race hatred, was widely distributed. Harvey Springer continued publication of his Western Voice. Reilly’s organization “front,” The Lutheran Research Society, was disavowed on June 10, 1949, by The National Lutheran Council, official church body, in a statement which pointed out that Reilly “was not a member of the ministerium of any of the Lutheran bodies in America.” During the period under review, Reilly published a pamphlet, Moscow’s Master Plan, attacking Jewish organizations as Communist because of their support of civil rights legislation.

Mothers’ Groups

Of the groups exploiting the theme of motherhood for anti-Semitic ends, the National Blue Star Mothers in Philadelphia, Pa., led by Catherine V. Brown, was the most active. It met regularly during the period reviewed, distributed literature, and achieved notoriety by picketing the conventions of both major political parties at Philadelphia. The United States Attorney General on April 27, 1949, officially listed the group as Fascist and subversive. We, The Mothers, of Chicago, headed by Lyrl Van Hyning, confined its activities to the publication of its monthly paper, Women’s Voice, and did not hold meetings. Agnes Waters of Washington, D.C., a lone agitator in the women’s sphere, picketed the Republican convention, and walked down the aisle while the Democratic convention was in session, shrieking anti-Semitic slogans until escorted to an exit.

“Patriotic” Groups

The Loyal American Group of Union, N. J., headed by Conde McGinley, and the Nationalist Action League of Philadelphia, headed by W. Henry MacFarland, Jr., merged forces on June 1, 1949. McGinley’s semi-monthly Common Sense became the official publication of the Nationalist Action League, while steps were reported to have been taken for that organization to absorb the Loyal American Group. The Nationalist Action League, which was named as subversive by the United States Attorney General on April 27, 1949, discontinued publication of its monthly, National Progress. Up to June 1, the Loyal American Group held meetings in northern New Jersey, its principal function having been the support and distribution of Common Sense, which, in addition to publishing anti-Semitic and pro-German material, also defended Robert H. Best, later convicted of treason. While the circulation of Common Sense was between 2,000 and 7,000, its issues of October 3 and 31, 1948, were distributed through the mails in large quantities. These two issues were exclusively devoted to attacks on Zionism with anti-Semitic overtones,
and were subsidized by a wealthy pro-Arab supporter of McGinley. W. Henry MacFarland, Jr., self-styled "nationalist coordinator," worked closely with the National Blue Star Mothers and other minor groups, such as the National Renaissance Party, operational front of James Madole, of Beacon, N. Y.

The Nationalist Unity Congress was formed at a "Nationalist Convention" convoked by Andrew B. McAllister at Hinckley, Ill., where he conducted the Pro-American Information Bureau. The event, held June 15 to 17, 1949, was poorly attended, drew no bigots of consequence other than Salem Bader, pro-Arab propagandist; Kenneth Goff, Nationalist "youth leader"; and Lyrl Van Hyning, Chicago "mothers'" leader, who was elected chairman. The Nationalist Unity Congress, despite its ambitious program for effecting a coalition of anti-Semitic forces in the United States, gave no indication of having such strength.

**German Groups**

German agitators in the United States pressed their campaign for a "soft" peace for Germany mainly by distributing literature, an endeavor in which they received substantial cooperation from the anti-Semitic press. The principal themes exploited were "Allied brutality" and "the Morgenthau Plan." Such pamphlets as *Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe*, by Austin App; A. O. Tittman's *Planned Famine*; and *Gruesome Harvest*, by Ralph Keeling were among the materials widely distributed.

Few active German groups remained, however. In New York, Kurt Mertig's Citizens' Protective League, which was declared subversive in 1948 by the United States Attorney General, was moribund, while A. O. Tittman's Voters' Alliance for Americans of German Ancestry held small meetings in a restaurant. Leonard Enders' Organized Americans of German Ancestry in Chicago met regularly and issued a monthly bulletin. A segment of the German-language press carried anti-Semitic material, especially in comments on DP's, Jewish American Military Government officials, the German black market, and related topics. Articles by Otto Strasser, notorious former Hitlerite, appeared in several papers.

**Judge Armstrong Foundation**

George W. Armstrong, 84-year-old millionaire of Fort Worth, continued the operation of his Judge Armstrong Foundation with the aid of George Van Horn Moseley. Incorporated in 1945 for charitable purposes, Armstrong announced two years later that it had been established for the purpose of publishing his anti-Semitic pamphlets. During the period reviewed, two pamphlets, *Traitors* and *Zionist Wall Street*, appeared under the Foundation's imprint. During the Presidential campaign, Armstrong inserted many bigoted political advertisements in southwestern newspapers.

**Ku Klux Klan**

The bitter controversy over the issue of civil rights legislation during the national political campaign provided much impetus for the growth of the Ku
Klux Klan. More than fifty instances of terror and violence in the South during 1948 were attributed to increased Klan activity, as localities throughout the region, especially in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Florida, were visited with Klan parades, initiations, and cross-burnings. Floggings, kidnappings, shootings, threats, and other forms of terror and violence were perpetrated on both Negroes and whites by white-robed hoodlums. On April 27, 1949, the United States Attorney General officially listed and declared the Association of Georgia Klans and the Original Southern Klans, Inc. (a schismatic offshoot) to be organizations which have "adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States." The principal organizational structure of Klanism continued to be Grand Dragon Samuel Green's Association of Georgia Klans, with headquarters at Atlanta, Ga. While accurate estimates of Klan strength were unobtainable, Green publicly boasted that there were 140 Klaverns (units) in Georgia, 20 in South Carolina, and 15 each in Tennessee, Alabama, and Florida, no unit with less than 100 members. While Klansmen were chiefly motivated by race-hatred, an increasing tendency toward violence against whites for alleged moral lapses became apparent. At the close of the period under review, no abatement of Klanism was discernible. In sharp contrast to the apathy displayed by Klan-infested regions in the 1920's, however, the press, church, chambers of commerce, civic, veterans', and other community groups, legislative bodies, and law-enforcement agencies in the states affected, vigorously combated the Klan, and the vast preponderance of Southern public sentiment was vehemently opposed to it. Statutes and ordinances prohibiting the wearing of masks or other forms of Klan conduct were enacted in Atlanta, Augusta, Macon, Columbus, and Wrightsville, Ga.; in Chattanooga, Tenn.; in Tallahassee, Miami, and Coral Gables, Fla.; other state and local legislation was pending at the close of the period under review. The governors of South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida ordered enforcement agencies into action. On January 22, 1949, an official of the Southern Baptist Social Service Commission was reported to have warned churches against accepting Klan donations, which he termed "bribe-money." In Chattanooga, important church members resigned over the election of a Klansman pastor. The mayor of Soperton, Ga., on May 21, 1949, ripped the masks off three Klansmen and arrested them, receiving President Truman's congratulations for this action. At Gainesville, Ga., Negroes openly jeered a Klan procession, without incident. As this report was written, Alabama's Klan leader, William Hugh Morris, was jailed for his failure to deliver membership records to a grand jury at Birmingham, while at Rome, Ga., a federal grand jury began a probe of Klan activities there.

**Legal Proceedings**

The Reverend Arthur W. Terminiello, Catholic priest who retired from anti-Semitic activity in 1947 and was later reinstated by his bishop, attained nation-wide notice on May 16, 1949, when the United States Supreme Court reversed his conviction for inducing a breach of the peace. The conviction was the result of disturbances at a meeting jointly held by Terminiello and
Gerald L. K. Smith. Based on a highly technical interpretation of the local ordinance, the decision did not affect the basic principles of law involved. Also on May 16, 1949, the Federal Parole Board at Washington, D. C., denied parole to William Dudley Pelley, Silver Shirt leader, who was convicted of sedition in 1942 and was serving a fifteen-year sentence. Homer Loomis, Jr., Columbian leader convicted of inciting a riot, was denied a new trial by a Georgia court on June 25, 1949. Both Loomis and his colleague, Emory C. Burke, who was convicted of usurping police power, were at large pending appeal. August Klapprott, former Bund leader of New Jersey, was denied reinstatement to United States citizenship by a Newark Federal Court on June 23, 1949. Also on June 23, 1949, at Muncie, Ind., Court Asher, publisher of the weekly, X-Ray, was sentenced to ninety days and fined $100 for assault and battery.

Reappearances and Departures

Long inactive in the organizational field, Allen Zoll was revealed in July, 1948, to be the moving spirit behind the National Council for American Education in New York, which had been formed with the stated objective of combating subversive influences in the schools. A decade before, Zoll had headed the American Patriots, Inc., which was listed as subversive by the United States Attorney General. On learning of Zoll's connection with the National Council for American Education, several prominent citizens withdrew from that organization.

Formerly active as Father Coughlin's representative, Leo F. Reardon attracted attention as director of the American Education Association of Detroit, which had patriotic objectives similar to the National Council for American Education, and published a semi-monthly newsletter, Crossroads. The early March, 1949, issue of Crossroads attacked Brotherhood Week as sentimental and Red-inspired, and boasted that "... the native energy and dishonesty [sic] of the people always pulled the Nation through to greater prosperity."

Eugene Flitcraft abandoned his Chicago anti-Semitic boycott organization, the Gentile Cooperative League, and discontinued publication of its organ, The Anti-Communist.

International Collaboration

An increase in the collaboration between agitators in the United States and those abroad was noted. Communication was maintained largely through liaison agents in the various countries who provided an international anti-Semitic network for the purpose of facilitating literature distribution, exchange of information, and editorial, and other forms of mutual assistance. The anti-Semitic leaflets of Einar Aberg of Sweden continued to be widely distributed in United States. The writings of Arnold Leese, G. F. Green, and Oswald Mosley of England were quoted by the anti-Semitic press of the United States. A pamphlet by Adrien Arcand, Canadian Fascist leader, The Key to the Mystery, was distributed by Russell Roberts of Detroit. Ray K. Rudman, a South African Nazi publisher, projected an international anti-
Semitic organization, "nominating" many of the United States' agitators as directors or officials. The plan was, however, abortive. According to G. F. Green, an international anti-Semitic conference was planned for 1949, but this meeting had not materialized at the time of the preparation of this report.

Publications

The publications of the anti-Semitic press ranged in style from the mimeographed hate-sheet to the intellectual newsletter and the well-printed magazine. New publications were: Williams' Intelligence Summary, a monthly newsletter issued by Robert H. Williams, anti-Semitic pamphleteer, in Hollywood, Cal.; The National Renaissance Bulletin, monthly newsletter published by James A. Madole, at Beacon, N. Y.; Dan Gilbert's Washington Letter, a monthly newsletter, whose first issue, attacking socialized medicine, bore the salutation "Dear Christian American."

GEORGE KELLMAN

INTERGROUP AND INTERFAITH ACTIVITIES

The outstanding development of the year under review was the emergence of the local community as the focal point for intergroup relations. In the wake of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights issued in October, 1947, there was increased interest on the part of the American public in the problems of group prejudice and discrimination and a greater professionalism of community relations work. Accompanying an emphasis on community organization for civil rights, there was less generalized mass education for democracy and more specialized education in human relations, carried on through civic and special interest groups and through community-centered programs of adult education.

Community Planning for Intergroup Relations

Beginning in 1943, government assumed more responsibility for local intergroup relations. Interracial commissions on a state-wide basis came into existence in Connecticut, Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In addition, state commissions to deal with problems of discriminatory employment were operating in Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin.¹ Of these, the Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin commissions lacked enforcement powers; the other commissions could enforce their orders through the courts. On June 9-10, 1949, a four-state conference of anti-discrimination administrators in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York was held in New York City. The purpose of the conference was to provide an opportunity for an interchange of experience and to consider methods for improving the administration of the respective laws against discrimination. State commissions

¹ See also p. 104.
set up to deal specifically with the problems of Negroes existed in New Jersey, North Carolina, and West Virginia, and the Texas Good Neighbor Commission concerned itself with the problems of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans.

MAYORS' COMMITTEES ON UNITY

Locally, mayors' committees were developed to discharge municipal responsibility for good intergroup relations within a community. Official committees of this type were set up in Fresno, Los Angeles, Oakland and San Francisco, Cal.; New Britain, Conn.; Denver, Colo.; Savannah, Ga.; Chicago, Galesburg, Peoria, and Rockford, Ill.; Evansville and Indianapolis, Ind.; Brookline, Cambridge, Lynn, and Springfield, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.; St. Louis, Mo.; Omaha, Neb.; Buffalo, Mt. Vernon, New Rochelle, and New York City, N. Y.; Cincinnati, Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Milwaukee, Wis.

In general, these official committees, operating as boards of arbitration and moderation, attempted through conference and conciliation to resolve specific intergroup problems which arose in the community. They dealt with intergroup incidents, arranged for police training in human relations, and employed public relations programs via the radio, newspapers, and other media in order to lessen discrimination and tension in employment, education, housing, public accommodations, and welfare. Emphasis was placed on the publication and distribution of literature publicizing the facts about discrimination rather than on specific counteraction.

CIVIC UNITY COUNCILS

In some communities the local citizenry organized private unity committees to undertake social action, as distinct from negotiation. The Civic Unity Council of Denver campaigned for the creation of an official mayor's commission which, after its appointment in the Autumn of 1947, conducted a civil rights survey in the city. The Civic Unity Council of San Francisco played a leading role in securing in May, 1949, an anti-discrimination resolution from the city Board of Supervisors in connection with urban redevelopment housing. The Civic Unity Council of Seattle and the Spokane Council on Race Relations were active in the 1949 campaign for fair employment practices legislation in Washington. The Trenton Committee for Unity stimulated the public to support the omnibus civil rights bill passed during the 1949 session of the New Jersey state legislature.

In other communities, the local organizations interested in group relations combined their resources and consolidated their programs to service the total community. The Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, the Interracial Federation of Milwaukee County, the Chicago Council against Racial and Religious Discrimination and the Los Angeles County Conference on Community Relations were illustrative of this trend.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

In addition, field offices and local chapters of national group relations organizations operated throughout the country. Table 1 presents a break-
down of the number of professionally staffed field offices (regional, state, and local) maintained by the major organizations active in intergroup relations.

**TABLE 1**

**FIELD OFFICES OF NATIONAL GROUP RELATIONS AGENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee</td>
<td>6/3 (^b)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>18/3 (^b)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship of Reconciliation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Democracy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese American Citizens League</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Christians and Jews</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Urban League</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Regional Conference</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Defense League</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Only organizations with budgets in excess of $50,000 and with one or more field offices as of June 30, 1949, are included.

\(^b\) Maintained three offices jointly.

Catholic interracial councils existed in eleven cities; the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches maintained 32 state conference committees and 308 local church social action committees; the United Council of Church Women operated 40 state and 1,500 local branches; the Department of Race Relations of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America worked through Protestant councils in the major urban centers; Jewish community councils affiliated with the National Community Relations Advisory Council existed in 27 regions and cities.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION SERVICES**

Community consultation services were maintained by the Race Relations Department of the American Missionary Association, the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, the American Friends Service Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The American Council on Race Relations served as an information clearing house and consultation bureau for the approximately 385 independent and 749 affiliated intergroup relations agencies listed in the 1948-49 *Directory of Agencies in Intergroup Relations* published by the Council. In 1949 the Council also published two digests, *Studies in Reduction of Prejudice* and *Inventory of Research in Racial and Cultural Relations*, as well as selected bibliographies on the several aspects of community and group relations programs. Furthermore, the Council stimulated the development of an advisory group, the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials.

**NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS**

Several years of rapid population shifts in New York City provided the basis for projects involving neighborhood group work. In the East Bronx, private group relations organizations, the Mayor's Committee on Unity, and
city and state departments combined with the local population to foster the development of community councils, to open the public schools as community centers, to develop civilian boards for handling problems of truancy and juvenile delinquency and for providing facilities for adult education. The New York chapter of the American Jewish Committee, the New York Urban League, the New York office of the Anti-Defamation League, the Bronx Roundtable of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the City-State Youth Board, Police Precinct Coordinating Councils in the area, the Department of Community Activities, Board of Education, and Sachs Quality Furniture Stores participated in this project. Similar work was undertaken by the Catholic Interracial Council in South Jamaica; and in Brooklyn, by the Commission on Community Inter-relations of the American Jewish Congress, and the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, the Mayor's Friendly Relations Commission worked with the school principal at Washburn Elementary School in a mixed, low-income area to develop an inter-racial faculty and a school-community center. In New Haven, Conn., with the aid of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, an intergroup neighborhood council was developed in a middle-income area. The "Back of the Yards" Neighborhood Council of Chicago, formed in 1939 as an early experiment in neighborhood organization, reached a membership of 120,000 individuals and 186 cooperating organizations. The Industrial Areas Foundation of Chicago which had supported the "Back of the Yards" movement also contributed to the development of the Los Angeles Community Service Organization which provided a community relations service for that city's Mexican-American community. Adventure in Cooperation, published by the Bureau of Adult Education of the New York State Education Department, outlined a pattern for community organization in a central school district serving rural communities.

For the most part, however, local community relations were merely the local counterpart of activities which were formerly the major preoccupation of national organizations—the day-to-day handling of specific incidents, the staging of large public meetings embracing interfaith or inter-racial themes and the mass distribution of "good will" educational materials. It is against this background of community relations in transition that the record of accomplishment in combating prejudice and discrimination must be assessed.

Community Organization for Civil Rights

COMMUNITY SELF-SURVEYS

As part of the community education process, a technique known as the community audit, or self-survey, became increasingly popular. The prime objective of this type of community project was to involve the local citizenry in self-examination.

Three distinct types of surveys were developed. Charles S. Johnson of Fisk University, a pioneer in the field, developed self-surveys in Pittsburgh, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Kalamazoo, Mich., which were later duplicated in Denver and Cincinnati. The Fisk type of survey was a fact finding project publicly undertaken by an official mayor's committee. The Montclair
type of survey, developed by the Montclair (N. J.) Forum and the American Veterans Committee and later promoted by the National Citizens Council on Civil Rights, was a fact finding project undertaken by a group of private organizations dedicated to the fight against discrimination. The “Northtown” type of survey, developed by the Commission on Community Inter-relations of the American Jewish Congress, involved the organization of citizens’ committees which included interested citizens and all civic organizations, not only those active in civil rights work.

The “Northtown” survey placed greater emphasis on total community participation in the audit and on the scientific validity of the facts found; the other surveys placed their emphases on the education of the community. All three surveys envisaged the organization of the community for action programs as the end result.

SOCIAL ACTION CAMPAIGNS

The period under review was marked by the development of two organizational frameworks for social action. One was the nonsectarian council, such as was utilized in the 1949 Illinois campaign for fair employment practices legislation. The other was the state-wide citizens’ committee, such as was utilized by the New York State Committee on Discrimination in Housing. The pattern of operation was similar in both approaches. The first objective, the education of the community to the problem, was met by the use of newspaper stories, public meetings, radio forums, and the distribution of literature. Although campaigns were inevitably initiated in urban centers with large minority groups, the development of state-wide movements necessitated the creation of county organizations throughout the state, in rural as well as urban areas. Community organization also required the support of church groups and of the organized special-interest groups within the community, including veterans, labor, and business.

**Intergroup Relations in the Public Schools**

Intercultural education is the term used to describe any organized attempt to educate young people in public schools and colleges toward a better understanding of themselves and their milieu, and particularly of people who are of different religion, race, or color. The period under review witnessed the conclusion of the field work initiated in 1944 by the major organizations in the area of intercultural education and the beginning of an evaluation of results.

**THE BUREAU FOR INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION**

The Bureau for Intercultural Education carried on a series of school-community projects throughout the years 1944-1948 for the purposes of investigating the extent of group antagonisms in public school systems and devising techniques to overcome them; of creating a reservoir of competent professionals to conduct programs of intercultural education; and of testing and developing the best materials for teachers and school administrators. The
emphasis was on securing the cooperation of school administrators and teachers and on training them in intercultural education practices and techniques. The Bureau worked with the school systems and community leaders in Detroit, Kalamazoo and Battle Creek, Mich.; Gary and East Chicago, Ind.; Philadelphia, Pa.; and White Plains, N. Y.

Perhaps the most significant accomplishment was the development in Gary of a non-segregated school system. The initiation of this policy led to school strikes in 1946 which were resolved successfully, and at its 1949 session, the Indiana legislature provided for an end to segregation in the state's public schools.

In Philadelphia, the "Early Childhood Project" was carried on with the cooperation of the Philadelphia public schools, the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, and the Research Center for Group Dynamics of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The aim was to develop ways in which the school could deal with prejudice on the kindergarten, first- and second-grade levels. In White Plains, the Bureau cooperated with the New York State Commission against Discrimination and Westchester County school superintendents in developing the White Plains Human Relations Center, designed principally to provide in-service training for teachers in the techniques and content of education for democratic human relations.

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

The American Council on Education, aided by financial grants from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, completed during the past year two projects which had been started in 1944. The "Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools" project was an experimental program of in-service teacher education originally begun in Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Pittsburgh, and later extended to seventy-two school systems from Massachusetts to California. The approach of this project differed from that of the Bureau for Intercultural Education in that work began with group conflicts in the school or the community before the cooperation of educational leaders was secured. The project sought to integrate intergroup education into all subjects in the curriculum and to develop school-community relations. Four publications were produced as part of the project's "Work in Progress" series. They were: Reading Ladders for Human Relations (1947), Literature for Human Understanding (1948), Sociometry in Group Relations (1948), and Curriculum in Intergroup Relations (1949).

The second project, "The College Study in Intergroup Relations," was designed to discover how to effect changes in the behavior of prospective teachers. During the past year twenty-four colleges participated in the project.

OTHER PROJECTS IN INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

The Pacific Coast Council on Intercultural Education, formerly affiliated with the Bureau for Intercultural Education, devoted 1946-49 to the development of an intercultural education program in the San Diego city schools. The Council also organized a pre-service teacher education project in seven state colleges in California. In cooperation with the University of California
at Los Angeles (UCLA), the Council undertook a study of personnel policies and practices with reference to minority groups in public education in California. The Council furnished a consultative service to the local school system and to thirteen local city schools. It also sponsored annual Summer workshops in intercultural education at UCLA.

In New York City, a sharp controversy over the intercultural education program for the public schools arose over the decision of the Board of Education to disband Youthbuilders. This was a private organization established in 1938 to help public schools furnish children with opportunities to deal with school and neighborhood problems. The program was officially approved as a school activity in 1946, but in 1949 the Board of Education voted to take over the Youthbuilders program. The decision was criticized by the Protestant Council, the Board of Jewish Rabbis, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Public Education Association, the United Parents Association, and the Commission on Christian Social Relations of the Episcopal Diocese of New York.

The Commission on American Citizenship at Catholic University in Washington, D. C., promoted intercultural education within the parochial school system. The Commission prepared textbooks and study guides for school use, and published a series called "The Faith and Freedom Readers," written for elementary school students and emphasizing the intergroup approach to community problems. Parental responsibility was stressed in the programs of the Association for Childhood Education which operated in New York, Cleveland, in Baltimore, Md., and in Louisiana, and in the program of the Workshop for Cultural Democracy which attempted, through the medium of the school system, to secure the social integration of parents in mixed neighborhoods.

In addition to these organizations whose primary interest was intercultural education, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the American Jewish Committee, and the Anti-Defamation League also emphasized intercultural education as part of their overall programs and made funds and resources available to organizations specifically engaged in this field.

**Adult Education in Intergroup Relations**

With the enlistment of the school in the program for bringing intercultural education to youth, adult education assumed the task of training American adults for citizenship and community organization. Organizations such as the American Association for Adult Education, the Institute of Adult Education at Teachers College of Columbia University, and the New York State Citizens Council, and adult education councils in California, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, the Missouri Valley, New Jersey, and the Southeast, were active in this program. In addition, the Armed Services and the Department of Justice, as well as departments of education in the several states, developed education for citizenship programs. On the community level, the work of the boards of education of Chicago, Detroit, New York City, N. Y., and of Springfield, Mass.; and of mayors' committees in Buffalo, N. Y., and Cincinnati were typical of the activities of municipalities.
DISCUSSION GROUPS

One of the most effective techniques for adult education was the discussion group organized in 1946 and 1947 on a professional basis by the National Institute of Social Relations. Discussion groups generally were organized within a specific community or neighborhood. Material outlining the substance and conduct of the discussions was made available to leaders, and audio and visual aids were furnished. In general, the discussions were framed in terms of local, national, or international problems, into which elements of the intergroup problem were woven.

When the National Institute of Social Relations ceased operations in October, 1948, its program was assumed by the American Jewish Committee, which also undertook publication of the discussion series "Straight Talk." Similar in nature were the "Fireside" discussion group program and the "Interfaith Seminars" developed by the Anti-Defamation League.

WORKSHOPS

Workshops were a second technique of adult education. A workshop was generally limited to the formulation of a program of action to deal with a specific problem. Summer workshops for youth, teachers, and citizens, involving living with members of different groups and sharing experiences, became increasingly popular.

Illustrative of the workshops held during the year were the "Encampment for Citizenship" sponsored by the American Ethical Union, the "Institute of Community Leadership" sponsored by the New York State Citizens Council, the "New Jersey Institute on the Community" sponsored by the New Jersey Citizens Conference, the "Annual Institute of Race Relations" sponsored by the Race Relations Department of the American Missionary Association, the "Institute on World Affairs" sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee, the "Workshop in Community Action" sponsored by the New York State Citizens Council, and the "National Conference on Citizenship" sponsored by the Citizenship Committee of the National Education Association in cooperation with the Department of Justice. The American Jewish Congress through its Commission on Community Inter-relations conducted a series of "personal incident" workshops designed to equip laymen to deal with overt prejudice.

FORUMS

A third technique of adult education was the forum, offering programs of panels, town meetings, roundtables, and other types of educational meetings which afforded the audiences an opportunity to participate through question-and-answer or discussion periods. Among those forums which were intergroup in their composition were the Anselm Forum of Gary, Ind., the Hamilton County Forum in New York State and the Pilgrim Interfaith Forum in New York City.

Effective adult education furnished the springboard for community under-
takings in the group relations field. The community self-survey project\(^2\) frequently began in a discussion group or workshop. These techniques likewise proved useful in involving the members of special interest groups in group relations problems. For example, a series of “Turnover Talks” on civil rights problems prepared by the National Labor Service was utilized by the educational departments of labor unions. National Labor Service and the Jewish Labor Committee also helped trade unions and university labor extension divisions to develop anti-discrimination courses and teaching materials for workers’ education institutes. On March 23, 1949, the Troy Area Industrial Union Council of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), in cooperation with the Troy Council of the State Commission against Discrimination, held a conference in Troy, N. Y., for shop stewards, chairmen, and committeemen on “Democracy at Work.”

**COLLEGE-CENTERED PROGRAMS**

Adult education on the college campuses took the form of leadership training in community organization and community problems. The National Conference of Christians and Jews concentrated on the development of programs of community integration, using the college as a focal point. A five-year program of leadership training sponsored by the Conference began in February, 1948, at Teachers College of Columbia University in New York City. Other Conference-financed projects, emphasizing research into the nature of prejudice as well as leadership training, were being carried on at Wayne University in Detroit and at the Center of Intergroup Relations at the University of Chicago.

The Conference also cooperated in projects relating to curriculum planning, faculty training, entrance requirements, and extracurricular activities, with the Department of Human Relations at Miami University in Florida, Western Reserve in Cleveland, Ohio, and the School of Mines at El Paso, Texas. The Race Relations Department at Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn., the Human Relations Center at New York University (NYU) in New York City, the Research Center for Human Relations at the New School for Social Research in New York City, the Social Research Laboratory at the City College of New York (CCNY), the Social Science Foundation at the University of Denver, and the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan were other college-centered projects designed to integrate adult education, community planning, and scientific research in the area of intergroup relations.

In this connection, the American Friends Service Committee continued to provide a unique service by making available to schools and colleges visiting Negro lecturers and teachers who were persons of recognized competence in their specific fields of learning. The object was to create a situation in which a Negro assumed leadership on the campus. The American Council on Race Relations and the Bureau for Intercultural Education were among other national organizations which provided a consultative service to college-centered intergroup relations projects during the year.

\(^2\) See p. 119.
INTERGROUP AND INTERFAITH ACTIVITIES

Education for Democracy

To achieve a climate of opinion favorable to healthy intergroup relations, several organizations developed intensive educational programs addressed to the public at large. In the conduct of these programs, the media of mass communication—radio, newspapers, magazines, motion pictures—played a central role. Through these media, the message of cordial intergroup relations was directed to an estimated audience of more than eighty million persons during the year.

Advertising Media

The Advertising Council, Inc., composed of eleven private advertising firms, sponsored a large advertising campaign, “United America,” stressing the responsibility of the individual citizen for making democracy work. The Council cooperated with the Institute for American Democracy in the large-scale production and distribution of mass-appeal educational materials, including blotters, billboard posters, car cards, matchbooks, school book covers, and other advertising items. The Institute distributed its materials through mayors’ committees, junior chambers of commerce, veterans posts, YM and YWCA’s, ministerial associations, and other local civic groups.

Six feature advertisements dealing with the theme of human rights in the United States and abroad were prepared by the American Jewish Committee and distributed to newspapers and magazines throughout the country from January to June, 1949. More than 200 publications reprinted one or more of these advertisements. Increasing numbers of private business firms—such as the Latex Corporation, Shell Products Co. Inc., Sachs Quality Stores—devoted a share of their advertising to public service items emphasizing pro-democracy themes.

Dramatizing Intergroup Relations

Dramatizing good intergroup relations was part of the mass education process. “Brotherhood Week,” sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, was observed nationally from February 20 to February 27, 1949 and was marked by the presentation of awards for outstanding contributions to good will among Americans. “Race Relations Sunday,” sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, was held for the twenty-first successive year on February 13, 1949. “Inter-racial Justice Week,” sponsored by the National Catholic Commission on Inter-racial Justice, was observed in 147 Catholic colleges from February 28 through March 6, 1949. “Religious Book Week,” sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, was held from October 24 to October 31, 1948. On Jefferson Day, April 13, 1949, the Council against Intolerance in America announced awards for the advancement of democracy in 1948.

To dramatize the observance of “Rededication Week” in communities throughout the nation, the project of the “Freedom Train” was conceived in the Fall of 1947 by the American Heritage Foundation. Displaying to the American public the cherished documents that established and perpetuated
American freedom, the "Train" toured America from September 17, 1947 through January 22, 1949, covering 37,250 miles and visiting 322 communities. The exhibit was witnessed by 3,521,841 persons, with an estimated forty-five to fifty million persons participating in "Rededication Week" ceremonies. Included on the "Train" was George Washington's letter to the Jewish community of Newport, R. I., in which he enunciated as an American creed: "To bigotry no sanction. . . ."

On March 2, 1949, President Harry S. Truman signed a bill authorizing the United States government to purchase the Freedom Train and extend its tour. Congressional appropriation to this end was under consideration at the time of writing.

The "Panel of Americans," a project originated at the University of California in Los Angeles (UCLA) in the Fall of 1947 under the sponsorship of the University Religious Conference, featured a sextet of attractive girl students of different nationalities, colors, and religions. During the Spring of 1948, these girls toured the country together, visiting Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New York City, and Kansas City, Mo., as well as other communities, recounting the stories of their personal problems and triumphs to high school students. Beginning in the Fall of 1948, local "Panels" were developed in St. Louis, Cleveland, and Cincinnati, and plans for "Panels" were being made for San Francisco and Seattle.

An exhibition on superstition, prejudice, and fear, organized by the National Committee of Thirteen Against Superstition and Fear, started a ten-day showing on Friday, August 13, 1948, at the Museum of Natural History in New York City. The American Jewish Committee undertook to publicize the exhibition and to promote its presentation in other communities.

THE SPECIALIZED APPROACH

Materials produced by the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League, and the Jewish Labor Committee were channelled to large audiences in America through the special interest groups to which they belonged—labor unions, veterans organizations, business associations, church groups, youth groups, and others. In the form of cartoons, feature stories, editorials and pamphlets, these materials were picked up by the publications and house organs of the various special interest groups, distributed by these groups as a service to their members, and displayed at conventions where they were made available to the membership. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People also maintained a service to labor and veterans groups. Much of the material produced by the Jewish organizations was made available to veterans groups by the Jewish War Veterans of America.

TRENDS IN EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

During the period under review, two trends were observable: first, the material emphasized specific cooperation to secure civil rights in the United States and dramatized successful intergroup projects; second, special interest groups assumed increased responsibility for the production and distribution of group relations materials. For example, the Methodist Women produced an outstanding pamphlet analyzing the report of the President's Committee on
Civil Rights and calling for implementation of the recommendations on the local level. The February, 1949, issue of *The Woman's Press*, YWCA publication, dealt with “Progress in Civil Rights.” American Federation of Labor (AFL), CIO, and independent labor unions distributed materials to their members to mobilize support for fair employment practices (FEP) legislation. The National Social Welfare Assembly, representing twenty-two national youth organizations, produced and distributed materials describing the activities of youth councils and recommending organization of youth groups. Veterans' publications called upon the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations to support civil rights as part of their Americanism programs. *Business Looks Ahead—To Fair Employment Practices*, a pamphlet citing business support for FEP, was prepared for use in campaigns for fair employment practices measures in the Middle and Far West.

Nevertheless, the American Council on Race Relations, on the basis of a survey of the role of organized labor in civil rights and intergroup relations (*ACRR Progress Report*, April 4, 1949, covering the period January through March, 1949), stressed the fact that labor had not exerted as positive an influence in these areas as its potential would indicate.

In general, while education in the area of intergroup relations among and within special interest groups was part of the programs of these groups nationally, there was a dearth of programs on local levels.

**Edwin S. Newman**

---

**IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION**

More than one hundred bills touching upon immigration and naturalization were introduced in Congress during the period under review—from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. The vast majority of these bills dealt with minor or technical matters. Aside from the “war brides” measures authorizing the admission of war fiancées whose cases were pending, only one other measure was passed by Congress. This was H.R.2663, passed by the House on March 7 and by the Senate on May 27, 1949, section 8 of which provided for the permanent admission, regardless of existing immigration laws, of not more than 100 aliens a year if their entry “is in the interest of national security or essential to the furtherance of the national intelligence mission.” It was to be administered by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Three bills were approved by the House: 1. the Judd bill (H.R. 199), passed on March 1, 1949, eliminating racial discrimination from our immigration and naturalization laws. This would make quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples and set a limit of 100 immigrants to be admitted annually from each colony, chargeable to the quota of the governing country; 2. Resolution 238, passed on June 6, 1949, which would permit the naturalization of aliens permanently admitted to the United States, regardless of race. This bill was narrower than the Judd bill in that it did not eliminate racial restrictions from our immigration laws. It was acted on by the House as an interim measure while the Judd bill was being held over to 1950 for further study by the Senate.
Subcommittee to Investigate Immigration and Naturalization; 3. the Celler bill (H.R. 4567), passed on June 2, 1949, to amend the Displaced Persons Act.

Statistics

After the end of the second World War immigration to the United States was small but steadily increasing. During the fiscal years ending June 30, the number of immigrants admitted was 108,721 in 1946; 147,292 in 1947; 170,570 in 1948. Official figures for the year ending June 30, 1949, were not available, but for the first half of the period, from July 1 to December 31, 1948, the number admitted was 88,157. The principal countries of birth of the immigrants were Germany (17 per cent), Canada (14 per cent), United Kingdom (12 per cent), Italy (8 per cent), Poland (5 per cent), and Mexico (5 per cent). Quota immigrants filled about one-fourth of the quota authorized for the year. They increased, however, during the latter part of the fiscal year, owing to the acceleration of the DP program. Most of the non-quota immigrants were “war brides.” It was impossible to ascertain with any degree of exactness how many of these immigrants were Jewish.

The number of aliens naturalized has been declining since 1945. For fiscal years ending June 30, the numbers were 150,062 in 1946; 93,904 in 1947; and 70,150 in 1948. The decline was especially marked in cases of members of the armed forces and of persons married to United States citizens. Since a minimum of five years’ residence is required for naturalization, it will be some years before displaced persons and other recent immigrants enter the ranks of naturalized citizens.

Displaced Persons

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which became effective on July 1, 1948, authorized the admission into the United States of 205,000 DP’s within a period of two years. Because of the law’s preferential provisions favoring Balts and farmers and because of its complicated procedure, the program was slow in getting under way. The first group of DP’s to be admitted under the act did not arrive until October 30, 1948. They were greeted by Attorney General Tom Clark, representing President Harry Truman, as “The Pilgrims of 1948.” By December 31, 1948, only 2,499 DP’s had been admitted. In 1949 the movement gained momentum, and by June 30, 40,435 DP’s had been admitted, but this was far short of the estimated goal of at least 75,000 during the first year of the act.

Estimates supplied by the major voluntary agencies indicated that about 50 per cent of the DP’s who had entered this country by June 30, 1949, were Catholics, 30 per cent were Jews, and 20 per cent Protestants.¹ There was some overlapping in reporting by various agencies and some DP cases were not processed by any of the voluntary agencies. The percentage of Jews among the DP’s admitted to the United States declined over the period, in part because of the increasing activity of non-Jewish agencies in processing cases and in part because Israel was opened as a country of DP immigration. The National Catholic Welfare Conference estimated that of the 205,000 DP’s to

¹ For more detailed figures, see p. 74.
be admitted eventually under the act about 55 per cent would be Catholics, 27 per cent Protestants, and 18 per cent Jews.

Forty-five per cent of the DP's who had been admitted to this country by June 30, 1949, were Poles, 16 per cent Lithuanians, 9 per cent Latvians, 6 per cent Russians, 4 per cent Estonians, and 3 per cent Czechoslovaks. Other nationalities accounted for less than 3 per cent each. Three and one-half per cent were listed as stateless.

Federal and State DP Commissions

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 provided for a three-member commission to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, to formulate and issue regulations under the provisions of the act for the admission of eligible DP's. The members appointed included Ugo Carusi, chairman; Edward M. O'Connor, and Harry N. Rosenfield. The first step in the process of bringing a displaced person into the United States was the securing of assurances. A basic statutory condition of eligibility was that there be provided, in behalf of the displaced person, assurances of suitable employment and of safe and sanitary housing which would not displace a resident of the United States, and an assurance against his becoming a public charge. The most important source of assurances was the voluntary agencies and the most common type of assurance was one for unnamed persons.

In addition to the voluntary agencies, more than twenty states established commissions or committees for the resettlement of displaced persons. Their membership generally included representatives of the state government, business and industry, the three major religious faiths, public and private welfare organizations, labor organizations, and citizens at large. These official state bodies acted on behalf of sponsors when so requested in submitting assurances to the Displaced Persons Commission, conducted state-wide surveys of resettlement opportunities, provided information regarding the program, coordinated the resettlement activities within the state, and carried out plans for the rapid integration of the DP's into the local community. Most active was the New York State Commission on Displaced Persons, under the chairmanship of Industrial Commissioner Edward Corsi, which was the model for many of the commissions set up in other states. As a result of these agencies and activities, the validation of assurances from all over the country proceeded at a faster rate than the arrival of DP's under the provisions of the act.

Record of DP Arrivals

The great majority of the DP's arrived on ships that docked at New York, Boston, and New Orleans, where they were warmly welcomed by official and voluntary committees. Others, especially orphans, pregnant women, and mothers with small children, were brought in by plane. About one-quarter of those who entered the United States under the Displaced Persons Act remained in New York City, but the percentage was declining as community programs in other parts of the country proceeded. Displaced persons settled in every state of the Union, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska. The lead-
ing states in the reception of DP's were, in order, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, Michigan, Ohio, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, Louisiana, California, and Mississippi. From the two Southern states of Louisiana and Mississippi came reports that the DP's were mistreated as "slave labor," but Commissioner Carusi stated: "We investigated and found the reports without basis. It is true work in the South is hard, pay low, and living conditions, in some cases, below the Northern average. But our checks showed, first, that the DP's themselves were not unhappy and, second, that they were not being discriminated against. Their pay and working conditions were identical to those of the native Americans around them." According to figures supplied by the Displaced Persons Commission, 55 per cent of the DP's went to large cities, 22 per cent to smaller urban areas, and 23 per cent to rural areas.

In numerous communities the DP's helped to ease a shortage of skilled labor, and their employment in turn provided employment for American citizens. The same result ensued when DP's set up their own businesses and hired others. While skilled and unskilled workers had little or no difficulty after they arrived, some trouble was experienced by those in the professions. Doctors and lawyers, for the most part, had to conform with the laws of the states in which they settled by obtaining the required schooling and taking examinations before being admitted to practice. The Wisconsin State Board of Medical Examiners, for example, ruled in November, 1948, in the case of a DP Polish doctor engaged by a small town that "it is contrary to the policy of the state to allow doctors who are graduates of foreign universities to practice in the state." The doctor in question was given a minor position in a Chicago hospital. The International Refugee Organization stated on August 17, 1948, that most countries participating in the resettlement program were reluctant to take in persons in the professional groups, especially physicians, whom the IRO termed the "forgotten men" of Europe's DP camps.

Under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 every adult DP admitted was required to submit a report to the Displaced Persons Commission twice a year for a period of two years. The report called for information regarding the alien registration number, place of residence, kind of job or occupation, name and address of employer, and whether wages received were the prevailing ones. These records showed that the DP's had done well, had made a good adjustment, and had been successful in their varied occupations. Not a single DP had to be deported as a public charge, or for any other reason. Reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of private welfare agencies showed that the DP's had become accepted members of their communities. It was estimated that an average of six months was needed to get individuals or family groups settled and completely self-supporting. Children on the whole were most successful in becoming integrated, as reflected in their excellent school records.

Public Opinion

Most of the public expression of sentiment concerning immigration was related to displaced persons and to the question of liberalizing the Displaced
Persons Act of 1948. No major organizations came out in opposition to the immigration of DP's; at any rate, no major opposition was reported in the press. A few columnists and editors supported the current DP act, arguing the needs of the native unemployed, the shortage of housing, and the like. In reply, it was pointed out that under the act assurances were required of jobs and housing that did not displace native Americans, and that the total immigration permitted under the act would add less than .2 per cent to the population of the United States.

Various Catholic spokesmen stated that the current law was not discriminatory as far as Catholics were concerned. The National Catholic Resettlement Council proposed on January 13, 1949, that the number of DP's be increased to 400,000 in four years, that the “cut-off” date be advanced to December 31, 1948, and that all future immigration be in proportion to the racial and religious groups and elements represented in the DP camps in Europe. Protestant groups invariably spoke in favor of a more liberal and effective DP law and against discrimination on grounds of race, religion, or national origin. The same applied to Jewish groups which, in addition, expressed the fear that ex-Nazis and anti-Semites might enter as DP's unless there was the most careful screening.

Besides the religious groups, some 140 national institutions, including the major welfare, civic, and labor organizations, publicly supported the McGrath-Neely bill [see below]. Prominent among these groups were the national labor organizations, the CIO and AFL, which unequivocally endorsed the effort to secure adequate and non-discriminatory legislation—a fact of considerable significance since organized labor was traditionally opposed to a liberal immigration policy.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 played a prominent part in the Fall election. President Truman made a number of speeches against it and asked for its amendment. Governor Thomas Dewey of New York attacked the law and refused to support his fellow-Republican Chapman Revercomb for re-election to the Senate because of his sponsorship of the act. Senator Revercomb was defeated by Matthew M. Neely who demanded repeal of the act of 1948 and the substitution of a “humane” immigration law that would permit the entrance of 400,000 DP's. The Democratic platform contained a plank to that effect, and Senator J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, co-authored such a measure on July 27, 1948, in Congress.

Amendment of the DP Act of 1948

The Displaced Persons Commission, in its First Semi-Annual Report and in the testimony by its chairman before the House Judiciary Subcommittee, declared that the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was discriminatory and “all but unworkable.” It recommended the following amendments:

1. The eligibility date be changed from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947; 2. the 40 per cent limitation for de facto annexed areas be eliminated, and in lieu thereof there be a provision to assure the selection of displaced persons without discrimination as to race, religion, or national origin; 3. the 30 per cent preference for agricultural pursuits be eliminated, and agricul-
tural pursuits remain within the occupational preferences; 4. the assurance for employment and housing be deleted, and instead there be a requirement for assurances of reasonable and suitable resettlement opportunities; and the assurance against public charge be sufficient to meet the requirements of all immigration laws relating thereto; 5. the charging of visas to future quotas be discontinued; 6. the in-camp priority be removed; 7. the number of visas authorized be increased to 400,000 for issuance over a four-year period; 8. a revolving fund be established for loans to recognized voluntary agencies to meet the expenses of reception and transportation of immigrants from ports of entry; 9. provision be made for recent political refugees whose admission into the United States was in the national interest; 10. provision be made that no visas be issued to anyone who advocated or assisted in persecutions of others for reasons of race, religion, or national origin; 11. the provision relating to the adjustment of status of displaced persons already in the United States [see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, p. 435] be amended to cover those arriving by January 1, 1949, and the Attorney General's action in such cases be made final; 12. Section 12 of the act [making 50 per cent of the German and Austrian quotas available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin] be transferred to its appropriate place in the regular immigration laws, since it was not a part of the displaced persons program.

These legislative recommendations were embodied in the McGrath-Neely bill (S. 311) and its companion bill (H.R. 1344), introduced in the House by Emanuel Celler. By June 30, 1949, no action had been taken in the Senate, nor did it appear likely that action would be taken during that session of Congress. The House, however, by a resounding voice vote, passed a modified Celler bill (H.R. 4567) on June 2, 1949.

**The Celler Bill**

This bill sought to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by permitting a total of 339,000 DP's to enter the United States over a three-year period (ending June, 1951) instead of 205,000 over a two-year period. This number would include 5,000 orphans (an increase of 2,000 over the present provision), 4,000 refugees living in Shanghai, 18,000 veterans of the Polish army resident in England, and 15,000 carefully screened political refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. It would advance the cut-off date of eligibility to January 1, 1949, and eliminate the requirements that 30 per cent of the immigrant DP's be farmers and that 40 per cent be of Baltic origin. It retained, however, the requirements of assurances of employment and housing and the practice of mortgaging quotas against future admissions. It specified that the selection of DP's should be made without discrimination in favor of or against a race, religion, or nationality, and it established a revolving fund of $5,000,000 for loans to public or private agencies to help finance the reception of DP's and their inland transportation to places of permanent settlement. While not perfect and admittedly a compromise, the DP bill as passed by the House of Representatives went far to redeem the hitherto timorous and ungenerous position of the United States on the refugee question.
The Senate

In the Senate, on the other hand, the opponents of liberal DP legislation successfully adopted the strategy of delaying action. Chief among them was Senator Patrick A. McCarran of Nevada, Democrat, who occupied the powerful position of chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and of all three of the subcommittees dealing with immigration and naturalization. Senator McCarran declared that the current law had been “falsely criticized” as being discriminatory, and introduced his own bill to increase the number of DP’s admissible but retain all the current provisions which administration leaders called unjust and unworkable. His committee had taken no action on DP legislation by June 30, 1949, and it appeared that Senator McCarran intended to kill the House proposal by refusing to do anything about it. Against such tactics, the only parliamentary maneuver was a motion by a member of the committee to override the chairman and to bring the bill to the floor, or the introduction of a motion on the floor of the Senate itself to discharge the committee. Such a tactic, however, would involve an outright repudiation of a committee chairman, a rare event in Senate annals, and it did not appear likely that it would be invoked. Meanwhile, an appeal for Senate action on DP legislation was issued by prominent citizens and business leaders from all sections of the United States, and similar demands were made by a bi-partisan group of senators. Moreover, the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, in a summary of an extensive inquiry into the outlook for 700,000 refugees still in Europe, declared on January 9, 1949: “If our Government is to maintain leadership in this vital matter it must carry out its declared policy [of asylum] by effective measures aimed at liberalizing the admission of displaced persons.” The committee’s chairman, Senator Herbert R. O’Connor of Maryland, Democrat, made it plain that the report was, in part, an appeal for action in the Senate Judiciary Committee on a liberalized displaced persons bill already passed in the House. At the time of writing, the prospect was for no final action in the current session of Congress unless Senate leaders forced the bill from committee.

Maurice R. Davie

UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL

The year under review was one of increased intercourse between America and Israel. With Israel on the agenda in the United Nations, the American government was in the forefront of the negotiations that were to decide the eventual political fate of Israel. The position of Harry S. Truman and his administration on the original United Nations Partition Plan of November 29, 1947, was a major issue in the Presidential elections in the United States in November, 1948. The American people were frequently reminded of the problem of the Arab refugees and the internationalization of Jerusalem, major obstacles in the way of the final solution of Arab-Israeli conflict.

1 See Israel and the United Nations.
In addition to their interest in Israel as Americans, American Jews were concerned with the heavy responsibility of financing the mass immigration into Israel from the displaced persons (DP) camps and from North Africa. Jewish organizational life was also involved in constant self-questioning concerning the nature of the future relationship between the American Jews and Israel. Zionist organizations of every political shade, in particular, were engaged in a re-evaluation of their future roles and structures.2

**American Politics and Israel**

In the Summer of 1948, the platforms of the major parties contained resolutions unequivocally supporting the partition plan of November, 1947. This stand was altered after the endorsement on September 27, 1948, by United States Secretary of State George C. Marshall of the plan submitted by Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator.3 Without specifically detailing its position on the Bernadotte plan, the Republican party through John Foster Dulles, one of the leading members of the United States delegation to the General Assembly, indicated that Secretary Marshall’s statement was not a part of the bi-partisan foreign policy, but was a unilateral decision of the State Department. The whole month of October, 1948, during the Presidential campaign, was notable for the silence of both major parties on the subject of Israel. This common evasion was breached on October 23, 1948, when President Truman, speaking in New York City, recommitted himself to the boundary lines set down in the United States partition plan of the previous spring, and ignored completely the Bernadotte plan endorsed by Marshall. Governor Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican candidate, then issued his first statement of policy on October 21, 1948, in which he pledged his whole-hearted support of the partition plan as endorsed in the Republican platform.

Campaigners in the elections to Congress also cited their support of Israel as proof of their worthiness for election. This was particularly true in New York City where Jules J. Justin and City Councilman Eugene P. Connolly, candidates of the Republican and American Labor party respectively, sought to unseat Sol Bloom, who had represented the Congressional district for twenty-six years.4 Israel was also an issue when Representative Leo Isacson, vied with State Senator Isadore Dollinger, and when Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr. contended with Municipal Court Justice Benjamin Shalleck, Democratic candidate.

**De Jure Recognition of Israel**

On January 31, 1949, President Truman fulfilled one of his major promises of October, 1948, by granting American *de jure* recognition of Israel upon the election of a permanent government in Israel. The Arabs were compensated by a simultaneous announcement extending full diplomatic recognition to Trans-Jordan as well.

---

2 See Zionist and Pro-Israel Activities, p. 167.
3 For a description of the Bernadotte plan, see American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, p. 264 ff.
4 Congressman Sol Bloom, who was re-elected, died on March 7, 1949. See Obituaries.
On February 25, 1949, James G. McDonald was nominated by President Truman to serve as ambassador to Israel, a move which evoked considerable favorable comment in Israel, for the United States maintained legations in several Middle-Eastern countries. At the same time, Eliahu Elath, who was Israel's special representative to the United States, was named as the first Israeli ambassador to the United States.

Official relations between the two governments were cordial. Several official visits were paid by Israeli officials to the United States. The celebration of Israel's first anniversary on May 4, 1949, was the subject of a congratulatory message from President Truman to Israeli President Chaim Weizmann. On May 3, 1949, sixteen congressmen, including both Jews and Christians, arose in the House of Representatives during a two-hour special order on Israel to register their endorsement of the new nation.

Economic Cooperation Between the United States and Israel

The establishment of friendly political relations between the two governments extended into economic spheres as well. On January 19, 1949, the Export-Import bank authorized a credit of $100,000,000 to Israel. An immediate credit of $35,000,000 was allocated to assist in financing Israel's purchase in this country of equipment, materials, and services for the development of agricultural products; in addition, $65,000,000 was earmarked to be available until December 31, 1949, to help finance projects under study in the fields of communication, transportation, manufacturing, housing, and public works. On June 9, 1949, the Bank of America advanced $15,000,000 to the Keren Kayemet L'Israel, Limited, Jerusalem, representing the first major large-scale loan of a non-governmental or non-charitable character made to an Israeli corporation. The funds were understood to be needed to compensate Arabs who fled their homes during the hostilities.

American Interest in the Middle East

American interest in the Middle East as a whole was to be viewed in the light of the East-West conflict for spheres of influence throughout the world. In January, 1949, President Truman concerned himself, in Point Four of the program outlined in his inaugural address, with the improvement of undeveloped areas as a factor in the role of "advancing world trade and checking Communism."

It was generally believed that President Truman's call for a "bold new program" referred specifically to the Near East, for on May 18, 1949, a joint resolution sponsored by forty-five legislators of both houses of Congress proposed a Near East Survey Commission. The sponsors declared that "the fate of Israel is now to be unalterably linked with the fate of the whole region," and said their plan offered "a way to bring permanent peace between Israel and other Near East countries." They pointed out that an expenditure of $500,000,000 on power and irrigation alone could transform some 15,000,000 acres into fertile farms in the valleys of the Jordan, the Tigres, and the Euphrates, and in the area of the White Nile.
The problem of the Arab refugees from Palestine evoked considerable interest both on governmental and non-official levels. On January 27, 1949, President Truman sent a special message to Congress urging a $16,000,000 contribution to the United Nations to assist in the relief of Palestinian refugees, and on March 15, 1949, the House of Representatives authorized the contribution. In signing the bill, President Truman expressed the hope that “Before this relief program is ended, means will be devised for the permanent solution of the refugee problem.” The American position on the resettlement and repatriation of the Arab refugees was never published officially. It was generally believed that this policy was based on the “McGhee Plan,” named after George C. McGhee, the new Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and African Affairs. In line with Point Four, the McGhee Plan emphasized the need for higher living standards if a further breakdown of the Arab economy were to be avoided and if a half-million Arabs were to find new homes in the Arab world.

PRIVATE REACTIONS TO ARAB REFUGEE QUESTION

In private American circles, too, there was considerable interest in the Arab refugees and in the criticism of Israel’s attitude toward their resettlement. On March 7, 1949, Millar Burrows, a Yale Divinity School professor, criticized not only the attitude of Israel with respect to the Arab refugees but also, more specifically, the attitude of the American Jews because they did not “show a sincere and active concern for the Arab refugees.” Henry Smith Leiper, associate general secretary of the World Council of Churches, took a similar tack. At a meeting of the American Council for Judaism on February 28, 1948, he asserted that in order to allay a rising tide of anti-Semitic feeling the “Jewish leaders ought to come out publicly with an expression of sympathy for the 800,000 victims of the violent expulsion of Arabs from Israel.” Millar Burrows’ assertion was answered by Harry Zinder, press adviser to the State of Israel Mission, who pointed out that the flight of Arabs from Palestine was not created or encouraged by the state of Israel, and that the Jews had publicly requested the Arabs to remain.

A debate on the same subject appeared in The New York Times in April, 1949, between Karl Baehr, executive secretary of the American-Christian Palestine Committee, and Mary Garvin. Miss Garvin demanded compensation for the homes of the dispossessed. She laid particular emphasis on the fact that the “United States has a very real strategic interest in the security of the area, and a deep political interest in the good will of the 300,000,000 Mohammedans who separate the western powers from Russia and Asia.” Baehr replied that the Israeli constitution guaranteed the compensation of expropriated private property, that repatriation of Arab refugees was impossible until peace was secured, and “that the best solution for Arabs and Jews is for a resettlement program to be undertaken immediately.”
Dual Loyalty

In his speech before the American Council for Judaism, Leiper warned that “Americans of the Jewish faith must be on their guard against a dual nationality which would divide their allegiance between Israel and the United States.”

In response, Aaron Zeitlin, well-known Yiddish journalist, attacked the American Council for Judaism for inviting “a non-Jew to its meeting to threaten American Jews.”

The arrival of British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin in the United States in February, 1949, to sign the Atlantic Pact brought about a demonstration protesting his alleged “anti-Semitic statements” and “hostile policy towards Israel.” The picketing of Bevin led to a brief melee with mounted and foot patrolmen and the arrest of several youths involved. Magistrate Morris Rothenberg, in whose court the hearing was to be held, disqualified himself on the grounds of prejudice against Bevin. This disqualification evoked criticism by Milton Konvitz of Cornell University at the annual conference of the American Council for Judaism (April 22-24, 1949), who declared that the magistrate “should have used the occasion to tell the defendants that . . . they have the unqualified duty to obey the laws of the United States. . . .”

Louis Shub
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

THIS REVIEW of Jewish communal organization is concerned primarily with the major developments in the organization of the various types of local and national programs and in their inter-relationships during the period under review.

Developments in National Organization

During the year under review no national organization coordinating all local interests and national activities existed and none was in the process of being established. Efforts to build such a national organization had been made in the past, and temporary organizations had been established for emergency purposes. The most recent was the American Jewish Conference which was founded in 1943 to coordinate American Jewish efforts in behalf of Israel and toward solution of the political and economic problems of overseas Jewry. In 1948 that body attempted to project the organization of an American Jewish Assembly to be its successor and to function in the area of domestic problems as well.

The American Jewish Conference voted to discontinue operations on January 19, 1949, when the plan for an American Jewish Assembly was rejected by several major organizations, including B'nai B'rith, which had been an active supporter of the Conference. At this final meeting, the chairman of the executive committee of the Conference called attention to the fact that the creation of the Israeli state required serious consideration of the relations between Israel and the Jewish communities throughout the world, and of the inter-relationship and internal organization of those communities.

There was general agreement on the desirability of a coordination of Jewish effort, but the structural organization necessary to achieve such a goal raised many basic questions which were difficult to resolve.

Discussions of Theories of National Organization

During the year these and other questions of a national Jewish community organization received some attention in the Jewish press and at meetings of Jewish organizations in the United States. Some of these discussions were devoted to the question of whether a national organization of American Jewry should rest primarily on a religious basis and exclusively for religious objectives.

Thus, the suggestion was made by Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan in the
Reconstructionist of February 18, 1949, that “organic” communities be established where “all Jews who wish to live as Jews, and have their children raised as Jews should be registered as members.” Similar in nature was the proposal made by Henry Hurwitz in Menorah Journal of Autumn, 1949, in which Hurwitz advocated the establishment of a Jewish assembly consisting of representatives of the religious congregations. This organization would establish various “commissions” consisting of independent experts: a commission on higher learning and letters, one on colleges and universities, one on foreign relief and rehabilitation, and one on interfaith relations. The plan called for the abolition of existing individual agencies. Programs would function directly under the aegis of the proposed organization. David Petegorsky in the Congress Weekly of December 20, 1948, urged the creation of a “mass movement” of individual Jews, “launched by an integral merger of the memberships and facilities of the groups that share common principles.” This mass movement would be concerned with all major aspects of Jewish life but would neither function directly “in areas of work in which the groups that create it are functioning” nor “coordinate the activities of those groups.”

COORDINATION AND COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Though no such bodies were created in the United States, there were active attempts on the part of national agencies and national and local communities to coordinate their efforts and develop more satisfactory relationships. Thus, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) established a Committee on Stable and Unified Fund Raising in 1949 to consider various proposals for a closer integration of local community fund-raising efforts with those of national agencies operating in the overseas and domestic fields.

Problems studied by this committee, which was to report to the General Assembly of the CJFWF in December, 1949, included multiple appeals, the competition which resulted in wasteful promotional efforts and the need for a greater participation by local communities in national and overseas programs.

In 1948 ten welfare funds operating in the larger cities (Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Newark, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco) organized a “Large-City Budgeting Conference” to review cooperatively the finances and programs of the agencies benefiting from their funds. Various meetings were held in 1948 and 1949 with representatives of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B’nai B’rith Anti-Defamation League, Jewish Labor Committee, the Joint Defense Appeal, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, and the National Jewish Welfare Board. The conference projected a program calling for more intensive study of the work of these public relations organizations.

Among the questions raised were several concerning the structure and operations of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA). At a meeting of its board of directors in September, 1949, the JTA decided on some basic changes in its corporate structure. Expressing dissatisfaction with the administrative practices and policies of the JTA and its affiliates, a number of members resigned from the board and called for “a thorough impartial study of management practices, the value of the services of JTA and its affiliates, and the relation-
ships of the JTA with its affiliates." The Large-City Budgeting Conference planned to review these developments with representatives of the JTA in October, 1949.

A step forward in the rationalization of national organization was the establishment in 1949 of the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA). Until then, the United Service for New Americans (USNA) had served Jewish immigrants both in New York City and nationally. NYANA assumed responsibility for immigrants remaining in New York City. Both NYANA and USNA were to continue to be financed by the United Jewish Appeal (UJA).¹

Efforts were made during the year to coordinate national and overseas immigration service activities of the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), and USNA. In October, 1948, a partial agreement was reached concerning services by JDC and HIAS to the displaced persons (DP's) coming from Central Europe to the United States. However, with the increase of immigration to Israel, difficulties arose early in 1949 when HIAS attempted to negotiate with the International Refugee Organization (IRO) concerning its participation in the voluntary agency responsibility for moving DP's to Israel—a responsibility which had previously been borne largely by JDC, which was cooperating with the Jewish Agency. This controversial problem was finally resolved when IRO decided to continue its former relationship with JDC alone.

Attention was also given to the procedure for achieving greater participation of local community organizations in the UJA. In 1947, community representatives had been given equal representation with JDC and the United Palestine Appeal (UPA) in the administration and executive committees of the UJA which were established annually to conduct the UJA campaign; improved procedures had been devised to secure direct community representation in the annual UJA meeting, which decided programs and campaign goals. In 1948 and 1949 the Committee on UJA of the CJFWF requested further and more direct participation in the actual planning, and an involvement equal to that of JDC and UPA. The 1949 UJA accepted procedures which would give this committee a formal place in the course of JDC and UPA negotiations and planning.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL (NCRAC)

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) had decided at its 1948 plenary session that there was need for further coordination among the national civic defense agencies on matters of clearance, joint decisions on policy, and utilization of available resources in the community relations field. The possibility of allocation of functions among the various agencies was also studied during the year. At the plenary session of the NCRAC held at the end of April, 1949, there was agreement on procedures for clearance, on the setting up of a service to report on methods for arriving at policy decisions, and on assignment of work among the constituent agencies to implement policies on which there was agreement. No definite action was

¹ See p. 196.
taken on the functional division of responsibilities among the various national organizations for service in the community relations field.

Zionist Organizations

During the period under review, the functions and structure of national Zionist organizations also became the subject of major interest. With the creation of the state of Israel, it was felt in many quarters both within and outside the Zionist movement that the primary goal of Zionism had been achieved. Hence, the question was raised whether it was necessary to continue the various American Zionist groups and philanthropies in their existing forms.

Among the proposals made was the suggestion that "although Zionist groups had rendered historical services to the Jewish people and Jewish destiny . . . their role in American Jewish life is becoming less creative [and] they are inadequate both for the specific tasks they are now performing and for the larger and long term needs of American Jewry." (David Petegorsky, Congress Weekly, December 20, 1948.) It was suggested that these tasks be transferred to "a democratically organized and administered" Jewish community.

The fifty-second annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) heard a report from its Commission on the Future Program and Constitution of the World Zionist Organization. Asking no radical proposals for the reorganization of the ZOA, the Commission's report welcomed the participation of non-Zionist groups in fund raising and in the support of Israel and noted the desirability of coordinating all efforts in behalf of Israel. As a first step it recommended the formation of a consultative body representing all Jewish groups and interests. The ZOA convention decided that the recommendations of this committee required further study and referred the report to its incoming national administrative council and national executive committee.2

ORGANIZATION FOR FUND RAISING

Questions concerning the structure and function of the Zionist movement in this country were also reflected in the discussions leading up to the continuation of UJA for 1949. The UJA was regularly constituted on an annual basis by joint agreement between the JDC and the UPA. In the Fall of 1948, a Committee of Contributors and Workers challenged the structure and the activities of the UPA and its two constituent member agencies, the Keren Hayesod and the Keren Kayemeth. After protracted negotiations and discussions in which a committee of the CJFWF served as conciliators, a final settlement was reached by the board of the UPA on February 28, 1949.3

The announcement of a 1950 UJA was made in July, 1949. JDC and UPA agreed to continue joint fund raising, leaving for a later settlement the allocation of funds and other details involved in the annual contract.

2 See p. 169.
3 See pp. 168 and 182.
MULTIPLE FUND-RAISING CAMPAIGNS

The growing needs of the state of Israel had stimulated independent fund raising by many established and new Jewish agencies. This was a problem of concern to the local welfare funds, the UJA, and the Jewish Agency. Following resolutions and discussions of this subject at the annual meeting of the UJA, the General Assembly of the CJFWF, and at various regional and local meetings, representations were made to the Executive of the Jewish Agency meeting in New York City in February, 1949. Agreement was reached that a plan of procedure was necessary to reduce multiple campaigns and simplify the organization of appeals in behalf of causes in Israel. A special office established by the Jewish Agency to deal with multiple campaigns in the United States made considerable progress in reducing duplication of the various appeals in behalf of Israel.²

UNIFICATION OF FUND RAISING

A further development in this area took place at the meeting which was called by the Jewish Agency and held in Israel at the end of July, 1949. The desirability of a single unified campaign within the UJA for all Israel agencies and causes was advanced and supported by some Jewish Agency leaders, Israel government officials, and representatives of American fund-raising agencies, but was not adopted. Although recognizing the prime importance of the UJA, several of the other fund-raising agencies, including Hadassah and Histadrut, insisted on continuing their independent campaigns. However, it was agreed that an attempt would be made to improve such campaigns and to introduce a licensing system in Israel which would control and regulate the fund-raising programs of the many agencies conducting campaigns for Israel. Discussions were also begun on the extension of JDC services to the unemployable and disabled among the new immigrants to Israel and on the centralization of the aid being given to the religious educational institutions in Israel. Later in the year it was announced that agreement had been reached among the JDC, the Jewish Agency, and the government of Israel for the establishment of a new program under the combined auspices of these three bodies for the “hard core” of the new immigrants. A fund of $15,000,000, of which the JDC was to distribute $7,500,000, was established to operate this service, which was scheduled to begin in November, 1949.

Community Organization—Local Developments

Progress continued both in the organization of central communal agencies and in the raising of the standards of local community fund raising and the planning of programs and services. The record amounts that had been secured in 1948 by the organized central fund-raising campaigns made more funds available for national agencies and for local needs as well. In many cities attention was directed to expansion of programs for health and welfare services, and an increase in the planning to secure the necessary capital resources.

² See also p. 181.
FUND RAISING IN 1949

However, at the time of writing there were indications that the high level of 1948 would not be reached in 1949. It was estimated that totals for 1949 would be approximately 20 per cent below those of 1948. Nevertheless, amounts raised would not be less than those raised in 1947 and larger than those raised in years previous to 1947.

The victorious conclusion of World War II, the memory of the six million dead of European Jewry, and the emergence of Israel were considered factors which had stimulated American Jewish interest in communal work in the period between 1945 and 1948. Some observers sensed a growing apathy in certain segments of the American Jewish population toward their continuing communal responsibilities both in the United States and abroad during the period under review. However, it was recognized that real gains in communal participation had been achieved and that a large part of these gains would probably be maintained during the years when the emergencies were considered to be less acute. Energetic efforts in community organization would be required to conserve the gains of the previous decade for the benefit of continuing communal needs and programs.

The inability of local welfare funds, with few exceptions, to repeat their 1948 fund-raising record is explained largely by economic factors and by a possibly growing complacency on the part of contributors. Fund-raising agencies reported a lessened ability to reach all of their potential contributors, and a slight decline in the total number of contributions was anticipated. A number of cities reported marked reductions, in a few instances by as much as 30 to 40 per cent, in the contributions made by their largest donors. This loss was only partly made up by increased donations from contributors in the middle brackets.

The decline in contributions intensified many of the problems faced by local communities because there was no appreciable decline in the demands made on the Jewish community in the United States for the support of overseas, national, and local causes. The questions of priority among these causes and competition among the leading agencies for what they considered to be their legitimate share of the funds became more acute.

Communal Structures and Functions

Having achieved a basic form of central communal organization, almost all the centers of Jewish population during the period under review were engaged in the consolidation of gains in organization and improvements in structures and service programs. Additional communities reorganized their central communal planning agencies to allow broader representation from all communal groups in the community. The Detroit Jewish Federation, for instance, enlarged its board to include representatives of communal agencies, of the trades and professions, of youth and women's divisions of the campaign, of councils of group organizations, as well as individuals at large. In some communities, such as Danbury, Conn.; Elmira, N. Y.; Sacramento, Cal.; and Denver, Col., constitutions were revised to enable the development of a democratic com-
community body, in some instances as a successor to a more informal type of welfare fund organization. Several communities, including Lynn and New Bedford, Mass.; Waco, Texas; and Spokane, Wash., were organized to include year-round community planning rather than to be concerned exclusively with fund raising.

Changes were made to permit existing fund-raising organizations and social service or other central agencies to be merged in a single unified fund-raising and planning federation for the entire community. Chicago successfully merged its federation and welfare fund campaigns in 1949, and Baltimore, where local federations and overseas agencies had previously held separate campaigns, was planning a single combined campaign in 1950. Buffalo, N. Y.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Worcester, Mass.; South Bend, Ind.; and Little Rock, Ark., combined or integrated their local federations and their welfare funds. Central Jewish organizations were also developed in Bangor, Maine, and New Britain, Conn.

Studies were being made in a number of cities with the aim of improving communal structure and functions—among them, Akron and Cleveland, Ohio; Atlantic City and Paterson, N. J.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Ore.; Rochester and Troy, N. Y.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Pittsfield, Mass.; and Seattle, Wash.

POPULATION SURVEYS

To provide a basis for local communal planning, Memphis and Nashville, Tenn.; Miami, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and Norfolk, Va., completed Jewish population surveys in 1949; population studies were in process in Springfield, Mass., and Trenton, N. J.

OFFICE FOR POPULATION RESEARCH

A new development in population research was the creation of the Office for Population Research, initiated as a joint project by a number of Jewish organizations. The aim of the Office was to establish a permanent program for Jewish population studies and for assembling of Jewish demographic data. The project had been initially discussed at the Conference on Jewish Demography held in December, 1945, and recommended at a second conference in April, 1949. The organizations represented in the conferences included: the American Association for Jewish Education, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Historical Society, the Anti-Defamation League, the Conference on Jewish Relations, the CJFWF, the Jewish Statistical Bureau, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the National Jewish Welfare Board, USNA, and the Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO).

It was hoped that the project would aid local communal agencies and national organizations to develop and plan their programs on the basis of concrete information about the trends and characteristics of the American Jewish population. At the end of 1949 the structure of a permanent organization was being planned, and methods for securing financial support were being explored.
For the first time in the history of American Jewish community organization, a conference was held of cities too small, for the most part, to organize central communal efforts employing salaried personnel. Held in St. Joseph, Mich., on June 17, 1949, under the auspices of CJFWF many small communities from the midwestern area, ranging in size from 100 to 500 families, participated. The conference was devoted to defining the needs of the Jews in small communities, the relationship of a central organization to programs of Jewish education, community relations, and social planning, and to the role of the synagogue and the rabbi in the small community. The possibilities of developing communal organization in sparsely populated areas on a wider geographical basis were described in the report of the results achieved by the Southern Illinois Federation, consisting of almost 100 separate towns containing approximately 3,000 Jews. At the time of writing the Maine Jewish Council was studying a possible state-wide organization to meet the needs of a widely scattered Jewish population.

The three largest federations—in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia—held their fourth annual meeting of federation directors and pooled their views on the need of the large-city federation to adjust its organization, administrative procedures, fund raising, and public relations programs to the changing problems and conditions of the Jewish populations in large cities.

A Committee on Community Organization was established by the regional division of the CJFWF to assist in the development of central planning organizations in the local communities, and to help define the scope and structure of local Jewish community organizations. A study of the structure and function of central organizations in the twelve largest cities was completed, and a study was being conducted under the Committee's auspices, of the structure of federations, welfare funds, and community councils in intermediate communities and of their relationship to the local functional agencies.

In recognition of the increasing role which women were playing in fund raising and social services, a Committee on Women's Participation in Community Service was set up by CJFWF to stimulate the participation of women in all aspects of community service and to gain recognition for them on policymaking committees and boards of community organizations.

Many annual planning and promotional conferences in a number of fields of Jewish activity were continued by the major organizations on national, regional, and area scales.

In addition, various conferences and institutes for professional workers were held. The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service continued its educational program for executive leadership, conducting several institutes and short courses for special groups and placing its basic course, the Institute for Advanced Study, on a unit basis, thus permitting greater student utilization of its educational services. Most of the conferences apparently met with sufficient success to warrant their continued use as a means of disseminating the ideas of their sponsors and gaining support for them.
While it was generally felt that there was a continued shortage of prepared and experienced professional personnel in Jewish communal service, agencies reported less difficulty in filling vacancies. Personnel departments reported some unemployment in certain categories and a decreased turnover in executive, sub-executive, and specialized positions. A decline in the foreign service of the JDC and a general stabilization in domestic programs of national and local agencies in the United States may have been some of the factors responsible for the limited personnel opportunities. On the other hand, the National Jewish Welfare Board reported many unfilled vacancies in professional center and group work services; Jewish casework agencies experienced a similar difficulty in filling vacancies with qualified personnel, though it was somewhat less acute than in previous years.

The need for qualified lay leadership as well as for professional personnel was also felt and expressed on various occasions. Some organizations were seeking to enlist youth and young adults in organizations and to train them for potential leadership.

Economic factors were held largely responsible for the increasing difficulties in securing lay leadership and their assistance in fund-raising campaigns, in agency administration, and in central boards, and for the inability of many volunteers to continue to devote as large a part of their time to communal service in 1949 as they had previously. Inadequate planning to secure the best lay leadership was also considered a factor by some observers. The problem would require concentrated attention in the years ahead.

Harry L. Lurie

RELIGION

The emergence of the state of Israel brought into sharp focus a problem that had been of concern to Jewish theoreticians, both secular and religious, for many years: the nature of the distinctive character of the Jewish group.

The State of Israel and the Character of American Jewry

That Jews constituted a unique religio-cultural-ethnic group, to be described not as a race, a nationality or a religious sect, but by the less technical Hebrew term am—meaning “people”—had been maintained by some participants at the “Conference on Reorienting Zionist Education Today,” convened by the Education Committee of the Zionist Organization of America on February 21-22, 1948. In varying forms, this view was reaffirmed and its implications were explored at the “Conference on the Jewish Community,” convened by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation on February 1, 1949, and at the convention of the Young Peoples League of the United Synagogue on April 9, 1949. The Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox) stressed the same view, as did the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Con-
servative), the latter dedicating its 1949 annual convention to "The Demands of the New Diaspora."

Only the numerically insignificant American Council for Judaism persisted in its campaign to interpret Zionism as antagonistic to American loyalty. Its efforts, however, were hampered by the resignation of several of its important rabbinical members, who saw in the American Council far greater zeal against Zionism than active concern for Judaism.

A noteworthy development was the acceptance of this point of view by many intellectuals and other community leaders who had previously been indifferent to the religious emphasis. Thus Rabbi Barnett A. Brickner of Cleveland, Ohio, called for a conference of intellectuals "to clarify the direction of American Judaism." The need to organize American Jewry, or at least those elements which would accept the centrality of the religio-cultural elements of Judaism, was urged by Henry Hurwitz, editor of the Menorah Journal, in a series of articles and public addresses. In a similar spirit, Rabbi Robert Gordis, past president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, urged the group at its annual assembly to take the initiative, together with the representative bodies of Reform and Orthodox Jewry, to create "a voluntary community dedicated to the organic view of Judaism" and presented a ten-point Platform of Principles upon which most Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Jews, as well as many unaffiliated individuals, might agree.

**Efforts for Religious Revival**

Due in some measure, at least, to the emergence of the state of Israel, the synagogue groups put forth increased efforts to stimulate religious observance and adherence. Ninety members of the Reform rabbinate participated in the third annual "Jewish Cavalcade" by addressing meetings throughout the nation. The Rabbinical Council of America initiated a similar project in its "National Torah Tour," during which fifteen Jewish communities in Pennsylvania were visited on behalf of Orthodoxy. This experiment was so successful it was decided to continue it.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations continued its efforts to introduce new ceremonies into the Reform synagogue through such occasions as Shabbat Shalom, dedicated to the ideal of peace, and Shabbat Todah, associated with Thanksgiving Day, as well as by determined efforts to revitalize traditional customs that had been discarded in the earlier period of Reform. There was no disposition to overlook the difficulties facing an enterprise of this character.

The enormous challenge facing Jewish religious leadership as a whole was highlighted by an article by Robert Brunner in the International Review of Missions (April, 1949), which sought to discover new methods for proselytizing Jews since "the Jew, for the most part, has ceased to be a Jew in the religious sense." The need for grappling realistically with the growing problem of intermarriage, and with the possibility of winning the non-Jewish partners for Judaism, was beginning to win increased attention. Less important quantitatively, but qualitatively at least as significant, was the quest of some American Jewish young people for a living religious faith. The need for
setting up “Information Centers on Judaism,” properly staffed and easily accessible, was increasingly discussed at local and national rabbinical conclaves.

All in all, the recognition was growing in religious circles, and to some degree elsewhere as well, that the meaningful survival of American Jewry could not depend upon the strength of anti-Semitism or even upon the resurgence of the state of Israel. The future of American Jewry hinged upon its religious vitality, broadly conceived and interpreted.

**Religious Authority and Freedom in Israel**

The emergence of the state of Israel gave to the Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem a measure of official recognition and prestige enjoyed by no other rabbinical office in the world. The Rabbinical Council of America, through its president, Rabbi Israel Tabak, accordingly called on American Jewry “to recognize the authority of the Chief Rabbinate.” Some of the implications of this recognition were indicated in the statement made on May 25, 1949, before the Rabbinical Council of America by Rabbi Jacob Goldman, secretary to Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog: “As Roman Catholics look to the Pope, the Rabbinate throughout the world should be unified through the establishment of a Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem.” This reference to the institution of the Papacy aroused widespread misgivings on the score that the outlook expressed was at variance with Jewish tradition and that no recognition, however limited, was being contemplated under the plan for the non-Orthodox Rabbinate. On his visit to the United States under the auspices of the United Jewish Appeal, Rabbi Herzog established no official contacts with Reform or Conservative religious agencies and institutions of learning and invited only the American Orthodox rabbinate to send delegates to a contemplated rabbinical conference in Jerusalem.

That even this limited objective of a unified Orthodox rabbinate would not prove easy to achieve, became clear from the protests lodged by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis against Rabbi Herzog’s recognition of the Rabbinical Council of America, representing for the most part the younger, American-trained rabbis of Orthodox persuasion.

Meanwhile, the exclusive jurisdiction in matters religious granted by the Israeli government to official Orthodoxy, began to arouse misgivings in America. Rabbi Abraham Feldman, in his presidential address before the Central Conference of American Rabbis in June, 1949, warned against “theocratic tendencies in Israel” and protested “the refusal to give religious freedom to liberal Jewish communities in Israel.” The Conservative rabbinate, because of its own adherence to traditional Judaism and consistent loyalty to the Zionist cause, was more restrained in its reaction. It sent a delegation to Israel in the Summer of 1949 with instructions to report back its findings on various matters, including the problem of religious freedom. Though the Feldman statement and similar utterances were violently attacked in the pro-Orthodox Yiddish press, it seemed clear that this was only the opening round in a long struggle.
Religious Belief

The implications for American Jewry of the state of Israel took precedence during the year over abstract philosophical and theological considerations. Nonetheless, the ferment in Christian theological circles had its repercussions in Judaism. Will Herberg, writing in *Commentary*, declared that “nationalism, culture, social service and anti-defamation” were only “ersatz faiths,” inferior substitutes for the Jewish religion. In his more technical papers, Herberg continued to develop his theological position, for which he was greatly indebted to Reinhold Niebuhr, whose brilliant synthesis of a reinterpreted theological Orthodoxy and an advanced social outlook is one of the most influential factors in contemporary Christian thought.

Interest in Jewish religious values was reflected not only in the columns of such religious journals as *Conservative Judaism* and the *Reconstructionist*, but also in the pages of *Commentary, Menorah Journal*, and *Jewish Frontier*, general periodicals which published the work of Jacob B. Agus, Milton Steinberg, Robert Gordis, and other exponents of a modern approach to Jewish tradition. On the popular level, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations reported that its series of “Popular Studies in Judaism” had achieved a circulation of 60,000. Orthodox groups became more active in the publication of materials on the idea of the Jewish day school, Sabbath observance, *kashrut* and the laws of “family purity.”

Observance

In Judaism, credal adherence, generally taken for granted, has never bulked as large as concrete observance, whose relaxation was a particularly acute problem for both Orthodoxy and Conservatism. The decline of the domestic observance of *kashrut*, due in some degree, at least, to the rising prices of kosher meat, began to attract attention and evoke demands for action. The Rabbinical Alliance of America, an extreme Orthodox group of younger rabbis, considered a resolution requesting Mayor William O'Dwyer of New York City to investigate the subject of kosher meat prices. This resolution was ultimately tabled, because of possibly “embarrassing consequences.” In the Rabbinical Assembly, the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards, headed by Rabbi Morris Adler of Detroit, Mich., devoted serious attention during the year to the possibility of liberalizing some phases of traditional Jewish law, as part of a campaign for increased observance of the fundamental *mitzvot* by Conservative Jews.

The Rabbinical Seminaries

With the exception of Dropsie College, a postgraduate nonsectarian institution of Semitic learning in Philadelphia, Pa., and the Yiddish Scientific Institute in New York, higher Jewish education in the United States was concentrated largely in the rabbinical seminaries. Reflecting the widespread feeling that religion should become increasingly central in the pattern of Jewish
life in America, the principal rabbinical schools all proceeded to expand the scope of their work.

YE'SHIVOT

The Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan of New York City, its secular departments now organized as Yeshiva University, announced plans for a $6,000,000 medical school. The first step was the introduction of pre-medical courses in the liberal arts college. Four new buildings were dedicated and a School of Education and Community Administration was scheduled to begin functioning in the Fall of 1949. In addition, the Yeshiva announced the appointment of the eminent Talmudist, Rabbi Avigdor Cyperstein, former Chief Rabbi of Lida, Poland, to head an Institute for Advanced Rabbinic Research. This Institute would offer a select number of promising young scholars, whether refugee or native-born, the opportunity to carry on the advanced Talmudic study and dialectic characteristic of the famous yeshivot of Lithuania before World War II. Similar institutes were established in recent years in Lakewood, N. J. and in Spring Valley, N. Y., the latter under the auspices of the Yeshiva Torah Vodaath of Brooklyn, N. Y. Yeshiva University also announced a gift of $50,000 from a New York businessman, Morris Morgenstern, for an annual award to be made to "an outstanding personality."

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Jewish Theological Seminary found that its recently established University of Judaism in Los Angeles, Cal., designed to serve the needs of the rapidly growing Jewish community on the West Coast, was winning wide community support. The various departments on the West Coast—the Teachers Institute, the Graduate School and the Extension Department—had an enrollment of nearly 1,000 students, taught by distinguished visiting scholars from the East, as well as by a permanent resident faculty. In New York, Professor Saul Lieberman, the famous Talmudic scholar, was appointed Dean of the Seminary's Graduate School, to coordinate and intensify the work of the Summer Session and other courses leading to higher degrees.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) was united as a single institution under the presidency of Dr. Nelson Glueck, who was installed as president of the latter school on October 29, 1948. It announced the establishment of the Joshua L. Liebman Department of Human Relations, under whose imprint a pamphlet entitled Man's Place in God's World—A Psychiatrist's Evaluation by Sol W. Ginsburg appeared. In New York a School for Jewish Religious Education was opened by the Hebrew Union College and Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to prepare teachers for Reform Sunday Schools. In addition, the HUC sponsored a School for Jewish Sacred Music, which opened its doors in New York City. Its stated purpose was to prepare cantors for all branches of the American synagogue, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. In Los Angeles, the Hebrew Union College of Jewish Studies was opened. It reported an enrollment of 197 students for courses conducted by nine volunteer instructors.
SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS AND COURSES

The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago, Ill., announced the appointment of Rabbi C. David Regensburg as Dean of the Faculty to succeed the late Rabbi Jacob Hirsch Greenberg, who had served from 1922 until his death on January 31, 1949. As part of its expanded program, it empowered the "first two American-born shohetim" to exercise their calling, a perhaps minor symbol of the coming-of-age of American Jewry. It also gave advanced rabbinic ordination (yadin yadin) to two of its graduates.

Graduate courses for rabbis during the summer proved increasingly popular. Several hundred men enrolled in the courses given by HUC-JIR, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and the Yeshiva University, all in New York City.

There was an important scholastic exchange between Israel and America. Israeli scholars who came to the United States included Ernst Simon, who taught education at the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Gershom G. Scholem, who lectured on Hasidism at the HUC-JIR.

ERRATUM

Page 151, line 14—Solomon Buber should read Martin Buber.
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both the emergence of the state of Israel and the unclear pattern of American economic life in the postwar period, tended to relegate the concern of the synagogue with social questions temporarily to the background. The

\[1\text{ See Obituaries.}\]
life in America, the principal rabbinical schools all proceeded to expand the scope of their work.

**Yeshivot**

The Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan of New York City, its secular departments now organized as Yeshiva University, announced plans for a $6,000,000 medical school. The first step was the introduction of pre-medical courses in the liberal arts college. Four new buildings were dedicated and a School of Education and Community Administration was scheduled to begin functioning in the Fall of 1949. In addition, the Yeshiva announced the appointment of the eminent Talmudist, Rabbi Avigdor Cyperstein, former Chief Rabbi of Lida, Poland, to head an Institute for Advanced Rabbinic Research. This Institute would offer a select number of promising young scholars, whether refugee or native-born, the opportunity to carry on the advanced Talmudic study and dialectic characteristic of the famous yeshivot of Lithuania before World War II. Similar institutes were established in

**Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion**

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) was united as a single institution under the presidency of Dr. Nelson Glueck, who was installed as president of the latter school on October 29, 1948. It announced the establishment of the Joshua L. Liebman Department of Human Relations, under whose imprint a pamphlet entitled *Man's Place in God's World*—*A Psychiatrist's Evaluation* by Sol W. Ginsburg appeared. In New York a School for Jewish Religious Education was opened by the Hebrew Union College and Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to prepare teachers for Reform Sunday Schools. In addition, the HUC sponsored a School for Jewish Sacred Music, which opened its doors in New York City. Its stated purpose was to prepare cantors for all branches of the American synagogue, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. In Los Angeles, the Hebrew Union College of Jewish Studies was opened. It reported an enrollment of 197 students for courses conducted by nine volunteer instructors.
SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS AND COURSES

The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago, Ill., announced the appointment of Rabbi C. David Regensburg as Dean of the Faculty to succeed the late Rabbi Jacob Hirsch Greenberg, who had served from 1922 until his death on January 31, 1949. As part of its expanded program, it empowered the "first two American-born shohetim" to exercise their calling, a perhaps minor symbol of the coming-of-age of American Jewry. It also gave advanced rabbinic ordination (yadin yadin) to two of its graduates.

Graduate courses for rabbis during the summer proved increasingly popular. Several hundred men enrolled in the courses given by HUC-JIR, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and the Yeshiva University, all in New York City.

There was an important scholastic exchange between Israel and America. Israeli scholars who came to the United States included Ernst Simon, who taught education at the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Gershon G. Scholem, who lectured on Hasidism at the HUC-JIR. Solomon Buber, the eminent philosopher, was scheduled to arrive at the Jewish Theological Seminary during the coming academic year. Particular interest was attached to the appointment of the famous rabbi and theologian, Rabbi Leo Baeck, as Visiting Professor of Jewish Philosophy at the HUC.

These new activities highlighted the regular day-to-day work of these institutions—not merely the training of rabbis and teachers for the Jewish community, but the creation through various general and extension schools of the nucleus of a literate Jewish laity.

Finances

Both the normal activities of these schools and their projected plans for expanded service, however, were being hampered by financial problems of growing urgency. Increasingly, the leaders of religious and cultural institutions protested the comparative neglect by American Jews of their spiritual needs in the raising and allocation of communal funds. Maxwell Abbell, prominent Chicago businessman and Chairman of the National Planning Campaign Committee of the Jewish Theological Seminary and its affiliated institutions, announced on May 1, 1949, that $1,972,000 had been set as the irreducible minimum for the campaign and called upon American Jewry not to neglect their "own religious and educational institutions" because of their legitimate concern with overseas aid. The same warning was sounded by the leaders of Reform Judaism. Abba Hillel Silver, the Zionist leader and past president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, called upon American Jews to strengthen their spiritual roots at home.

Social Justice

Both the emergence of the state of Israel and the unclear pattern of American economic life in the postwar period, tended to relegate the concern of the synagogue with social questions temporarily to the background. The

---

1 See Obituaries.
Rabbinical Assembly of America at its convention went on record as favoring the exploration of the possibilities of a joint commission on social justice for the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinates. The Commission on Social Justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis continued its practice of issuing statements on matters of social concern.

Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, leader of the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, addressing the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly, urged the creation of a "common religion of American democracy," with the American holidays as the holy days of the new creed. He called for the strengthening of a free pulpit in the American synagogue and for the practice of democracy in American Jewish communal life. Eisenstein also asked for active participation by American Jewry and by the synagogue in contemporary social issues. Through its membership in the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the Synagogue Council of America was representing religious Jewry in some of these areas.

Interfaith Activities

Interfaith work was carried on during the year, as in the past, by numerous agencies in Jewish life, many of which were not specifically religious in character. However, religious agencies continued to play a large role in this area.

The "Eternal Light" program, created and sponsored by the Jewish Theological Seminary, continued to win many awards as one of the most distinguished religious programs on the air, with a weekly listening audience of several million.

The radio sermon series "The Message of Israel" sponsored by the National Jewish Laymen's Committee and conducted by Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, also brought the message of Judaism to millions of men and women on a national hook-up.

A sign of the times was a television program over CBS in New York called "Lamp Unto My Feet."  

The HUC-JIR continued its practice of organizing one-day Institutes on Judaism for Christian clergymen in communities throughout the country. The Institute for Religious and Social Studies in New York, Boston and Chicago sponsored by the Jewish Theological Seminary, offered lecture courses by outstanding leaders in religion, government, the arts, industry, and labor. Its published volumes constituted a library of thought on the problems of contemporary life, particularly as viewed from the vantage point of religion. The HUC-JIR announced graduate fellowships for Christian ministers, two awarded by the Louis J. and Mary E. Horowitz foundation, and three by the Department of Interfaith Activity of the American Jewish Committee.

The National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, which sponsored the Jewish Chatauqua Society, reported that 180 rabbis had lectured on Judaism in 421 colleges and universities during the year, particularly during the summer sessions. In twelve colleges they served as instructors, giving accredited college courses in Jewish religion and culture.

The essential spirit of American democracy was dramatically symbolized

---

2 See also Radio and Television, p. 258.
at the inauguration of President Harry S. Truman on January 20, 1949, at
which a prayer was offered by Rabbi Samuel Thurman of St. Louis, Mo.
Though it was not, as announced, the first instance of a rabbi taking part in
a presidential inauguration, since Rabbi Gershom Mendez Seixas had par-
ticipated in George Washington’s first inaugural, it testified to the vitality of
the American ideal of interfaith amity.

Brotherhood Week in February, 1949, was generally observed with wide-
spread Jewish participation. Other interfaith projects in local communities
were initiated on Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, and other occasions. How-
ever, there was a growing tendency to demand proof of the tangible benefits
derived from these traditionally accepted patterns of interfaith work. The
subject was discussed by Rabbi Benedict Glazer at the Central Conference of
American Rabbis, which had expressed strong criticism of several good-will
agencies which were supported in large measure by Jewish funds. Represent-
ing the Orthodox point of view, Rabbi Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva
University, issued a statement on “Religion and Group Relations” in which
he declared that the prevalent practice in many synagogues and churches of
exchanging pulpits was “doing Judaism more harm than good.”

Religious Organization and Consolidation

During the period under review, the problem of strengthening the organi-
zational character of Jewish religious life remained acute, both within
Orthodoxy, Conservatism and Reform, and in their mutual relations.

ORTHODOX ORGANIZATION

The basic problem for Orthodoxy remained the internal competition and
lack of unity which affected virtually every phase of its active program.
William B. Herlands, newly elected president of the Union of Orthodox
Jewish Congregations, issued a plea for a League of United Orthodoxy to
include all Orthodox Jewish agencies—but thus far it remained unheeded.
Moving in the same direction, Yeshiva University announced in November,
1948, the formation of a Council for Community Program Coordination in
cooperation with the Rabbinical Council of America and the Union of
Orthodox Jewish Congregations. Its stated purposes included the creation
of a men’s club movement and an organized program of adult education. Thus
American Orthodoxy was following the organizational patterns previously
fashioned by Reform and by Conservatism.

Even if successful, however, this body would not include all Orthodox
groups. The position of the Rabbinical Council of America, which consisted
largely of the graduates of the Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan (Yeshiva Uni-
versity) in New York and of the Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, was
challenged not only by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, the organization of
the older European Orthodox rabbis, but also by the Rabbinical Alliance of
America, most of whose members were ordained by the extreme Orthodox
yeshivot Torah Vadaath and Rabbi Chaim Berlin in Brooklyn, N. Y., and
Tiferet Jerusalem in New York.

When the Rabbinical Alliance was invited to merge with the Rabbinical
Council of America, it set as a preliminary condition that there be dropped from the roster the considerable number of Rabbinical Council members occupying pulpits of synagogues in which men and women were not segregated. When the leadership of the Rabbinical Council of America declared that it could not accede to this demand, negotiations for the merger were suspended. On the other hand, the Rabbinical Alliance reported that it was exploring a basis for a quasi-autonomous affiliation with the Union of Orthodox Rabbis.

REFORM AND CONSERVATIVE ORGANIZATION

Reform and Conservatism were not beset by these difficult internal problems and were able to concentrate on organizing and strengthening new congregations. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations gave substantial aid to new congregations on the West Coast as well as in the large metropolitan centers in the East, and thus brought new accessions to the ranks of Reform. The United Synagogue rendered field service to many new congregational units but gave no financial subsidies.

At the end of the year under review, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations numbered 392 congregations, the United Synagogue of America 365, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations 500, though there remained an undetermined number of unaffiliated Orthodox synagogues.

Zealous efforts to enhance the quality of Jewish congregational life were made in all quarters. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations sought to stimulate synagogue singing in order "to infuse life and warmth into the services by the singing of Hebrew responses and hymns." Through phonograph records it sought to re-introduce religious observances into the home.

The National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs of the United Synagogue sponsored Jewish Laymen's Institutes in various parts of the country. They generally took place on a week end and included a Sabbath with religious services, Jewish music, lecture courses on the Bible, Talmud and religious ideals, and discussions of current problems. The Young Peoples League of the United Synagogue and the National Federation of Temple Youth, which had declined during the war years, sought to strengthen their organizations and to intensify their services to their local affiliates, particularly in the field of religious participation and cultural activity—always the Achilles' heel of American Jewish youth groups.

COOPERATIVE ACTIVITY

While the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform groups were naturally concerned with strengthening their own specific interpretation of Judaism, they were all constituents of the Synagogue Council of America, which Rabbi Robert Gordis served as president. The function of the Council was to speak with united voice on behalf of the religious household of American Jewry wherever agreement was possible, and in general to stress the elements held in common by the various wings of American Judaism. In conjunction with its first public installation of officers, the Synagogue Council conducted a seminar-conference on "Revitalizing the Synagogue" with Orthodox, Con-
servative, and Reform rabbis participating. The Synagogue Council of America delegated Rabbi Isaac Klein of Springfield, Mass., to serve as Adviser on Jewish Religious Affairs to the American Military Government in Germany.

The suggestion originally advanced by the Synagogue Council that the Tenth of Tebet be observed by world Jewry as a day of mourning and commemoration for the millions of Jews exterminated during the Nazi holocaust, already approved by the Chief Rabbis of France, England and Italy, was adopted by the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. The Synagogue Council of America continued energetically to seek consideration from colleges and universities for the religious scruples of observant Jewish students in fixing the dates of examinations. It urged Jewish organizations on the national and the local level to maintain the public observance of the Sabbath and the dietary laws, and secured widespread promise of cooperation.

Because of lack of adequate support, many of the Synagogue Council's activities were conducted not independently but in cooperation with large secular Jewish organizations. Particularly significant for the future was the establishment of a Joint Committee with the National Jewish Welfare Board to study the relationship of the synagogue and the center and to establish a code of procedure for these agencies, so as to minimize friction and enrich their contributions to a vital Jewish program. The Synagogue Council also cooperated with the Training Bureau of Jewish Communal Service in planning an institute for rabbis on community problems to be held in the Summer of 1950.

During the period under review, the Synagogue Council sought to lay the groundwork for a World Council of Synagogues. Considerable attention was given to the project of establishing synagogue councils in local American communities to represent religious groups, but the plan still lacked the unanimous approval required by the constitution of the Synagogue Council. Nonetheless, several local communities were proceeding independently with such an organization.

Rabbinical associations, cutting across denominational lines of Orthodoxy, Conservatism, and Reform, were actively functioning in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago, as well as in some smaller communities. In New York and Philadelphia, the rabbinical associations received the bulk of their support from the central philanthropic chest of the Jewish community, which recognized the value of their work, particularly in such areas as chaplaincies in hospitals and institutions of correction.

The Synagogue Council of America expressed the almost universal sentiment of American Jewry in opposing the efforts being made to break down the separation of church and state. It was associated in the Vashti MacCollum case before the United States Supreme Court which invalidated "released time" for religious instruction in the public schools. It continued to oppose released time in New York, where the project was actively supported only by the extreme Orthodox League for Jewish Religious Education, an offshoot of the Lubavitcher Yeshiva movement.
Publication

Jewish scholarship continued to be an integral element in Jewish religious activity. Similarly, the publication of textbooks and other educational material continued to be a prime undertaking of religious groups. All three wings of American Judaism continued the publication of periodicals. The Reform monthly, Liberal Judaism, and the Orthodox bi-monthly, Jewish Life, followed the popular format of Reader's Digest and were intended for the general public. The quarterly journal, Conservative Judaism, was concerned with problems of theology, ethics, and Jewish problems on a more specialized level. Technical material of religious and scholarly interest continued to appear in the Hebrew Union College Annual and the Jewish Quarterly Review. The Reconstructionist served as a meeting-ground for diverse points of view, while general periodicals like Commentary, Menorah Journal, the Jewish Frontier, and the Jewish Spectator, and news weeklies like the National Jewish Post, gave a large amount of space to material concerned with Jewish religious life and its underlying traditions.

Religious Functionaries

The personal problems of religious functionaries were directly dependent upon the character of Jewish religious life in America, since the recruiting of personnel was considerably influenced by such factors as personal effectiveness, social position, tenure and old age security. The pension plans established by the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Rabbinical Assembly for their members were becoming recognized as a natural condition of employment for rabbis. Steps were taken by the Cantors Assembly of the United Synagogue to extend the plan to cover its membership. The Orthodox Rabbinical Council of America had a similar plan under consideration. Similar provisions for religious teachers were still not universally accepted, but the idea was gaining ground. Life contracts for rabbis were not yet the norm, but were increasing, and one cantor, Myron Glass of Indianapolis, Ind., attained such status in his congregation.

Thus the Jewish year 5709, not distinguished by any outstanding achievement, nevertheless was marked by an increasing tempo of activity in the field of religion. The struggle to make American Jewry worthy of its opportunity was on in earnest.

ROBERT GORDIS

---

3 For a discussion of Jewish scholarship, see p. 218.
4 For a discussion of educational texts, see p. 165.
TWO CONTRADICTORY developments took place in the field of Jewish education during the past several years. On the one hand, there was a continuous expansion of educational activity and an increasing Jewish school enrollment; on the other hand, a shrinking supply of qualified teachers and administrative personnel.

Enrollment

The total enrollment in all Jewish schools (Sunday, weekday afternoon, all-day, Yiddish, and released time) in the Spring of 1949 was 255,865. Of this number the Sunday schools had 128,719, or 52.3 per cent; the weekday schools, 122,109, or 47.7 per cent. The 1949 enrollment represented an increase of 6.9 per cent over that of 1948. Both the Sunday and weekday schools shared in the increase. The Sunday schools augmented their enrollment by 6.5 per cent from 120,896 in 1948 to 128,719 in 1949; the weekday schools by 3 per cent from 118,502 to 122,109.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weekday Schools</th>
<th>Sunday Schools</th>
<th>Combined Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>122,109</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>128,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>118,502</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>120,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 1949 enrollment estimate is based on reports from 107 communities distributed over thirty-five states, comprising a Jewish population of 3,880,225, or 81.2 per cent of the total Jewish population in the United States.

Teacher Shortage

Simultaneously with this trend of growing school enrollment, a growing shortage of qualified teachers was observable.

A survey of 107 communities revealed that 74 were in need of teachers, 11 reported no shortages, and 22 failed to indicate whether they had a shortage. Of the 74 communities which reported teacher shortages, 54 indicated that they needed 255 qualified teachers and principals. On the basis of these figures, the total shortage of qualified teachers in the country may be estimated at over 700. In 1946, a similar survey revealed a shortage of about 600 teachers.

As a consequence of this situation, the schools with the less intensive programs, which traditionally relied to a considerable degree on untrained teachers, were benefiting from the increasing interest in Jewish education. To this group belonged most of the Sunday schools, many of the congregational

* Prepared with the help and cooperation of the American Association for Jewish Education.
schools, and the kindergartens and the early grades of the all-day schools. The latter, though part of the most intensive type of Jewish school, had been enrolling increasing numbers of children, despite the fact that adequate provision for teachers could not be made. Of the nearly 5,000 children enrolled in the Jewish all-day schools outside of New York City in the Winter of 1948, over one-third (33.5 per cent) were concentrated in the kindergarten classes.

On the other hand, the more intensive type of schools, both under congregational and non-congregational auspices, such as the four- and five-day-a-week schools, as well as the high school departments of the weekday afternoon schools, recorded considerable declines in enrollment in the period under review: the combined enrollment in the four- and five-day-a-week schools declined 10.6 per cent; in the high schools, 5.8 per cent.

A comparative study of enrollment data for forty-four communities for the past two years offers additional data bearing on this development (see Table 2). The combined enrollment in the congregational and non-congregational four- and five-day-a-week schools in these cities declined sharply during the past year. However, the non-congregational schools recorded a larger decline, 9.1 per cent, while the congregational schools declined 6.5 per cent.

The only type of weekday schools (except the all-day school) which recorded increases in registration were the two- and three-day-a-week afternoon congregational schools. The former recorded an increase of 18.1 per cent; the latter, of 28.9 per cent. On the other hand, the enrollment in the non-congregational two- and three-day-a-week schools declined. The relatively large increase of enrollment in the three-day-a-week congregational schools was aided by the official educational policy of the Conservative congregations which for the past few years had been advocating a school program based upon six hours of instruction a week with classes meeting not less than three days a week.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type, by Days of Attendance</th>
<th>Congregational</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Congregational</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Per Cent Change</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Per Cent Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-day</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>—75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-day</td>
<td>7,605</td>
<td>9,802</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>—14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-day</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>—4.7</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>—12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-day</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>—9.1</td>
<td>8,552</td>
<td>7,833</td>
<td>—8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total weekday</td>
<td>16,787</td>
<td>18,778</td>
<td>—11.9</td>
<td>11,986</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>—13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>37,246</td>
<td>40,973</td>
<td>—10.0</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>4,622</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54,033</td>
<td>59,751</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15,705</td>
<td>14,984</td>
<td>—4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This survey covers 44 communities.

**The All-Day Schools**

In 1935 there were sixteen all-day schools in New York City and two outside of New York, with a total enrollment of about 5,000 pupils. During the last
decade, the Jewish all-day school movement was taken over by militant sectarian groups which came to the United States in the wake of World War II. These carried the all-day school to many American Jewish communities which had previously been uninfluenced by it.

There were, at the time of writing, 126 complete and incomplete all-day schools in 46 cities distributed over 17 states and the District of Columbia, with an enrollment of 18,654 pupils who formed 15.3 per cent of all children attending weekday schools and 7.3 per cent of the combined registration in all Jewish schools. Of the 58 all-day schools outside of New York City, only 8 were complete, each with 8 grades, and 2 with 7 grades each.

### TABLE 3

**All-Day School Enrollment in the United States, 1948**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Per Cent</th>
<th>Boys No.</th>
<th>Boys Per Cent</th>
<th>Girls No.</th>
<th>Girls Per Cent</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten and elementary ......</td>
<td>16,160</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>11,266</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,406</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,248</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the rest of the schools the number of grades varied from one (kindergarten, or kindergarten and first grade) to six, with the majority having four grades or less.

Most of the existing 106 all-day school departments (kindergarten, elementary, and high school) outside of New York City were established recently: one in 1917, three in the thirties, 44 between 1940 and 1944, and 54 in the last four years.

### Yiddish Schools

The total enrollment in all Yiddish schools in 1948 in the United States was a little over 17,000. Of this number, the Workmen's Circle schools had 5,500; Sholem Aleichem schools, about 1,500; those of the Jewish National Workers Alliance, almost 4,600; and the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order schools, about 6,000.

The Workmen's Circle schools celebrated their thirtieth anniversary in 1948. They were first organized in 1918 as Yiddish Socialist schools, cosmopolitan in outlook and labor-centered. They deliberately excluded all teaching of traditional Jewish values or subjects from their curriculum with the exception of the Yiddish language which was also the medium of instruction. Their textbooks, especially those that appeared in the twenties, contained no references to Jewish religion or culture and no mention of Jewish holidays or customs. During the thirties and forties, the Workmen's Circle schools altered ideologically. Their curricula included, at the time of writing, the
teaching and celebration of Jewish holidays, the study of the Bible in Hebrew and in Yiddish, Jewish history, and the study of Hebrew. The total budget of the Workmen's Circle schools in 1948 was $450,000. Of this sum, the Workmen's Circle national education committee contributed $100,000; local welfare funds, $75,000; tuition fees netted $150,000; and special fund-raising campaigns, $125,000.

Released Time

By and large, Jewish communities were making very little use of released time for carrying on Jewish educational programs. Of over 110 respondent communities, only 14 reported that they had conducted some sort of a Jewish educational program on released time, and in only one community (Buffalo, N. Y.) were the released-time classes integrated into the wider Jewish educational program of the community. The reports seemed to indicate a lessening interest in the use of released time. In New York City, the enrollment in the classes conducted by the Jewish Education Committee declined from 5,000 in 1946 to 2,911 in 1948; in Los Angeles, Cal., classes which were conducted in the past on released time were discontinued in 1948, and in Boston, Mass., they were to be discontinued in 1950.

Teacher Training

The number of teachers who were graduated from the ten leading teachers seminaries in the country in 1947-48 was 83; in 1948-49, it was 85. The number was probably insufficient to replace the teachers who left the field during the year through retirement, death, or for other reasons.

During the past few years only five or six teachers a year applied for teaching licenses at the Board of License for Hebrew Teachers for Greater New York. In the period under review, thirty-three men and women took the examination.

In some of the larger communities, such as Los Angeles; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Buffalo, N. Y., the problem of the teacher shortage was being partly met by the organization of emergency teacher training programs in conjunction with summer training institutes conducted by accredited institutions. On the whole, the steps taken by communities or by national organizations to alleviate the shortage of teachers and other educational personnel by attracting young men and women to teachers colleges, were insufficient, to judge by the almost total absence of scholarships for aspiring young teachers.

Hebrew in the Public High Schools and Colleges

The number of students studying Hebrew in the public high schools grew steadily during the forties. In 1939, Hebrew classes had an enrollment of 2,400; in 1949, 3,970—an increase of 65.4 per cent. During this same period the number enrolled for all foreign-language courses in the New York City public high schools decreased from 150,000 to slightly over 88,000. Hebrew was being taught in nineteen high schools, five junior high schools, and two evening
high schools. These schools offered a total of 137 classes taught by 37 licensed high school teachers. A special committee on the “place and function of foreign languages in New York City schools,” headed by Henry C. Olinger of New York University (NYU), reported in 1948 that Hebrew was among the best-taught languages in the city. In order to attract capable teachers to the field of Hebrew teaching in the public high schools, the University of the State of New York made available a grant to Brooklyn College and Hunter College for special graduate courses leading to the degree of Master of Education in Hebrew.

Outside of New York City, Hebrew was offered in 1948-49 only in the Salden-Blewett High School in St. Louis, Mo. Several communities (Boston and Worcester, Mass.; Newark, N. J.) were planning to introduce the study of Hebrew in the public high schools during 1949-50.

Interest in Hebrew literature and culture extended beyond the Jewish students of the city schools. More than 1,000 students of all faiths and races participated from 1944 to 1948 in the annual contests, “Hebrew Culture and its Contribution to American Life,” conducted by the Hebrew Culture Council in conjunction with the Board of Education of the City of New York.

In a study published in June, 1949, by A. I. Katsh, it was disclosed that 206 colleges in the United States were offering 524 courses in Hebrew; 414 of these courses treated Hebrew as a biblical study, while 110 taught Hebrew as a modern language. All but 199 of 1,021 colleges polled by Katsh accepted Hebrew as a satisfactory language to meet admission requirements.

In New York City, 1,500 graduate and undergraduate students were to be found in the Hebrew Departments of Brooklyn College, City College, Hunter College, and NYU.

**Influence of the State of Israel**

The influence the emergence of the state of Israel would have upon Jewish education could not be foretold. The consensus of Jewish educational thought foresaw two important developments: one, an increasing spiritual and cultural relationship between American Jewry and Israel; the other, a more optimistic attitude on the part of Jewish educational workers.

There were no important curricular revisions during the period as a result of the emergence of the state of Israel. Yet significantly, there was news from a number of the larger communities (Los Angeles, Cal.; Chicago, Ill.; Baltimore, Md.; Duluth and St. Paul, Minn.; Buffalo and Syracuse, N. Y.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pa.; Memphis, Tenn.) of local and regional teachers conferences and special assemblies at which the problem of revision of the Jewish school curriculum in the light of the new position of the Jewish people in the world was the main theme of discussion.

Some concrete influences could already be discerned. Of the 107 communities canvassed, 54 reported an increase in the study of Hebrew which was stimulated by the nascent Israeli state; in 42 of these communities interest was manifested by adults in conversational Hebrew, intended for prospective visitors to Israel. In a few cities this interest extended to Bible and modern Hebrew literature in the original.
A number of schools reported increased interest in Israeli geography and history, the United Nations, and the social problems of the new state. This interest was expressed in current events sessions and at assemblies; in Minneapolis formal courses dealing with the state of Israel were introduced into the Hebrew high school.

Confirmation and graduation orations in many schools were based on Israel's struggle for independence, and in 79 out of the 110 communities reporting, Israeli themes were used for assembly programs.

In St. Paul, introduction of the Sephardic pronunciation of Hebrew was planned in all Jewish schools; the East Midwood Jewish Center of Brooklyn, N. Y., was experimenting with the use of the Sephardic pronunciation in the upper grades.

The events in Israel stimulated the use of audio-visual material in most schools. Over 75 per cent of the respondent communities indicated increased use of film strips, movies, record discs, and the preparation of exhibits bearing on life in Israel. In many schools the arts and crafts projects were based on Israeli motifs.

Evidences of inter-educational relationships between Israel and the United States were also apparent. Several educational workshops and seminars for American students and teachers were held in Israel. Among the more important ones was the accredited workshop on "Palestine Life and Culture" under the auspices of the NYU School of Education in cooperation with the Katzenelson Institute of Social Studies of Kfar Saba, Israel and the Jewish Culture Council. The workshop consisted of formal classes, lectures, and tours. More than seventy students participated. A seminar for more than fifty American teachers and principals was held in Jerusalem during the Summer of 1949, under the auspices of the Hebrew University and the World Union for Jewish Education. The seminar included intensive courses in the Hebrew language, literature, and methods of teaching Bible and history. The studies were supplemented by observation of Israeli schools and guided tours to all parts of the country. In addition, the Jewish Agency's youth department and the Hebrew University co-sponsored a summer institute in Israel. The institute included three weeks of work on Israeli farm settlements and one month of attendance at classes at the Hebrew University.

Another educational influence attributable to the rise of the state of Israel was the inauguration of the "Jerusalem Examination" in Hebrew by the Hebrew University and the World Union for Jewish Education, patterned after the "Cambridge Examination" in English. The examination was given on December 30, 1948. The aim of this examination, which was to be an annual event, was to encourage the study of the Hebrew language and literature. The examination was based on excerpts from the Bible, Mishnah, Liturgy, the Mishnah Torah of Maimonides and selections from modern literature. Forty-eight persons took the examination in the United States.

Parent-Teacher Associations

A significant development in Jewish education was the growth throughout the country of parent-teacher groups of Jewish schools. In an increasing num-
ber of communities, parent groups of Jewish schools have been forming for
the double purpose of parent participation in the Jewish education of their
children, and their self-education as well.

In 83 communities 446 schools reported parent-teacher associations in
1948-49, with the majority centered in the large metropolitan centers of New
York City, Philadelphia, and Boston.

A study of the functions of these associations showed that they ranged from
helping to decorate the school and serving refreshments to children, to the
sponsorship of educational projects for the improvement of both parent and
child.

In cities with central agencies of Jewish education, the activities of the
parent-teacher associations were more sustained and meaningful. They in-
cluded parent education in child problems, as well as parent education in
Jewish living through Jewish holiday institutes and workshops whose aim
was to carry the teachings of the school into the home.

In a few cities parent groups were affiliated with a central organization of
Parent-Teachers Associations (PTA's). There were such associations in New
York and Baltimore, sponsored by the local central agencies of Jewish educa-
tion.

Los Angeles had a United Parent-Teachers Association for all the East Side
schools. It contemplated forming similar organizations for the other sections
of the city. In Philadelphia an association of PTA's of Conservative schools
was sponsored by the Board of Jewish Education.

In Detroit there was a Council of PTA's covering the schools affiliated with
the United Hebrew Schools.

In Schenectady and Syracuse the local central organizations of Jewish edu-
cation sponsored a city-wide PTA.

The PTA's were moving in the direction of a national organization. At
the week-end annual conference of the American Association for Jewish Edu-
cation in Atlantic City, on Decoration Day, 1949, a National Organization of
PTA's was officially launched. At the same time, the PTA's affiliated with
Jewish all-day schools held their first national conference under the auspices
of Torah Umesorah in Hartford, Conn.

Allocations for Jewish Education

In 1935 Samson Benderly estimated the cost of Jewish education at some
$4,900,000. In the fifteen years since it more than quadrupled and was still
mounting. American Jewish leadership was coming to realize that the financing
of Jewish education was a community responsibility and could not be borne
by the parents alone, nor even by the congregations alone, and that it must
be borne by all the elements in the community. A concrete expression of this
awareness was the increasing number of Federations and Welfare Funds which
were allocating funds for Jewish education annually. In 1936, twenty-nine
cities reported allocations by Federations and Welfare Funds for Jewish edu-
cation; in 1947, fifty-three cities reported such allocations. In 1936 the
Federation subventions for Jewish education amounted to $523,749, or 6.13
per cent of the total sum spent by the Federations for all local needs. In 1947
the amount subvented for Jewish education by the Federations was $2,181,417, or 8.79 per cent of the total budgeted by Federations for all local needs. The amount of money allocated for Jewish education through Federations and Welfare Funds increased proportionately more rapidly than the amount of money allocated through the same channels for "all local needs."

A major part of the Federation funds for Jewish education was spent in communities which had central agencies for Jewish education. In 1948, thirty-five of the thirty-seven existing central agencies for Jewish education reported a total budget of $2,854,053.65. Of this sum, $2,125,072.63, or 75 per cent, was contributed by Federations and Welfare Funds, and $728,981.02 was derived from other sources.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cities Reporting (Number)</th>
<th>Amount Budgeted for All Local Needs</th>
<th>Allocation for Jewish Education</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$24,806,661</td>
<td>$2,181,417</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$20,661,511</td>
<td>1,875,320</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$17,429,647</td>
<td>1,532,246</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$14,718,993</td>
<td>1,132,150</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$12,820,330</td>
<td>892,165</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$12,724,666</td>
<td>817,973</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$11,971,317</td>
<td>706,469</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data not available.

Amounts given under "All Local Needs" include, in all cases, allocations for Jewish education and for recreational and cultural activities.

Conferences

The Rabbinical Assembly held its third annual conference on Jewish education in New York City on January 11 and 12, 1949. The theme of the conference was "Implementing a Program of Intensive Jewish Education in the Synagogue Schools." Intensification of Jewish education in all types of schools was the theme of the national conference of the Mizrachi National Education Committee held on Thanksgiving week end, in 1948, in New York City. The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education organized eight regional conferences during the period under review, and the Torah Umesorah held two regional conferences in which teachers, administrators, and lay leaders of all-day schools participated.

The Hebrew Union School of Education and Sacred Music, an affiliate of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, held a conference on religious school administration in cooperation with the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues. The conference resulted in the formation of a
permanent Association of Religious School Boards, whose aim was to coordinate the work of the forty-seven Reform religious schools in the metropolitan area. The American Association for Jewish Education held a special conference on the occasion of its tenth anniversary. The conference was held in conjunction with the National Council of Jewish Education and the Federation of Hebrew Teachers. At this conference held in Atlantic City on Decoration Day weekend, 1949, the groups involved in the Jewish educational process in America were represented, including laymen, administrative personnel, and teachers as well as representatives of all the ideological shadings: Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Yiddish groups.

The problem of Yiddish education was an important subject of the World Yiddish Congress which met in New York City from September 16 to 20, 1948. The Congress organized a central committee for Yiddish schools.

Educational Events

During the period under review the Jewish Education Committee in cooperation with the Histadruth Ivrit of America organized a Hebrew section of its "Theater for Children" which held its premiere on April 10, 1949, with the play, *Ha-Otzar Bamearah* ("Treasure in the Cave"), especially written by the Israeli playwright Michael Alma.

Community graduations of elementary schools were becoming more and more the vogue. Such celebrations were reported held in Los Angeles; Rock Island, Ill.; Pittsfield, Mass.; Schenectady, N. Y.; and in Chicago, Ill.; where the twenty-fifth anniversary of such public graduations was celebrated.

Cleveland celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Bureau of Jewish Education; Memphis, Tenn., the ninety-fifth anniversary of the Temple Israel School. In Philadelphia, tribute was paid to William Chomsky, teacher and author of important works in Jewish education, for his twenty-five years of service to Gratz College.

The Beth Hayeled of New York City, a pioneer experimental school in early childhood education based on the principle of an integrated bi-cultural program, celebrated its tenth anniversary.

Jewish Educational Literature

Only two books dealing with the history, philosophy, and theories of Jewish education in America appeared during the period under review. Rabbi Louis Katzoff's *Issues in Jewish Education: A Study of the Philosophy of the Conservative Congregational Schools* discussed the rise of the Conservative school in America, and analyzed its structure and curriculum. The study was based on inquiries made among more than 50 per cent of the Conservative synagogues which conducted schools.

The Yiddish volume of essays, *A Shul-Pinkes*, was published in 1948 by the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary in 1946 of the Chicago schools. The volume was edited by Yudel Mark, S. Berkowitch, M. Bronstein, and J. H. Pomerantz. It represented a valuable collection of articles on the development, history, and philosophy of the Yiddish
schools in America. The second volume of *The Jewish People: Past and Present*, published in 1948 (Jewish Encyclopedic Handbooks, Central Yiddish Culture Organization), contained nine articles on the history and problems of Jewish education in many lands, two of which dealt with the United States: “Yiddish Secular Schools” by S. Yefroikin, and “Jewish Education in the United States” by Leo L. Honor.

A new curriculum was prepared by Louis H. Ruffman of the Jewish Education Committee of New York for the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education. This curriculum presented a graded program for the elementary school based upon the “objectives and standards for the congregational school” as officially formulated by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education. In addition, the Board of Jewish Education of Philadelphia—the local branch of the United Synagogue of America—reported the publication of a curriculum for the first and second years of the congregational school. A curricular development in the making was the experimentation with a uniform program of studies for a group of intensive afternoon schools in New York City which was carried on by the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

Several new Hebrew and English texts were published during the year for the weekday afternoon and Sunday schools. The more significant ones were: *Modern Jewish Life in Literature* by Azriel Eisenberg, and *Fifty Assembly Programs for the Jewish School* by Samuel Sussman and Abraham Segal. Both of these books were published by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education.

The United Synagogue also published a book on intercultural education. *America’s Triumph* was intended for the use of children in the upper high school grades. It was the first book of its kind produced for general use by a Jewish organization.

Among the more important Hebrew texts published during the period under review was *Hebrew Reading the Picture Way*, a Hebrew primer by Leah Klepper, illustrated by Jessie B. Robinson and published by the Jewish Education Committee of New York. *Yisroel B’artzo* by Ben Zion Toback was intended for use by children with some knowledge of Hebrew. The text followed the requirements formulated by the Hebrew Principals Association of New York. A more advanced text, *Modern Hebrew Literature*, a literary anthology edited by George L. Epstein and Max Zeldner, was intended for high school classes of the public high schools and colleges.

The Baltimore Hebrew College began the publication of a series of booklets presenting classic stories from modern Hebrew literature in abridged form. In 1948-49 it published two booklets based on stories by Ibn-Zahav and Judah Yaari, condensed and edited by Louis L. Kaplan and Zevi Tchack. The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education continued its *Oneg* series of Hebrew literature for children, and published three original stories by William Chomsky, Mrs. L. C. Chomsky, and Ben Aronin. In addition, the Histadruth Ivrith of Philadelphia published several “easy” children’s books in Hebrew.
**Personalia**

Alexander M. Dushkin, executive vice-president of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, resigned his position to accept the post of dean of undergraduate studies at the Hebrew University and of adviser to students from the United States. His place was filled by Azriel Eisenberg, former executive director of the Council on Jewish Education of Philadelphia. Israel S. Chipkin, formerly executive director of the American Association for Jewish Education, accepted the position of vice-president of the Jewish Education Committee, for research and experimentation and as consultant to the Board. He will undertake a long-range study of Jewish education in New York City. Judah Pilch was appointed executive director of the American Association for Jewish Education. His position as head of the Jewish Education Association of Essex County, N. J., was filled by David Rudovsky, who resigned his affiliation with the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

There were several changes in position of directors of central agencies of Jewish education. A. P. Gannes, director of the Bureau of Jewish Education in Miami, Fla., was appointed executive director of the Council on Jewish Education in Philadelphia, and Louis Schwartzman, director of the Board of Jewish Education of Altanta, Ga., was appointed director for Miami. Mark Krug, director of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Buffalo, took the position of assistant superintendent of the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago, his place in Buffalo being filled by Elzar Goelman, principal of Haar Zion Hebrew School in Philadelphia. Alexander S. Kohanski, former director of the Maine Jewish Council, was the new head of the Jewish Education Society of San Francisco, and Israel T. Naamani was appointed to head the Bureau of Jewish Education of Louisville, Ky. Noah Nardi, psychologist, formerly with the Jewish Education Committee of New York, was appointed head of the department of research of the Ministry of Education in Israel.

**ZIONIST AND PRO-ISRAEL ACTIVITIES**

The establishment of the state of Israel was quickly reflected both politically and culturally in Jewish organizational life among Zionist and non-Zionist bodies.

The decision of the American Zionist Emergency Council to change its name to the American Zionist Council was an indication of the easing of the four-year-old Zionist emergency. On June 17, 1949, the Council announced that Abba Hillel Silver would be succeeded by a presidium of four, composed of Benjamin G. Brody of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA); Mrs. Judith Epstein, Hadassah; Baruch Zuckerman, Poale Zion; and Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, Mizrachi. Thus, the Council continued to be constituted by proportional representation of the largest of the American Zionist parties. In view of the continued anti-Zionist activities of the American Council for
Judaism, it was felt necessary that the American Zionist Council continue as the political and public relations spokesman for the official Zionist movement in the United States.

ZOA and the United Jewish Appeal

The rift in the ZOA between the administration headed by ZOA president Emanuel Neumann and Abba Hillel Silver on the one hand, and the Committee for Progressive Zionism (CPZ), led by such Zionist veterans as Louis Lipsky, Louis E. Leventhal, Stephen S. Wise, and Charles I. Rosenbloom on the other, continued after the fifty-first annual convention in July, 1948, when the administration won a complete vote of confidence. Never ideologically very clear, the conflict was ascribed to CPZ charges that the ZOA was reactionary, both in its political and economic program. It assumed national significance when it was extended to the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), where the controversy between Abba Hillel Silver and Henry Montor became the cynosure of the entire American Jewish community.

Henry Montor's resignation as executive vice-chairman of the United Palestine Appeal (UPA), submitted on September 10, 1948, was accepted by the executive committee on October 21, 1948. In his letter of resignation, Montor charged the ZOA with using UPA funds for political purposes. Israel Goldstein, chairman of the UPA, wrote in reply: "The United Palestine Appeal has the support of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the highest authority in the conduct of its affairs." This statement was corroborated by a cablegram sent on November 6, 1948, to the UPA convention in Chicago by Berl Locker, chairman of the Jerusalem Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Displeased with the results of the Chicago conference, the Committee of Contributors and Workers, a body close to the CPZ, announced on November 10, 1948, that it would hold a conference of fund-raising leaders to map out an independent campaign with three major objectives: all American Jews were to share in the responsibility for raising funds for Israel in 1949; all funds raised in the United States were to be remitted directly to Israel; and final authority for allocation and disbursement of funds remitted to Israel from the Jews of America was to rest with the Executive of the Jewish Agency in Israel.

On December 9, 1948, Edwin Rosenberg of New York, chairman of the conciliation committee of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), which conducted negotiations between the two groups, announced a settlement of the differences. Ostensibly, the agreement healed the rift. But conflict broke out again at the Atlantic City conference of the UJA on January 12 and 13, 1949, when the UPA rejected the return of Henry Montor as executive vice-chairman of the UJA campaign. The conflict was sharpened when Henry Morgenthau, Jr., chairman of the 1948 campaign, made his 1949 chairmanship contingent upon Montor's return.

The proposed intervention by the Israel section of the Jewish Agency led to the passage of a resolution of objection on January 23, 1949, by the national executive committee of the ZOA.
However, the full Executive of the Jewish Agency, including the Israel section, decided in favor of Morgenthau, who was asked to head the 1949 drive with the assumption that he would ask Montor to work with him. This precipitated the resignations of Silver and Neumann from the Executive.

ZOA CONVENTION

The struggle between the two groups in the ZOA continued until the eve of the organization's fifty-second annual convention, held in New York City from May 27 to May 30, 1949. A peace settlement led to an endorsement of Daniel Frisch as the compromise candidate for the presidency to succeed Neumann. The outgoing administration, however, passed a resolution vindicating the resignations of Silver and Neumann from the Agency Executive.

Repercussions from the resignations of Silver and Neumann from the Jewish Agency were still felt at the sessions of the Zionist Actions Committee in Jerusalem from May 5 to 15, 1949, although they did not attend. Acceptance of the resignations meant in effect endorsement of the position taken by the Agency Executive in support of Morgenthau and Montor, and also was an implicit rejection of any unwarranted intervention on their part in the American scene. At the closing session the resignations were accepted after exhaustive deliberations. A motion was also passed replacing the two Americans by Yitzhak Gruenbaum, former Minister of the Interior in the provisional government of Israel, and an American who was to be selected.

RIFKIND COMMISSION REPORT

There was much interest in the Report of the Commission on the Future Program and Constitution of the World Zionist Organization, published by the ZOA on May 23, 1949, which laid particular emphasis on the functions of the Zionist movement in America and elsewhere. The American Zionists were urged by the Commission headed by Judge Simon H. Rifkind:

To generate among the Jews of America a climate of opinion favorable to Israel; to perform the practical tasks necessary for the firm establishment of Israel; promote in the general body politic of America an understanding of the aims and ideals of the Zionist movement; to build a two-way bridge between America and Israel for the free movement and exchange of men, materials, and ideas for the common enrichment of both communities; to facilitate the immigration of the Jews into Israel, encourage halutz movements among the youth, provide for the training of the migrants and their economic absorption in their new home; to promote agricultural, industrial, commercial, and scientific development so as steadily to enlarge the capacity of the land to receive new increments of population; to enlarge the means at the disposal of the central funds of the movement; to encourage the investment of capital and talent in useful enterprises in Israel; to foster among the Jews of America self-awareness and a sense of kinship with Jews everywhere and stimulate Jewish cultural creativity; to encourage the spread of the Hebrew language and of Jewish culture among the Jewish youth and the Jewish population generally; to cooperate with other organizations in defense of Jewish rights and other matters of common concern.
Other Zionist Organizations

The need for a reorientation occupied the attention of almost all Zionist groups, with the possible exception of those engaged primarily in social welfare. The establishment of the state of Israel and the influx of immigrants intensified the social services of Hadassah. On November 8, 1948, Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin was unanimously re-elected national president by delegates representing 265,000 members. A budget of $6,535,000 was voted to provide $3,000,000 for the Hadassah medical program in Israel and $2,100,000 for the Youth Aliyah program.

At their convention on June 13 and 14, 1949, the Pioneer Women likewise emphasized social service projects and adopted a two-year quota of $2,000,000 to aid women and children immigrants reaching Israel. Attending this convention was Golda Meyerson, Israeli Minister of Labor and Social Insurance, who spoke unofficially to the convention as a member of Mapai, the Labor Zionist party in Israel. She urged the immediate unification of Labor Zionist activities in the United States, declaring that the recommendation "had come directly from Prime Minister David Ben Gurion, also a member of Mapai." However, her recommendation was rejected.

The Mizrachi movement at its convention on June 22 to 24, 1949, was also concerned with its future structure, particularly on the world scene. Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, chairman of the Mizrachi national administrative board, called for the establishment of an autonomous world federation of general Mizrachi organizations to pursue a comprehensive program of action. This suggestion was to be taken up at the world Mizrachi conference to be convoked in Jerusalem in August, 1949. Rabbi Jacob Hoffman, president of the Mizrachi National Education Committee, recommended that American Jews recognize the chief rabbinate of Israel as "the final authority in Jewish religious life."

Labor Zionism

The Labor Zionist movement in America reported in its semi-monthly publication, The Labor Zionist (March 18, 1949), that four central committees were engaged in a study of the following proposals for reorganization:

1. The amalgamation of all Labor Zionist organizations into an organization with a fraternal department which would have complete autonomy in benefit matters and an autonomous women's section;
2. The retention by each Labor Zionist organization of the structure and autonomy for inner organizational matters but the establishment of an over-all body to which the individual members of the respective organizations would automatically belong and pay dues and which would act in behalf of the entire movement;
3. The creation of a Labor Zionist federation, with equal status for existing Labor Zionist organizations, to coordinate certain specific activities through permanent standing committees;
4. The coordination of specific cultural and political activities by committees composed of representatives of the Labor Zionist organizations, each
organization retaining its autonomy in organizational and fund-raising fields.

The Labor Zionist organization also announced the establishment of Ha Oved, an organization to render service to those who wished to be workers in Israel but were past the Hechalutz age of twenty-five and had no large financial means at their command.

Seeking to broaden its base of operation, the Labor Zionist organization also sponsored the first national “Assembly for Labor Israel,” which met on June 22 and 23, 1949. The assembly stressed the responsibility of the entire Jewish people to provide the necessary finances and skills for developing Israel, and laid particular stress on American governmental aid through implementation of Point Four of President Harry S. Truman’s program.

Activities of Non-Zionist Organizations

Interest in Israel was not confined to official Zionist organizations. This was perhaps most emphasized by the visit made to Israel in April, 1949, by a delegation from the American Jewish Committee headed by Jacob Blaustein, newly elected president, and John Slawson, executive vice-president, at the invitation of the government of Israel. The visit was preceded by an earlier “Statement of Views” with respect to Israel which was adopted by the American Jewish Committee on January 23, 1949, during its annual meeting.1

Many Zionists resented the rapport between non-Zionist organizations and the government of Israel. On the other hand, dissatisfaction with the official Zionist organization came to the surface when David Petegorsky, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, proposed the dissolution of the ZOA. Writing in Congress Weekly (December 6 and 20, 1948), Petegorsky found that “the Zionist movement evokes the disciplined loyalty of a proportionately decreasing section of American Jewry. The full and effective mobilization of political action for Israel in this country can be achieved today only by a much more inclusive and all-embracing body than the Zionist Organization of America.”

The National Council of Jewish Women, which in the past had concentrated its efforts in the United States, began to display its concern for Israel. In April, 1948, the Council held a conference in New York City on “Critical Problems of Education in Israel.” The Council undertook as one of its main projects sponsorship of the department of education at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Of considerable interest during this period was the concern for Israel shown by the non-Zionist Jewish Labor Committee (JLC) and organizations ideologically sympathetic to that organization. Several delegations went to Israel where they initiated projects to be supported by the JLC and affiliated organizations. A chair was established at the Hebrew University in honor of Abraham Cahan, editor of the Jewish Daily Forward of New York City, and the International Ladies’ Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), which contributed $250,000 to the United Jewish Appeal, also gave $100,000 to the Trade Union Council of Histadrut to build a cooperative center in Israel.

---

1 See Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee, at the end of this volume.
Anto-Zionist Activities

Three subjects bulked large among the arguments used by the anti-Zionists: the plight of Arab refugees, the fear that the establishment of the state of Israel would result in increased anti-Semitism in the United States, and the desecration of Christian shrines and holy places by the Israeli armed forces. At public and private meetings, the American Council for Judaism, through both Jewish and non-Jewish speakers, reiterated the fear that the position of the American Jew was becoming increasingly precarious because of the suspicion by other Americans that the loyalty of American Jews was divided between Israel and the United States.

Outstanding among the Protestants who expounded these arguments were Henry Sloane Coffin, president emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, and Henry Smith Leiper, associate general secretary of the World Council of Churches. They also expressed their concern for the Arab refugees, especially the Christian Arabs who were stated to be the “victims of persecution and ruthless extermination by Jewish extremists in Palestine,” and called upon American Jews to take a public stand against these persecutions. Similarly, Christian Century (March 1, 1949) called attention to the fear and hatred incurred by Israel among the Arabs, in part as a result of the expansionist ambitions of the Israeli government but mainly as a result of the conditions of Arab refugees. Similar opinions were expressed by members of the Committee for Peace and Justice in Palestine, headed by Virginia Gildersleeve, James Shotwell, Kermit Roosevelt, and Henry Sloane Coffin, as well as such churchmen as Richard Niebuhr, professor of Christian ethics at Yale University; Millar Burrows, professor of biblical theology at the Yale University School of Divinity; John S. Badeau, president of the American University in Cairo, and Stephen Penrose, president of the American University in Beirut. Both Jewish and non-Jewish sources, outstanding among whom were the members of the American Christian Palestine Committee, denied these charges in both the daily and periodical press and from lecture platforms.

The charges that Israeli forces were guilty of deliberate vandalism in the damage of Christian shrines and Holy Places, and of frequent indignities to the religious personnel connected with these shrines, were made in the Catholic press. The appointment of a joint Catholic-Israeli commission to inspect damages and to agree on reparation, as well as the testimony of a large number of witnesses—most notable among whom was Monsignor Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association—that the damage was largely the result of the exigencies of war, helped to reduce these charges to a minimum.

Communist Organizations

Following the reversal of the American Communist attitude toward Zionism, the Morning Freiheit, Yiddish Communist newspaper, on March 29, 1949, indicated its intention of embarking on an intensive campaign against "Jewish bourgeois nationalism." Moshe Katz, a staff member who had taken issue with
Ilya Ehrenburg's statement on Zionism in Pravda in September, 1948, issued a statement of recantation and acknowledged the justice of Ehrenburg's analysis.\(^2\) This proved to be a springboard for further attacks on Zionism. The Freiheit also published a lengthy editorial stating its plan "to begin a new educational campaign to enlighten the Jewish masses about bourgeois nationalism. We believe that this is in the interest of the Jewish people of the United States as well as in the interest of a truly democratic and independent Israel."

But the Jewish organizations associated with Communist ideology, such as the Jewish People's Fraternal Order and the American Jewish Labor Council, continued to raise money for Israel. However, at a conference of the American Jewish Labor Council, a resolution was adopted that "Jewish unions and organizations could make their contribution to the progressive powers by sending aid only through the American Jewish Labor Council." On July 5, 1949, the Jewish People's Fraternal Order announced a campaign to raise $250,000 "to aid progressive elements who do not share in the millions collected in the United States."

**Fund Raising for Israel**

As in previous years, the UJA was in the forefront of all fund-raising campaigns for Israel. On February 28, 1949, the UJA announced the opening of its campaign for $250,000,000, and during the first half of 1949 Israeli officials, including President Chaim Weizmann, Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog, and Minister of Labor and Social Insurance Golda Meyerson, came to the United States to spur the drive.

The advocates of local needs challenged what they termed an over-emphasis on overseas philanthropy. At a dinner on May 20, 1949, sponsored by the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues, Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, pointed out that only .4 per cent of the monies raised for American Jewish welfare funds was being allocated for religious, cultural, and educational purposes. "We may be destroying the very soul and heart, and, in time, the body, too, of American Jewry in the process of saving Jews elsewhere," he asserted. A similar position was taken by an Orthodox spokesman, Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, who warned that UJA contributions should not be "at the expense of our educational institutions in the United States."

**UNAUTHORIZED FUND RAISING**

Concurrently, a plethora of "unauthorized and illegitimate" fund-raising campaigns challenged the dominance of the UJA as the central fund-raising agency on behalf of Israel in the United States. To eliminate this confusion the Jewish Agency for Palestine appointed a committee headed by Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the American Section of the Agency, to check multiple fund-raising campaigns. The committee was instructed to take note of the authorized traditional collections of the Jewish National Fund (JNF), as well

\(^2\) For a discussion of Ehrenburg's article, see p. 336.

\(^8\) See also p. 151.
as the campaigns of Histadrut and Hadassah which were authorized by the World Zionist Congress. Particular attention, it was believed, would be devoted to the numerous fund-raising campaigns of the Revisionist party, including the Palestine Pioneers Foundation, the American Committee for the National Sick Fund of Israel, and the League for Jewish National Labor in Palestine. [See also p. 181.]

The Institute on Overseas Studies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds announced that it would study the question of the American Jewish communities' responsibility for Israel in the light of the economic trends, the developing welfare needs and services of Israel, foreign governmental loans, private investments, and local resources.

That the Council proposed to play a greater role in the future in the budgeting and central planning of the UJA was adumbrated in a statement by Stanley C. Myers, president of the Council. Though commenting favorably upon the action the Jewish Agency was taking to eliminate needless duplication, Myers criticized the Agency for permitting its own favorites to initiate $10,000,000 campaigns. This was a reference to the nationwide campaign by Histadrut to raise $10,000,000 during 1949.

At the three-day JNF conference which opened in New York City on March 3; 1949, Abraham Granovsky, world chairman of the JNF, announced that the program for 1949 proposed "to double the national land holdings of the Jewish people in Israel by acquiring the second million dunams of land [250,000 acres] which is an essential prerequisite to the founding of 200 new agricultural settlements planned for this year in Israel."

**Private Investment**

The stress on fund raising of a charitable nature was balanced during this period by an encouragement of private investment. Efforts in this direction were made by the three investment corporations operating in the United States: AMPAL—American Palestine Trading Corporation, the Israel Corporation of America, and the Palestine Economic Corporation. Robert Nathan, director of the economic department of the Jewish Agency, speaking to the delegates of the National Assembly for Labor Israel on June 20, 1949, declared: "If the people are to become self-supporting, large amounts of private capital are essential to Israel. The absorption of 225,000 immigrants a year is impossible unless private capital and 'know-how' come in. Incentives must be provided to bring in private capital."

To encourage such investment the economic department of the Jewish Agency published a monthly economic digest whose first issue was distributed to 12,000 persons.

**Cultural Relations**

The term "cultural bridge" was a constant refrain heard at many meetings of Jewish organizations. Some 300 Jewish scientists, educators, scholars, and cultural leaders attended the first American Conference for Hebrew Language and Culture held in New York City (May 1 and 2, 1949). A comprehensive
program was adopted for the widespread dissemination of the Hebrew language and culture in the United States.

Writing in The National Jewish Post on March 18, 1949, Rabbi Herbert Weiner suggested that the Beka-half shekel for the support of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus be revived as an instrument for cultural unity between the Jews of Israel and the Diaspora. As coordinator of the summer institute for the youth department of the Jewish Agency, Rabbi Weiner announced on April 7, 1949, that the Jewish Agency and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem would sponsor a course of study in Israel for 120 selected American college students, irrespective of religion.

In addition, various Zionist organizations granted scholarships to forty-four Jewish youth leaders from the United States and Canada for a year’s study and training in Israel, to enable them to assume leadership in the Zionist youth movement.

A number of Jewish educators left America for Israel to assume educational posts. Alexander M. Dushkin was appointed director of undergraduate studies to reorganize the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Noah Nardi was designated director of the department of research for the Ministry of Education. Benjamin Akzin, who had served as political secretary for the American Zionist Council, was named associate professor of political science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

It appeared that the celebration of the anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel would be added to the calendar of Jewish holidays. Throughout the United States, large meetings were held to celebrate Israeli “Independence Day” on May 4, and the Synagogue Council of America disclosed that it was preparing a ritual for observance of Israel’s Independence Day.

LOUIS SHUB

OVERSEAS PROGRAMS

The establishment of the state of Israel, followed immediately by Arab attack and invasion, formed the background for the overseas activities of American Jewish agencies as the year 1948-49 opened. Largely in response to the infant state’s war of defense, the contribution of American Jews to Jews overseas reached its peak in 1948—exceeding the historic levels of 1946 and 1947.

After victory had been achieved and even during the period of armed conflict, Israel began to fulfill its major immediate mission—the “ingathering of the immigrants.” From the proclamation of the state on May 14, 1948, to the end of June, 1949, Israel received 250,000 immigrants. The problem of the absorption of so large a volume of immigration in so short a time affected every aspect of overseas services and planning. It was reflected in a substantial reduction in the Jewish population of the displaced persons (DP) camps in Central Europe which had in the past several years been a major area of concern for overseas agencies.
United Jewish Appeal

The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) was the major channel through which American Jews made their contribution to Jews overseas. In 1948, the UJA raised an estimated $150,000,000—the greatest sum realized in any of the ten annual campaigns which it had conducted since 1939.1

On the basis of the formula for distribution of funds prevailing in the 1948 agreement, of the $150,000,000 total the United Palestine Appeal (UPA) was to receive about $71,800,000; the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) $63,900,000; and the United Service for New Americans (USNA) $10,400,000.

In 1949, the UJA adopted a goal of $250,000,000—the same goal which had been set in 1948. No valid prediction could be made by July, 1949, as to what would actually be raised, but it was clear that the UJA would receive less than it had obtained in 1948 since most local community campaigns fell below their 1948 performance. The 1949 net funds, after campaign expenses and USNA allocations, were to be distributed as follows: Of the first $100,000,000, JDC was to receive 45 per cent and UPA 55 per cent; of the next $25,000,000, JDC 30 per cent and UPA 70 per cent; of all sums over $125,000,000 JDC was to receive 15 per cent and UPA 85 per cent. This percentage formula, which gave larger shares to the UPA than it had received formerly, reflected the growing needs of Israel and the relatively declining requirements in Europe.

European Programs

JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE

The JDC appropriated $70,600,000 for its world-wide operations during the calendar year 1948. This represented a slight decline from the $73,400,000 appropriated in 1947. A sharper decline was evident in June, 1949, when appropriations were being made at an annual rate of about $62,000,000.

JDC activities, as in prior years, covered a wide range of services including emigration aid; relief supplies; welfare programs for aged, children and other dependent groups; economic reconstruction; and educational, cultural, and religious programs. Emigration aid was of growing importance, accounting for appropriations of $11,000,000 in 1948 and rising to a rate of $2,000,000 per month in 1949. While part of these costs were reimbursable through payments for the movement of displaced persons made by the International Refugee Organization (IRO), JDC was carrying the costs for other migrations, primarily from Eastern Europe and the Balkans and from Moslem countries to Israel. The JDC reported that it aided 125,000 Jews to leave Europe in 1948.

At the end of 1948, it was estimated that 110,000 displaced Jews remained in Central Europe and Cyprus. By July, 1949, Cyprus had been emptied and about 50,000 to 60,000 remained in Central Europe.

JDC appropriations for the DP areas declined from over $13,000,000 in 1948 to $2,385,000 in the first six months of 1949. Emigration was proceeding

---

1 The result of the 1947 UJA campaign was originally estimated at $125,000,000. Actual 1947 pledges, recorded as of December 31, 1948, totaled $117,500,000.
at a rapid pace, particularly to the United States under the DP immigration act. It was anticipated, however, that JDC would have a continuing responsibility beyond 1949 for perhaps several thousand ill and incapacitated people unwilling or unable to emigrate immediately and representing the "hard core" of the Jewish DP problem.

Eastern Europe and the Balkans were the single major area of JDC operations, accounting for appropriations of over $16,000,000 in 1948 and over $5,000,000 in the first six months of 1949. JDC aid consisted of emergency relief, health and welfare programs for dependent groups, as well as economic aid in helping the Jewish population to adjust to the new social and economic structures in Eastern-European countries. The intensified trend toward nationalization in those countries and the hardening of their relations with the West affected JDC operations. In March, 1949, Rumania nationalized all welfare programs, closing the offices of JDC, ORT, and OSE. In Hungary, where JDC was still able to operate, greater emphasis was being placed on reconstruction activities, primarily in the form of vocational training and producers' cooperatives, which were designed to help Jews adapt themselves to the nationalization and industrialization programs being pursued in those countries.

In Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Poland emigration of Jews was still permitted. JDC terminated its Bulgarian program in the Spring of 1949 after virtually the entire Jewish population had left. It was expected that continued emigration would remove or at least drastically reduce the need for further JDC aid in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia by the end of 1949.

Improving economic conditions in Western Europe made it possible for JDC to reduce its appropriations in that area from $6,300,000 in 1948 to $2,300,000 in the first six months of 1949. In such countries as France and Belgium, continuing responsibilities were being carried for the Jewish refugee populations rather than for the permanent indigenous Jewish groups.

Reflecting the increased production of consumer goods in Europe, JDC reduced its supply program substantially, and the SOS (Supplies for Overseas Survivors), a supplementary campaign for gifts in kind which had been organized in 1946, was finally terminated in April, 1949.

On the other hand, there was a growing program of aid for Jews in Moslem lands, chiefly North Africa. Following the establishment of the state of Israel, there was a wave of persecution in Moslem countries, and large numbers of Jews began to emigrate from North Africa. Programs to facilitate migration and to provide medical care and other services in preparation for resettlement were established in Algeria and Marseilles. In addition, JDC medical and educational surveys began to establish a more permanent program of assistance for an area of Jewish population which had been largely ignored in the past as representing a chronic rather than emergency need.

**OTHER AGENCIES**

The declining scope of European operations was reflected also in the programs of other agencies such as ORT and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immi-

---

2 These figures exclude supplies.
grant Aid Society (HIAS). The World ORT Union reached its peak of activity in the calendar year 1948, when it spent $2,891,000. Of 23,000 students enrolled at the beginning of 1948, more than 13,000 were in the DP camps. During 1948 and in the early months of 1949, total enrollment decreased, reflecting the emigration of the DP's. By March 31, 1949, the total was 13,937 of whom 6,093 were in DP countries. The enrollment in Eastern Europe grew from 4,485 on January 1, 1948, to 7,424 on January 1, 1949, but declined to 3,096 by March 31, 1949, because the ORT schools in Rumania, with an enrollment of 4,200, were nationalized on March 8, 1949.

Although ORT had attempted since the war to emphasize short-term courses for adults in need of retraining in order to prepare them for new occupations or to prepare them for emigration, its program still reached the younger people primarily. In March, 1949, half of the enrolled students were under twenty years of age. Most of the courses were concentrated in traditional Jewish occupations. Expansion into other fields was limited by problems of equipment, qualified teaching personnel, and the desires of the students themselves.

In the United States, ORT had not conducted its own campaign since 1947, but obtained subventions from JDC. In 1949, the grant was $1,500,000, compared with $1,800,000 in 1948.

HIAS appropriations for the overseas aspects of its work (as distinct from immigration services in the United States) were $1,575,482 in 1948, compared with $1,899,025 in 1947. HIAS reported that in 1948 it assisted 22,370 persons to move from various European countries to the United States, Canada, Latin America, and other lands, excluding Israel.

The Jewish Labor Committee and the Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation continued their special efforts on behalf of ideologically affiliated groups overseas, each spending about $700,000 on these programs in 1948.

Coordination

Some gains in the coordination of overseas programs were made in 1948. The JDC, HIAS, and USNA concluded an agreement in October, 1948, whereby they were conducting a joint operation in Germany, Austria, and Italy on behalf of Jewish DP's entering the United States under the DP act. They continued to operate separately in regard to all other phases of their programs. Rescue Children, an Orthodox agency which had been rendering financial support to Orthodox child care institutions in Europe, was absorbed by the JDC in 1948. Similarly, JDC took over support of Orthodox educational institutions in North Africa and the Middle East which had been receiving grants from Ozar Hatorah. As a result, the Committee for the Forgotten Million, a group raising funds on behalf of Ozar Hatorah, went out of existence. The Central Orthodox Committee continued to function as an advisory group in regard to the special needs of Orthodox groups and institutions in the areas of JDC operations. Although the Vaad Hatzala continued to function independently in that same field, its program declined sharply.
Shift of European Agencies to Israel

A trend developed at the end of 1948 in which agencies which had previously operated mainly in Europe undertook projects in Israel. On the initiative of authorities in Israel, JDC was invited to discuss the possibility of participating in the care of new immigrants. It was estimated that almost 10 per cent of the immigrants entering Israel were not immediately employable and required long-term care because of age, illness, physical or mental handicaps, or other chronic problems. These "social cases" required a type of care considerably outside of the major program of economic absorption and called for the development of special services and institutions. JDC was invited to consider assuming this responsibility on the basis of its long experience with rehabilitation services. By July, 1949, no satisfactory agreement had been reached between JDC and the Jewish Agency, but discussions were continuing.

ORT began to operate in Israel in 1949 and reported that it was giving vocational training to 550 persons by March of that year. These activities were not being financed out of the JDC grant to ORT, but expenses were being met temporarily by grants from the Jewish Agency and other bodies in Israel. HIAS was negotiating with authorities in Israel in order to share in providing services to the immigrants, and the Jewish Labor Committee and National Council of Jewish Women had undertaken limited projects of a cultural character in Israel.

International Refugee Organization (IRO)

One of the noteworthy developments of the past year was the success achieved in obtaining a larger measure of public aid for Jewish overseas needs. Basic maintenance of displaced persons in the camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy was provided, as in the year before, by the International Refugee Organization (IRO). The Jewish voluntary organizations, however, found it necessary to expend large sums on supplementary feeding, medical care, vocational training, and other services. Furthermore, the IRO, after establishment of the state of Israel on May 14, 1948, adopted a policy of refusing to pay for the transportation of all displaced Jews to Israel. After prolonged negotiations led by the JDC and intensive public discussion initiated by the Institute on Overseas Studies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), the decision was finally reversed in April, 1949. At that time, the IRO agreed to reimburse JDC for the transportation of 120,000 DP's to Israel at a cost of $10,550,000.

The severely limited budget of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund made the assistance available for Jewish children through that source negligible. Other possibilities of aid to Jews in Europe through the Economic Cooperation Act (ECA) and governmental resources within Europe were being explored.
Programs in Israel

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

The establishment of Israel as a state made it necessary to clarify the functions of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which had formerly acted as a quasi-governmental agency, although it had no power of taxation and was dependent on voluntary financial resources. Until August, 1948, for example, the Jewish Agency had been responsible for financing the defense and security needs of Israel.

As of August 1, 1948, the Jewish Agency discontinued all contributions to the government of Israel, and full responsibility for all military and political affairs of Israel was assumed by the government. The functions of the Jewish Agency were defined further at meetings of the Zionist Actions Committee in September, 1948, which assigned to the world Zionist movement, through the Jewish Agency, the following tasks: Care and support of immigrants, housing, agricultural colonization, trade and investment, development of Jerusalem, fostering of Hebrew culture among the Jewish people of the world, and similar functions to be continued under voluntary auspices. In regard to immigration, the government was to issue visas, but it was left to the Jewish Agency to organize immigrant groups, prepare them for life in Israel, receive and care for them upon arrival, and help them to adjust in the new country.

In the first six months of 1949, the Jewish Agency for Palestine borrowed heavily from banks in Israel and spent almost $50,000,000, the bulk of which was for the direct reception and maintenance of immigrants. This left little resources for other aspects of Israel development which had originally been projected for Jewish Agency financing, such as industrial enterprises and the building of Jerusalem. The Jewish National Fund (JNF), which was the other major beneficiary of United Palestine Appeal (UPA) income, restricted the scope of its traditional land-buying program and used a larger measure of its income to provide funds to the Jewish Agency for the agricultural settlement programs.

OTHER AGENCIES

Other important established organizations raising funds in the United States for Israel expanded their traditional programs. Hadassah, the largest organization outside the UJA, raised $9,579,848 in 1947-48, compared with $6,218,398 in 1946-47. Its largest expenditures were for its medical program, which was adjusted to the emergencies of the war in Israel, and payments to the Jewish Agency to cover part of the cost of the care and training of immigrant children and youth through the Youth Aliyah program.

The National Committee for Labor Israel, raising funds on behalf of the Histadrut, experienced a similar expansion; it raised $3,953,421 in 1947-48, compared with $2,252,139 in 1946-47. The goal for 1948-49 was set at $10,000,000. This campaign paralleled, in many respects, the larger programs of the Jewish Agency on behalf of housing, agricultural colonization, and aid in absorbing immigrants. It represented the traditional interest of
Histadrut in making a distinct contribution, within its ideological framework, to the building of the Jewish state.

These two organizations, together with nine other agencies coming under the regular reporting procedures of the CJFWF (e.g. American Friends of the Hebrew University, American Fund for Israel Institutions, etc.), raised about $17,200,000 in 1948, compared with $12,260,000 in the previous year. They projected goals totaling over $28,000,000 for 1949.

MULTIPlicity OF CAMPAIGNS

The total amount of activity in the American community on behalf of Israel was, however, much greater than these figures indicate. A vast number of separate and distinct efforts on behalf of Israel began to emerge after the establishment of the state. Many of these were small in scope and of questionable validity. Sponsorship of these campaigns varied from small groups of self-appointed individuals to branches of the government of Israel. Of particular importance was a series of mass commodity drives initiated by the Israel government's supply mission, which was seeking materials for the defense needs of the state. Almost all of the important membership groups in the American Jewish community—whether or not they had had a previous role in aid to Israel—developed special projects; and each branch of the Zionist movement sought to make a special contribution. Organizations which had operated traditionally in Europe began to shift parts of their program to Israel.

This lack of planning and resultant confusion in regard to fund raising for Israel became a matter of great concern to the Jewish welfare funds and to the UJA which were faced with diversionary competition in their efforts to mobilize maximum funds for the basic institutions in Israel. After months of discussion and negotiation, in March, 1949, the American Section of the Jewish Agency established a Committee on Multiple Appeals which undertook to pass on the merits of organizations raising funds for Israel. This committee, having no police power, relied on negotiation and public opinion to bring greater order into fund raising for Israel. The question of what further steps might be taken, both in the United States and in Israel, to establish more effective planning and controls was still under discussion at the end of the period under review. By that time, however, mass commodity campaigns had been discontinued, agencies of the Israel government had removed themselves from philanthropic fund raising, and the problem seemed less aggravated, despite the continuation of a large number of separate campaigns.

PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The pressing needs of the immigrants for food, shelter, medical care, and other immediate necessities were the major claim on Jewish philanthropic contributions. To absorb the immigrants economically, Israel needed, in addition, capital for expansion of agricultural and industrial activity. Only a small portion of philanthropic funds was available for these developmental purposes.

3 Between August and November, 1948, the CJFWF received inquiries in relation to 100 separate fund-raising efforts on behalf of Israel.
A major contribution to this need was the loan of $100,000,000 advanced to Israel by the United States Export-Import Bank.\textsuperscript{4}

Difficulties were encountered, however, both in the development of projects within Israel and in the mobilization of additional capital. The credits made available through the Export-Import Bank were used slowly at first, but orders were being placed more rapidly by the middle of 1949. Progress in developing the investment of private American capital was disappointingly slow. The Palestine Economic Corporation, the Israel Corporation of America sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), and the American Palestine Trading Corporation of Histadrut (AMPAL) were the major organized efforts to mobilize investment. These efforts, combined with projects of individuals or private groups, failed to realize more than a fraction of their goals during the first year of the state. It was estimated that no more than one-third of $60,000,000 in capital investment in Israel came from abroad during that period. Efforts were being made by the Israel government and the Jewish Agency to establish coordinated services both in Israel and in the United States to guide interested investors and to overcome some of the obstacles which had developed in carrying out investment projects.

\textit{Relationship of American Philanthropy to Israel}

The achievement of the Jewish state as a reality rather than a political ideal had its repercussions on all Jewish affairs and raised new questions of relationship in all spheres—political, economic and cultural. One of the facets of these emerging problems was reflected in an organizational controversy that developed in the UPA in the Fall of 1948 and delayed the organization of the UJA for 1949.\textsuperscript{5}

A group of individuals prominent in UJA campaigning organized themselves as a “Committee of Contributors and Workers to the UJA” with the expressed purpose of bringing about a reorganization in the United Palestine Appeal (UPA). They asked that local community welfare funds be given representation on the UPA board of directors together with the existing representatives of the Jewish National Fund (JNF) and Keren Hayesod; and that responsibility for administering UPA funds be centered clearly in the Jewish Agency in Israel rather than channeled through the fund offices in New York, which were controlled by the American Zionist parties. Underlying these organizational proposals was the allegation that American funds, raised by all of American Jewry, might be used by the American Zionist parties (and particularly by the General Zionist) to bring pressure upon Israel for the types of political and economic programs which would conform with the views of those parties. These charges were vigorously denied by the General Zionist leadership, who interpreted the controversy as an attempt by the fund-raising groups to destroy the integrity and autonomy of the Zionist movement.

The differences were settled ultimately through a compromise agreement which provided that local communities were to receive 40 per cent representation on the UPA board, clarified the powers of the UPA board for more direct

\textsuperscript{4} See p. 135.
\textsuperscript{5} For other aspects of this subject, see pp. 141 and 168.
management of its own affairs, and set up certain explicit safeguards whereby
the agencies in Israel would have the final voice in determining how funds
were to be transmitted and spent. A conflict over the leadership of the UJA
campaign for 1949 followed, with the Jewish Agency intervening to make the
final decision. The General Zionist members of the American Section of
the Jewish Agency thereupon resigned, charging that the Jewish Agency, as an
international body, had no jurisdiction to decide on a question which was
purely an internal American matter.

It was apparent that the problems and issues underlying these controversies
were not fully resolved and that the Jewish community would continue to be
concerned with them for some time to come.

Arnold Gurin

SOCIAL SERVICES

The year under review was one of transition in American Jewish com-
munal services—the ending of one era and the beginning of another.

After twenty years of dealing with the emergencies that accompanied
depression, war, and postwar adjustment, communities found themselves in
1949 faced with mounting pressures to meet needs that long had been put off
and neglected.

Communities were older, with a much larger proportion of people over 60,
and with the prospect that this proportion would grow even faster. On the
other hand, the record number of war babies had reversed a previous trend
ward a smaller birth rate, and many familial problems, resulting from ten-
sions of war marriages, were forecast.

Hospitals with 1929 facilities and practicing 1929 methods would be hope-
lessly outdated. To keep up with the advance in medical science required
constant adjustment in technique and equipment.

Family welfare agencies which had left to governmental agencies the basic
task of relief, while themselves concentrating on preventing personal and
family breakdowns arising from psychological, emotional, and environmental
factors, now found themselves again concerned with relief on a growing scale,
due to the greatly accelerated influx of refugees.

Vocational service agencies faced again the problems of growing unemploy-
ment in a tightening job market, and the need to find employment for young
people and marginal workers.

Community centers found themselves with deteriorated buildings in slum
neighborhoods, from which most of the Jewish population had departed.

To complicate the picture, agencies which had come to depend largely on
community chests rather than directly upon the Jewish community for their
support, found their dollar income virtually stationary, while the value of
the dollar had shrunk to only 72 per cent of its 1929 purchasing power. At the
same time communities were staggering under the load of rebuilding shattered
European Jewish communities and reconstructing individual lives and a com-
plete society in the new state of Israel.

These conditions demanded the sharpest self-evaluation, keen analysis of
the causes of problems, and their projected solutions.
The former communal structures of American Jewry had often been erected by groups of individuals acting for themselves and not as an organized community, and without planned relationship to needs other than their own, without consultation with other groups or official community sanction.

The new communal structures, whose foundations were being laid during the period under review, were based upon different procedures and set in a different framework. Almost all of the agencies which sought to serve the community were associated, at the time of writing, with the local federations. Decisions were arrived at communally with the knowledge and consideration of all other communal needs and their relative urgencies and were based upon systematic collection of facts and expert consultation.

**Studies**

New York as well as Philadelphia and Newark to a large extent had completed a series of studies which embraced every major field of need and service. Chicago was in the process of continuous intensive self-study.

Baltimore, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Montreal, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Toronto, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Kansas City (Mo.), and Minneapolis conducted studies of their health needs or engaged expert consultants for guidance on them; Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Los Angeles, Montreal, Toronto, and Milwaukee were especially active in such studies during the period under review.

Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Toronto, Cincinnati, Houston, and Toledo were some of the numerous cities which were examining the needs of their aged and chronic sick.

Baltimore, Kansas City, Syracuse, and Hartford were typical of the cities analyzing the family welfare services, in some cases with special reference to refugee needs.

A number of cities were scrutinizing the Jewish center requirements—Newark, Los Angeles, St. Paul, Miami, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Kansas City, Atlanta, and others.

The emerging pattern revealed that the largest cities had virtually completed the basic process of determining their needs in terms of major structure and services, and other cities were studying and analyzing those fields where their problems seemed most pressing, under central communal auspices and coordination.

As a corollary to their special studies communities were organizing to deal more intensively on a permanent basis with these problems. Detroit's federation, for example, set up a special permanent social planning division. Smaller cities, such as Kansas City, Cincinnati, and Buffalo, followed the example set by Milwaukee and Hartford in expanding their professional staffs to make such local planning possible.

**Joint Planning**

A movement of special significance which took place during the period under review was the association of a number of communities, each too small
to meet its own social welfare problems adequately, for the study of their common needs and to plan for them through collective action. The Jewish communities of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina jointly studied their needs in reference to the aged and worked out a plan for meeting them; five southeastern states made a similar study of child care problems; there was joint planning for the aged by the cities of Virginia, the communities of eastern Pennsylvania, and by several cities in New Jersey; there was joint planning for both child care and aged in the Southwest; and for health in Arizona.

This action marked progress toward an assumption by communities of the responsibility for their own needs which they had previously left to national and regional agencies.

Allied with this development was the beginning of a changing relationship between small cities and large ones in the use of the latter's facilities. The practice had been one of haphazard, individual arrangements under which each large community planned its facilities and then unilaterally offered or withheld them from neighboring small cities. During this period a start was made in the East Central area of the United States toward joint consultation on such plans and toward agreements concerning the respective financial responsibility of the cities in that area for the use of facilities, with reference to participation in management and policy determination.

**Construction**

With these studies behind them and with many of the blueprints ready, communities finally turned to the actual construction of buildings, which really began to get under way during the period under review.

A few communities had already completed or purchased their new plants—Buffalo, a community center; Omaha, a home for aged; Denver, a new hospital; Hartford, a center and hospital. Most of the other communities had either just begun construction or were about to do so. All in all, the construction reflected an enormous investment by American Jewry in its communal future.

For the large cities the problems of health and age had become especially pressing. At the time of writing, practically every major city had already raised funds for new hospitals or major additions, and in several construction was already under way. Baltimore started its drive for a $12,000,000 medical center; Boston added major facilities for obstetrics, maternity, and other purposes to its Beth Israel Hospital; Chicago was constructing additions to its Michael Reese and Mount Sinai hospitals; Cleveland's additions to Mount Sinai were well under way; Detroit was expected to break ground for its new hospital in the near future; Los Angeles was raising funds for additions to two hospitals, while the Los Angeles national Jewish Consumptives Relief Association had already completed major new units for the care of the tuberculous.

Miami purchased a former government hospital, which it was renovating and planning to expand; Montreal was constructing additions, including a nurses' home, to its Jewish General Hospital. Based upon its current $50,000,000 capital program, New York had vast plans which included new
hospital facilities in areas of recent and rapidly growing Jewish settlement and major additions to existing old plants; Philadelphia initiated a similar program for its hospitals, and had a good part of the funds in hand; Pittsburgh and St. Louis included substantial sums for hospital repair and improvement in their last welfare fund drives; San Francisco completed most of the work toward erecting its new Maimonides Hospital for the Chronically Ill and additions to its Mount Zion Hospital; Toronto raised over $4,000,000 for its new Mount Sinai Hospital and was planning to start construction soon; Cincinnati raised over $1,000,000 for its hospital additions; Minneapolis had secured most of the funds for its new hospital; Providence was in a similar position, with the help of federal governmental subsidy.

All these plans represented a mobilization of American Jewry for an attack on sickness and disease within the framework of America’s tradition of sectarian sponsorship of medical programs from which all of society would benefit. At the same time there was a constant surveillance of the growing role of government in meeting medical needs, so that Jewish communities would undertake no program which government might be likely to provide.

The list of communities with plans for the expansion of institutional facilities for the aged was even larger. Most of these communities raised at least part of the funds needed and several undertook construction. These included Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Troy, Paterson, Memphis, Jacksonville, Baltimore, Miami, New York, Pittsburgh, Toronto, San Francisco, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Jersey City, Kansas City, New Haven, Dallas, Houston, Oakland, Portland (Ore.), Rochester, Worcester, and others.

Cities of every size and in every section of the country were planning for new and renovated community centers. Buffalo and Hartford moved into their new facilities, Montreal’s construction was well under way, Detroit started a new neighborhood unit, Sioux City was to occupy its new quarters in the near future, Hamilton’s (Ontario) plant was under construction, as was that in Columbus (Ohio). Cities with similar plans in the blueprint or intensive discussion stage, with sites already acquired in a number of instances, and with part of the funds already raised in most, represented a cross-section of Jewish communities: Miami, New York, Toronto, Milwaukee, New Haven, Paterson, Winnipeg, Atlanta, Camden, Houston, Oakland, San Diego, Scranton, Harrisburg, Springfield (Mass.), Syracuse, Trenton, Youngstown, and others.

This was exclusive of the very extensive construction of new synagogues, some with special recreational and educational facilities, a number of which were completed, and exclusive also of the construction of new communal plants for Jewish education.

Communities which raised part of their funds in 1945 and 1946 and then held up building because of scarcity of construction materials, United Jewish Appeal priority, building costs, and other reasons, found that prices had risen to the point where substantial additional funds were needed in order to carry out their original plans. Some annual welfare fund campaigns set aside various percentages of their incomes for these purposes in 1948, and such inclusion was more widespread in 1949.

Much of the funds still remained to be secured, and careful planning was
required to assure that the need being met was unavoidable, that buildings were constructed wisely and economically, with proper provision for future maintenance and operating costs, and that no intolerable mortgage commitments would be incurred. There was considerable evidence that many of the mistakes of building in the 1920’s would be avoided.

**Maintenance of Services**

In planning and building new facilities and programs, communities were confronted with the problem of maintaining the most necessary and permanent services. Caught between the shrinkage of the purchasing power of the dollar on the one hand, and the virtual freezing of community chest support on the other, communities turned increasingly to Jewish welfare fund campaigns for supplemental funds to maintain minimum operations. Such supplementation which long had been the pattern in Chicago, and had for several years been a major factor in Los Angeles and Newark, was extended to other cities such as Cleveland, in 1948, and San Francisco, in 1949. The welfare funds had been established primarily to meet community obligations for non-local purposes, while community chests were to provide for local needs with the exception of such specific Jewish programs as Jewish education and community relations. But the funds now found themselves confronted with local pressures to which they were compelled to respond by providing sufficient supplemental support to maintain essential minimum standards of operation.

**Medical Care**

The major financial problem in the largest cities was medical care. Hospital costs had risen to the point where they accounted for 35 per cent, and even more, of total local federation expenditures. In addition, changing concepts of medical care emphasized the desirability of central planning, coordination, and operation of all types of hospital programs. The inter-relationship of all types of medical problems upon which these concepts were based, meant the extension of hospital responsibility from the care of acute and physical illness to that of chronic and mental ailments. It called for close cooperation with related communal programs, such as those for the aged, which also involved a large incidence of chronic illness. New programs of home care were initiated, both to provide a well-rounded service and to ease the financial strain on hospitals.

Such central community planning was increasingly evident during the period under review in Boston (as a result of its health survey), in Baltimore, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Montreal, St. Louis, Cincinnati, San Francisco, and New York. One concrete evidence of this planning was the merger of Israel Zion and Beth Moses hospitals in Brooklyn, N. Y., to form the new Maimonides Hospital.

At the same time these concepts posed serious questions as to the limits of Jewish responsibility. How far could communities go in assuming service and financial obligations? How did these responsibilities relate to those of other groups in the community, and to the growing role of government?
As communities like Cleveland studied these questions in order to limit their capital and program extension to the most urgent and clear-cut needs, the role of Jewish hospitals in contributing to research and medical care, in postgraduate education of Jewish doctors, and in pioneering in other areas began to take more definite shape.

The 310,000 persons cared for by fifty reporting Jewish hospitals in 1948 represented a high point of service, although the increase over 1947 was slight, reflecting in part the limitations of hospital capacities. This was true also of the number of new admissions and the 3,600,000 days of care given in 1948.

Local and national tuberculosis hospitals showed little change in admissions and totals of days of care in 1948. This fact, and the emphasis in communities on local care in the light of medical findings that climate was not a necessary factor in arresting tuberculosis, has meant continuing differences of opinion between community organizations and national tuberculosis hospitals on the financing of current operations and plans for capital expansions.

Hospitals for chronic illnesses gave somewhat greater service because of an increasing incidence of these diseases in an aging population, greater pressure for their care, and greater interest and recognition by general hospitals of their responsibilities for treating these illnesses.

About one-fifth of all days of service in general hospitals in 1948 were given without charge to the patients, a slight increase over 1947. The proportion in tuberculosis hospitals was much higher, more than three-fourths of the care being free.

As part of the trend toward medical centers and integration of medical programs, communities were merging independent out-patient clinics giving free or very nominal fee service with general hospitals. Montreal was the latest to follow the pattern. Thirty-six communities or hospitals reporting out-patient services had over 1,400,000 patient visits in 1948—a 4 per cent gain over 1947, but a slowing of the upward trend in evidence since 1945.

The proportion of Jewish persons using out-patient facilities continued to decline, the ratio of Jews among new patients being only about one out of four. Two primary causes for this decline were the shift of Jewish population away from the location of Jewish hospitals and improved economic circumstances which enabled more Jewish persons to use private medical resources at regular fees.

The service rendered by Jewish hospitals to the total community was also evident from the fact that less than half the patients admitted to general Jewish hospitals for in-service care were Jewish. In tuberculosis hospitals, however, more than one-half were Jewish, and in hospitals for chronic illness nearly nine-tenths were Jewish. The proportion of Jewish patients was generally consistent with the size of the Jewish community—higher in the larger cities.

CARE OF THE AGED

The growing emphasis on care of the chronically ill cut across several fields of Jewish service and was especially evident in programs for the aged. Although in the past some institutions had been reluctant to admit persons with chronic illnesses, during this period, in forty-six reporting agencies,
nearly one-third of the beds of institutions for the aged were set aside for the chronically ill, in some as much as 100 per cent.

There was, in addition, a general recognition that services for the aged could not be limited to institutional care, but had to include also provision for home care and residence in private boarding or foster homes wherever feasible, with non-institutional case work, recreation programs in Jewish community centers and other facilities, occupational therapy, and health services closely tied in with hospitals.

The trend toward the formation of community planning committees for the aged under federation auspices, to tie together the planning and the services of institutions for the aged, hospitals, family welfare organizations, community centers, and vocational service bureaus, continued. The result was a far more flexible and intelligent program, intended not only to meet the current pressures, but to lay the foundations for meeting the larger problems in the future.

Greater flexibility was also being achieved in institutional programs as communities began to follow the example of New York City in experimenting with apartment houses and other congregate living arrangements differing from the traditional institution.

With an increase of 3 per cent in the number of beds available, there was little or no abatement in the pressures on institutions for the aged during 1948, and there were long waiting lists. Fifty-three institutions were caring for a total of only 7,700 persons, 95 per cent of whom were 65 years of age or over.

A factor of growing importance, and one to which Jewish communities were giving increasing attention, was the governmental aid provided by Old Age Assistance. The number of residents of Jewish institutions for the aged receiving such aid continued to rise and almost one-third of them were receiving such help.

**CHILD CARE**

While planning for a growing number of aged who required help, communities were expecting an increase also in responsibilities for child care, reversing the sharp downward trend. The peak of child care reached in 1937 had been followed by a decline which lasted until 1945, reflecting both the lower birth rate and the improved child care practices which made possible the prompt return of children to their parents or relatives.

But in 1945 there began an upswing in child care needs, and in 1948, 8,000 children were cared for by 54 reporting agencies. The high birth rate during the war, coupled with all the tensions, uncertainties, and maladjustments of many war marriages, created problems which the communities would have to face in the near future.

The program of child care continued to be one of integrating all forms and types of service within a flexible pattern, so that each child could receive the type of help he needed and could shift from one to another when necessary. Emphasis was on keeping a child within his own home wherever possible, separating him from his parents only as a last resort, and returning him home at the earliest feasible date. When the child was separated, every attempt was made to place him in an environment most closely matching his home, namely
a foster home. Group institutional care was reserved for those children with special problems and then only for the temporary periods needed.

Thus, 55 per cent of the children under care of Jewish agencies in 1948 were in foster homes, an increase of 5 per cent over 1947, but less than would have received such help had a serious shortage of foster homes not continued. Communities were addressing themselves with increasing concern and co-ordination to the problem of securing more foster homes.

Approximately 25 per cent of the children under care were in institutions. Hartford joined the growing list of cities which had closed their institutions, and Newark was the latest city to merge its institutions and non-institutional agencies into one all-embracing communal child care agency. Cities which no longer operated institutional programs (which were much more specialized and intensive treatment services and thus much more expensive) pooled their resources by utilizing regional agencies for the relatively few children requiring such care, or arranged to use the facilities set up by very large cities such as New York City.

The remainder of the children under care were in their own homes (13.2 per cent), or in homes of relatives (3.6 per cent).

FAMILY WELFARE SERVICE

There was little change in the total number of families helped by family welfare service agencies (with or without financial aid) during 1948. The 45,000 families receiving service were 2 per cent fewer than in 1947; and the 44,500 applications for aid in 1948 were 1 per cent less than in 1947. But for 39 reporting agencies the number of immigrant cases during the year grew by 22 per cent—and these cases were much more expensive than the others. The resulting total increase in assistance costs was a 33 per cent increase over 1947, reflecting the higher cost of living in 1948. Total assistance granted by reporting Jewish agencies was $2,250,000, the largest sum expended since 1932. It was anticipated that the costs in 1949 for these purposes would be even higher.

TRANSIENT CARE

For the first time since the war, there was no increase in family welfare aid to transients. Financial aid to transients declined, and the trend toward the closing of shelters which had been maintained by federations under family welfare agency direction continued. Thus, one of the ancient traditions of Jewish charities, the providing of shelter for strangers, was disappearing from organized communal programs. Communities found the volume of need too small to maintain this expense, in view of other urgent requirements and the fact that they could provide the services needed more adequately, flexibly, and economically through the use of hotels, lodging houses, private homes, and other arrangements. Of fourteen large cities checked, only Detroit and Cleveland were maintaining federation-supported shelters and even those cities were using the shelters partly for refugees.

Theoretically, the care of transients had become a responsibility of tax-supported agencies, but in practice the municipal lodging house standards

---

1 For discussion of immigrant aid, see pp. 193 ff.
often had not yet reached a level acceptable to the Jewish communities, so that provision for Jewish transients continued to constitute a minor responsibility for Jewish communal programs.

Community Centers

Several of the changes mentioned in relation to other fields also affected community centers—shifts of population, outmoded plants, greater concern for the aged, community-wide coordination of program, and less emphasis on institutionalization. In the 318 centers affiliated with the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) in 1948, there was a growing emphasis on adapting the program to the needs of the individual and the group rather than adapting the service to the limitation of a central building. In accordance with this emphasis, communities were working toward relating community centers more closely to synagogue centers and Jewish educational facilities and programs, as part of an integrated over-all community service. The plan was to use center staff and skills in synagogue centers and Jewish educational organizations, to bring meetings and programs into individual homes, and to decentralize the center operations on a neighborhood basis wherever desirable.

In consonance with this approach, more attention was being given to “family-centered” programs, in which parents were related to the work being done with children in the development of their skills and personality. Furthermore, education for communal service and responsibility was stressed. Programs increased in variety and flexibility, involving more nursery schools under center auspices, programs for the aged, youth councils. Rural summer camps and urban day camps were integrated into winter programs as part of year-round communal service.

Emphasis on mass activities in a number of centers was giving way to concentration on activities of small groups, under more skilled, professional direction, in which group association was employed as the avenue for individual personality development. This required more trained professional staff, and schools of social work had not yet caught up with the demand.

The combined total membership of community centers rose to 468,000 in 1948, a gain of 10,000 over the previous year, and an increase of more than 11 per cent since 1944.

Like other communal services the rise in the costs of center operation was attributable more to the inflation of the dollar than to the expansion of services. The costs in 1948 were nearly 11 per cent over those of 1947, and almost 45 per cent over 1945. Most of the increase was for the cost of programs; administrative and maintenance costs were being cut.

The volume of operation and the sources of center financing were evident from a sample of 89 centers which had a total income of $6,620,000 in 1948. Nearly one-half of that income came from federations and community chests; nearly one-fourth of the income came from program, and less than one-fifth from membership dues. Although average dues rates had increased 25 per cent in the past few years, they had not increased more rapidly than operating costs, and the proportion remained the same.
Vocational Service

The economic factors which were affecting the experiences of all the fields of service described—hospitals and clinics, institutions for the aged, child care and family welfare agencies, and community centers—most directly affected Jewish vocational service organizations. Newest of Jewish communal agencies, vocational service was most influenced by the rapid and drastic alternate rises and falls in the types of need and demand. The year 1948 found them operating at a record level. Applications reached a high of 87,247 in twenty-one agencies, 10.6 per cent above the previous record of 1947; placements were up 14.6 per cent; registrations rose 4.4 per cent, including a notable rise of 17 per cent in registration for counseling; and the number of persons in the active file at the end of 1948 was 17.4 per cent greater than in 1947, with a striking rise of 32.7 per cent in counseling cases.

The significant causes of these increases were several: the declining labor market in the latter months of 1948 with a natural lay-off rate higher in December, 1948, than in any December since 1939; the increased number of immigrants entering communities and seeking guidance, retraining, and employment; the rise in the number of requests for guidance in choosing and preparing for a career, especially from young people about to select their life's work—reflecting also a greater recognition of the value of these agencies by the Jewish community generally; and greater attention to the needs of marginal workers, such as the aged and handicapped, whose problems were aggravated by a tightening employment market in which they were often the first to be discharged.

These conditions were underscored by the experience in April, 1949, when job openings received had dropped 22 per cent under that month of 1948 and placements were 11.5 per cent under 1948, at the same time as the active file for both counseling and placement had grown by more than 17 per cent.

Increased concentration on assistance to aged employable individuals who were able and willing to work and were reluctant to become a drain on their families or communities, was evidenced by the intensive and quite successful drive of the Federation Employment Service (FES) of New York City to bring the special needs of this group to employers. Similarly, the renewed interest manifested by several communities in sheltered workshops as possible opportunities for the aged, marginal workers, the handicapped, and immigrants pointed up the communities' interest in creating employment opportunities for these special groups where normal channels seemed closed or limited, and where the undesirable alternative was some form of direct relief.

The aggregate cost of operating the twenty-one vocational service agencies in 1948 was $1,200,000, received almost entirely from Jewish federations and welfare funds. The Chicago Jewish Vocational Service initiated the experiment of charging fees to some applicants, along the lines of experiments initiated in previous years by family welfare agencies in several cities. Other vocational services, however, felt that the charging of fees would produce a very limited income; that it might adversely affect the ability of the agency to attract a representative clientele and hence harm its service out of proportion to the
The resumption of Jewish immigration after World War II resulted in a very large movement to the United States of the survivors of Nazi concentration camps and of those who had fled the unbearable conditions prevailing in Europe.

The need for aid to these immigrants reversed the trend toward the elimination of special agencies providing immigrant aid in the United States, which had prevailed for a while during the war. At the time of writing, two major national organizations, the United Service for New Americans (USNA) and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) were engaged in an unprecedented volume of work. In the local communities as well, nearly all Jewish social agencies were engaged to some extent in the provision of immigrant aid. The National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) reported that in 187 Jewish communities its sections were participating in the local immigrant aid programs. Immigrant aid was a major part of the programs of Jewish family agencies in almost all of the nearly one hundred communities where they existed; in some cases the immigrant load constituted as much as two-thirds of the total load of the family agency. At least an equal number of communities without organized family services were accepting and caring for refugees. Similarly, the communal agencies permanently involved in child care, recreational and cultural activity, medical care, vocational placement, training and counseling, and immigration and naturalization work were engaged more or less extensively in immigrant aid.

Needs of Immigrants

The postwar immigrants required considerably more in the way of aid than had the previous migrants of the 1930’s. The majority of the new immigrants arrived in the United States with little funds, often in need of complete assistance in order to achieve economic and social rehabilitation. Because of these needs in 1949, immigrant aid constituted a major form of Jewish social service in the United States.

Services

The exact number of immigrants receiving aid during this period is not known. But an estimate of the extent of the need may be obtained from the
figures of one agency. According to the 1948 annual report of the USNA, 59 of every 100 Jewish immigrants who arrived in the United States in 1948 were assisted by its Port and Dock Department; 29 of these were provided with shelter at its reception centers, and 40 received casework assistance from its family service or religious functionary division. Similarly, HIAS met all boats or planes bringing in Jewish immigrants and provided a very large proportion of them with pier service, temporary shelter arrangements, transportation within the United States, and related national services.

The cost of operations of these two major national immigrant aid agencies reveals the extent of the service provided. In 1948 USNA spent approximately $3,688,000 of its total expenditure of $10,462,141 on its national services; HIAS spent $2,390,755 in 1948 on its national and international service. USNA estimated that it would spend about $4,450,000 on national services in 1949; HIAS estimated that it would spend about $5,000,000, including its international services.

As a part of migration services, national agencies cooperated with international organizations such as the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), International Refugee Organization (IRO), and with such agencies of the United States government as the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Displaced Persons Commission, in dealing with such special problems as temporary visas, transit to other countries, and similar legal involvements. For the local communities, the migration services provided interpretation of immigration laws and regulations. HIAS received some cooperation and international services through its offices in Europe, in the Far East, and in Central and South America.

One of the highly successful forms of immigrant aid performed by both USNA and HIAS and usually classified as a form of migration service was the provision of the assurances required of immigrants under the Displaced Persons (DP) Act of 1948.

It was possible to obtain individual assurances for DP's who had relatives or friends in the United States to comply with these requirements. However, a very large number of displaced persons were without relatives or friends in the United States. For these and for those unable to obtain individual assurances from other sources, the DP Act of 1948 permitted community assurances. Individual assurances were processed through both HIAS and USNA and then transmitted to the Displaced Persons Commission. Community assurances, however, were processed through USNA, which succeeded in obtaining an increasingly large number of such assurances with the cooperation of local Jewish communities. Most of the immigration through July, 1949, was on the basis of individual assurances. Of approximately 25,000 cases (involving 55,000 to 60,000 individuals) processed through August, 1949, there were 14,800 individual assurances and 10,200 community assurances.

LOCATION AND SEARCH

Another national service in which all national and migration agencies participated was that of the location of and search for prospective immigrants who were relatives and friends of Jews both in the United States and abroad. This form of immigrant aid, which reached its peak during 1946 and 1947,
was declining steadily, but had been instrumental in uniting thousands of families in the chaotic period following the end of the war.

PORT AND DOCK SERVICE

Still another important service rendered by national organizations, known as pier or port and dock service, consisted in meeting the boats or planes on which immigrants were arriving and helping them make their first contact with the United States. This involved making arrangements for the immigrant's meeting relatives or friends, helping him through customs and immigration inspection, assisting him to understand the unfamiliar language and customs, providing him with temporary shelter when needed, food and medical care, arrangements for transportation to destinations in other cities, and similar assistance.

HIAS met all the planes, boats and trains, and provided service to a very large group of Jewish immigrants. During 1948, assisted by volunteer workers from the National Council of Jewish Women, USNA met a total of 709 ships, planes, and trains bearing over 9,000 Jewish immigrant passengers in all of the principal ports of entry in the United States.

RESETTLEMENT

A major form of immigrant aid rendered by the national agencies was the resettlement of immigrants from the port of arrival to an ultimate city of destination. Every attempt was made to prevent an accumulation of large numbers of the arriving immigrants in New York City and to a lesser extent in San Francisco. USNA maintained a special department which arranged with agencies in local communities all over the United States for the reception and care of immigrants.

Through a complex system of quotas and specific arrangements with individual Jewish community agencies, USNA settled more than 2,800 persons in 122 communities in 37 states during 1948. Beginning in 1949 there was an acceleration of immigration under the DP Act and a much wider distribution of Jewish immigrants was achieved; hence, by the end of July, 1949, 7,716 arrivals under the DP Act had been assisted to their destinations in 334 communities in 43 states.

In the period ending June, 1948, USNA estimated that 60 per cent of all Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remained in New York City, with about 40 per cent going off to settle in other communities. A gradual change in this proportion took place as a result of the provision of community assurances from the communities outside of New York, combined with planned effort by USNA to move all possible immigrants to other communities. As a result it was expected that during 1949 approximately 40 per cent of arrivals would remain in New York and 60 per cent would go into other communities.

HIAS also encouraged the movement of individual immigrants to join friends and relatives in other cities, but was not maintaining a continuing relationship with local agencies for this purpose.
NATURALIZATION AND AMERICANIZATION

Immigrants were aided in naturalization and Americanization both nationally and locally. On the national level, the work consisted essentially of consultation with local agencies and liaison with government. The actual naturalization and Americanization was carried on largely within the local communities themselves. In this respect the local sections of the NCJW were particularly active.

EUROPEAN JEWISH CHILDREN'S AID

Unattached Jewish children were served through the European Jewish Children's Aid (EJCA). Although the EJCA retained its separate corporate identity, its executive was the director of USNA and its program was managed through USNA. Until 1941, EJCA had been authorized to issue corporate affidavits for unaccompanied minors whose admission to the United States was requested by parents and agencies abroad. After 1941, the United States Committee for the Care of European Children assumed the responsibility of issuing corporate affidavits for all such children on a nonsectarian basis. The United States Committee referred all Jewish children who entered the United States on its corporate affidavit to the EJCA. EJCA was directly responsible to the United States government for children admitted on its corporate affidavit. The United States Committee delegated the responsibility for all children entering on its corporate affidavit to the ECJA.

The cost of financing the immigration of Jewish children who were considered a national responsibility was borne by the EJCA. The cost of maintaining children who were placed in local communities was the responsibility of the local community. Following the end of the war a large number of unattached children came into the United States under this program. About 1,000 were admitted under the terms of the "Truman Directive." Relatively small numbers entered the United States after the beginning of 1948; nearly all the children who arrived were members of family groups.

Local Communal Aid

Important forms of service were performed by the local communities. These services were of a great variety: financial assistance, vocational service, medical care, loans to assist immigrants to establish themselves in business and take advantage of housing, and recreational and cultural opportunities. In addition, communities helped immigrants with a great variety of personal problems.

NEW YORK CITY

The largest single local agency rendering services to immigrants was the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), established in the Summer of 1949. Included in these services were relief and family service, child care, aid to religious functionaries, vocational services, and business and rehabilitation loans; not included were such services as port and dock or shelter. The creation of the NYANA placed the administration of services to immigrants formerly rendered by USNA in local hands and established an
unusual pattern: that of the organization of a special agency for services to immigrants at the local level. On July 5, 1949, the NYANA began to provide financial and casework service to newcomers resident in New York City. The NYANA took over the New York City caseload, which averaged 5,000 cases open each month during the first six months of 1949. Nearly 2,750 new cases were added during the first six months of 1949 and 1,960 were closed. In June, 1949, some 79 per cent of the local caseload were receiving financial assistance in addition to casework service.

VOCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

To assist the newcomers in speeding their vocational adjustment, the Vocational Service Division of the USNA (also transferred to NYANA in July, 1949) secured a total of 4,353 jobs for its registrants, or an average of 405 per month, in 1948. During the first six months of 1949 a total of 2,369 jobs were secured, 518 persons were enrolled in special training courses, and several hundred more were assisted in other ways, such as the securing of union membership, tools, equipment, and occupational licenses where these were required for employment.

OTHER LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Outside of New York City, most of the local services to immigrants were provided by the agencies which served the whole community. Financial aid and personal adjustment were usually carried on by the Jewish family service agency. For special services in naturalization, preparation of affidavits, and related activities the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) maintained professionally staffed departments of service to the foreign born in the local sections of Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Miami, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Worcester, and San Francisco. In the smaller Jewish communities where there was no established Jewish family agency, the gap was filled by a special service to foreign born operated most frequently by the local sections of the NCJW. While it no longer carried on the national types of immigrant aid, NCJW maintained through its National Service to Foreign Born Advisory Committee a national consultative and information service to the 187 local sections which participated in the local aid programs.

HIAS maintained seven branch offices outside of New York: in Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, Seattle, San Francisco, and Baltimore. These offices operated a wide range of services which were as a rule classified as national forms of aid. The USNA had no branch offices at all. Through its field staff, it provided continuing consultative services to the local agencies for their information and guidance.

FAMILY SERVICE

Family service was one of the principal forms of immigrant aid in local communities. In the smaller and medium-sized communities, child care service was included in family service; in the larger communities child care services were frequently operated independently of the family service agency.

A preliminary analysis by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), based on service reports for 1948 by thirty-nine Jewish
family agencies, showed that immigrant cases represented approximately one-
sixth of all cases under care during 1948. In one-fourth of the reporting
agencies the immigrant load accounted for one-third or more of all cases.
Practically all agencies showed increases in 1948 in their load of immigrant
cases over the load of 1947; the average increase was 22 per cent. The family
agencies in Newark, St. Louis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Oakland, Portland, Ore., and St. Paul, Minn., reported that one-half or more of
their total caseloads on December 31, 1948, consisted of immigrants. Over
40 per cent of all the financial assistance given by the reporting agencies went
to aid immigrants. In Newark, St. Louis, Buffalo, and Minneapolis, four out
of every five assistance cases during the average month were immigrants.
Almost two-thirds of the total amount expended for financial assistance
cases in 1948 went to immigrant aid. Moreover, the immigrants received higher
monthly grants than the rest of the agency clients assisted: an average of
$115 per month per case for aid, as compared with $49 per month for non-
immigrant cases. This discrepancy was due to the fact that immigrant families
needed almost complete rehabilitation. In addition, many non-immigrant cases
were receiving public assistance with supplementation from the private agency,
while the immigrant was not eligible for public assistance.
However, not all immigrants were in such need. A considerable proportion
of the migrants, especially those with relatives or friends in the United States,
ever came to the attention of any agency and made successful, occasionally
even phenomenal, adjustments—financially, socially, and culturally. The
efforts to assist immigrants in their rehabilitation were to a considerable degree
highly successful. Reports from family agencies indicated that most of the
immigrants learned English, adjusted themselves in their community, and
found means of livelihood without community help following an initial
period of from three to eight months' duration.

FINANCING IMMIGRANT AID

Nevertheless, the amounts of money involved and the heavy costs of those
cases which could not be readily assisted to early economic self-maintenance
constituted a growing problem for many of the local Jewish communities. In
New York City, for instance, it was estimated that the cost of operating
NYANA during 1950 would be between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000.
Although there were three communities in which the community chest
provided funds for this type of immigrant aid, in practically all others the
cost was carried by the Jewish federation or welfare fund from funds raised
in the Jewish communities. In some cases this meant that some of the funds
originally intended for overseas services had to be allocated to this local
service.

CHILD CARE IN COMMUNITIES

Despite the fact that the number of unattached children among immigrants
had decreased, the total service to immigrant children actually increased
during 1948. This resulted from the fact that unattached children required
long-term aid and the loads tended to be cumulative. Thus, reports received
by the CJFWF from thirty-two agencies showed a rise in the proportion of
immigrant children cared for—from one in five of all children under care by those agencies to one in four during 1948. Twelve agencies indicated that one-third or more of their children clients were immigrants. Of those requiring agency service, the large majority were placed in family foster homes and only a small number in institutions.

**VOCATIONAL SERVICE**

Perhaps the most urgent need of the newcomers was for that form of aid known as vocational service. The personal adjustment of the family to its new situation depended heavily upon the kind of employment its wage earners could obtain and the financial return from that employment. In the study made of the communities by the CJFWF, it was found that practically all communities provided some form of vocational counseling and placement service for immigrants in 1948. In the larger communities the service was generally available through the regular vocational service agencies; few family agencies or migration agencies provided preliminary counseling and placement. In the intermediate and small communities, this service was usually provided by the family agency or a functional refugee committee.

According to statistics published by the Jewish Occupational Council, immigrant cases represented 21.7 per cent of all active cases of 16 vocational agencies in the United States and Canada, exclusive of New York City, for the month of December, 1948. With the inclusion of USNA (reorganized as NYANA), the proportion was 42.0 per cent of the total. Job placements of immigrants outside of New York City accounted for 23.9 per cent of all placements in December, 1948, ranging from no immigrant placements in four communities to over 60 per cent of all placements in four others. If New York City is included, the placement average for December, 1948, was 31.0 per cent.

**OTHER SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITIES**

All the health and welfare services available to the total Jewish community were utilized by the immigrant in need of aid. Community centers, Y's, hospitals, clinics, institutions for the aged and children, camp agencies, and others, all participated in service to the immigrant.

**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN**

Of special significance in the organization of local service to the immigrant was the extent to which the sections of the NCJW helped the local agencies, or themselves provided a program of community adjustment in smaller communities. About one-half of the sections reporting to the National Council of Jewish Women stated that they assisted in finding housing for the immigrants. Since housing was one of the main obstacles to organized resettlement, this represented quite a considerable effort.

Other forms of aid provided by volunteer groups of NCJW included the provision of furniture, the teaching of English, the provision of hospitality and orientation arrangements, and similar services. The NCJW reported that 115 of its local sections assisted in or provided community adjustment programs of the above type in their respective communities. In 101 Jewish com-
Communities local sections provided technical services including location and search (77), migration service, affidavits, and information on international matters (58), and naturalization (82).

Coordination

As can be seen from this picture of immigrant aid in the local Jewish communities in America, the variety and number of agencies involved was so great that in a number of communities coordination efforts were necessary. This was usually provided by the social planning departments of the Jewish federations, although in a few communities special coordinating committees were set up to correlate the work of the various agencies concerned with aid to the immigrant.¹

The future of immigrant aid was not altogether certain at this writing. However, once the displaced persons camps were emptied of their Jewish residents, it was expected that the load would begin to drop sharply. The national services, including preparation for migration, port and dock activities, and temporary shelter work, would decline drastically. Local aid was likely to be curtailed to a lesser extent, but requirements for such aid were expected to begin to show a considerable decline after the middle of 1950.

Morris Zelditch

¹ See Community Organization, p. 139.
Cultural

LITERATURE

This article is a review of books that appeared in the United States from June, 1948, to June, 1949, and touched on Jews or Jewish problems, directly or indirectly. The books selected for description or analysis manifested overt “Jewish content.” Those books containing latent “Jewish content,” that is, books which presumably originated in and were influenced by Jewish ideals and traditions but did not objectively exhibit that feature, have been omitted from consideration.

The employment of these touchstones has left a regrettable gap in the article, that of poetry, an area where many Americans of Jewish origin have made notable contributions. Unfortunately, these works contained little that falls within our definition of “Jewish content.”

The relatively large number of books that were published in this period precluded any extensive, itemized review. The reviewer has had to content himself with selecting those books which were either concededly meritorious or reflected significant trends or patterns in the literature of Jewish interest.1

In sum, this review deals with literature of Jewish interest, of a “popular order,” with manifest Jewish content, either meritorious in themselves or revelatory of significant attitudes and patterns of thought.

Fiction

The period under review abounded in novels which were concerned with the failure of conscience in American and world society, as revealed in the treatment of minority groups. The Jew and the Negro became, as it were, the focus or symbol of a progressive disintegration of society and expressed not only the author’s awareness of the shocking extent of prejudice but also his own peculiar role and yearnings in modern society.

This may account for the appearance of many novels by non-Jews, in which the Jew, if not central, played a significant role in shouldering the burden of the author’s grievances. The extraordinary variety of locales in the novels in which Jewish characters appeared, provided testimony of this uneasy sense of universal social disintegration. A cursory survey of the fiction of this period placed the Jew in such diverse environments as the American armed forces; a small New England island town and private academy; a setting in California; a small Midwestern town; a North African city; a South African city; and the Far East.

1 For a complete, annotated bibliography, see American Jewish Bibliography.
The ubiquity of the Jewish character, in situations or settings with which he was not ordinarily associated, lent color perhaps to the charge of Irving Howe ("The Stranger and the Victim," Commentary, August, 1949) that the non-Jewish and, less frequently, the Jewish author, employed the Jew as a conventional and convenient means for presenting his private vision of American [and world] society.

Whether this complaint had validity or not, it was possible and perhaps useful to classify the various novels according to the various subjects and themes with which the central or tangential themes of prejudice, bigotry, or discrimination were allied:

1. The War Novel, in which the Jew was exposed to bias within the American armed forces;
2. The Postwar Novel, in which a returning serviceman or a member of the occupation forces encountered bigotry;
3. The Institutional Novel, in which anti-Semitism brought bitterness or tragedy to Jews struggling for an education or profession;
4. The "Social Content" Novel, in which anti-Semitism was placed in a context of civic or social corruption;
5. The "Assimilationist" Novel, in which the characters faced the problems of intermarriage or flight from Jewish identity as a result of community hostility.

These five classifications, while by no means exhaustive, were roughly the types to which most novels which utilized the themes of prejudice, bigotry, or discrimination, conformed.

WAR NOVELS

One of the more striking phenomena of the American fiction under review was the extraordinary popularity of those war novels which not only explored war experiences but also incorporated the themes of prejudice and discrimination, or, more generally, social problems. The novels we shall deal with in this section, The Young Lions by Irwin Shaw, An Act of Love by Ira Wolfert, and The Naked and the Dead by Norman Mailer, all reflected to a greater or lesser extent, this duality of intention.

The Young Lions was the story of three men, a Jewish youth from the Midwest, a New York stage manager, and an ex-Communist and Austrian Nazi. Their fortunes are traced from 1938 to 1945 when all three meet in a Bavarian forest. There the Jewish youth is killed by the Austrian, who in turn is killed by the stage manager.

Perhaps the sharpest and most penetrating analysis of The Young Lions was undertaken by Alfred Kazin in an article in Commentary entitled "The Mindless Young Militants" (December, 1948). After paying tribute to the "long and expertly contrived book," and noting its documentary, realistic style, Kazin observed that the heart of the novel was the ordeal of the Jewish youth, Noah Ackerman, climaxed by his heroic death. Kazin taxed the author with worshiping a new Jewish type created by contemporary "Jewish Militants"—the type who regarded belligerence and resistance as ends-in-themselves.
This conception of the Jewish hero as “militant sacrifice” was more clearly delineated in Ira Wolfert’s *An Act of Love*. The “act of love” was a blind charge by Harry Brunner, an anonymous little Midwestern American soldier, into the face of Japanese machine guns, for the purpose of diverting a threat to the rest of his group.

While in essence there was a curious resemblance between Harry Brunner’s blind “act of love” and Noah Ackerman’s “act of faith” to achieve identity with the brotherhood of man, there was a marked difference in their treatment by the authors. Harry Brunner’s ordeal was described from the inside and was caused as much by his own fears, his defensive Jewishness, as by the attitude of the bigot. Wolfert blended in his novel a rather elaborate psychoanalytic approach with the realistic, minutely documented style of narrative characteristic of present-day war novels.

Norman Mailer’s *The Naked and the Dead* was less concerned with psychologic overtones and nuances than either *The Young Lions* or *An Act of Love*, but like these novels it encompassed a study of social ills within a framework of detailed, realistic depictions of battles and occupation. It was a long novel based on the reactions of the members of an American platoon to their part in the invasion and occupation of a Japanese-held island.

Norman Mailer, like Irwin Shaw and Ira Wolfert, was not content with merely providing a massive war canvas. He elaborated on themes of injustice within the American army in greater detail, pointing bitterly to the victimization of minorities and the persecution of enlisted men by officers. However, Mailer confined the story to actual external events. This concentration on the actual and the perceived was perhaps the source of the novel’s appeal (it was an instantaneous and overwhelming best seller) and, perhaps, its strength as well.

**POSTWAR NOVELS**

Of the novels which recorded the various phenomena in the wake of war and in which prejudice played a significant part, two may be regarded as representative: *Walk in Darkness* by Jean Bekessy (Hans Habe, pseud.) and *Find Me in Fire* by Robert Lowry. In both novels, the irrationality of prejudice and the failure of the war’s lessons to impinge on the consciousness of society were pointed to with great intensity of feeling.

*Walk in Darkness* was the story of a Negro who re-enlisted in the Army after the war and was sent to Germany where he found the same prejudice which had caused him to seek overseas duty. Towards the end of the book he came to realize that his hatred and prejudice against Jews and others had been as violently irrational as that of his tormentors. The plot of the story was melodramatic and the moral rather glib, but the reviewers felt the novel had a ring of sincerity.

*Find Me in Fire* was nominally a story about a returned soldier who found himself at odds with the small Ohio town from which he had come, and about his brief attempts to live there again.

In effect, this novel was an allegory embracing such ambitious themes as the meaning of life, evil, and violence. The single Jewish character presented was a symbolic vehicle for the author’s feelings about society.
INSTITUTIONAL NOVELS

There were two novels of uneven merit which mirrored or exposed educational or professional institutions; in one, *They Moved With the Sun* by Daniel Taylor (pseud.), the theme of bias was quite pronounced; in the other, *Lucifer With a Book* by John Horne Burns, the subject of prejudice was tangential, supporting the indignation of the author at the general evils of the institution he depicted.

*They Moved With the Sun* was a rather pedestrian and conventional, if conscientious, account of the adolescence and young manhood of an American Jew who became a successful psychoanalyst. The bigotry he encountered in medical school and during his internship strengthened his resolve to become a psychiatrist so that he could discover the sources of hate. While the novel shed little "revelatory light" on either the problems of prejudice or the world the author wished to describe, the novel had a certain biographical interest.

*Lucifer With a Book* was a bitter attack on an institution which had already been repeatedly assailed—the private school. In order to develop to the fullest the attack on the academy, the charge of bigotry was added rather unconvincingly to other evils. Among the student body one Jewish and one Negro boy appeared and were made to suffer great humiliation in their senior year. Practically all critics of this book found the volume achieved some good scenes but "that too much of it consisted of stereotypes and righteous indignation" (*Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1949). It might be pointed out that the employment of stereotypes in the description of the Jew and Negro applied not so much in the ascription of certain personal qualities to them but rather to the conventional and mechanical positions in which they were to be found.

SOCIAL CONTENT NOVELS

The subject of anti-Semitism was, during the period under review, a useful peg upon which the novel and film could hang a view of a corrupt society. Curiously enough, it was found that it could be excitingly blended not only with other social problems, but included in the frame of a detective story as well. It is of interest that two novels, *Shadow of a Hero* by Allen Chase and *For Us the Living* by Haakon Chevalier, which included anti-Semitism in their catalogue of social evils, adapted the technique of the mystery story.

ASSIMILATIONIST NOVELS

The novel detailing the trials of intermarriage or the love of a Jew for a non-Jew or the flight from Jewish identity had become familiar in recent years. In the period under review, four novels struggled with one or other of these themes: *The Curious Wine* by Bianca Bradbury; *Divided* by Ralph Freedman; *Whisper My Name* by Burke Davis; and *Passport to the Past* by Regina Kolitz. Of the four novels, *Whisper My Name* and *The Curious Wine* were regarded by critics as the more serious treatments of taxing subjects.

Fiction: Internal Jewish Life

In addition to those novels which placed the Jew within a hostile, neutral, or benevolent setting, another class of novels, less numerous, was devoted to
what may be termed the internal life of an American Jewish community. The characters involved sprang from a Jewish locale, or acted within the limits of a Jewish family. Two distinct types of novel could be perceived within this genre: 1. The “slice of life” novel which depicted realistically the lives of Jews overcoming or succumbing to a slum environment, or the relations within lower middle-class Jewish families; 2. The “folk” novel which affectionately, whimsically, or sentimentally evoked the customs, manners, and speech of a “typical” Jewish family in a “typically” Jewish section of an urban center.

“SLICE OF LIFE” NOVELS

The “slice of life” novel was most characteristically represented by *Cry Tough* by Irving Shulman. Shulman’s novel fell within the modern genre termed the “tough guy” novel. In spite of the violence and sordid naturalistic detail of the story, certain scenes, like the Friday night ritual meal of an Orthodox Jewish family, were movingly depicted.

*The World Is a Wedding* by Delmore Schwartz, which consisted of two short novels and five stories, was, superficially, a naturalistic treatment of middle-class Jewish families and friends in the period of the depression of 1929. The commonplace style and the monotone of the prose were employed, as some discerning critics noted, to sharpen the poetic and philosophic overtones of the stories. Such themes as “the true community,” “flight,” “rejection and acceptance” were the substance of the book, and were attached to descriptions of the sterile lives of the Jewish bourgeoisie, the tensions and frustrations of Jewish family life, and the griefs and dreams of young people “mired in the depression.”

FOLK NOVELS

Ethel Rosenberg’s *Go Fight City Hall* and Herman Wouk’s *The City Boy* exemplified the type of fiction which sought to recreate the atmosphere of school days and family life.

The situations described in *Go Fight City Hall* were common in Jewish communities. While it was generally agreed that the novel authentically described Jewish family life, some reviewers felt it would have a limited, parochial appeal. Others thought that it was a genuine contribution to the “pastoral poetry of the metropolis.”

Unlike Ethel Rosenberg, Herman Wouk did not give the specific character of his milieu. One critic (*Saturday Review of Literature*, August 21, 1948) treated this as a serious defect.

History and Contemporary Problems

The stream of postwar events left world Jewry in positions in which disquiet and anxiety had not ceased to be features of its existence. Nor had the immediate tragic past ceased to reverberate in the consciousness of Jewish thinkers and writers. These reverberations found an echo among non-Jewish scholars and writers who were concerned with the destiny of society. Necessarily, the Jew who had figured so greatly as victim in the past and whose
position even today was uncertain, embodied the troubled state of modern society. Accordingly, this consciousness of the past and anxious sense of the present and future colored historical works in which the Jew figured. Moreover, the establishment of Israel became a significant and climactic date from which to reckon history.

Writers of Jewish origin responded to these factors with varying emphases, according to their immediate experiences and the countries in which they lived. Thus, American Jewish writers, remote from the scenes of horror, paradoxically expressed either an interest in the immediate present by writing of events and conditions in Israel, and of such pressing contemporary concerns as civil and human rights, or expressed an interest in the more abstract subject of world Jewish history. European Jewish authors, their minds still occupied by the events of the past decade, continued to add to the accounts of the horrors of the concentration camps and experiences under the Nazi lash. The historical literature of this period reflected these accents in books that dealt with: world histories of the Jewish people; the Jews in Europe; Zionism and Israel; Jews in the United States; and the contemporary problems of anti-Semitism and civil rights.

WORLD HISTORIES

Of the seven books treating the universal history of the Jews, three were new while the remainder were revised and enlarged editions of existing texts. These three included, in order of their popular and critical reception, *Israel: A History of the Jewish People* by Rufus Learsi; *Story Without End* by Solomon Landman and Benjamin Efron; and *Universal Jewish History* (Vol. I, “Ancient Jewish History”) by Philip Leon Biberfeld. *Israel: A History of the Jewish People* considered both the social and political factors which have shaped the story of the Jewish people and conversely, the influence they have had on world history. Learsi’s efforts to bring into relief the interaction of Jewish and Gentile currents in world history were appreciatively discerned by some critics.

The authors of *Story Without End* did not fare as well in the estimation of critics; the uneven quality of the book, held to be alternately advanced and elementary, was attributed to the failure of the authors to define their audience for themselves. Other severe objections were raised against this book—particularly, the overestimation on the authors’ part of the cultural freedom of the nationalities in the Soviet Union. However, it was generally regarded as a “good readable history” which avoided “special pleadings.”

JEWS IN EUROPE

The books that were concerned with the Jews in Europe concentrated on their sufferings in the immediate past with subordinate references to their present status and future prospects. Most of these books were additions to the swelling literature on the experiences of Jews in the extermination camps of the Nazis.

The most striking of the books, in which the author, for many years a leader in the Polish Jewish Socialist labor movement, recounted the tragic and heroic resistance of the Warsaw Ghetto, was *The Stars Bear Witness* by
Bernard Goldstein. Written with restraint and impartiality, this moving account received unstinting praise with only minor exceptions.

*In Search of a Lost People* by Joseph and Sheila Tenenbaum was a more diffuse and extended portrayal of the fate of Polish Jewry. Praised as a sober and illuminating survey in academic journals, it was severely criticized by a reviewer in *The Christian Science Monitor*, who alleged a pro-Soviet bias on the author's part.

**ZIONISM AND ISRAEL**

The war in Palestine and the birth of Israel evoked a considerable response from such diverse sources as journalists, historians, and political figures. The popular hunger and pressure for information may have accounted for the uniformly impressionistic, journalistic literature that emerged, and even affected sober historical works. Perhaps most symptomatic of the tendency to reduce historical events in Palestine to a popular and assimilable scale was the unusual number of picture books that appeared.

The most notable exemplars of the “eyewitness” journalistic literature, evincing in varying degrees the merits and defects of this form of literature, were *The Birth of Israel* by Jorge Garcia-Granados, a member of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine; *This Is Israel* by Isidor F. Stone; and *Shalom Means Peace* by Robert St. John. Each of these books achieved a high degree of popularity with the public and was accorded cordial and, in some instances, enthusiastic receptions by reviewers. While all three books were personal, on-the-scene records of events in Israel, each covered somewhat different aspects. All three books were frankly and markedly sympathetic to the aspirations of the Jews and were pro-Israel. I. F. Stone’s book was the only one which recorded the fact that he was a partisan in advance of his visit to Palestine. The other books announced that their sympathetic, pro-Israel attitudes resulted from their experiences and observations in Palestine. Whatever the occasion and causes for such partisanship, its manifestations in these books were observed by some critics and, in certain instances, severely rebuked. *The Birth of Israel* suffered less from this criticism than the others, although not entirely escaping it. The author's account of what went on behind the scenes at the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine excited greater interest since the author's privileged position enabled him to reveal details unattainable elsewhere.

While general agreement obtained that Stone's book reflected the excitement and color of the events in Israel, there was doubt as to whether the author retained sufficient balance and objectivity.

The reception of *Shalom Means Peace* was mixed. Those critics who were impressed by it were of the opinion that it was a warm, readable, personal document; those who condemned *Shalom Means Peace* assailed it as slick, glib, and inaccurate.

Of the photographic histories of Israel, the most ambitious and successful was Herbert S. Sonnenfeld's *Palestine: Land of Israel* with an introduction by Pierre Van Paassen. Critical opinion was divided, however, depending on whether or not the reviewer deemed the intense partisanship of the book too great a drawback.
The various scholarly historical books on Palestine that appeared this year were not entirely free of the subjectivity characteristic of the journalistic books we have described thus far. The most important of this class of historical books were: *A History of Palestine from 135 A.D. to Modern Times* by James William Parkes; *British Rule in Palestine* by Bernard Joseph; and *The Palestine Dilemma* by Frank C. Sakran. The latter two books, critical and polemic in character, took antipodal positions: Joseph’s book supporting the Zionist viewpoint in attacking the British administration from 1917 to the end of the mandate, Sakran’s book presenting the case for the Arabs and attacking Zionism.

Parkes’ volume was the most ambitious effort to provide a historical background for the conflicts in Palestine and the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948. While not in major part a work of original scholarship and written primarily for the general public, the book was based on a wide range of general works and special studies and received the most glowing commendations from American reviewers. English periodicals, while conceding the boldness of the undertaking and the skill of its execution, caviled at its “intense partisanship.”

**JEWS IN THE UNITED STATES**

A number of books by Jewish and non-Jewish authors reflected the American Jewish interest in and concern with the problem of the adaptation and integration of minorities and immigrant groups. These books included *Pilgrims in a New Land* by Lee Max Friedman; *The Rescue of Science and Learning: The Story of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars* by Stephen Pierce, Hayden Duggan and Betty Drury; and *Investment in People: The Story of the Julius Rosenwald Fund* by Edwin Rogers Embree and Julia Waxman.

*Pilgrims in a New Land* was a collection of essays and biographical sketches on the achievements of the Jews in the United States. It embraced such themes as Jews in American history; the process of adjustment; Jews and the American spirit; and Jewish economic life. The book suffered from the fundamental difficulty of the phrase “Jewish contribution.” Some of the figures studied by the author (e.g., Samuel Gompers) were admittedly remote from Jewish values and tradition.

*The Rescue of Science and Learning* was a “meticulous scholarly” report in which the authors, the former director and executive director of the Institute of International Education, dealt with the rescue of European scholars, Jewish and non-Jewish, and their final reinstatement in scholarly positions in the United States.

*Investment in People* was an “inspiring” history of the $22,000,000 Julius Rosenwald fund which was used to help all Americans, especially Negroes. The money, which was to be used in a single generation, went toward education, medical service, and race relations.

**CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS**

The problem of anti-Semitism received fresh analysis from two different quarters among authors in the United States and France. The approaches to
this problem were of different order: the American—empiric and factual—and the French—theoretic and psychologic. The American book *How Secure These Rights?* by Mrs. Ruth Weintraub (Goldstein) was a political and social study of contemporary anti-Semitism in the United States, while the French book, *Anti-Semite and Jew* by Jean Paul Sartre, was a psychological portrait of the anti-Semite and his victim, with recommendations to the Jew to strike at what the author considered to be the two root causes of anti-Semitism.

*How Secure These Rights?* was a documented and detailed report, prepared by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, covering the right to education, employment, and freedom from discrimination in housing, public accommodation, and social organization. The report was optimistic in indicating that the year 1948 should appear on the credit side of the ledger.

Upon its publication, *Anti-Semite and Jew* ran the critical gamut, receiving vituperative attacks and fulsome praise. The two most thoughtful, restrained, and extended examinations of Sartre’s arguments were published in *Commentary* (January, 1949) and *Partisan Review* (May, 1949).

In the *Commentary* article, “Does the Jew Exist?,” Harold Rosenberg attempted a full-scale critical analysis of Sartre’s views, with special reference to the thesis that the modern Jew is primarily a reflex of the mentality and attitude of the anti-Semite. Rosenberg challenged the thesis that the Jews “have no history” and are only the wretched creatures of anti-Semitism. Rosenberg asserted that the Jew possessed a unique identity “which springs from his origin and his story . . .” and that “this identity has a remarkable richness for those who rediscover it in themselves.”

Sidney Hook’s “Reflections on the Jewish Question” in *Partisan Review* challenged Sartre’s conception of what a liberal and democratic attitude towards Jews and all minorities is and ought to be.

Though praising the depth of Sartre’s psychological insights, Hook believed that Sartre erred in the assumption that the ethics of democracy presupposed “an equality of sameness” rather than “an equality of difference.”

**Biography**

The prolific number of biographies that were published in this period again reflected the extraordinary sensitivity and pride of the Jews in their contributions to and integration into the American scene. Of the nineteen biographies issued, the greater number took as their theme the rise to success and subsequent contributions to America, or the unique adjustment processes of important Jews who significantly combined American and Jewish values.

The most important autobiographical book to appear in this period, both in terms of range of ideas and richness and subtlety of feeling, was Morris Raphael Cohen’s *A Dreamer’s Journey*. Posthumously published, this autobiography contained the reminiscences of a teacher of philosophy at the College of the City of New York who began life as the son of Russian Jewish immigrants. The book was significant, as reviewers discerned, for two reasons: the insight it provided into a complex, important mind; and the revelation it afforded of the making of an American.

Three other books of autobiography may be bracketed with *A Dreamer’s*
Journey insofar as the themes of immigration and response to the new country were concerned: The Autobiography of Sol Bloom; Tomorrow Is Beautiful by Lucy Lang; and American Spiritual Autobiographies edited by Louis Finkelstein. In all three books, the energetic, practical, or idealistic efforts of the immigrant or second generation Jew to realize the “American promise” were evident.

The most successful Jewish autobiography, as measured by popular and critical esteem, was not of an American but of the President of Israel, Chaim Weizmann. Trial and Error received immense acclaim because it was not only the story of a singularly gifted and noble individual, but the story, by extension, of the world Zionist movement. Indeed, the highlights of his private life were so subordinated to the political narrative that the book invited criticism on this score. Some reviewers complained of what they felt to be Weizmann’s emphasis on the mystic mission of Israel.

However, even those reviewers who called attention to these alleged flaws were in agreement that Trial and Error was a remarkable achievement and would constitute a major source of contemporary history.

HERBERT POSTER

YIDDISH LITERATURE

The period under review witnessed the liquidation of Yiddish literature in the Soviet Union with the suspension of the newspaper Einigkeit, and the bi-monthly reviews, Heymland and Der Shtern; the shutting down of the publishing house Der Emes, and the arrest and silencing of the remaining Yiddish writers. In the same period there was an exodus of all but a handful of the Yiddish writers from Poland. France remained only a temporary haven for Eastern-European Yiddish writers en route to the United States and Israel. Thus, the United States became the chief center of Yiddish literature in the world.

Yiddish literature in the United States was not, during the period under review, the local literature of American Jewry. It did not limit itself to American Jewish life but embraced all of Jewish life. Its main preoccupation was with the destruction of European Jewry. There was hardly a Yiddish writer or poet who did not touch upon this topic.

A second important problem with which Yiddish writers dealt was that of Jewish survival in Europe, the United States, and Israel. Israel’s establishment was warmly welcomed in Yiddish literature.

Conversely, in focusing on specifically Jewish problems, Yiddish literature continued the trend away from non-Jewish, secular, or universal themes. Yiddish literature in America was delving into the Jewish past, and tradition.

Translations of books written in languages other than Hebrew were disappearing from Yiddish literature. This return to Jewish roots found expression in the World Congress for Yiddish Culture, which was held in New York City in September, 1948, at which delegates from the United States, Canada, South and Central America, Western Europe, and Israel gathered
to discuss ways and means of strengthening Jewish cultural life and the status of the Yiddish language and Yiddish literature.

The dominant form in Yiddish literature during the period under review was poetry. Prose works of fiction were next in importance, followed by works that dealt with history, literary criticism, and contemporary problems.

**Poetry**

Yiddish poetry showed great vitality in the period under review. A number of both the better-known and lesser-known poets published new works. Halper Leivick, a major poet and dramatist, published *Di Khasene in Fernvald* ("The Wedding in Fernwald"), a poetic and symbolic drama about life in a displaced persons camp immediately after the liberation.

Nahum Bomse, a fine lyric poet, who had recently settled in the United States, published *A Khasene in Harbst*, a collection of poems the author had published before the war as well as those he had written while he was in Central Asia and some of his more recent works.

Joseph Rubinstein, another recent immigrant, published *Nakht oyf di Nalefkes* ("Night over the Nalevkes") with which he made a real contribution to Yiddish poetry. This work is Rubinstein's vision of the Jewish Warsaw that was destroyed.

The poet and critic Abraham Tabatchnik published *Dikhter un Dikhtung* ("Poets and Poetry"), a collection of poetry containing his excellent reflections about poetry and some poets.

Berysh Weinstein's *Lider un Poemen* ("Songs and Poems") appeared a year after the publication of his epic poem about Reisha, a small Jewish town in Galicia. His new volume contained both American Jewish and universal motifs presented in a very forceful form.

The tragedy of the Jews in Europe also found expression in S. Moltz's *Dos Lid fun Iyob* ("The Song of Job"); in Levy Goldberg's earthy *A Nigun in Vind* ("A Melody in the Wind"), and in Zelig Dorfman's *Amol iz Geven a Melekh* ("Once Upon a Time There Was a King").

L. Kussman in his *Ezra* attempted, in nearly three hundred related sonnets, to present the biography of a Jewish intellectual. Malka Tuzman's *Poems* were highly sensitive. The Louis LaMed prizes for poetry were won by J. Rolnick for his *Geklibene Lider* ("Selected Poems") and H. Rosenblatt for his *In Shotn fun Mayn Boym* ("In the Shade of My Tree") in September, 1949.

In *Oz Yoshir* ("Then Moses Sang"), a short collection of slight poetry, Kalman Heisler described his reactions to the establishment of Israel.

**CLASSICS AND ANTHOLOGY**

CYCO completed the publication of a new edition of the complete works of J. L. Peretz, edited with brief introductions by S. Niger.

YKUF published the first five volumes of a projected ten-volume edition of the works of Mendele Mocher Sforim (S. F. Abramowitch), edited by Nachman Maisel and based on an edition revised by the author.

*Oyf Noye Vegen* ("New Ways") was the title of an anthology of Soviet Yiddish literature which was published by IKUF. Edited by the Jewish Anti-
Fascist Committee of Moscow, this volume was one of the last productions of the committee before its liquidation by the government. The importance of the anthology lies in its presentation of a cross-section of Soviet Yiddish literature from 1918 to 1948, and the omission of some of the most important names in Soviet Yiddish literature, such as Moishe Kulback, Izzy Chavick, and Max Erick. The omissions indicate the nearly two hundred Yiddish writers liquidated between 1935 and 1948; the rest were arrested or silenced in November, 1948.

Memoirs

The year under review saw the publication of volumes IV and V of the projected seven volumes of J. J. Trunk's Poylen-Zikhrones un Bilder ("Poland—Reminiscences and Pictures"), a major event in Yiddish literature. These volumes were devoted to the wealthy Hasidic family, the Priveses, and to J. L. Peretz and his circle. Both volumes were written with great warmth, sympathy, and understanding in their portrayal of vibrant characters on a rich, broad canvas.

J. Opatoshu, the well-known novelist, published Rabbi Akiba, the first volume of Der Letzter Oyfshtand ("The Last Insurrection")—a colorful historical novel about the time of Rabbi Akiba and Bar Kochba.

Z. Shneour published three somewhat disappointing novels: the fourth volume of the historical novel Der Rav un der Kayser ("The Rabbi and the Emperor"), A Tag Olem-Haze ("A Wonderful Day"), and Di Meshumedeste ("The Baptized Jewess"). The first of these volumes dealt with Jewish life during the Napoleonic wars, the second with Jewish life in pre-revolutionary Russia, and the third with life in Paris.


In a minor key were the stories of N. Singlowsky which were collected and published under the title Der Oytzer ("The Treasure"). They dealt with life both in Russia and America. Abraham Bick in his Moses Hess presented a biographical novel of the life and works of the famous early Zionist theoretician.

A. Eisen, a young writer living in Mexico, had his book Menshen fun der Geto ("People of the [Vilna] Ghetto") published in New York City.

S. Kaiser's Es Vilt Zikh Dertselen ("There Is a Desire to Tell") was a modest description of his life in Europe and the United States. More important was the late S. Yanowsky's Di Ershte Yoren fun Yidishen Sotzializm ("First Years of Jewish Socialism") in which the author, for many years active in the Jewish labor movement in England and the United States and editor of the Yiddish weekly Die Freie Arbeiter Stime, described his life in his native Poland and later in England and the United States. The book was a lively hard-hitting critique of both Jewish life and individuals.

S. Bickel, an essayist and critic, published two books, Yiden Davenen ("Jews Pray"), a description of services in various synagogues, temples, and shtiblech (prayer rooms) in New York, and Eseyen fun Yidishen Troyer ("Essays of
Jewish Mourning”), portraits of Jewish personalities of Rumania and well-written reportage of Jewish life in Rumania. Jacob Rassen, in his Mir Vilen Leben (“We Want to Live”), and S. Taube, in her Dos Ummorgeslikhe (“The Unforgettable”), described their tragic experiences in Europe under the Nazi occupation.

The essayist, critic, and journalist Haim Liberman collected, in two huge volumes entitled Di Milkhome (“The War”), the touching and sensitive columns that he wrote for the New York Jewish Daily Forward during the war days.

The friends and admirers of the well-known writer and scholar B. Zivian (B. Z. Hoffman), in honor of his seventy-fifth birthday, published a selection of rich and varied essays, studies, and articles, under the title Far Fuftzik Yar (“For Fifty Years”).

In his Kodushe un Gvure bay Yiden (“Holiness and Strength of the Jews in the Past and Today”) the essayist Y. Efroykin touched upon a delicate issue. The author critically described the behavior of the European Jews on the threshold of the crematoriums.

S. Simon, in his Yiden Tzvishen Felker (“Jews Among the Nations”), discussed the problems that faced the Jewish people as a result of the establishment of the state of Israel, from the point of view of an ideology that was skeptical of the need for a Jewish state.

I. Levine in his Khurben Uropa (“Destruction of Europe”) collected articles dealing with the destruction of European Jewry which he had published during the war. The author also reproduced documents describing the attempts made to save some Jews.

Durkh di Yaren fun Yidishen Khurben (“In the Years of Jewish Destruction”), another collection of important historical material, dealt with the activities of the Jewish Socialist Bund in Poland during the Nazi occupation.

B. Sherman’s sociological study concerning Jews and other ethnic groups in the United States presented an analysis of Jewish communal life in the United States, and won a Louis LaMed prize.

The World Congress for Yiddish Culture began its activities with the publication of three important volumes: Lider fun di Getos un Konsentratzie Lager (“Songs of the Ghettos and Concentration Camps”) by S. Kaczerginski, edited by H. Leivick; the complete poetical works of the martyred poet Jechiel Lehrer; and the first volume of Simon Dubnow’s World History of the Jewish People.

I. Freedland, in his Royterd (“Red Earth”), a collection of short stories and reminiscences, described life in the unsuccessful cooperative anarchist colonies in the United States.

Victor Chernoff’s Yidishe Tuer in der Partay Sozialisten Revolutzionern (“Jews Who Were Active in the Socialist Revolutionary Party”), contained biographies and portraits by the veteran Russian socialist of the most important Jewish leaders in the Socialist Revolutionary Party of Russia.

 Literary Criticism and History

There were several outstanding new books in the field of literary criticism and the history of literature. In honor of the four hundredth anniversary of
the death of Elia Bachur, one of the founders of Yiddish literature, Judah Jofe published Bachur's *Bovobukh*, reproduced from the edition of 1541, with an important introduction in both Yiddish and English. This was the first in a projected three-volume edition of Elia Bachur's works.

Jacob Shatzky collected, edited, and published some of the important papers of Israel Zinberg, the author of the monumental *History of Jewish Literature*, under the title *Kultur-historishen Shtudyes* (“Studies in Culture and History”).

In a book by the late B. Rivkin, an important critic and essayist, *Grunt Tendentzen fun der Yidishe Literatur in Amerika* (“Main Tendencies of Yiddish Literature in America”), he reiterated his fundamental cultural approach that Yiddish literature was a substitute for the Jewish religion and for a Jewish territory, and that Yiddish literature had a messianic mission.

A. Mukdony published his *Peretz un der Yidishe Teater* (“Peretz and the Yiddish Theater”) describing his association with the great author in their campaign for a new and vital Yiddish theater.

The friends and admirers of the late writer and cultural worker S. Mendelsohn published his collected essays. Mendelsohn's enthusiasm for Yiddish literature and his admiration for Peretz were reflected in this volume.

The critic Nachman Maisel published a study entitled *Hirsh Glick un Zayn Lid* (“Hirsh Glick and His Song”), about the poet and partisan Hirsh Glick whose poem, beginning “Zog nit keyn mal,” became the battle-song of the partisans and the fighters of the Ghetto.

Abba Gordon collected a number of his critical essays in *Denker un Poeten* (“Thinkers and Poets”).

**History**

A number of new books were published in the field of Jewish history. Jacob Shatzky published the second volume of his *Geshikhte fun Yiden in Varsha* (“The History of the Jews in Warsaw”), covering 1831-63. Based on original research in government archives and old documents, it was a scholarly work, written with warmth, sympathy, and understanding.

M. Osherowitch, the author of some twenty volumes of short stories, novels, biographical and autobiographical works, and of a few volumes on Jewish history, published a two-volume work, *Shtet un Shtetlakh in Ukrayne* (“Cities and Towns in the Ukraine”). Chiefly a narrative and a popularization, M. Osherowitch’s volume was intended more for the layman than for the scholar.

Still another new book dealing with the Jews in the Ukraine, *The Jews in the Ukraine*, was written by I. S. Hertz, a new young historian who was a member of the once powerful Marxist Jewish Social Democratic Bund of Poland. But Hertz’s history, far from being Marxist, was in fact more nationalist than that of many of the more objective Jewish historians.

S. Szajokowski in his *Antisemitism in the French Labor Movement, 1845-1906* revealed the extent of anti-Semitism among French labor leaders and Socialists.

John Mill, one of the founders of the Bund, described the growth of the Bund in the second volume of his *Pionern un Boyer* (“Pioneers and Builders”). Dealing with the question of nationalities in Russia, the book depicted the
In his *Fun Golus Bovel Bis Roym* ("From the Babylonian Exile to the Roman Empire"), the poet and essayist B. J. Bialostotsky retold Jewish legends and popular tales from the Talmud and Midrash about this period in Jewish history. Chaim Shause supplied the historical notes.

Translations

Among the translations that appeared during the period under review were Naphtali Gross' new version of the Book of Psalms, and Mordecai Jaffe's *Antologya fun der Hebreyisher Poezye* ("Anthology of Hebrew Poetry"). Gross attempted a rendition in the spirit of the early Yiddish translations of the Bible, by reviving a large number of old Yiddish words and expressions.

David Pinski, who had resided in America for fifty years, settled in Israel during this period. His latest volume *Fir Tragedyes* ("Four Tragedies") was published in London, Ontario.

All in all, during the period under review, Yiddish literature continued to show a strength and vitality in the fields of poetry, prose, literary criticism, and history that augured well for the future.

Elias Schulman

HEBREW LITERATURE

Hebrew literature in America, while not displaying the wealth of previous periods, was a vital force in the field of Jewish culture during the past year. The temporary hiatus in the production of Hebrew literature in the United States was ascribable to such factors as the emergence of the Jewish state, a prime consumer of the energies of Hebrew intellectuals; the financial difficulties facing prospective authors; postponements of publication of works in the United States due to the attraction of later publication in Israel; and last, the natural reaction to a previous period of creativity.

Poetry

Since 1910, with the publication of N. B. Silkiner's *Mul Ohel Timura* ("Opposite Timura's Tent"), poetry has occupied an increasingly important place in the scheme of Hebrew letters in the United States.

In recent years such volumes of verse have appeared as Abraham Regelson's *El Ha-Ayin Venivkah* ("The Void Ends in Atomization"), Israel Efros' *Anahnu Hador* ("We, This Generation"), Simon Halkin's *Al Ha-i* ("On the Island"), Ephraim E. Lisitzky's *Adam Ale Adamot* ("Man upon This Earth"), Eisig Silberschlag's *Aleh, Olam, Beshir* ("Rise up, O World, with Song") and this writer's *Nof Shemesh Ukhfor* ("Landscape of Sun and Frost"). But during the year under review only two volumes of poems appeared: Abraham Z. Halevy's *Mitokh Hasugar* ("Out of the Cage") and Itzhak Zamir's *Miyam el Yam* ("From Sea to Sea"). The first collection was written by an honest, if somewhat
didactic realist, in strong, sinewy style; the second, a modernistic work, saw the light after its author's untimely death. Both books were the work of talented and comparatively young men.

Fiction

Hebrew fiction, while not particularly distinguished the past year, did bring to light two readable volumes: one, B. Isaacs' *Ben Shne Olamot* ("Between Two Worlds"), a warm-hearted and light first book of stories, and *Hedim* ("Echoes") by Shlomo Damesek, who sensitively recorded reminiscences of an Old World childhood. New works by such writers as Simon Halkin, Yochanan Twersky and Reuben Wallenrod are anticipated. Louis LaMed prizes for works published during 1948 were awarded in September, 1949, to Harry Sackler for his volume of short stories *Ha-Keshet Beanan* ("The Rainbow") and to Daniel Persky for his volume of essays *Ivri Anokhi* ("I Am a Hebrew").

Periodicals

In the field of journalism the outstanding and only volume was the late Rav Tzair's (Chaim Tchernowitz's) *Hevle Geulah* ("Pangs of Redemption"), a collection of essays and articles in which this scholar and Talmudist uncompromisingly discussed some of the problems that came to the fore with the realization of the Zionist ideal. At his death Rav Tzair was working on his autobiography, the first chapter of which appeared immediately afterward in *Bitzaron*, the monthly he founded ten years before and to which prominent scholars and men of letters were contributing. Serving on the new editorial board were Harry Wolfson, Hayim Greenberg, and Pinchos Churgin; Simon Halkin was chosen to serve as the contributing editor in Israel.

The weekly *Hadoar*, in its twenty-eighth year and edited by Menachem Ribalow, contained interpretive articles written by competent analysts dealing largely with the political and socio-economic climate in Israel. This emphasis upon the topical, although not unique in the Hebrew press in the Diaspora, was a noteworthy comment on the effect of the reality of Israel upon the new interests of the American readers of Hebrew.

In commemoration of the first year of Israel's independence, both *Hadoar* and *Bitzaron* published special issues (*Hadoar*, May 27, 1949; *Bitzaron*, August-September, 1948). These were of concern to the general reader as well as the specialist. It was the basic policy of both periodicals to publish in book form much of the material that first appeared in their columns: thus *Ogen* ("Anchor"), published with the assistance of the Histadruth Ivrith (Hebrew Culture Organization), was in a sense an adjunct of *Hadoar*, while *Bitzaron*, too, issued books under its own imprint. Working independently since 1942 was the Ohel Publishing Association.

During the year the quarterly *Talpioth*, a journal edited by Rabbi S. K. Mirsky and devoted to Jewish law and ethics, continued to be published as did *Horeb*, a periodical collection of studies in the history of Judaism, talmudic literature, and kindred subjects, edited by Pinchos Churgin. (Both were published under the auspices of Yeshiva University.) *Shevile Hahinukh* ("The
Paths of Education”), edited by Zevi Sharfstein, dealt largely with the philosophy and psychological aspects of Hebrew education, and was in its ninth year. Its May, 1948, issue was dedicated to the pioneer Hebrew writer on psychology, the educator Nisson Touroff, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. The Hebrew medical journal, Harofé Haivri, continued to appear as a semi-annual edited by Moses Einhorn, while the two bi-weekly supplements of Hadoar, Musaf Lakanor Hatzair (“Supplement for the Younger Reader”) and Hadoar Lanoar (“Hadoar for Children”), edited by Chaim Leaf and Simha Rubin-stein, respectively, were relatively popular.

Year Book

The publication deserving of particular attention was the Sefer Hashanah (“The Year Book of American Jewry”), a double volume of which (numbers 10 and 11) came off the press in June, 1949. Edited by Menachem Ribalow, it was a collection which gave equal place to the scholarly essay, the article, the poem, and story. It brought to mind the celebrated Hebrew quarterly Hatekefu-jah, another volume of which was in the process of preparation, although the Sefer Hashanah was by and large restricted to the American writer and reader of Hebrew.

In addition to the names already mentioned in this review, men like Aaron Zeitlin; A. S. Schwartz, dean of American Hebrew poets; J. J. Schwartz, S. L. Blank and Ari Ibn Zahav in belles-lettres, and A. S. Yahuda, S. Feigin, Yehuda Rosental, Meyer Waxman, A. R. Malachi, Nisson Tourroff, Abraham Epstein, Jacob Lestchinsky, R. Patai, M. Schulwass, Rabbi I. D. Agus, N. Nardi, Ephraim Shmueli, I. Yakobovitz, M. Prager, I. L. Miklishanski, E. Indelman, N. Levin-son-Lowy, the late S. Kraus, and D. Persky, writing treatises and monographs, articles and reviews, combined to make this a stimulating volume. Particular reference must be made to the translations that appeared in Sefer Hashanah (Eisig Silberschlag’s Hebrew version of Aristophanes’ Lysistrata and this writer’s rendition of Carl Sandburg’s Prairie), for American Hebrew authors had been making important contributions for years to the literature of translation into the Hebrew, particularly from English. It will suffice to mention here among the translations from Shakespeare those undertaken by Hillel Bavli, Simon Halkin, and Ephraim Lisitzky; and among those from American poetry, Abraham Regelson's rendition of William Cullen Bryant's Thanatopsis. In addition, the importance of the project on which Reuben Grossman, American-born Hebrew poet, was at work, a three-volume anthology entitled The Poetry of England (the first two volumes had already made their appearance) cannot be overestimated.

Among the non-scholarly Hebrew works which were published in English translation were Itzhak Shenberg’s Under the Fig Tree, translated by I. M. Lask, and the first volume of H. N. Bialik’s collected works, edited by Israel Efros.

It is to be hoped that painstaking translations, comprehensively planned and of a high quality, will be undertaken in the immediate future, both from Hebrew into English and from English into Hebrew.

Gabriel Preil
WITH the close of the decade the United States witnessed an increase in Jewish scholarly activity. The reconstruction and revival of Jewish scholarly and cultural institutions abroad which had been hoped for was far from realization. In a Europe still suffering from the effects of the war and the prevailing general economic and political situation, the decimated Jewish communities were unable to return to their labors in the field of Jewish scholarship.

The traditions of Jewish scholarship were therefore concentrated in the state of Israel and in the United States. The established Jewish institutions of higher learning in America bore the responsibility for the further development and dissemination of Jewish learning.

Aware of the possibility for wider and more effective contact both with growing centers of Jewish life in the United States, and with students and laymen who manifested an increasing interest in Jewish history and literature, institutions of Jewish study set up new branches and special institutes.1

In New York City, the Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO) and its library made important additions to a significant collection of books and documents, particularly of material dealing with the history of the Jews in Europe during the period from 1924 to 1949.

Two Jewish groups in the United States endeavored to organize Jewish scholars and the supporters of Jewish learning in permanent programs of scholarly activity, research, periodic discussion of learned papers, and the publication of these proceedings and researches. They were the American Academy for Jewish Research, in which scholars were the most active, and the American Jewish Historical Society, in which lay members as well as scholars were engaged.

The seventeenth volume of Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research contained, in addition to a summary of the Academy's work, scholarly papers by Solomon Gandz, Adolph Kober, Abraham Menes, Leo Strauss, and Mosheh Avigdor Shulvass. The Academy also published the third volume in its important series of "Texts and Studies," under the title Jewry-law in Medieval Germany, by Guido Kisch. The work was the result of many years of pioneering research. Kisch's carefully prepared work was of great importance as a sourcebook for the legal and sociological status of the Jews in Germany during the Middle Ages.

In September, 1948, the American Jewish Historical Society began to issue its Publications at quarterly intervals. This periodical presented papers on various aspects of American Jewish history.

The major publications devoted to Jewish scholarship were the HUC Annual of the Hebrew Union College, and the Jewish Quarterly Review edited at Dropsie College. The newly founded American Jewish Archives began the quarterly publication of American Jewish Archives, which contained new

1 For an account of the graduate and adult education programs of the theological institutions, see Religion, pp. 149 ff.
material on early Jewish settlements in Connecticut, Jewish participation in the Civil War, and many newly discovered letters and documents relating to the history of the Jews in America. Gershom Scholem of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem delivered a series of lectures on Hasidism at the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio, and New York City, which was to be published as the latest in the series of Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures. Scholem dealt with the sources and the background of Hasidism and the relation of Hasidism to the teaching of the Kabbalah.

The YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science appeared in a combined second and third volume. YIVO also published Jacob Shatzky's second volume of The History of the Jews in Warsaw, covering the period from 1831 to 1863, a scholarly study of the inner life of the Jews in the Warsaw community.

Foundations to Aid Scholarship

Jewish scholarship received financial support from foundations set up primarily to sponsor the work done by scholars and to provide the means for the publication of their learned productions. Louis M. Rabinowitz of New York City established the Rabinowitz Foundation to edit and publish the “Yale Judaica Series.” Published under the auspices of the Rabinowitz Foundation during the period under review was The Code of Maimonides: Book Thirteen—The Book of Civil Laws, which was translated by Jacob J. Rabinowitz. The Gorfinkle Foundation to publish and popularize Jewish classical writings in the original and in English translations was established. A popular edition of Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirke Abot), translated by Joseph I. Gorfinkle, was the first volume published in this series.

Monographs

The bulk of scholarly monographs appeared in the publications mentioned above and in the independently edited Historia Judaica, founded by Guido Kisch; Jewish Social Studies, published by the Conference on Jewish Relations; Horeb (in Hebrew), edited by Pinkhos Churgin and published by the Teachers Institute of Yeshiva University; Yidishe Shprakh; and YIVO Bleter (in Yiddish), whose last volume was devoted by the Yiddish Scientific Institute to problems of psychology and education. Gedank und Leben—The Jewish Review, a journal in Yiddish and English dealing chiefly with Jewish sociology, was published by the Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University. The National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare published the twenty-fifth volume of the Jewish Social Service Quarterly.


Conservative Judaism, the quarterly published by the Rabbinical Assembly of America, contained among other items chapters of the "History of Conservative Judaism" by Herbert Parzen. Numerous popular scholarly studies as well as non-professional papers appeared also in *Bitzaron, Commentary, Menorah Journal, Congress Weekly, Hadoar*, and *Jewish Education*, which devoted one of its issues to the life and works of Samson Benderly, the pioneer of organized Jewish education in the United States.

**Annuals**

*Sefer Hashanah*, the American Hebrew annual, published by the Histadruth Ivrit, devoted part of the volume to scholarly papers.

The *American Jewish Year Book*’s fiftieth anniversary volume, published in March, 1949, featured two special articles: "A Century of Jewish Immigration to the United States" by Oscar and Mary Flug Handlin, and "American Jewish Year Book, 1899-1948," by Harry Schneiderman. The *Year Book*’s regular review of the year was supplemented by bibliographies, directories, and statistical studies.

The seventh volume of the *Jewish Book Annual*, issued by the Jewish Book Council, contained surveys of Jewish literature in Hebrew, Yiddish, and English, and useful bibliographies.

Volume IV of *The Palestine Year Book and Israeli Annual* appeared under the editorship of Sophie A. Udin and the staff of the Zionist Archives and Library. *The Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis* (CCAR), volume 59, contained, in addition to a report of the proceedings of the CCAR, a number of papers on Jewish theology and Liberal Judaism.

**Discovery of Hebrew Manuscripts**

For scholars, the most important news of the period under review was the early reports of the results of examinations of some recently discovered ancient Hebrew manuscripts. The attention of the academic world was fixed on some of the oldest Hebrew biblical and post-biblical texts. These were first discovered in 1947 by several Bedouins who chanced upon a number of jars containing scrolls concealed in a cave on the northwestern shore of the Dead Sea in Palestine.

Some of the important manuscripts found at Ain Feshkha were acquired by the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and were deposited in its Museum of Jewish Antiquities. Another portion of the scrolls discovered was being held by the Syrian Metropolitan Athanasius Yeshue Shmuel of Jerusalem. The
fragments which were later unearthed were placed on exhibition in the British Museum in London.

The subsequent study and identification of the contents of these scrolls and a large number of fragments of additional manuscripts, later uncovered by British archaeologists, promised to shed light on biblical research, Hebrew philology, and the history of Judaism.

Although two years had passed since the important find, publication of some of the material had been limited to the pages of the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research and the more popular Biblical Archeologist issued by the same body. The American Schools of Oriental Research were also preparing a volume of photographs of a scroll containing a manual of discipline of an ancient Jewish sect believed to be pre-Christian. A preliminary report, together with facsimiles of the manuscripts owned by the Hebrew University, was published by Eliezer L. Sukenik in his Megillot Genuzot. It was believed that the scroll containing the complete text of the Book of Isaiah in Hebrew was the oldest extant copy of a complete book of the Hebrew Bible. Great value was therefore attached to the discovery of this particular manuscript. American scholars were preparing a volume of photographs.

Jewish scholars were actively engaged in an authoritative analysis and dating of these manuscripts. In addition to Eliezer L. Sukenik, Umberto Moshe D. Cassuto and Naftali H. Tur-Sinai (Toriczyner) of the Hebrew University, H. Louis Ginsberg and Harry M. Orlinsky of New York, as well as I. L. Seeligmann of Amsterdam, were making significant contributions in this labor.

On the other hand, in a series of articles in Jewish Quarterly Review and in communications to the American press, Solomon Zeitlin held that the claims of antiquity for the ancient scrolls were open to doubt.

**Anthologies**

More collections of holiday material in English were made accessible to American Jews as a result of the publication of a number of good anthologies. The Jewish Publication Society of America planned a complete series of anthologies on the Jewish festivals; several of the volumes already had been published. The latest addition to this series, The Purim Anthology, edited by Philip Goodman, was an example of competent and exhaustive industry in assembling material. In addition to folklore and literary material, the book also contained such scholarly essays as "The Esther Story in Art" by Rachel Wischnitzer, "The History of Purim Plays" by Jacob Shatzky, "Purim in Music" and "Music Supplement" by A. W. Binder, and "The Origin of Purim," by Solomon Grayzel.

Theodor H. Gaster's Passover: Its History and Traditions was a popular volume describing the origin of the Passover festival, with new translations of the songs sung at the Seder, and an account of the Samaritan Passover.

The Hebrew anthology Yamim Noraim by S. Y. Agnon, a collection of customs and folklore connected with the celebration of the High Holy Days, was translated by M. T. Galpert and Jacob Sloan under the title Days of Awe.

A second volume of Hasidic lore collected by Martin Buber was translated into English as Tales of the Hasidim, Volume 2: The Later Masters.
Nahum N. Glatzer edited a volume of Midrash texts in English translation by Jacob Sloan, and H. J. Fischel edited an English translation of the First Book of Maccabees. A Hebrew textbook anthology of Hebrew literature was edited by Max Zeldner and George Epstein, and one in English translation edited by Azriel Eisenberg. The monumental Yiddish translation of the entire Mishnah was completed by Simchah Petrushka.

History

_Pilgrims in a New Land_, a volume of popular scholarly monographs on American Jewish history, was edited by Lee M. Friedman and published by the Jewish Publication Society of America. Harry C. Schnur's _Mystic Rebels_ contained a chapter on Sabbatai Zevi. A popular sociological interpretation of the Jews and other ethnic groups in the United States was presented by Charles Bezalel Sherman in his volume _Yiden un Andere Etnische Grupes in di Fareynigte Shtaten_, and was awarded a Louis La Med prize in September, 1949. Nathan Drazin edited _Isaac Levinson's Genealogy_.

An important contribution toward an understanding of the mass migrations of the Jews during the last century was given by Mark Wischnitzer in his study _To Dwell in Safety: The Story of Jewish Migration Since 1800_.

_A History of the Jews in Poland_ and a volume on the Karaites by Raphael Mahler appeared in Hebrew translations. Gunther Boehm published a study of the history of the Jews in Chile in his book, _Los Judios en Chile_. The history of the Jews in the Mediterranean islands during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was treated by Joshua Starr in _Romania_.

Biblical Research

Chief among recent works in biblical research were the brilliant volume by H. Louis Ginsberg on the Book of Daniel, and the thirteenth volume of M. M. Kasher's encyclopedic edition of the Pentateuch, with a digest of the important commentaries, under the title _Torah Shelemah_.

The sources of the institution of slavery in ancient times were studied and made available to the student of Oriental institutions by Isaac Mendelsohn in _Slavery in the Ancient Near East_. The author presented a scientific interpretation of the legal, economic, and labor problems existing in ancient Babylonia, Assyria, Syria, and Israel.

The excavations at Dura Europos uncovered many valuable art objects and synagogue mosaics which resulted in important studies leading to a better understanding of ancient culture. In her volume _The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue_, Rachel Wischnitzer demonstrated that these ancient decorations were based on prevalent Jewish ideas concerning the Messianic era.

Other Studies

Selig J. Miller edited and translated into English for the first time the Samaritan _Molad Mosheh_, together with the original Arabic and Aramaic versions. This was an ancient Samaritan collection of legends concerning the

Michael Higger completed the systematic collection and publication of the Baraitot scattered throughout the tractates of the Talmud, by publishing the tenth volume of *Otzar Haberaitot*. Boaz Cohen wrote the introduction to the new American edition of Everyman's Talmud compiled by A. Cohen. Israel Elfenbein made available an edition of the customs of the Jews of thirteenth-century Germany, written by Rabbi Isaac ben Meir of Dueren, under the title *Minhagim Yeshanim Medura*.

Samuel S. Cohon edited the late Kaufmann Kohler's addresses and sermons under the title *A Living Faith*. Other works on Jewish theology and ethics included Beryl Cohon's *Judaism in Theory and Practice*, Samuel S. Cohon's *Judaism: A Way of Life*, and Israel H. Weisfeld's *The Ethics of Israel*.

The foundations of sex morality and the attitude of Judaism toward sex relations were treated by the late Louis M. Epstein in his volume *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism*. Essays by the late Kurt Lewin on Jewish education and the psychology of the Jews formed part of his posthumously published volume, *Resolving Social Conflicts*. Louis Katzoff made a study of the philosophy of Jewish education and the practices within the Conservative congregational school and made the results of his analysis available in *Issues in Jewish Education*. Jacob Lestchinsky surveyed the effects of the war on the Jewish people in Europe in his volume *Crisis, Catastrophe, and Balance*.

*A Checklist of Current Jewish Periodicals and Newspapers Received in Jewish Libraries in the United States* was compiled by Harry J. Alderman, Sophie A. Udin, and Mark Zborowski. It was the first publication issued by the Jewish Librarians Association. A useful bibliographical tool on Palestine and Zionism during the past three years, published by the Zionist Archives and Library and entitled *Palestine and Zionism*, was edited by Sophie A. Udin.

I. Edward Kiev

**ART**

For the purposes of this review, it may be well to distinguish between Jewish arts and crafts which accompany Jewish life, and the Jewish artist, who is conscious of his Jewish heritage and proves it directly or indirectly in his work. In terms of this distinction, Jewish art continued during the period under review to be an active field for organizations and individuals working with traditional themes and sentiments.

**Arts and Crafts**

The embellishments of Jewish life in home and synagogue met with increasing public attention. The Hebrew Union College made an impressive part of its valuable collection accessible to the public in a museum set up in the Bernheim Memorial Library on the H.U.C. campus. Among the objects on display was the famous fifteenth-century Haggadah of Cincinnati. The Jewish

---

2 Rabbi Epstein died on March 22, 1949. See Obituaries.
Theological Seminary of America arranged a museum of ceremonial objects in its West Coast branch, the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. The Jewish Museum of the Seminary in New York displayed loan exhibits of Jewish ceremonial art in the public museums of Baltimore, Md.; Worcester, Mass.; Houston, Tex.; and Burlington, Vt.

Architecture

With the greater availability of building materials, synagogue building progressed rapidly on a national scale. Over one thousand buildings were under construction; of those completed, the following deserve special mention: Tifereth Yisrael in San Diego, Cal.; Temple Israel in Hollywood, Cal.; Temple Beth Israel in Lima, Ohio; Temple Emanuel in Worcester, Mass.; Rego Park Jewish Center in Rego Park, L.I. Unfortunately, the funds raised enthusiastically for construction tended to be insufficient to cover the expense of the decoration of such objects as the Torah Ark. On the other hand, a number of older synagogues attempted to reshape their interiors. Temple Har Zion of Philadelphia, for example, began to install twelve huge stained-glass windows, in a carefully worked-out program which would require several years to complete.

Artists

A retrospective show by Max Weber, one of the prominent artists some of whose art may be called Jewish, was displayed in the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York February 5 to March 27, 1949, and transferred to the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, Minn., where it was shown from April 17 to May 29, 1949. Among the eighty oil paintings there were at least 10 per cent with obvious Jewish themes and characteristics.

Marc Chagall, who had left America to settle permanently in France, exhibited a series of 118 etchings for the book Dead Souls, by Nicholas Gogol, at the Knoedler Galleries in New York City from March 22 to April 9, 1949. The same gallery presented to the American art public the works of the late Yankel Adler, a Jewish artist whom many consider to have been one of the most prominent contemporaries. The painter Arnold Friedman also received posthumous recognition in an exhibition in the Marquis Gallery in New York City during March, 1949.

Among the individual painters who had one-man shows in New York were A. Raymond Katz, who also designed the huge mosaic on the entrance of the new Rego Park Synagogue (Katz also had a show in Baltimore); Emanuel Romano, the son of Enrico Glicenstein, whose work was on display at the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, which from time to time arranged art exhibits; Elias Newman, who showed Biblical subjects at the Jewish Museum and recent gouaches in the Babcock Galleries; the Israeli artist Rico Blass; the newcomers Luba Gurdus and J. Barosin; Eugene Spiro, formerly of Berlin, with an exhibition showing fifty-five years of his work made possible through the recovery of his paintings stolen by the Germans during the occupation in Paris; and Louise D. Kayser, who showed at the Jewish Museum.
Works of sculpture were displayed by Mitzi Soloman, Hugo Robus, and the newcomer A. Van Loen, who was a winner at the Village Art Center show in New York; and Nat Werner, who had nineteen Jewish themes among twenty-nine pieces of sculpture displayed at the ACA Gallery.

A memorial exhibit for the late Todros Geller took place from April 2 to May 20, 1949, in the Jewish Education Building in Chicago, Ill. The death of Theresa Zarnower, active chiefly as a sculptress and former leader of the Collectivist movement in Polish art, was a loss to Jewish art in America.

Group Showings

Shows of individual artists were supplemented by group shows all over the states, arranged in Jewish community centers and institutions like the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago, Ill. Deserving of special mention was the exhibition of Displaced Persons Art at the Sarah Singer Art Gallery of the Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles, Cal. Over 100 in number, these works were donated to the United Jewish Welfare Fund by the members of its Los Angeles delegation who visited Europe and Israel. During a short stay in Rome they saw an art exhibit sponsored by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and were so impressed with the work that they purchased the entire collection. The Congress for Jewish Culture Art Center arranged an exhibit in the Fall of 1948 at the Jewish Museum in New York of almost ninety works of art. These toured the country in 1949 and were shown in the following cities: Bangor, Me., and New Bedford and Pittsfield, Mass.

The growing importance of the state of Israel in the field of art made itself felt in an exhibition at the Jewish Museum, New York, called American Artists for Israel. These 110 works by a group of American artists, both Jews and Gentiles, were presented to the Tel Aviv Museum, the Bezalel Museum in Jerusalem and the Ain Harod Museum. This project was sponsored by the American Fund for Palestinian Institutions.

DANCE

Hardly an art with a distinctive form, Jewish dance continued during the year under review to be the presentation of Jewish subject matter in existing dance forms by artists whose techniques and vocabularies of movement were similar to those prevailing in the concert halls and theaters of our era.

Folk Dance

There was much activity in the non-theatrical field of Jewish folk dance, a self-conscious art which found material in the immediate past as well as sharing the contagious vitality of contemporary Israel. Most of this went on at community centers and educational institutions. Prominent teachers and leaders in this field were Dvora Lapson, dance director and consultant of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, and Katya Delakova and Fred Berk, directors of the Dance Institute of the Seminary School of Jewish Studies in New York.
Ruth Zahava was dance supervisor of the Jewish Centers Association of Los Angeles and director of that city's Jewish Folk Dance Society. Corinne Chochem was awarded the Nina Sokolov Scholarship to make possible research on Jewish dance at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Theatrical Dance

Biblical figures, Jewish legends, scenes from Eastern-European life and life in Israel were the themes used by Jewish dancers on the theater level. Some of the specific presentations in the season of 1948-49 follow.

Hadassah, whose repertoire included dances of India and Java as well as traditional Jewish dances, gave concerts on October 16, 1948, in the High School of Needle Trades (New York City), and in the American Museum of Natural History in the same city on November 18, 1948. Her most popular dance was *Shuvi Nafshi*.

Anna Sokolow choreographed the dances for Sholom Aleichem's *The Treasures Hunters*, produced in New York in October, 1948.

On November 27, 1948, the International Dance Festival held in the Philharmonic Auditorium, Los Angeles, included *Farewell to Queen Sabbath*, danced by Benjamin Zemach's Israeli Dancers.


The opera *Hechalutz* by Jacob Weinberg, presented in Carnegie Hall on February 19, 1949, contained dances staged by Alix Taroff.

Dvora Lapson's theatrical dances reflected her interest in folk dance. Some of her sketches were of a mother lighting Sabbath candles; guests at a Jewish wedding; a Hasidic dance, *In the House of Study*; a Palestinian dance, *Back to the Land*, and a period study, *Marranos*. Miss Lapson also appeared on February 23, 1949, in New York's Museum of Natural History's ethnologic dance series.

On March 5, 1949, in Hollywood, Bella Lewitsky and Sandra Orans danced *Warsaw Ghetto* with the Dance Theater. The music was by Sol Kaplan, the settings by Keith Finch.

Chaja Goldstein, well-known European dancer, came to the United States in March, 1949, and gave a number of concerts. Her dances dealt mostly with the Eastern-European ghetto.

Nachum and Dina shared a program with Bracha Zefira at the Arts Festival sponsored by the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago on April 9 and 10, 1949. Their dances included *Palestinian Work Dance, Sherele, and Hora*.

Dancers from Israel

The Israeli influence on American dancers was direct. There was interchange of artists between the two countries. When Habimah came to America
in May, 1948, the company included dancer Deborah Bertonoff, who presented
dance concerts at the completion of the drama season. Her dances were humor-
ous, satirizing the Eastern-European provincial and utilizing her considerable
ability as a mime.

Gertrude Kraus, teacher and choreographer of the Palestine Opera, Tel
Aviv, was in America during the Summer of 1948. She directed classes in
Hebrew dance at the Hebrew Arts Institute at Santa Susana, California, and
staged the dances for a production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

**American Dancers in Israel**

A number of American dancers visited Israel. Katya Delakova and Fred Berk
left on June 22, 1949, to give a series of twenty concerts for the Jewish National
Fund. Corinne Chochem exhibited her style at the Hebrew University in
Jerusalem. Dvora Lapson gave a number of concerts.

Almost all the Jewish dancing in Israel and in America was in the style of
the German "expressive dance" or in the modern American technique. Like
music and painting, it was felt that the dance in Israel could be developed as
a universal art. In June, 1949, Brazilian dancer Danilo and Karel Shook,
formerly of the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo, left New York for Tel Aviv to
teach and produce standard ballets for a company to be sponsored and sub-
sidized by the state of Israel.

**American Themes**

American Jewish life, rarely the subject for dance, was hinted at subtly in the
ballet, *The Guests*, choreographed by Jerome Robbins for Lincoln Kirstein's
New York City Ballet, and produced at the New York City Center in January,
1949. Marc Blitzstein composed the music for this work which dealt with rela-
tions between a majority and minority group.

A trio of young Jewish dancers who appeared on the program of the Choreog-
raphers' Workshop at Carnegie Recital Hall on October 24, 1948, performed
numbers that reflected their interest in current problems. Helaine Blok per-
formed *Ingram Case*, which dealt with race prejudice, Marion Scott danced
*Let the Earth Bring Forth*, and Alix Taroff, *Flight into Darkness*.

American dance was stimulated during the past few years by the New York
City Y.M. and Y.W.H.A. where dance director William Kolodney arranged
concerts and sponsored auditions that introduced and developed many dis-
tinguished dance careers.

**Prominent Jewish Dancers**

Many Jewish dancers and choreographers were prominent in the broad field
of theater dance. Those active during the season of 1948-49 were Alicia
Markova, Nora Kaye, Pearl Lang, Jerome Robbins, Michael Kidd, Norma
Vance, Muriel Bentley, Ruthanna Boris, Simon Semeonoff, Annabelle Lyon,
David Lichine, Sophie Maslow, and Harding Dorn.

**Ann Barzel**
THE GREAT interest which Jewish music, and with it all the peripheral phenomena of music by Jewish composers or Jewish influences on non-Jewish composers, had commanded in recent years reached a high pitch after May, 1948, in the wake of the creation of the Jewish state and feverish activity among Jewish organizations. If the quality of the music performed, printed, and recorded did not always keep pace with the quantity, this could not be blamed on a dearth of competent composers. On the contrary, modern Jewry commands some of the finest composers. Perhaps it was the failure on the part of Jewish organizations to explore the questions of the nature, delimitations, and influences of Jewish music which was partly responsible for this lack of interest.

Trends

But the Jewish organizations which promoted Jewish music did accomplish much for the music by bringing it before the public. Outstanding among the organizations was the National Jewish Music Council, which is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB). The Council, which published much theoretical material, program aids for concerts of Jewish music, and guides to appreciation, illuminated its season with the fifth annual festival of Jewish music (February 12 to March 15, 1949). The 1949 festival, consisting of symphonic, choral and chamber concerts, lectures, exhibits, contests, and radio programs, was reproduced by more than 1,000 Jewish community centers, synagogues, schools, and organizations. Among those whose services were enlisted were violinist Joseph Szigeti, soprano Marjorie Lawrence, fifteen national symphony orchestras, and Fred Waring's orchestra and chorus. Highlights of the festival were the opening Salute to Israel Day, and the recorded program The New Road, which used Yiddish, English, and Hebrew, against a background of authentic folk music to tell the story of DP's headed for Palestine. This and other programs were broadcast by the major networks and also beamed abroad to Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America.

Also important was the formation of the Israel Music Foundation in November, 1948, an organization devoted to the development of Israeli musical talent and to its dissemination on an international scale. The activities of the Foundation include research, the production of recordings, the publishing of music, the maintenance of a reference library of Hebrew music, and the granting of exchange scholarships for American and Israeli music students.

The discussion evenings of the Jewish Music Forum, a group of musicologists interested in the specific aspects of Jewish music, and the founding of the Hebrew Union School of Jewish Sacred Music in October, 1948, testified further to an earnest approach to the problems of Jewish music. The same was true of the second annual conference-convention of the Cantors Assembly (February 21-23, 1949), which was arranged by the United Synagogue of America and was concerned with both the theoretical and practical problems that face the cantor, choir-leader, and music director in connection with the liturgical service.
At the same time, the cultural influences of the newly formed state of Israel had broad consequences. Israeli folk and battle songs, with a necessary simplification of style, set their imprint upon the longer symphonic compositions as well. On the other hand, one of the major concerns of previous years, the emphasis on an interfaith musical program, as exemplified by the special program of the Park Avenue Synagogue in New York City, receded into the background.

Folk Music

Jewish folk music was naturally richest in Israel. Although some of the Israeli folk tunes had been known outside of Palestine for many years—if only through the song postcards distributed by the Jewish National Fund—they had had little influence on composers in America until the founding of the state of Israel. Thus, for instance, the music division of the Congress for Jewish Culture offered a prize of $100 for a four-part setting of the poem “Treist Mein Folk” by J. L. Peretz, to be based on Jewish motifs. The prize went to Leo Rosenbluet, chief cantor of Stockholm, Sweden, with honorable mentions to Jacob Weinberg and Leo Kopf of the United States.

Similarly, the annual Bloch Award was given in 1949 to a pronouncedly Jewish theme: René Frank’s setting of The Spite of Michal, based on passages from the Book of Samuel in the Old Testament, a choral composition for three-part women’s chorus, with incidental soprano and baritone solo, and piano accompaniment.

The exchange of artists with Israel was limited to those Americans recognized as Jews by the Israeli musical authorities. Thus, conductors such as Leonard Bernstein and Jascha Horenstein had no trouble finding engagements with Israeli symphony orchestras; but Serge Koussevitzky was rejected as guest conductor because “he had become converted to Catholicism.”

Concerts

Saturated with folk material, the majority of new works performed during the 1948-49 season in New York concerts or on the radio revealed the strong influence of Israel. The chief events centered around the music festival which featured the dramatic oratorio The New Road, mentioned above; A. W. Binder's oratorio Israel Reborn, a highly popularized attempt to integrate the folk spirit into the large concert form (March 13, 1949); and the excerpts from Jacob Weinberg's opera Hechalutz (February 19, 1949), a work previously performed in part, which took for its theme the toil of the Palestinian pioneers.

Another oratorio performed was Ruth by Mordecai Sandberg (May 22, 1949, Town Hall, New York), which in its text harked back to biblical times but in its music remained within the nineteenth-century framework.

The dramatic oratorio and opera seemed to be of greatest interest to Jewish composers, possibly because these forms provide the most appropriate vessels for conveying political-nationalistic thoughts in music. But there were also numerous concerts which featured either songs in solo or choral form, or short chamber pieces with biblical or topical titles. Most noteworthy in this category
were the presentation of the works and adaptations by Lazare Saminsky at New York's Times Hall in a program dedicated entirely to his works (March 13, 1949); a series of folk songs performed under the auspices of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation in Chicago, Ill. (January 9, 1949); a string quartet by Yehudi Weiner, played in honor of Cantor Moshe Rudinow and offered by the Society for the Advancement of Judaism in New York City (May 31, 1949); several chamber pieces by Moshe Rudinow, A. W. Binder, Ben Haim, Lazar Weiner, and Reuven Kosakoff, performed at the Jewish Music Forum in New York City (December 20, 1948); a series of folk songs presented by the School of Jewish Studies in New York's Town Hall (March 13, 1949); and a program of Hebrew concert music and folk dances presented by students from Hunter College, Columbia University, and Brooklyn College (March 13, 1949).

More ambitious and interesting to professional musicians were the three concerts of the Vinaver Chorus (Town Hall, New York; final concert, February 3, 1949), always notable for the high standard of its performances, in which compositions by non-Jewish composers such as Vaughan Williams shared the program with some interesting Jewish works. Among the latter were some by the Israeli composer Starominsky.

A certain trend toward modernism could also be detected in two works by Herbert Fromm and Philip James, which were performed by the Kinor Sinfonietta of the Hebrew Arts Foundation under Siegfried Landau at the Brooklyn Museum (March 20, 1949), and *Jewish Dances* by Karol Rathaus, which was performed by the Columbus (Ohio) Symphony Orchestra.

Important events during the course of the year were a new work by Arnold Schoenberg and the introduction of Erich Itor Kahn as a composer. Schoenberg's *Survivor from Warsaw*, a cantata for reciter, male chorus and orchestra based upon the horrible experiences of the Warsaw massacre, had its world premiere on December 3, 1948, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Written entirely in twelve-tone technique, the work integrated Jewish material so completely that its final apotheosis, the *Shma Isroel*, which was quoted literally and at length, came as the logical conclusion to an intensely dramatic work. Jewish material and modern expression here found a satisfactory balance. Thus, the work offered future composers a clue as to how to synthesize the traditional melos and modern texture.

Similar treatment was found in some of the works by Erich Itor Kahn, a musician heretofore known only as a pianist. Demonstrating his choral *Hasidic Rhapsody* and some *Jewish Madrigals* for solo voice and piano before the Jewish Music Forum in a lecture-recital, Mr. Kahn attempted an entirely new approach to Jewish music. His technique was also amply demonstrated in his *Actus tragicus* for chamber orchestra which was performed in April in Tel Aviv.

But the quest for a popularized music was further encouraged by the performances of music by Israeli composers. These compositions remained essentially a medley of folk tunes. Mahler-Kalkstein's *Folk Symphony*, played by the Columbus (Ohio) Symphony Orchestra, and a series of songs presented in a vocal recital by Sidor Belarsky in New York's Carnegie Hall, comprised the main events within this trend. There were reports from Israel to the effect that new and more original talents, such as the young Ben-Zion Orgad-Bushel, were
beginning to make themselves heard. But their music had not penetrated as yet to the United States.

Popular Jewish music was indeed so influential that even non-Jewish organizations programmed some primitive Jewish music, e.g., the International Singers, who performed Max Helfman's *Hashkivenu* at New York's Town Hall (January 26, 1949), and the Portland (Oregon) Symphony Orchestra, which gave the world premiere in concert form of David Tamkin's opera *The Dybbuk* (February 11, 1949), which cleverly mixes slick orchestral techniques with authentic Hasidic melos.

In view of this popularizing influence with its emphasis on the typical Jewish folk-tune, the interfaith movement, which had loomed large on the horizon a few years ago, faded rapidly into the background. No newly commissioned works of Gentile composers for the Jewish service were presented, but those works written two years before for the Park Avenue Synagogue in New York were repeated. This took place at the music festival at Columbia University (May 12, 1949), in which such composers as Morton Gould, Kurt Weill, and Roy Harris participated.

Even the much-heralded “George Gershwin Award” of the B'nai B'rith, received by the non-Jewish young American composer Ned Rorem for his *Overture in C* for orchestra, awakened little interest. The events organized by Jewish societies for the performance of non-Jewish music were another example of the difficulty in defining Jewish music. Among these should be noted an evening of choral music by the B'nai B'rith Chorus of New York (April 28, 1949, Town Hall, New York), featuring music from Purcell, Lassus, and Bach to Hindemith, Copland, and Gershwin, and a performance in Yiddish of the Gilbert and Sullivan *H.M.S. Pinafore* by a Brooklyn group of the Hadassah (May 8, 1949).

**Records**

The same musical trends that dominated concert music also prevailed in the majority of the recordings. In some cases, such as in *The New Road* program, which was available for rebroadcast by radio stations but not commercially to the general public, the works given at concerts and on records were the same. But the great majority of recordings consisted of the folk music created in Israel.

*M'zimrai Haaretz* (Palestine Art Corporation), an album representing songs of worship, labor, youth, and love for the land in Israel; *Haganah Sings* (Zimra) and *Songs of the Defenders of Israel* (Israel Music Foundation), two albums showing the political-nationalistic side of Israeli music; and several single discs featuring compositions by Marc Lavry, a semi-classical arranger of folk tunes (issued by the Israel Music Foundation) were all meant for popular consumption. Several other discs by the same company, featuring Western music by Israeli performers, such as Handel's *Hallelujah Chorus* and arias from Puccini's *Tosca*, demonstrated a higher standard of performance, but were not original Jewish music.

Of the remainder of the output in records, two albums, *Hebrew Spirituals* (Besa), a collection of arrangements of Hasidic melodies sung by Cantor Leib
Glantz, and *Jewish Holidays in Song* (RCA Victor), choral renditions of high holy day prayers arranged by A. W. Binder, were outstanding.

**The Synagogue**

The music presented in the synagogues remained comparatively free from popular influences. Extreme stands at opposite poles were taken by Chemjo Vinaver, advocate of traditional purity, and Herbert Fromm, a Hindemith disciple.

Both trends were followed, if in a somewhat more moderate fashion, in a new *Sabbath Eve Service* written by fourteen Israeli composers and performed at New York's Park Avenue Synagogue (May 20, 1949). Here a more serious attitude among Israeli composers was discernible. This is especially significant since a majority of them, such as Marc Lavry, Robert Starer, and Ben Haim, had been represented by inferior works of non-liturgical content in some of the concerts. Many of the compositions, most notably those by Ben Haim, Peter Gradenwitz, and Karl Salomon, showed great earnestness, imagination, skill, and, above all, a feeling of musical responsibility.

Similarly, a new *Sacred Service* by Darius Milhaud, performed at the Temple Emanu-El in San Francisco, Cal.; Lazar Weiner's *Sabbath Eve Service*, and a repeat performance of Ernest Bloch's famous *Sacred Service* (both given at New York's Central Synagogue on February 25, 1949), demonstrated serious concern with the question of traditionalism versus modernism, and solved the problem quite skillfully, although differently, in each work, through the integration of traditional *nusah* in modern texture.

Deserving mention, though less satisfactory to this reviewer, were the short liturgical pieces by A. W. Binder, Max Helfmann, Isadore Freed, and Max Janowski, which were broadcast over the CBS *Church of the Air*, and the selections by the same composers performed at a cantors' concert with both group and solo singing (New York's Times Hall February 23, 1949). Both programs contained serious aspects in the music by Herbert Fromm, Chemjo Vinaver, and Ernest Bloch.

By and large, an awareness of responsibility was evident in cantorial music. *The Cantor's Voice*, which was published by the Cantors' Assembly, contained both practical news items and theoretical essays investigating many questions of modern liturgical practices.

**Research**

Musical scholarship was also concerned with national prestige. A controversy arose among scholars over the question of whether the early Christian chant, and thus the roots of Western music, stemmed from early synagogue music. In his interesting book, *Eastern Elements in Western Chant*, which had been published in 1947, Egon Wellesz had asserted that early Christian music was partly influenced by Syrian liturgies, and possibly to some extent by the synagogue. The Jewish musicologist, Eric Werner, elaborated on this theme in an article in the *Musical Quarterly* (July, 1948), and insisted that Christian chant
stems directly from the Jewish liturgy. To substantiate this theory, Werner offered several musical examples.

In opposition, it was pointed out by this reviewer at the Jewish Music Forum in April, 1949, that at the time of the beginning of the Christian chant Jewish music was already so impure and intermixed with other Oriental influences that any apparent borrowing on the part of Christian music might have come from any number of Oriental sources.

On the other hand, in his book on The Music of Israel, Peter Gradenwitz asserted that even such modern composers as Schoenberg were offshoots of the Oriental roots which Gradenwitz regarded as the basis of Jewish culture.

Valuable musicological research during the year was contributed by Joseph Yasser in his article on “Hebrew Music in Russian Medieval Ballads,” published in Jewish Social Studies (January, 1944). Furthermore, several of the popularizing booklets and bibliographies published by the National Jewish Music Council on aspects of Jewish music furnished valuable reference material for laymen and synagogue music directors.

**Education**

It had always been felt that the confusion reigning in Jewish circles about the essence and meaning of Jewish music was due, at least in part, to the lack of educational facilities. Hence, the founding of the Hebrew Union School of Jewish Sacred Music was a welcome event. The school's purpose was to give prospective cantors a broad education in music, the liturgy, and general Jewish ideas. It was hoped the school would aid in the development of a new generation of competent Jewish musicians. The school's faculty included the most prominent names in Jewish musical life, such as A. W. Binder, Gershon Ephros, Jacob Weinberg, Eric Werner, and Lazare Saminsky, although there was no representative of the modern Western viewpoint.

Israel, on the other hand, recognized the importance of acquainting its musicians with the Western world. In response to this need, the Esco Foundation for Palestine granted two scholarships annually to two Israeli musicians. Recipients of the 1949 awards, composer Ben-Zion Orgad-Buschel and conductor Elyakum Shapira, were enabled to study at the Berkshire center at Tanglewood, Mass., under Aaron Copland and Serge Koussevitzky, respectively.

**Conclusion**

The future of Jewish music in America remained uncertain despite feverish activity. Nevertheless, the talents of men like Ernest Bloch, Arnold Schoenberg, Herbert Fromm, Chemjo Vinaver, Erich Itor Kahn, and others continued to seek and find expression. Their seriousness and concern with music could not be questioned. It was from them and the new generation of musicians, both in the United States and in Israel, that the Jewish community expected compositions and performances which would neither keep the Jew apart from the Western community nor force him to abandon his identity. 

Kurt List
FILMS

Although this review touches upon the theatrical film as it affects social attitudes, it is concerned chiefly with the non-theatrical, educational film.

The important fact that emerged during the war was the enormous educational potential of the motion picture. The motion picture met the requirements of speed and audience comprehensibility and cut down training time from months to weeks. It was estimated by United States Navy visual-aids experts that films helped trainees to learn up to 35 per cent more material and retain it over a period of time 35 per cent longer.

Although the non-theatrical film got its real start back in 1923 with the introduction of non-inflammable film and the 16mm. film camera, its widespread use by schools was comparatively recent. This lag could be attributed in some part to budgetary difficulties in connection with procuring necessary equipment. But, according to a Department of Commerce survey, while in 1936 there were only 458 projectors in schools, in 1941 there were 6,384 and by 1946 the number had jumped to 24,000. In May, 1949, Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, addressing the annual convention of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in St. Louis, estimated that 50,000 sound projectors were in use in American schools.

The churches made concurrent progress with educational films. Owning an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 projectors, their use of films and purchase of equipment was said to be increasing even more rapidly in terms of percentage than that of the schools.

Human Relations Films

Two types of human relations films were being produced during the period under review—symbolic and realistic.

One of the best known and most popular films being displayed in the former group was Brotherhood of Man, produced in 1946 and based upon the pamphlet Races of Mankind by Gene Weltfish and Ruth Benedict. It was an animated color cartoon showing that the differences between races were superficial, accidental, and environmental. Another popular film in this group was Boundary Lines, made in 1947. Using animated paintings, moving lines, realistic and abstract symbols, and a dominating musical background, this picture pleaded for the elimination of the arbitrary divisive lines of color, origin, and religion. In the Spring of 1949 a sequel to this film was released called Picture in Your Mind. Like its predecessor, this was an animated color film which used symbolic drawings and an original, impressionistic music score to explain how negative stereotyping erected barriers between individuals of different backgrounds.

A different type of film in this same group was Sing a Song of Friendship, produced in 1949 and based upon a group of songs by Irving Caesar. This film was a community sing: a sequence of three songs, coordinated with animated cartoons in color, using the bouncing ball technique.
Realistic Films

The realistic films approached the question of intergroup relationships in a more direct manner. Their stories were projected into real life situations. In some cases, they were based on actual events; in others, on fictional happenings; in still others, on a mixture of both. *The World We Want to Live In*, produced in 1941, was a factual presentation of intergroup problems and methods of solving them. Pleas for greater understanding and cooperation were made by Charles Evan Hughes, Al Smith, Eddie Cantor, and Wendell Willkie. In the film *Man—One Family*, produced in 1946, the master-race theory was refuted on scientific grounds. *The Story of Dr. Carver*, made in 1938, described the rise of a Negro slave to scientific eminence. Haym Salomon, Jewish patriot of the American Revolution, was the subject of *Sons of Liberty*, produced in 1939.

The way in which one neighborhood in New York City sought to eliminate racial tension provided the story for the film *Whoever You Are*, produced in 1946. Another film dealing with community action, released early in 1948, was *Make Way For Youth*, the story of a typical American community shocked by a tragedy into taking cooperative action to establish an intergroup youth council.

The immediate rejection and ultimate acceptance of a little Polish refugee boy by a "gang" of his American contemporaries, was the subject of a short dramatic film, *The Greenie*, produced in 1942. *One God*, released in 1949, was based upon the book of the same name by Florence Fitch and was an objective portrayal of the ways in which the three major faiths worship and observe their holy days.

Effect of Human Relations Films

It was difficult to measure the effects of such educational techniques as motion pictures. But among the "social action" films, there was one about whose effectiveness there was some direct knowledge. *Make Way For Youth* was produced in 1947 by Robert Disraeli, director of the film division of the American Jewish Committee, under the sponsorship of the youth division of the National Social Welfare Assembly, an organization representing twenty-one national youth-serving agencies. During the year and a half of its distribution, it was seen by approximately one million people. It resulted in the establishment-of about thirty inter-group youth councils, of the kind envisaged in the film, in communities all over the United States. It was in great demand by churches, schools, veterans organizations, small groups in neighborhoods where racial tension existed, and all types of youth and adult clubs. Numerous panels and forums used it as a springboard for discussions of racial and religious prejudice, parent-child relationships, the extent of adult participation in youth projects, and similar problems. It was shown commercially in about 100 theaters throughout the United States.

Theatrical Films

While the non-theatrical film makers were beginning to produce the human relations films which were more and more in demand, Hollywood, too, turned
an attentive ear to the voice of social consciousness. Large strides had been made in commercial films during the past twenty years, from a human relations standpoint. The major improvement was in the less frequent use of stereotypes. The typed Negro, foreign, or Jewish character was not often seen except in revivals of old films. They were not totally eliminated—the hero and heroine still had predominantly Nordic names and the humorous or villainous actors often had foreign names, but, on the whole, the tendency was toward characterization rather than stereotyping.

The year under review witnessed the production of a number of pictures tackling the problem of Negro discrimination. Home Of the Brave and Lost Boundaries were released in the Spring of 1949, and, at the time of this writing, three pictures with similar themes were in varying stages of production. As an indication of what could ultimately be hoped for from such films, Home Of the Brave, dealing with racial prejudice in a wartime situation, was being shown throughout the South.

Problems of juvenile delinquency and social maladjustment were also being aired via the screen. In 1948 RKO made a short called Who's Delinquent? Earlier in the same year, they had released Children's Village, the story of Children's Village in Dobbs Ferry, New York, where delinquent youths were sent for rehabilitation. A small independent company produced in 1948 a 16mm. film for non-theatrical showing called The Quiet One, concerning a maladjusted Negro child. The demand for this film was so great that the 16mm. prints were temporarily withdrawn in favor of distribution of the film commercially in theaters throughout the country.

Films About Israel

With daily reports on Israel appearing in the press, films about the new state received wider attention than previously. A catalogue of non-theatrical films on Israel, issued by the film division of the American Jewish Committee in January, 1949, was in great demand by Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and religious groups, libraries, etc. Among the films evaluated were: Assignment: Tel Aviv, produced in 1947, which told the story of the day-to-day life of a Jewish family in the modern city of Tel Aviv, with Quentin Reynolds as narrator; Birthday of a Prophecy, made in 1947, which showed how the dreams and hopes of Theodor Herzl were realized in the new state; House in the Desert, made in 1947, which dramatically portrayed the creation of a modern productive settlement out of salt-laden desert lands. This film was also available in a 35mm. version, and had wide theatrical distribution. Look Homeward, Wanderers, produced in 1947, showed the contribution of Jews to the war effort and to the building of Israel.

There were newsreel presentations of events in Israel in Israel Reborn and Israel in Action, both produced in 1948. The former was an account of the birth of the Jewish state; the latter highlighted the climactic points in Israel’s struggle for independence during the first months of its statehood. Early in 1949, Tomorrow's a Wonderful Day was released—the story of a young survivor of a concentration camp who received physical and mental rehabilitation in an Israel children's village as its subject.
Two theatrical films on Israel were released in the Summer of 1949. *Sword in the Desert*, a Hollywood production, was the story of the British-Israeli conflict in Israel just prior to the termination of the British mandate. An indication of public interest in this film was the fact that in the first two days of its run at the Criterion Theater in New York City, it broke that theater's box-office record. Produced in Italy and released at about the same time, *The Earth Cries Out* dealt with the British-Israeli conflict and also took into account the factional splits among the Israelis themselves.

**International Problems**

Numerous pictures, both theatrical and non-theatrical, dealing with various aspects of the international situation were exhibited during the period under review. These covered such subjects as the work of the United Nations, the displaced persons, and German war guilt.

Many of the non-theatrical films were produced by, or under the supervision of, the United Nations Film Division. *Clearing the Way*, made in 1948, was the story of a group of children living in that part of New York City taken over by the United Nations (UN) headquarters site. One of a series of documentaries, *Tomorrow Begins Today*, which was released in the Fall of 1949, concerned itself with the work of the UN Economic and Social Council, as seen by six students visiting UN headquarters from different parts of the world. Also released in the Fall of 1949 was *Men of Good Will*, a study of the UN Secretariat, where people from different countries and of different races and creeds worked together successfully. *The United Nations in Action*, released in the latter part of 1949, was a dramatic presentation of the work of the UN International Children's Emergency Fund, a project in which all the member nations of the United Nations cooperated.

The plight of the displaced persons was the subject of several theatrical films. *My Father's House*, based upon Meyer Levin's book of the same name and produced in 1947, was the story of a displaced Jewish boy's search for his parents. *The Search*, released in 1948, followed the paths of a Jewish child and his mother seeking one another in the displaced persons camps of Europe. Another theatrical film which was released in 1948, *The Long Road Home*, told the story of a Jewish family, victims of the Warsaw ghetto holocaust, who wandered through the European displaced persons camps, hoping for ultimate refuge in Israel.

Although four years had passed since the end of the war, the subject of German war guilt received considerable attention on the screen. *Nuremburg—Its Lesson for Today*, produced by the United States Army in 1946, was released in the Fall of 1949 for 16mm. distribution. A documentary made up in large part of captured Nazi film, it was an account of the Nazi crimes against humanity. *The Last Stop*, filmed in Poland and released in the United States in 1948 for commercial distribution, told the story of the Auschwitz concentration camp. In the Fall of 1949, *Germany—Year Zero*, filmed by Roberto Rosellini in Italy and Germany, was released in the United States. The story of a German family in present-day Berlin, the plot focused upon the plight of the twelve-year-old son of the family.
Films for Television

Requests for films were coming from a new source during the period under review. Television stations, most of which devoted varying percentages of their air time to televising motion pictures, had to rely to a large extent on reissues of old films—mainly Westerns and comedies. New television film producing companies were springing up rapidly, but there was a marked interest by the stations in films dealing with human relations themes, with Israel, with German war guilt—in fact, with most subjects of general concern today.

Yiddish Films

Few Yiddish films were made in recent years. Theater exhibitors who specialized in Jewish film programs depended upon such staples as Moyshe Oysher's *Overture to Glory*, produced in 1939, or *A Vilna Legend*, originally made in 1924 but expanded in 1940 with narrative sequences supplied by Joseph Buloff, well-known on the Broadway stage. Moyshe Oysher favorites were *The Singing Blacksmith*, produced in 1938, the story of the life of a blacksmith in Eastern Europe; and *The Cantor's Son*, produced in 1937, the story of a young emigre to America who sings his way to success and then returns to the old country of his parents and his sweetheart. One of the classics, *Tevya*, made in 1939, was based upon the famous Sholom Aleichem book. Another classic was *Green Fields*, produced in 1935 and based upon the Peretz Hirshbein story of a young Talmudist who sets out to see the world. A famous classic, *The Dybbuk*, produced in Poland in 1938, was a dramatic presentation of a tale from Jewish folklore. *Di Klatche*, produced in 1939 and based on Mendele Mosher Sforim's well-known stories, was a comedy-drama portraying the joys and sorrows that entered into the life of a Jewish family.

Of more recent vintage was the documentary *We Live Again*, made in 1947, the story of the orphaned Jewish children cared for in various institutions in France. Another recent documentary was *Road to Israel*, which showed how Jewish children and adults in Europe were taught skills and trades in preparation for their eventual emigration to Israel.

All of these theatrical films, with the exception of the two documentaries, mentioned above were also available in 16mm. versions for non-theatrical screenings.
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RADIO AND TELEVISION

With the advent of television into the American home, the air waves played a doubly important role during 1948-49. As of June 30, 1949, 2,002 AM stations, 727 FM stations, and 72 television stations were operating in the United States. Many of these stations used their time and facilities to promote good will and ease intergroup tensions, as well as to broadcast material of interest to special segments of their audience.
Communal Activities

Jewish communal organizations used these media to present programs which dramatized the needs and interests of the community. Such programs on a local scale included *Everyman’s Story*, depicting the functions of The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York; the *World Over Playhouse*, a program for Jewish children under the auspices of the Jewish Education Committee of New York; *Homecoming*, presented by the New York campaign of the United Jewish Appeal; and *Family Close-Up*, a story series based on the problems handled by the Jewish Family Service of New York.

In addition to New York City’s efforts, civic programs of cultural interest were the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission’s *Within Our Gates*, St. Louis’ *The American Jewish Hour*, and Los Angeles’ *Community Hour of the Air*.

All four networks offered their national facilities to the United Jewish Appeal during its national fund-raising campaign for the production of dramatizations featuring such popular motion picture personalities as Al Jolson and John Garfield.

Radio coverage of topics of Jewish interest was not limited to the English-language stations. Station WEVD, which devoted forty-four hours per week of radio broadcast time to programs delivered in the Yiddish language, led in this field, with thirteen other stations throughout the country also offering this service to lesser degree.

Intergroup Relations

Many of the daytime interview programs designed to appeal to women were very active in promoting good will over the radio. Particularly successful in this undertaking were Martha Deane, Tex and Jinx McCrary, Barbara Welles, and Mary Margaret McBride, who celebrated her fifteenth year on the air with a dramatic presentation of Morton Wishengrad’s script, *Unfinished Business, U. S. A.*, with Melvyn Douglas as narrator.

Many regular commercial and sustaining series, such as *We, the People*, *Superman*, Fred Waring, *Quiz Kids*, and *Winner Take All*, produced programs which sought to promote better intercultural relations. Also highly effective in this field was the United America campaign of The Advertising Council Inc., which was supported by the entire radio industry through 632 network broadcasts and a radio circulation totaling 999,300,000 “listener impressions.” (A “listener impression” is one radio message heard once by one listener.)

Television audiences acclaimed *The Goldbergs*, when the popular radio program about Jewish family life was brought into the parlor by the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) television network. *Howdy Doody* on the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) network and *The Small Fry Club* on the Dumont Network conducted an interesting and successful experiment in the promotion of improved group relations for children by incorporating into their programs cartoon spot announcements distributed by The Advertising Council.
“Script Kits,” compilations of scripts with intergroup themes and spot announcements, were sent to local stations for use in “live” shows. The National Broadcasting Company distributed among its 164 affiliated stations a “script kit” celebrating United Nations Week (October 17 to 24, 1948). In May, 1949, the United States Department of Justice issued a “kit” to one thousand local stations for use on “I Am an American Day.” The script library of Broadcast Music Inc., served its 2,000 subscribing stations in the United States and Canada each month as a source of material in behalf of improved communal relations.

During the year all four television networks, as well as local television stations, showed the film, Make Way for Youth, the story of the formation of a youth council in Madison, Wis. Rabbi Roland Gittelson’s Flag Day address on June 12, 1949, was presented on Television Chapel over Station WPIX.

Fifteen-minute recordings of electrically transcribed programs were prepared by the Institute for Visual Education in three individual Lest We Forget series and were used by 918 local radio stations and 196 schools. This organization also distributed to 900 stations Little Songs on Big Subjects, a group of musical good-will jingles recorded as spot announcements. Another series of one-minute spot announcements was broadcast by prominent persons and distributed during November, 1948, by the National Citizens’ Council on Civil Rights to 150 stations to celebrate the first anniversary of the appointment of President Harry Truman’s Civil Rights Commission.

Religion

The Message of Israel, a devotional service produced since 1924 by the United Jewish Laymen’s Committee, Inc., continued to be heard regularly each Sunday morning as a weekly broadcast over the network of the American Broadcasting Company. Also heard on Sunday over the National Broadcasting Company network under the auspices of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America was The Eternal Light, half-hour dramatizations of Jewish cultural subjects. This series completed its fifth year of broadcasting in October, 1949.

In addition to these two regular programs, the various networks broadcast special one-time shows, including commemorations of Jewish holidays. For example, the Mutual Broadcasting Company observed the celebration of Passover on April 12, 1949, with a half-hour dramatization by Morton Wishengrad, The Camel and I, which starred Sam Levene and was produced by the American Jewish Committee.

One of the first regular religious network television series was the presentation each Friday morning over Station WABD and the Dumont Network of Morning Chapel, a devotional service produced by the American Jewish Committee. The Columbia Broadcasting System conducted an experiment in television programming with Lamps Unto My Feet, a weekly series in which children demonstrated the teachings of the three faiths. The Jewish portion of this program was under the supervision of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

On the New York scene, the American Jewish Committee contributed a
half-hour religious program monthly to the *Television Chapel* presented over WPIX. *Stained Glass Windows* was the title of a regular series of religious films concerning the three faiths, televised over the American Broadcasting System.

**Israel**

A report on Israel received national coverage in *Israel through American Eyes*, a speech by Jacob Blaustein, president of the American Jewish Committee, delivered over the NBC network on May 4, 1949. Locally, the Zionist Organization of America depicted daily life in Israel in *Report from Israel*, which was carried over the air direct from that country to New York’s Station WMCA.

*Tomorrow’s a Wonderful Day*, Hadassah’s film dealing with the life of Israeli youth, was televised by CBS’s network as well as by the American Broadcasting Company. This latter network also presented two showings of *The House in the Desert*, a portrayal of agricultural pioneering in Israel.

_ Irma Kopp_
FOREIGN COUNTRIES
World Jewish Population

During the period under review, the dynamics of the Jewish world population were influenced by the opening of the two significant outlets for immigration: Israel and the United States. In addition, numbers of Jews were resettled in Australia, Canada, Latin America, and other countries. Under the impact of these movements important changes occurred in the distribution of the Jewish population in various areas. The Jewish settlement in Israel grew substantially and amounted to 891,000 persons on May 31, 1949, as compared with 713,000 on November 8, 1948. On the other hand, Jewish communities behind the "Iron Curtain" and, to a lesser degree, in Moslem countries and the Middle East, decreased. Especially affected by the migration movement during the past year were the displaced Jews. As a result of their resettlement in various countries, the specific problem of Jewish displaced persons entered the phase of a final solution.

In Eastern Europe, a gradual liquidation of Jewish communities in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and a substantial decline of the Jewish population in Czechoslovakia took place. It was estimated that as of the end of August, 1949, there were 7,000 Jews in Bulgaria, 3,500 in Yugoslavia, and 18,000 in Czechoslovakia. Corresponding figures for the same countries in July-August, 1948, were 45,000, 10,000, and 42,000, respectively. Unfortunately, no data were available on the age structure and occupational distribution of the remaining population. It was also difficult to venture an opinion on the chances of survival of Jewish settlements in the countries mentioned above. If there was little change in the size of the Jewish population in Rumania and Hungary, the reason for this fact was to be found in the policy of the Rumanian and Hungarian governments in restricting emigration. Despite these restrictions, numbers of Hungarian Jews managed to infiltrate into Austria during the period under review.

Among the countries of the Middle East and North Africa, the Jewish communities of Yemen, Tripoli, and Turkey were particularly affected. Unbearable conditions in Yemen had been driving local Jewry from its native land since 1939-40. The establishment of the Jewish state gave an impetus to this displacement. The Jewish population in Yemen in September, 1949, was estimated at 30,000 and in Aden at about 2,000.

The Tripoli Jewish communities numbered 30,000 members after World War II. At the time of writing there were some 25,000 members. The Jewish population in Turkey was 55,000 in 1949 as against 80,000 in 1948. With almost no help from the outside and overcoming many difficulties, the Turkish Jews began to move to Israel toward the end of 1948. Consequently, many

1 For background material, see "Jewish Population of the World," American Jewish Year Book Vol. 50, p. 691; also articles on individual countries for more detailed statistics.
2 For sources of immigration to Israel, see p. 406.
small Jewish communities in Turkey lost virtually all their members. The large community of Izmir had 6,000-7,000 Jews early in 1949 as compared to 14,000 in 1948 (La Boz de Turkiye, 222, April 1, 1949).

The Jewish population in Western Europe (England, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy, Scandinavia, Greece) remained relatively stable.

As of May 31, 1949, a total of 431,896 displaced persons (DP's) received care and maintenance from the International Refugee Organization (IRO). In addition, 227,912 DP's benefited from IRO services only. Among those who were maintained and cared for by IRO were 58,127 Jews.

Europe

At the time of writing there were about 3,500,000 Jews in Europe. The largest Jewish community was situated in the USSR with an estimated 2,000,000 Jews. Outside the USSR there were in Eastern Europe about 640,000 Jews, approximately one-sixth of the European total. The largest Jewish community in that area was in Rumania, with some 350,000 Jews. In Western Europe and Scandinavia, the total number of Jews was about 700,000, including 345,000 in England and 235,000 in France.

Asia and Australasia

Out of about 1,247,000 Jews in Asia, 950,000 were in Israel, which was the third largest Jewish center in the world. Of the remaining 300,000, the principal Jewish communities were in Iraq (110,000) and Iran (90,000).

There were about 40,000 Jews in Australia and 4,000 in New Zealand.

Israel

According to available data from a registration of population conducted in Israel on November 8, 1948, there were at that time 782,000 residents in Israel, of whom 713,000 were Jews and 69,000 Arabs and others.3

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe (including Asiatic USSR and Turkey)</td>
<td>3,505,800</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America (North and South)</td>
<td>5,782,850</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,247,200</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>723,500</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New Zealand</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,303,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compared with 1948, the total Jewish population in 1949 showed a decrease of 70,000. This decrease was not a real one and reflects the fact that 1948 figures for some countries were overestimates; this was true particularly for Rumania and Jewish DP's in Germany. The immigration to the United States was not accounted for in the 1949 data because the available estimates on United States Jewish population varied from 4,500,000 to 5,000,000. (See American Jewish Year Book Vol. 50, p. 651.) It must be pointed out that in compiling the data the natural increase could not be taken into account, a task that would be hardly feasible.

TABLE 2

Estimated Jewish Population in Europe, by Countries a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6,953,000</td>
<td>21,500 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>8,557,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7,048,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>12,339,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4,190,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>50,033,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3,958,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>40,800,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>66,007,000</td>
<td>55,000 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>7,790,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>9,165,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Free State</td>
<td>2,997,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>45,706,000</td>
<td>38,500 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>292,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9,794,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3,181,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>23,900,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>8,402,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>15,873,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>193,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>27,761,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6,883,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4,609,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>19,500,000</td>
<td>55,000 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>15,752,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>595,655,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,505,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Data on the total population were taken from the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, Statistical Office of the United Nations, September 1949, Vol. III, 9, Great Neck, N. Y. These data represent available figures for 1947 and 1948. Where such material was not available data were taken from various United Nations publications and other sources. The data on Jewish population are mostly for 1948-49 and are based on information derived from local sources.

b These numbers include not only local residents but displaced Jews as well.

c Including Asiatic USSR and Asiatic Turkey.

At the end of 1948, according to the estimates of the Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel, of a total population of 859,000, 759,000 were Jews and 100,000 Arabs and others.4

During 1949 about 200,000 Jews 5 entered Israel, bringing its Jewish population to 957,000 (as of September 30, 1949) and its total population to over 1,050,000.

Africa

It was estimated that more than 720,000 Jews were residing in Africa. The largest Jewish community was Morocco (280,000), followed by Algeria (130,000) and Tunisia (90,000).

4 Includes results of the additional registration in January, 1949 in Western Galilee (the areas of Nazareth and Acre); does not include areas of Majdal, Beer-Sheba, and Arab villages in the Sharon.

A sizeable Jewish migratory movement toward Israel from the Moslem countries began in 1949. For some time to come, its effects, however, would be counterbalanced by considerable natural increase, which in this area still showed an upward trend. Outside of Moslem countries, a substantial Jewish community was to be found in the Union of South Africa (100,000).

North and South America

Out of a total of approximately 5,782,000 Jews in the Western Hemisphere, an estimated 5,000,000 lived in the United States and about 185,000 in Canada. There were no recent estimates on Latin American countries. It was known, however, that during 1948-49 numbers of Jews entered various Latin American countries from Europe and from Asia (China and the Shanghai area).

The countries with the largest Jewish populations in 1949 are shown in Table 7.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12,883,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>146,571,000 b</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL North America</strong></td>
<td>159,454,000</td>
<td>5,185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>16,109,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3,922,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>48,450,000</td>
<td>110,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5,621,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10,777,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>813,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>5,195,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2,214,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Guiana</td>
<td>189,000 c</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3,362,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>3,717,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1,260,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>24,447,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1,160,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>746,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1,270,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>7,246,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>4,190,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL South America</strong></td>
<td>150,926,000</td>
<td>597,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>310,387,000</td>
<td>5,782,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See footnote a, Table 2.

b Exclusive of Alaska.

c Data on the small Jewish community in British Guiana are not available. There had been an exodus of Jewish refugees who had found temporary sanctuary in that country.
TABLE 4
ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN ASIA, BY COUNTRIES a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>730,880</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>463,493,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch East Indies</td>
<td>72,000,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Indo-China</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>342,114,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4,800,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>80,697,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchuria</td>
<td>36,949,972</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>73,321,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>19,964,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria-Lebanon</td>
<td>4,166,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,156,785,852</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,247,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Excluding Asiatic provinces of the USSR and Turkey; see footnote a, Table 2.

b In addition, at this writing, there were in Aden some 12,000 Yemenite Jews en route to Israel.

TABLE 5
ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AFRICA, BY COUNTRIES a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinia</td>
<td>9,500,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>19,528,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>888,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (including Tangiers)</td>
<td>9,082,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Rhodesia</td>
<td>1,979,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>3,015,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa</td>
<td>11,790,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,382,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>723,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a See footnote a, Table 2.

TABLE 6
ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Population</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7,710,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1,841,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,551,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a See footnote a, Table 2.

TABLE 7
COUNTRIES OF LARGEST JEWISH POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN SELECTED CITIES *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bialystok</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casablanca</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracow</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzierzoniow</td>
<td>6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort-on-Main</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haifa</td>
<td>128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbin</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jassy</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legnica</td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodz</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonika</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teheran</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunis</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walbrzych</td>
<td>4,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Leon Shapiro and Boris Sapir
INTRODUCTION

The Latin American countries suffered from political and economic instability during the period under review. Argentina and Chile experienced unsuccessful conspiracies. Guatemala, Salvador, Bolivia, and Ecuador suppressed uprisings. In Paraguay, Venezuela, and Peru revolutions were carried out successfully. The political unrest in this region had not yet subsided at the time of writing, and a number of countries were in a state of political tension. This unrest was due, to some extent, to economic causes. The currencies of nearly all Latin American countries had been devalued, inflation was rampant, and an economic crisis threatened some areas.

Though the Jewish communities suffered from this unrest together with the general population, there was no specific Jewish element in these occurrences, and the development of the communities proceeded.

Efforts for Israel

The central fact of life within the Jewish communities was the establishment of Israel and concern for its consolidation. The different communities actively worked for the recognition of Israel by their respective countries, and its admission to the United Nations. A special role in these efforts was played by the “liaison officers” of the Israeli government who maintained contact with the Latin American republics. In almost every case these liaison officers were members of the local Jewish communities.

Recognition of Israel by the Latin American countries did not take place immediately. With the exception of Uruguay and Guatemala, which were represented in the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine and were therefore among the first to recognize the Jewish state, nearly all the other countries extended recognition in three stages: First was the establishment of postal communications; second, support of Israel’s admission to the international conference on radio communications which was held in Mexico, and third, trade contacts which were followed by recognition. As the Latin American countries progressed from one stage of recognition of Israel to another, continual efforts on the part of the local Jewish communities were required.

These political activities, as well as the unanimous desire of all Jews to see Israel recognized as a member of the family of nations, contributed toward the cementing of internal solidarity. The honor accorded Israel in some of the parliaments (those of Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, and Cuba); the
establishment of regular diplomatic relations; the arrival of Jacob Tzur as the only accredited minister to Uruguay and Argentina; the festivities marking the first anniversary of Israel and its admission to the United Nations—all these contributed to the sense of Jewish self-respect and the rising esteem in which they were held by their neighbors.

The Jewish communities were drawn closer to the new center of Jewish life in Israel as a result of the frequent visits of individuals and groups of tourists to the Jewish state. Nearly four hundred young people volunteered for Israel's army—most of them settled there permanently—and scores of young people accepted the invitation extended by the Jewish Agency to spend a year in Israel in order to prepare to serve as youth leaders in their native lands. This interchange exerted a beneficial influence on local Jewish life.

Of equal significance were the visits of leading personalities of Israel and of members of the Israeli government. Special mention should be made of I. Gruenbaum, former Minister of Internal Affairs, David Shaltiel, Inspector General of the Israeli army, M. Tov, secretary of the Latin American Department in the Israeli Foreign Office, M. Laniada, former military governor of Jaffa, A. Hollander, Undersecretary for Trade and Industry; and M. Beigin, member of the Knesset. In addition, the Latin American countries were visited by prominent members of the Jewish Agency, among them E. Dobkin, vice-president of the Agency.

UNITED APPEALS

The campaigns for Israel and the needs of the refugees, which were nearly everywhere conducted as united ventures, further contributed significantly to the consolidation of Jewish communal life in the Latin American countries. Communal leaders in a number of countries had come to realize that in order to insure the success of the campaigns for Israel it would be necessary to include in these campaigns the drives for the various organizations of worldwide scope, such as JDC, the World Jewish Congress, ORT, OSE, and HIAS. In some countries the most important local institutions were also included in the united campaigns. Chile was the first to introduce such a united drive and was shortly followed by Peru, Bolivia, Southern Brazil, and the small communities in Central America. In Argentina the local institutions, with the exception of the Jewish hospital in Buenos Aires, which was to receive a single large contribution, were not included in the drive. In Uruguay, Paraguay, Mexico, and Rio De Janeiro the united drive was exclusively for Israel. But even where local institutions were not included in the drive, from 3 to 5 per cent of the funds raised was earmarked for local cultural and educational activities.

INTERNAL RIFTS

The united appeals served powerfully to foster understanding and solidarity between the various trends within the communities. However, complete unity lasted only during the first year of Israel's existence. The profound differences between the Eastern and Western blocs in the international scene were reflected in local Jewish life. Nearly everywhere an open rift occurred between those elements which leaned toward the People's Democracies of the
Soviet zone of influence and those who clung to the traditional principles of democracy as it is understood in the West. The left-wing elements had entered Jewish life in a number of countries and there gained influence as a result of their dynamic and drastic methods. Their demand that their ideology be accepted in the work for Israel led to an ultimate rift.

Effect of Israel on Public Opinion

The rise of Israel also influenced the political situation of the Jewish communities in Latin America. The daily reports in the press concerning Jewish achievements and their significance for the political stability of the Middle East, the novelty of participation by local political notables in Jewish public affairs, Jewish mass demonstrations in the streets, and such events as the reception of the Israeli representatives by the Presidents of Argentina and Uruguay changed the attitude of the average person toward the Jews, who were previously looked down upon as persons without a country.

Anti-Semitic Manifestations

Despite these developments anti-Semitism appeared sporadically in different parts of this region. Thus, Bolivia suddenly promulgated a law in September, 1948, requiring a review of the property of Jews who had entered that country since 1939. This was a clear case of racial discrimination, and the law was repealed only after the intervention of the World Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee.

In Peru, too, anti-Semitism was apparent in radio programs, the publication of a new anti-Jewish paper, Temple, and a government regulation forbidding the importation of matzoth—though the last ban was excused on the grounds of a shortage of foreign currency. However, as time passed the situation in Peru again became normal in this respect.

The establishment of trade relations between Israel and the Latin American countries would no doubt have its effects. The first transport of frozen beef had already been sent from Argentina and another was being prepared. A shipment of beef was also exported from Uruguay. Brazil could export lumber, pre-fabricated houses, and furniture to Israel. Chile could find a market in Israel for its fertilizers, which were already being exported to Egypt. There were also the beginnings of imports of such items as artificial teeth and chemicals from Israel.

Emigration

The rise of Israel introduced still another and unexpected factor into the situation of the Jews in Latin America. They became an emigrant as well as an immigrant element. The consulates of Israel in Argentina and Uruguay, which at the time of writing also served Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, and Peru, had issued 1,741 visas for more than 5,000 persons during the few months since they were opened. One-third of these were for tourists, the remainder for persons intending to settle in Israel.
Civil Rights

It was expected that the political situation of the Jewish communities would also be favorably influenced by the inclusion in the new constitution of Argentina of Article 28, prohibiting discrimination on grounds of race, religion, or descent. Argentina had often been emulated by other Latin American countries in the past, and it was expected that they would imitate Argentina's example.

Internal Organization

There were no important achievements in the field of community organization to be recorded, but some significant steps were taken in the direction of the consolidation and expansion of the internal organization in the larger communities.¹

In Brazil a congress of the Brazilian federations and institutions of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Porto Alegre and Recife was held in January, 1949, with the aim of forming a union of Jewish institutions on a nation-wide scale.

In Montevideo, Uruguay, a dispute which had troubled the community for years was patched up, and though complete harmony had not yet been attained, internal peace bade fair to produce beneficial results.

In Chile the Comité Representativo, which was the spokesman of all Jewish institutions in the country, gained in authority and influence, since the united campaign for all Jewish needs was placed under its direction. The prestige of this committee was such that no urging was required to collect pledges to the campaign. Five per cent of the funds raised in Chile were deducted for the use of the local education committee, providing it with an opportunity to expand its activities.

The first census which was conducted in Mexico deserves mention as a significant contribution to the internal organization of the community.²

Culture and Education

Definite though unspectacular progress was made in the field of culture and education. Heightened interest in Jewish scholarship and culture emphasized a shortage of teachers and cultural workers. It was also evident that this type of personnel could not be imported and that the larger communities had to rely on their own resources. Teachers' seminaries were therefore established in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo in Brazil, in addition to those existing in Buenos Aires, Argentina and Mexico City, Mexico. Teachers' training courses were initiated in Santiago de Chile. Special mention should be made of the Hebrew courses for adults which existed in Buenos Aires, as well as in a number of other cities in Argentina, in Santiago, Montevideo and in other Latin American centers. In some localities there were Yiddish courses as well, but at the time of writing Hebrew monopolized the interest of those adults who had the time and inclination to devote themselves to Jewish studies.

¹ For a discussion of communal consolidation in Argentina, see p. 265.
² See p. 257.
The following table describes the state of Jewish education in Latin America:

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>est. 4</td>
<td>est. 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>est. 169</td>
<td>est. 16,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Jewish communities in Latin America concluded the year 5709 in a hopeful mood, stimulated by their activities in behalf of Israel and the continuity of Jewish life in the lands of their adoption.

Moises Senderey

**CENTRAL AMERICA**

The year 1948-49 in Central America was pock-marked by numerous military uprisings, civilian unrest, and student riots. That region also came close to an international war between two contiguous neighbors, Costa Rica and Nicaragua, when Costa Rica was invaded by revolutionary forces whose base was in Nicaragua.

In El Salvador the revolution succeeded in ousting the President and his government. In Guatemala, Panama, and Costa Rica the military revolts failed to achieve their purposes. Students led strong internal civilian opposition in Nicaragua. Many students were jailed and one was killed.

Against this background of political instability, military uprisings, and civilian rioting, tiny Jewish groups, estimated at about 3,000-4,000, led an isolated existence in the six Central American republics, from Guatemala in the north to Panama in the south, and were incapable of carrying on even the minimal tasks of Jewish communal living.

**Honduras**

In Tegucipalpa, the capital of Honduras, there were 76 Jews among a population of 65,000. There was no way of providing the twelve Jewish children with any Jewish experience or education. In San Pedro Sula, the country’s second largest city, with a population of 27,000, there were 50 Jews. The twenty children among them were similarly cut off from all facilities for a Jewish education.

**Panama**

The situation was no better in Panama. Most of the Jews lived in its two chief cities: Panama City, the capital, on the Pacific side, and Colon, on the
Caribbean. The former had about 170 Jewish families, of whom 60 were Ashkenazic, 75 Sephardic, and 35 Dutch Jews from Curacao, who were also Sephardic. Colon's 85 Jewish families were divided between 35 Ashkenazic and 50 Sephardic families.

These groups maintained separate synagogues and there was no liaison between their respective leaders. There was no Jewish school or teacher. The religious life of the communities was very inactive. While the Ashkenazim and Sephardim could muster a quorum for certain festivals and the High Holidays, or even an occasional memorial service, Temple Shearith Israel of the Curacao Jews was open only for Yom Kippur services. Nor was there any kosher slaughtering.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica boasted the highest cultural standards in Central America. Its Jewish community could make a similar claim for itself vis-à-vis the Jewish groups in the other republics of Central America. However, in this republic that prided itself on having more teachers than soldiers and police and one of the highest literacy rates in Latin America, there was more anti-Jewish sentiment than in any other Central American countries. Jews were popularly referred to as polacos, a derogatory term. Jews and non-Jews had only business contacts, but did not fraternize socially.

Of the 275 Jewish families in Costa Rica, most lived in the capital city, San José. A few score were to be found in Cartago and the two port cities, Limon on the Caribbean Sea and Punto Arenas on the Pacific. In San José there was a Jewish center. The afternoon Jewish school had thirty-five pupils, ranging in ages from six to sixteen. The teacher traveled twice a week to Cartago to teach twenty children in that town. There was no rabbi.

El Salvador

Jewish relations with the surrounding community were bright in the smallest of Central American countries, El Salvador. According to a report from Eugenio Liebes, president of the Jewish community in the capital city, San Salvador, the 200 Jews living in that republic were free of anti-Semitic experiences. Liebes assigned the very small number of Jews as one of the principal reasons, but added that the immigration restrictions in force were made necessary by the country's inability to absorb large numbers.

Official circles and the press of El Salvador were completely free of any discriminatory manifestations towards Jews. Catholic-Jewish relations were very cordial, and business relations between Jews and residents of Arabic origin, most of whom were Catholic, were very friendly. There was no social intercourse between Jews and Arabs, but there never had been any in El Salvador. The Arabs carried on no anti-Jewish propaganda.

1 See also World Jewish Population, p. 248. The disparity in the figures may be explained in part by the fact that persons who visited the country on business may have been counted in the estimate.
Economic Life

In Central America as in the rest of Latin America, Jews were making their contribution to industrialization. They pioneered in the clothing industry and in shoe manufacturing in Costa Rica. There, as well as in the other countries of that region, Jews were also importers, retailers, and, in some cases, even coffee planters. The chief economic complaint of Central American Jews was against Mexico, whose consular representatives in the Central American republics usually refused visas to naturalized citizens of these countries. This discrimination applied also to tourists wishing to visit or pass through Mexico.

Need

The supreme need of Central American Jews was for Jewish companionship both at home and with other larger Jewish communities. This was important for the adults themselves and for their children with whose future they were concerned.

JOSHUA HOCHSTEIN

MEXICO

The year under review was one of continued growth for the Mexican Jewish community, of further organization and consolidation of previous achievements. The formation of the Campaña Unida (United Jewish Appeal) was a successful experiment in collective responsibility and proof of the participation of Mexican Jewry in world Jewish affairs.

Population

Exact population statistics for Mexican Jews were not to be available until the end of 1949, pending the completion of the census being prepared by the Central Jewish Committee. Tentatively, it was estimated that there were between 20,000 and 25,000 Jews in Mexico. The numbers from Poland, Russia, Germany, Hungary, and other European countries were indeterminate, but approximate information was available concerning the Sephardic Jews. José Benbassat, the president of the Unión Sefardita de México reported 300 Sephardic families and an estimated 3,000 individuals. The bulk of the Jewish population of Mexico resided in the capital, an insignificant fraction in provincial cities and towns.

Political Events

The period was a tranquil one in the political life of the country, no overt Fascist or reactionary movement having emerged. There was a favorable atmosphere for civil liberties under the government of President Miguel Alemán, which cut the ground under reactionary attacks against the regime. The gov-
ernment's effort to achieve harmonious relations with the Catholic Church was a tremendous factor in bringing stability to Mexican political life.

The elimination of both the fascistic Sinarquistas and the Communists from the elections for the parliament due to convene on September 1, 1949, resulted in an overwhelming majority for the government party, the Partido Revolucionario Institucional, the Mexican equivalent of the New Deal in the United States. Mexican Jews participated in unprecedented numbers in the balloting.

**Economic Life**

The past year was one of economic adjustment after the period of war prosperity. The need for more home production and the devaluation of the peso were reflected in an increased production by many Jewish industrialists, in response to the government's appeal for the achievement of Mexican economic independence from foreign markets. Marginal Jewish middle-class elements suffered from the economic strain, and a trend toward the emergence of a Jewish proletariat was discernible. The establishment of a Mexican branch of ORT in order to train Jewish workers, a class previously absent from the Mexican scene, was under discussion. The need for more adequate social assistance to provide for the increasing numbers of needy Jewish families was pointed out in *Di Shtimme* by a prominent member of the board of the local Hilfsverein (benevolent society). The Hilfsverein was caring for fifty families weekly, in addition to the relief work carried on by the local branch of OSE as well as other local benevolent societies. On June 23, 1949, the president of the Unión Sefardita de México reported the existence of a similar problem among the Sephardic community. On the other hand, there was a trend for those Jews formerly engaged in commercial activities to transfer to industry.

**Intergroup Relations**

There was no official discrimination against Jews in Mexico, and Jews held important government posts. Three local Jewish schools were even granted the use of the Palace of Fine Arts for the celebration of the first anniversary of the proclamation of the state of Israel.

However, Jews suffered from the traditional Mexican identification of all foreigners as "exploiters." There was a lessening of organized anti-Semitic provocation by the Sinarquist movement, whose influence was greatest in the mining state of Guanajuato, particularly in León, in Central Mexico. A few exclusive upper-class clubs attempted to be *Judenrein*.

**Israel**

The creation of the state of Israel and the victories of the Israeli army reflected favorably in the popular Mexican mind upon the Jewish community, and were even more effective than the activities of the Comité Mexicano pro Palestina in counteracting local Arab propaganda. On the other hand, much uneasiness existed in the Jewish community concerning the government's attitude toward Israel, in view of Arab influence among high government func-
tionaries. The latter often accepted invitations to social affairs tendered by such rabid anti-Zionists as the multimillionaire Miguel Abed. Mexico failed to recognize the state of Israel, despite the efforts of the Comité Mexicano pro Palestina, until the eve of the admission of Israel into the United Nations. But the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations had not yet made an official declaration, despite the permission granted by the Mexican government for the establishment of an Israeli immigration office.

Communal Organization

The most notable progress in communal organization was the result of the activity of the Central Committee, a representative body democratically elected. The next Central Committee, to be elected in November, 1949, was to consist of thirty members, twenty-one from the Ashkenazic community and nine from the Sephardic. Working autonomously, the two sections of the plenum were to meet only to discuss and decide affairs of concern to all the Jews of Mexico. Since its election in March, 1948, the Central Committee initiated the census cited above. The Committee's Commission for Cultural Activities was responsible for an official pinkas, or community record, begun on April 25, 1948, which was expected to be of vast interest to historians of Mexican Jewry.

Religion and Education

The outstanding Jewish religious institution in Mexico was Nidje Israel, whose most recent contribution was the establishment of an old age home in Cuernavaca, a famous resort near Mexico City. Nidje Israel numbered among its many activities the supervision of the Yavne school, and the maintenance of the Jewish cemetery in Mexico City. Mizrachi maintained the Orthodox Yeshiva Etz Hayim, an afternoon school which was growing slowly but steadily. The Colegio Israelita conducted its own preparatory school and teachers' seminary, as well as a publishing department which issued a number of books and educational manuals. Seventy-five per cent of the Jewish children of school age were attending Jewish schools. Many Mexican Jews were planning to send their children to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the Hebrew Technion in Haifa.

United Jewish Appeal

The success of the Campana Unida, the local United Jewish Appeal, was important morally as well as materially. The reluctance of a few members of the community to share the collective responsibility for Israel was only a minor breach in Mexican Jewish solidarity. Local institutions, guaranteed a permanent subsidy, could devote all their efforts to the improvement of their programs.

Zionism

The Zionist influence, important in Mexican Jewish life for twenty-nine years, was felt in every communal undertaking. Contributions of Mexican
Jewry to the Jewish National Fund ranked high proportionally among those of all Jewry. Halutzim, though numerically few, were a source of considerable spiritual strength.

**Emigration and Immigration**

The Jews of Mexico felt sufficiently rooted in the economic life of the country to be indifferent to the prospect of emigration, even to Israel, which was, however, visited by many enthusiastic tourists. The immigration of Jews into Mexico was negligible.

**Culture**

Yiddish was the principal language of Jewish culture in Mexico. The Yiddish press was widely circulated. Beside the two privately owned newspapers, each of the political groups from the rightist Mizrachi to the leftist Progressives had its own organ. The publication of the Zionist Organization appeared in Spanish, for the benefit of the Sephardic community.

In July, 1948, the Central Jewish Committee began to sell cheap editions of Yiddish books, as well as Spanish volumes on Jewish subjects. During the very first month, an income of 2,000 pesos was received, a far from negligible amount. H. Kashdan’s *The History of Jewish Education in Poland between the World Wars* was published by the Shlomo Mendelssohn Fund of the Bundist Gezelshaft far Kultur un Hilf. In addition, the Tzvi Kessel Fund presented three prizes of 2,000, 1,000 and 500 pesos to authors for works on Jewish subjects, as well as publishing the volume *Shtill Zol Zayn* ("Let There Be Silence") by the local poet, Isaac Berliner. Winners during the period under review were Leo Katz for his novel *Seed Time*, published in a Yiddish translation, and the local intellectual and essayist I. Austriak for his Spanish volume *The Jewish Question and Zionism*.

The League for Labor Palestine initiated the institution of the Oneg Shabbat, Sabbath eve entertainments which became very popular, in which local writers and intellectuals, as well as distinguished visitors like Hayim Greenberg and B. Z. Goldberg of the United States, participated. The Central Jewish Committee also planned to inaugurate a Yiddish dramatic studio under the direction of Ezra Harari, who was engaged and brought to Mexico from the United States.

**SOLOMON KAHAN**

**CUBA**

Cuban Jewry felt its position more secure during the past year as a result of the establishment of the state of Israel, the stability of the government, and the favorable atmosphere of public opinion.

**Population**

The Jewish population of Cuba consisted during the period under review (June 1, 1948, through June 30, 1949) of slightly more than 10,000 inhabitants,
90 per cent of whom were concentrated in Havana. Of this number, 6,500 were Yiddish-speaking persons of Polish, Russian, Lithuanian, and Rumanian origin, 3,000 were Sephardic Jews from Turkey and the Balkans, and 800 were refugees who had arrived during and after World War II. In addition, there was a permanent colony of 100 influential American Jewish businessmen. No Jewish census had ever been undertaken in Cuba; the above figures were estimates based on the contributors to various campaigns, whose maximum number was 2,000.

Economic Life and Political Situation

The Jews in Cuba were employed principally in commercial and industrial occupations. As a consequence of the nationalistic "Cuba for the Cubans" legislation promulgated by the revolutionary regime of Grau San Martin in 1933 and still in force at the time of writing, every business establishment was required to hire 50 per cent of its laborers from the Cuban citizenry. As a result, 400 Jews who were non-citizens for a variety of reasons were forced to give up their employment as tailors, shoemakers, etc., and became small-businessmen, peddlers, and small manufacturers organized in cooperatives. Another factor contributing to the absence of a Jewish laboring class in Cuba was the seasonal nature of such employment.

Jewish industrialists were represented in the shoe industry (fewer than previously), in knit-goods, building construction, clothing, and linen industries, where they made important contributions to the Cuban economy by developing industries and producing and distributing commodities which had previously been imported into Cuba. There was also a considerable number of Jewish importers, of whom some 300 did business with the United States.

During the period under review there was a decline in the volume of Cuban business, which inevitably affected Jewish businessmen and industrialists, as well.

Unlike other Latin-American countries, Cuba had a quiet year, politically speaking. The Communists lost a great deal of the significant power they possessed in 1945, both in the government and the federation of labor. The Jewish colony, which in the Western tradition had no official political party of its own, was not affected by the anti-Communist agitation.

Anti-Semitism

There was no organized anti-Semitism in Cuba. Occasional anti-Semitic manifestations were referred by the Jewish community to the government, which quickly put a stop to them. One such instance occurred when several non-Jewish Cubans bought an hour of radio time and broadcast slanderous accusations at Cuban Jewry daily from October through December, 1948, with the intention of blackmailing the Jewish community. But at the complaint of the Jewish Center of Cuba, the Minister of Communications investigated and halted the broadcasts. At the time of writing the case was in the hands of the courts.

In July, 1949, particularly as a result of the rise of the Jewish state of Israel
in May, 1948, press as well as public opinion was favorable to the Jews. The Cubans had reacted instinctively in favor of this new independent small nation; the rally for recognition of Israel held by the Federation of Cuban University Students on June 2, 1948, is worth noting at this point. On the other hand, the opposition of the Cuban citizens of Arab origin is not to be overlooked in assessing Cuban public opinion in reference to Israel and the Jews.

Communal Affairs

On September 6, 1948, an effort was begun to coordinate all local fundraising campaigns into one united campaign to raise $500,000. Of this sum, 80 per cent was allocated to organizations which had previously conducted separate campaigns for Israel (e.g., Keren Kayemet); the remaining 20 per cent was destined for the refugee aid committee, World Jewish Congress, HIAS, ORT, and local philanthropic institutions.

Unfortunately, the campaign had succeeded in raising only half of the sum desired at the time of writing (July, 1949)—this despite the auspicious opening dinner at which $40,000 was collected in the presence of Moshe Yuval, the vice-consul of Israel in New York, and the decision of the campaign committee that all Cuban Jews were to contribute 1 per cent of their incomes. To carry out this decision, evaluation and arbitration committees were created, and individuals were required to forward their contributions directly to the campaign committee rather than wait to be asked. The committee threatened all recalcitrants with sanctions as national traitors, but failed to act on its warning, despite large-scale defections. This caused some dissatisfaction with the campaign committee. Nevertheless, in the light of poor business conditions, the campaign results were satisfactory.

Zionism

The Zionist Federation of Cuba consisted of all the Zionist groups, with the exception of the Revisionist Betar youth movement, which was small. The Federation embraced the General Zionists, Histadrut, Hashomer Hatzair, Zionist Refugees, and Women’s International Zionist Organization (WIZO), and had 400 individual members, 200 of them accessions as the result of a recent campaign. The goal was 1,000 members. Histadrut was preparing a new membership drive. Most active among these organizations was WIZO, with a membership of 1,200, and branches of Yiddish-speaking, Sephardic, refugee, and American groups. WIZO sent two representatives to the WIZO Congress in Israel in February, 1949.

Another very active Zionist organization in Cuba was the Keren Kayemet committee under the presidency of Baruch Shames. By attending public and private functions assiduously, representatives of the Keren Kayemet collected some $25,000 for Israel.

Cultural Activities, Education, and Religion

Founded on September 1, 1925, with the aid of the American Jewish Committee, the Jewish Center of Cuba was the oldest Jewish institution in that country. The Jewish Center opened a new adults’ and children’s library on
December 11, 1948, an occasion which it commemorated with a large book exhibit of all the Yiddish volumes ever published in Cuba.

The Jewish Center was the sponsor of an independent school, the largest in Cuba, with an enrollment of 360 children. The children studied Yiddish and Spanish through the sixth grade, whence they were graduated into government institutions. Second largest school was the Sholom Aleichem School of the "progressive" elements, with 80 children; a private school called The Modern Jewish School numbered about 60 children and the Theodore Herzl School (Sephardic), 100. All these Jewish schools were in Havana; there were no Jewish schools in the provinces of Cuba, where the Jewish population was 1,000.

A tragi-comic religious controversy between competing burial societies created a furor in the Cuban Jewish community and was still unresolved at the time of writing, despite the intervention of Rabbi Meyer Rosenbaum, who had been called to Cuba from the United States in 1947. The Cuban Jewish kehillah, unable to expand its membership beyond 200, also found it impossible to unravel a tangled kashrut situation.

COMMUNAL COORDINATION

The Central Council of Jewish Institutions in Cuba collapsed during this period. The "progressive elements," in an attempt to dominate the Central Council, created so many fictitious organizations that at one point the Central Council consisted of thirty-six members, mostly on paper. It was necessary in emergencies for representatives of the dominant Cuban organizations to form special committees. Such was the case during the United Campaign mentioned above.

Emigration and Immigration

During the period from December 13, 1948, to June 29, 1949, 223 Jews emigrated from Cuba to Israel. Of this number, 117 were refugees, 24 of the Cuban Jews traveled to Israel as tourists, and the remainder (82) settled in Israel. After having received preliminary training in the United States, 8 Cuban halutzim left for Israel.

Immigration to Cuba was at a standstill. During the period from 1945 to the present (June 30, 1949), only a few hundred Jewish immigrants entered Cuba, of whom only a small portion remained. On October 15, 1948, the American Joint Distribution Committee discontinued its relief activities in Havana, and asked the local community to continue to maintain 200 Jewish refugees who were unable to support themselves because of the Cuban legislation prohibiting the employment of non-citizens.

Governmental Relations with Israel

Under the leadership of ex-president Raphael Silber and the political leader, S. M. Kaplan, Israel's liaison in Cuba, the Zionist Union of Cuba was instrumental in obtaining Cuban de facto recognition of Israel on January 15, 1949,
and *de jure* recognition on March 18, 1949, although Cuba had voted against the partition of Palestine in the United Nations in November, 1947.

On May 6, 1949, the Cuban government appointed the Zionist veteran, Raphael Silber, as commercial attaché of Cuba in Israel.

**ABRAHAM J. DUBLÉMAN**

**ARGENTINA**

During the period under review, the political situation in Argentina continued satisfactory for the Jewish residents, who benefited from the affirmations of friendship by President Juan Perón. At the end of September, 1948, a law was passed in the Argentine congress granting general amnesty to all foreigners who had entered the country without the necessary visas. This allowed several thousand Jews to settle legally in Argentina and relieved many hardships.

Publicly supported by President Perón, the Organización Israelita Argentina (OIA), which dealt officially with the above problem, became a political body interested in the relationships between the Jewish community and the government. On the whole however, though there were Jews in governmental positions of importance, the Argentinian Jews did not make great efforts to secure official office, either by election or by appointment.

**Economic Situation**

Argentina suffered from the same dearth of dollars that affected all the nations of the world during the postwar period. Though it was premature to talk about an economic crisis, the situation had already affected the financial contributions of Argentinian Jews to various philanthropic causes.

**Population**

The total Jewish population in Argentina as of 1946 was 321,546, as compared with the total population of 16,000,000, or approximately 2.13 per cent; in the capital, Buenos Aires, the figures were 207,000 and 3,000,000 respectively, or approximately 7 per cent.¹ Table 1 presents an analysis of distribution of Jews in the Argentine interior, based on the study prepared by Yedidia Efron for the Jewish Colonization Association.

**TABLE 1**

**DISTRIBUTION OF JEWS IN ARGENTINIAN INTERIOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires (including La Plate and Bahia Blanca and excluding Buenos Aires proper)</td>
<td>38,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe (including Moisesville, Rosario, and Santa Fe)</td>
<td>23,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entre Ríos (including Paraná and Concordia)</td>
<td>22,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córdoba (including Córdoba City)</td>
<td>8,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other provinces (including Tucumán, Mendoza, San Juan, etc.)</td>
<td>500—2,500 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For later population estimates, see World Jewish Population, pp. 248-49.
Sephardic Community

The Sephardic community in Argentina numbered some 45,000 persons in 1946. Of this number, some 40,000 resided in Buenos Aires, comprising 21 per cent of the total Jewish population in that city. The remaining 5,000 were distributed in the provinces of Córdoba, Rosario, Tucumán, Santa Fe, and Corrientes. The majority was Middle-Eastern in origin; there were also Sephardic Jews from Morocco and a substantial number from the Balkans.

Communal Organization

Significant of the growth of Jewish community life during the period under review was the change in the title of the body originally known as the Chevra Kadisha and later as the Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina. This organization, in whose religious, social, and educational work some 38,000 Jewish individuals and heads of families participated, became the Kehila Ashkenazi, in an analogy to the all-inclusive kehillot of pre-war Eastern Europe.

Education

The problem of the general and Jewish education of Jewish children in Argentina aroused the increasing interest of community leaders and parents. Though the law permitted Jewish pupils to absent themselves from the Christian religious classes held in the public schools and the Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas (DAIA) repeatedly and publicly advocated that this privilege be exercised, the parents and children themselves were hesitant to attract attention to themselves by taking advantage of the legal exemption. Hence, many Jewish pupils were being indoctrinated in the Christian religion.

To counteract this unfortunate situation, several new Jewish schools and classes opened during the period under review. The total number of children receiving a Jewish education of some kind was approximately 10,000, of whom 7,500 were in Buenos Aires and 2,400 in the provinces—the percentage having risen above 15 per cent during the past two years. In addition, the cultural department of the Jewish Agency in Argentina established a Midrasha Ivrit, which held night classes for post-university students, and for adults. Deserving of mention were the development of the Makhon Lelimude Ha-Yahadut—the preparatory school for teachers and rabbis sponsored by the Congregación Israelita Argentina—and the Sunday classes held in the newly opened building of the Temple Libertad. In recognition of the value of Argentine Jewish education, the central office of the Jewish Agency assigned a sum up to 3.5 per cent of the net income of the United Jewish Appeal of Argentina to the local educational system.

United Appeal for Israel

Immediately after the proclamation of the Jewish state in May, 1948, the Argentinian Campaña Unida pro Israel was founded. Including the Keren
Hayesod, Keren Kayemet LeIsrael, World Jewish Congress, ORT, American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), OSE, and Bitachon, the United Appeal launched a drive which was eminently successful. Sums collected in 1948 were 800 to 1,000 per cent larger than those for any previous year. The Jewish community displayed a strong sense of solidarity, and on rare occasions applied effective moral sanctions to a small number of recalcitrant contributors.

Zionism

In an attempt to exploit the favorable atmosphere for Zionism in Argentina that resulted from the founding of the state of Israel, the Consejo Central Sionista—an inter-party organization—with the aid of the Jewish Agency unified Zionist efforts and sponsored the agricultural training and emigration of young pioneers to Israel through hachsharah and aliyah programs, respectively. Press references to Zionist activities were generally favorable; non-Jewish papers frequently devoted pages and half-pages to Zionist topics. Critica, for example, published important extracts of Trial and Error, the autobiography of Chaim Weizmann, which later appeared and was widely read in book form.

Government and Israel

Although one of the last of the nations to recognize Israel (February, 1949), Argentina's recognition evoked a thanksgiving celebration which was attended by 2,500 Jewish guests and many high government officials, headed by President Perón. Similar demonstrations and expressions of friendship on the part of General Perón ensued when Pablo Manguel was nominated Minister Plenipotentiary of Argentina in Israel. The Argentine government also received Jacob Tzur, the first Minister Plenipotentiary from Israel, whose functions were to begin in August, 1949, with all honors.

Intergroup Relations

The official attitude toward anti-Semitism was exemplified by the paragraph introduced into the revised constitution adopted in March, 1949, outlawing racial and religious discrimination. With the government taking so firm a stand, it was impossible for Nazi and pro-Nazi elements to engage publicly in their jingoistic activities. Nevertheless, the continued existence of such groups, as well as of several nuclei of Arab anti-Israel agitators, the dissemination of anti-Jewish literature such as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and the origin of a great deal of Nazi material in Argentina for distribution abroad—all these phenomena required the continuance of the defense activities of the Instituto Judio Argentino (IJA), which was founded in June, 1948. IJA attempted to enlighten the non-Jewish public through small publications and the introduction of good-will articles in the local press. IJA received considerable moral support from the government's insistence that overt discrimination would not be countenanced.
Emigration and Immigration

The founding of the state of Israel attracted some 300 emigrants from Argentina during the period under review; an equal number was studying the possibility of emigrating in the future. There was, in addition, a constant and increasing stream of tourists to Israel. Jewish immigration into Argentina was still limited to special permits for immediate relatives. It was expected that a larger number of permits would be assigned to Jewish skilled laborers with the settling of the difficulty over illegal immigrants [see above].

Personalia

Important visitors to Argentina included Eliahu Dobkin, in December, 1948, and Itzhak Gruenbaum in June, 1949 (from Israel). Eli Eliashar of Jerusalem visited during the period of the United Appeal, to call special attention to the needs of the Alliance Israélite Française school in Jerusalem. Eliashar's emphasis on the responsibility of the Sephardic community for their brethren in Israel and elsewhere aroused controversy within the Sephardic community.

Abraham Mibashan

BRAZIL

The Brazilian government's policy toward Jews was generally favorable. Native Jews were exempt from all discrimination and enjoyed full rights as Brazilian citizens. Many were in national government service. Some were granted government scholarships for study abroad. Jews frequently represented Brazil at international congresses. Jewish aliens were secure in their economic and community activities. Zionism, which had been prohibited by the dictatorship of General Getúlio Dornellas Vargas during World War II, enjoyed full freedom at the time of writing. Zionist organizations had their headquarters in the principal streets of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Porto Alegre, and frequently received favorable official attention.

Population

Informed opinion placed the Jewish population of Brazil at 100,000 to 115,000. Of this number approximately one-third resided in the capital, Rio de Janeiro, another third in São Paulo, and the remainder in smaller urban areas. The Quatro Irmãos colony, sponsored by the Jewish Colonization Association, contained approximately 1,500 Jews.

Although vital statistics were lacking, the Jewish population showed a very small natural increase. Increase through immigration was considered unlikely because of the government's unfavorable attitude to Jewish immigration. The government based its opposition on the argument that Jewish immigration would only aggravate the situation in the large, overpopulated cities, citing the meager achievements of Jewish colonization. Would-be Jewish immigrants therefore found Brazil's doors almost hermetically sealed.
TABLE 1

URBAN CONCENTRATION OF JEWISH POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Alegre</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recife (Pernambuco)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belém do Pará</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belo Horizonte</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curitiba</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there was a more liberal policy in regard to transit visas, and a stream of transitory migrants passed through Brazil en route to Argentina and other countries, leaving a very small sediment in Brazil.

Intergroup Relations

The powerful Fascist Integralist movement had been strongest among alien Germans and Poles during the peak of Nazi influence. But under the constitutional regime instituted by President Enrico Gaspar Dutra in 1946, anti-Semitism declined noticeably.

Economic Situation

The economic situation was a highly satisfactory one. The war prosperity had enabled many installment peddlers to transfer to more stable commercial enterprises and some even entered industry. The Jews were contributing considerably to Brazil's industrial development. Table 2 describes the occupational distribution of Brazilian Jewry by urban area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Area</th>
<th>Rio de Janeiro (Per Cent)</th>
<th>São Paulo (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Other Urban Areas (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Installment Sales</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Commerce</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and Employees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals and Official Functionaries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of communal background, Eastern-European Jews comprised about 70 per cent of the total, and showed preference for the various branches of commerce, with a tendency to pass into industry. German-speaking Jews with a strong preference for industry constituted about 20 per cent, while Sephardic Jews accounted for about 10 per cent and were almost exclusively in commerce. The proportion of native Brazilian Jews was not significant nor was that of the naturalized citizens.

The process of integration among these several groups was delayed by differences of language, custom, and religious ritual.
Communal Organization

Communal organization was still in a rudimentary stage in Brazil. In the larger cities there were a number of institutions: synagogues, schools, welfare societies, Zionist centers, and sports and cultural groups. Rio de Janeiro possessed over fifty such organizations; São Paulo, forty-five; Porto Alegre, fifteen; Curityba, five.

Coordination

However, all of these institutions were independent of each other and there was a lack of coordination. In recent years attempts were made to federate community life on a local scale as a preliminary to national federation. But only in São Paulo were appreciable results achieved. Forty-four societies which were making a beginning at coordinating activities comprised the São Paulo federation, which provided for the deficits of its member organizations through an annual fund drive. In 1947, this drive raised about $50,000 and in 1948 a third less. It was compensated for the loss, however, by the Brazilian United Campaign for Israel, for which the federation had suspended its separate fund-raising activity.

At the time of writing each of the member organizations of the São Paulo federation was following its own program of activities without any coordination to prevent duplication in such areas as building projects and the expansion of activities.

Federations also existed in Rio de Janeiro, Porto Alegre, and Recife. On May 29 and 30, 1948, representatives of these federations had met in Rio de Janeiro with those from São Paulo to found a Brazilian general federation. A resolution was passed to organize the other communities in the interior. However, nothing or very little was achieved in the direction of implementing this resolution. Brazilian Jewry had barely commenced the development of organized community life.

Education

Jewish education was a subject of general Jewish concern in Brazil. There were thirteen primary and two secondary schools with a total of 1,775 pupils in Rio de Janeiro. In São Paulo there were eight primary and two secondary schools, with an enrollment of 1,100 pupils; in Porto Alegre, one school with 217 pupils; in Curityba, one primary school with 110 pupils; and in Nicteroi, one with 48 pupils. Curityba and Nicteroi were typical of the smaller communities in the country.

These were all schools in which both general and Jewish education programs were conducted. As a result, some of them included a small percentage of non-Jewish students. In Curityba, there were 18 non-Jews among 110 students; in Porto Alegre, 21 non-Jews among 217 pupils. The Colegio Hebreu Brasileiro in Rio de Janeiro included 5 non-Jews in its student body of 400.

It is noteworthy that almost all these educational institutions were housed in buildings which were, for the most part, community property. S. Gelman
and L. Fleitich deserve particular mention for their generosity in making educational facilities available.

PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION

In addition to the usual financial problems, these schools faced two fundamental difficulties.

First, motivated by Brazil’s concern with national defense against foreign colonies of Germans and Japanese, Brazilian law prohibited the teaching of foreign languages in primary schools, and religious instruction was limited to two hours a week. Hence it was necessary to teach Hebrew outside of school hours.

Second, there was a pronounced shortage of teaching personnel. The number of teachers available was very small and they frequently had to divide their time among several schools. To remedy this situation, a teachers’ seminary was organized in São Paulo three years previously. In Rio de Janeiro one such seminary was opened at the beginning of the 1949 school year. The faculties of these seminaries consisted of the teachers in the local schools, who gave up their evenings to make the seminaries possible.

Religious Life

During 1948-49 there were forty-one synagogues in Rio de Janeiro, twenty-six in São Paulo, and five in Porto Alegre. There were two rabbis in Rio, three in São Paulo, and one in Porto Alegre. These three cities also had other religious functionaries, such as ritual slaughterers and circumcisers. In the smaller towns, where synagogues usually were located in the Jewish school buildings, there were no rabbis and very few other religious functionaries.

Dietary laws were observed by a small number in the three large centers, where there were several kosher butcher shops. In general, the smaller the town, the less the observance. On the other hand, such basic rites as circumcision, religious marriage, and burial were strictly observed by the large majority, although the Sabbath and festival observances were not.

There was a noticeable intensification of religious life, as evidenced in the large percentage of Jewish children attending schools of a religious character. In Rio de Janeiro they formed 23 per cent of the total enrollment of Jewish students and in São Paulo, 35 per cent.

Cultural Life

The various communities made vigorous efforts to preserve Jewish culture and to interest the younger generation in Yiddish and Hebrew literature.

There were three Jewish libraries in Rio de Janeiro, two in São Paulo, three in Porto Alegre, and one in each of the other important cities.

Some efforts were made to make Judaica accessible in Portuguese in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. Enrique Yussin founded the Jewish Book Lovers’ Club, a publishing venture which at the time of writing had issued Simon Dubnow’s abridged Jewish history, a translation of the Song of Songs, the Passover Hagadah, and a history of the Jews in Brazil. A Portuguese trans-
lation of the Old Testament was announced for early publication. Each edition included 300 de luxe copies for the subscribers of the Book Lovers' Club, a device that permitted the sale of the popular edition at reasonable prices. A collection of short stories translated from the Yiddish appeared in São Paulo, and other similar volumes were in preparation.

The Jewish press included two Yiddish weeklies in São Paulo: The Jewish Press and Our Voice. There was also a Portuguese weekly, Aonde Vamos, edited in Rio de Janeiro by Aaron Neumann. Argentine Jewish publications in Yiddish and Spanish had a wide circulation in central and southern Brazil, while in northern Brazil and in Rio de Janeiro the Yiddish press of the United States was widely read. A bulletin in Portuguese and German was published by the Jewish Religious Association, which represented the community of German-speaking Jews of Rio de Janeiro.

International Relations

Despite the fact that they belonged geographically to Latin America, Brazilian Jews did not identify themselves with the communities of the continent. Though there is little difference between Spanish and Portuguese, it was nevertheless sufficient to form a barrier between the Jewish communities speaking the two languages in Latin America.

Moreover, Brazil is geographically closer to Europe and the United States than to Argentina, which has the largest Jewish community in Latin America, and the Brazilian Jewish leaders were more influenced by Israel and the United States than by Argentina.

There was a lively exchange of visitors between Brazil and Israel. Brazilian Jewish merchants and industrialists visited Israel during the first year of its independence, and young people went to Israel, some to settle there, others to complete their education.

Almost all of the emissaries of the Jewish Agency who came to South America visited Brazil.
The Jewish community of Canada enjoyed a period of relative well-being, moderate growth, and relaxation from tensions during the period under review. Canadian Jewry was able to devote its energies to a more effective organization of the Jewish community and to the furtherance of Jewish culture.

Population

A study of Montreal Jewry being prepared by Louis Rosenberg, research director of the Canadian Jewish Congress, revealed a decrease in the rate of Jewish population growth in Montreal and, by inference, in Canada as a whole. Since the restriction of immigration from Eastern Europe in 1923, the growth of the Jewish population depended on a natural increase, which was declining, and the usual internal migration of residents from smaller Canadian centers to Montreal. This increase was balanced by a considerable migration to the United States of Canadian-born graduates from schools of higher education and colleges. However, as a result of a continued decline in the Jewish mortality rate, which had been low previously, the Jewish community was increasing slowly and aging rapidly. Other factors, such as an increase in the number of marriages since 1939, a rise in the birth rate, and the immigration during 1945, of wives and children of soldiers who had married overseas, and an increase in immigration after 1947, contributed to a rise in the population. Nevertheless, the Jewish family in Montreal was not reproducing itself, having declined from an average of 4.5 members in 1921 to 3.6 in 1941. This was also reflected in the number of Jewish children attending schools in Montreal. Although the Jewish population of the metropolis had increased by 75 per cent since 1923—from 45,845 to some 80,000—the number of Jewish children attending school had actually declined by 26 per cent, from 14,650 to 10,867.

These demographic trends also emerged in Toronto and in Canada as a whole, though not in Winnipeg or in each of the smaller communities in the country. A study of Jewish longevity in Canada prepared by Mortimer Spiegelman in 1941 and published in Population Studies, Cambridge, England, confirmed these findings.

Economic Life

In the economic sphere there was an increase in the proportion of Jewish professional men and owners of businesses. In the needle trades Jewish workers
were present in the categories of skilled and higher paid personnel, and the average income per family increased. All in all, there was a narrowing of the gap between the highest paid Jewish groups and the lower paid groups. However, Jews were not participating in the basic industries, in finance, insurance, banking, shipping, mining, etc., to any greater extent than they had in previous years.

**Intergroup Relations**

Anti-Semitism presented no immediate menace to the Jewish community. Acts of physical and open anti-Semitism were rarer than they had been at any time since Hitler came to power in Germany in 1932. No anti-Semitic propaganda appeared in media with a general circulation, nor was there evidence of any extensive anti-Jewish whispering campaign. During the federal election campaign, on June 27, 1949, Jewish candidates were nominated by several parties, but scarcely any racial or religious criticism was directed at Jews. David Croll and Maurice Hartt, K.C., both Liberals, were re-elected by their constituencies in Toronto and Montreal, respectively. The only alarming feature in the election results was the considerable number of votes polled by Adrien Arcand, the avowed Fascist and anti-Semite who was an unsuccessful contender on the National Unity party ticket for the Richelieu-Vercheres seat in the province of Quebec. He managed to emerge second in a field of four in this contest, polling 5,190 votes compared with 12,329 for the Liberal party candidate and a total of 18,362 ballots cast.

The nearest approach to political anti-Semitism in Canada during the past year was the propaganda of the Social Credit movement, particularly in Alberta and Quebec, which identified political Zionism and international finance. A Canadian publisher issued the book *From Smoke to Smother* by Douglas Reed, written in the same vein.

The statement on anti-Semitism by the London, Ontario, conference of the United Church of Canada was indicative of the attitude of all denominations in the country. The conference expressed concern about “evidence of racial prejudice and discrimination which are altogether too manifest in our society.”

**Palestine**

The issue of Palestine came close to straining favorable relationships with the Anglo-Saxon elements in Canada. However, the improving relations between Israel and Great Britain forced a more accurate appreciation of the realities of the Palestine—and therefore of the Jewish—situation and was bringing about a much more sympathetic understanding of the facts of Jewish life.

**Relations with French Canada**

Relations between the Jewish and French-Canadian communities, which in the past had been among the most serious intergroup problems on the Continent, continued satisfactory. The award of the honorary degree of Doctor of the University by the official Catholic University of Montreal to Samuel
Bronfman, national president of the Canadian Jewish Congress, was widely interpreted as reflecting this state of affairs. However, the militant campaign against anti-Semitism among French Canadians suffered a severe loss in the passing of Monsignor Henri Jeanotte of Montreal, chairman of the St. Paul diocesan committee which concerned itself with Catholic-Jewish relations.

A regrettable incident of anti-Semitism took place in the Ste. Marguerite area of Quebec when a number of Jewish businessmen were prevented from purchasing a hotel property following the open opposition of the priests in the area.

**Discrimination**

The continuing discrimination against Jews in employment, which was indicated by every analysis and survey and exposed fully by *McLean's Magazine* in the Fall of 1948, was somewhat ameliorated by the general economic situation. This discrimination did not result in any considerable unemployment among Jews and was therefore not an immediate source of resentment.

Similarly, social anti-Semitism which, in effect, excluded Jews from many circles and institutions was also accepted, because the Jewish community found its internal social and group life adequate. However, in a disturbing development, the Ontario Court of Appeals upheld a decision of a lower court which declared a restrictive covenant in the Beach O'Pines resort area near London, Ontario, to be valid. The Court of Appeals proceeded to discourage legislation which might outlaw such covenants. In this case, both the prospective purchaser and vendor undertook legal action to void the discriminating agreement and at the time of writing were preparing to carry their case to the Supreme Court of Canada. (A judgment by Justice Mackay in 1945 had ruled such covenants contrary to public policy.) Articulate public opinion on this question was divided, with a majority opposed to the sanctioning of such open discrimination. When a Jewish congregation applied for permission to build a synagogue in the Toronto suburb of York Township, its request was denied on zoning and taxation grounds. Charges were made publicly that religious prejudice was a motivating element in the decision of the municipal council.

The Jewish community in Canada did not allow itself to be deluded by the moderately satisfactory state of affairs. The programs of the Joint Public Relations Committee of the Canadian Jewish Congress and B'nai B'rith, of the National Council of Christians and Jews, and of the Joint Labor Committee, were proceeding.

**Censorship**

The distribution of the British-made film, *Oliver Twist*, in Canada was vigorously opposed by all sections of Canadian Jewry; the reports in *Life* and *Time* magazines that the Canadian Jewish Congress was uncertain on this question were strongly resented as a serious misrepresentation of the position of the community. However, on this question non-Jewish opinion was not so unanimously with the Jewish community. Even newspapers friendly to Jews
felt that the threat to freedom of speech and art involved in this issue outweighed the immediate menace of the film. Some were of the opinion that the community was too extreme and too sensitive in this matter.

Zionism

Interest in the state of Israel continued to unite the Jewish community. The increased quotas for funds for Israel were met, and Canadian Jewry transmitted $4,296,177 to Israel (including the United Israel Appeal, Youth Aliyah, Labor Zionist funds, Mizrachi, etc.), in addition to the considerable quantities of donated supplies. For the first time opportunities for investment in Israel were being promoted by corporations sponsored by Labor Zionists and by General Zionists. A not inconsiderable Canadian-Israeli trade was already under way.

In the political sphere, the Jewish community of Canada urged the Canadian Government to extend recognition to the state of Israel, and a joint delegation of the Canadian Jewish Congress and of the United Zionist Council had audience with the Secretary of State for External Affairs on this subject. Canada recognized Israel de facto on the eve of Passover, 1949; it also supported Israel’s petition for admission into the United Nations.

International Refugee Organization (IRO)

Canada was also instrumental in advancing other Jewish claims in the international area. Canada’s representative on the Executive of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) strongly supported Jewish claims for restitution of the costs of migration of Jewish DP’s to Israel, which had already been borne by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) and by other Jewish groups, and the recognition of such migration as legitimate and within the scope of IRO. This resulted, among other things, in repayment of more than $9,000,000 to the JDC.

Education

With the relaxation of external demands upon the Canadian Jewish community, increased attention was devoted to its cultural and educational needs. Generally speaking, Jewish schools had capacity enrollment and the level of education was high. The two Jewish teachers’ seminaries in Montreal were beginning to fill the need for trained teachers with a Canadian background. During 1949, the Canadian Association of Hebrew Schools conducted its second summer camp for teachers at Ste. Agathe des Monts, Quebec.

Culture

A high percentage of Jews continued to indicate Yiddish as their mother tongue in the census reports. This rate ran high in such cities with good educational facilities as Winnipeg and Montreal. It could not be said that the immigrant Jews tended to name Yiddish more often than the Canadian-born, and the economic-geographical-linguistic pattern which once showed a high
correlation between the wealthier Jews who lived in certain areas and those who considered English their mother tongue was not discernible.

The Canadian Jewish Congress enriched its archives with a collection of materials on the Jews of the Far West, secured largely through the cooperation of the Provincial Archives of British Columbia. S. Petrushka, the translator and annotator of the Mishnah, was named consultant on archives for the Canadian Jewish Congress and was pursuing his work in Israel. The late Martin Wolff left a bequest for these archives in his will. The second volume on Canadian Jews in World War II was published by the Canadian Jewish Congress.

A. M. Klein published a fragment of an elucidation of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in the literary quarterly, *Here and Now*. His volume of poems, *The Rocking Chair*, won the Governor General's Medal for Canadian Poetry in 1948. H. Hershman published a volume of Yiddish ghetto poems by Eva Rosenfarb (*Di balade fun nekhtigen vald*). Rachel Corn, the distinguished Yiddish poet from Poland who settled in Montreal after the war, published a volume of poems, *Bashertkeit*. N. Shemen of Toronto wrote a biography of Rabbi Michaelson of Warsaw, and Gershon Pomerantz of the same city published a series of chapbooks on literary and historical topics.

**Immigration**

During the calendar year 1948, there were 9,386 Jews among the 125,414 immigrants admitted to Canada (from countries other than the United States), a record exceeded only in 1907, 1912, and 1913. This total included some 800 Jewish war orphans and Jewish tailors and furriers admitted under special industrial immigration projects which were coordinated and financed by the Canadian Jewish Congress with the cooperation of the industries and labor unions concerned, the Jewish Immigrant Aid Society of Canada, and other immigrant aid groups. [See American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, pp. 290-91.]

The reception, settlement, housing of the immigrants and financing of these projects imposed a considerable strain upon the entire Jewish community of Canada, but it was carried out with marked smoothness. It is important to note that the arrival of immigrants to Canada during the past year was welcomed by practically all sections of the Canadian populace, and there was scarcely any opposition to this policy of the government. An indication of the generosity of government immigration policy during the past year was the re-admission to Canada of six Jews who had previously been deported because of illegal entry. The government also granted permission to 350 Jews who were marooned in Shanghai during the war to enter the country, and 290 of them were able to reach Canada before the fall of the Chinese city in May, 1949. Some 200 liners, a large number of whom were Jews, were brought over from Europe, together with their families.

David Rome

---

1 For complete statistics of emigration to Israel, see p. 406 ff.
A grand total of 125,414 immigrants entered Canada during 1948, as compared with 64,127 for 1947. Of the 125,414, the official government statistics attributed 46,057 to “English, Irish, Scottish, Welsh” origin; 16,957 to “Northern European Races”; 55,019 were identified as belonging to “Other Races.” Immigrants from the United States numbered 7,381. The largest single group among the “Northern European Races” were the Dutch immigrants, numbering 10,169.

“Other Races” included 13,799 Poles, 10,011 Ruthenians, 9,386 Hebrews; followed by Lithuanians, Italians, Letts, Estonians, and Magyars. Although official figures did not break down immigration from the United States according to “origin” of immigrants, unofficial information estimated the number of “Hebrews” in this category as 506. In addition, some 400 Jews entered as part of the over-all British immigration. The total immigration of Jews to Canada during 1948 approximated 10,292.

Of the grand total of 125,414 immigrants, the displaced persons' camps accounted for 47,388. Of the 10,292 Jewish immigrants, 7,103 came from the DP camps. The high proportion of DP’s among the Jewish immigrants was due to the large number of immigration projects involving Jews that matured during the calendar year 1948. Thus, 787 orphans arrived during the year under the War Orphans Project (a total of 1,010 had arrived previous to February 28, 1949). The Garment Workers Project included 1,149 Jewish tailors who, together with their families, totaled 2,439 persons. The Fur Workers Project accounted for 281 Jewish furriers, or, including their families, 655 Jews. Smaller groups of Jewish DP’s entered as lumbermen, agricultural workers, and domestic servants. Those who entered under projects totaled approximately 4,200; the remainder were largely admitted under the Close Relatives Scheme.

During the first half of 1949, a total of 53,508 immigrants entered Canada. Of these, 13,375 came from the British Isles, 3,474 from the United States, and 10,069 from countries described in the official statistics as belonging to the “Northern European Races.” Immigrants of “Other Races”—totaling 26,590, almost entirely Eastern-European and Italian in origin—included 2,640 “Hebrews.” Of the immigrants coming from the United States and the United Kingdom, an undetermined number was Jewish.

Of the 2,640 “Hebrews” listed under “Other Races” for this period, some 600 arrived under work projects, some 50 under the War Orphans Project, and the balance under the Close Relatives Scheme. The Canadian Jewish Congress estimated that of the 2,640 “Hebrews,” some 2,000 were probably DP’s.

The Canadian Jewish Congress estimated the expected Jewish immigration

---

1 Based on Manfried Saalheimer, “Immigration of Jews to Canada: Calendar Year 1948,” Information and Comment (Montreal: Canadian Jewish Congress), March, 1949, pp. 12-14.
2 Statements for the Six Months ended June 20, 1949, Immigration Branch, Department of Mines and Resources, Ottawa, Canada.
3 Letter of September 14, 1949, from M. Saalheimer of the Canadian Jewish Congress.
for the entire calendar year 1949 at about 5,000, of whom more than half were expected to enter under the Close Relatives Scheme.  

SIDNEY LISKOFSKY

GREAT BRITAIN

Any figures attempting to present a picture of the Jewish population of Great Britain must necessarily be an estimate because there is no inquiry on census forms as to the religious denominations of British citizens. However, it was generally accepted that the total Jewish population of Great Britain and Eire was 400,000, or less than 1 per cent of the total population. About 250,000 of the British Jews resided within Greater London. The other major concentrations of British Jews were in Leeds, with 25,000 Jews out of a general population of 160,000; Manchester, with 22,000 Jews; Glasgow, 15,000; Liverpool, 7,500, and Birmingham, 6,000. The rest of the Jews were distributed in approximately ninety other centers, none of which had more than 2,500 Jews, and thirty localities with less than 100 Jews.

Recognition of Israel

In the House of Commons on June 11, 1948, the government’s objection to the recognition of the state of Israel was ascribed to the desire not to disturb the status quo in favor of the Jews. It was not until six months later (January 29, 1949) that His Majesty’s Government decided to accord de facto recognition to the new state.

The intervening period was devoted to a rear guard action by the pro-Arab element in the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office remained obdurate on the question of the release of Jews detained in Cyprus. As late as December 6, 1948, the attitude of the government as announced in the Commons was that the “entry into the Jewish area of Palestine of a large number of men of military age at present in Cyprus would have created a situation markedly to the military advantage of one side.”

Early in January, 1949, the Foreign Office began to take an even stronger line with Israel. First came the British landing at Aqaba, and then the “reconnaissance” by Royal Air Force planes over the Egyptian-Israeli border during which five of them were shot down. The incident brought home to the British public the direction in which the government’s policy was leading, and it came under a fierce attack in the press and Parliament, making a change in the government’s attitude inevitable.

Release of the Cyprus Detainees

Immediately following its recognition of Israel, the government ordered the release of the Cyprus detainees. In February, 1949, Alexander Knox Helm was appointed United Kingdom representative to Israel and Mordecai Eliash came to London in April as Israel’s first representative to the Court of St. James.

4 Letter of September 2, 1949, from M. Saalheimer of the Canadian Jewish Congress.

1 See Israel and the United Nations, p. 379 ff.
The first evidence of the re-establishment of friendly relations was the opening of Anglo-Israeli financial talks early in May, 1949. They dealt primarily with the release of blocked sterling balances and the resumption of trade. After four weeks of bargaining it was announced that Great Britain had agreed to release $28,000,000 of Israel’s blocked balances at the rate of $2,800,000 monthly.

Intergroup Relations

On August 13, 1948, the London *Jewish Chronicle* observed in an editorial that “the Fascist movement is, at the moment, moribund politically.” Yet soon afterward, Professor Selig Brodetsky, president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, told the Board that the community had to deal with a considerable growth of anti-Semitism. Both these apparently paradoxical statements were true. Though the Fascist Union Movement showed no signs of growth and none of the fifteen Union Movement candidates were elected in the borough council elections in May, 1949, there was a noticeable increase of unorganized anti-Semitic sentiment. This growth may be attributed to two factors: first, the conflict between Britain and Israel in which the Jews in Israel were presented in an unfavorable light, and, second, the tremendous publicity given the tribunal which investigated charges of corruption against ministers and other government servants. Though the report of the tribunal did not confirm the sensational allegations which had been made, the fact that Jewish witnesses were involved in transactions which, though not illegal, were open to misconstruction, created widespread anti-Jewish feeling. So much so, that the attorney-general, Sir Hartley Shawcross, felt it necessary to condemn such generalizations in his concluding address to the tribunal.

In October, 1948, the Porter Committee on the reform of the law of defamation issued its report. Evidence in favor of extending the law of libel to include community libel had been given to the committee by the Board of Deputies. In its report, however, the committee considered that the law afforded as much protection as could safely be given consistent with the need to preserve free public discussion. It therefore did not recommend any general change in the existing law to deal with group defamation.

Anti-Semitic Activities

Provocative action by anti-Semites was not lacking. On Yom Kippur night, 1948, slogans were daubed outside several synagogues in and around London; street corner meetings under Fascist auspices continued and with them the usual sequel of prosecutions involving Jewish war veterans who participated in the melees which generally followed these meetings. Furthermore, two Jewish lads were beaten up in a London street on the night of April 30, 1949. When this latter incident was raised in the House of Commons, Home Secretary Chuter Ede assured the House that investigations into the incident were being vigorously pursued. Rather curiously, he added: “I have no reason to suppose that they [the attacks] were connected with racial or political matters.”

The Defense Committee of the Board of Deputies remained the central
agency of the community dealing with these matters, but it did not have the field entirely to itself. The 43 Group of Veterans still pursued an independent "activist" policy and refused to join the Deputies. For the first time, the Anglo-Jewish Association also declared its interest in this field, though it limited its announced scope to dealing with "the enemy within."

Communal Life

The common factor in practically all areas of organized Jewish communal activity was the shortage of funds. The United Synagogue, the largest and wealthiest body of its kind in the country, was unable to proceed with an ambitious scheme for community centers. Even its general budget was affected; in spite of an annual income of $620,000, it reported that it faced a serious financial situation with expenditures mounting rapidly. Financial anxiety was also expressed during the year by the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Anglo-Jewish Association, the Jewish Board of Guardians, and educational bodies. The London Board for Jewish Religious Education was forced to drop elaborate projects and reduce administrative and educational staffs. Its budget for 1948-49 was estimated at $300,000 with an income of only $220,000.

The Jewish Fellowship, which was the counterpart of the American Council for Judaism, went out of existence. The announced reason for its demise was that the objects of the Fellowship could be achieved through other existing and older bodies. Other contributing factors were the lack of support and the loss of its raison d'être after the establishment of the state of Israel.

A noteworthy communal event was the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, which was formed at a conference in 1899.

Board of Deputies of British Jews

Conflicts within the Board of Deputies of British Jews came to a head during the period under review, when the Liberal Synagogues, the Reform Synagogue, the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation, and the Union of Jewish Women, following the example set by the Anglo-Jewish Association in 1946, declined to elect deputies for the 1949 session. In all, thirteen constituents having thirty-four representatives withdrew from the Board of Deputies, depriving the Board somewhat of its non-partisan representative character. The immediate reason for the secessions was the rejection of an amendment which would empower the president of the Liberal Jewish Synagogues to certify branch Liberal synagogues to conduct marriages that would be recognized by civil law. An act of Parliament had conferred this right on the president of the Board of Deputies in 1836.

The seceders had long been complaining that the Board of Deputies was becoming merely a rubber stamp for decisions which had already been made by the majority group, known by its opponents as the "Zionist caucus." The triennial session of the Board of Deputies ended in April, 1949, with no weakening of the dominating influence of this majority group. However, the forces of what might have been previously described as the non-
Zionists rallied toward the end of the session, when amendments to the constitution were considered. Anticipating an attempt to connect the Board of Deputies with the World Jewish Congress, they endeavored unsuccessfully to secure a declaration of the Board of Deputies' independence in the constitution.

The Board of Deputies was also in difficulty in its foreign affairs activities. In order to acquire consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the Board had combined with the American Jewish Conference and South African Jewish Board of Deputies to form the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations. With the dissolution of the American Jewish Conference at the beginning of 1949, the Board was constrained to spend considerable time and effort in seeking a new American partner. Eventually, it was announced that the B'nai B'rith had stepped into the breach, though this was subject to approval by its annual convention.

At the first meeting of the new session of the Board of Deputies on June 26, 1949, the Rev. Dr. Abraham Cohen was elected president, succeeding Selig Brodetsky. Dr. Cohen, minister of the Birmingham Hebrew Congregation and a vice-president of the World Jewish Congress (British section), thus became the first rabbi to hold this office.

**Personalia**

The community suffered the loss of some notable personalities during the year under review. Dr. Samuel Krauss, who died in Cambridge, was one of Jewry's leading scholars. Lord Bearstead, industrialist and vice-president of the Anglo-Jewish Association; Lord Melchett, who in later life became a leader of British Zionism, and Dr. Ignaz Zollschan, famous anthropologist, were among those whose passing was mourned.

The Spanish and Portuguese congregation made the first appointment of a Haham since that of Moses Gaster in 1880. Rabbi Solomon Gaon, who was born in Yugoslavia in 1912 and came to London as a student in 1934, was the new chief minister.

A popular appointment with the community generally was that of Professor Selig Brodetsky as president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. In the educational sphere, too, were the appointments of Rabbi Isadore Epstein as principal of Jews' College and Isadore Fishman as education officer of the London Board of Jewish Religious Education. The Jewish community of Eire selected Immanuel Jakobovits, twenty-seven-year-old rabbi of the Great Synagogue, London, as its new Chief Rabbi to succeed Isaac Herzog, who became Chief Rabbi of Israel.

William Frankel
AUSTRALIA

Although the period under review brought some contraction in spending power and greater competition in the business world, and industrial unrest slightly retarded the development of the country, Australia was in a favorable economic position. Her export was never larger, industry was expanding, and there was actually a shortage of labor estimated at almost 150,000. Labor's situation was probably one of the best in the world.

Population

Statistics of Jewish population were available from the population census which was taken throughout the commonwealth in June, 1947. There were then in Australia 32,019 persons of the Jewish faith out of a population of 7,580,000. They were distributed as follows: 14,910 in Victoria, 13,194 in New South Wales, 2,294 in West Australia, 1,011 in Queensland, 454 in South Australia, 123 in Tasmania; and 33 in the Capital and Northern Territories.¹

These figures were not complete, for the census questionnaire made the registration of “religion” optional. Some 11 per cent of the whole population did not register their religion, and the proportion of Jews in this category was estimated to be at least as high, so that an estimate of well over 40,000 as the total number of Jews in Australia to date could be regarded as reasonable. This figure included the new arrivals after the census. More than 98 per cent of the Jewish population lived in the capital cities of the various states.

Anti-Semitism

There has been no radical change in regard to the Jewish question. There was occasional press agitation of an anti-Jewish character toward Israel, but at no time did the agitation reach alarming proportions. Nonetheless, the efforts to fight anti-Semitism were strengthened organizationally, and there was full cooperation between the representative bodies of the community and the various councils combating anti-Semitism, particularly in Sydney and Melbourne. There has also been increased activity in the councils' propaganda, including several publications concerning Israel and the new immigrants. A special federal conference on anti-Semitism was held in November, 1948, under the auspices of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, and all defense work was coordinated.

This year attention was focused upon the libel case which Fanny Reading, president of the National Council of Jewish Women, initiated in Sydney against the national press in regard to an article published in Smith's Weekly in May, 1947, accusing Youth Aliyah of supporting terrorism and coercing Australian Jews to contribute to its campaign. The case was heard in April, 1949, and was dismissed on the technical ground that the law had devised no regress against a community libel. But morally this was a clear victory for

¹ For later population estimates, see also World Jewish Population, pp. 246, 249-50.
Youth Aliyah, for the judge unmistakably vindicated this fund in his ruling. He intimated that only Parliament could remedy the situation, and the Executive Council therefore approached the appropriate authorities to legislate against anti-Semitic agitation. The enactment of such legislation was a distinct possibility in Australia whose Parliament was the first to ratify the United Nations Convention on Genocide. The sympathies of the government were unquestioned. The Minister for Trade and Commerce, for instance, banned the import of anti-Semitic pamphlets. But legislation might nonetheless be difficult.

Maurice Orbach, a member of the British House of Commons, came over to Australia in January, 1949, to assist in the campaign against anti-Semitism on which the councils cooperated in Melbourne and Sydney.

The New South Wales Council of Christians and Jews, which was founded in 1942 to improve interfaith relationships, continued dormant, there being no acute necessity for its services. There was little social anti-Semitism in Australia. Even the anti-refugee bias which was strong some years ago had lost much of its sting due to the education by the government regarding the need for immigration from non-British countries.

Shehitah

The agitation against Shehitah which flared up in June, 1947, had subsided, but because of that agitation the Victorian government intimated in June, 1949, that no kosher killing should take place in that state without the use of an approved casting pen. A reasonable period was allowed for the introduction of the pen, which was being built locally. The Jewish communities in other states, particularly New South Wales, were likely to follow suit, although no government restriction was impending.

Communal Organization

The Jewish communities of the commonwealth continued their steady progress. Under the auspices of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, commonwealth-wide conferences were held during the year on anti-Semitism, education, and immigration.

The growing concentration of the Jewish population in the major capital cities, notably Sydney and Melbourne, with some 88 per cent of the total Jewish population, was the topic of one of the Executive Council's conferences. While, for instance, in the middle of the last century some 40 per cent of the Jewish population lived in the country, at the time of writing less than 2 per cent lived outside the capital cities of the various states. The stream of recent immigration went almost entirely to Sydney and Melbourne. It was therefore decided to endeavor to direct a portion of the new immigrants to the smaller communities. For the same reason, the Victorian Board of Jewish Deputies resolved to subsidize the office of minister at Hobart, where the congregation was too weak to afford a minister. The Congregational Committee recently formed by the Executive Council planned extended cooperation among all congregations.

Both in Sydney and in Melbourne plans were on foot for the establishment
of Jewish hospitals. In Sydney the appeal on behalf of the hospital had so far yielded $180,000. It was hoped to open the Sydney hospital in about July, 1950.

The Sydney YMHA acquired and opened its new and extensive center, which was consecrated by Rabbi I. Porush and opened by Arthur A. Calwell, the minister for immigration. The B’nai B’rith also came into possession of its own home.

For the first time several local organizations in Sydney combined during the period under review for a United Charities Appeal under the auspices of the New South Wales Board of Jewish Deputies, and it was hoped that this unification would soon comprise all local efforts.

Relief

The efforts on behalf of the United Jewish Overseas Relief Fund continued, though on a smaller scale. Both clothing and food were sent abroad in substantial quantities. In Sydney, the Appeal was combined with a campaign on behalf of the Magen Dovid Adom. In the course of the year under review, the Sydney Relief Fund dispensed cash, clothing, and food to the value of over $65,000.

Religion and Education

In September, 1948, the Adelaide Hebrew Congregation celebrated the centenary of its foundation. The Perth Hebrew Congregation celebrated its jubilee. Several smaller congregations were formed in Sydney and Melbourne. The tendency was to decentralize congregational life and to build up centers in the outlying suburbs.

In the field of education, there were two notable events in an otherwise unexciting period. The first Australia-wide conference on Jewish education was held in February, 1949, in Melbourne, under the auspices of the Executive Council. The tenor of the discussion was that the present system of education, i.e., the Sunday morning and week-day afternoon schools, was inadequate and should give place to a system of Jewish day schools. All communities were urged to establish such schools.

In Melbourne, the first Jewish day school based on traditional lines, the Mount Scopus College, was opened in February, 1949, in the presence of the minister for education. The school comprised a kindergarten and the first two primary classes. The number of children enrolled was 140, but the waiting list was so large that extension of the premises was to be undertaken in the near future to enable a doubling of the present capacity. In Sydney, it was not yet possible to secure a suitable building for a communal day school, either in addition to or incorporating the North Bondi School which had been in existence for six years.

The expenditure for Jewish education increased considerably, and in Sydney the major synagogues agreed to levy a tax on their members for the purpose of education.
Youth Activity

Jewish youth activity was strengthened. The various summer schools and jamborees, and the annual interstate sports carnival, which was an important inter-communal link and particularly of great moment for the smaller communities, was held in Perth, and drew large numbers of young people from all over the country. Several youths were sent to Israel on special scholarships to be trained as leaders.

Zionism

As in the rest of the Jewish world, the events in and around Israel occupied a major place in the thoughts and activities of Australian Jewry. The rally in Melbourne on the anniversary of Israel's Declaration of Independence showed the largest attendance ever recorded in a Jewish gathering in Australia.

An added interest sprang from the fact that it was Herbert V. Evatt, Foreign Minister of Australia, who was president of the United Nations during the crucial phase of negotiations. His outstanding services for the cause of Israel from the moment the Palestine question was placed before the UN until the recognition of Israel by Australia, were fully appreciated by Australian Jewry.

In Parliament, some members of the opposition to the Labor government, criticized Evatt for championing the Israeli cause, because, they said, he thereby antagonized the Arab peoples. But the Liberal party as such did not formulate a policy antagonistic to Israel. Until Australia's recognition of Israel in January, 1949, the comments on Israel took up much space in the general press, which was often critical of Jewish aspirations. But when recognition came, it was generally accepted as a realistic conclusion.

There was much agitation in the Catholic press in favor of the internationalization of Jerusalem. In September, 1948, the Executive Council submitted a memorandum to Cardinal Norman Thomas Gilroy in reply to statements in the Catholic press regarding the Holy Places in Palestine and their alleged violation by Jews.

Australian Jewry was honored by the visit of several prominent leaders who came in connection with the various Zionist appeals. Professor Selig Brodetsky paid a short visit to Australia early in 1949 to open the United Israeli Appeal, while at the end of last year, Mrs. Rebecca Sieff and Rabbi Kopul Rosen came to Australia on behalf of the Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO) and Mizrachi.

On the whole, the appeals this year were not as successful as in 1948. The slight recession in business and the anti-climactic mood following the establishment of the state of Israel might have contributed to this decrease of support. While in 1948 the appeal yielded over $650,000, apart from $95,000 for food and clothing and special appeals for WIZO and Mizrachi, this year's Appeal had brought in only $420,000 at the time of writing and would probably conclude at $480,000.

However, some sixty societies and fund-raising organizations with a mem-
embership of about 5,000 were affiliated to the Zionist Federation of New Zealand. The Pioneer movement among the youth greatly increased, and the hachsharah farm in Victoria had to be enlarged.

Immigration

The Australian “white immigration” policy was supported in principle by all parties and was a cornerstone of the country's planning. The loopholes in the legislation which became apparent through a decision of the High Court in March, 1949, were being eliminated by new laws, and the 800 Asiatic refugees who had sought shelter in Australia during the war would have to leave the country. Oriental Jews of non-European origin, especially from India, where a considerable number wished to come to Australia, were finding it increasingly difficult to enter Australia because they were classified as Asiatics. This matter was receiving the attention of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry.

Though British immigration was preferred—the schedule provided for 72,000 British immigrants in 1949—since only limited numbers could be transferred from Britain for lack of shipping, the government extended the scope of its assisted immigration to include the European continent. Agreements were entered into with European countries for schemes of assisted migration similar to the one which had been operating for some time in regard to British migration.

International Refugee Organization (IRO)

An agreement was also reached with the International Refugee Organization for the transfer of migrants from the displaced persons camps, mostly Poles and Balts. Some 40,000 arrived in Australia during the period under review, and many more were scheduled to arrive in the near future. These migrants came under contract with the government, and had to accept the work and the location the government allotted to them for a period of two years. After that they would be free to work wherever they desired. These migrants were allotted to work of an essential character, or where the shortage of labor was most acute. This IRO scheme was expected to continue for another year.

In the period under review, more than 100 Jewish DP's came to Australia through IRO. Many of them did not understand the implications of the agreement with the government, and were disappointed that they were not necessarily given work in the neighborhood of a Jewish community, which meant, for practical purposes, in the capital cities. In several instances, however, they were sent in groups to the capital cities. In June, 1949, the Executive Council resolved to ask the American Joint Distribution Committee and Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society to press for the maximum number eligible in the IRO scheme and for the appointment of a Jewish officer to visit the camps in Europe.

Welfare Society

The general flow of Jewish migration to Australia under the permit scheme, that is, on the basis of an application by a resident in Australia or of a guar-
antee by the Australian Jewish Welfare Society, was practically on the same scale as during 1947-48. Well over 2,000 immigrants came under this scheme. An essential condition for a permit, owing to the shortage of housing, was the provision of accommodation which would not displace Australian citizens. For this reason the welfare societies established hostels, four in Melbourne, three in Sydney, and one in Brisbane. The Welfare Society was concerned not only with transportation, the securing of permits, but also with reception, assistance, and employment on arrival.

The restriction that Jewish immigrants could not make up more than 25 per cent of the immigrant passengers on any ship leaving Europe, imposed on November 15, 1948, was entirely eliminated in May, 1949, on the representation of the Executive Council, which intimated that it would keep the flow of immigration within the bounds of smooth absorption. The traveling conditions on the boats coming from Europe were often very poor, and this matter was given much publicity in the press.

Some 5,000 applications from Jews in Europe were in the hands of the Welfare Society. The figure suggested by the Society to the government as the one that could be absorbed "smoothly and harmoniously," was 3,000 per annum. The majority of the new permits were issued on the basis of a guarantee from the Society for persons who had no kin or sponsors in Australia, and the total figure of Jewish immigrants who were transported to Australia, with the help of JDC and HIAS in the postwar period was 7,500. This figure did not include the few hundred who were transported through private arrangements by plane or boat, the 80-odd children who came under a separate scheme, and the 100-odd who came with the help of IRO. A number of Jews who had been advised that this would facilitate entry into Australia, entered under the guise of other denominations. The Australian Jewish community thus increased by almost 25 per cent from 1945 to 1949.

The economic conditions of the new settlers were on the whole good, though for some, especially older people, it was more difficult to gain a foothold. But the financial responsibilities of the Welfare Society were far beyond its means, and help from abroad was necessary. The local Appeal in 1948-49 yielded in Sydney only $40,000, and $65,000 in Melbourne, where the Welfare Society combined with the Relief Fund.

OTHER IMMIGRATION

Among the migrants were also refugees from Shanghai. Only those were permitted to enter Australia who had permits. The government did not agree to permit large numbers of refugees who fled Shanghai in the wake of the Chinese war to stop over in Australia in transit to other countries.

A number of British Jews also settled in Australia; no exact figures were available. They organized themselves as the London Club in Sydney, and were preparing a program of mutual advice and help for their compatriots.

Public Relations

The question of whether Jewish immigration to Australia should be encouraged, or whether no support at all should be given, so as to force all
prospective European immigrants to go to Israel, was the subject of a vivid discussion in the Jewish press and by the Executive Council. A special immigration conference was convened to clarify the position in regard to this question, and the Executive Council and the Federation of Welfare Societies resolved in June, 1949:

... The Executive Council adheres to its policy of extending help to those Jews who desire to migrate to Australia and who, lacking private sponsorship, obtained the sponsorship of the authorized Jewish organizations abroad and in Australia.

Generally there was a much better public understanding of the newcomers than ever before. This was due to the need for a larger population which was fully understood by the nation.

Personalia

Sydney Jewry lost its most prominent Jew in Sir Samuel Cohen. Descending from one of the old Jewish families in Australia, Sir Samuel was prominent in the commercial world and a devoted worker in civic affairs. For many years he was head of the Jewish community in Sydney, president of the Great Synagogue, and president of the Australian Jewish Welfare Society in whose affairs he took an active part from the time of its inception. He was knighted in 1937 for his work as president of the New South Wales Kindergarten Union.

Zionism in Australia suffered a great loss in the death of Mrs. Ida Wynn. She was federal president of WIZO, and the most prominent woman Zionist in the country.

Israel Porush

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

The year under review was a critical period for the Union of South Africa and its Jewish community. It was the first year of office of the Nationalist party-Afrikaner party coalition government headed by Daniel Malan which defeated Field-Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts' United party government by a narrow majority in the general election of May 26, 1948. The period was characterized by political tension over the new government's policies, and by economic contraction resulting partly from the political uncertainty, partly from serious dollar and sterling deficits and the need to impose severe restrictions on imports. In the Jewish sector there was anxiety because of the Nationalist party's anti-Semitic record during the Hitler years; but this diminished as the government fulfilled its post-election assurances that there would be no discrimination against any section of the European (white) population.

Population

Figures released in 1949 from the Union's latest census (taken in 1946) give the number of Jews in South Africa as 103,435, out of a European (white)
population of 2,372,690, and a total population of all races (white and non-white) of 11,391,949.

Distribution of the Jewish community over the Union's four provinces is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Province</td>
<td>15,198</td>
<td>14,195</td>
<td>29,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>5,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transvaal</td>
<td>33,337</td>
<td>32,179</td>
<td>65,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Free State</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,083</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,352</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,435</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ten years since the 1936 census, the Jewish community has increased by 14.1 per cent (as compared with a total European increase in the same period of 16.5 per cent). Jews constituted 4.4 per cent of the total European population in 1946, as against 4.52 per cent in 1936.

**Political Developments**

The issues on which the general election of May 26, 1948, was fought were outlined in Vol. 50, p. 297 ff. of the *American Jewish Year Book*. The Jewish question was not among them, and the election was free from anti-Semitism.

Soon after the new government took office, it caused high feeling, particularly among ex-soldiers, by granting amnesties to four men jailed for sabotage and treason during the war—among them the rabidly anti-Semitic Robey Leibbrandt—and several public protest meetings against the government's action were held. In the parliamentary session in August, 1948, the new Prime Minister, Daniel Malan, voiced the Nationalists' resentment of the charges of pro-Nazism leveled against them at these meetings, and also in the election campaign. Much press comment, in South Africa as well as abroad, had tended to condemn the Nationalists in terms of their wartime attitudes, when their opposition to the war, motivated by isolationist and anti-British rather than pro-Nazi sentiments, often seemed indistinguishable from pro-Nazism. On the other hand, the reactionary nature of the policies which the Nationalists introduced at the new government's first parliamentary session scarcely helped towards a more accurate assessment. The Smuts administration had introduced a state-aided immigration scheme; the new government withdrew the state aid and set up "screening" machinery which in effect reduced immigration (particularly from Britain). Social Welfare and Public Works programs were curtailed. Under the slogan of *Apartheid* (segregation) the new government enacted a stronger segregation policy toward non-Europeans (non-whites). All Union governments had based their non-European policy on segregation; but the Nationalists envisaged more extreme measures than their predecessors.

Under the existing legislation, colored people (half-castes) had a vote on
the common roll, and natives (Negroes) had proxy representation through three European members of the House of Assembly and four European senators. The Nationalists wanted to remove colored voters from the common roll and withdraw the representation of natives in the Assembly. The provisions for this representation were, however, entrenched in the South African constitution by a clause providing that they could be altered only by a joint session of both houses of parliament, at which the alteration would have to be approved by a two-thirds majority. The Nationalists believed that the government could effect the change by a simple majority. Finance Minister N. C. Havenga and his Afrikaner party (which participated in the Nationalist government) were opposed to this; Havenga at the Afrikaner party conference in November, 1948, declared his stand on the constitutional provision. In order to avoid a cabinet split and the fall of the government, the Nationalists were compelled to defer this particular proposal.

Differences also developed between the Nationalists and the Afrikaner party in regard to the Provincial Council elections, held on March 9, 1949, and as a result the Afrikaner party did not participate in this contest. The election therefore became a straight fight between the Nationalists and the United party-Labor opposition. The campaign was conducted with all the fervor of a general election, and was marked by high feeling, and even by some cases of violence at election meetings. The outcome was that the opposition managed to recover a small margin of lost ground, as compared with the general election; but in general it confirmed the Nationalist victory of May, 1948, and showed that this had not been a freak result. It also showed that in practice the abstaining Afrikaner party did not have substantial mass support, and this fact was responsible for an improvement of relations between the two government parties after the provincial contest. At the time of writing, the Nationalists were urging the Afrikaner party to merge with the Nationalist party; there were conflicting reports on the likelihood of this eventuating. Next to Malan, Havenga was the strongest member of the cabinet; and because of his known moderation and previous ministerial record, he commanded the highest prestige abroad. This placed him in a position of independence which he could maintain if he chose.

In June, 1949, further political tension was aroused in the country by the introduction of a new citizenship bill, the central objection to which was taken on the ground that it radically changed the basis of citizenship for British immigrants to South Africa, and abolished common British Commonwealth status. Notwithstanding its small majority and the public protest, the government pushed the bill through parliament, and though it made some concessions in the face of the opposition, refused any retraction of the main provisions referring to British immigrants.

**Governmental Attitude to Jews**

In none of these controversial measures and projects, however, was there anything affecting Jews as such. When, in July, 1948, a deputation from the South African Jewish Board of Deputies called upon the new Prime Minister to ask for clarification of the government's attitude to the Jewish community,
Malan in reply stated that both he and his government stood for a policy of non-discrimination against any section of the European (white) population in South Africa. He looked forward to the time when there would be no further talk regarding the so-called Jewish question in the life and politics of this country. In the year that followed, the government acted in terms of this assurance.

**Jews in Public Service**

There was no anti-Semitism in parliament during the year and there was no anti-Semitism in the Provincial Council election campaign of March, 1949. Twelve Jewish candidates were returned in the elections—ten for the United party and two for Labor. Of these, seven were returned unopposed, three defeated Nationalists by very substantial majorities, and in the remaining two constituencies Labor and United party Jewish candidates scored decisive victories over Jewish opponents who stood as Independents. One of these Independents, I. Frank of Cape Town, was associated with the efforts by J. Nossel to woo Jewish support for the Nationalist party (See *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 50, p. 304). Nossel continued these efforts during 1948-49.

Jews continued as before to play their full part in public life. Several Jews held mayoralty office in various towns and others were elected to local governing bodies. In August, 1948, the government appointed two well-known Jews—A. Schauder, ex-mayor of Port Elizabeth, and M. L. Hanson—to the National Housing and Planning Commission. Two Jews also figured in the current year’s appointments to the rank of King’s Counsel, while one Jew was appointed an acting judge.

However, the Jewish community was disquieted by the anomalous constitutional position of the Transvaal provincial division of the Nationalist party. During the Hitler years, this division had written into its constitution a clause barring Jews from membership. The other provincial divisions of the Nationalist party did not have such a clause, and when the new government came to power, it was thought that the Transvaal division would withdraw this clause at its annual congress in November, 1948. But no such step was taken, and at the Jewish Board of Deputies’ Congress in May, 1949, much criticism was directed at this position.

It was reported that Nationalist leaders had taken note of the discussion at the Deputies’ Congress, and that there were some who favored the withdrawal of the Transvaal ban. But at the time of writing, nothing had been done to alter the situation.

**Anti-Semitism**

There was little overt anti-Semitism during the year, but the following instances should be recorded.

On December 24, 1948, Robey Leibbrandt, granted an amnesty in June, 1948, from a prison sentence for wartime treason, caused a disturbance at a Christmas celebration in Parys by interrupting the proceedings and delivering an anti-Semitic harangue. In the trial that followed, he made various
anti-Semitic statements in the course of conducting his defense. Leibbrandt was acquitted for lack of corroborative evidence, though the magistrate deplored his anti-Semitic remarks. On January 4, 1949, the Board of Deputies drew the Prime Minister's attention to the perturbation caused in the Jewish community by this anti-Semitic outburst. Malan expressed his regret, but added that the government had no control over Leibbrandt's private activities.

In February, 1949, J. Larrat Battersby, a grandson of the founder of the famous hat firm, came from England to settle in South Africa. This Battersby was an ex-Mosleyite who had been interned in England during the war. He established a quarterly journal in Pretoria, called The Nation, whose first issue, blatantly Nazi and anti-Semitic, appeared in May, 1949. The question of how Battersby came to be admitted to the Union was raised in parliament. The Minister of Justice, C. R. Swart, replied that he knew nothing of the details, but if Battersby "proves a danger to the state and if he incites feeling or causes uproar, I'll certainly deal with him."

R. K. Rudman of Edendale, Natal, who had been active in Fascist movements since the early 1930's, continued his dissemination of anti-Semitic material. Rudman had his own printing press, and was associated with the so-called "Aryan Book Store" which, he claimed, worked in conjunction with similar businesses elsewhere in the world. Books published included the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and other anti-Semitic publications.

South Africa and Israel

Just prior to the general election of May, 1948, the Smuts government had granted de facto recognition to the newly proclaimed state of Israel. During the new government's first parliamentary session, in September, 1949, the Prime Minister, in reply to a question by Morris Kentridge, a member of parliament, said that his government would continue the previous administration's policy and commitments on Israel. In response to the request of the United Nations Mediator, the government forbade the export of war materials to Israel.

No interference was made with the shipment by South African Jews of non-military material to Israel, however; on the contrary, both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense approved a $1,200,000 shipment of goods to Israel in August, 1948. The shipment was sponsored by the South African Zionist Federation, and assistance was given by the Union Customs Department in working out the arrangements for the cargo, which included tinned foods, dehydrated vegetables, boots, blankets, and clothing.

The first anniversary of the establishment of Israel was celebrated in South Africa with a series of special functions in May, 1949, and at the main event, held in Johannesburg on May 3, the guest of honor was the Minister of Transport, Paul Sauer. This was the first occasion since the general election that a minister of the new government had officially attended a Jewish function, and political importance was attached to it. In his address, Sauer brought greetings from the Union government to Israel, and looked forward to expanding trade between South Africa and Israel.

The same night, Field-Marshal Smuts, as the last surviving author of the
Balfour Declaration, was the guest of honor at a parallel celebration in Cape Town, and was thanked for the understanding and support he had always given Zionism.

The Administrator of the Transvaal sent greetings on behalf of that province to a Pretoria celebration on the Israeli anniversary.

At the final UN session on the admission of Israel to the United Nations, South Africa voted in favor of membership for Israel, and following upon Israel's admission, the Union government replaced its de facto recognition of Israel with de jure recognition.

In June, 1949, S. Hirsch came to South Africa on behalf of the Israeli government to discuss with Union government heads a large-scale purchase of South African cattle.

The Israeli government appointed a consular representative to South Africa on July 14, 1949. No reciprocal South African consular representation in Israel had yet been announced at the time of writing.

Communal Organization

The further consolidation of South African Jewry as an independent community, in progress since the war years, found its expression at the Congress of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies in Johannesburg in May, 1949. The Congress was attended by more than 350 delegates from all parts of South Africa. Special sessions were devoted to consideration of the relations between South African Jewry and Israel, the South African political situation, communal organization, fund raising.

RELATIONSHIP TO ISRAEL

On the subject of relations with Israel, a full and frank discussion took place, and it was recognized that while South African Jewry would continue to give the utmost possible support to Israel, the community's political allegiance would be undividedly to South Africa, and there could be no question of any kind of political affiliation or interference with Israel, whose policies would have to be decided exclusively by its own government and citizens. Nor could there be any question of the "liquidation of the Galut." Jewish communities would continue in their various lands, their members, citizens, integrated in those lands.

UNITED APPEAL

This meant a strengthening of the communal structure, and the cultivation of native institutions for the promotion of communal living and culture, education, and research. Stress was laid upon the need for greater coordination in fund-raising programs as well. In 1948, for the first time in South African Jewry, the experiment of a united campaign was tried in relation to Zionist and overseas relief needs, through the Israeli United Appeal. That experiment proved successful and delegates to the Congress of the Board of Deputies voted for the retention and extension of the united appeal principle. It was decided to institute a system whereby overseas and domestic needs would be met by alternating annual united fund-raising campaigns.
The first united campaign for the domestic needs of South African Jewry was to be launched in the Fall of 1949, and allocations were to be made from the proceeds to the Board of Deputies, the South African Board of Jewish Education, the Cape Board of Jewish Education, the Union of Jewish Women, and other organizations of national scope. Special provision was also to be made for the needs of the small country communities which were not able to meet adequate communal budgets on their own limited resources.

Plans were laid at the first national conference of the South African ORT-OZE in Johannesburg from May 25 to 27, 1949, to expand ORT vocational guidance and training work in South Africa. The conference was attended by A. Syngalowski, veteran ORT leader, who also addressed the Board of Deputies' Congress on ORT work during his visit to South Africa. During a brief visit to Cape Town, Syngalowski met leading members of parliament, including the Minister for Health and Social Welfare, A. J. Stals, who expressed deep interest in Syngalowski's report on ORT reconstructive work in Europe and in Israel.

South Africa was visited during this period by A. L. Easterman, political secretary of the World Jewish Congress, who endeavored to secure the Board of Deputies' affiliation to this body, and a contribution to its funds. The Board decided that it was not prepared at this stage to become affiliated to the World Jewish Congress, but agreed that South African Jewry should make a financial contribution to the work being done by the Congress. It further resolved to send a delegation overseas in order to investigate the obstacles to Jewish unity in the international field, and endeavor to assist unification of representation. After the return of this delegation, and on the basis of its report, the Board would decide its future attitude to the World Jewish Congress.

**Religion**

Constructive development in the field of religion was hampered by rabbinical and regional rivalries and by congregational quarrels (one of them involving legal action) of too parochial a character to detail here. The [South African] Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations was the subject of controversy between the Cape and Transvaal provinces, and the question of "chief rabbinates" was also a cause of division. While attempts were still being made by the Board of Deputies to secure agreement in connection with the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations (involving *inter alia* the problem of a representative Chief Rabbinate), the Federation of Synagogues in the Transvaal announced the appointment of Chief Rabbi L. I. Rabinowitz of Johannesburg as chief rabbi of the Federation as well. The South African Jewish Ecclesiastical Association (a predominantly Cape body) followed with an announcement that Chief Rabbi I. Abrahams of Cape Town was also chief rabbi of the Association. Both announcements were the subject of criticism in the community, and at a meeting of the Board of Deputies in July, 1949, I. A. Maisels, the newly elected chairman of the Board, said that "the recently announced appointments of two chief rabbis functioning in different areas in South Africa was a matter of concern to the community as
a whole.” He emphasized that the controversy did not revolve around any particular personalities, but expressed doubt as to whether “the cause of congregational unity would be advanced by these appointments.”

On the constructive side, progress was recorded in a number of congregations, notably in the two main cities of Johannesburg and Cape Town. The United Hebrew Congregation of Johannesburg decided to engage an additional minister to help Chief Rabbi L. I. Rabinowitz cope with his expanding work; it also resolved to extend the premises of the Yeoville Synagogue. The Oxford Synagogue, affiliated with the United Hebrew Congregation, began the construction of its communal hall, whose foundation stone was laid by W. Nicol, the Administrator of the Transvaal, on May 3, 1949. This congregation represented one of the most progressive developments in the Jewish religious field in South Africa. Conceived as a planned community center, it aimed to provide for all aspects of communal activity—spiritual, educational, cultural, and social—grouped round the synagogue.

Another constructive feature in the religious field was the further importation of leading overseas ministers for the strengthening of congregational life. Chief of these appointments was that of Dayan M. Swift, of London, by the Berea Hebrew Congregation of Johannesburg, which this year celebrated its silver jubilee.

The Reform movement in South Africa registered consistent progress during the year and made a valuable contribution to social welfare work through a school for native children in Johannesburg, which was warmly praised by the Mayor at the opening of its new premises in January, 1949. Rabbi M. C. Weiler, chief minister of the Reform movement in South Africa, was elected a vice-president of the World Union for Progressive Judaism at its sixth international congress in London during July, 1949.

Educational

The steady progress of the last few years in the Jewish educational field was maintained during the period under review, despite regional differences (already referred to) hindering the achievement of an over-all unification effort. At the end of November, 1948, the Linksfield Hebrew Educational Center was opened in Johannesburg. An undertaking of the South African Board of Jewish Education, this center comprised a nursery school, a preschool and a junior school, and was part of the plan for educational institutions conceived by Rabbi J. L. Zlotnik, director of the South African Board of Jewish Education. Rabbi Zlotnik resigned from his post in February, 1949, in order to settle in Israel, where he became president of the Israeli Institute of Folk-Lore. In June, 1949, the first graduation of Hebrew teachers trained in the seminary established by Rabbi Zlotnik in Johannesburg took place, and the rabbi had the pleasure of presenting diplomas to the ten graduates, some of whom were to study further and qualify for the Jewish ministry. Rabbi Zlotnik was succeeded in office by I. Goss, previously assistant director of the South African Jewish Board of Education. Goss was the first South African-born person to be appointed to the senior position.

In the Cape province progress continued under the Cape Board of Jewish
Education, which in March, 1949, appointed A. Moar its director, in succession to the late A. Birnbaum, who died in 1948. Moar was a Palestinian educator who came to South Africa at the invitation of the South African Board of Jewish Education.

Cultural programs carried out during the year included Jewish book festivals in Cape Town and a number of other centers, and lectures and seminars on a wide range of subjects.

**Overseas Relief**

Relief work on behalf of shattered European Jewry remained in the forefront of communal activity. This work was channeled through the South African Jewish Appeal (SAJA), which worked in partnership with the American Joint Distribution Committee. The Appeal's relations with the JDC formed one of the chief topics of a special conference of the SAJA National Council, held in Johannesburg on September 25 and 26, 1948, and attended by representatives from all over the Union. A full report was delivered by M. J. Spitz, national chairman of the SAJA, of a mission to the United States, Britain, Europe, and Israel he had carried out to investigate problems of relief administration. The SAJA urged the JDC to call an international conference of all Jewish relief bodies to discuss future policy and eliminate overlapping. The JDC agreed to the need for this conference, which took place in Paris in November, 1948, and at which the South African delegation, headed by Spitz, H. Sonnabend, and M. Greenstein, played a valuable part.

A major development in South African Jewish relief activities during the period under review was the Israeli United Appeal, a partnership between the SAJA and the South African Zionist Federation. The Appeal was for Israeli and European needs, with the main share of funds going to Israel. This Appeal ran continuously through 1948-49, and achieved outstanding results—so much so that the National Council of SAJA, reviewing the campaign on February 21, 1949, urged the permanent adoption of the united campaign system. The Israeli United Appeal was conducted by a special National Council, which included representatives of both SAJA and the South African Zionist Federation, and of which Leo Tager was appointed national chairman. Tager introduced new organizational techniques which increased the scope and effectiveness of the Appeal.

The South African ORT-OZE, mentioned above in relation to local welfare, made a valuable contribution throughout the year to relief work. Its chairman, Rabbi M. C. Weiler, carried out a visit to Europe and attended the World ORT Conference in Paris in August, 1948, at whose invitation he went on a special mission to the Jews of North Africa.

**Zionism**

Work for Israel in this predominantly Zionist-orientated community went on apace during the period under review.

In addition to the shipment of goods in August, 1948, mentioned above, a number of South African Jewish institutions made loans to Israel from ac-
cumulated funds during the year. The Johannesburg Chevra Kadisha approved a loan of $1,600,000, and the South African Jewish Orphanage a like amount. A number of other institutions approved smaller loans. These loans were routed through the South African Zionist Federation.

The South African Zionist Federation celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in December, 1948, and its organ, the Zion Record, its fortieth anniversary.

During the year, a number of Israeli personalities visited South Africa on Zionist missions. These included L. A. Pincus, a former South African and now a staff member of the Israeli administration; Mrs. Hadassah Samuel, chairman of the Israeli Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO) Executive; and Mrs. Ziporah Rubens of Tel Aviv. Correspondingly, a number of South African Zionist leaders visited Israel on Zionist work. These included Bernard Gering, chairman of the South African Zionist Federation; M. J. Spitz, national chairman of the SAJA; and J. Daleski and H. Hurwitz, who attended the Revisionist conference in Tel Aviv on behalf of the Revisionist party in South Africa.

Several well-known South African Zionists left the Union permanently during the period under review to settle in Israel. Chief of these were Mrs. Katie Gluckmann, for years chairman of the Jewish National Fund in South Africa, and David Dunsky, an executive member of the South African Zionist Federation.

Six former South Africans who had previously settled in Israel occupied leading positions in the Israeli government service. These were: Arthur Lourie (Israeli consul to the United States), Aubrey Eban (United Nations delegate), Michael Comay (chief of the commonwealth section of the Israeli foreign office), Louis Pincus (secretary to the Israeli department of communications), Harry Levin (Israeli consul-general to Australia and New Zealand) and Lionel Feitelberg (assistant director of the Israeli foreign press division).

Appointments

Appointments conferred upon Jews during the year included the following: Dr. Ludwig Lachman, formerly of Hull University, England, appointed professor of economics at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg; Dr. Wolfgang Yourgrau, formerly of the School for Higher Studies, Jerusalem, appointed lecturer in philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand; B. Beinart, formerly of Rhodes University College, Grahamstown, (South Africa), appointed professor of Roman law and jurisprudence at Cape Town University; Gerald Gordon (Cape Town) and J. J. Friedman (Durban) appointed king's counsel; Edgar H. Henochsberg (Durban) appointed acting judge, Natal Division of the Supreme Court.

Necrology

South Africa and its Jewish community suffered heavy losses during the year through the death of outstanding personalities. The nation mourned in the death of Jan H. Hofmeyr, a leading member of the previous government, a Christian liberal and a pro-Zionist.
In the Jewish community, losses included such prominent personalities as Arie Birnbaum, director of the Cape Board of Jewish Education; David Mierowsky, director of the United Hebrew Schools of Johannesburg; Samuel M. Gordon, veteran Zionist worker; Isaac E. Judes, South African Revisionist Pioneer; Miss Mary Kuper, director of the Johannesburg Legal Aid Bureau; Victor Rosenstein, barrister and communal leader; Dr. Wulf Sachs, pioneer South African psychoanalyst; Dr. David Landau, chief of the Union health centers at Durban; and Mark Summerfield, founder of the South African Jewish Ex-Service League.

EDGAR BERNSTEIN
Western Europe

INTRODUCTION

The status and future of the Western European Jewish communities was rapidly assuming a definite shape and form in the period under review. This region, consisting of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Italy, Sweden, Norway, and Greece, had in 1948-49 a total population of some 125,000,000, of whom about 400,000, or approximately .32 per cent, were Jewish. Large-scale emigration was practically at an end, and the movement that existed was fairly well-defined. The question once hotly argued as to whether or not Jews should remain in Europe had been settled by reality and the Jews themselves. There were Jewish communities, and there would continue to be such communities. It was now possible to measure with some accuracy the Jewish civic, economic, and legal position, as well as to evaluate the internal life of the various Jewish communities in Western Europe.

In Western Europe there were two fundamental problems which faced the communities. The first was the major necessity of creating central communal bodies with a leadership capable of giving their membership a sense of status. The second necessity was for the knowledge of the techniques with which to build those healthy social and religious institutions which unite a community.

Influence of Israel

The year under review started only two weeks after the proclamation of the independent state of Israel in May, 1948, and covered the entire period of Israel's victorious struggle against the seemingly superior forces of invaders intent on destroying it. This struggle captured the imagination of Western-European Jews and helped restore to them the self-respect that had been shaken by the record of Jewish martyrdom under the Nazis. Israel seemed the primary answer to the needs of displaced European Jews for emigration. But at the time of writing an end was expected in the near future to the large-scale emigration of European Jewry to Israel which began with the independence of Israel. News of the economic difficulties in Israel had caused large numbers to adopt a waiting attitude. A continuation of this attitude toward Israel was expected to have important psychological effects particularly on Dutch and Belgian Jewry, who were faced with the need to rebuild their life in their native countries.

The fact of Israel also presented short-range problems of an external and defensive nature. These problems revolved around the issues of the Holy
Places and the Arab refugees, which were acute in countries like France and Belgium where Catholicism was strong and active. Pending an actual solution of these problems, much depended on skillful public relations by Israel to prevent its opponents from winning the battle for world public opinion by default. Another immediate problem was the resentment felt in the Scandinavian countries over the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator, by Jewish terrorists in Israel. Swedish Jews felt that in some measure they were being held responsible by Swedish public opinion. They hoped that with the passage of time their former good relations with the rest of the Swedish population would be restored.

FRANCE

Between the Summer of 1948 and the Summer of 1949, France made political and economic progress to an unexpected degree. The “Third Force” government of Prime Minister Henri Queuille, having assumed the conduct of affairs in September, 1948, was still in power almost a year later as a coalition of the parties of the Center. The strength both of General Charles de Gaulle, on the right, and of the Communists, on the left, seemed to be waning slowly.

No class of the population was content with its economic lot, but none could deny that conditions had improved. In September, 1948, the black-market exchange rate of francs for dollars had been about 500 to 1; by July, 1949, the black market in dollars had practically suspended operations, and the official rate of about 320 to 1 was approximately the going rate.

The French Communists continued to count on the support of from one-fifth to one-fourth of the French people, and on a rather smaller proportion within the Jewish community. The Communists had several important advantages in their efforts to dominate the life of the Jewish community, and their failure to do so needs to be specially noted. The Communists had played an important part during the three years of resistance to the Nazis during the occupation; the record of the Soviet Union and Soviet satellites in behalf of Israel during 1947 and 1948 in the United Nations could be cited in all appeals for Jewish support; the Communists sedulously labeled all their opponents, of the left and the right, as anti-Semites, inventing or magnifying anti-Semitic incidents to lend plausibility to this label. Yet, despite all these factors in their favor, the Communists had a relatively smaller following among French Jews than among all Frenchmen. In part, this was to be explained by the fact that Jews had proportionately fewer industrial workers than the French population as a whole, and in France the Communist party had a strong proletarian base. Another important reason for this failure lay in the growing tension between Israel and the countries within the Soviet sphere of influence. In addition, those French Jews with a particularly strong interest in Yiddish culture were outraged by the Soviet Union’s liquidation of its most prominent Yiddish writers, and the closing down of the last remnants of a Yiddish press in that country.¹

¹ See Soviet Union p. 337.
Communal Activities

Though France contained Western Europe's largest Jewish community, with a population of about 250,000, French Jewry was without a central organization to give direction to its efforts. There was a plethora of Jewish organizations, but none to speak in behalf of all the Jews of France, and none to explain the Jews in France to the non-Jews. The pressures of war and persecution had forced the establishment of such a combined group in 1943, Le Conseil Représentatif des Organisations Juives de France (CRIF), but CRIF had made no real impression upon the community, because the various conflicting ideologies and groups within it neutralized one another, and at the time of writing it was practically defunct. In June, 1949, an agreement was reached by the major non-Communist organizations of French Jewry for an annual fund-raising campaign, called Fonds Social Juif Unifié in support of French Jewish philanthropic and cultural enterprises. It was expected to begin functioning in October, 1949, and would not include fund-raising for Israel during its first year. The American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) had worked hard and long for this agreement, and it came at a time when the JDC had reduced its expenditures in France to a fraction of what they had been immediately after the war. There was hope that the Jewish community had attained sufficient stability and prosperity to support its own communal institutions, despite the barriers of the cultural and ideological divisions within French Jewry. The cultural division consisted of that between native French Jewry and the immigrants. The former had for generations sought the complete assimilation within the homogeneous French cultural pattern which was the price of full acceptance into French society. The trend to assimilation which had been halted by the war seemed to be rising again. It was estimated that more than 25 per cent of the marriages of French Jews outside of Paris were with non-Jews during this period. The immigrants, on the other hand, were Yiddish speaking, the majority from Eastern Europe, with a strong attachment to Yiddish culture. Interest in Israel had served for a time to unite nearly all the elements of the French Jewish population, though Zionism had never been popular among the French Jews before the war.

But this temporary unity was breaking down during the period under review. In August, 1949, the Communists withdrew from the joint fund-raising efforts for Israel, citing as their reason the alliance of the Haganah Committee with the “treacherous warmongers” and “plutocrats” in the United States and other “imperialistic countries.” Earlier, in February, 1949, Eliezer Kaplan, Israel’s Minister of Finance, declared that the government of Israel recognized “Aid for Israel” as the sole French fund-raising agency for Israel.

This split within the unity front for Israel was a reflection of the three-way ideological split. The Union des Sociétés Juives de France was the organization of the Communist-directed groups. Admittedly the most active element in the Jewish community and organizationally strong, it succeeded in making itself heard out of all proportion to its numerical strength. Every effort initiated by the Union followed the Communist party line.

The Fédération des Sociétés Juives de France, though not a political group,
was the pro-Zionist representative of the Eastern-European immigrant Jews. The Fédération, an anti-Communist amalgamation of some 120 religious, cultural, and welfare organizations, was a “Third Force” in French Jewish life. The majority of the member groups retained full freedom of action, and four-fifths of the Fédération’s fund had come from the JDC, not from local French sources.

The native French population played no significant role in either the leftist Union or the Zionist Federation. The Consistoire Central, whose activities had been confined to religious matters since 1906, numbered only 3,000 to 4,000 members. However, its new president, Guy de Rothschild, hoped to revive the influence of the Consistoire. The Alliance Israélite Universelle was limited in its activities to educational work in North Africa, other Moslem countries, and Israel.

Economic Life

On the whole, the Jews in France had made a more or less satisfactory economic adjustment since the liberation of France, and the Eastern-European immigrants had been aided by French liberality in granting work permits. Jewish groups in France had sought no special restitution laws; application of the general restitution laws involved so much red tape and delay that many claimants had given up in discouragement.

The community was still unable to take care of its own relief burden, and it had been borne for the most part by the JDC until June, 1949. There was at the time of writing a hard core of some 5,000 persons on relief, and an equal number of transients receiving some cash relief from the JDC. In addition, there were approximately 3,000 children in orphanages, the largest number of whom would eventually emigrate to Israel. There was a need, in addition, for more old-age homes.

Intergroup Relations

French tolerance was traditional, and there was little overt organized anti-Semitic activity in France, although Hitler’s propaganda had left an impression in the minds of many Frenchmen. At the time of writing, there were five or six publications of a collaborationist and anti-Semitic character whose circulation ranged from a few thousand to forty thousand. The French government was active in attempting to suppress this literature, as well as the organizations that sponsored them. At the request of Jewish organizations, the government agreed in February, 1949, to investigate the financial support for these publications. In the same month, Jules Moch, the Jewish Minister of the Interior, brought the newspaper Unity to court for publishing an article urging that all Jewish government ministers be deported to Israel. In March, 1949, the Ministry of Education instructed all teachers to read to their classes the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Teachers were asked to stress the clauses directed against racial and religious discrimination.

There were two important sources for strained intergroup relations. The first was the campaign of propaganda and diplomatic influence conducted by
the Vatican and by French Catholicism for the removal of the Holy Places in Palestine, together with their environs, from Israel sovereignty. There were constant allegations by such noted French Catholic scholars and writers as Louis Mainsignon of Le Collège de France, and Paul Claudel and François Mauriac that the Israel authorities were mistreating Catholic clergy and laity, that sacred edifices and sites had been wantonly damaged by Israel soldiers with the connivance of their superiors, and that no redress had been made and no satisfactory assurances for the future given. Efforts were made to convince leaders of Catholic opinion in France that the charges were either unfounded or greatly distorted. There was alarm among the Jewish leadership in France over the possibilities of the resurgence of a religious anti-Semitism in which Zionism would figure as the anti-Christ.

Another large factor aggravating organized anti-Semitic sentiment were the demands made by individual French Jews for restitution. In March, 1949, the French police were reported investigating two groups formed for the purpose of combating restitution: the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights, Compensation, and Amnesty, and the Union of Civic Victims. The existence of these groups reflected the lack of interest of the French government in the prosecution of Nazi collaborators. In June, 1949, according to official statistics, 120,000 collaborators should have faced trial; in actual fact, only "economic collaborators" and those responsible for the murder of anti-Nazis were tried; of 38,000 sentenced by French courts, 27,000 had already been released. Of the 40,000 collaborators deprived of their civil rights, 39 per cent had been reinstated and were enjoying full rights; very few of the 790 collaborators sentenced to death had been executed. The "economic collaborators" fared best; less than 50 per cent of them faced trial, the government stating that they were needed to assist in France's reconstruction efforts. Most of the collaborators who had become trustees of Jewish property and business houses were still in possession of their loot (Jewish Chronicle, London, June 17, 1949).

There was no central well-organized group in France to combat these anti-Semitic manifestations, though an over-all program of vigilance appeared to be a real need.

Culture

Jewish religious, cultural, and educational work in France tended to emphasize the differences within the various groups, rather than minimize them. Thus, of the three Yiddish dailies published in Paris, one expressed the Communist point of view, another the Labor Zionist, and the third the Bundist. There was no non-Yiddish daily for native-born French Jews. The few periodicals appearing in French were mostly of a partisan and propagandistic nature. There was an almost complete lack of current Judaica in French, and no well-organized attempt to publish French Jewish books on a regular basis. However, there were a few encouraging notes. Jewish students at the Sorbonne in Paris were making renewed efforts to put out a scholarly journal. Rabbi Zaoui of the Reform synagogue in Paris was the head of a group which had issued the first number of a quarterly on Judaic subjects. There were some young French Jewish writers who were seeking to make contact with their
Jewish environment. French Jewish intellectuals and community leaders were becoming more and more concerned with the problem of cultural expression and had come to realize the need for some central efforts in that direction.

Yiddish literature, on the other hand, had benefited from the influx of Jewish writers and journalists from Eastern Europe. A half dozen Yiddish books appeared within the space of a few months previous to the writing of this article. However, these works were outside of the French tradition. The same could be said of the Yiddish theater in Paris.

Religion and Education

The religious activity of French Jewry was limited to participation in the synagogue; but none of the synagogues offered any of the larger programs so popular in the United States. The main religious activity was concerned with the education of Jewish children. The potential number of Jewish school children in France was approximately 40,000. Of this number, only 10 per cent were receiving a Jewish education, much of which was insufficient. The Jewish schools suffered an almost total lack of central organization, coordination and curriculum planning.

There were five large yeshivot in France at the time of writing. But the 1,700 pupils hailed from Central Europe and intended to emigrate; they had no connection with and were making no contribution to French Jewish life.

More interesting for its possible eventual effect upon French Jewish life was the school of the OPEJ (Organisation pour la Protection des Enfants Juifs) near Paris, which was training teachers for Jewish schools. Students of the school published a series of manuals in French which described Jewish holidays and rituals and were circulated among all the OPEJ children's homes. The school was planning to issue a children's newspaper in French dealing with Jewish subjects, the first of its kind in the country.

The leader of another such training school, Robert Gamzon, left for Israel with fifty of his pupils, but the school was continuing.

Finally, during this period, a yeshivah came into being at Aix-les-Bains which was seeking to recruit its students from the Jewish population of France, and to train community leaders and organizers. This project was meeting financial difficulties.

BELGIUM

The outstanding political event in Belgium, during the period under review, was the election held in June, 1949. The Catholic party fell short of the majority it had expected, and the stalemate over the issue of the restoration of King Leopold continued.

There was a total of some 42,000 Jews in Belgium, the Jews constituting less than 1 per cent of the total Belgium population, but Jewish aliens in Belgium were close to 10 per cent of all aliens. The economic situation was not good and unemployment figures were high; the result was a difficult economic and moral environment for the Jews of Belgium.
Naturalization had always been circumscribed by rigorous requirements, but after the war it became apparent that civil servants in the naturalization service were using unequivocally anti-Semitic criteria in their recommendations as to the admissability of applicants to Belgian nationality. A higher court overruled a lower court's approval of the withholding of Belgian citizenship from fifteen-year-old native sons of Jewish immigrants because the civil servants who had examined them considered their home environments too Jewish and therefore incapable of providing the sort of education needed for inculcating real Belgian loyalties.

This explains the large trend toward emigration. Movement out of the country in the direction of Israel was approximately 400 a month from May, 1948 to January, 1949. However, large numbers were being kept from leaving Belgium for Israel at the time of writing by Israel's financial difficulties.

Antwerp and Brussels

The 10,000 to 15,000 Jews in Antwerp made up a small, tight, and stable community. The large majority were Orthodox and were organized in an efficient network of religious, educational, and ideological institutions. They lived in a distinctly Jewish quarter, educated their children in Jewish parochial schools, and earned their living, by and large, in the diamond trade. The community was in need of little aid in order to take care of its welfare needs and was showing an increasing willingness to do so.

However, the 20,000-25,000 Jews in Brussels had little community organization, religious life, physical closeness, or identity of economic interest. As in France, the population was composed of Jews who had come to Brussels from different lands at different periods. Only about one thousand persons were members of the two Brussels congregations.

Communal Coordination

No representative organization existed among Belgian Jewry capable of dealing with community life and defense. The influence and function of the publicly recognized Consistoire Central were strictly limited. Moreover, there was little coordination between the Antwerp and Brussels communities, so that important Jewish problems were frequently being handled separately, and differently, by both communities.

Culture and Education

The rootlessness of Belgian Jewry was illustrated by the fact that there was not a single Jewish periodical in the country, though almost every Belgian community had a press organ of its own before the war. The education of children represented the main Jewish activity.

Of some 7,000 to 7,500 Jewish children of school age, about 1,200 were receiving instruction in three day schools, two of which were located in Antwerp. Another 1,000 were attending supplementary schools; 500 in private homes, and 180 in yeshivot.
The day schools were quite good and were partly financed by the state. The teaching in the supplementary schools was poor, and since there was no local publication of school texts, pupils were forced to use whatever material was at hand.

There were about sixty students preparing to be teachers and educators as well as rabbis in the yeshiva in Antwerp. While the students were principally of Central-European origin, there were several students from Western Europe and Belgium itself.

**Intergroup Relations**

There was a very definite consciousness among the general Belgian population of the presence of Jews. The period under review witnessed specific anti-Semitic phenomena in the shape of vicious articles based on Catholic reports of desecration of the Holy Places in Israel. Feeling about this subject ran higher in the Belgian press than that of any other country. For example, members of the Belgian Association for Assistance to Palestine Refugees toured European capitals with a ten-foot wooden cross containing a relic of the “true cross” to demonstrate the need of safeguarding the Holy Places in Palestine (Religious News Service, May 24, 1949). Yet neither the Brussels nor the Antwerp Jewish community was doing anything to counteract the effect of this propaganda.

**NETHERLANDS**

**Dutch Jewry** presented an apparent paradox during the period under review: its 28,000 Jews formed one of the best-organized and economically stable Jewish communities in the world, and lived in a nation where they were secure. Yet the leaders of the community insisted there was no future for Jews in Holland. The leadership of the community had either already emigrated or was planning to do so.

Despite the very drastic ravages of the war—five-sixths of the prewar Jewish population of approximately 140,000 had been killed off, and much wealth lost—Dutch Jewry no longer needed financial help from outside sources. Composed largely of upper middle-class professionals, businessmen, and industrialists, Dutch Jewry had raised sizeable sums for its own social and welfare work and was even supporting 500 children from other lands en route to Israel.

But while Dutch Jews were financially prosperous, they were psychologically unhappy. Dutch Jewish leaders felt that to live both as a Dutchman and a Jew involved an intolerable split in loyalties, and were openly declaring their choice of life as Jews rather than Dutchmen. This feeling seemed to be understood by non-Jews, and did not seem to produce anti-Semitism.

A new development in community affairs was the organization early in 1949 of a group to influence the government to vest the heirless assets of Dutch Jews killed by the Nazis in a successor body that would use them for communal and relief purposes. Preparations were also made to constitute the
successor body itself, to be ready whenever the appropriate legislation was passed. Informed opinion was cautiously optimistic about the prospects for the success of this effort.

Religion and Culture

The Sephardic element of Dutch Jewry had been virtually wiped out by deportation during the war: the large Sephardic synagogue in Amsterdam had difficulties in gathering a quorum. There are only three Ashkenazic rabbis in Holland as contrasted with some twenty-five who had served in a network of religious institutions that extended to every Dutch province before the war. Only one-fourth of the remaining population was registered with synagogues, and there was a strong assimilationist trend.

There were two publications issued by and for the Jewish community, in addition to a special weekly devoted to Jewish topics which was circulated among important non-Jews. The community had a rich heritage of cultural material, except for books and periodicals on current Jewish topics which it could not afford to publish because of the small size of the community.

Defense and Restitution

The relations of Dutch Jewry with the government were excellent and its central organization, the Jewish Coordinating Committee, was an effective quasi-official body.

The burning postwar problem for Dutch Jewry was its struggle for the restoration to the Jewish community of some 4,000 Jewish children who had been hidden in Christian homes during the years of the war and occupation. The community had apparently lost its struggle, for the Dutch parliament reasserted its determination to permit the nomination of non-Jewish foster organizations to serve as the guardians of Jewish war orphans.

SWITZERLAND

Exclusive of some 4,500 refugees, the Jewish population of Switzerland consisted of approximately 18,500 persons who resided in twenty-seven communities. A number of the refugees were expected to remain in Switzerland, since the government had granted residence to refugees who could not return to their countries of origin and was making it easier for them to secure work permits.

Communal Organization

The Swiss Federation of Jewish Communities extended aid to educational and cultural activities, and supported a school in Basle which provided the community with teachers, educators, and communal workers. There was also an active Jewish students' union which was helping needy students. To a large extent, the education of Swiss youth was being taken over by such youth
groups as the Jewish Boy Scouts and the Zionist Hechalutz and Hashomer Hatzair organizations. The Zionist organization in Switzerland consisted of some 1,200 members; on the whole, the attitude of the general population to Zionism was favorable.

**Intergroup Relations**

Swiss Jews possessed the same civic rights as the rest of the population and were subject to no official discrimination. However, anti-Semitic allusions had grown somewhat more frequent since the end of the war. In the Fall of 1948, a Swiss magazine, *Die neue Politik*, was banned by the British from circulation in their zone of Germany for printing propaganda accusing the Jews of being responsible for conditions in postwar Germany, and particularly for the war crime trials. The American authorities had also investigated the Swiss magazine, but at the time of writing had not announced the results of their investigation.

Though this propaganda had evoked no significant public response, the Jewish-Christian Association to Fight Anti-Semitism felt the need to defend the Swiss Jewish community. They were attempting to secure the incorporation in the penal code of a clause making anti-Semitic activities subject to prosecution.

**Restitution**

Switzerland continued during the period under review to be the scene of a struggle which was being conducted by Jewish organizations for restitution of assets belonging to Jews who had died heirless. Because of the Swiss banking laws which were very favorable to secrecy, thousands of Jews from other countries had deposited assets in Switzerland estimated variously at from $5,000,000 to $50,000,000. The Jewish organizations were appealing to the precedent of a number of countries where such assets had been allocated by special legislation to specifically Jewish communal and relief purposes. However, the Swiss government was reluctant to waive the existing law under which such assets should escheat to the government of the country of which the dead Jews were nationals, pleading the difficulty occasioned by the bank-secrecy law in the determination of the heirless Jewish assets. However, the position of the Jewish organizations was fortified early in the Summer of 1949 with the discovery of an unpublicized trade agreement between Poland and Switzerland in which Switzerland had obligated itself to repatriate to Poland such assets as had been held by deceased Polish citizens.

**ITALY**

The government of Italy continued during the period under review to be in the hands of the Center parties, with the Christian Democrats the major element in the coalition, and economic conditions, though far from satisfactory, continued to improve slowly.
Population and Emigration

For the first time since the end of the war, at the time of writing the large majority of the 38,500 Jews in Italy were native Italians. By the beginning of 1949, only 5,578 displaced Jews remained in Italy, of whom more than a half preferred the United States to Israel as the country to which they wished to emigrate. In the previous twelve months, some 20,000 Jews had left Italy for Israel. By the beginning of the Spring of 1949, the diversified structure of communal and cultural organizations created by the displaced Jews of Italy had all but disappeared, most of their members and beneficiaries having left, including the Union of Jewish Writers and Artists; the Organization of Jewish Refugees; Hechalutz, which operated a series of hachsharah farms to train prospective immigrants to Israel in agriculture and communal living, and the Yiddish newspaper, Baderech ("On the Way"), and the monthly, In Gang ("On the Way").

Communal Organization

The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) reduced its assistance. In 1949 JDC funds for Italy were used to supplement the contributions of Italian Jewry itself for its orphanages and homes for the aged (of which there were 6, with 165 inmates) and for the Collegio Rabbinico. The synagogues had a prior claim on the communal taxes that Jews were obliged to pay by Italian law, and the institutions of social welfare, whose originally generous endowments had been rendered completely inadequate by the inflation, were desperately in need of funds (the average income from the communal properties was $1.50 per month). During the few preceding years Italian Jews had contributed more, per capita, to the Haganah and similar Israeli purposes than the Jews of any other Western-European country. In October, 1948, the Union of Jewish Communities came to an agreement with the JDC, by which they undertook to launch a campaign for the necessary funds, and the JDC undertook to supplement the income. Arie Stern, the Israeli representative in Italy, was a member of the committee of sponsors. The JDC also contributed to the capital funds of the first Jewish credit cooperative in Italy, which had been established in August, 1948, in order to provide loans to professional people, artisans, and tradesmen who were in need of credit.

The fact that the Israeli representative was a sponsor of local philanthropic enterprises and the unprecedented outpouring of Italian Jewish contributions for Israel were most significant, and emphasized the great revolution that had occurred in the thinking of Italian Jews in the course of a single decade. Before 1938, when Mussolini introduced racist legislation, there was little Zionist feeling in the Italian Jewish community. But the racist legislation was followed by the Nazi deportations and murders. The result was that, though relatively few native Italian Jews chose to emigrate to Israel, enthusiasm for Israel was universal. In addition, as Italians the Jews of Italy felt no strangeness in the face of indistinct boundaries between church and state, or between the religious and the governmental: Catholicism had long enjoyed and con-
continued to enjoy a special legal status in Italian life; but the head of the Catholic Church was also the sovereign of an independent state, Vatican City. It did not seem strange to anyone, therefore, that Arie Stern, Israel's representative in Italy, was invited to be active in almost every phase of the Italian Jewish community's activities, or that David Prato, the Chief Rabbi, was invited to give formal religious sanction to practically every official celebration or ceremony in honor of the Israeli representative in Italy. Rabbi Prato had spent about ten years in Israel, from which he returned to Italy shortly after the war to assume the office of Chief Rabbi vacated by the apostate Zolli.

**Intergroup Relations**

There was rather less fear of anti-Semitism in Italy than in most other countries because the experiences of the war and the postwar attitude to the Jewish displaced persons had shown that the Italian people had a high resistance to anti-Semitism.

In March, 1949, anti-Jewish leaflets were found on the tombs of the Roman Jews murdered by the Nazis in the Fosse Ardeatine; the leaflets were the work of unrepentant Fascists of the worst sort. This was not considered nearly so serious as the anti-Jewish sermons of a popular Jesuit preacher in Turin, Father Lombardi. Taken in conjunction with the Vatican's propaganda against Israel on the issue of Holy Places, it caused some concern to Jewish leaders. They felt, however, that when a satisfactory compromise had been reached between the Vatican and Hakirya, the seat of Israel's government, the danger that might be inherent in the Lombardi incident would be exorcised.

**Restitution**

During the Summer of 1949 various negotiations were being conducted in Washington, London, and Rome to have several classes of Italian war booty, in the custody of the United States and Great Britain, set aside for Jewish relief and migration purposes.

**Culture and Education**

The heart of the program for perpetuating Jewish life in Italy was education, yet only a small percentage of the Jewish children was being reached. Such education, to be effective, had to be taught in all-day schools, for the Catholic Church was very influential in the regular educational program. Some kindergartens, for instance, were taught by nuns. In Rome, Milan, and eight other of the larger communities there were such all-day schools, while in Naples and seven other small cities there were talmud torahs. Of these schools, that in Milan was excellent, but the others were poor. The great problem was attracting teachers.

The meager cultural activity in Italy was conducted by the Union of Jewish Communities, which was issuing a monthly cultural and historical magazine and a monthly youth supplement, as well as helping to subsidize a national weekly, a bi-weekly, and a publishing house in Florence. The publishing
The most significant event in the history of the 15,000 persons comprising Swedish Jewry during the period under review was the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator in Palestine, by Jewish terrorists in Israel, in September, 1948. Bernadotte had been very popular with the Swedish people as a devoted friend of the weak and oppressed everywhere whose work reflected glory on his country. During the war, he had engaged in unofficial diplomatic negotiations, and had used his high office in the Swedish Red Cross in an attempt to save some Jews from the Nazis. Hence, when Bernadotte was murdered by Jews in Israel, and the Israel government subsequently failed to apprehend the murderers, popular sentiment against the Jews reached an intensity which, though not alarming when compared with the norm in some other countries, was greater than at any previous time in modern Swedish history.

**Intergroup Relations**

The leading newspapers were careful to point out, in the numerous editorials condemning the crime itself and what was considered to be the laxity and indifference of the Israeli government, that Swedish Jews should not to be held responsible; references were made, however, to the ingratitude of the Israeli Jews in murdering a man who had done all he could to save the European Jews from Hitler.

An adverse result for Israel was the failure of either Sweden or Norway to extend recognition—Denmark was the Scandinavian exception in giving de facto recognition in February, 1949—and the settled Scandinavian hostility to Israel within the United Nations. Swedish Jews felt that their previously secure status had been impaired, and that it would take years for the bad effects of Bernadotte's assassination to disappear. Many thought they now discerned a hostility which was formerly restricted to the more reactionary and tradition-bound branches of the nobility—a hostility which was evident even in the middle-class circles among which Jews normally moved. They interpreted the official distinction between Israel Jews, who were responsible, and Swedish Jews, who were not, as reassuring proof that overt anti-Semitism was still considered disreputable by respectable people. They interpreted similarly the appointment of Hugo Valentin, the author of the famous book on anti-Semitism, to an honorary professorship of history at the University of Upsala in March, 1949, and that of Ragnar Josephson to head the Royal Dramatic Theater in Stockholm. They hoped that the many reports of trade negotiations

---

1 See also Israel and the United Nations, p. 379, and Israel, p. 391.
between Sweden and Israel, under whose terms Sweden would receive profitable contracts to supply lumber, prefabricated dwellings, machinery and the like, were not merely reports, and that extensive trade relations would in fact soon be established.

The one important anti-Semitic voice in Sweden, that of Einer Aberg, had been silenced by government decree. Whether this decree could be used to stop Aberg from sending his anti-Semitic materials to other lands was still in doubt.

Community Organization

The approximately 7,000 native Jews in Sweden were legally required to belong to the Jewish community, and Swedish congregations possessed the power to levy taxes. A law was being drafted to make affiliation to religious communities voluntary, and it was anticipated that if the law was passed the communities would lose the support of a number of members who were Jews by birth only. The bulk of the work done by Mosaiska Församlingen, the central Swedish Jewish organization, was on behalf of the refugee population, composed of 6,000 Orthodox girls and 2,000 Jews who came to Sweden from Germany during the first years of the war. The Orthodox girls had difficulty in finding husbands among the small Jewish community of Sweden, and a number of them left Sweden during this period.

The disposition of the heirless assets of non-Swedish Jews was a problem still unresolved at the time of writing.

As in most of the rest of Western Europe, the Jewish community deeply regretted the scarcity of good reading matter—on all aspects of Jewish life, thought, religion, or history—in Swedish, the language most easily read by the majority.

GREECE

The Jewish population of Greece numbered 8,000 at the time of writing. Of this number, 3,700 resided in Athens and 1,620 in Salonika. The Greek Jews had been emigrating at the rate of approximately 90 per month—an emigration of more than 10 per cent of the Jewish community yearly. This movement was intensified in July, 1949, when 132 Jews emigrated from Greece as a result of the decision by the Greek government to permit Jews of military age to leave for Israel if they so desired on condition that they renounced their citizenship.

Intergroup Relations

Greek anti-Semitism was an important factor in this emigration, as were the economic difficulties attending the civil war. Thus, the Greek press unanimously attacked the appointment of Joseph Mallah, a Jew, as Greek envoy to Israel, until a letter from Foreign Minister Constantin Tsaldaris put an end to the agitation.
The Jewish community in Greece was also suffering from official economic discrimination. Evidence of this was a national tax imposed by the government on the various industries in Greece, allocated according to the estimated wealth of the individual industrialists. The result was that the Jews of Athens, though constituting only .5 per cent of the population, were asked to pay 4 per cent of the total amount; those in Salonika, who were .2 per cent of the population, were asked to pay 16 per cent of the total. (This tax rate was eventually withdrawn.)

Restitution

The most important development affecting Greek Jewry during the period under review was the signing by King Paul on March 27, 1949, of a decree transferring Jewish heirless property to a Jewish successor organization established for that purpose. Since the property involved was valued at approximately $4,000,000, it became apparent that the Greek community would easily be able to take care of its future communal needs. A temporary central body to administer the funds was set up in Athens, and local committees were established in Salonika and the smaller Greek towns, as well as in Crete. The successor organization defined its aims as, first, to take an inventory of the heirless property and, second, to work out a plan for assistance and rehabilitation. Until the master plan was worked out, the Central Council of Jewish Communities was to receive funds with which to do relief and rehabilitation work.

Turkey

The Jewish population of Turkey declined sharply during the period under review as a result of a large and unexpected emigration to Israel. At the time of writing, there were some 55,000 Jews in Turkey; an estimated 30,000 Jews had left Turkey since August, 1948. Worst hit of all by this exodus was the Turkish province of Ismir, where only 4,500 Jews remained of an original Jewish population of 15,250. The community faced the problem of maintaining eighteen synagogues and yeshivot, and combining its schools. Istanbul and Brousse had been similarly affected, though not as sharply.

Government Attitude toward Jews

The reasons for this large-scale emigration of Jews from Turkey lay in a number of factors. First was the basic governmental treatment of the Jews as a minority group and its consequent refusal to recognize the Jewish communities as juridic personalities, which made it difficult for them to hold property. Teaching in Jewish schools was under strict state control, and Jewish schools were forbidden to make the study of Hebrew compulsory, though it could be elected by the students. The government forbade the formation of any group having a religious basis, and non-Moslems were banned from all public employment.

However, toward the end of the period under review, there seemed to be a
change in the government's attitude. More freedom of action was granted to minority schools in July, 1949 (JTA, July 18, 1949), and Jewish citizens were given permission to become officers in the Turkish Army Reserve Corps; in addition, there were growing opportunities for Jews to secure minor positions in the government bureaucracy and school system. Nevertheless, Turkish Jews felt neither safe nor secure in Turkey. Their feeling was aggravated during the Arab-Israel war, which found Turkey neutral but the Turkish population pro-Arab.

**Government Attitude on Emigration**

Another important factor militating for the emigration of Turkish Jewry to Israel was the government's attitude on emigration. Turkey had officially forbidden Jewish emigration to Israel, but it permitted Jews to secure visas to other countries, and was aware that their ultimate destination was Israel. With the Turkish recognition of Israel on March 28, 1949, this pretext was dropped. There was an emigration representative of Israel in Turkey at the time of writing.
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DISPLACED PERSONS

The period from June 30, 1948, to June 30, 1949, saw the greatest activity in the resettlement of the Jewish displaced persons (DP's) since the end of the war. However, the flow was not entirely in one direction. There continued to be some infiltration from the countries within the Russian orbit. During this period approximately 9,000 Jews, most of whom came from Hungary and some from Rumania, made their way to the United States sector of Vienna. A combination of factors induced this clandestine migration. Most of the people left these countries because they could not adjust to Communism; many, to elude the ban on migration to Israel; and all, in a large measure, because of the feeling that in these "satellite" countries they were permanently cut off from the rest of Jewry. The Austrian government supplied the basic ration, and the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), supplementary relief, for the needy element of this group. Most of the newcomers appeared to have some resources and those who did not leave promptly for Israel were able to maintain themselves in Vienna while waiting to resettle in other countries.

TABLE 1

Geographical Distribution of Jewish DP's, December, 1946-July, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>December, 1946</th>
<th>June 30, 1948</th>
<th>June 30, 1949</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Zone</td>
<td>126,563</td>
<td>91,396</td>
<td>30,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Zone</td>
<td>12,809</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>3,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Zone</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Zone</td>
<td>29,158</td>
<td>15,701</td>
<td>5,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Zone</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Zone</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>18,249</td>
<td>5,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>5,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>197,005</strong></td>
<td><strong>142,936</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures given are the official estimates of the International Refugee Organization (IRO). Due to the fluid character of the DP population, departures from camps were not always reported in time to be reflected in the official records. It is estimated that the official IRO figures are 10 to 20 per cent in excess of the actual population.

The peak of this movement was reached during the month of April, 1949, when over 1,900 people arrived in the American sector of Vienna. A closer surveillance of Hungary's borders, the threat of severe penalties for attempted
illegal border crossings, and the trial in June, 1949, of the six Zionists accused of stimulating the exodus of Israel-bound Jews, resulted in the tapering off of this unauthorized movement. By July, 1949, this infiltration had been reduced to 300 per month. It appeared then that there would be little future infiltration either from Hungary or Rumania.

**Population: Size and Distribution**

On June 30, 1949, the total number of DP's receiving care and maintenance from the International Refugee Organization (IRO) was 418,271, distributed as shown in Table 3. Of these, 52,398, or 12 per cent, were Jewish. On June 1, 1948, the Jewish DP's represented 27 per cent of the total DP population. Table 1 shows the geographical distribution of the 52,398 Jewish DP's and the decline in their number from December, 1946, when the Jewish DP population was at its highest.

The major countries of citizenship or ethnic groups of the non-Jewish DP's are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTRIES OF CITIZENSHIP OR ETHNIC GROUPS OF THE NON-JEWISH DP'S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country or Ethnic Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nansen Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 418,271 DP's, Jewish and non-Jewish, receiving care and maintenance on June 30, 1949, were dispersed as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF ALL DP'S, JUNE 30, 1949</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country or Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the 52,398 Jewish DP's (see Table 1) there were approximately 20,000 Jewish DP's, as of June 30, 1949, who, though eligible under the IRO mandate for care and maintenance, preferred to live in the local communities and support themselves. Having made that choice, they were entitled to receive from the IRO only resettlement assistance and legal protection.

**Birth Rate**

The birth rate among the Jewish DP's, which had been 50.2 per thousand in the Fall of 1947, was among the highest in the world. It leveled off to 31.1 per thousand by the Summer of 1949. One of the most characteristic features of a Jewish DP camp from 1947 on was the presence of many infants and expectant mothers. The children were either the first born to the parents or children whom either parent or both parents had lost under the Nazi regime and later recovered. More than one child was born in only a relatively small number of Jewish DP families during the four-year period following their liberation in 1945.

**Camp Consolidation**

As the population contracted, the number of DP camps was correspondingly reduced. Table 4 reflects this reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Italy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1946</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1948</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1949</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these major installations, there were in Germany, as of June 30, 1949, four exclusively Jewish DP hospitals, one TB sanatorium for children, and three rehabilitation centers.

In Italy the hačšarot centers where prospective immigrants were prepared for life in Israel housed on the average 50 per cent of the resident Jewish DP population. These small camps played an essential role in aiding refugees to make their way across Italy on their way to Israel, and were the rallying points for the DP's in Italy who were determined to get to Israel. With the legalization of movement to Israel, most of these installations were able to close. In June, 1948, there were 72 such camps housing 7,300 Jewish DP's. By June, 1949, the number had been reduced to 16, with an aggregate population of 760 persons.

The obvious reason for camp consolidation was to shorten the lines of supply, to reduce administrative costs, and otherwise to effect economies for the IRO, the occupation authorities, and the voluntary agencies serving the DP's. An additional and by no means secondary reason was the conviction that the closing of camps would result in the advancing of the date of the ultimate resettlement of many occupants. Instead of exchanging the known in-
adequacies of one camp for the unknown discomforts of another camp, a substantial percentage of the residents of each camp closed did, in fact, take immediate advantage of their resettlement opportunities.

The closing of the camps was not accomplished without some difficulty. In the early stages of the consolidation program, the camp population generally associated the closing with their concentration camp experience and maintained that they would resist the "liquidation" of their homes. However, as the program gained momentum and the camp population realized that camp consolidation was inevitable, they cooperated, and the camp closings were effected within the prearranged time table.

In the United States Zone of Germany, where the greatest number of camps were involved, the Office of Adviser on Jewish Affairs, the Jewish organizations, and the DP leadership progressively mapped out the consolidation plans which were accepted in every instance by the Army and the IRO.

The most spectacular instance of camp consolidation was the air-lift evacuation of all of the DP's from Berlin. Between July 23 and August 1, 1948, 5,546 DP's, of whom all but 90 were Jewish, were flown from Berlin to be absorbed in the existing camps in the United States Zone. When the DP camp at Zeilsheim was closed in November, 1948, the teaching staff and fifty-two students of the yeshiva which had been in that camp, were transferred as a group to Lyon, France.

As the camps closed in the United States Zone of occupation in Germany, the former residents were segregated into four categories: the Israel-bound, the medical "hard core" and family members, the America-bound, and those who, being ineligible or unprepared to go to the country of their choice, were listed as "undecided." Each of these groups was then moved into a separate camp, in order to establish homogeneous groups where their unique problems could most efficiently be handled.

Concomitant with the reduction of the DP population and the closing of the camps, the voluntary agencies and the DP leadership curtailed their activities. The Central Committee of Liberated Jews in Germany determined at the end of 1948 to hold no future annual congresses; the regional committees were abolished; the number of DP newspapers and other publications was sharply reduced; all of the JDC workshops were closed by the Spring of 1949; nearly all of the ORT vocational schools were discontinued. The general retrenchment in all but the indispensable services to the DP's, and the dedication of the DP leadership and of the Jewish organizations to the task of assisting in emigration, however, did not in any way interfere with the intensity with which the education of the children was pursued.

Care and Maintenance

In general the DP's were provided with a diet which approximated that of the indigenous population. This was, in a measure, regulated by the United States Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1948-49 which provided for the United States' subvention to the IRO and at the same time specified that the caloric diet of DP's in IRO camps in Europe should be no higher than that prevailing for the local population. The daily caloric ration scale by
categories of consumers in effect in Germany from October 1, 1948, is indicated in Table 5.

### Table 5

**Caloric Rations of Jewish DP Consumers in Germany**  
**October 1, 1948-June 30, 1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumers</th>
<th>Calories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal consumers</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>2,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and nursing women</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy workers</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General hospitals</td>
<td>2,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB hospitals</td>
<td>3,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB hospital workers</td>
<td>3,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With slight variation this schedule was applied in other areas where the IRO operated. At the same time the diet was improved through the partial replacement of an overbalance of starches by an increased quantity of fat and sugar. In addition to the ration they received from the IRO, the Jewish DP's who were either employed in the DP program, engaged in ORT or in university studies, or fell into certain social categories (pregnant and nursing women, children, persons over fifty-five), received a special supplementary ration from the JDC. The currency conversion in the Western zones of Germany on June 20, 1948, created some hardships for the Jewish DP's living within the German economy. This inconvenience, however, was only of a temporary nature. On the whole, the displaced persons were provided with a balanced diet which was sufficient to insure the maintenance of the standards of good health.

### Table 6

**Resettlement of Jewish DP's, July 1, 1948-June 30, 1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Destination</th>
<th>July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1949</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>86,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>15,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>10,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resettled</strong></td>
<td><strong>120,299</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This figure does not include the Cyprus evacuation, mentioned elsewhere in this article. The immigration to Israel from the DP countries during this period was 53,588 from Germany, 17,683 from Austria, and 15,285 from Italy.
* This figure includes 11,993 processed under the United States DP Act of 1948.
* Approximately 7,000 of those included in this figure represented a known decrease in population whose migration from the DP countries was not reported.
Emigration

During the period covered by this survey the rate of resettlement of Jewish DP's was higher than the corresponding rate of any other DP national group. Table 6 shows the number of Jewish DP's resettled between July 1, 1948, and June 30, 1949, and the countries of destination.

EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

When the United States DP Act of 1948 was passed, it was estimated that a maximum of 20,000 Jewish DP's would eventually qualify under this law. By June, 1949, it was evident that this prediction had been far too conservative. It was then fairly certain that before the expiration date of the law, about 40,000 Jewish DP's would be admitted to the United States under this measure. There were three factors which converted the act, generally condemned as discriminatory against Jewish and Catholic DP's, into a measure which gave the Jewish DP's an equitable share of the visas issued. The first was the liberal implementation of the law by the Displaced Persons Commission. The second was the efficiency of the Jewish organizations—JDC, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), and the United Service for New Americans (USNA)—in procuring community assurances for the DP's and in making available their broad experience in handling immigration. The third, and a completely unanticipated development, was the construction placed upon the act, to the effect that the territory turned over to Poland for administration under the Potsdam Agreement, notably Silesia, would, for the purpose of determining residence eligibility, be considered part of Germany. Apparently, a large number of Jewish DP's were in Silesia prior to December 22, 1945.

EMIGRATION TO ISRAEL

The enthusiasm for Israel which permeated all of the Jewish DP camps was sustained throughout the year following the creation of Israel in May, 1948. Several months before the fighting started in Israel, the DP leadership placarded the camps with posters calling upon all men and women of military age to join in the defense of the new state. Sanctions of varying degrees were applied by the leadership against those who could give no legitimate reason for failing to join the Giyus (mobilization for Israel). This mobilization effort resulted in the departure for Israel of approximately 13,000 Jewish DP's in the period from February, 1948, to August, 1948.

Of the 86,356 persons moved to Israel from the DP countries, approximately 6,500 were transported by air. These were mostly pregnant women, families with infants, and the ill. To expedite travel by land and sea, the port of Bari, Italy, was made available in June, 1949.

By the Summer of 1949 it appeared that the mass immigration of DP's to Israel would run its course before the year ended. Thousands who gave Israel as their ultimate resettlement goal still remained in the camps and communities. They were discouraged, however, by the gloomy reports of unemployment and housing shortages in Israel, and preferred to wait until these conditions should improve.
IRO SUPPORT OF EMIGRATION TO ISRAEL

On May 18, 1948, almost immediately after hostilities in Israel broke out, the IRO withdrew its support of DP immigration to Israel, on the stated ground that it was contrary to the spirit of the IRO constitution to participate in the resettlement of DP's in a country at war. With the single exception of the emergency air evacuation of approximately 1,800 Jewish refugees from Shanghai to Israel, which took place between December 24, 1948, and January 1, 1949, the IRO abided by this policy until January 28, 1949. On that date the IRO authorized the reimbursement to the JDC, which was financing the movement to Israel, of amounts advanced during the period from December 18, 1948, to January 31, 1949, up to a maximum of $4,000,000. The decision did not go beyond the latter date because the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission was then in the process of settling the dispute over Israel, and the IRO did not wish to take any step which might prejudice this inquiry. On April 5, 1949, after receiving word from the Conciliation Commission that the question of the support of emigration to Israel was not within its competence, the IRO authorized full resumption of IRO logistic and financial support for the movement to Israel. At the same time it allocated a total of $9,000,000 to the JDC, and left for a later date the determination of the per capita reimbursement for Jewish DP's within the IRO mandate involved in the movement to Israel. This tentative declaration of policy ultimately took the shape of a specific agreement reached between the IRO and the JDC on May 5, 1949, in which the IRO agreed to pay the JDC at the rate of $120 per person for the first 35,000 Jewish DP's shipped to Israel after May 15, 1948, $90 for the next 30,000 and $70 and $61 per capita for the next 35,000 and 20,000, respectively. The IRO also placed all of its facilities at the disposal of the Jewish Agency for Palestine on the same basis as it offered them to the other agencies engaged in resettlement work.

EVACUATION OF CYPRUS

Jewish DP's who had been intercepted en route to Palestine, were interned on the island of Cyprus by the British government beginning in April, 1946. Up to the time of the creation of the state of Israel, the evacuation from the island was gradual. The British regulations permitted the departure of approximately 750 persons per month; the number was charged against the quota fixed by the White Paper of 1939. After the establishment of Israel the evacuation was increased and by August, 1948, every one who was not of military age had been permitted to leave Cyprus. The ban on men in that category was lifted on January 24, 1949. Between that date and February 11, 1949, the remainder of the internees, 10,201 in all, completed the last lap of their journey to Israel.

Assistance Rendered by Organizations

The IRO had the basic responsibility for feeding, clothing, providing medical care, and paying the cost of resettling the DP's. In this program the

---

1 For assistance rendered by American overseas agencies, see p. 175 ff.
Jewish DP's shared the facilities and services of the IRO on an equal footing with the DP's of other national groups. The conspicuous differential between the care which the Jewish DP's and other DP's received was made possible by the wide range of activities of the Jewish voluntary agencies which worked among the Jewish DP's. The Jewish Agency for Palestine provided the key personnel in the teaching staff of the DP schools, stimulated interest in migration to Israel, and organized and superintended this migration.

The Central Committees of Liberated Jews in Germany and Austria, the Merkaz Haplitim in Italy, and the Merkaz Hechalutz in Italy and in France, and their subordinate committees, served as spokesmen for the Jewish DP's, indoctrinated the people with a zeal for Israel, and assisted the IRO and the voluntary agencies in the administration of the DP camps.

Attitude of the Occupation Authorities and of Italy

Within the framework of the primary occupation mission, the generals commanding the United States forces in Germany and Austria, Generals Dwight D. Eisenhower, Joseph T. McNarney, Lucius D. Clay, Clarence E. Huebner, Mark W. Clark, and Geoffrey Keyes, and their immediate subordinates, were consistently helpful in decisions affecting the Jewish displaced persons.

The Adviser on Jewish Affairs, a post occupied successively by Simon H. Rifkind, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Louis Levinthal, William Haber and Harry Greenstein, in the United States occupation zones, helped in shaping policy affecting the Jewish DP's. As the Jewish DP problem entered its liquidation phase, the impatience which had previously prevailed at the operational level yielded to a general feeling of pride in being identified with the United States Army's role in extending a haven to the Jewish DP's who passed through the United States occupation zones.

At the insistence of the United States authorities, the Occupation Statute for Western Germany, which became effective on September 21, 1949, provided that the control over the DP's would be reserved to the occupation powers. This was done chiefly because the United States authorities felt that the time had not arrived when the Germans could be trusted with the impartial treatment of the DP's.

On May 13, 1949, General Clay's office in Berlin was the scene of an historic occasion. There, the Adviser on Jewish Affairs, the representatives of the major Jewish organizations working in Germany, and a member of the DP rabbinate, presented General Clay with a volume of the Talmud. The book was from an edition of the Talmud, published in April, 1949, which General McNarney had ordered to be printed by the Army on the soil where all other editions had been burned. The set was dedicated by the DP rabbinate to the United States Army of Occupation. The dedication read:

This edition of the Talmud is dedicated to the United States Army. This Army played a major role in the rescue of the Jewish people from total annihilation, and after the defeat of Hitler bore the major burden of sustaining the DP's of the Jewish faith. This special edition of the Talmud published in the very land where, but a short time ago, everything Jewish and of Jewish inspiration was anathema, will remain a symbol of the in-
destructibility of the Torah. The Jewish DP's will never forget the generous impulse and the unprecedented humanitarianism of the American forces, to whom they owe so much.

Although the British and French authorities had a comparatively smaller Jewish DP problem in their occupation zones, they, too, pursued a liberal policy with respect to the Jewish DP's.

In May, 1949, the Italian government introduced a curfew measure which had the effect of restricting the movement of all in-camp DP's. Although this naturally displeased the DP's it did not lessen their appreciation for the generous asylum they had found in Italy. In permitting freedom of movement across their borders, Italy and France played an unforgettable role in the migration of Jewish DP's to Israel, both before and after the creation of the Jewish state.

**IRO “Phase-Out” Plans**

With the notification to the member nations on August 28, 1948, that on August 20 Denmark had become the fifteenth country to ratify the IRO constitution, the IRO officially came into being. On September 10, the Preparatory Commission of the International Refugee Organization (PCIRO) formally dissolved itself as trustee for the IRO.

During the two years of the operation of the Preparatory Commission of the IRO, the organization, assisted by the voluntary agencies, had, in addition to its welfare, rehabilitation, and medical and legal protection activities, succeeded in resettling 538,035 individuals: 348,328 by mass resettlement and 189,707 by individual migration.

At a special session of the IRO's General Council, which convened in Geneva June 28, 1949, the organization put final approval on a series of date lines for the termination of the agency, in the following three stages:

1. August 31, 1949:—the deadline for registration by refugees for aid from the IRO. This deadline was not applicable
   a. to unaccompanied children located by the Child Search Branch of the International Tracing Service;
   b. to refugees leaving their country of origin after August 31, 1949, (these were eligible to register up to October 15, 1949); and
   c. to refugees who wished to register only for legal and political protection.

2. December 31, 1949: No persons would be admitted to DP camps after that date, and after March 31, 1950, no more persons would be admitted to cash assistance programs in the areas where IRO operated no camps.

3. June 30, 1950: Care and maintenance would be discontinued, except for the refugees in the process of repatriation or resettlement and for those who required permanent assistance, such as institutional care, and for whom no other satisfactory arrangements could have been made.

At the same session a counseling plan was agreed upon. Under this plan all persons receiving care and maintenance in Germany, Austria, and Italy, were required to be interviewed by November 1, 1949, to determine what
plans, if any, they had. Each displaced person would be asked to make a choice from among the three alternatives: repatriation, resettlement, or integration in the local economy. The choice would be appraised in the light of existing possibilities, and those who refused to indicate their plans or proposed an alternative which was obviously unrealistic would be denied further care and maintenance by the IRO.

The news of IRO's determination to "phase out" by June, 1950, caused great concern among the representatives of the voluntary agencies working with DP's. It was generally felt that even after 1950 there would be need for some international organization, preferably working within the framework of the United Nations, to extend legal protection to DP's who would not then be resettled and, particularly, to care for those who were in the medical "hard core" category.

The Medical "Hard Core" Problem

The "hard core" was a term applied to the tubercular, the chronically ill, the physically handicapped, and the aged, who, because of these disabilities, were ineligible for emigration to any country. Mass examinations conducted in the Spring of 1949 by the JDC and IRO in Germany, Austria, and Italy, revealed that approximately 3,300 people fell within this category. Together with their families, who either could not or would not emigrate without them, they numbered about 6,500 persons.

The IRO was cognizant of the gravity of the problem and at the session of the General Council on June 28, 1949, weighed the four possibilities, which it determined to consider: the absorption of this group on a "fair share" basis by the nations of the world, an alternative which would require, in most countries, the relaxation of existing physical requirements; the permanent care of this group in the country of residence, to be underwritten by several governments on a "fair share" basis; the division of the responsibility for permanent care among the IRO, the indigenous authorities of the country of refuge, and other interested agencies or governments; and the placing of the complete responsibility for the maintenance of this group with the countries of present residence.

While some of these alternatives might be workable in the cases of the non-Jewish DP's, it was unthinkable to the responsible Jewish leadership that the aged, the sick, and the handicapped Jewish DP's should be consigned to the Germans or Austrians. Israel was willing to accept the Jewish DP's who fell into the medical "hard core" category, but, in view of the formidable problems it faced, Israel was not prepared to do so without outside material assistance in the rehabilitation and future care of this group. Negotiations between the Israeli government and the IRO led to the written assurance, which Israel received from the IRO on July 18, 1949, that in any allocation which would eventually be made by the IRO for this purpose, the Israeli government would be reimbursed for the "hard core" cases admitted to Israel from July 1, 1949, until the close of the IRO program.

Abraham S. Hyman
AFTER the failure of many attempts by the Big Four to reach an agreement on all of Germany, a conference of six nations (the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg), held in London in June, 1948, adopted a policy for Western Germany. This program was gradually implemented.

The Parliamentary Council of the eleven Western German Laender (states), which convened in Bonn, prepared a draft of a constitution for a German "federal republic," and elections to the National Assembly of the federal republic were slated for August 14, 1949. A Tri-Partite Military Security Board and an International Authority for the Control of the Ruhr were established to prevent a revival of aggressive and militarist forces in Germany. An occupation statute for Germany providing for the establishment of an Allied High Commission as the supreme Allied agency of control in Germany was agreed upon by the occupation authorities of the United States, Great Britain, and France.

In May, 1949, General Lucius D. Clay, United States Military Governor in Germany since 1946, resigned, and John J. McCloy was named by President Harry Truman as United States High Commissioner for Germany to work under the immediate supervision of the Secretary of State. Great Britain appointed as its High Commissioner General Sir Brian Robertson, former British Military Governor in Germany, and France appointed M. Francois Poncet, former French ambassador in Berlin.

The new system was to go into effect as soon as a government of the German federal republic was established.

The Soviet government denounced the formation of the Western German state, and a "People's Congress" was elected in the Eastern zone on May 15, 1949. It met in Berlin the same month and ratified a constitution for a German "democratic republic."

The reform of currency in the three Western zones which replaced the almost valueless Reichsmark by the Deutsche Mark in June, 1948, brought about a change in the economic condition of the country. In December, 1948, industrial production in the United States and British zones of occupation was approximately 78 per cent of the 1936 output. A year earlier this percentage was 44. On the other hand, the currency reform resulted in unemployment: in the Spring of 1949 the unemployed numbered more than one million persons.

The blockade of Berlin, instituted by the Soviet Union in 1948, was lifted early in the Summer of 1949. On May 23, 1949, a conference of the Big Four convened in Paris to discuss the German problem once again, and again no agreement could be reached. The conference also discussed the Austrian peace treaty and succeeded in resolving the main issues which had hindered the preparation of this instrument. At the time of this writing a special commission of the four occupation powers was attempting to formulate a draft of a peace treaty with Austria.
Population

The results of the census of German population conducted on October 29, 1946, were published early in 1949.\(^1\) In the total population of 65,195,200, there were 156,705 persons of Jewish faith: 112,013 in displaced persons' camps, and 44,692 in communities. Their distribution by zones of occupation are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. Zone</th>
<th>British Zone</th>
<th>French Zone</th>
<th>Soviet Zone</th>
<th>Greater Berlin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population...</td>
<td>17,258,856</td>
<td>22,344,866</td>
<td>5,077,806</td>
<td>17,313,734</td>
<td>3,199,938</td>
<td>65,195,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in DP camps ....</td>
<td>376,799</td>
<td>283,304</td>
<td>24,628</td>
<td>8,712</td>
<td>693,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in communities .</td>
<td>16,882,057</td>
<td>22,061,562</td>
<td>5,053,178</td>
<td>17,313,734</td>
<td>3,191,226</td>
<td>64,501,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish population (^a)</td>
<td>126,695</td>
<td>18,795</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>7,585</td>
<td>156,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in DP camps .....</td>
<td>98,684</td>
<td>12,474</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>112,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in communities ..</td>
<td>28,011</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>44,692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The Jewish population figures are included in the figures of the total population above.

The census unfortunately did not indicate the citizenship of the Jewish population living outside of camps; thus, the number of German Jews among the 44,692 persons of Jewish faith registered in the communities was not determined. However, both DP's and native Jews were included in the total.

An attempt was made by a German Jewish newspaper \(^2\) on December 24, 1948, to compute data on Jews in Germany on the basis of the memberships of local Gemeinden (communities). According to the periodical, in the Spring of 1948 there were 24,632 Jews in towns with functioning Gemeinden (United States Zone 9,097, British Zone 4,994, French Zone 1,372, Soviet Zone 1,169, and Greater Berlin 8,000).

The survey, however, also failed to show the number of German Jews, since it included many DP’s living in the towns. This was particularly true of the United States Zone where, according to a statement made in the Bavarian parliament, only 1,632 German Jews resided in 1948.\(^3\)

Indications of the proportion of displaced Jews among the members of the Gemeinden were contained in statements made by some communal leaders at the conference held in the Office of the Advisor on Jewish Affairs to the United States Army in Germany and Austria on March 13 and 14, 1949. These indications are summarized in Table 2.

\(^1\) Volks- und Berufszaehlung vom 29 Oktober 1946 in den vier Besatzungszenonen und Gross-Berlin (Berlin-Munich, 1949).
\(^2\) Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland, Duesseldorf.
\(^3\) Neue Welt, Munich, August 12, 1948.
TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF GERMAN JEWS AND DP'S IN GEMEINDEN (MARCH, 1949)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gemeinde</th>
<th>German Jews</th>
<th>Displaced Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>300 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesse (including Frankfort-on-the-Main and ten other Gemeinden)</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>526 26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuerttemberg</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>265 18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only Gemeinde to publish data on its membership regularly was Berlin. Table 3 describes the membership of the Berlin Gemeinde in June, 1949.

TABLE 3

MEMBERSHIP OF THE BERLIN GEMEINDE,\(^{a}\) JUNE 27, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 &amp; over</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>2,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>7,044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Der Weg, July 15, 1949.

Estimates of the number of native Jews in Germany depended upon observations by local leaders and overseas welfare workers, who were in agreement that in May, 1949, there were some 16,000 German Jews living in Germany.

The census of 1946 and the survey published in Juedisches Gemeindeblatt on December 24, 1948, although inadequate for the purpose of accurately establishing the size of the German Jewish population, offered an indication of the future of the Jewish community in Germany. Many of the displaced Jews who joined the Gemeinden were expected to remain in Germany and become a part of postwar German Jewry.

**Displaced Jews**

A striking feature of the period under review was the mass emigration of Jewish DP’s from Germany, mainly to Israel and the United States. According to reports of the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), since the establishment of the Jewish state (May 14, 1948) and up to June 30, 1949, 57,083 Jewish DP’s left Germany for Israel. From October, 1948, through June 30, 1949, 12,950 Jews departed from Germany for the United States under the United States Displaced Persons Act of 1948. It may be taken for granted that almost all of them were DP’s. The total number of Jewish DP’s who left Germany between June, 1948, and June, 1949, was estimated at more than 70,000.

* See Displaced Persons, p. 320.
It was difficult to forecast the number of displaced Jews who would remain in Germany after the current wave of emigration. The Office of the Advisor on Jewish Affairs to the United States Army in Germany and Austria estimated this number at approximately 15,000 (JDC Review, V, May, 1949). At any rate, as a result of the mass emigration the system of self-government of displaced Jews, which functioned since 1944-45, was on the threshold of virtual liquidation. Jewish DP’s who remained in Germany after the emptying of the camps were expected to be absorbed by the Gemeinden. Negotiations toward a merger of the committees of displaced Jews and the Gemeinden in the United States Zone were initiated during the period under review. The Gemeinde and the DP committee in Frankfort-on-the-Main merged in May, 1949.

**Gemeinden**

According to the previously mentioned survey published in Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, there were 102 Gemeinden in all zones of Germany in the Spring of 1948, with 24 in the United States Zone, 51 in the British Zone, 15 in the French Zone, 11 in the Soviet Zone, and 1 in Greater Berlin.

Thirty-two of the Gemeinden had memberships of more than 100, five exceeded 500, and three exceeded 1,000. Those with memberships of 250 or more are listed in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gemeinde</th>
<th>Membership 1948</th>
<th>Number of Jews 1939</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>159,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>3,300-3,400</td>
<td>4,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>8,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort-on-the-Main</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>13,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>7,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>4,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiesbaden</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lueneburg</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(Unknown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The membership includes German and displaced Jews. The Gemeinde in Stuttgart was not listed separately.

b These figures are from the German census of 1939.

Although small and weak, the Gemeinden were drawn into the political turmoil in postwar Germany. Particularly involved was the Gemeinde in Berlin, where the Soviet Union clashed directly with the Western allies. The Berlin Gemeinde tried to preserve a neutral attitude. Its point of view was expressed in an article published by Heinz Galinski in Der Weg on December 3, 1948. The Jewish community in Berlin, he wrote, was a non-political body and beyond political party struggles. In conformity with this attitude,

Galinski took over the chairmanship of the Berlin Gemeinde in May, 1949, after his predecessor, Hans-Erich Fabian, emigrated to the United States.
Galinski resigned the chairmanship of the Berlin section of the Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes (VVN), the Union of Persecutees of the Nazi Regime, because this organization became involved in political campaigns under Communist leadership (AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, p. 378).

The split between East and West hindered the activities of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Juedischer Gemeinden Deutschlands, (Coordinating Committee of the Jewish Communities of Germany), established in June, 1947 (AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, pp. 381-82). The executive committee of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft met only once during the period under review, on May 30, 1948 (Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, June 9, 1948). There were conferences of the Gemeinden in the British Zone on May 16, 1949, and in Bavaria in September, 1948.

The establishment of the Jewish state strengthened the Zionist sympathies of the official leadership of the Gemeinden. This attitude was warmly supported by all German Jewish publications.6 There was no important opposition to the Zionist views of the official Gemeinde leadership. The German Jewish press, however, mentioned the existence of a union in Hamburg called Die aus Theresienstadt (Those from Theresienstadt) under the chairmanship of Dr. Leopold, who allegedly was refused membership in the Hamburg Gemeinde (Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, May 6, 1949).

While accurate data on the number of institutions supported by the Gemeinden was not available, it was known that they maintained five hospitals, one convalescent home, nine homes for the aged, two children's homes, two kindergartens, and three schools.

Education and Religion

A majority of the Jewish children attended general schools. The three Jewish schools in Berlin held only supplementary weekly religious classes and were attended by some 150 children. There were few children among German Jewish families. Centers of worship existed in every Jewish community; there were several in Berlin. During 1948-49, synagogues and houses of worship in Cologne, Duesseldorf, Essen, and Frankfort-on-the-Main were restored. The Gemeinden were responsible for the restoration of cemeteries, and the Berlin Gemeinde was supervising three cemeteries, including the one on the Grosse Hamburger Strasse which dated back to 1827.

Religious life was handicapped by a lack of rabbis. All of the rabbis officiating were either of foreign origin or residents of foreign countries in Germany on temporary assignments. Altogether, there were five rabbis in the Western zones of occupation: one in the British Zone, one in Bavaria, one in Wuerttemberg, one in Hesse, and one in Berlin. They were Rabbis Schwarzschild (Berlin), Broch (British Zone), Ohrenstein (Bavaria), Guttmann (Wuerttemberg), and Weinberg (Hesse). In place of Rabbi Simon G. Kramer, who terminated his service early in 1949, Rabbi Isaac Klein of the Synagogue

---

6 Only two German Jewish periodicals were published in Germany at the time of this review: Juedisches Gemeindeblatt in Duesseldorf, and Deg Weg in Berlin. Neue Welt, Munich, and Zwischen den Zeiten, Coblenz, ceased publication in 1948. The Juedische Verlagsgesellschaft (Jewish Publication Society), set up in Wiesbaden in March, 1948, was liquidated in the same year.
Council of America was appointed the Jewish Religious Adviser on the staff of the American Military Government (AMG) in Germany.

**Economic Life**

Early in 1949 the Union of Jewish Merchants and Handicraftsmen was set up in Hanover and Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in June of the same year the Centralverband juedischer Gewerbetreibender in West-deutschland was founded in Frankfort-on-the-Main.

Taxes did not contribute any substantial amount to the budget of the Gemeinden. The activities of the communities were dependent upon the assistance of Jewish overseas welfare organizations, among whom the most important role was played by JDC, which supported almost all communal institutions and Gemeinde members in need. The Jewish Committee for Relief Abroad operated in the British Zone and in Berlin, while ORT was responsible for initiating vocational training courses in Berlin and Hamburg.

During 1948 two German governmental offices dealing mostly with Jewish affairs were reorganized. In Bavaria, the office of Philip Auerbach, State Commissioner to Protect Racial, Religious, and Political Persecutees, became the Office of Attorney General for Restitution and Indemnification. In Hesse, the office of Curt Epstein, former State Commissioner for the Regulation of Jewish Affairs, became the Section for Indemnification within the Liberation Department, the Wiedergutmachungsabteilung im Befreiungsministerium.

There were no surveys of the occupations of German Jews. The impression obtained from casual information was that the economic status of Jews in Germany resembled that of the period before Hitler. There was, however, one important difference. A larger percentage of Jews than formerly was in the higher age bracket and dependent upon pensions granted to victims of the Nazi regime. The data on Jewish lawyers (Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, April 15, 1949) revealed 91 Jewish lawyers in all the zones of occupation: 38 in Berlin, 19 in the British Zone, 15 in the United States Zone, 14 in the French Zone, and 5 in the Soviet Zone. The same newspaper published the following figures on Jews in governmental agencies: one minister (Kiel), one chief of police (Saarbruecken), one member of the Bavarian senate, twelve high court justices, and six high governmental officials.

Most of the Gemeinden regained their public law corporation status. In the British Zone the Military Government was reluctant to restore the pre-Hitler legal status of the Gemeinden because the latter were affiliated with the Central Committee of Liberated Jews in the British Zone, which in the eyes of the British represented only displaced Jews who were unwilling to remain in Germany. In December, 1948, however, the Lord Mayor of Hamburg, Max Brauer, with the approval of the British Military Government, presented the Hamburg Gemeinde with a charter recognizing it as a public law corporation.

**Restitution and Indemnification**

The most important legal acts adopted during the year under review in the field of compensation for losses suffered under the Hitler regime were the
following: In the United States Zone the Military Government, on June 23, 1948, recognized the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization (JRSO), and on August 5, 1949, approved the General Claims Law. In the British Zone (May 23, 1949) and in the Western sectors of Berlin (July 26, 1949) laws relating to restitution of identifiable property were enacted by occupation authorities, and all Laender of the British Zone passed laws on indemnification for imprisonment (*Haftentschaedigungsgesetz*).

Thus, all the Western zones of occupation and all the Western sectors of Berlin possessed laws relating to restitution of identifiable property enacted by the respective occupation authorities. As of December 31, 1948—the time limit for filing restitution claims under Law 59 in the United States Zone—JRSO filed more than 163,000 claims. It was estimated that as of June 30, 1949—the special time limit allowed JRSO to file claims under the same law—the number of claims filed was some 200,000.

The closing date for filing claims under British Restitution Law 59 was set as December 31, 1949; under French *Verordnung* 120, August 15, 1949; and under the Berlin Restitution Law, June 30, 1950.

As to indemnification, the most inclusive regulation was that incorporated into the General Claims Law approved in the United States Zone on August 5, 1949, which granted compensation in almost all cases not covered by Restitution Law 59. A first draft of the General Claims Law was passed by the *Laenderrat*, the Council of States, of the United States Zone on September 28, 1948, and subsequently submitted to AMG for approval. Mainly because it did not include DP’s living in camps as beneficiaries and did accept the principle of escheat with respect to heirless claims, this draft was returned to the *Laenderrat* by AMG. The *Laenderrat* revised the draft in conformity with the wishes of the Military Government and, on April 26, 1949, a final text was adopted which was submitted to AMG. On June 6, 1949, AMG sent the new draft back to the *Laenderrat* and indicated that it should be up to the German Federal Republic to enact it. On August 5, 1949, however, United States High Commissioner McCloy reversed the decision of the American Military Government and approved the draft.

With the approval of the British Military Government, partial indemnification laws (*Haftentschaedigungsgesetz*) were adopted by the parliaments of Nordrhein-Westfalen, Niedersachsen, Schleswig-Holstein, and Hamburg, i.e., all the Laender in the British Zone. In addition, there were other laws approved in these Laender which provided for compensation of victims of the Nazi regime.

On June 29, 1948, the Military Government of the French Zone promulgated in *Verordnung* 164 a program for indemnification of victims of National Socialism. The Laender of the French Zone had not acted upon this measure at the time of writing.

**Intergroup Relations**

Many contradictory features characterized the attitude of Germans to their Jewish fellow-citizens. Several groups were seeking to bridge the abyss created by Hitler between Jews and non-Jews.
In Duesseldorf, the congress of one of the strongest of Germany’s political parties, the Social Democrats, unanimously passed a resolution in September, 1948, urging the German authorities to extend assistance to persons persecuted during the rule of the Third Reich because of their race, religion, or political opinion. Kurt Schumacher, leader of that party, in an address to the congress, deplored the lack of humanity in the legislation concerning restitution and indemnification of Jews by German authorities (Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, September 17, 1948).

The seventy-second congress of German Catholics (Katholikentag), held in Mainz in 1948, condemned the crimes committed against Jewish individuals and emphasized that these crimes were not openly opposed within Germany (Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, September 17, 1948). To commemorate the tragic events of 1938, when hundreds of synagogues were set on fire and tens of thousands of German Jews put in concentration camps, the Evangelische Hilfstelle fuer ehemals Rasseverfolgten; Buero Pfarrer Grueber, Evangelical Relief Office for Former Racial Persecutees, organized a special meeting in Berlin at which Christian and Jewish clergymen denounced the crimes committed against Jews during the Hitler period (Der Weg, November 12, 1948).


On the other hand, expressions of anti-Semitism were reported in German Jewish newspapers, and there was no abatement of acts of desecration against Jewish cemeteries. Juedisches Gemeindeblatt recorded thirteen acts of vandalism against Jewish cemeteries. Certain decisions of the denazification courts shocked democratic opinion in Germany. For example, Veit Harlan, producer of the anti-Semitic film, Jud Suess, who was charged with a crime against humanity, was acquitted by the court. Another instance should be mentioned. In Memmingen, Upper Bavaria, a landlady who wanted to get rid of her Jewish tenant, permitted her lawyer to accuse the tenant of a ritual crime. The landlady and her lawyer were brought before the court in Memmingen in April, 1949, and were found not guilty. Making use of legal niceties, the court decided that the Bavarian law against race hatred could not be applied. On appeal, a superior court in Munich annulled the decision of the lower court and in July, 1949, the landlady and her lawyer were sentenced on a charge of slander.

The anti-Semitism still virulent in Germany was encouraged by the attitude of certain members of the AMG. General Lucius D. Clay stated in response to a question at a press conference that he had become aware of anti-Semitic inclinations on the part of some members of the Military Government, including high officials, which he then vigorously denounced (The New York Times, February 16, 1949).

Before leaving Germany for Israel, Hermann Helfgott, the former chief rabbi in the British Zone, wrote to his congregation: “Do not forget that Ger-
many for us is nothing more than a cemetery where no Jewish life can or may develop" (Juedisches Gemeindeblatt, September 17, 1948). About a year later, the chief rabbi in Berlin, Stephen S. Schwarzschild, expressed a completely different opinion: "We should prepare ourselves and others to accept the fact that there will be a German Jewry for an unlimited period of time" (Der Weg, June 8, 1949).

Only the future will show who was right.

AUSTRIA

Population

As of March 31, 1949, 11,801 Jews were registered with the Gemeinden of Austria. Table 5 is a breakdown of membership in the Gemeinden on March 31, 1949, as published in Die Gemeinde of Vienna in April, 1949.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gemeinde</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>10,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linz</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bregenz</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steyr</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Ischl</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As of March 31, 1949.

TABLE 6

New Members of the Vienna Gemeinde, January-April, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Repatriates</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. and Canada</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel and Cyprus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infants, Austrian Jews from other cities, and persons returning to the Jewish Gemeinde — — 65

Grand total 2,037

Not all of these were native Jews. In Vienna, for instance, some 2,000 of the Gemeinde members were foreigners. More than 90 per cent of the Austrian Jewish population resided in Vienna. The membership of the Vienna
Gemeinde was increasing as a result of repatriation and infiltration. As of April 30, 1949, the Vienna *Kultusgemeinde*, the religious community, listed 11,716 members—an increase of nearly 1,000 over March 31, 1949—and of the total, 981 were under thirteen years of age; 344 between the ages of thirteen and eighteen; 4,849 between nineteen and forty-five; and 5,542 over forty-six years of age (*Die Gemeinde*, June, 1948).

According to the reports of the Vienna Gemeinde, 2,037 new members entered the community during the first four months of 1949. Of this number, as shown in Table 6, 541 were repatriates, 1,431 were refugees, and 65 were infants, Austrian Jews from other cities, and persons returning to the Jewish Gemeinde.

There were more than 9,000 displaced Jews in Austria as of April 30, 1949. During the period between July, 1948, and June 30, 1949, some 11,800 Jewish DP's left Austria. Almost all of them went to Israel. The infiltration of DP's from Eastern Europe did not cease during the period under review. It reached its lowest point in October, 1948, began to increase in November of the same year, and totaled about 8,000 for the first five months of 1949. In June, 1949, infiltration declined.

**Community Life**

The change in leadership within the Vienna Gemeinde which resulted from the April, 1948, elections to the Gemeinde council (*American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 50, p. 386) did not bring about a resolution of the internal struggles. The left-wing group adhering to the Gemeinde president, which was defeated in the 1948 elections, formed an organization called *Juedische Einigkeit*, Jewish Unity, and continued to publish the magazine *Der neue Weg* during 1948.

On May 18, 1949, a new presidium of the Gemeinde was elected. Juedische Einigkeit won three seats, the Jewish Federation (Zionist) three, and the Jewish Socialists (Social Democrats) two. The coalition of Zionists and Socialists retained the majority in the presidium.


More than 50 per cent of the Vienna Gemeinde budget was covered by JDC subsidies, the rest by donations, fees for various services, and, to a small extent, by taxes. A substantial number of the members found it difficult to make ends meet. For each of the months February through June, 1949, on an average the Vienna Gemeinde gave cash relief to more than 1,500 persons, served some 165 persons in two canteens, cared for 107 aged, accepted 86 in reception centers, admitted 88 patients to the Vienna Jewish Hospital, and provided scholarships to 260 university and professional school students. In addition, it maintained a synagogue (*Seitenstettengasse*) and a cemetery, recorded births, deaths, and marriages, and conducted a locator service. To enable it to cover current expenditures, to finance repairs on Jewish homes damaged during the war, to set up a Jewish rehabilitation fund, and to re-establish the Rothschild Hospital, the Vienna Gemeinde sought a loan from
the Austrian government. Heirless Jewish property was expected to be offered as security for the loan. Negotiations with the government were still in process at the time of writing.

On the initiative of the Gemeinde and with the assistance of JDC, a credit cooperative, Juedische Spar- und Kreditgenossenschaft, was established in Vienna. The organizational meeting of the cooperative was held on March 14, 1949, at which time a board of directors and a control committee were elected. One hundred and thirty members subscribed 100,000 Austrian schillings as share capital.

An important contribution to the welfare of the Austrian Jewish population were the JDC parcels distributed monthly throughout the Vienna Gemeinde. Through April, 1949, 12,000 of these parcels, each of which contained between 12,000 and 15,000 calories, were distributed monthly; after May 1, 1949, 8,000 were distributed a month. (The daily ration in Austria was 2,100 calories.)

Education of children presented a complicated problem because of the small number of youngsters and the fact that they were widely dispersed throughout the city. The Gemeinde tried to organize supplementary classes on religious and general Jewish subjects, to meet two or three times a week.

Like the Jews in Germany, Austrian Jews faced anti-Semitism. In connection with the elections slated for the Fall of 1949, attempts were made to introduce a fourth political party into the country's political life. (Only three political parties, Catholic, Socialist, and Communist, were recognized by the occupation authorities.) A group called Vereinigung der Unabhaengigen, the Union of Independents, attempted to develop support among former Nazis, and exploited anti-Semitic feelings among some segments of the population as a weapon in its political struggle. This group published several anti-Semitic newspapers (Der Weg, May 27, 1949).

The Verband der Rueckstellungsbetroffenen, Union of the Acquirers of Jewish Goods, was established in Vienna on June 17, 1948, to oppose restitution of property taken from Jews during the Nazi regime. The group issued a publication, Unser Recht (“Our Right”). A rally of Vienna Jews, held under the auspices of the Gemeinde on November 18, 1948, urged the government to revoke the charter of the organization and demanded an active policy to compensate victims of the Nazi regime.

Austria did not have a general law on restitution or indemnification. Instead, the government envisaged a series of laws dealing with special aspects of compensation for losses suffered during the Hitler regime. Four such restitution laws (Rueckstellungsgesetze) were enacted in 1946 and 1947 (AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 49, p. 379; Vol. 50, p. 387). A fifth restitution law had been pending for approximately two years. In view of the scheduled election, it was considered doubtful that the parliament would act on the legislation. Three additional restitution laws were also under consideration. The time limit for filing claims under the third restitution law (Law 54, March 27, 1947) was extended until December 31, 1949. The Opferfuersorgegesetz (AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, p. 387) was amended early in 1949 to give persons who were persecuted because of their race or religion the same privileges as political persecutees.

Boris Sapir
Eastern Europe

SOVIET UNION

The year under review was a year of "cold war," of a mobilization of all material and spiritual resources by countries within the Soviet sphere of influence for the struggle against the West, and of the strengthening of militant Communist control in all fields throughout Eastern Europe.

Inside the Soviet Union, the year saw a drive that aimed at inducing implacable hostility to the Western world and at eradicating all vestiges of Western influences in Soviet life. A systematic campaign of vilification was conducted against all manifestations of "cosmopolitanism" and of nationalism other than Russian. The Soviet publications attacked and violently denounced every opinion and every group which was suspected of admitting the existence of any kind of beneficial foreign influence in Soviet life or Russian culture, in the present as well as in the past, or which stressed any kind of ideological, cultural, or communal ties between groups inside and outside the Soviet sphere of influence. The admitted aim of this campaign was to liquidate such groups and opinions. The result was that all fields of public activities were purged of "cosmopolitan" and "nationalist" tendencies, and persons accused of such deviations were demoted, dismissed from their jobs, exiled, or arrested.

This general trend found one expression in a new attitude toward the Jewish question. The period of silence about Jewish problems was abruptly ended. However, Soviet publications carried no information about the number of Jews, their economic conditions and social stratification, or their communal life. But the Jewish question in Russia came suddenly into the limelight when the Soviet press announced a new party line on Jewish problems and when the new attitude was introduced in a series of public statements.

The New Attitude

This turn in policies was introduced by a programmatic article by the well-known Russian writer Ilya Ehrenburg in the Moscow Pravda on September 21, 1948. This article was an official directive for the new policy: it was reprinted, quoted, and interpreted as such again and again. Its main stress was upon denying the existence of any bonds of solidarity between Jews of different countries. Ehrenburg argued that the only bond between them was that imposed by anti-Semitism and persecution. When this persecution ends, he said, the Jews would "simply enter the common life of other nations." The Jewish question could be solved only by the world-wide victory of the Soviet Union and its allies, which would remove the roots of anti-Semitism.

1 See American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, p. 400 ff.
This reaffirmation of traditional Communist assimilationist views was coupled with attacks against Zionism and the government of Israel. Israel was to be considered a transitory place of refuge where Jews from "reactionary," i.e., non-Communist countries might survive until the deluge of anti-Semitism subsided and the Jewish question was definitely solved by the world-wide victory of the Soviet system. Israel should be supported in its fight against "Western imperialism." But the Zionists, being bourgeois nationalists, could not be trusted. Israel, as a capitalist state, was not ruled by the people but by exploiters, and it was the duty of Israeli workers to fight not only against the invaders but also against the reactionary Jewish bourgeoisie.

The final part of the article contained strong warnings against any identification by Russian Jews with Israel. Soviet Jews were urged not to look to the Near East, but rather to build their "socialist fatherland," Soviet Russia.

On October 19, 1949, an article by G. Zhitz, editor of Einikeit, the only Yiddish newspaper in Russia which was still in existence at that time, vehemently attacked the idea that Israel was the homeland of all the Jews.

In January, 1949, a pamphlet against Zionism and "Jewish nationalism," written by the economist T. A. Genin, was published by the Soviet Society for the Dissemination of Political and Social Knowledge. About 150,000 copies were reportedly distributed through bookstores and news-stands in Moscow and other large cities. Genin attacked Zionism as a "reactionary and anti-democratic trend of the Jewish bourgeoisie" working for the interests of British and American imperialism.

The Liquidation of Jewish Organizations and Press

At the same time the Soviet government was quietly liquidating all remaining Jewish organizations and press organs. Zionism had been outlawed in Russia in the early twenties and its leaders had died in jails and concentration camps. The remaining Jewish institutions, after many purges, were headed by Jewish Communists who were closely following the party line. Nevertheless, they cultivated the Yiddish language and literature and, during the war, maintained relations with Jews outside the country, trying to impress them with propaganda about the favorable attitude of the Soviet government to Jewish civic equality and to Jewish culture. The center of these activities was the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow, founded for that purpose in 1941, and Einikeit, its Yiddish organ. In November, 1948, after the Soviet line changed, Einikeit was suddenly discontinued and the Anti-Fascist Committee dissolved, without any public explanation. According to repeated reports, the leaders of the Committee and most of the well-known Yiddish writers were arrested and deported. Among them were Itzik Pfefer, secretary of the Anti-Fascist Committee; L. Goldberg, an editor of Einikeit, and the writers Peretz Markish, Nistor, S. Halkin, David Bergelson, Moshe Broderzon, and Leib Kvitko. There was no official announcement about their arrest. But repeated reports of the arrests were never denied; their names disappeared from the press and none of them was mentioned in connection with the pro-Communist "World Congress of Partisans of Peace" held in Paris in April, 1949.
The world Communist press answered repeated questions about their fate with either silence or abuse, carefully evading a clear answer.

At the same time, the Yiddish almanac, Shtern, in the Ukraine was discontinued on the charge that it was "cultivating nationalist feelings." No Yiddish periodicals were left in the Soviet Union, except possibly in Birobidjan.

The Campaign Against "Cosmopolitanism"

Beginning in January, 1949, an intense official campaign was conducted in the Soviet Union against "homeless cosmopolitanism." This deviation was officially defined by the noted Soviet author, Konstantin Simonov, as "the desire to undermine the roots of national pride because people without roots are easier to push over and to sell into slavery to American imperialism" (Pravda, February 27, 1949). The "cosmopolitans" were denounced as people who were "kowtowing to the West," as "anti-patriotic" and as traitors. They were expelled from the party, fired from their jobs, and in many cases arrested.

The purge of cosmopolitans started with attacks against theater critics, but was subsequently expanded to all kinds of public activities, from art and science to sports and circus performances. Although it was by no means aimed at the Jews exclusively, the Jews constituted more than two-thirds of the known victims. The best known among them were the theater critics Y. Yuzovsky, A. Gurvich, I. Altman, L. Subotsky, A. Leites, A. Erlikh; the literary critics D. Danin, B. Kholtsman, E. Kholodov, A. Kron, F. Levin; the film critics and directors S. Yutkevich, M. Bleiman, V. Volkenshtein, Trauberg; the literary historians B. Yakovlev, E. Byalik, G. Brovman; the professor of philosophy M. Rozental; the historians I. I. Mintz, N. L. Rubinshtein, Feigina, and Kafengauz; the economic historians I. Blyumin, D. Rozenberg, B. M. Shtein; the architects E. A. Levinson, Moises Gintsburg, I. Khiger, L. Gabrichevsky; the sports writers G. Yasny (Finkelstein), V. Viktorov (Zlochevsky), A. Svetov (Sheidlin) and G. Gurevich; and the scientist S. Altschuler.

Whatever the primary intent of the campaign, its result was a drastic purge of a great part of the Soviet Jewish intelligentsia. In addition, the adjectives used to describe the victims—especially those with Jewish names—such as "homeless," "rootless," "passportless," "alien," "wandering," were reminiscent of the stereotypes employed in anti-Jewish propaganda, and probably reinforced anti-Semitic prejudices. There were repeated insinuations that such people were not able to properly understand Russian national character and that Russian national pride was "alien" to them.

But the most startling development in the campaign was the systematic revelation of the original Jewish names of purged persons who had been using Russian names or pseudonyms for many years. This was a radical departure from well-established Soviet custom. Before 1949, the original names of authors, artists, and politicians had been mentioned, in addition to their pseudonyms, only in official decrees about appointments, prizes, and other honors for which the individual had to be clearly identified. But they had never been used in political or literary polemics, and they were often omitted
even from official announcements. Such practices had always been considered anti-Semitic, counter-revolutionary, and criminal.

However, after January, 1949, the Soviet newspapers began to add the original Jewish names to the Russian pseudonyms of the “homeless cosmopolitans.” Melnikov was now revealed as Mehlman, Yakovlev as Kholtsman, Kholodov as Meyerovich, Stebun as Katznelson, Burlachenko as Berdychevsky, Sanov as Schmulson, Yasny as Finkelstein, Martish as Finkelstein, Svetov as Sheidlin, Alexander Isbakh as Isak Bakhrahh, etc. In March, 1949, the Komsomolskaya Pravda suddenly discovered that the pen-names Zveryev and Vladimirov covered the identity of the “cosmopolitan” scientist whose real name was S. Altschuler.

In many cases, the charge of cosmopolitanism was directly linked to that of “Jewish nationalism.” The Jewish State Theater in Moscow was attacked for “anti-patriotic activities,” allegedly instilled there through the influence of cosmopolitan Jewish theater critics. The Yiddish theater in Minsk was condemned for producing the classical plays of Abraham Goldfaden, and N. I. Gusarov, secretary of the Bielorussian Communist party, told a party conference in Minsk that “only one theater in the Republic—the Jewish one—has until recently put on anti-patriotic plays.” The plays were termed anti-patriotic and cosmopolitan because they “idealized the patriarchal life of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie and praised the life in bourgeois America.” An article in Literaturnaya Gazeta attacked the editors of a glossary to a Soviet encyclopedia because they devoted as much space to world Jewish literature as to the literature of the Uzbekhs, Khazaks, and Georgians combined, and because they treated world Jewish literature as an entity. At the end of March, 1949, the Soviet critic B. Byalik was castigated in the same magazine because he had written that the Russian poet Mayakovsky had been influenced by the Jewish writer Chaim Nachman Bialik, described by Literaturnaya Gazeta as “a Jewish mystic poet and reactionary.” In another article, the Jewish writer Alexander Isbakh (Isak Bakhrahh) was condemned for his “glorification of the Jewish religion” and for “Zionist propaganda,” because he had written in a semi-autobiographical book that Zionism had greatly influenced him during his youth and that Jews had gathered in synagogues and studied the Talmud.

Thus, the campaign against Zionism and “Jewish nationalism” was broadened to include attacks on all Jewish cultural and communal traditions, and all traditions of Jewishness were denounced as a form of both “cosmopolitanism” and “nationalism.”

The effect of the campaign was to identify all traditions of Jewishness with Jewish nationalism, Jewish nationalism with “reactionary bourgeois Zionism,” Zionism with “homeless cosmopolitanism,” and cosmopolitanism with “service to imperialism and treason” against the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, measures were taken only against Jewish individuals and groups suspected of “Jewish nationalism” or “cosmopolitanism”; reliable Communists of Jewish origin who took active part in the fight against these heresies were able to keep their positions in the party hierarchy, and among the winners of Stalin prizes for science and art, which were awarded in 1949, there were several citizens with Jewish names.
Mass Deportations

During the Summer of 1949, the Jewish press outside the Soviet Union carried a number of reports about the mass deportations of Jews from the Western border regions of the Soviet Union, especially from White Russia, the Ukraine, Eastern Galicia, Bukovina, and Bessarabia. According to one report, the deportations affected mainly those Jewish citizens who had relatives in America or Western Europe; other sources maintained that the whole Jewish population of some territories was being deported. The reports described, often in great detail, how the secret police rounded up the Jews, put them on deportation trains, and sent them off to unknown destinations, presumably Siberia or the Arctic regions of European Russia. One report asserted that 30,000 Jews had been deported from Lwow (Lemberg) and other cities of former Polish Eastern Galicia, and that the whole region was now free of Jews. Another dispatch described similar proceedings in an unnamed Ukrainian city. Indirect evidence of the veracity of these reports was seen in the fact that Polish Jews who had maintained correspondence with their relatives in the Ukraine and White Russia ceased to receive answers and their letters were returned with the comment: "Returned to sender, addressee has left." According to a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report, the American embassy in Moscow received reports about the deportations but was not able to verify them on the spot, because travel by foreigners in Russia was severely limited. At the same time, similar reports were received about mass deportations of Estonians, Letts, and Lithuanians from the Baltic countries, and of Greeks, Turks, and Armenians from the Black Sea coast.

The American Jewish League Against Communism sent a protest to the Secretary General of the United Nations in which it estimated the number of Jews affected by the deportations as 400,000. The American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists labeled these accusations as "fantastic" and "without foundation." They were also denied by the Communist press in countries outside Russia, but the Soviet government did not issue an official denial. At the time of writing it was impossible to ascertain with any degree of certitude to what extent the reports were true.

Birobidjan

During the year under review, no news was received about the life of Jews in the "Autonomous Region of Birobidjan." The Ambijan Bulletin, published by the American Birobidjan Committee, printed lengthy reports about the celebrations of the fifteenth anniversary of Birobidjan, which were held in New York City; about organizational activities of the Committee in the United States; and about alleged anti-Soviet conspiracies in America. But the periodical carried no recent information about Birobidjan.

Joseph Gordon
The merger of the Socialist and Communist parties, in December, 1948, completed the political transition period which started in Poland toward the end of 1947 with the flight of Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, leader of the Peasant party opposition. After the merger, the Communists became the undisputed possessors of the administrative apparatus of the country. Joseph Cyrankiewicz, former leader of the Socialist party (PPS), thereafter a member of the Politburo of the United Workers party, retained his post as prime minister of Poland apparently resigning himself to accepting an unenviable status as a figurehead.

Immediately preceding the fusion congress, the Communist (PPR) and Socialist (PPS) parties underwent a thorough purge in which "rightist" and "nationalist" deviationists were exposed and the guilty removed from leadership posts or simply expelled from the party. Among the well-known leaders of the PPS who were dropped in this fashion were Edward Osubka-Moravski, who was a former prime minister, and Boleslaw Drobner, Stanislaw Szwalbe, and Julian Hochfeld.

In the Communist ranks the purge resulted in the ousting of Wladislaw Gomulka, secretary-general of the PPR and alleged leader of the deviation. He was succeeded in the party hierarchy by Boleslaw Bierut, the President of Poland.

There were widespread rumors of another fight going on among the top leaders of the party and involving Hilary Minc, minister of industry and commerce. There were apparently differences of opinion among Polish Communists concerning the collectivization of agriculture. One school of thought held that collectivization should not be rushed, for fear of provoking the peasant population.

The three-year reconstruction plan, which was scheduled for completion by the end of 1949, was to be succeeded by a new six-year plan which, according to Minc, was to have as one of its chief aims not only the rehabilitation but the expansion of industrial facilities of the country, particularly in the rural districts, as well.

In this connection it should be noted that Poland achieved such substantial progress in the reconstruction of its war-shattered economy that rationing was totally abolished in January, 1949.

Far-reaching reforms in public education were effected. The universities and schools were placed under strong government control, with a government body responsible for the appointment of professors and teachers. The newly established All Polish Youth Union controlled all youth activities. Through this Union the younger generation of Poles was being brought into line with established Communist policy.

Since the fusion of the Socialists and Communists, and notwithstanding the continued existence of a coalition government, supreme power was in the hands of the Politburo of the United Workers party.
Population

There is no way of ascertaining the exact number of Jews now in Poland. The figures given by some local observers vary from 60,000 and less, to 80,000. During the 1949 Passover registration conducted by the Central Committee of Polish Jews in connection with matzoth distribution, the figure obtained was over 90,000, including about 45,000 Jews residing in Lower Silesia; Lodz reported 13,690 Jews, Warsaw (including some small neighboring towns—Ger, Otwock, Plock) 5,162, Bielsko 900, Bendzin 75, and Kielce 51 (Dos Naye Lebn, April 6, 1949). Some local observers, however, have questioned the validity of the figures indicated by the matzoth registration, believing that in several cities the numbers were considerably inflated by local Jewish officials. In the Spring of 1948 there were from 87,000 to 90,000 Jews in Poland. During 1948, several groups of Jewish repatriates returned from Russia (the total of these did not exceed 2,500) and some 1,000 persons returned from the displaced persons camps. On the other hand, from January, 1948, through March, 1949, some 7,000 Jews left Poland legally, most of them for Israel. In addition, several thousand Jews left the country illegally. On the basis of this data, a conservative estimate of the 1949 Jewish population is in the neighborhood of 80,000.

Although the Jewish population was fairly well established in various parts of the country, Jewish leaders were recently concerned with the problem of the transfer of Jews from small towns to larger cities, where employment opportunities were better.

Economic Status

Data on occupational distribution of the Jewish population showed that in 1948 out of a total of 88,257, 36,954 persons were gainfully employed. The distribution of the gainfully employed is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and light industry</td>
<td>17,080</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial enterprises</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and transportation</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, municipal, and community employees</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and cultural institutions</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and social workers</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,954</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Dos Naye Lebn, December 13, 1948)

With the general recovery and the improvement of economic standards, the Polish Jews undoubtedly took a considerable step forward on the road to eco-
nomic rehabilitation and achieved substantial progress over the previous year. Nevertheless, the social status of the Jews had changed profoundly from the purely economic as well as the psychological point of view.

REORGANIZATION OF COOPERATIVES

Immediately after liberation and even as late as 1947, the Jewish community had striven for the reconstruction of its economic position unhindered, but it did so along the lines of traditional Jewish occupations. Even in creating producers' cooperatives, the Jewish community tried to adjust the Jewish economy to the new social structures emerging in Poland. This situation changed radically, however, during the year under review, when new slogans were advanced by the Communist party, and emphasis was laid on total integration in the economic plans of the government. From this point of view the most important changes occurred in the legal situation of Jewish producers' cooperatives, as well as in their composition, following the promulgation of the cooperative law of May 21, 1948, which regulated the status of the whole cooperative sector in the Polish economy. Prior to this law, the Jewish cooperatives had operated rather freely. They were not controlled by the government insofar as their production activities were concerned, and were subject only to periodic financial review by a special body. Before the new law went into effect, the Jewish producers' cooperatives were in a sense private enterprises, owned and directed by their members.

The new law provided for many structural changes in the cooperative movement: it abolished the internal autonomy of the cooperatives, whose production plans were now to be centralized in the top government-controlled body. According to the new law, a Central Union of Cooperatives (CZS) was created as an over-all directing agency, whose aim was to integrate the activities of the cooperatives into the state-controlled economy. All existing cooperatives were then affiliated with the CZS through a number of "centers," each coordinating activities in a particular industry, e.g., dairy cooperatives, meat cooperatives, fish cooperatives, etc. An exception was made for the Jewish producers' cooperatives, which were affiliated with the CZS through the Center for Jewish Producers' Cooperatives, Solidarnocs. The Solidarnocs, originally created in April, 1946, was dissolved and a new Center for Producers' Cooperatives was established in its place with the aim of maintaining the "productivization" of the Jewish population within the "framework of the general planned economy of the state" (Official Guide of the Central Union of Cooperatives, Book I, No. 2, July 5, 1948). The rather loose relationship which had existed between the producers' cooperatives and the Solidarnocs was replaced by a rigid government-controlled structure. After the reorganization, Solidarnocs was limited to the direction of Jewish producers' cooperatives in the field of handicrafts and small industry. Five Jewish agricultural cooperatives and seventeen meat, fish, and service cooperatives were directed to join their respective non-Jewish trade centers. The remaining 186 Jewish producers' cooperatives were compelled to become members of Solidarnocs, which not only supervised production and marketing but was also responsible for the creation of new Jewish producers' cooperatives, if any.

The scope and importance of the Jewish producers' cooperatives in Poland
may be gauged by the fact that in 1948 they were expected to reach a total output of the value of about four billion zlotys ($10,000,000), and in 1949 over twelve billion zlotys ($30,000,000). The Jewish producers’ cooperatives constituted about 20 per cent of the total cooperatives in Poland and were expected to produce about one-fourth of the total urban cooperative output in 1949. In that year there were in Poland 220 Jewish producers’ cooperatives, employing over 9,000 persons (Yidishe Nayes fun Poylen, Wechentlicher Informatzie Bulletin, Central Komitet fun di Yiden in Poylen, Warsaw, March 18, 1949). These were located in the regions of Lodz, Chorsow, and Warsaw, with about half of the total number in the region of Wroclaw.

In terms of composition, the ever-increasing number of non-Jewish members of cooperatives was of special significance: as of December, 1948, one-quarter of the total membership was non-Jewish. The reasons for this development lay not only in the emigration of substantial numbers of skilled Jewish artisans and workers, but also in the general economic assimilation policy pursued by the directing groups. One aspect of this change in the character of the membership of the cooperatives should be especially mentioned. These enterprises had for years been the backbone of Jewish social life in Poland. From a broader Jewish point of view, their importance in this respect was at least equal to their economic usefulness. Regardless of the place that the producers’ cooperatives was to occupy in the general economy of the country, with the increase of non-Jewish membership their role in Jewish life was continuously decreasing.

The Polish government assisted the cooperatives in various ways and particularly by making buildings and factories available. Thus, for instance, the government handed over to Jewish producers’ cooperatives a mill plant in Wroclaw, a weaving mill in Walbrzych, a sawmill in Szczegas, and a soap factory in Szczecin.

Communal Organization

In the years following the liberation and until June 1948, a certain duality existed in the Jewish communal organization in Poland: On the one hand, there was the Central Committee of Polish Jews, a political formation representing a coalition of Jewish political parties and possessing considerable influence in government circles; on the other hand, there were the old pre-war Jewish kehillot, with their Committee of Religious Congregations, dealing exclusively with matters of religious interest. Notwithstanding the fact that the quasi-official Central Committee administered all Jewish communal activities and represented Polish Jewry both internally and externally, the Committee of Religious Congregations continued to be regarded as at least partly representing the traditional kehillot. As early as 1947, negotiations for a merger between the two organizations were pending, but religious Jewry laid down a number of conditions and resisted “unity” (See AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, p. 395). Constant pressure was brought to bear on religious Jewry, and finally, at a session in April, 1948, the Committee of Jewish Religious Congregations decided to join the Central Committee of Polish Jews. A compromise was accepted which declared that the Committee of
Religious Congregations was to try to convince the Central Committee to observe the Sabbath whenever the activities of the two organizations coincided, and that kashrut would be provided wherever Jews required it. The affiliation of the Committee of Religious Congregations was ratified at a session of the Central Committee held in Warsaw on June 16, 1948.

Commenting upon the decision taken by the Committee of Religious Congregations, Joel Lazebnik, secretary-general of the Central Committee, stated: "...the Central Jewish Committee felt that the existence of separate representation of Polish Jewry was harmful ... The consolidation of both groups brings an end to separate action ... Henceforth, there will be one Jewish representative body speaking for the Jews of Poland, the Central Jewish Committee ..." (Jewish Life in Poland, July, 1948).

Soon after the affiliation of the Committee of Religious Congregations, another step in the direction of “organic unity” was made possible by the merger of the Jewish Socialist Bund with the Communist party. In 1948 the Central Committee of Polish Jews was still organized on a party coalition basis. Its presidium included four persons from the PPR (Communist) and the Socialist Bund, two from United Poale-Zion (left-wing Marxist), one from Poale-Zion C.S. Hitahdut (middle-of-the-road labor), and one representative from Ihud (General Zionist). The popular elections promised by the Central Committee never took place notwithstanding repeated assurances. With the Committee of Religious Congregations joined to the Central Committee and the Bund in the process of “self-liquidation,” the way was open for further changes. It was then decided to reorganize the Central Committee by changing its structure from that of an organization based on a coalition of political groups to that of a “mass” organization, enlarged by the inclusion of representatives of all existing agencies, cooperatives, “shock-workers” (Udarniki) and all other representatives of the “laboring classes.”

REORGANIZATION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

The Congress for Reorganization of the Central Committee was held in Warsaw on February 26 and 27, 1949. Among its 264 delegates were representatives of local and regional committees, Jewish writers and artists, heads of various Jewish welfare agencies, and fifty shock-workers (Dos Naye Lebn, February 28, 1949). The Congress was officially greeted in the name of the government by the minister of administration, Wladyslaw Wolski, who assured the delegates that “there will not be another Kielce (pogrom of Kielce, July 4, 1946) ... bestial anti-Semitism will be destroyed in Poland. ...” The new slogans of the Congress for Reorganization reflected the policy adopted by the Communists. The class struggle in Polish Jewish society was emphasized and it was pointed out that the “productivization” of the Polish Jewish population was essentially socialist; Polish Jewry was called upon to strive for better social integration with the Polish working class in order to build the new Socialist Poland (Speech delivered at the Congress by Joel Lazebnik, secretary-general of the Central Committee, Dos Naye Lebn, February 28, 1949).

A new Central Committee of Polish Jews, composed of fifty-four members,
was elected at the Congress. The fusion between the Socialist Bund and the Communists, and the presence on the Central Committee of so-called non-party representatives, giving to the Communists by far the largest number of seats, altered completely the character of the organization. The general direction of Committee affairs was entrusted to a presidium of eleven persons, consisting of Simon Zachariach, Adolph Berman, Joel Lazebnik, Hercz Smoliar, Shalom Grayek, Marek Bitter, Chief Rabbi David Kahane, David Sfard, H. Parnas, Salo Fiszgrund, and Pavel Zelicki. Adolph Berman (United Poale-Zion Left) was re-elected president, and Joel Lazebnik (Communist) general-secretary of the Committee. In turn, the presidium elected a small executive bureau of five which became the actual governing body of the Central Committee. Berman was the only non-Communist on the executive bureau, which in addition included among its members Hercz Smoliar, Joel Lazebnik, Marek Bitter, and Salo Fiszgrund (Yidishe Nayes fun Poylen, March 18, 1949). Berman's forced resignation as president of the Committee, which occurred soon after and his replacement by Hercz Smoliar, a Communist, further underlined the structural changes which occurred in Jewish communal organization. The United Poale-Zion Left, Berman's party, objected to the creation of the executive bureau and its composition (Arbeiter Zeitung, No. 3—58, March, 1949), but this protest had no practical results. The reorganization of the Central Committee followed the line of the Eastern-European conception of "unity," with the Communist party clearly and unequivocally at the head of all Committee activities.

Religious Activity

While the Central Committee, by including in its structure all existing Jewish agencies, expanded its influence, the Committee of Religious Congregations suffered a considerable setback and was steadily losing ground. A large number of rabbis left or planned to leave Poland. Toward the end of 1948 and the beginning of 1949, ten rabbis and some twenty religious leaders went to France, and most of them went on to Israel. Of 86 religious congregations existing at the beginning of 1948, only 65, comprising some 100 synagogues and houses of prayer were functioning in Poland in 1949. A meeting of the Rabbinical Council held in June, 1949, in Warsaw, repeated a previous appeal made to the Jews of Israel and other countries to send an authoritative religious scholar to Poland to direct a yeshiva. This was felt to be the only way to assure the continuation of higher religious education in the country. At this writing no practical response to this appeal had been received, and, as far as was known, the only existing yeshiva was that in Lodz, which had twenty students and faced a hopeless situation.

The problem of the exhumation of victims of the extermination and the preservation of seventy-one Jewish cemeteries continued to absorb the attention of the Committee of Religious Congregations. This work was proceeding very slowly despite the government law ordering the return to the Committee of Religious Congregations of tombstones which had been used for building and paving purposes by the Nazi regime.

Rabbi David Kahane, one of the chief representatives of religious Jewry in
the Central Committee of Polish Jews, continued to head the Rabbinical Council.

Welfare Activities

A widespread network of Jewish welfare agencies continued to function in Poland. Conducted by the Central Committee, Committee of Religious Congregations, TOZ (health and child care agency), ORT (vocational retraining agency), and various other organizations, the welfare agencies provided all types of social services to a considerable number of beneficiaries. Welfare activities were directed particularly toward service to special groups—orphanned children, widows, invalids, and the aged. In December, 1948, among other services, sixty-four canteens, fourteen children’s homes, twenty-one day nurseries, eight homes for the aged, one hospital, five tuberculosis sanitariums, fifty-three dispensaries, and fifteen infirmaries functioned in Poland. All of these institutions were receiving substantial support from the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. In this connection it should be pointed out that a number of the twenty-two foreign agencies engaged in relief work in Poland had recently ceased to operate following a governmental move to reduce to a minimum the contact of the population with foreign organizations.

In addition, the government indicated its willingness to absorb and place under state control some of the local welfare institutions. In a statement on August 13, 1948, to delegates of the Central Jewish Committee, Stanislaw Skrzeszewski, minister of education, declared that the ministry “was willing to nationalize all the Jewish institutions for children, for example, the children’s homes and kindergartens” (Jewish Life in Poland, October, 1948). At this writing, however, Jewish welfare activities in Poland were still being conducted by the various Jewish agencies and congregations.

Political Activities

While Jewish political parties still existed in Poland, their character and the scope of their activities were greatly affected by the general political evolution in the country. Political actions undertaken were channeled through the Central Committee of Polish Jews, whose spokesmen were considered to represent “the united democratic Jewish masses.” On several occasions during the period under review, the Central Committee of Polish Jews participated in world-wide Jewish political activities. Two such occasions deserve special mention: The Committee was represented at the Jewish Cultural Conference in Paris (July 9-13, 1948) organized by the left-wing Jewish groups in order to counteract a similar conference of the non-leftists—the World Jewish Cultural Congress, which was planned for New York. The Committee also participated in the Montreux session of the World Jewish Congress (June, 1948) with which it had been affiliated since January, 1948. Soon after the Montreux session was over, the Central Committee protested against the neutrality stand taken by the WJC in the East-West struggle. The Polish group also objected to the publication in one of the bulletins of the WJC of a survey of the situation of Jewish communities in various countries. The survey indicated the necessity
for mass emigration to Israel by Jews in the countries of the Soviet bloc. When WJC refused to participate in the Peace Congress organized by the Communists and held in Paris, the Central Committee decided that it was “aimless to continue the association with the present administration of the WJC” (Yidishe Nayes fun Poylen, May, 1949).

**Liquidation of Jewish Socialist Bund**

One arm of the Jewish political body was liquidated when the fifty-year-old Jewish Socialist Bund, which for decades had represented strongly anti-Zionist social-democratic Jewish labor, merged with the United Workers party. The Central Board of the Bund and the representatives of its regional organizations convened in Lodz on October 23 and 24, 1948. After acknowledging the past “errors” of the party which, according to its leaders, had always been under “pernicious Menshevik influence,” the convention decided to intensify its efforts toward achieving “organic unity” with the Communist workers of the country. Soon after, at a congress held in Wroclaw on January 16, 1949, the “organic unity” was realized, and the Bund decided to dissolve and merge with the United Workers party (Dos Naye Lebn, January 21, 1949).

**Zionist Activity**

Nor could the Zionist parties, which were still functioning, help but feel the heavy weight of the totalitarian trends now prevailing in Poland. Zionist youth organizations and a Zionist press (among others, Befrayung, Arbeiter Cajtung, Nasze Slowo) were still functioning, but their work was made more and more difficult by the official anti-Zionist position of the Communist party. The middle-of-the-road Poale-Zion C.S. Hitahdut, and even the left-wing Marxist Poale-Zion could not continue their political activities and their propaganda for emigration to Israel with the same freedom as before. The national conference of Jewish workers of the Communist party, held in the Winter of 1948, flatly rejected the “reactionary idea of Jewish exodus from Europe” and decided to fight even more vigorously the Zionist ideology and the “petty bourgeois utopian Halutzim . . .” (Dos Naye Lebn, November 17, 1948). The same slogan was repeated again and again on numerous occasions, and became the official line of the Communist party and the Central Committee.

**Relations with Israel**

Curiously enough, the strongly anti-Zionist policy had not for the time being affected the favorable attitude toward the state of Israel. In this particular respect the attitude of the Jewish Communists reflected the official position of the Polish government, which on numerous occasions not only supported Jewish demands in the United Nations but encouraged friendly relations with Israel at home. During the war in Palestine, daily meetings were held throughout Poland at which Jews and Gentiles alike expressed support of the Jewish state and contributed to Haganah. Interestingly enough, a Society of Polish-Israeli Friendship was functioning in Warsaw with the
sympathetic support of the government. On the occasion of the first anniversary of the Jewish state a solemn celebration was organized by the Society, at which, in addition to the Israeli minister, a number of representatives of the government and intellectuals and writers were present. Professor Rostopinski presided at the celebration, and among those present were the well-known writers Dobrowolski, Zawieiski, Bronewski, and others. The establishment of the Jewish state was greeted with genuine sympathy by some Polish writers. The literary weekly, Kuznica, published a number of letters from distinguished literary figures expressing sympathy with and faith in the new state. Catholic writers joined their colleagues in voicing their support of the state of Israel.

Youth

The creative urge and century-old tradition undoubtedly accounted for the widespread cultural and educational activities of the Polish Jews, despite the increasing Eastern-European political pressure in this field of communal endeavor. In line with the government-promoted policy of ideological control of the youth (through the All Polish Youth Union), the Central Committee of Polish Jews developed large-scale Jewish youth activities. In March, 1949, 2,000 youths from factories and producers' cooperatives, 1,000 university students, 1,200 high school pupils, 1,000 students from vocational schools, 2,000 athletes, and some 800 members of youth hostels, were affiliated with the youth department of the Central Committee. Their activities, particularly their ideological training, were conducted under the slogan of service to their "socialist country." A special review, Nasz Glos, was published in Polish by the youth department to promote and spread these ideas. Zionists of all shades of opinion were trying to resist Communist penetration through hachsharot, youth kibbutzim, and Hebrew courses. Their fight on behalf of the youth of Poland constituted at this time the most important aspect of their work. They labored, however, under great disadvantages, and the dissolution by the authorities of the Coordinating Committee for Zionist Youth in Lodz (The Day, New York, June 29, 1949) was an important indication of what the future held for all these efforts.

Education

In the Jewish schools the prevailing trend was in the direction of Gleichschaltung of the educational system, in line with the "interest of Polish revolution" (Statement by Lozowski, manager of the school section of the Central Committee, Dos Naye Lebn, December 31, 1948). At various educational conventions, the structure of Jewish education was discussed and basic reforms were prepared in order to liquidate the "national separatist tendency" of the traditional Yiddish school. With this in view, an important reform was suggested with respect to the language of instruction. According to the leading educators, Polish was to be the language of instruction for all studies in Polish history, geography, and allied subjects; Yiddish was to be the language for all other subjects up to the fifth grade; starting from the fifth and through
the eleventh grade, some subjects were to be taught in Polish and others in Yiddish. Hebrew was to be taught as a part of the Jewish curriculum from the fifth grade up. In 1948-49 there were 25 Yiddish schools, with 3,086 pupils in Poland. A number of schools were closed because there were not enough pupils in attendance.

At the beginning of the academic year 1948-49, the Yiddish schools were taken over by the government and became part of the state public school system. The connecting link between the government-controlled schools and the Central Committee was to be a special school inspector, appointed by the government but proposed by the Committee.

Of the eleven Hebrew schools whose curricula resembled the pre-war Tarbut Schools, five were closed in the Fall of 1948 by local school authorities. Some of these were later reopened. In January, 1949, 10 Hebrew schools were taking care of some 800 pupils. Hebrew schools were the subject of much discussion at educational conferences and in the press, and it was the opinion of leading circles that there was no place in Poland for separate Hebrew education. Following the decision on unification of all Jewish elementary and high schools taken by the Central Committee, it was resolved at the beginning of April, 1949, to close all the Hebrew schools at the end of the school year 1948-49.

The policy of unification affected the religious schools as well, although because of their specialized character, the parochial school system was the last to be streamlined. At this writing, the fate of the religious schools was uncertain. In January, 1949, the Committee of Religious Congregations conducted 36 talmud torahs, with 1,100 pupils.

Cultural Activities

During the year under review, activities in the field of popular adult education, the theater, research, and publishing were carried on by various Jewish organizations. The Jewish Cultural Society, which directed all cultural life of the community, reported in March, 1949, 57 local chapters with a total membership of about 9,000. The Society had 39 libraries, containing some 40,000 books, 43 small clubs, 6 orchestras, and 3 choral groups. Through its radio department, the Society broadcast four Yiddish programs weekly, including musical and informational programs and talks on political and cultural subjects.

LITERATURE

In the field of literature it may be recorded that fifteen volumes of fiction, poetry, and drama were published by the Yiddish Book Press, and a second volume of the almanac Yidishe Shriften, representing fifty-two writers and scholars (eight of whom perished during the occupation), appeared in Lodz. In this connection it should be noted that a number of Jewish writers and intellectuals had recently left Poland, among them some of those who participated in and directed literary activities. Since the liberation some seventy Jewish writers and journalists, some of them among the best representatives of the Jewish belles-lettres, had left Poland. A full list of these writers was published in Unzer Schtime, Paris, February 7, 1949.
Emigration

Emigration prospects, which were already bad in 1947, deteriorated further in 1948. According to available reports, emigration was permitted only to politically allied countries. Passport applications made after March 31, 1948, the original deadline set by the government, were more often than not rejected by the authorities. This refusal to grant passports was based chiefly on chapter 3 of the passport regulations, which stipulated that the foreign office was not obligated to divulge to applicants the reasons for refusal. Passports issued were valid for only six months and every extension was considered a new application. Recently the passport fee was increased from 1,000 to 20,000 zlotys (400 zlotys = $1), and possessors of passports were required to leave the country within three months after their issuance.

In December, 1948, the so-called PalAmt (the office dealing with emigration to Israel) was closed by the Polish authorities, and some of its functions were taken over by the Israeli consulate. Subsequently, in February, 1949, Polish authorities also closed the emigration section of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee office in Poland. Although Polish officials gave repeated assurances that the government would place no obstacles in the way of the emigration of Jews to Israel, only small numbers were permitted to leave the country.

In a statement made to the press in Tel Aviv, Israel, in June, 1949, Barzilai, Israeli minister to Poland, declared that "despite the fact that the Polish government does not permit the emigration of Jews from the country, special arrangements have been made for the relatives of residents in Israel to come to the Jewish state under certain conditions." Barzilai estimated that the number of emigrant relatives averaged several hundred monthly.

Summary

The consolidation of the Communist regime had a profound impact on the small Jewish community. The powerful totalitarian grip of Polish communism considerably affected the social and institutional life of the Jewish community. Those Jews who found it possible to emigrate had done so, but at the time of writing, only very few were allowed to leave the country.

Leon Shapiro
Southeastern Europe

INTRODUCTION

In the countries of Southeastern Europe, the year under review was one of consolidation of the Communist regime and of a thorough elimination of all non-conformist elements. In all these countries, the Communist parties obtained absolute power; other political groups in the different “People’s” or “Fatherland Fronts,” insofar as they were allowed to exist, became simply Communist front organizations without any real influence. The political opposition was outlawed, and its leaders executed, imprisoned, or forced into exile as “traitors” and “imperialist spies.” Constitutions were changed accordingly, and elections were held to ratify the faits accomplis. The liquidation or complete Gleichschaltung of all economic, social, and cultural organizations followed the elimination of opposition in the political field. Finally, purges were staged against heretic Communists suspected of “nationalism” and conspiracy with the Tito government in Yugoslavia.

For a time, the churches and religious communities remained the last relatively independent organizations. Finally, they were confronted with ultimatums to subordinate all their activities to the political and ideological dictates of the state. Those among them which tried to maintain their independence or spiritual and organizational ties with religious organizations outside the Russian orbit became the object of a violent denunciation and of political persecution which culminated in the trials against Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary and the Protestant ministers in Bulgaria.

Economic Life

In the economic field, a new wave of nationalization virtually liquidated the remaining private sector in commerce and industry, and the labor market was restricted by numerous compulsory regulations, including the introduction of forced labor for “unpatriotic” and “idle and unproductive” citizens.

This economic policy ended the restitution of Jewish private properties. The liberal postwar restitution laws were in part revised in such a manner that restitution was almost impossible, and in part were simply disregarded. Promises made to return heirless Jewish properties to Jewish communities were not honored. Those Jewish survivors who had been able to begin a new existence in the private sector of economy, were once again expropriated or squeezed out of business by tax policies, non-delivery of raw materials, and similar economic pressure.

There were no reliable statistics about the absorption of the Jewish popula-
tion in the new economy and administration. A small number of Jews were conspicuous in high party and state positions, which were now accessible to all Communists and fellow-travelers without racial discrimination. Some of the economically displaced former businessmen and professionals found new jobs as managers and administrative employees in nationalized industries and public administrations. Finally, a number of dispossessed Jews found employment as workers in factories and in agriculture. In some countries—especially in Poland and Bulgaria—Jewish producers' cooperatives and retraining courses, organized under government auspices with the financial support of foreign Jewish relief organizations, helped to integrate a part of the Jewish population into the new economy. But these efforts at the "productivization of Jewish labor" helped only a minority of economically displaced Jews. The economic situation of the majority, especially in such countries with large Jewish communities as Rumania and Hungary, was very difficult. There was a relatively large amount of unemployment and under-employment in the Jewish population, and many Jews could maintain themselves only by occasional jobs and by selling their personal properties. Jewish welfare and relief organizations, which had enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy during the first postwar years, were taken over by the state or by the Communist-dominated religious communities. In Hungary and Rumania the offices of foreign Jewish relief organizations were closed by the authorities, and those considerable parts of the Jewish population which were still dependent on relief were hit hard by the liquidation of foreign financial aid.

Education, Culture, and Religion

Jewish educational and cultural institutions also lost their autonomy. Jewish community schools were taken over by the state; Hebrew teaching was abolished and Yiddish instruction substantially reduced. In administration, curriculum, ideology, and in most cases in the language of instruction as well, Jewish schools became indiscernible from other schools except that special pains were taken to fight the ideology of Zionism. Jewish state theaters, cultural associations, and scientific institutes were still maintained in several countries, but their activities had to conform to the Communist party line.

Jewish religious communities were under a Communist-dominated administration. Non-Communists, and Zionist elements in particular, were purged from their leadership. The communities were forced to support Communist policies on the domestic as well as on the international scene. Their cultural and defense activities were seriously curtailed; their religious activities were under thorough governmental supervision. Some interference with religious services and customs was reported, especially in Rumania. In general, purely religious activities were tolerated, provided that communities and rabbis manifested conspicuous loyalty to the Communist regime.

Intergroup Relations

All the new constitutions contained special paragraphs outlawing manifestations of racial or religious hatred. Reports about open anti-Semitic riots were
scarce; anti-Semitic incidents that were reported involved clandestine manifestations, such as anti-Jewish wall inscriptions, desecration of Jewish cemeteries, etc. Anti-Semitic feelings were to a large extent driven underground, but according to all eye-witness reports, they were intense and violent. The official doctrine that anti-Semitism was simply a heritage from the capitalist past to be found only in “Fascist” groups, hampered a sound approach to an effective anti-bias education. Special Jewish activities in combating anti-Semitism were considered unnecessary and obnoxious.

At the same time, anti-Semitic moods and feelings found nourishment and the possibility of some legal expression during the official campaign against “Jewish nationalism” and “cosmopolitanism” in which all anti-Jewish stereotypes about the “rootless,” “alien,” and “wandering” Jew were profusely used and combined with accusations of economic sabotage and illegal currency traffic.

Israel and Zionism

The official attitudes toward Israel and Zionism underwent a significant change after an article by Ilya Ehrenburg in the Moscow Pravda on September 21, 1948. Official friendly relations with the government of Israel were maintained, but at the same time it was denounced as “bourgeois, reactionary, and subservient to Western imperialism.” A violent campaign against “reactionary Zionism” and “Jewish nationalism” was conducted in all the satellite countries. Zionists were purged from all posts of influence in the communities, and some of their leaders were arrested on charges of “illicit dealings in foreign currencies” or of “aiding illegal emigration.” All Zionist political, cultural, and relief organizations in Rumania and Hungary were dissolved, and Israeli citizens who had come to those countries to help organize emigration were arrested and expelled.

Emigration to Israel

Emigration to Israel met with increasing difficulties and was generally discouraged, but the immediate policy of the Southeastern-European governments varied. In Rumania and Hungary, emigration was practically stopped at the end of 1948; illegal emigrants trying to escape over the “green border” were hounded down by frontier guards and severely punished. In Bulgaria, on the other hand, mass emigration was permitted, with the result that the great majority of the Jewish population left the country. The same policy was followed by the Yugoslav government, and the result was the same. Czechoslovakia concluded an agreement with Israel concerning emigration at the beginning of 1949, and from January 1, through September, 1949, about half of the Jewish population emigrated. Poland concluded a similar agreement, after prolonged negotiations, in September, 1949.

In the Fall of 1949, only two large Jewish communities remained in Southeastern Europe, both in countries where Jewish emigration had halted. There were an estimated 350,000 Jews in Rumania and about 160,000 in

1 See pp. 356 ff.
Hungary. In Poland, at the time of writing, there were about 80,000 Jews, a large part of whom were preparing to leave. In Czechoslovakia, there were 18,000 to 20,000 Jews, and emigration was continuing. In Bulgaria, where the mass exodus was almost finished, the number of remaining Jews was estimated at 10,000 by the Communist leadership of the Jewish Consistory, and at 4,000 by the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC). In Yugoslavia, 4,000 Jews were left, only 2,000 of whom were expected to stay. There were also about 300 Jews in Albania.

Generally, wherever emigration was free, a great majority of the community decided to emigrate. There was no doubt that the same would happen in Hungary and Rumania if the governments of these countries could be persuaded to permit unrestricted emigration.

Joseph Gordon

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

After the Communist coup of February, 1948, Czechoslovakia was quickly transformed into a Communist dictatorship. All institutions and organizations, including the non-Communist political parties, were taken over by Communist-dominated action committees. New, one-list elections in May, 1948, gave the Communists an overwhelming majority in the parliament. The Social Democratic party, under a new leadership imposed by an action committee, was forced to fuse with the Communist party; the National Socialist and Catholic People’s parties, and two minor Slovak parties headed by pro-Communist collaborators, were allowed to exist and to have representatives in the parliament and in the cabinet only for the purpose of window-dressing. A new constitution was adopted over the objections of President Eduard Benes, who resigned from his office after the elections and lived in enforced seclusion until his death on September 3, 1948. The Communist leader Klement Gottwald became president of the Republic; the Communist union leader, Antonin Zapotocky, was appointed premier. All industrial and commercial enterprises with more than fifty employees were nationalized; subsequently, most of the remaining private businessmen and artisans were forced into liquidation by repressive tax policies, discrimination in access to raw materials, discrimination in rationing, and other means of economic pressure. The forcible fusion of all village economic organizations into “unified cooperatives” and numerous expropriations of agricultural enterprises for non-delivery of food quotas and for “political unreliability” prepared the way for a future collectivization of agriculture. State administration as well as economic and cultural life were radically purged of non-Communist elements; a series of “espionage” and “conspiracy” trials resulted in many sentences of death and long prison terms for political opponents of the regime. “Corrective labor camps” were introduced for “subversive elements,” “blackmarketeers,” and “saboteurs of socialist planning.” Finally, in the Summer of 1949, a violent campaign was conducted against the churches and religious communities which resisted the complete control of all their activities by the state, and especially against the Catholic Church, headed by the Prague Archbishop Josef Beran.
Population

Of the 360,000 Jews in prewar Czechoslovakia, only about 55,000 remained in the country after the war. On June 30, 1948, the Council of Jewish Religious Communities in Bohemia and Moravia counted 24,395 members in these two provinces; of these, 19,123 were “persons of the Mosaic faith,” 5,272 were “other members of Jewish communities,” mostly agnostic Jews. About 8,500 of the Jews in Bohemia and Moravia were recent immigrants from Carpatho-Russia, the easternmost Czechoslovak province, which had been ceded to the Soviet Union in 1945. About 30,000 Jews lived in Slovakia, 24,000 of whom were “persons of the Mosaic faith” and 6,000 “other Jews.” These numbers diminished considerably through emigration during the year under review.

At the end of 1948, the Czechoslovak Bureau of Statistics estimated the number of Jews in the country at 42,000. In September, 1949, private Jewish sources reported that 18,000-20,000 Jews were left in Czechoslovakia.

Economic Conditions: Restitution

The prewar Jewish community, especially in the western part of Czechoslovakia, had included a great number of well-to-do middle class and professional persons. As the survivors returned from concentration camps completely destitute, the problem of restitution became vital. The original restitution laws, promulgated after the liberation, were based on liberal principles but had many loopholes and were successfully sabotaged by the authorities even before the Communist coup. The result was that most of the restitution proceedings concerning properties not subject to nationalization at that time were either abandoned or still pending at the beginning of 1948. The paragraph of the original restitution law which provided that heirless Jewish properties were to be given to the Jewish communities, had been abolished in 1947, by a law relating to the currency liquidation fund, which confiscated these properties for the state treasury. After the Communist coup, the purged parliament adopted on April 7, 1948, a revised restitution law which contained the following provisions.

REVISED RESTITUTION LAW

The landed properties which had been distributed (by Nazi or Quisling authorities) among small landholders were not subject to restitution. Industrial and other business properties which were nationalized after the war were not to be restituted even if their size would not have made them subject to nationalization if they had remained in the hands of their original owners. In either event, owners were supposed to receive an indemnity in government bonds but it was left to the cabinet to decide when and how these bonds were to be issued and redeemed. The bonds had not been issued at the time of this writing. Restitution was to be denied in all cases where it was considered to be “against the public interest,” the nature of the “public interest” to be decided by national committees whose decisions were binding upon the courts. All persons claiming restitution had to prove their “national reliability.” Restitution in kind could not be claimed for persons whose whereabouts were not
known, or for heirs further removed than one degree from the original owner. All restitution claims were decreed null and void if not filed within three months after the promulgation of the revised law, i.e., by July 27, 1948.

This revision ended effectively all restitution claims, because the claimed properties were either in the hands of "small landholders," or nationalized after the war, or re-expropriated for the benefit of Czech or Slovak "patriots." Claims which did not fall into one of these categories were disposed of by the provisions concerning "public interest" and "national reliability." Since whole families had been exterminated in many cases, the exclusion of more remote heirs automatically left their properties in the hands of the state. Immediately after the coup, the Jewish press, which had sharply opposed the revision bill and had devoted much space and energy to restitution problems, ceased writing about them completely. It became unpatriotic and dangerous to raise a restitution claim; and it also became hopeless.

NATIONALIZATION

In the meantime, a new wave of nationalization overwhelmed the small business enterprises which some of the survivors had been able to establish. Later, the medical and legal professions were reorganized in such a manner that doctors and lawyers practically became state employees.

Up to the beginning of 1948, the Jewish community had moved considerably in the direction of self-sufficiency and economic rehabilitation. That success was attributable to the fact that a number of middle-class and professional Jews found jobs in public administration or in nationalized industries as officials, managers, clerks, or workers. On the other hand, small industries and commercial enterprises had not been completely nationalized, and a number of Jews earned their living in this private sector of the economy. After February, 1948, the situation deteriorated again. All hope for restitution was definitely lost and the remaining small private enterprises were nationalized or forced out of business. In August, 1948, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) reported: "The rapid nationalization of industry following the change in the government has displaced a large number of Jewish businessmen who have been the main support of the communities." In June, 1948, about 4,000 persons, 800 of them transients, were receiving cash relief from the JDC. At that time, the relief program had already been reduced to a minimum and the emphasis had been shifted to reconstruction.

But the rehabilitation activities were on a rather small scale: two loan kassas and a few producers' cooperatives with a total of 200 to 300 members, supported by the JDC. The ORT retraining courses had an average of 200 to 300 students throughout 1947 and 1948, and about 500 prospective emigrants received vocational training in Zionist hachscharot and kibbutzim.

Communal Life

The religious communities, reconstituted after the war, were organized in two central organizations: the Council of Jewish Religious Communities in Bohemia and Moravia, and the Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Slovakia. The Council and the individual communities in Bohemia and
Moravia had representative bodies, elected in 1947. Although unity lists were elected in most communities, the composition of the leading bodies was the result of genuine negotiations between different Jewish groups; in some communities, including Prague, opposition lists were admitted and received proportional representation. Different trends of opinion were represented in the leadership: Zionists, assimilationist-liberal “Czech Jews,” and Conservative and Orthodox groups of Carpatho-Russian immigrants. All elected leaders could be considered loyal to the ruling regime, but few of them were outright Communists or fellow-travelers. The Zionists had the majority and the leading positions. Their majority in the leadership was even stronger in Slovakia.

All this changed after the Communist coup. On February 27, 1948, an action committee for the Council of Jewish Religious Communities and for the Prague community was appointed by the district action committee of the National Front in Prague. Its chairman was Mrs. Laura Simek, an employee of the cadre commission in the headquarters of the Communist party. Among the nine original members of the action committee, only two were elected members of the representation of the Prague community, both from the “Czech Jewish” group. Holding no elections, the action committee purged the elected bodies as well as the staffs of the Council and of the communities. The president of the Council, Arnost Frischer, was demoted; its secretary, Kurt Wehle, fled abroad; the chairman of the Prague community, Karel Stein, was forced to resign; the leader of the opposition group in the last elections, Kurt Premysl Heller, was expelled from the elected body; other members were forced to resign and were replaced by appointees of the action committee. The deputy chief rabbi, Hanus Rezek, resigned and left the country soon afterward; he was subsequently killed in an airplane accident in Greece on his way to Israel.

**COMMUNIST LINE IN COMMUNAL LIFE**

Under the new leadership, the fight for restitution and for the defense of Jewish rights against encroachments within the country was immediately stopped. Complaints of anti-Semitism and discrimination within the country were replaced in the Jewish press by a campaign against anti-Semitism in America, England, and Western Germany. The Jewish press and Jewish organizations followed Communist policies in their domestic as well as in their international activities. They took part in the denunciation of any internal opposition as “Fascist” and “pro-imperialist,” as well as in the international Communist “peace offensive.”

This line was expressed in an address by the new president, Emil Ungar, at a meeting of the Council on February 6, 1949. Reporting on the first year of the new leadership's activities, Ungar sharply criticized the pre-Communist leadership for its defense of private Jewish restitution claims, for its supposedly excessive relief activities, and especially for its support of transient Jews fleeing from other Iron Curtain countries. He warned against the defense of “narrow, particularist” Jewish communal interests and demanded that the Jews subordinate all their productive forces and all their connections with foreign countries to the fight for a “complete victory of really democratic and progressive forces.”

Ungar also revealed the difficult financial situation of the communities. The
subsidies, which the communities had until then received from the so-called “Terezín assets,” i.e., from funds expropriated from Jews and found after the war in the ghetto of Terezín, had been discontinued and the assets confiscated for the state treasury. Still, according to the law which continued in force after the Communist coup, all churches and religious communities were entitled to subsidies from the state budget. But the budgets which Jewish communities submitted to the authorities were returned, and the budget for 1949 provided for no appropriations. The communities were forced to reduce their staffs and relief activities substantially, to live on loans, and to sell their properties.

**Intergroup Relations**

The new Czechoslovak constitution adopted in April, 1948, proclaimed the freedom of religion but prohibited the abuse of religious activities for political purposes. It also contained a paragraph which forbade utterances and activities aimed at threatening the integrity and unity of the state, its constitution, or the institutions of the People's Democracy. The paragraph stated that it was forbidden “to abuse civil rights and liberties” for such purposes, adding that it was forbidden to disseminate in any form Nazism, Fascism, racial or religious intolerance, or national chauvinism.

After the February coup, the official doctrine concerning anti-Semitism was that it is only a heritage of the past, the remnants of which were to be found merely in “Fascist groups.” The defense activities of the Jewish religious communities were radically curtailed: interventions in behalf of Jewish interests in restitution matters ceased, special campaigns against anti-Semitism were discontinued, and, as noted above, complaints about discrimination disappeared from the Jewish press.

Nevertheless, anti-Semitic riots, which had been occurring in Slovakia throughout the postwar years, did not stop. On August 20, 1949, violent anti-Semitic demonstrations took place in Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia. According to a detailed report published in the Bratislava weekly, *Tribuna*, on August 27, 1948, a quarrel between a Jewish and a Gentile woman over precedence in a bread line was the pretext. Crowds assembled, attacked Jewish citizens in the streets, moved to the Jewish quarter and attacked Jewish soup kitchens and the Jewish hospital. The police allowed the crowds to assemble and stood by for a long time without intervening. In some cases, Jews were taken into “protective custody” and beaten up by the police. It was not until the following day, when the riots were resumed, that the police finally intervened and dispersed the crowds. Subsequently, a number of rioters were arrested and condemned to prison and forced labor terms from one month to three years.

**Israel and Zionism**

The Czechoslovak government had supported the partition of Palestine from the moment Russia decided to support it, in October, 1947. It was among the first governments to recognize the state of Israel (on May 18, 1948). Subsequently, diplomatic and commercial relations were established, and the friend-
ship between both countries was stressed in repeated official declarations. A society for friendship between Czechoslovakia and Israel was founded in Prague under official auspices. The Zionists were allowed to develop their educational and organizational activities and to train prospective emigrants. The official attitude was that Jews who considered themselves as members of the reconstructed Jewish nation were free to go to Israel; those who stayed in Czechoslovakia were to be assimilated totally (Declaration of Václav Kopecky, Minister of Information, on January 26, 1948).

This attitude was modified after an article by Ilya Ehrenburg in the Moscow Pravda in September, 1948. The Jewish press started to carry violent attacks against Zionism as a reactionary, bourgeois, nationalist ideology, and the government of Israel was criticized as a “tool of Western imperialists.” The Zionist training camps were discontinued in December, 1948, and several Zionist leaders were arrested without published charges or on charges of illicit valuta dealings. The president of the Zionist Organization of Czechoslovakia, Oscar Krasnansky, was arrested in September, 1948. In January, 1949, several other Zionist leaders, among them Leo Rosenthal, head of the Jewish Agency office in Bratislava, and Emmanuelfrieder, president of the Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Slovakia, suffered the same fate. But the Zionist organizations in Czechoslovakia were still being allowed to continue in the Summer of 1949, when such organizations in Hungary and Rumania had already been dissolved.

Emigration

In 1948, 5,000 Czechoslovak Jews left for Israel, and 3,000 for other countries. In addition, there was some illegal emigration to Austria and the American zone of Germany.

At the beginning of 1949, a new emigration agreement was concluded with the Israeli authorities. It provided for the emigration of 20,000 Jews within four months. The deadline was subsequently extended, and groups of emigrants were leaving via Austria-Italy, and via Rumania, as well, throughout the first half of 1949.

A new policy was introduced in regard to Jewish transients from other Eastern-European countries. As early as 1948, the Czechoslovak government had ceased to issue transit visas to Jewish emigrants from Rumania, and measures were taken to stop the influx of transients at the Hungarian border.

At the end of April, 1949, when the Austro-Hungarian border was closed and tightly watched, several thousands of Hungarian Jewish refugees tried to pass from Hungary to Vienna through the Czechoslovak city of Bratislava. The first groups were allowed to pass after encountering some difficulties, but at the beginning of May, the traffic was stopped by Czechoslovak authorities. Posters displayed in the streets of Bratislava announced that all newcomers would be arrested and returned to Hungary and that Czechoslovak citizens who tried to help them would be punished. The Jewish community of Bratislava declared that it could neither intervene in behalf of the refugees nor give them any material help.

Joseph Gordon
THE LIFE of Hungarian Jewry was characterized during the period under re-
view by the rapid proletarianization and destitution of the broad Jewish.
middle class, the growing subordination of the Jewish community, as well as
all other religious organizations, to the state, and the outlawing and destruc-
tion of the Zionist movement.

An official campaign of political repression of all non-Communist groups in
Hungary was responsible for the wave of “voluntary” capitulation which swept
the Jewish community.

Against this background of Gleichschaltung, these three major trends in the
life of Hungarian Jewry followed a rapid and logical development.

Economic and Social Life

The year beginning March, 1948, (the date of the enactment of the decree
which nationalized 90 per cent of Hungarian industry and commerce, the bulk
of which was owned and managed by Jews) and ending in March, 1949, saw the
final completion of a program of nationalization which transformed Hungarian
Jewry from an important economic and social factor in the rehabilitation of
Hungary after the war into an expendable, marginal social element. It was
impossible for this Jewish element to readjust within the new economic order
because the Jewish middle class lacked the necessary experience in factory or
other types of physical labor. (This was particularly the case with the survivors
of concentration camps.) In addition, the authorities were uninterested in
admitting members of the middle class to factory jobs. Exacerbating the
situation was a preponderance of aged persons and a disproportionately large
number of women and invalids, as reported on April 19, 1949, by Imre Kis-
faludi, head of Mizrat, an organization to aid Jewish rehabilitation.

The expropriation by the state of all major private undertakings left only
retail trade and the handicrafts open as fields of individual business activity.
Even within this narrow area, subsequent drastic governmental measures
undermined the position of Jewish businessmen. Thus, John MacCormac re-
ported in *The New York Times* on January 9, 1949, that of the 19,000 clothing
and textile stores in Budapest (of which 18,000 were owned by Jews), 17,000
had been ordered closed as “superfluous.” This complete liquidation was also
rapidly proceeding through other, less direct means, such as the prohibitive
limitation on private profits, the imposition of exorbitant taxes, the cut-throat
price competition of state enterprises, the denial by nationalized industries of
merchandise and raw materials to private traders and craftsmen, and the per-
mission granted to state-owned retail stores to keep longer hours than private
stores (*Amerikai Magyar Népozseva*, March 17, 1949). As a result, tens of thou-
sands of trade licenses were “voluntarily” returned by Jewish businessmen as
liabilities. *The Black Book on the Martyrdom of Hungarian Jewry* by Eugene
Levai (Zurich, 1948), asserted that the original assets of the Jewish population
in Lesser (Trianon) Hungary constituted between 20 and 25 per cent of the
total wealth of the country, representing a sum believed to be in the neighborhood of seven billion gold pengos, or 1.5 billion dollars.

Many Jewish state employees were dismissed from their positions, and, as reported by John MacCormac, “most of the Jewish members of the Hungarian Workers (Communist) Party have been excluded by a purge now going on in its ranks” (The New York Times, January 9, 1949). In most cases, exclusion from the party was tantamount to the loss of position and livelihood. At the time of writing, Hungarian Jewry was reduced to a state of pauperism; it was completely at the mercy of the government, unable to care for its sick, aged, and orphans, or to maintain its religious, cultural, and social institutions. Through the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), American Jewry continued to provide relief and welfare assistance to some 60,000 otherwise helpless Jews in Hungary.

Restitution

On paper, there was a Jewish Rehabilitation Fund in Hungary. Under the treaty of peace, all Jewish heirless assets were to have been transferred to this fund. In actual practice, only a small number of urban real estate units which produced no income was transferred to the fund.

In the Spring of 1948, that part of the so-called “Hungarian Golden Treasure Train” which was captured in Austria by the French army was returned by France to Hungary. At the time of writing, this property had been returned neither to the owners nor to the Jewish Rehabilitation Fund. On January 26, 1949, Ferenc Jeszenszky, director-general of the National Bank of Hungary, declared that the assets were not exclusively Jewish property, since pieces of jewelry with Fascist “Arrow Cross” emblems were found among them. Former high Hungarian government officials in exile asserted that these symbols were simply carved into some of the pieces with pocket knives, in order to furnish an excuse for denying the return of these assets to their Jewish owners.

Communal Affairs

With the assistance of a handful of people, notably Louis Stoeckler, president of the important Jewish community of Pest, and of the Central Board of Jews in Hungary, the official Jewish community organization was regimented during the period under review for the service of the state.

Stoeckler and his community board were never elected to office by the Jewish electorate. The community elections were delayed for almost three and a half years, during which period the two large electoral opposition camps, the middle-class religious group and the Zionists, were disorganized and suppressed with official Communist assistance. Finally, in May, 1948, Jewish community elections were called. On the eve of the elections, Joseph Szucs, a close relative of Stoeckler, was appointed chairman of the electoral board. In this capacity, Szucs simply disqualified the opposition candidates on the ground of “irregularities in form” and declared that “since only one ‘regular’ list of candidates was received, no voting will take place.” Thus, in the absence of an “opposition” Stoeckler and his slate were unanimously “elected” (Uj Elet, May 20,
1948). At the end of 1948, a “compact” was concluded between Stoeckler’s Central Board and the Communist-dominated government.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL LIFE

The agents of the government within the Jewish community achieved the following “results” in the religious life of Hungarian Jewry.

The nationalization of almost all schools formerly owned and managed by the Jewish community; the prohibition of the teaching of Hebrew, even at the Tarbut Hebrew high school; the frequent replacement of Jewish teachers by non-Jewish (Communist) teachers in former Jewish schools; the proclamation of the Sabbath as a day of compulsory instruction in all former Jewish schools, with only a maximum of 20 per cent of the enrollment eligible for exemption upon application (Uj Elet, October 7, 1948); and the requirement that Jewish-owned shops and stores be kept open on Saturdays and Jewish holidays during business hours—a clearly discriminatory measure on the part of the government, since the observance of Sunday was compulsory (Uj Elet, November 20, 1948).

According to eye-witness accounts, ritual slaughter was prohibited by local municipal order in almost all provincial Jewish communities; and political police spies regularly attended religious services to control the content of sermons. Since the Summer of 1948, repeated attempts had been made by Stoeckler to induce the Orthodox Jewish leadership to agree to the “voluntary” transformation of all religious communities into “Jewish people’s communities.”

In the May 12, 1949, issue of Uj Elet, Stoeckler and a number of his lieutenants in the Jewish community administration appealed to the Jewish public to vote “yes” for the Communist-dominated government slate in the national one-list elections.

LIQUIDATION OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

By the end of 1948, the time was considered ripe for the liquidation of the Zionist movement, which had become the most popular ideology among Hungarian Jews since the end of the war.

In previous years, the response of the Jews of Hungary to the call for emigration to Israel had been slower than that of any other Eastern-European Jewish group. But, late in 1948 and during the first half of 1949, the situation changed radically. A frantic drive to escape gripped the Jewish masses. The number of visa applications to Israel alone reached a total of 60,000 by the end of 1948, before the state intervened.

Unfortunately, during the first postwar years the Zionist leadership had aligned itself with Stoeckler’s temporary “caretaker” regime, in opposition to the religious middle-class camp, whose prewar anti-Zionist tendency was well known. The Hungarian Zionists failed to realize that middle-class Jewry all over the world had substantially revised its attitude to Zionism.

On March 14, 1948, Michael Salamon, president of the Zionist Organization of Hungary, publicly admitted that “we have arrived at the conclusion that
today the Hungarian Jewish masses are no longer in a position to conduct any legitimate fight based on principles" (Uj Elet, March 18, 1948). On November 11, 1948, the New York Jewish Morning Journal reported from London that Jewish Communists in Hungary, following the Soviet reversal of its pro-Israel policy, had launched a propaganda campaign against Zionism and the state of Israel and had actually characterized "the Yishuv and its inhabitants" as "lackeys of Anglo-American capitalism."

This Communist campaign soon became the official stand of the (unelected) Jewish community leadership, as reflected in a front page editorial in Uj Elet on December 30, 1948, in which Stoeckler stated, "The great majority of Hungarian Jewry . . . cannot tolerate . . . interference with their affairs on the part of those . . . who consider themselves to have one leg already over the frontier. . . ."

This open declaration of war was followed by an avalanche of "official" statements against Zionism, including an especially vicious denunciation by Max Domonkos, secretary-general of the Pest Jewish community. During the last week of February, 1949, the Zionist leaders were summoned by the Communist Minister of the Interior and confronted with a governmental ultimatum which outlawed the Zionist movement and demanded the immediate cessation of the activities of all of its branches and subdivisions. Accordingly, on March 24, 1949, the "Committee for the Liquidation of the Zionist Organization of Hungary" (appointed by Stoeckler) announced that on March 13, 1949, the national governing committee of the Zionist Organization had adopted a "unanimous resolution . . . voluntarily" discontinuing all Zionist activities in Hungary. On March 22, 1949, an identical pledge was made by the Hungarian Palestine office. Early in March, the government expelled ten Zionist leaders from the country.

**Emigration**

Despite the obstacles placed in their way by the government, the Jewish masses frantically attempted to escape from Hungary to the West. Between November, 1948, and February, 1949, more than 3,000 Jewish refugees from Hungary arrived in Austria. During February and March, a weekly average of 200 reached Vienna. On the night of April 23 alone, 1,200 refugees arrived in Vienna via Czechoslovakia (barbed wire installations and redoubled frontier guards had previously sealed off the direct route to the Austrian border) (New York Herald Tribune, April 24, 1949). The New York Times reported on April 27, 1949, that another group of 1,000 immigrants attempting to follow the same route was turned back on the frontier by the Czechoslovak police. According to Harry Greenstein, Adviser on Jewish Affairs in the United States zone of Germany, during the two weeks ending May 12, 1949, more than 3,000 Hungarian Jews in all had fled via Czechoslovakia to Austria. Amazingly, between forty and fifty Hungarian Jews were reported still to be reaching Vienna daily.

This continued emigration of Jews may have prompted the government to climax its war on Zionism in the middle of June, by arraigning ten and sentencing seven leading figures in the Hungarian Zionist movement to prison terms ranging from six months to three years. Those sentenced were Bela Denes, for-
mer president of the Hungarian Mapai, and Alexander Kertesz, lawyer (both to three years' imprisonment); Madge Weiss, an official of the Zionist organization and of Mapai, and M. Feld, merchant (two years and six months); Aladar Felkai, merchant (six months); Nicholas Frankfurter of the Zionist Organization (two years and eight months); and Alexander Dienes, a Christian worker (two years and six months). The convictions were obtained under a 1948 law forbidding any attempt to cross the border illegally—a law contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations.1

World Reaction

Throughout the year under review, the Israeli government continued to press the Hungarian authorities for an agreement that would open the way for the emigration of at least 30,000 Hungarian Jews to Israel. American Jewry stood prepared to defray the expenses of their transportation. But, at the time of writing the government of Hungary was persevering in blocking Jewish emigration completely.
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RUMANIA

The establishment of a full-fledged Communist regime in Rumania was achieved in the second half of 1947 and at the beginning of 1948. The liquidation of the opposition parties, the merger of the pro-Communist wing of the Socialists with the Communist party, the replacement of Foreign Minister Tatarescu by Anna Pauker (November, 1947), the forced abdication of King Michael (December, 1947), and a controlled election which gave the People's Democratic Front 405 of the 415 seats in the parliament (March, 1948) were the main steps in the process of final Gleichschaltung. By the beginning of 1948, the Communist dictatorship was firmly established, no opposition was tolerated, and the totalitarian “unification” was carried to the field of non-political, cultural, social, and relief activities. It could not but affect strongly the life of the Jewish minority.

Population

Among the Soviet satellite countries, Rumania had the largest Jewish community. The number of Jews was estimated at 350,000 at the beginning of the year under review. In view of the virtual cessation of legal emigration at the beginning of 1948, and the extreme difficulty of illegal emigration via Hungary or Czechoslovakia to Austria, there was no major change in the number of Jews. The only officially published figure was that of 138,795 Jews who had declared Yiddish to be their mother tongue. The total number of persons who had declared their (ethnic) nationality to be Jewish was not released. Nor were there any new official statistics concerning persons who professed the Jewish faith.

1 See United Nations and Human Rights, pp. 433 ff.
Economic Conditions

The economic conditions of the Jewish community deteriorated considerably with the almost complete nationalization of small industry, trade, and commerce after the completion of the Communist dictatorship. As early as 1947, the Jewish party and the Union of Rumanian Jews, still legal at that time, had complained that none of the promises of the pro-government People's Democratic Front had been fulfilled. At that time a joint memorandum sent by the Jewish party, the Union of Rumanian Jews, the Zionist Organization of Rumania, and the Rumanian Section of the World Jewish Congress to the United Nations' Special Committee on Palestine had stressed that many thousands of Jews were existing solely on relief and that a large number of them considered emigration the only solution to their economic problems. Soon afterwards, a new wave of nationalization overwhelmed the remaining small businessmen; in addition, those whose enterprises were not officially subject to nationalization because of the smallness of their size, were squeezed out of business by currency and taxation policies, and by lack of raw materials.

There were no reliable statistics on the absorption of the Jewish population into the new economy. Certainly, one part of the community eventually found jobs as workers, employees, etc. At the national conference of rabbis and community leaders held in July, 1949, it was reported that over 13,000 unemployed Jews were provided with jobs in the past year, and that 91 vocational schools retrained 2,400 adults and 2,700 children. There was no possibility of checking these figures; nor did the report indicate how many Jews remained unemployed. But according to all unofficial reports, the unemployment among the Jewish population remained considerable. Some reports maintained that 80 per cent of Rumanian Jewry had been left without a regular source of livelihood, and many of them were supporting themselves by the sale of their remaining household goods and clothes. Some were forced to engage in black market activities, and the prisons were consequently filled with Jews. (One report estimated that at one time 2,000 of the 3,000 inmates of Bucharest jails were Jews.) There were laws on the book that prescribed punishments for persons not engaged in "productive activity." They had not been rigidly enforced at the time of writing although there were instances in which public parks were raided and persons unable to prove definite employment in the nationalized economy were arrested and sent to labor camps.

 Prosecution of War Criminals

The trial of the culprits of the Jassy massacre of 1941, in which 14,000 Jews had been murdered, took place in June, 1948. Of the 151 persons originally charged with participation in, or responsibility for, the pogrom, only 55 were indicted, and only 33 were present at the trial. Chief defendant was General Georghe Stavrescu, the commander of the troops who had rounded up the Jews for "deportation" and killed and tortured them in the death trains. The general, five colonels, and eighteen other defendants were sentenced to
hard labor for life; six individuals were sentenced to hard labor for twenty-five years; other defendants received prison sentences down to five years; four were acquitted.

Several minor trials against war criminals guilty of anti-Jewish atrocities were conducted in 1949. In June, three persons found guilty of torturing Jews in Bessarabia were sentenced to solitary confinement for from three to twelve years. In July, a town clerk from the Cernauti district received a prison sentence of five years for mistreating and robbing 150 Jews in a concentration camp. The former assistant police chief of Gura Humora was sentenced for three years for a similar crime. Two army officers were sentenced to hard labor for life for having exterminated fifty Jews, the whole Jewish population of Hancesti, Moldavia. In another case, three officers were sentenced to twenty, ten, and ten years respectively for the mass murder of Jewish civilians.

On the other hand, according to a report published in the New York *Jewish Morning Journal*, Ian Popescu, a notorious anti-Semitic priest who had turned Communist, was appointed secretary of the Ministry of Education. Popescu had participated in the Jassy massacre, leading the mob which roamed the Jewish quarter and killed many of its inhabitants.

**Liquidation and Gleichschaltung of Jewish Organizations**

During the first postwar years, Rumanian Jewry had an extensive net of communal organizations of all kinds. In addition to the *kehilat*, with their central Federation of Jewish Religious Communities, there were: the Union of Rumanian Jews, a defense organization with a long tradition; the Jewish party, which had been founded in 1931 and had at one time been represented by five deputies in Parliament; a powerful Zionist organization, with all Zionist parties represented and a postwar membership estimated at 130,000; and, finally, the Jewish Democratic Committee, with provincial and local branches all over the country, which was led by Communists but had strong Zionist factions in its ranks and leadership.

In November, 1947, William Filderman, the well-known leader of Rumanian Jews, was forced to resign from the chairmanship of the Union of Rumanian Jews, which he had headed since World War I, as well as from the presidency of the Federation of Jewish Religious Communities. A conference of Jewish organizations, at which the Union of Rumanian Jews was absent, adopted a resolution demanding the dissolution of the *kehilla* boards and the “appointment of new boards elected according to democratic principles.” The resolution charged that the previous boards had included members of the Rumanian opposition parties, the National Peasants and the National Liberals. In February, 1948, the government dissolved the board of the Federation of Religious Communities and a new board was “inducted” without the benefit of an election. The Communist H. Serban Leibovici became Secretary-General of the Federation. The chief rabbi, Alexander Shafran, had to flee to Switzerland; and Moses Rosen, a pro-Communist, became the Chief Rabbi.

The Union of Rumanian Jews was forced to re-unite with a left-wing postwar splinter, the Democratic Rumanian Jewish Union. The leader of this group, the Communist M. A. Saraceanu, became one of the two co-presidents
of the united organization. But in November, 1948, the Union was forced to "disband voluntarily" because "its goal has been achieved."

The Jewish party had already been "voluntarily dissolved" in December, 1947.

LIQUIDATION OF ZIONIST ORGANIZATIONS

At the end of 1948, a violent political offensive started against all Zionist organizations with the avowed purpose of liquidating them and eliminating all Zionist influences from Jewish life. The offensive ended with the dissolution of all Zionist organizations and agencies as well as of all local branches of foreign relief organizations. At the same time, all Zionist and pro-Zionist members were purged from the leadership of the Jewish religious communities and from the branches of the Jewish Democratic Committee.

In November, 1948, a police raid was made on the offices of the Jewish National Fund and of the Palestine Foundation Fund. Four managers were arrested on charges of "valuta blackmarketeteering" and held incommunicado. Among them was the veteran Zionist leader Leon Itzcar; the others were Solomon Rosenhaupt, Enciu Cohen, and Michel Leiba. Unirea, the organ of the Democratic Jewish Committee, started a violent campaign against the Zionists as "blackmarketeers," "disrupters of the socialist economy," and "saboteurs of socialist construction."

Early in December, 1948, the Communists forcibly occupied the headquarters of Zionist organizations and Zionist clubs throughout the country. Groups of Communists also broke into the offices which had been previously closed by the police, smashed the windows, and tore down the pictures of Israeli leaders. Among the organizations affected were the Palestine Office (Jewish Agency), the Jewish National Fund and the Palestine Foundation Fund, Poale Zion, Chovevei Zion, Mizrachi, Tarbut, the Zionist Youth, the Zionist Women's Organization, the B'nai Akiba and the B'nai B'rith. When the Zionist youth rallied and tried to reoccupy the offices, a number of clashes occurred in which several persons were injured. The police intervened only when the Zionists succeeded in regaining about a half of the lost offices. Then a "truce" was imposed on the parties and the decision was left to the Romanian police authorities. The clashes occurred in Bucharest as well as in the provinces.

On December 15, 1948, the Unirea published a resolution of the Political Bureau of the Rumanian Workers' (Communist) party which condemned Zionism and Jewish nationalism as reactionary bourgeois trends and called on Jewish Democratic Committees and other Jewish organizations to purge themselves of Zionists. A violent official campaign against Zionism started; in numerous articles, speeches, and demonstrations, Zionists were denounced as reactionaries, counter-revolutionaries, and agents of Western imperialism.

On December 23, 1948, the Central Board of the Zionist Organization decided to suspend all activities. It appointed a special committee to notify the affiliated groups throughout the country. Each group was to decide whether it would disband "voluntarily" or try to continue its activities as an independent organization. By the beginning of January, 1949, the General Zionists, Mapai, Haoveed Hazioni, Mizrachi and the student group Hasmonea
had disbanded. The Hechalutz movement needed several more weeks to liquidate its assets. The left-wing Zionist Mapam reduced its activities to a minimum and finally had to disband, too.

In a conference of Jewish Democratic Committees on January 9 and 10, 1949, the Communist deputy Bercu Feldman demanded a merciless fight against Zionism in order to liquidate completely any Zionist influence in Jewish life. He warned his listeners against completely accepting the “voluntary” liquidation of Zionist bodies, because “the enemies of the working class never give up their positions of their own free will.” This warning was subsequently repeated several times and some Jewish Communists were reprimanded for lack of vigilance in contending against Zionist influences.

In February, 1949, it was announced that the regional Jewish Democratic Committees of Galati, Timisoara, and Constanta had been completely replaced because they failed to carry out the anti-Zionist measures as thoroughly as had been expected.

**LIQUIDATION OF OTHER COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Next to be liquidated were Jewish relief and social organizations. At the beginning of March, 1949, the government dissolved the religious burial society Chevra Kaddisha. On March 7, 1949, the Bucharest branch of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee was closed. The ORT and OSE offices followed several days later. The government decided to dissolve all foreign Jewish relief organizations and to transmit their assets to the Communist-dominated Federation of Jewish Religious Communities. In April, 1949, 256 Jewish charity institutions, such as orphanages, children’s homes, etc., were nationalized. Nineteen Jewish hospitals had been taken over before the general decree.

**Educational and Cultural Life**

In June, 1948, there were in Rumania, according to Laurentiu Cziko, a high official of the Ministry of Education, 69 Yiddish elementary and 23 high schools with more than 1,000 teachers and 13,000 pupils. Cziko declared that the government was pursuing a policy of developing the schools of national minorities. Their teachers were to have civil service status and receive the same salaries and pensions as teachers in other state schools. The curriculum would be the same as in Rumanian public schools, but instruction would be offered in the minority language. But in August, 1949, all the Jewish schools were taken over by the state, which declared that any resistance to that measure would be punishable as sabotage.

After the summer vacation, not a single school with Yiddish as the language of instruction was reopened. But the promise was made that courses in Yiddish language and literature would be introduced into those Rumanian schools 20 per cent of whose enrollment was Jewish, and where Jewish parents demanded Yiddish instruction for their children.

In January, 1949, it was announced that four Yiddish schools would be reopened. At the beginning of March, 1949, two were opened in Bucharest and Timisoara, a third in Jassy, shortly afterward. These three schools were
all that remained of sixty-nine elementary and twenty-three high schools in existence in 1948. In addition, forty Yiddish courses were given in Rumanian schools, according to official reports in July, 1949. These reports stated that "7,000 students are studying Yiddish." Private Jewish reports gave the number of pupils as 970: 400 in Bucharest, 320 in Jassy, and 250 in Timisoara. The discrepancy is probably due to the fact that the official figure included Jewish students of Rumanian schools which had courses in the Yiddish language, while the private figures referred to students in the three Jewish schools.

At the opening of the Bucharest Yiddish school, the official speaker declared that the Yiddish schools would teach their pupils Rumanian patriotism and "will wipe out the bourgeois mentality of Zionism which is unfortunately widespread among the Jewish youth." He also declared that the opening of the school proved that for the first time in Rumanian history the Jews were being accorded equal rights.

At the end of the period under review, there were three Jewish newspapers, one in Yiddish, one in Rumanian, and one in Hungarian, all directed by Communists and serving the aims of anti-Zionist and anti-nationalist propaganda. There were also weekly Yiddish broadcasts of a similar character.

There were Yiddish-language theaters in Bucharest and Jassy, and a number of amateur Jewish theater societies, choirs, etc. The first annual report of the Bucharest theater, issued in August, 1949, stressed that the theater "fought for the unmasking of Zionist nationalism" and that the character of the audiences had changed from "bourgeois and petty-bourgeois" to "working class."

In April, 1949, a conference of Yiddish writers was held in Bucharest in order to mobilize them "to combat Zionist, nationalist, and reactionary tendencies in Yiddish literature." Henceforth, the Yiddish writer Wolf Tambur announced, their work would be inspired by the new socialist life. Soon afterwards, in an article in the Rumanian literary journal Contemporanul, T. Faerstein strongly criticized Yiddish writers for "lack of consistency in the merciless fight against any nationalist tendency and against all mystical and bigoted trends." Jacob Gropper, the president of the Yiddish Writers' Association, was attacked for poems depicting Jewish sufferings, because "he did not see the democratic fighters, the non-Jewish partisans who fraternize with the suffering [sic] of the Jews." Even Wolf Tambur did not escape censure; although he wrote a novel about a Communist heroine, he "failed to show the typical qualities of a party member."

In May, 1949, the Democratic Jewish Committee banned the works of eighteen "reactionary, nationalist" Jewish writers from public libraries. Among them were Isaac Meier Dick, David Pinsky, H. Leivick, Z. Segalowich, and other Zionist and Bundist authors. After the disappearance of several Russian Yiddish writers, the Yiddish theater in Bucharest dropped the plays of two of them, Peretz Markish and David Bergelson.

Religious Life

Freedom of religion was guaranteed by the new constitution but the "mis-use" of this freedom for anti-government purposes was considered a crime.
A law promulgated in 1948 reorganized the churches and religious communities. All denominations except the Rumanian Orthodox Church were ordered to seek renewed state recognition. The law provided that all church officials had to be Rumanian citizens and swear allegiance to the People's Republic. Major religious officials had to be confirmed by the state. The religious communities were only allowed to communicate with foreign communities of the same denomination through the Ministries of Religion and of Foreign Affairs.

New by-laws of the Jewish religious communities promulgated by the government in July, 1949, provided for the merger of all Jewish communities in each city or town into one organization. This meant that the Sephardic, Orthodox, and other groups were unified. Only the rabbis of the unified communities were allowed to perform religious rites.

The religious communities were permitted to continue their activities under Communist leadership. Previous to 1949, religious services had not been disturbed, but during 1948-49 instances of interference with religious life and customs became frequent. During Passover, 1949, many aged Jews were forced to go hungry because Passover food was distributed only to those who could present working cards issued by nationalized enterprises. Furthermore, the state being practically the only employer, Orthodox Jews could not work in enterprises where the Sabbath was observed. Rabbi Yehoshua Aaron Gross, who prepared lists of Orthodox Jews for the purpose of petitioning the government to organize employment facilities for Sabbath observers, was arrested on the charge of engaging in subversive activities. Special taxes were introduced on religious rituals and ceremonies such as weddings, bar mitzvahs, and circumcisions performed in Jewish homes. In many instances, the authorities charged religious groups with misusing religious ceremonies for political purposes. In one case twenty-eight persons, including the bride and the groom, were arrested and sentenced to prison terms for singing *Hatikvah* at a Jewish wedding. The Chief Rabbi of Timisoara was arrested for concluding his sermon with the traditional prayer "... and may the Redeemer come unto Zion." Although suffering from sickness, he was kept under arrest and interrogated. The Chief Rabbi died several days after he was released from prison.

An anti-religious Jewish organization was founded under the leadership of the Communist Marcel Fischer. It issued a new "catechism" of how to fight religious ideologies. Young Communists were instructed to enter synagogues, bareheaded, to sing the Rumanian national anthem, and to force the congregations to join them. As a result, many Jews, fearing reprisals, stopped attending synagogues.

Some Orthodox children's homes were abolished, some still existed at the time of writing. Attempts were made to force Orthodox children to move to Communist orphanages, first by cutting off their food supplies, and then, by direct command. The children, most of whom were undernourished survivors of Nazi concentration camps, resisted the blockade and finally dispersed to Orthodox homes or wandered around hungry. A number of Orthodox Jews were being sought by the police because of their support of the children's resistance.
Emigration

Until the end of 1948, emigration to Israel was permitted, although in many cases tremendous sums were exacted for the issuance of passport and exit visas. At the end of 1948, the Communist-controlled community organs insisted on their exclusive right to select and to register prospective emigrants and to exclude Zionist or pro-Zionist organizations from participation. In January, 1949, the government permitted 3,600 of those who registered with the Communists to emigrate, and then stopped further emigration. At that time, all Zionist organizations were dissolved and the halutz farms closed. Propaganda for emigration was considered treasonable, and all Zionist emigration activities were practically outlawed.

On February 11-13, 1949, rumors were spread in Bucharest that the Israeli legation was conducting large-scale registration of applicants for emigration. Thousands of Jews jammed the street around the building and applications were handed in by the basketful. Applicants appeared even on Saturday when the office was closed, and threw their appeals through the gates. Legation officials, however, explained that no mass registration was planned and that they could not explain the origin of the rumors. On February 14, 1949, a spontaneous demonstration by an estimated 10,000 Jews took place in the streets near the legation. Crowds gathered to celebrate the opening of the Israeli Constituent Assembly and to demand free emigration; they danced in the streets and shouted “Long live Israel!” and “Aliyah!” On February 17, 1949, rumors again circulated that 100,000 Jews would be allowed to emigrate. Several thousand Jews gathered in front of the legation. The crowd shouted for emigration papers.

Unirea charged that the Zionists were spreading false rumors about Israeli visas in order to “hamper the consolidation of people’s democracy” and the Communist deputy Bercu Feldman attacked the demonstration as a “provocation.” Seven Israeli citizens, who had come to Rumania to help organize the emigration, were arrested on vague charges of “plotting against the state security.” They were released at the beginning of April, 1949, after several diplomatic interventions of Israeli representatives, but had to leave the country. Leon Itzcar and Enciu Cohen, leaders of the Zionist organizations, who had been held in prison from October, 1948, to May, 1949, were sentenced to four months in jail each for “violating currency and tax regulations” in connection with fund-raising and emigration activities.

The emigration ban was in force throughout the first half of 1949, with some minor exceptions. On July 18, Israeli Foreign Minister Sharett revealed in the Knesset that the Israeli government had sent a note to Rumania asking free exit for Rumanian Jews, but had not received an answer. The Israeli representative in Bucharest was instructed to open negotiations on the subject, but no result was achieved. At the end of August, 1949, the Israeli government decided to recall its Bucharest minister, Reuven Rubin, for consultation, and to leave the legation in the hands of a chargé d’affaires. This was considered a demonstration against the negative attitude of the Rumanian government, as well as against the prolonged absence of the already appointed
Rumanian minister from Tel Aviv. (The Rumanian legation in Israel was administered for many months by the chargé d'affaires, Paul Davidovici, a violent anti-Zionist.) New negotiations were launched at the beginning of September, 1949, when Shmuel Eliashev, director of the Eastern European Division of the Israeli Foreign Office, arrived in Bucharest on a tour of Eastern European capitals, but the result was not known at the time of this writing.

Illegal emigration, which had been proceeding on a large scale via Hungary to the DP camps in Austria previous to 1947, was made extremely difficult by the severe police measures of Rumanian and Hungarian authorities. The gendarmerie at the Transylvanian border received orders to shoot at emigrants, a number of whom were killed or wounded attempting to cross the frontier. The Hungarian government deported emigrants caught in Hungary back to Rumania, where they were sentenced to heavy prison terms. The dissolution of Zionist organizations in Hungary and the persecution following the Budapest trial of Zionist leaders accused of aiding illegal emigration contributed to the effective closing of this avenue of escape.
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BULGARIA

The last remnants of legal opposition in Bulgaria were suppressed in 1947 and 1948. The largest independent group, the Peasant party, was liquidated and its leader, Nikola Petkov, executed in August, 1947; a series of trials against former leaders of the party extended until April, 1948, when deputy D. Gichev was sentenced to prison for life, and twenty-five other former officials of the party received long prison terms. The liquidation of the independent Social Democrats and the trial of their secretary-general, deputy Kosta Lulchev, followed in November, 1948. Kosta Lulchev and some of his colleagues were sentenced to prison for life; with them, the last opposition members disappeared from parliament. In the meantime, the “Fatherland Front” was transformed from a coalition of parties into a unified organization under tight Communist control (February, 1948); the pro-Communist wing of the Social Democrats was compelled to merge with the Communist party (August, 1948); and finally, all political parties except the Communists and the Communist-front Agrarian Union were forced to disband (February-March, 1949). Within the Communist party, a large-scale purge of “unreliable” and “nationalist” elements began after the party congress of December, 1948. It reached its climax in the dramatic expulsion from the Politburo of the Vice-Premier and Minister of Economy Traicho Kostov in March, 1949. In June, 1949, Kostov was expelled from the party and jailed. One of the major accusations lodged against him was that he tried “to sow distrust” between the Bulgarian and Soviet Communist parties and to misuse the authority of Premier Georgi Dimitrov for this purpose. At about the same time, Premier Dimitrov went to the Soviet Union to cure his illness; he died there on July 2, 1949. Vasil Kolarov became his successor as Premier and leader of the Communist party.

Simultaneously, new legislation and a series of police measures prepared the
Gleichschaltung of churches and religious communities. The Bulgarian Orthodox Church, purged of independent elements, was made an instrument of state policy. A new church law, promulgated in February, 1949, decreed that churches with headquarters outside Bulgaria were forbidden to have missions, orders, or charitable institutions in the country; that religious communities in Bulgaria could maintain relations with analogous communities abroad only through the Foreign Ministry; and that clergymen would have to obtain confirmation by the state authorities to perform their duties. At the beginning of 1949, fifteen Protestant ministers were indicted on charges of “espionage” and “conspiring” with “foreign imperialists.” After a public trial in which the defendants confessed to all the alleged crimes, four of them were sentenced to hard labor for life and nine others received prison terms ranging up to fifteen years.

In the field of economy, the private sector in industry and commerce was virtually eliminated by the nationalization laws of 1947 and 1948. Only state enterprises and state-controlled cooperatives remained in urban economic life. But the land remained in the hands of the peasants. Although harassed by attempts to force collectivization and by requisitions of their produce, the peasants, who constituted a majority of the population, resisted tenaciously, though passively, and forced the Communist party to order a partial retreat. At a Central Committee session in June, 1949, the Communists condemned the excesses committed by “local Communists” in the villages, and decided to reduce the tempo of collectivization to permit the peasants to sell their surplus produce on the free market, after delivery of their quotas to the state, and to raise the price of grain.

Jewish Population

Bulgaria was the only country under German domination where the Jewish community escaped total extermination. There had been 48,000 Jews in 1934 according to the last prewar census; after the war, a census taken by the Jewish Central Consistory reported 49,172 Jewish inhabitants, with 56.3 per cent of them residing in Sofia and constituting 3 per cent of its total postwar population; 77 per cent of all Bulgarian Jews were concentrated in seven large communities. Thus, the Bulgarian Jewish community had survived the war with only a small numerical loss, which seemed to have been more than compensated by a natural increase and probably by an influx of refugees fleeing other Balkan countries.

Economic Conditions

The emigration of almost the entire Jewish population could be explained in part by the strong Zionist tradition of Bulgarian Jewry, but it was also an outgrowth of postwar economic and social conditions. While Bulgarian Jewry was not exterminated during the war, it was expropriated and completely impoverished under the pro-Nazi regime. As in other Iron Curtain countries, the postwar restitution laws remained mainly on paper, and a large part of the Jewish population was forced to live in poverty, surviving only with the
help of international Jewish relief organizations. The hope of former businessmen and employees to find a new existence in private enterprise, whose preservation was promised by the early postwar administrations, was crushed by the new wave of nationalization in 1947-48. Mass unemployment among the Jewish people resulted. Although some attempts were made to reintegrate the economically displaced Jews into the new economy with the financial help of Jewish organizations abroad, only a small part of the community was affected. At the end of 1947 there were 26 Jewish producers' cooperatives, financed by the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), with 657 members, and 3 more cooperatives with a preponderantly Jewish membership among their 130 members. Even in the JDC-supported cooperatives not all the members were Jews and, according to some sources, the proportion of non-Jews was close to 50 per cent. In September, 1948, when a representative of the JDC came to Sofia, the total number of Jewish cooperatives was reported to be 38; but only 20 were able to present somewhat brief reports at a conference called for that purpose. The number of their members was not mentioned at that time, but at the end of 1948 it was estimated at about 1,400 (Jews and non-Jews). In any event, the cooperatives helped only a minor part of the Jewish population.

No statistics were available on the absorption of Jews in government and public administration jobs, except for a rather unreliable report of the Sofia community in May, 1947. This report recorded 6 to 7 per cent of the employable Jewish population as state or public employees, representing a definite increase in percentage compared with the prewar years when the number of Jews in public service was negligible. But when the tremendous increase in the number of "public" as against private jobs is taken into account, the increase was not so considerable and certainly could not solve the problem of the economically displaced Jewish population. Thus, Bulgarian Jewry, driven from its traditional place in the economy by Nazi expropriation and unable to resume it because of the postwar economic transformations, remained an impoverished mass and eventually found the only solution of its economic problems in emigration.

Communal Life

After the war the religious communities were reconstituted under Communist leadership. At the same time, the Central Jewish Committee of the Fatherland Front was formed to direct the political and cultural life of the Jewish minority. The Zionist movement had the sympathies of the great majority of Bulgarian Jews. It reported an active membership of 13,000 in 1946, who represented, with their families, about 75 per cent of all the Jews in Bulgaria. In May, 1946, the Zionists were induced to join the Jewish Committee of the Fatherland Front under an agreement assuring parity representation in the leadership. As a matter of fact, with the help of some "sympathizers" the Communists had a majority in the leading organs, and the Jewish Committee of the Fatherland Front as well as the religious communities were forced to follow the Communist line in all important matters of internal and foreign policy. The religious communities were obliged to participate
in election campaigns and in the fight for the elimination of the opposition parties; to refuse the international guarantee of minority rights in the peace treaties; and to accept the \textit{Gleichschaltung} of Jewish schools along with the abolition of the elaborate system of Hebrew education which had existed in Bulgaria for decades.

\textit{Education}

In 1939, there were fifteen Jewish kindergartens, twenty-five primary schools, fifteen Sabbath schools, and five junior high schools, totaling about 3,800 pupils. Maintained by the Jewish communities, these institutions used Hebrew as the language of instruction. Only the Bulgarian language, literature, and history were taught in Bulgarian.

Reopened after the war, the schools were nationalized at the end of 1946. Bulgarian was made the language of instruction for all subjects except Jewish history and Hebrew. Subsequently, Jewish history was ordered taught in Bulgarian and within the framework of general history. Thus, the schools of the Jewish minority, in administration, curriculum, and ideology, were treated as all other Bulgarian schools, but with only two differences: Hebrew was taught as a foreign language, and special care was taken to fight Zionism and Jewish nationalism. In January, 1947, there were Jewish elementary schools of this type in twelve communities and Jewish junior high schools in four communities, with a total of 1,700 students.

\textit{Religion}

A decision to separate the synagogue from the Jewish community was adopted at the third conference of Jewish communities in May, 1948. The communities were ordered to stop the financial support of religious institutions, which thereafter were to be supported by the voluntary contributions of observant Jews.

At the same conference it was decided, over Zionist protests, that the Jews were to have only one press organ, the weekly \textit{Evreiski Vesti}, under the complete control of the Communists. The two Zionist weeklies, \textit{Tsionisticheska Tribuna} and \textit{Poale Tzion}, were ordered to cease publication. For a time, they maintained a precarious existence as “internal bulletins” for members of their respective organizations only. But they became the targets of sharp attacks for their “reactionary” and “nationalist” policies, and finally ceased publication.

The Jewish Committee of the Fatherland Front was reorganized into a Jewish subcommittee of the Minority Commission of the Fatherland Front, with appointed members and a purely advisory function. But the Central Consistory, which directed the religious communities, was retained even after the mass emigration at the end of 1948, its “representation” of Bulgarian Jews outside the country being among the reasons offered. In July, 1949, the Central Consistory decided to sever relations with the World Jewish Congress (WJC) because of the “reactionary and pro-Zionist activities” of the WJC leadership and for its refusal to participate in the Communist-organized
“World Congress of Partisans of Peace” held in Paris during the preceding April.

**Emigration**

During the early postwar period, the Communist leadership of Jewish organizations repeatedly declared that Bulgarian Jews did not wish to emigrate. Emigration was discouraged and made difficult in many ways. With the change in Russian policy on the Palestinian question in 1947 came a change in the official Bulgarian attitude toward emigration. The official Jewish press defended the right of “Jews, who are persecuted by reactionary regimes [to emigrate] to their Fatherland, the independent and democratic Palestine,” and even encouraged “active, fighting elements” to go to Israel from the progressive Peoples’ Democracies, to fight against the “feudal Arab rulers and their masters, the Anglo-American imperialists.”

The Jewish Communists tried to control the flow as well as the composition of emigration, and illegal emigrants were severely punished. In the Spring of 1947 three Jewish youths who tried to cross the Turkish border on their way to Israel were killed by Bulgarian frontier guards, while several others who were captured were sentenced to hard labor. The Jewish communities were forced to declare their agreement with these severe punishments.

Not until October, 1948, did the Bulgarian government agree to permit mass emigration. Transport priorities were continued for young people who were to fight in Israel, yet in principle all Jews were free to leave. The Bulgarian government reserved only the right to hold back such specialists as doctors, nurses, engineers, and technicians. Some 10,000 Jews left for Israel during October, 1948, the first month of the new policy. Some 37,000 Jews in all left the country, according to reports by the Bulgarian communities, 41,000 according to the JDC which paid for the transportation. In closing its office in Sofia in May, 1949, the JDC announced that “less than 4,000 Jews remain in Bulgaria, out of a postwar population of 48,000, while all but 1,000 of those still remaining plan to leave.” Organized Jewish communities continued to exist in Sofia, Plovdiv, Russe, Yambol, Burgas, and other towns. In July, 1949, the mass exodus was considered finished, although there were reports that additional groups of about fifty persons might still be leaving periodically.
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**YUGOSLAVIA**

The year under review was the year of the split between the Yugoslav government and the Soviet bloc. It was full of dramatic developments and violent Russian political attacks against “Titoism”—from the famous Cominform resolution in June, 1948, to the denunciation of the Soviet-Yugoslav treaty of friendship in September, 1949. When the general anti-Zionist campaign started in Russia and her satellite countries at the end of 1948, Yugoslavia was already outside of the Cominform bloc.

Of the prewar Jewish population of more than 80,000, only 11,000 survived
the war and Nazi extermination. Some Jewish religious communities were re-constructed after the war; their central body, the Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Yugoslavia, resumed its activities under Communist control.

Immediately after the liberation, the prospects of the survivors were considered favorable; many of them had fought with the partisans, and it was expected that they would be able to participate fully in Yugoslav national life. In April, 1946, the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Problems of Jews in Europe and Palestine reported that there was no evidence of discrimination, and that the majority of the survivors wanted to stay in Yugoslavia. According to the report, only 2,750 of the 11,000 Jews wished to emigrate to Palestine, and 550 to other countries, chiefly to the United States.

But at the end of 1948, when the Yugoslav government permitted mass emigration to Israel, a great majority of the remaining Jews decided to leave the country. About 4,100 emigrants left for Israel in December, 1948; 3,000 followed in July and August, 1949; and 2,000 more were expected to leave in the Fall of 1949. Only 2,000 Jews were expected to stay in Yugoslavia, most of them specialists (doctors, technicians, engineers), who did not get exit permits, and a small number of those who wished to stay. The emigrants were allowed to take with them their personal belongings, including furniture and jewelry, but their houses and land were taken over by the government, without compensation.

Although the Yugoslav government had been the only Eastern-European government which did not support the partition of Palestine (probably in order to appease the Moslem minority in Yugoslavia), it recognized Israel on May 19, 1948, sent a Minister to Tel Aviv (July, 1949), and maintained friendly relations with the Israeli government.

JOSEPH GORDON
Israel

ISRAEL AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The Fall of 1948 witnessed more progress towards a solution of the Palestine problem than had been made since the General Assembly of the United Nations began its deliberations over this problem in September, 1947. Starting most inauspiciously with the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations mediator in Palestine, through the perseverance of the Acting Mediator Ralph J. Bunche, the UN nevertheless succeeded in obtaining armistice agreements in the Arab-Israeli conflict. This was followed by the admission of Israel as the fifty-ninth member of the United Nations, a political achievement by Israel which overshadowed the major differences being negotiated at the Lausanne Conference, such as the questions of the Arab refugees, the internationalization of Jerusalem, and the boundaries of Israel. These successes added considerable prestige to the United Nations.

Assassination of Count Bernadotte

Three days before the opening of the third regular meeting of the General Assembly at Paris on September 17, 1948, while on an inspection tour through the city of Jerusalem, Count Bernadotte was assassinated along with a member of his staff, Colonel André P. Serot of France. This brought to seven the number of men who lost their lives in the service of the United Nations in Palestine. Ralph J. Bunche, special United Nations representative in Palestine, was immediately designated by United Nations Secretary-General Trygve Lie to take charge pending the appointment of a new mediator. On September 18, 1948, the Security Council met in a special session, at which the members unanimously and strongly condemned the act of assassination. Major Aubrey Eban, representative of the Provisional Government of Israel, issued a statement expressing his government’s “horror and grief at the murder of Count Bernadotte.” The government of Israel added on September 18, 1948, that “The government of Israel is outraged by the appalling crime committed yesterday in Jerusalem. . . . This murder is an attack on the authority of the UN and a calculated assault on the sovereignty of Israel. . . .”

The Bernadotte Proposals

Count Bernadotte’s report had been completed a few hours before his death and sent on to Paris in time for the meeting of the General Assembly. Its recommendations were:
1. Jerusalem be placed under UN control. The area included was to be the
same as that originally proposed by the UN partition plan; 2. the area known as the Negev be defined as Arab territory; 3. the towns of Ramleh and Lydda be included in the Arab territory; 4. Galilee be defined as Jewish territory; 5. the port of Haifa, including the oil refineries and terminals, be declared a free port, with assurances of free access to interested Arab countries; 6. the Arab port of Lydda be declared a free airport with assurances of free access to Jerusalem and interested Arab countries; 7. a conciliation commission responsible to the UN be set up.

REACTIONS TO BERNADOTTE PROPOSALS

Statements expressing the attitude of the Big Three—the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain—were soon forthcoming. General George C. Marshall on September 21, 1948 stated that: “The United States considers that the conclusions contained in the final report of Count Bernadotte offer a generally fair basis for settlement of the Palestine question. My government . . . strongly urges the parties and General Assembly to accept them in their entirety . . .” This was followed, on September 23, 1948, by a statement from Britain’s foreign secretary, Ernest Bevin, who announced in the House of Commons that the British Government gave its “wholehearted and unqualified support” to Count Bernadotte’s proposals. As sponsor of Trans-Jordan, Great Britain was particularly partial to the Bernadotte suggestion that there were “compelling reasons for merging the Arab territory of Palestine with the territory of Trans-Jordan. . . .” This implicit recognition of the sovereignty of Israel marked a departure from previous British foreign policy.

Without specifically committing herself on the merits of the Bernadotte proposal, the USSR, through its representative, Andrei Y. Vishinsky, declared that the decision of the General Assembly on November 29, 1947, recommending the partition of Palestine was endangered not only by the direct proposal on the part of certain states to revise that decision, but also by proposals for the setting up of a trusteeship over Palestine and the appointment of a mediator.

The Israeli government protested the United States proposal that Count Bernadotte’s recommendations on Palestine be adopted in their entirety, but indicated willingness to “explore all proposals which are put forward as a basis for a final lasting peace.” Particular exception was taken to the suggestion that the Negev be excised from the state of Israel, in the light of the recommendation of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine that the territory of the Negev be included in the Jewish state. In a memorandum entitled, The Importance of the Negev to the State of Israel, and circulated among the fifty-eight members of the UN, Israel condemned the territorial changes proposed in the Mediator’s report as “an entirely inequitable apportionment of land between Israel and the neighboring Arab state.”

The Arab reaction was negative. Charles Malik, Lebanon’s UN representative and Minister to Washington, said the “chief bone of contention is the irrevocable view supported by the Bernadotte report and by the United States that a Jewish State is here to stay.” The Arabs were particularly concerned over the Bernadotte suggestion that Arab Palestine be incorporated into the present kingdom of Trans-Jordan, and it was reported (The New York Times, October
that the Lebanese Premier, Riad es-Solh, cabled King Abdullah asking
the King of Trans-Jordan to clarify his position.

The General Assembly meeting on September 23, 1948, immediately placed
Palestine on the agenda. Egyptian and Syrian representatives protested that
the Bernadotte report was long and bulky and the questions involved were so
complicated that they called for the most careful consideration by their govern-
ments. Russian opposition was based on the claim that the truce imposed by
the Security Council was effective, and that the Palestine question could wait
until the problem of atomic energy and Andrei Vishinsky's proposals for arms
cuts had been discussed. Thus, an Arab-Russian bloc succeeded in defeating
by 21 to 16 the motion by Hector McNeil to discuss the Bernadotte report
at once.

The Palestine problem then began to shuttle between the Security Council
and the Political Committee, though it also was on the agenda of the Social,
Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee because of the Arab refugee problem.
On September 30, 1948, Bunche cited both the Arabs and Israel before the
Security Council for six types of alleged interference with the legitimate
activities of truce observers in Palestine and stated: "There can be little doubt
that appropriate action by the Security Council at this time would be helpful
to the effort to ensure the maintenance and effective supervision of a truce in
Palestine." He again appeared before the Security Council, on October 14,
1948, to declare that he found "inescapable the conclusion that in this instance
[the assassination of Bernadotte] there was negligence on the part of the local
Jewish authorities in Jerusalem and that had minimum precautions been
taken this crime could not and would not have been committed." Aubrey
Eban, Israeli representative, retorted by referring to the drastic measures
taken by his government immediately upon the assassination of Count
Bernadotte, and affirmed that the Israeli government was acting to eradicate
those movements which were an "exploitation of public bitterness and frus-
tration."

The following day, appearing before the First (Political and Security) Com-
mittee, Bunche urged immediate action upon the Bernadotte report with
which he stated he was "in full accord." Quoting from Count Bernadotte's
report, he emphasized, that "both sides will acquiesce, however reluctantly,
in any reasonable settlement on which is placed the stamp of approval of
the United Nations." His emphasis that the Bernadotte plan should be treated
as a rough basis for a settlement rather than as a hard and fast proposal was
significant.

SECURITY COUNCIL OCTOBER RESOLUTIONS

Called into emergency session at the request of the Acting Mediator to
consider a new outbreak of hostilities in the Negev, the Security Council
after a two hours' debate on October 19, did not hold either side responsible,
but insisted that fighting must cease at once. The order was passed unani-
mously. The Security Council also decided by a vote of 9 to 0, with Russia
and the Ukraine abstaining: 1. that both sides be asked to retreat to the
lines they held before the renewal of the fighting; 2. that both sides undertake
negotiations—either through a UN intermediary or directly—on outstand-
ing problems affecting the Negev; 3. that UN observers be stationed throughout the Negev.

On October 25, 1948, the Security Council was summoned to meet in emergency session to consider Egyptian charges that “Zionist forces in Palestine are constantly and increasingly violating the truce and defying the cease fire orders given by the Security Council.” Particular concern was expressed by Israel over Bunche’s interpretation of the October, 1948, resolution, in view of his issuance of another order calling for a withdrawal of Egyptian and Israeli forces to positions occupied on October 14, 1948. To restore the Egyptians to a position from which they had been ejected would, Israel felt, be “an international anomaly of fantastic dimensions.”

It was at this point that on October 28 an Anglo-Chinese resolution was submitted asking the Security Council to plan sanctions against either party in Palestine that continued to defy its orders. The Anglo-Chinese resolution asked that the Security Council “appoint a committee of the Council consisting of the five permanent members, together with Belgium and Colombia, to examine urgently and report to the Council on the measures . . . appropriate . . . under Article 41 of the Charter if either party or both should refuse to comply with [Bunche’s interpretation of the resolution of October 19, 1948], within whatever time limit the Acting Mediator may think it desirable to fix.”

(Article 41 provides for the use by the Security Council of any measure short of armed force “to give effect to its decisions” and it specifically says: “These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations . . . means of communication and severance of diplomatic relations.”)

On October 29, 1948, at a meeting of the subcommittee of the Security Council, the United States offered several amendments to this draft resolution. According to the original draft the Security Council was to “endorse” the Acting Mediator’s request to Israel and Egypt to withdraw their troops. The United States amended this to “take note of” the request. The United States also called upon the two governments to withdraw their forces, establish permanent truce lines, demilitarize zones “without prejudice to their rights, claims, or position with regard to a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine or to the positions which the members of the United Nations may wish to take in the General Assembly on such peaceful adjustment.”

But the most important change was a third amendment which removed all reference to Article 41. Instead, the proposed committee was to give such advice as the Acting Mediator might require with regard to his responsibilities under the resolution, and in the event of a failure of either party or both to comply with provisions of the resolution, “to study as a matter of urgency and to report to the Council on further measures it would be appropriate to take under Chapter 7 of the Charter.”

The resolution perplexed many observers because it was not certain whether it strengthened or weakened the original text, since the amendment was extended to cover all of Chapter 7 of the Charter—of which Article 41 is a part. Israeli circles believed that it was intended “as a club to be held over the Israelis,” but most observers believed that it was an effort to avoid the consideration of sanctions. On November 4, 1948, the Security Council passed the Anglo-Chinese resolution, as amended by the United States.
Somewhat earlier, on October 9, 1948, Bunche had submitted to the Security Council a proposal for a definite end of hostilities which he considered “an indispensable condition to an ultimate peaceful settlement of basic political issues.” In accordance with this proposal, A. G. L. McNaughton of Canada, on November 15, 1948, introduced a draft resolution calling for the establishment of an armistice in all sectors of Palestine and calling upon the parties directly concerned to negotiate either directly or through the Acting Mediator. The Soviet Union opposed the transitional step from a truce to an armistice and proposed as “an even bolder course” the immediate passage into a state of final peace. Philip Jessup, representing the United States, favored the armistice.

Aubrey Eban, speaking for the Provisional Government of Israel, favored the institution of the new phase looking forward to a peace settlement, but objected to the use of the resolution of November 4, 1948, as a frame of reference, on the grounds that Israel was being asked to abandon its responsibilities throughout the greater part of its territory “for no other reason than that an invading army had challenged unsuccessfully its internationally sanctioned rights by force of arms.”

The Syrian, Lebanese, and Egyptian representatives told the Council they were unwilling to negotiate directly with Israel because this would signify the acceptance of Israel as an independent state. Despite their requests for delay, the armistice resolution was passed by eight members of the Security Council, with the Soviet Union and the Ukrainian delegates abstaining.

Political and Security Committee

While the Security Council was occupied with the technical problems of truces and armistices, the Political and Security Committee completely avoided a discussion of the Bernadotte report or any other matter pertaining to the eventual political settlement. Because of the crowded UN agenda, Herbert D. Evatt had established a special subcommittee of the Political Committee to discuss the Palestine question. On October 23, 1948, the United Nations again postponed action on the basis of a motion introduced by Iran which carried by a vote of only 19 to 16, with 14 abstentions.

The proceedings of the Political Committee were also hindered by the efforts of the United States and Britain to reach an agreement concerning the Bernadotte proposal. On November 18, 1948, The New York Times reported that the experts of the United States and British delegations were working on the “third draft” of the Anglo-American Palestine resolution, dated October 15, 1948. This provided that a settlement in Palestine must be reached on the basis of the Bernadotte plan, with no essential changes in the boundaries that the late mediator had proposed. Moreover, there was to be no explicit recognition of Israel as an independent state; the resolution referred throughout to “non-Arab areas of Palestine” without mentioning Israel. Failure to obtain American support for this “third draft” compelled the British to introduce a proposal of their own on November 18, 1948, at the
meeting of the Political Committee. The resolution called for a permanent settlement of the Palestine question on the basis of the Bernadotte plan but, surprisingly, referred to the “Jewish State.” There was much conjecture about the American position, but on November 20, 1948, Jessup told the United Nations that “no change must be made in Israel’s borders without that state’s consent,” though he insisted that any territorial additions Israel demanded beyond the boundaries set forth in the partition resolution must be offset by Israel’s surrender of other territory. This would mean that it would be necessary for Israel to surrender some of the Negev to keep the Galilee. The Bernadotte report was to be accepted as the basis for renewed efforts to bring about a peaceful adjustment of Arab-Israeli differences.

On November 23, 1948, Jessup recommended that the boundaries of Israel and of the Arab part of Palestine be determined on the basis both of the Assembly’s partition resolution and the final proposals by Count Bernadotte. This was in flat opposition to the British resolution specifying that the settlement be based on the Bernadotte report.

The Israeli representatives objected that Jessup had placed the partition resolution and the Bernadotte report on the same level as the partition resolution, as guides to the proposed Conciliation Commission, and that there was no reference to his previous pledge that the United States would not support boundary changes unless they were acceptable to Israel.

The Australian government, through its representative, John D. L. Hood, submitted another draft resolution proposing that the partition resolution be the “basic starting point” of a settlement of the Palestine question, and that although the final settlement should take into account the Bernadotte report, it should be in conformity with the principles contained in the partition resolution. The Australian resolution also included the Assembly recommendation that the Security Council approve Israel’s application for membership in the United Nations when it would be submitted.

Thus, the United Nations was confronted with finding a compromise between two extreme views: That of the British delegation, which favored a permanent settlement strictly on the basis of the Bernadotte report; and that of the Soviet delegation, which insisted on a settlement entirely on the basis of the partition resolution.

Most of the United States amendments to the British resolution submitted by Jessup were accepted by the British government and incorporated into a revised resolution by Hector McNeil. However, McNeil said that the British government still felt “the emphasis should be on the Bernadotte plan, although it need not rest exclusively on it.”

Because of the large number of additional resolutions submitted by Syria, the Soviet Union, Poland, and Colombia, the First Committee at its meeting of November 26, 1948, set up a Working Group composed of the authors of all the draft resolutions and amendments. On December 4, 1948, the Political and Security Committee finally succeeded by a vote of 26 to 21, a margin far short of the two-thirds majority that would be required for adoption by the Assembly, in passing a resolution which bore little resemblance to the original British-American proposals. The resolution in effect proposed: 1. a three-nation commission of mediation to be appointed by the Big Five, with in-
Instructions to mediate between Arab and Israeli leaders and to carry out Security Council orders with regard to the truce ordered by the UN; 2. the internationalization of Jerusalem; 3. no instruction as to the settlement of the boundaries of the rest of Israel. Six members of the Soviet bloc and fifteen supporters of the Arabs voted against the resolution.

**DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE**

The closeness of the vote adumbrated a substantial modification of the draft resolution prepared by the First Committee. It was finally approved in the General Assembly by a vote of 35 to 15, with 8 abstentions. The three-member Conciliation Commission was instructed to carry out specific directives given by the Assembly or by the Security Council and to undertake, upon the Security Council's request, any function assigned by the Council to the Mediator or the United Nations' truce commission.

Another part of the resolution dealing with Holy Places, including Nazareth, provided that these should be protected and free access to them assured.

A third important aspect concerned Jerusalem, which in view of its association with three world religions was to be accorded special and separate treatment and be placed under effective United Nations control. The resolution also called upon the Conciliation Commission to present at the next session detailed proposals for a permanent international regime, providing for the maximum local autonomy for distinctive groups consistent with the special international status of the Jerusalem area.

Refugees wishing to return home and live at peace with their neighbors were to be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date and compensation was to be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for damage to property. The Commission was likewise instructed to facilitate the repatriation and resettlement and the economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees, and the payment of the compensation mentioned above.

The Assembly later accepted the proposal that the Conciliation Commission should be composed of France, Turkey, and the United States, with its headquarters in Jerusalem.

**Application for UN Membership by Israel**

In the meantime, the Palestine problem had returned to the Security Council when on November 29, 1948, Israel submitted her application for admission to Secretary-General Trygve Lie exactly one year after the passage of the General Assembly's partition resolution. Both the United States and the Soviet Union indicated immediately their intention of supporting the Israeli application for membership. In supporting the application, Jessup pointed out that all authorities on international law had stated that a state must have a people, a territory, a government, and the capacity to enter into relations with other states. The United States was satisfied that Israel met these qualifications and that it was able to carry out the obligations of the Charter. Jacob Malik of the Soviet Union indicated that the USSR had always maintained that the only correct solution of the Palestine question was the implementation of the decision of November 29, 1947, and that it adhered.
to this position in supporting Israel's application. Great Britain opposed
the admission of Israel to membership on the grounds that it would
"diminish the chances of an early settlement in Palestine." After many draft
resolutions were rejected, Israel's bid for admission was voted upon and re-
jected. The vote was five in favor (the United States, Soviet Union, the
Ukraine, Argentina, and Colombia), five abstentions (Britain, China, Bel-
gium, France, and Canada), and one opposed (Syria). Thus, the application
failed by two votes to receive the seven votes required for a majority.

**Admission of Israel into the UN**

The armistice agreements which were reached between Israel and the Arab
states were auspicious omens for Israel's second application for membership
in the United Nations on February 24, 1949, the very day the Egyptian
armistice was signed. On March 4, 1949, Israel's application was approved
by the Security Council by a vote of 9 to 1, with Egypt opposed and Britain
abstaining. The resolution recommending Israel for membership was intro-
duced by Warren R. Austin, United States representative, who held that
Israel was a peace-loving state, able and willing to carry out the obligations
laid down in the Charter. The bid was then sent to the General Assembly,
which decided on April 14, 1949, to refer Israel's application for membership
to the Political Committee for consideration, rather than vote upon such
admission immediately. The fear that Israel's bid might be delayed by a
crowded agenda did not materialize when the discussion was transferred to
the Ad Hoc Committee. Most of the discussion revolved around the position
of Israel on the question of the Arab refugees and Jerusalem, and the Ad Hoc
Committee asked the Israeli representative to explain his government's at-
titude to provisions of the General Assembly's resolutions of November 29,
1947, and December 11, 1948, regarding the internationalization of Jerusalem
and adjacent areas. It also requested a statement on the problem of Arab
refugees and the Israeli investigation into the assassination of Bernadotte.
The Israeli representative, Aubrey Eban, replied that his government was
willing to discuss the Arab refugee problem under the auspices of the Concil-
iation Commission; that Israel was in favor of an international regime in
Jerusalem restricted to the protection and control of the Holy Places; and
that it regretted its inability to discover and bring to justice the assassins
of Bernadotte.

Following Eban's presentation, and after further debate, John Hood of
Australia moved a formal resolution recommending Israel's admission,
seconded by Warren Austin of the United States. Israel's entry was then ap-
proved by the UN Ad Hoc Committee by a vote of 33 to 11, with 13 absten-
tions. On May 11, 1949, the General Assembly, by a vote of 37 to 12, with
9 abstentions, admitted Israel as the fifty-ninth member of the United Nations.

**Lausanne Conference**

Attention now shifted overseas to Lausanne, Switzerland, where the United
Nations Conciliation Commission had already begun its task of taking an-

---

1 See pp. 393-94.
other step in the transition from an armistice to a political settlement. According to the Commission's Third Progress Report to the Secretary-General, published on June 21, 1949, the negotiations which had begun on April 27, 1949, started well, for the four Arab States—Egypt, Trans-Jordan, Lebanon and Syria—and Israel sent highly qualified delegations. First, the Commission met with the delegations separately to explore their views on all outstanding questions and on May 12, 1949, a French protocol was agreed upon as the agenda. The protocol stated that the exchange of views "would bear on the territorial adjustments necessary to achieve as quickly as possible the objectives of the General Assembly resolution of December 11, 1948, regarding refugees, as well as territorial and other questions." The following indicates the respective stands taken by the governments on the various questions.

**THE ARAB REFUGEE QUESTION**

Israel stated that if the Gaza area were incorporated into Israel, it would accept the entire Arab population of the area—Inhabitants and refugees—as citizens of Israel. This was to be on the understanding that resettlement in Israeli territory would be subject to such international aid as would be available for refugee resettlement in general. Israel was not in a position to submit proposals on the number of refugees it could take if the Gaza area were not incorporated. This proposal the Arab delegations refused to accept.

The Arabs proposed the immediate return of the refugees who had come from the territories now under Israeli authority but which formed part of the Arab Zone in the General Assembly's partition resolution: Western Galilee, Lydda, Ramla and Beersheba, Jaffa, Jerusalem, and the coast line north of Gaza. This proposal was turned down by the Israeli delegation.

**TERRITORIAL QUESTIONS**

Israel proposed: 1. that its frontiers with Egypt and Lebanon be the same as the frontier between these countries and Palestine under the British mandate. (If this proposal was to be accepted, Israel was prepared to accept all Arabs at present in the Gaza area as citizens of Israel.); 2. that its frontier with Jordan remain the same as the frontier between Trans-Jordan and Palestine under the British mandate; 3. that in the central area of Palestine now under Jordan military authority the boundary was to follow the present line between Israeli and Jordanian forces, subject to certain modifications to be discussed later. As to the future status of this area, Israel had no ambitions and proposed that it be settled by the Arab states, the inhabitants of the territory, and the refugees. Till the future status was determined, Israel would continue to recognize Jordan's de facto authority as military occupying power.

The Arab delegations regarded the proposals concerning the frontiers with Lebanon and Egypt as "a flagrant violation of the terms of the protocol of May 12, [1949] since it was considered that such a proposal involved annexations, not territorial adjustments as envisaged in the proposals."

The Arab delegations for their part indicated that their proposal for the return of refugees to areas designated as Arab territory bore a territorial aspect: they envisaged a return of the refugees to territories which were to be
recognized in principle as Arab. To this Israel replied that "it could not accept the distribution of territory agreed upon in 1947 as a criterion for territorial settlement in the present circumstances."

The Progress Report did not specify the particular positions of the Arabs and the Israelis on the question of Jerusalem. However, the Arabs, it was known, called for the internationalization of Jerusalem and the appointment of an international government by the United Nations. Walter Eytan, head of the Israeli delegation, in a private meeting with the Commission on June 21, 1949, stated that Israel would not agree to the complete internationalization of Jerusalem. In order to prevent the partition of the city, he suggested that the whole city area might be included within Israel, and that the Israeli authorities would undertake to grant Christians and Arabs unrestricted access to the Holy Places.

On June 26, 1949, the Commission adjourned the peace parley from July 1, 1949 to July 18, 1949, so that the Israeli and Arab delegations could return to their respective capitals for discussions and new instructions. A general committee appointed by the Commission continued to work on the immediate problem of Arab refugees in Israeli territory. There was reason to believe that greater progress would be made in the renewed negotiations. President Chaim Weizmann of Israel two days earlier, on July 16, 1949, indicated the position that would be taken by the Israeli delegation when he spoke of a "Middle East" scheme, "based on the assumption that interested parties would cooperate in bringing about proportional resettlement, with Israel doing her share within the limits set by her internal security." The nature of the "proportional resettlement" was reflected in an earlier announcement made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Israel that the government would consider favorably the requests of Arab citizens of the state of Israel for permission to bring into the country their wives and young children, and to facilitate their admission.

The United States member of the Commission, Mark F. Ethridge, resigned on June 10, 1949, after having recessed the conference because in his opinion a stalemate had been reached. He was replaced by Paul A. Porter.

Israel's Participation in the UN

Israel immediately began to function as a full-fledged member of the United Nations and her representatives joined a number of UN special agencies, such as the International Labor Organization. The very first day of Israel's membership in the UN, Israel voted on such pertinent issues as the question of the disposition of the Italian colonies. Israel voted against the proposal to place Cyrenaica under a long-term British trusteeship, though abstaining from voting on the plan as a whole. On May 16, 1949, Eban indicated to the General Assembly that Israel would vote against a proposed resolution lifting the UN diplomatic embargo on the Franco regime in Spain. He pointed out that the Franco regime was linked to the Nazi-Fascist alliance, which had been responsible for the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews. On June 16, 1949, Israel cited Great Britain before the Security Council, because of Great
Britain’s decision to resume armed shipments to Arab States despite the fact that the UN arms embargo to the Middle East had not been lifted.

Louis Shub

Israel

The state of Israel came into existence on May 14, 1948. The year that followed was one of the most dramatic and important in the history of Judaism. For the population of Israel, the events of the year fell into two significant parts: first, the defense against the aggressive invasion of the neighboring Arab states of Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Trans-Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon; and second, the internal consolidation of the state, politically, economically, and culturally.

First Truce

The first phase of the war lasted from May 15 to June 11, 1948. [For a summary of this phase, see American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, pp. 424-435.]

On June 11, 1948, a truce of four weeks arranged by Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, president of the Swedish Red Cross and a well-known humanitarian who had been appointed United Nations Mediator in Palestine, went into effect. The Jews, who had appealed to the United Nations Security Council on May 15, 1948, to stop the invasion of Palestine as a threat to world peace, were glad to gain a respite. But the Arabs were unwilling, and ceased fighting only with great reluctance. For the Jews this first truce was a godsend without which they might not have held out, especially in Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley, and the Negev.

Arms Embargo

Count Bernadotte brought with him a very large staff of observers whose task was to police the truce and to report any breaches. The truce, however, was not an unmixed blessing for Israel. It provided that no side was to receive reinforcements in arms or men during the truce period. Israel had entered the war quite unarmed and unprepared. Nevertheless, she was in duty bound to obey the embargo clause of the Security Council resolution.

The Altalena Affair

The very extreme elements in Israel did not share the government’s scruples over the embargo. The Irgun Zvai Leumi planned to import Irgun members from overseas to Israel in a ship specially bought for this purpose. The S.S. Altalena, sailing from southern Europe, reached the coast of Israel near Nathanyahu on June 20, 1948. The Haganah would not agree to the unloading of the ship, and rejected overtures by Irgun to share the cargo of arms on board, as a flagrant breach both of the international truce obligations and of the government’s national authority. In the ensuing clash, several Jews were killed, and the ship caught fire. A crisis developed in the government as the Mizrachi ministers, Rabbi Judah Maimon (Fishman), and Moshe Shapira,
resigned. Prime Minister David Ben Gurion appeased these ministers, but
resolved to fight this challenge to his authority. Many Irgunists were arrested,
including such leaders as Hillel Kook (known in the United States as Peter
Bergson) and Jaacov Meridor. At the sight of this show of force by the govern-
ment, Irgun surrendered.

Reorganization of Armed Forces

At this time Ben Gurion decided to dissolve all partisan armies, including
the Haganah with its striking force, Palmach, and to establish one national
army, to be called Zva Haganah LeIsrael (Israel Defense Army). On June 28,
1948, soldiers, sailors, and airmen were sworn in, and the IDA came into
existence. Three months later the special command of Palmach was dis-
banded, followed at the end of the year by the Palmach units as well. Irgun
eventually disbanded as a private armed movement, and founded the Herut
(Freedom Movement) in August, 1948, under the leadership of Menahem
Beigin. The Stern group disbanded only in the area outside of Jerusalem.

Second Phase of the War

The Arabs having rejected the proposal made by Count Bernadotte to
extend the June truce for another month, fighting broke out again on July
9, 1948, with renewed fury. The Jewish civilian population, believing that the
Arabs had used the respite to prepare for the deliverance of a postponed coup
de grâce, viewed the resumption of hostilities with anxiety. But army com-
manders were more confident. The fighting after July 9, 1948, found the Jews
in a stronger and more favorable position. In Jerusalem they not only held
their ground, but cleared important Arab quarters and consolidated their
position in the New City. They also widened the road corridor to the coast.
In the course of this operation the threat to Tel Aviv was relieved when the
Arab Legion was driven out of Lydda town and airport and Ramleh, and
thrust back into the mountains. In this battle, Jewish tanks appeared for the
first time.

SABOTAGE AT LATRUN

Meanwhile, Count Bernadotte was making new efforts to obtain a truce.
The Jews, however, finding themselves attacking and winning, were not now
so keen on a cease fire. But this second truce eventually came into operation
on July 18, 1948, when the Jewish forces were just short of taking the Latrun
water station and road junction, the last Arab strangle hold on Jerusalem.
Count Bernadotte began to conduct talks with both sides with a view to re-
lieving Jerusalem of its thirst by renewing the water supply along the fifty-
mile pipeline from the plain. The Arabs delayed until August 12, 1948, when
they blew up and destroyed the pumping station at Latrun. The next day,
however, the Jewish authorities announced that a “Burma pipeline” along
the “Burma road” had been supplying water to the city for some days. But
for this, water in Jerusalem would have given out by the middle of August.
ISRAEL

Jerusalem

Under the UN partition plan [see American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, p. 243] Jerusalem was to be internationalized. The experience of April to June, 1948, had shown, however, what would happen to the 100,000 Jews of Jerusalem if the city was cut off from Israel. Public opinion in Israel was therefore unanimous on no account to expose Jerusalem to new dangers, certainly not to a vague international government without safeguards or guarantees. Before and after May 15, 1948, the writ of the Haganah, and later of the Jewish Army, had always run in Jerusalem. On August 1, 1948, Jerusalem was declared a military area of occupation of the Israeli Army, in which Israeli law prevailed as elsewhere in Israel. Six months later, on February 1, 1949, Jerusalem was declared an integral part of the state of Israel.

Assassination of Count Bernadotte

All through July and August, 1948, Count Bernadotte tried to persuade the warring sides to turn the truce into permanent peace. He prepared proposals for a political settlement to this effect. In July, 1948, he suggested a plan in which the Negev and Jerusalem were to be put under Arab rule, while Western Galilee was to come under Jewish rule. The Jews rejected this without hesitation. From his headquarters in Rhodes he continued his efforts. By early September, 1948, it was known that the UN mediator was preparing proposals for a permanent settlement to the forthcoming UN General Assembly. Certain fanatical groups associated with the Stern group in Jerusalem began a country-wide smear campaign against the Count, calling him a British agent and advising him to get out. On September 17, 1948, Count Bernadotte was murdered in Jerusalem by an unknown hand. The Israel government, in whose territory the crime was perpetrated, suspected the Stern group of the murder. It arrested several hundred Stern group members, apprehending their leader, Nathan Friedman-Yellin, in Haifa, just as he was about to flee the country. The whole Stern movement was outlawed, and all arrested persons were closely screened. But the murderer was not discovered. Friedman-Yellin and his associate, Mattithyahu Shmuelevitz, were put on trial before a special military anti-terrorist tribunal for leading an illegal organization. On February 10, 1949, Friedman-Yellin and Shmuelevitz were found guilty and sentenced to eight and five years' imprisonment respectively, with the option of going free if they declared their renunciation of the Stern group. However, before they had time to consider their choice, they were freed by a general amnesty which the state council had legislated as its final statute, to celebrate the beginning of the parliamentary life of the Knesset on February 14, 1949.

The murder of Count Bernadotte cast a severe gloom over Israel. It forced home the lesson that the government of the young state still had far to go to impose its full authority in political and legal matters. The general public expected that at the forthcoming UN Assembly the murder would lead to serious setbacks for Israel's cause, especially as her frontiers were as yet unsettled.

See pp. 379 ff.
FIGHTING IN THE NEGEV

On other fronts the second spell of fighting was mainly a holding war. The threat to the Emek and to Galilee remained. In the Negev both Israeli and Egyptian troops roamed freely in the unsettled spaces. The Israeli and Egyptian supply lines intersected at the Falujah road junction. To prevent constant truce breaches over this intersection, the UN truce observers ruled in August, 1948, that the Jews and Egyptians were to use two separate roads at different hours. This arrangement held until October, 1948, when new fighting broke out in the Negev. At that time it was clear to the government of Israel that this state of threat and uncertainty could not be accepted as a basis for peace, nor even for a prolonged truce. The validity of this view was corroborated by the constant rearming of the Egyptians in that area. Egyptian provocation was due to her reliance on her superior armaments. Eventually, on October 15, 1948, a serious clash occurred at the Falujah crossroads, when a Jewish convoy to the Negev was mined and blown up. Fighting broke out, and the war flared up again in the whole Negev. In very stiff fighting the Israeli army broke open the Egyptian strangle hold on the main Negev highway and beat back the Egyptians to the frontier.

Again the fighting was brought to a stop, on October 22, 1948, by decision of the Security Council. When the new cease fire came into force, the Jews found many Egyptians cut off from their bases and enclosed in two pockets, named Iraq-es-Sueidan and Falujah after the nearby villages. The smaller pocket, Iraq-es-Sueidan, surrendered to the Israeli army on November 9, 1948.

CONCLUSION OF NEGEV FIGHTING

The Security Council had ordered the two sides to withdraw to their previous positions and to negotiate an armistice. However, the Egyptians delayed negotiations until the Jews should withdraw from the Negev. The Egyptians continued to supply their beleaguered troops at Falujah. The truce was again interrupted on December 22, 1948, when Egyptian tanks attacked the Jewish settlement of Nirim on the Sinai border. The Israeli troops pounded the pocket severely, put the Egyptian armored columns to flight into Gaza, and penetrated deep into Egyptian territory. At this incursion, the Egyptians submitted to a further UN cease fire resolution, and fighting finally ceased on January 7, 1949.

AQABAH INCIDENT

After that date the Jews moved freely in and into the Negev, and it became an integral part of the state of Israel, as had been provided by the partition resolution of November 29, 1947. By virtue of this resolution and title, Jewish spearhead columns pushed southward from the Dead Sea until they reached the Red Sea, arm of the Persian Gulf, at a point where a seven-mile stretch of Israeli coast adjoined a similar stretch of Trans-Jordan coast known as Aqabah. The Jewish spearheads established themselves at the ancient biblical place of Eilath on that coast, not however without having caused alarm among British military commanders and politicians, who dispatched a battleship and a battalion of British troops to the Trans-Jordan side of the gulf.
GALILEE CLEARED

While the battles of October and December, 1948, in the Negev were proceeding, not one of the Arab states was ready to help its Egyptian ally by engaging the Israel army on any other front. Only Kaukji showed courage enough to molest the Jewish forces in Galilee. The Jewish army took up the challenge, and in thirty hours during October 30 and 31, 1948, drove Kaukji’s troops out of Palestine and far into Lebanon, occupying eleven Lebanese villages in the pursuit. Christian-Arab Nazareth, seat of many Christian churches and monasteries, came under Israel occupation.

Egyptian Armistice

After the December, 1948, fighting in the Negev described above, Egypt showed readiness to comply with the Security Council order to negotiate an armistice with Israel. Ralph Bunche, the acting mediator, convened a conference between Israel and Egyptian representatives at Rhodes. After patient and skillful negotiating, the parties signed the armistice on February 24, 1949, with the following principal provisions: In the western half of the Negev, troops of both sides were to be limited but to have full freedom of movement. The area of Auja el Hafir was to be demilitarized. Prisoners of war were to be exchanged, and the Egyptian troops cut off at Falujah and in Hebron were to be allowed to evacuate through the Israel lines. Egyptian troops were to remain in Palestine only at Gaza.

Trans-Jordan Armistice

After the successful conclusion of the Egyptian armistice, Bunche invited Trans-Jordan and all other invading Arab states to make armistice arrangements with Israel. The Israeli and Trans-Jordan delegations met at Rhodes on March 2, 1949, and reached a final accord on April 3, 1949, leaving minor questions to be decided by local arrangement. Negotiations with Trans-Jordan were much more complicated, since they involved many semi-political issues, such as the Jerusalem situation and the government of the central Arab-held area of Palestine. In Jerusalem there had been constant truce breaches all through the Summer of 1948, and only on November 30, 1948 was a “real truce” signed between the local commanders. In the central area the Iraqi expeditionary force had been in occupation.

But Iraq refused to meet the Jews for armistice talks. The Iraqi government therefore authorized King Abdullah to negotiate the armistice for the central area as well, and used this opportunity to extricate itself from the expensive Palestine adventure by withdrawing its troops and handing the area over to Abdullah’s administration. Abdullah readily agreed. He changed the name of Trans-Jordan to “the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.” Israel did not object; but, in return, a number of territorial adjustments in favor of Israel were agreed to. These had the effect of bringing the entire railroad from Haifa to the Negev and from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem under Jewish control, a matter vital to the development of the country. In addition, 150 square miles of land
and a few Arab villages were transferred to Israel, and the direct highway from Hadera to the Emek was included in Israel territory.

**Syria and Lebanon Armistices**

Simultaneously, armistice talks proceeded with Lebanon. The eleven villages captured by Israeli forces were handed back, the old Palestine Lebanese frontier becoming the armistice line. Similar negotiations with Syria were more complicated, for the Syrians had gained a foothold at the settlement of Mishmar Hayarden, which they refused to relinquish. Negotiations continued until July, and were halted for a time by the rise to power of the Syrian military dictator, Husne el Zaim. The armistice was signed on July 20, 1949.

The Israeli government, of course, wished to pursue the matter through to full peace with its Arab neighbors. There was no doubt, however, that this would be a very difficult matter, and that a formal peace might not immediately be made. In view of this, particular importance attached to the arrangements, territorial and military, arrived at in the armistice agreements. Under the UN partition plan, the Jews were to have the whole Negev, the eight-mile wide coastal strip in the center of Palestine, the Emek, and Eastern Galilee with the Upper Jordan Valley. On May 15, 1948, they had effective control only over the coastal strip, the Emek, and the upper Jordan. In the course of the defense against invasions, they gained effective and exclusive control of the whole Negev, the whole of Galilee (East and West), and a wide corridor to Jerusalem, including the New City of Jerusalem, while surrendering none of the area they previously held.

**Summary**

In the Summer of 1949, Israel was neither at war nor at peace with her neighbors. There was no fighting, but the danger of an Arab war of revanche was ever present. The government and army were fully alive to the implications of such an imminent situation. According to Ben Gurion, Israel's frontiers were to be secured by a line of frontier settlements upon which defensive troops would be based.

**Recognition of Israel**

On May 14, 1948, the state of Israel was declared to exist. President Harry Truman of the United States was the first and most important statesman to recognize the new state. He proclaimed recognition *de facto* within five hours of the proclamation of statehood in Tel Aviv. This gave the Jews of Palestine immense moral strength. The Soviet Union recognized Israel *de jure* on May 17, 1948, and was the first to send a minister to Tel Aviv (August 9, 1948). Several smaller states followed suit; Poland and Czechoslovakia extended recognition on May 18, 1948, Guatemala and Uruguay, May 19, 1948, and South Africa on May 24, 1948. Hungary, Finland, Rumania, Panama, and Costa Rica recognized Israel in June, 1948. In the Winter of 1948-49, after the elections had proved Israel's stability, countries in Western Europe, the British Com-
monwealth, Scandinavia, and South America recognized Israel. Full United States recognition, and the establishment of an embassy in Tel Aviv headed by James G. McDonald, was announced on January 31, 1949. By the Summer of 1949, all but the Moslem-populated countries had recognized Israel, and after her entry into the United Nations she became a full-fledged member of the family of nations. Following recognition, Israel exchanged envoys with Washington, Moscow, Prague, Warsaw, Buenos Aires, Bucharest, Paris, London, Rome, Belgrade, Brussels, and consuls were sent to many other capitals.

**Provisional Government**

The government set up on May 14, 1948, styled itself the Provisional Government of Israel, in conformity with the UN partition resolution.

David Ben Gurion had previously formed a cabinet consisting of thirteen members and a legislative body, the State Council, consisting of thirty-seven. While the cabinet decided on policy and on executive matters, the Council ensured democratic rule from the start by serving as a parliamentary body of review, as well as a legislature for urgent current matters. However, as soon as the most pressing tasks of war had been accomplished, it became necessary to replace this *ad hoc* arrangement by a democratically elected parliament, whose task would be to pass a constitution.

**Elections**

The date of the first Israel general elections was fixed for January 25, 1949. The State Council legislated a set of rules for the nomination and election of delegates to the Constituent Assembly and for the transitory period until the Israel constitution should be enacted. This set of rules became known as the "small constitution." The system adopted for nomination was that of the party list dominant in Europe. Twenty-one lists entered the field, but only four parties obtained more than 10 per cent of the votes. Seats were allocated to each party by dividing the total number of valid votes cast by the 120 seats in the Assembly, and then dividing the votes cast for each party by the quotient thus obtained.

In order to establish precise voters' lists, a census of the population was held on November 8, 1948. This revealed that 782,000 persons were then resident in Israel, of whom 71,000 were Arabs. The vote was given to all persons over eighteen years of age resident in Israel, of whatever nationality, race, or sex. There were 471,000 eligible voters, including 30,000 Arabs. These had equal voting rights with the Jews, and Moslem women went to the polls for the first time in history.

The results revealed that in an orderly election, out of 471,000 adults 440,080 had gone to the polls. As about 5 per cent of the residents could not vote, their identity papers not being ready in time, this attendance at the polls was a record figure for any free election. Table 1 shows the election results.

It was the consensus of the many analyses of the election that the mass of new immigrants and the young soldiers probably voted predominantly Mapai. The vote for the Religious Bloc was large, and was helped by the solidarity of
the groups comprising the bloc. The vote of 50,000 for Herut disappointed its leaders, who had hoped for much more. The successful war and foreign policies of Mapai's Ben Gurion and Sharett during 1948 had won many Herut votes over to Mapai. The middle-class parties, General Zionists, Progressives, and Sephardim, who by splitting had repelled the large middle-class electorate, suffered the greatest loss. Of the Arab members of parliament, two were elected from the Nazareth local list, the third from the Communist Arab list.

**TABLE 1**

**RESULTS OF ELECTIONS FOR CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY, JANUARY 25, 1949.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party</strong></td>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapai</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapam</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herut</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Zionist</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sephardim</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth Democrats</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighters for the Freedom of Israel</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIZO—Women's International Zionist Organization</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemenites</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practical result of the election was that Mapai was stronger than the two next largest parties combined, but did not hold an absolute majority. It devolved upon Mapai to form the new government. Mapai needed the support of sixteen to twenty additional delegates to the Constitutional Assembly in order to secure a working majority. The choice lay between a Socialist coalition or a Labor-Center coalition.

**Knesset**

The Constituent Assembly convened in Jerusalem on February 14, 1949, for its ceremonial opening session. Jerusalem had been selected in order to emphasize that it remained the traditional capital of Israel and seat of the Jewish parliament. The traditional Hebrew word *Knesset* was agreed on as the name of the parliament.

The opening session was conducted by Chaim Weizmann, in the presence of a selected gathering of notables and foreign diplomats. The envoys to Israel from the United States, the Soviet Union, and several other countries did not attend, since their governments regarded the location in Jerusalem as contrary to the UN plan for the internationalization of the city.

Knesset first elected a speaker, Joseph Sprinzak, chairman of the late State Council, and two vice-speakers, one from Mapam and one from the Religious
Bloc. It then proceeded to elect Chaim Weizmann President of Israel. He was sworn in at Jerusalem on February 17, 1949.

FORMATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

President Weizmann immediately began consulting all the parties represented in the Knesset on the question of selecting a prime minister and government. These consultations were somewhat of a formality, since David Ben Gurion, the leader of Mapai, was the only serious candidate for the premiership. Ben Gurion first obtained the cooperation of the religious bloc (consisting of Mizrachi, Agudah and their workers’ parties), and thus gained a bare majority by adding sixteen seats to Mapai’s forty-six. Ben Gurion then brought in the Progressives and the Sephardim. Negotiations with Mapam on the left failed, mainly because Mapam sought guarantees for an unwavering socialist program including the nationalization of agriculture and industry which Ben Gurion refused. The General Zionists on the middle right demanded anti-socialist safeguards, and refused to join when these, too, were refused.

TASKS BEFORE THE KNESSET

Knesset settled down in Tel Aviv to its three tasks, legislation, review of government action, and constitution-making. Its first legislative act was to confirm the “small constitution” of the State Council. The President was made a head of state after the French system, having no executive power and no control over legislation. He was to appoint the prime minister, who was the real head of the executive. The cabinet might be of any size, and was to be responsible to the Knesset, on whose confidence it depended for its permanence.

CONSTITUTION

The making of the constitution, the principal function of Knesset, was not begun during the first six months of the Knesset’s existence. There were several reasons: First, Knesset was preoccupied with internal politics, in which the government contended with a strong coalition opposition of Mapam and Herut. Secondly, Knesset was preoccupied with legislative problems held over from the days of the British mandate, or arising out of the changed conditions. In addition, the government was hesitant to start constitution-making because it soon became evident that any constitutional issue might arouse very profound differences of opinion and endanger the unity of the coalition government and of the state. A number of clashes between partisans of the right and left, religious and free-thinking, was evidence of the deep feeling aroused by social issues. In May, 1949, religious zealots in Jerusalem stopped Israel army vehicles delivering rations to forward positions on the Sabbath, and an incited mob attacked cinemas opening before the close of the Sabbath. The parties of the extreme left, for their part, incited demonstrations and strikes over economic matters, such as anti-inflation wage cuts. Whenever any such question of principle was imposed upon the cabinet for a decision—as when the Orthodox ministers demanded the non-importation of non-kosher meat—there was an unwritten *modus vivendi* whereby Mapai made concessions on religious matters and the Orthodox bloc gave Mapai a free hand on economic questions. The painful process of writing down these issues in a constitution
was put off, although a semi-official draft constitution composed by Leo Kohn was issued by the government. This was a conglomeration of various constitutional outlooks, and provided for such modern safeguards as the right to work, as well as the right of all Jews to immigrate to Israel. In the course of time a body of opinion developed that if no constitution were written within the next four years, constitutional practices would develop based on the coalition program and the "small constitution," which would take the place of constitutional laws.

**Coalition Program**

The coalition established the following ten-point program: development of a democratic republic of Israel to be ruled by law, and based on the freedoms of speech, religion, movement, and language, and the equality of sex and race; adherence to the UN charter and a policy of neutrality between East and West; friendship with Israel's Arab neighbors; assistance to Jewish immigrants; a four-year development plan to provide for the doubling of Israel's population through immigration, and the encouragement of private capital; irrigation of the Negev; lowering of the high cost of living; and special cultural facilities for the Arabs.

**Arab Minority**

In November, 1948, 70,000 Arabs were living in Israel. The precise number of Arab refugees was not known, and was variously estimated at between 500,000 and 1,000,000. Many of them lived a life of misery, and wished to come back to Israel. The Israel government, however, refused to accept any Arabs for fear of letting in a large potential fifth-column minority. However, about 20,000 refugees infiltrated through the armistice lines. In June, 1949, Foreign Minister Sharett put Israel's Arab population at 165,000, an increase of 95,000 over November, 1948. Of this number only 10,000 were taken into Israel as part of armistice adjustments; in addition, 50,000 migrant Bedouins were in the Jewish-occupied Negev.

Not all the Arabs were Moslems. In Galilee alone there were 40,000 Christians, Arabs, Druzes, and Europeans. The Druzes disliked the Arab Moslems, and became very loyal to the state of Israel. The Ministry of Minorities was abolished by the second coalition, much against the protests of the Arabs. Its functions were divided between the Moslem and Christian sections of the Ministry of Religions and the Interior Ministry, thereby emphasizing the civic equality of all citizens and leaving the Ministry of Religions to care only for the religious interests of the Arab minority.

During 1948 the Arabs in Israel had been severely restricted in their movements and trade, since their presence was considered a danger to the war effort. With the end of the war all these restrictions were lifted.

**Christian Interests**

Christian interests in Israel presented many more problems than the Moslem minority. Since May 15, 1948, Christian opinion had fought against the in-
ISRAEL

ISRAEL 399
corporation of Jerusalem into Israel, on the ground that the Holy Places of
worship must be guarded by international government. The Israeli government
pointed to the fact that during the siege and shelling of Jerusalem only the
Jews had protected the Holy Places, and that the harm they had suffered was
an inevitable accompaniment of battle. The Jews were considerably embar-
rassed by propaganda abroad of Israel cruelty to minorities and damage to the
sanctuaries. Though realizing that this had merely the political aim of wresting
Jerusalem from Israel, the government agreed in August, 1949, to compensate
Christians for damage suffered by religious institutions during military action.

Immigration

One of the first acts of the new state on May 15, 1948, was to abolish the
British anti-immigration laws, and to open the country to all Jewish immi-
grants, subject only to technical arrangements of transportation. Between May
15, 1948, and June 30, 1949, 241,000 immigrants came to Israel, whose popula-
tion on May 15, 1948, was only slightly more than 600,000 Jews. This meant an
increase of 40 per cent in one year.

Immigration fell into two main categories. Those who came from the
Anglo-American countries and France were mainly young men and women
who wanted to help in the war. Some of the Mahal (Overseas Volunteers) were
acknowledged specialists in important jobs, others simply idealists, but all were
full of the spirit of self-sacrifice. They were estimated to number about 3,500.
A few hundred stayed on after the war, and settled in Israel. Other immigrants
came from free countries, bringing with them things the country vitally needed
—capital, enterprise, and technical skills.

But the large majority of immigrants came from DP camps, the countries of
Eastern Europe, North Africa and Cyprus. The Jewish Agency, which was in
charge of technical arrangements, at first gave preference to men who could
help in the war. Gahal (Overseas Recruits) came to fight and settle. While they
did not always have the training of Mahal, their numbers made a great con-
tribution to the fighting efficiency of the Israel Army at a critical moment.

CYPRUS

When the Palestine mandate ended, over 30,000 Jewish would-be immigrants
from Europe and North Africa were still detained on the British island of
Cyprus. On the day of the Arab invasion of Palestine, the British opened the
camps to let out the Jews, but no means of transportation were available. There
was a high proportion of young people in Cyprus who had been selected for
the hazards of visaless immigration and they were vitally needed for Israel's
war effort. But in June, 1948, the British prohibited the exit of people con-
sidered of military age, only gradually letting out the others. By June, 1948, the
impatience of many of these young people had grown to desperation. Israel's
representative to the UN, Aubrey Eban, filed a protest in which he made public
a bitter letter of complaint from the inmates of the Cyprus Jewish camps, on
June 6, 1948. In September, 1948, the government of Israel sent a lawyer to fight
a habeas corpus case on their behalf in the Cyprus courts. This attempt failed,
was renewed, and dragged on until January, 1949, when the last 5,000 persons
detained on Cyprus, including 700 infants in arms, were released by order of British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin.²

NORTH AFRICA AND MIDDLE EAST

Similarly, until January, 1949, Jewish immigrants to Israel from other British possessions, such as Aden and Tripoli, were restricted to those of non-military age. Between May, 1948 and June, 1949 about 12,000 Moroccan Jews entered Israel. The Jewish Agency and the American Joint Distribution Committee arranged for 5,000 Yemenite Jews to be flown out of Aden to Israel in the airlift known as “Operation Magic Carpet” which began December 15, 1948.³ Turkey, which recognized Israel soon after becoming a member of the UN Palestine Conciliation Commission, allowed its Jews to emigrate to Israel. Five hundred Jews from Afghanistan, who had fled to India, were also brought to Israel by special airlift. Likewise, 4,400 Jews from Shanghai were brought over by airlift and by boat; 200 came from Tientsin, 120 from Hongkong, and 1,000 from Asmara and Djibouti in Eritrea.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The great majority of immigrants came directly from the DP camps. They were mostly young married people with children. Most of them had no training in any productive craft, and had difficulty in integrating themselves into the economy of the country. Many of them preferred trading to working, others crowded the towns and larger villages, and only 10 to 15 per cent went into agriculture. Since most had family responsibilities, it was very difficult to draft them into pioneering tasks, in which they were most urgently needed. As the country was short of skilled workers, ORT undertook the training of immigrants in twenty schools specially set up for this purpose.

Housing and Employment

The immigrants brought in by the Jewish Agency started life in Israel in temporary transit camps. By March, 1949, all available housing was full; but so long as immigrants had to wait in the camps, they could not take employment, so that the two problems of work and housing were interlinked to form a vicious circle. In the first part of 1949 there was no unemployment, there having been a scarcity of labor during the war. But in June, 1949, 26,000 persons registered at labor exchanges as unemployed. The real figure was even higher. Unemployment was greatest in the transit camps, and in those abandoned Arab centers in which not many employers had opened factories, especially Ramleh and Lydda. The unemployed immigrants grew restive, and in July, 1949, demonstrated frequently in demand of work. In order to reduce unemployment, the government tried to attract enterprises into the new centers, and also started public works and large harvesting schemes.

In the absorption of immigrants, housing was by far the biggest problem. It had always been a problem in this immigrant country. In 1946 the housing density of Jews in Palestine averaged over three persons per room. Owing to the unexpected abandonment of Arab properties, 50,000 Jews could be settled

² See also p. 320.
³ For complete statistics of immigration to Israel during the period under review, see pp. 406 ff.
in Jaffa, 10,000 in Haifa, and others in Safed, Tiberias, etc. But not all of these localities were suitable for housing, because some were below the standard fit for Europeans, and others were too close to the front line. In all, twenty Arab-abandoned villages and three towns were settled by 130,000 to 140,000 Jewish immigrants. One hundred and seven new Jewish settlements were established in the fifteen months between January 1, 1948, and March 31, 1949, sixteen during the emergency days of May to August, 1948, alone. In the whole of Israel there were in April, 1949, 490 towns, villages, and settlements. Of these, 97 were Arab villages, 187 kibbutzim, 30 cities and townships, and 62 Jewish villages; in addition, Israel had established 42 small-holder's settlements, 6 autonomous urban suburbs, and 3 farm schools.4 Ben Gurion declared it to be the government's policy to set up 500 new Jewish villages during the course of four years, in order to absorb the immigrants, maintain the population, and defend the country.

During 1948, all the immigrants, a total of 118,993, had found temporary or permanent housing. The crisis first reared its head about April, 1949, when the Jewish Agency announced that no more Arab property was available except for agricultural settlement. In May, 1949, 55,000 persons found themselves in immigrant transit camps, under crowded and primitive conditions, their waiting period lengthening from a few days to weeks and months. But Jewish Agency chairman Berl Locker promised that all immigrants then in the camps would be housed within five months' time. Most of the camps were former British army camps, but even these did not suffice, and additional camps had to be put up. Meantime the budget of the Agency had to be drastically cut, as the United Jewish Appeal campaign in the United States did not come up to expectations.

Immigration Reduced

The problem of absorbing immigrants became really critical, when 90,000 people found themselves both unemployed and unhoused. Certain financial circles led by Finance Minister Eliezer Kaplan advocated the curtailment of immigration, in order to integrate the arrivals in an orderly fashion; but Ben Gurion and his group insisted on doubling the population in the shortest possible time, arguing that the difficulties would resolve themselves in due time. Arguments were cut short when in June, 1949, word reached prospective immigrants in Europe, Africa, and elsewhere, of the difficulties in Israel, and mass immigration fell off sharply from 23,228 in May, 1949, to 16,373 in June, 1949.

In cooperation with private and semi-public bodies, the government took in hand many housing projects. The $12,000,000 Amidar corporation was set up by the Agency and the government to provide mass housing for immigrants. Histadrut established new estates, and private builders from Israel and overseas promoted various schemes. But the problem remained very acute because of the high cost of building and the shortage of trained building labor. In June, 1949, the minister of labor proposed a plan to build 30,000 homes by using idle immigrant labor.

Economic Difficulties

Another factor that temporarily slowed down the mass immigration plan was that of economic difficulties. Even before the state was established, Israel had found economics a very hard nut to crack. The repulse of the Arab rebellion from December, 1947 to April, 1948 had cost much in money, men, and property. The War of Independence was an infinitely greater burden. The establishment of orderly government out of planned chaos and war was an additional charge on this young country. And last, the addition of almost a quarter of a million immigrants per annum to a population of 600,000 created an economic burden unparalleled in history.

DOMESTIC LOANS

The Jews of Israel had to rely on world Jewry to assist in these various tasks, yet had no illusions but that the main burden of all this had to be borne by the citizens of Israel themselves. The urgent need for money to buy arms and maintain soldiers and immigrants demanded very high taxation and public loans. On May 1, 1948, the Jewish Agency floated a $9,000,000 loan in Israel. Early in 1949 a second loan of $40,000,000 was issued, in three parts: a $22,000,000 loan taken up by business houses, a $9,000,000 loan subscribed by banks and financial institutions, and a $9,000,000 loan taken up by the general public.

INVESTMENTS

Loans, however, only represented a part of the needs of Israel. In June, 1949, a government source estimated the capital needed for developing the country at $2,000,000,000, the bulk of which was expected to come from big business investors overseas, notably in the United States. This did not, however, immediately materialize; many prospective investors delayed because the high costs in Israel made investment an uncertain venture.

CURRENCY

On August 16, 1948, the national Zionist Anglo-Palestine Bank was authorized by law to issue a new currency on behalf of the government. The Israel pound replaced the Palestine pound previously current in Palestine and Trans-Jordan. The Israel public gave the new money full confidence, exchanging Palestinian pounds for the Israeli, and saw in it another step toward gaining Israel's independence. This step became necessary when Palestine was arbitrarily excluded from the sterling area early in 1948 while the Palestinian money remained controlled by a currency board sitting in London which did not recognize the state of Israel.

BUDGET

In July, 1949, Finance Minister Eliezer Kaplan presented his first annual budget. It consisted of two parts: the normal budget and the secret war budget. While in July, 1948, the war budget was estimated to be from $30,000,000 to
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5 For foreign loans to Israel, see p. 135.
$45,000,000 a month, and the normal budget for that month was disclosed as $4,900,000, the normal budget grew with the establishment of civil government until it balanced at $111,000,000 for the year 1949-50. To this was added a special development budget of $186,000,000 to be financed mainly from overseas loans. Notwithstanding the large war budget, modern total war made such inroads on finances that it was impossible to meet many vital payments on time; soldiers' pay was frequently behind schedule and family allowances were overdue. The vast intake of immigrants, too, had a very serious effect on finances. The Zionist General Council, which met in Jerusalem in August, 1948, and again in March, 1949, agreed to take part of this financial burden off the shoulders of the Israel government by looking after the absorption of immigrants, and by giving a $2,400,000 grant for the schooling of immigrant children.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

By far the gravest cause of the economic difficulties was the high cost of living, which reached inflationary levels. In December, 1947, the index had risen to 282 points above the base year of 1939, or nearly three times as high. In December, 1948, it stood at 370 points, a rise of 90 points in one year. The real cost of living was much higher, as only official prices were recorded, and food and clothing were even higher still, being five to ten times above the cost of 1939. By December, 1948, the provisional government realized that this position was untenable. Ben Gurion declared that if allowed to continue, economic developments might break the young state, since the inflation paralyzed Israeli exports and prevented foreign capital investments for development. Siegfried Hooftien of the Anglo-Palestine Bank, who was appointed economic coordinator to the government, advised that both wages and prices be frozen for six months, to enable a natural drop to begin. But nothing was done, as employers were reluctant and the unions rejected the proposals outright; each side demanded that the other commit itself first.

AUSTERITY PLAN

In March, 1949, Ben Gurion's second administration turned its immediate attention from war to economics. The prime minister, together with the finance, supply, and labor ministers took a leading part in this policy. He appointed an over-all planning board for the four-year plan, and two advisory councils, one scientific and the other economic. At the end of April, 1949, the government published its economic plan for the reduction of costs, which became known as the "austerity plan." The plan aimed at gradually and simultaneously lowering costs, prices, and wages, by removing the scarcity of food and other commodities, by an immediate reduction of all commodity prices, a drive to increase production to a point of supply where prices would naturally drop, and a cut in unnecessary consumption. The reductions began with lower ceilings for food, followed by clothing, fuel, fares, and services. In the two months of May and June, 1949, the index was forced down by 20 points, and on July 15, 1949, the workers' higher-cost-of-living bonuses were also cut by this proportion to open the way for further reductions. The population had to undergo certain restrictions which did not amount to real austerity, but there
was ample and good food, and distribution was well regulated. A luxury tax was imposed on many goods, in order to stop wasteful consumption.

The raising of productivity was more difficult. It proceeded only at the pace set by two factors: the replacement of outworn machinery by new tools brought from overseas, and the integration of the large number of immigrants into the economic system of the country. The plan as a whole succeeded and promised to bear fruit, because Mapai was strong enough to force all sections of the community into compliance, capital as well as labor, trade as well as industry and agriculture. In doing so it had to put aside a number of its professed labor-socialist aims, and to estrange certain sections of the labor movement.

**FOREIGN TRADE**

In its foreign trade Israel sought to reduce its vast imports to the minimum of unessential goods, but at the same time maintain the importation of all capital goods vital for development. Trade pacts were signed with Hungary on January 12, 1949, and with Poland on May 20, 1949, and trade talks were begun with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Great Britain. The main Israeli export goods were diamonds and oranges. The diamond cutting and exporting industry maintained its 1948 level, but the citrus industry ran into many difficulties. Of 6,000,000 cases that had been agreed upon for shipment to Europe during the 1948-49 season, only 4,500,000 were actually dispatched, because the fruit was poor and harvest labor very costly.

**HAIFA OIL**

The large Haifa oil refineries, owned and managed by the British, were closed in May, 1948, when the British evacuated and Iraqi oil ceased to flow through the pipeline. Throughout 1948 Israel made unsuccessful efforts which were blocked by Great Britain to reopen the refineries. By early 1949 it became obvious that the lack of British-owned oil from Haifa was a drain on Britain's dollar reserves, and tentative efforts were made to persuade Iraq to recommence shipment of supplies to Haifa. These failed, and in the Summer of 1949 the government was considering opening the refineries and supplying raw oil from overseas.

**Cultural**

Cultural activities continued to flourish in the war year of 1948. Several hundred Hebrew books were published, and an important Hebrew Book Exhibition was held in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem in February, 1949. The continuing revival of the Hebrew language was again the central factor in Israel's cultural life. Hebrew acquired new meaning in 1948-49, as hundreds of thousands of new immigrants became acquainted with this tongue. This proved no easy matter, as many immigrants came at an age where a new language is no longer easily learned, and they lived together in centers in which they tended to speak their native tongues. To strengthen the dominance of Hebrew in the Jewish state, a Hebrew Academy was founded on January 3, 1949, consisting of twenty-eight members. The army provided full facilities for a more extensive Hebraization, by giving immigrants all-Hebrew surroundings.
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

In March, 1949, the coalition government turned its full attention to cultural matters and established a ministry of education and culture, under Zalman Shazar (Rubashov), who in July, 1949, introduced a law providing for universal, compulsory, and free education. The law provided schooling for the 10 per cent of Jewish children who had not previously attended school. All Arab children, too, had of course to attend in the future. There were only 4,000 teachers in Israel in 1949 for 92,000 children, and plans were laid to raise the school-leaving age to fourteen. Thus, many more teachers would be needed.

The school system, in which schools were divided by political trends (Labor, General, Orthodox and Agudah), continued. Ben Gurion declared himself against it, however, and prospects arose that it might die out with a centralized educational system.

HEBREW UNIVERSITY

In the field of higher studies, the Hebrew University suffered badly in Jerusalem, being cut off and shelled on Mount Scopus. After the Trans-Jordan armistice, periodic convoys to Scopus were arranged; but academic life remained paralyzed and had to be transferred to temporary premises in the New City. Practically all University students were away on war service. One hundred of them fell in action.

It was not until April 22, 1949, that the Hebrew University opened its academic year. At its reopening, the loss of its first rector and president, Judah L. Magnes, was felt and mourned. On May 17, 1949, the Medical Faculty was ceremoniously opened, thus beginning to satisfy a need for more doctors. A faculty of law and social science was preparing to open in the Fall of 1949. The Board of Governors met in Jerusalem from May 23 to 26, 1949, considered development plans, and elected Selig Brodetsky of England chairman, replacing Chaim Weizmann. On March 13, 1949, the Hebrew University awarded its third honorary degree to Albert Einstein on his seventieth birthday.

FINE ARTS

The fine arts flourished in Israel. Many exhibitions of paintings and drawings took place, the Tel Aviv Museum providing the most hospitable home. Overseas Jewish painters visited Israel to paint and to exhibit, and American artists sent a gift collection. Music, the Israel national art, was presented mainly by the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, and other orchestras and ensembles. Foreign guest conductors included Leonard Bernstein from the United States, Nicolai Malko from Russia; Louis Cohen from England; and Paul Paray, who accepted the post of the IPO's musical director, from France. On the stage, Habimah went through a severe crisis over the production and presentation methods of this one-time Russian Hebrew theater cooperative. After the intervention of leading public figures, Habimah eventually recovered itself, scrapped its old repertoire and troupe, and presented several new plays, including a timely piece called In the Deserts of the Negev which aroused con-
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6 For an account of the life and accomplishments of Judah L. Magnes, see pp. 512 ff.
7 For a description of this collection, see p. 225.
troversial interest among civilians and soldiers. Ohel, the Histadrut theater, produced a piece about the defense of Jerusalem, while the Hebrew Opera lured the public into more distant spheres with the Tales of Hoffman, Manon and The Barber of Seville, all presented in Hebrew. The Chamber Theater, a group of young players, continued to delight audiences with translated modern comedies and plays of social significance. The films remained the most popular entertainment, especially with the non-Hebrew speaking public, and plans were laid by several film companies for making films in Israel.

As the first year of the state of Israel drew to its close, its people looked ahead to bringing peace, stability, and prosperity to the whole Middle East.

Helmuth Lowenberg

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS

DURING the calendar year 1948, a total of 118,993 immigrants entered Israel, the largest part of these after the achievement of independence on May 14, 1948. This number constituted 21.5 per cent of the total immigrants who entered the country during the thirty years from 1918 through 1948. During the first year of independence, from May 15, 1948, to May 15, 1949, approximately 218,000 Jews were admitted. From May 15, 1948, to July 2, 1949—a period of about thirteen and one-half months—the number of immigrants reached almost one-quarter of a million (247,485). This compared with 27,561 Jewish immigrants in 1939; 17,760 in 1946; and 21,542 in 1947. During 1948, 177 immigrants were admitted per thousand Jewish residents, compared with 64 in 1939; 30 in 1946; and 35 in 1947. Only in 1925 and 1935 were the immigration rates higher, being 285 and 192 per thousand residents respectively. Table 1 gives the figures by month for Jewish immigration during 1948.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>2,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>6,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>17,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>8,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>10,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>20,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>27,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,903</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA), May 18, 1949.
3 Israel Office of Information, New York; based on JTA reports and other sources.
4 Statistical Bulletin of Israel, I, I, July, 1949, p. 7; adapted from Table 1.
During the first half of 1949, over 141,000 Jewish immigrants entered Israel—a monthly average of close to 23,700. This compares with a monthly average of 3,900 during the first half of 1948 and 15,900 during the latter half. Monthly figures for this period are given in Table 2.

**Table 2**

**Jewish Immigration by Month, January through June, 1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>23,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>24,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>25,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>23,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>16,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,381</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Immigration**

Most of the immigrants during 1948 were of Balkan and Russo-Polish birth, as indicated in Table 3.

**Table 3**

**Jewish Immigrants by Country of Birth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>1948 No.</th>
<th>1948a Per Cent</th>
<th>1947b No.</th>
<th>1946a No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALL COUNTRIES</td>
<td>111,222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19,702</td>
<td>7,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Countries in Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries in Middle East</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries in Asia</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries (except the Soviet Union)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>8,268</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunis, Morocco, Algeria</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Not including 7,564 immigrants (7,483 immigrants and 81 travelers, later registered as immigrants); no details available as to their country of birth.
* b Not including 501 immigrants (arrived at entry stations controlled by the mandatory government only), 439 travelers registered later as immigrants, and 900 visaless immigrants; no details available as to their country of birth.
* c Not including 9,910 visaless immigrants; no details available as to their country of birth.

---

* Op. cit., I, 1, 2, August, 1949; p. 106, Table 1.
* Based on op. cit., I, 1, July, 1949, p. 10, Table 4; I, 2, August, 1949, p. 107, Table 3, and p. xxxviii, Table A.
### Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries in Africa</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union and Poland</td>
<td>33,608</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>3,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union (not otherwise specified)</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia, Latvia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcaucasia and Bokhara</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>32,245</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkan Countries</td>
<td>44,784</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>24,780</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>15,676</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central European Countries</td>
<td>8,8654</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>446</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European Countries</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Countries</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hemisphere and Australia</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>8,018</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Immigration from the Moslem countries of North Africa and the Middle East was on the increase during 1948-49. With the emptying of the displaced persons' areas and the governmental restrictions on emigration from Eastern Europe, the Israeli authorities were, in fact, directing their planning to receiving increasingly large proportions of Jewish immigrants from the Moslem countries. A Jewish Agency report in July, 1949, noted that 40 per cent of all the immigrants were then arriving from the Near East and North Africa.7 Of the countries in the Near and Middle East, the largest immigration came from Turkey. An estimate made in July, 1949, placed the number at approximately 20,000.8 Most of these arrived during the first six months of 1949.9

During the year following the establishment of the state of Israel (May 15, 1948—July 21, 1949), the influx of Jewish immigrants from the Moslem countries continued to increase. The principal source of these immigrants was Turkey, which received 78 per cent of them.8

---

7 JTA, July 25, 1949.
8 JTA, July 21, 1949.
9 JTA, March 8, March 28, April 7, April 29, May 6, May 20, July 21, 1949.
1948, through May, 1949), about 79,100 Jews from the DP zones were resettled in Israel with the aid of American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (in cooperation with the Jewish Agency).\textsuperscript{10}

During the eleven and one-half month period from May 14, 1948, to April 30, 1949, JDC estimated that, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency, it had helped resettle 133,702 European Jews in Israel—77,612 (58.0 per cent) from the DP areas, 52,908 (39.6 per cent) from Eastern Europe, and 3,182 (2.4 per cent) from Western Europe.\textsuperscript{11}

Apart from these major sources of immigration, smaller numbers of Jews from Western Europe, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and the United States settled in Israel during the period under review.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Age} & \textbf{1948} May-Oct. & \textbf{1948} Jan.-April & \textbf{1947} & \textbf{1946} \\
\hline
All ages & 10,000 & 10,000 & 10,000 & 10,000 \\
\hline
0- 4 & 794 & 830 & 620 & 179 \\
5- 9 & 298 & 203 & 207 & 181 \\
10-14 & 516 & 1,046 & 478 & 517 \\
15-19 & 1,225 & 3,094 & 2,357 & 2,226 \\
20-24 & 2,021 & 1,543 & 2,160 & 2,851 \\
25-29 & 1,610 & 1,244 & 1,432 & 1,666 \\
30-34 & 916 & 684 & 772 & 880 \\
35-39 & 820 & 504 & 549 & 488 \\
40-44 & 613 & 263 & 342 & 282 \\
45-49 & 442 & 127 & 232 & 181 \\
50-54 & 345 & 143 & 230 & 160 \\
55-59 & 187 & 114 & 201 & 121 \\
60-64 & 129 & 95 & 197 & 98 \\
65-69 & 48 & 55 & 114 & 87 \\
70-74 & 21 & 31 & 65 & 57 \\
75 and over & 15 & 24 & 44 & 26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Age Distribution per 10,000 Immigrants (January, 1946—October, 1948)\textsuperscript{12}}
\end{table}

\textit{Age Distribution}

There was a notable difference in the age distribution of the immigrants during the two periods from January to April, 1948, and from May to October, 1948. During the first period, the age group fifteen through nineteen constituted a particularly high percentage of the total (30.9 per cent); but it constituted only 12.3 per cent during the period from May to October, 1948. During the months May to October, 1948, the age group twenty through twenty-nine formed the unusually high percentage of 36.3 per cent of the total number of immigrants. Except for the year 1946, this percentage was the highest during the fourteen years between 1934-48.

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{JDC Review}, July, 1949.
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{JDC Review}, May, 1949.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Statistical Bulletin of Israel, Op. Cit.}, p. xii, Table C.
The relatively low percentage of children of the ages five through nine reflected, among other factors, the lowered birth rate of the Jews in Europe during the period of persecution and war.\textsuperscript{13}

Table 4 shows the age distribution of immigrants during the period January-October, 1948, and for 1946 and 1947.

Table 5 gives the percentage distribution of Jewish immigrants by age for the full year 1948.

\textbf{TABLE 5}

\textbf{PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH IMMIGRANTS BY AGE, 1948}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Statistical Bulletin of Israel, I, 2, August, 1949, p. xxxviii, Table C.

\textbf{Sex Ratio}

A change also took place in the sex distribution of the immigrants. During the years 1935-39 (1938 excepted) the proportion of female immigrants was larger than that of the males. It fell below that of the males in 1940, and continued lower through 1948.\textsuperscript{14}

Table 6 gives the number of females per 1,000 males among the Jewish immigrants.

\textbf{TABLE 6}

\textbf{NUMBER OF FEMALES PER 1,000 MALES AMONG JEWISH IMMIGRANTS, 1935-1948}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Marital Status}

The distribution by age and marital status of the female immigrants was different during the year 1947 from the two periods of 1948. While during the months January through April, 1948, the proportion of single women was in nearly all age groups higher than during the year 1947, the reverse was true during the months May through October, 1948. For the male immigrants the changes during the course of these periods were less pronounced.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} Statistical Bulletin of Israel, I, 1, July, 1949, pp. x, xv.
\textsuperscript{14} Op. Cit., I, 5, p. xxviii, Table B.
\textsuperscript{15} Op. Cit., I, 1, p. xxv.
The distribution of the immigrants by sex, age, and conjugal condition during the period 1946-48, is shown in Table 7.

### Table 7

**Jewish Immigrants by Conjugal Condition, Sex and Age**<sup>16</sup>  
(number of each conjugal condition per 1,000 of each age group and sex)  
(1946-1948)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 &amp; over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>598</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>747</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>788</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>864</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>677</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>932</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>945</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>961</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>984</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>977</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>989</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 &amp; over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>992</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 &amp; over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes both divorced and widowed immigrants under "married."

### Family Size

The distribution of the immigrants by size of the family was generally similar in the months January through October, 1948, and in the year 1947. The percentage of immigrants arriving singly decreased slightly, while a rise

---

<sup>16</sup> Op. Cit., p. xiii, Table D; a similar table giving absolute numbers rather than proportions can be found on p. 11, Table 5A; figures for 1948 are adapted from the *Statistical Bulletin of Israel*, 1, 2, p. xxxix, Table D.
took place in the number of families of three or four persons. The average number of persons per family (not taking into account immigrants arriving singly) was 2.8 during the ten-month period January through October, 1948, as compared with 2.5 in the year 1947.  

TABLE 8

JEWISH IMMIGRANTS BY SIZE OF FAMILY  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Family</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1948 a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,383</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and over</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding 7,564 immigrants because of absence of details on the size of their families.

**Occupations of Immigrants**

As a result of the fact that during the months January to August, 1948, no information was kept about the occupation of the immigrants, only figures from September, 1948, onwards can be produced. During this period, too, the data is not sufficiently accurate.

A characteristic feature of the male immigration was the large number of those with no definite occupations or in respect to whom no occupational data is available. The large number of females with no occupation is explained by their inclusion in the category of housewives. The occupations represented among the male immigrants pertain mainly to the clothing, building, and metal industries.

A Jewish Agency survey of the occupational background of the immigrant camp populace in Israel, made public at the end of October, 1949 (New York Herald Tribune, November 6, 1949) disclosed that roughly 80 per cent of the male family heads among the 90,000 immigrants in the camps at that time had never held jobs in their native countries and were totally untrained for any type of skilled labor. There were 29,336 men in this category, as compared to 5,492 who knew a trade or profession.

This disproportionate number of trained men was explained as being a result of the large number of immigrants arriving from the backward countries of the Middle East, where they had existed in hand-to-mouth fashion as part-time peddlers or mendicants. Thus, for example, of the figure reported for October, out of 19,907 immigrants, 12,300 came from backward Middle East

countries. In contrast, the initial waves of immigrants reaching Israel had come from European countries and had been composed of a high proportion of artisans and professional men.

As a result of this new immigration trend, government officials had found it necessary to draw up plans for the creation of a network of vocational training schools in various camps.

**TABLE 9**

**JEWISH IMMIGRANTS BY OCCUPATION AND SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>19,702</td>
<td>36,618</td>
<td>33,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines and Quarries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather works</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood works</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal works</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Products</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Products and Tobacco</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress and Toilet</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and Artistic Trades</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Finance</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Service</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Professions</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Services</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (16 years and over)</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1,571&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation ill-defined</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No occupation, or unknown occupation</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>9,451</td>
<td>13,022</td>
<td>22,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, up to 15 years</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>4,287&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9,286</td>
<td>8,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines and Quarries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather works</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood works</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal works</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Products</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Products and Tobacco</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress and Toilet</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and Artistic Trades</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Finance</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Service</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Professions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Services</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (16 years and over)</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation ill-defined</td>
<td>10,057</td>
<td>15,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No occupation, or unknown occupation</td>
<td>5,688</td>
<td>5,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, up to 15 years</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>15,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>b</sup> Excluded: 9,010 immigrants in respect of whom details are not available.
<sup>c</sup> Excluded: 1,840 immigrants in respect of whom details are not available.
<sup>d</sup> Students aged 17 years and over.
<sup>e</sup> Children up to 16 years of age.

*SIDNEY LISKOWSKY*
INTRODUCTION

THE WAR launched by six Arab states—Trans-Jordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and Iraq—when the state of Israel was proclaimed on May 14, 1948, was halted by a series of armistices during the period under review.

But for the Arab world the war had laid bare two fundamental problems that were expected to harass the rulers of the several Arab nations for some time: first, the semblance of Arab unity, political and military, vanished with the disintegration of the Arab League in the face of the unexpected strength of Israel; and, second, the internal difficulties which beset several of the Arab regimes were aggravated by defeat. But while both these problems were for the most part of concern to the Arab world alone, the war also left in its wake several issues of international scope. Chief among these was the problem of the Arab refugees, who had fled from their homes and their land in Israeli territory and whose dire straits demanded immediate action.

Domestic Conditions

THE SPECTER OF COMMUNISM

As long as the war was of paramount importance, the several Arab regimes had succeeded in subordinating the fact of domestic instability to the immediate external conflict. The widespread poverty and misery were adduced by some observers as an explanation of the apparent lack of interest on the part of the Arab masses in the war; some even saw the Arab position on the refugees as an attempt to deflect attention from the discontent at home.

But the Arab leaders could not evade the fact that their regimes were tottering. Throughout the Middle East there were rumblings of social and political revolution. The wretched conditions of the masses under the feudalistic order provided a fertile field for Communist agents. Indications that Communism had taken hold—among Egyptian students, at least—was borne out by the fact that more than 50 per cent of the students at the universities in Cairo and Alexandria refused to demonstrate against the United Nations decision to partition Palestine; their identification was held to be not with Israel but rather with the Soviet Union, which supported partition.

THE MOSLEM BROTHERHOOD

In addition to its anxiety about Communism, the Arab political hierarchy found itself threatened by the rapidly growing influence of the "Moslem

---

1 See American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, p. 434.
2 For a discussion of the Arab refugee problem, see Israel and the United Nations, p. 379.
The Brotherhood. A nationalistic, religious organization which was fanatical in its hatred of "Westernization," its creed was directed against all foreigners. The Brotherhood's stronghold was Egypt but it also had branches in other Arab countries.

The Aftermath of the War

Egypt signed an armistice with Israel on February 24, 1949, and the other Arab countries all followed suit by July 20, 1949. With the end of hostilities, the persecution and discriminations suffered by the Jewish inhabitants relaxed somewhat. However, at the time of writing, a feeling of insecurity still prevailed among Jews in Arab lands.

The major problem to emerge from the Arab-Israeli conflict was that of the Arab refugees. The United Nations, the United States government, the International Red Cross, and the American Friends Service Committee, as well as smaller groups, all joined in extending assistance to these Arab refugees. But the problem of caring for and resettling them was far from solved and remained an important barrier to the negotiation of permanent peace treaties between Israel and the various Arab countries.

Perhaps the most significant outcome of the Arab war against Israel was the almost complete disintegration of the Arab League. Weakened from the very beginning by personal rivalries and ambitions and by nationalistic aims, the League was unanimous only in its opposition to the UN partition decision and the establishment of the state of Israel. The war with Israel revealed that each of the members of the Arab League was concerned only with its own material advantage. Each seemed to have its own ambitions for the outcome of the war.

Most important among these ambitions was the long-standing dream of Trans-Jordan's King Abdullah for a "Greater Syria" which would link his own country with Arab Palestine, Syria, and Lebanon, and with himself as ruler. All the other Arab countries with the exception of Iraq, which was ruled by another member of the Hashemite dynasty, vehemently opposed the project. Nevertheless, after the signing of a truce with Israel on April 3, 1949, Abdullah proclaimed Trans-Jordan as the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

The coup d'état in Syria by Colonel Husne el Zaim in March, 1949, further widened the gap in the League when Zaim aligned himself with Egypt in opposition to Abdullah because he had no intention of allowing Syria to fall within the orbit of the Hashemite dynasty.

Egypt

The latter half of 1948, following the creation of the state of Israel, was a nightmare of persecution, discrimination, economic deprivation, and general terror and insecurity for the Jews of Egypt. As the period under review came to a close however, anti-Jewish attitudes and anti-Jewish measures were

---

3 For a discussion of the armistices, see Israel, pp. 393-94.
4 See also Israel and the United Nations, p. 588.
relaxed in almost every way, and, for Egypt at any rate, the problem of those subjects whom it labeled stateless persons appeared to be in the process of solution.

Population

The Jewish population of Egypt, numbering about 75,000 persons, was about equally divided between the two principal cities of Cairo and Alexandria. Although 90 per cent of Egyptian Jewry was native born, only about 5,000 Jews were Egyptian nationals.

Domestic Conditions

The military defeat of the Egyptian army in the war against Israel, and the insecurity of King Farouk and his government in the face of the rising tide of Communist propaganda and the opposition of the Moslem Brotherhood, created a state of near panic in the ruling class, leading it to seize upon every and any opportunity for the suppression of its subjects.

That the king and his political aides had reason to be anxious for their very lives was borne out by the assassination of Prime Minister Mahmoud Nokrashy Pasha. On December 8, 1948, Mahmoud Nokrashy Pasha had outlawed the Moslem Brotherhood, and thousands of its followers were arrested; on December 28, 1948, the Prime Minister was murdered by a member of the Brotherhood.

The declaration of war with Israel furnished the government of Egypt with the eagerly-sought excuse for the imposition of martial law and its attendant restrictions.1

Branded as enemies of the country, accused of Zionist activities, denounced without evidence, Egyptian Jews had been confined in internment camps. In August, 1948, Eli Eliashar, leader of the Sephardic community in Israel, asserted that 3,000 Jews had been interned in Egypt. However, Egyptian Jewry was not the sole target of government attack. Much of the legislation and many of the decrees were actually directed against all foreigners, and hundreds of residents of different nationalities were rounded up as suspected Communists and placed in internment camps.

However, with the appointment of the new Prime Minister, Ibrahim Abdul Hadi Pasha, shortly after the assassination of Mahmoud Nokrashy Pasha, the situation of the Jews in Egypt was considerably eased. Because of pressure from outside sources, a marked change was evident in the attitude of some of the Egyptian newspapers after April, 1949. Inflammatory articles accusing the Jews of every offense from profiteering to treason no longer appeared in these publications. As the journalistic attacks subsided, public antagonism decreased and the government lifted some of the restrictions. Sequestration of property and arrests of Jews were halted, and most of the properties seized under the decree of May 31, 1948, were returned to their owners. The special office for sequestration of Jewish property was abolished.

1 See American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, pp. 442-445.
Communal Life

Despite the suffering and hardships to which they were subjected, especially in the early days of the anti-Jewish activity, the Jews of Egypt continued their communal life. Jewish schools remained open. Synagogue worship was not interrupted and the Chief Rabbi Nahoun continued to represent the government in all matters of personal status involving Jews. Furthermore, through a well-organized welfare system, the Jews were able to care for themselves without calling upon world Jewry for assistance.

Emigration

In 1949 the first group of fifty Egyptian Jews was released from internment on condition that they leave the country. Earlier, in August, 1948, a group of fourteen French Jews had been released, after representations by the French government. It was believed that by the end of 1949 all Jews remaining in the camps would be released on the provision that they emigrate. Release was granted only to Jews arrested for alleged Zionist activities and not to those interned as alleged Communists.

Future

Although the situation of Egyptian Jewry improved steadily during the first six months of 1949, it nevertheless could see no future for itself in the country. Certainly the government's insistence that Jews released from the detention camps leave the country added urgency to their need to emigrate.

IRAN

While the Jews of Iran had always experienced a certain amount of anti-Jewish prejudice, they did not suffer any unusual deprivations or discriminations arising from the Arab-Israeli war. Anti-Jewish feelings were intensified by the conflict, and occasional anti-Jewish articles began to appear in the press during the period under review, but on the whole the Jews did not face the hardships which beset their co-religionists in the neighboring Arab countries.

There was no official discrimination against Jews in Iran. Moreover, with the composition of the parliament determined by the proportionate strength of religious denominations, Iranian Jewry had one deputy.

Population and Economic Conditions

One of the oldest Jewish communities in the world, Iranian Jewry numbered about 90,000 (12,000 to 14,000 families) including 25,000 children between the ages of six and sixteen. Approximately 58,000 of Iran's Jews were concentrated in five cities: Teheran, Isfahan, Shiraz, Hamadan, and Kermanshah.
There were between 25,000 and 30,000 Jews in Teheran of whom 8,000 to 10,000 lived in the ghetto. Emigration from the provincial towns brought an increase of several thousand since 1942. Some 7,000 to 8,000 Jews lived in Isfahan, and about 15,000 in Shiraz, of whom 90 per cent were in the ghetto, as compared to 70 per cent in Isfahan and Hamadan, and from 30 to 35 per cent in Teheran. There were approximately 5,000 Jews in Hamadan, 4,000 in Meshed, and about 2,500 in Yezd.

The Jews were still in the process of migrating from the provincial towns to the cities and from the farms to the provincial towns.

Living among the Iranian Jews were about 1,500 Iraqi Jews who maintained few contacts with them but who were among the most liberal contributors to Jewish community funds in Iran. There was also a small number of European Jews in the country.

As in other Moslem countries, the vast majority of Iranian Jews earned scarcely enough for their meager subsistence. In fact, living conditions for almost half of the Jewish population were below the minimum existence level, compared even with the low Iranian standard, and disease was rampant among them. According to the government doctor, 2,000 of the Jewish children suffered from trachoma and skin diseases.

Approximately 1 per cent of the Jews of Iran were in the upper economic class. These made the bulk of their fortune during World War II as large importers of radio parts, ointments, and medications, and as large exporters of rugs and skins. Ten per cent belonged to the middle class; approximately 30 per cent lived a marginal existence. In all, about half of the Iranian Jews had a living standard below the minimum. About half of the Jews of Shiraz were in need of relief.

Communal Organization

There had been no improvement in the organization of the Jewish community in Iran since 1941. At the time of writing the Jews of Iran were appealing for greater funds for their social services, which consisted of education, school lunches, clothing for the poor, and similar assistance. The Committee of the Jewish Community of Iran and the local communal committees were totally inactive in Teheran and the provincial towns. They had formerly raised funds for philanthropy and for the maintenance of schools, bath houses, and cemeteries. As a result of the inactivity and lack of influence of these moribund Jewish organizations, the government had requisitioned the old cemeteries, grounds, and communal buildings belonging to the Jewish community.

Iran's Jews were scattered throughout the cities and villages of the country, and many of those in the outlying villages had drifted completely away from Judaism in the course of centuries. This trend was arrested in the middle of the nineteenth century when Jews in other parts of the world began to take some interest in their Persian brethren. One of the most effective influences was that of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, which succeeded in establishing some schools and organizing a semblance of community life in Iran. Ozar Hatorah, the religious education organization, was also important in the re-
surge of Jewish consciousness among Iranian Jews. During the period under review the Alliance and Ozar Hatorah were providing for the schooling of about 10,000 of the 16,000 Jewish pupils in Iran. Enrollment at the Alliance’s twenty schools was 6,600, and at Ozar Hatorah’s twenty-eight schools, 3,800; 4,500 were attending government schools, 1,500 were enrolled at missionary institutions, and some 8,000 Jewish children were not attending any schools whatsoever.

IRAQ

IN SOME respects the Jews of Iraq suffered more than any of their Middle Eastern brethren from the rise of anti-Jewish sentiment throughout the Arab and Moslem World. Among the reasons for this were the magnitude of their numbers, their importance to Iraq’s economy, the severity of the measures taken against them, and the extreme difficulties involved in communicating with and aiding them.

As the period under review came to a close, several hundred Iraqi Jews arrested during the past year were still in prisons and internment camps. There was slight prospect that the anti-Jewish activities which had begun in 1933 would abate. It was declared openly that the policy would be a long-term one: While overt acts and violence would be discouraged, a definite pattern was being established for the elimination of Jews from the economy of Iraq.

Population

There were about 110,000 Jews in Iraq, 60 per cent of whom lived in Baghdad. The rest were scattered in Basra, Mosul, Kirkuk, and other smaller towns. In addition, there were some tribes of Kurdish Jews living in the mountains of Iraq, about whom very little was known except that they continued to practice Judaism, and were engaged in agriculture.

The pattern of the economic structure of Iraqi Jewry was similar to that prevailing in all the other Arab countries and to that of the population of the Middle East as a whole, with but one difference: Whereas the largest number of Arabs lived from hand to mouth, they were mostly peasants and nomads; in the Jewish population, there was a considerable number of rich landowners and wealthy businessmen, though a substantial majority which subsisted on its daily earnings was composed of small traders, artisans, and peddlers.

Anti-Jewish Acts

Rumblings of anti-Jewish sentiment were heard in Iraq much sooner than in any of the other Arab countries. Anti-Semitic activities began in 1933 after the death of King Feisal and increased in June, 1941, during the rebellion instigated by Haj Amin el Husseini, former Mufti of Jerusalem. Over 120 Jews were killed, many hundreds were wounded, and Iraqi Jewry suffered heavy losses of property in the course of the rebellion.
When Iraq joined the other Arab nations in the war against Israel in May, 1948, the antagonism and bitterness, which had been stored up against the Jews of Iraq during the six months that followed the United Nations decision to partition Palestine, found an outlet. There were demonstrations by angered mobs and riots in some of the smaller towns in Iraq which resulted in some loss of life and damage to property. But for the most part Iraqi Jewry suffered from forms of official persecution, such as travel restrictions, dismissal of Jewish government officials, excessive taxation, and “voluntary contributions” to “general welfare” causes.

All Jews were classed as enemy aliens, and all Zionist activities were characterized as treason. Imposing martial law, the government embarked on a program of searching Jewish homes “for illegal weapons,” since, under martial law, arrests or searches could be made on the sole basis of suspicion. Many Iraqis found this a convenient way of settling long-standing personal feuds with their Jewish neighbors. All in all, 310 Jews were arrested in Bagdad alone during the initial period of the war; about half of these were released after questioning, and the rest were held for trial. Similar acts occurred in other towns and villages.

The anti-Jewish repressions also served as a lucrative source of income for the government, which imposed heavy fines upon arrested Jews, thus replenishing its treasury and helping to finance the cost of the war. In addition, the government requisitioned buildings owned by the Jewish community, as well as some Jewish-owned private buildings, to house Arab refugees from Palestine. The sequestration of Jewish property and business, and blackmail, official and unofficial, proved profitable undertakings. The Jews found themselves forced to become the heaviest contributors to government campaigns for funds to continue the war and to provide for the Arab refugees, as the alternative to being branded enemies, Zionists, Communists, or spies. Thus, the wave of arrests of wealthy Jews was especially productive financially. The dismissal of almost all Jewish officials from government jobs, to “insure the better guarding of state secrets,” proved of benefit to the large number of Iraqi Moslems who replaced them. Jews were also prohibited from enrolling in government schools of higher education.

The anti-Jewish persecutions reached their height with the arrest and execution of Shafiq Ades, an Iraqi Jew, on the charge of dealing with the enemy by selling arms to Israel. Surplus material which Ades had purchased two years previously from the British army was found in Palestine during the fighting. Ades claimed that he had sold the equipment to Italy. Because Ades threatened to expose several Moslem high government officials as having been involved in the deal, his trial was held behind closed doors. He was convicted in September, 1948, and his hanging in the public square in Basra was followed by the confiscation of his property, officially valued at $20,000,000. The execution of Ades was a shock to most Iraqis, Jews and non-Jews alike, because he had never associated himself with the Jewish community or contributed to its institutions.

No Jew was spared in the outburst of Iraqi antagonism, not even Chief Rabbi Sassoon Kadourie, who was arrested in October, 1948, allegedly for having, in the course of his Yom Kippur sermon in the synagogue, exhorted the Jews to “acts contrary to the safety of the state.”
Fear and tension continued among the Iraqi Jews, and most of them felt that their only salvation lay in emigration. The necessity for leaving the country was heightened by open indications that the Iraqi policy of repression of the Jews would be maintained for some time. Young Arabs were to be trained to replace Jews in important positions and the Jewish population mulcted of its resources.

LEBANON

During the wave of anti-Jewish feeling which swept the Middle East, the Jews of Lebanon fared considerably better than Jews in any of the other Arab countries. There were some restrictions, but they were limited in scope. Furthermore, the Lebanese government supplied police protection for the Jews when matters threatened to get out of hand. As a consequence, Jewish communal life continued much as it had before the Arab-Israeli war.

Population

There were about 6,000 Jews in Lebanon, concentrated almost entirely in Beirut. Some Jews also lived in Tripoli in the north and in Tyre and Sidon in the south.

Intergroup Relations

With more than 50 per cent of its population Christian, Lebanon appeared less averse to the establishment of the state of Israel than its Moslem neighbors. Many Lebanese Christians, in fact, appeared to welcome the idea of a strong minority group which would help to bolster their own feeble position in the vast Moslem ocean of the Middle East. After the United Nations partition decision and the establishment of Israel, the Jews were permitted to continue their business activities. However, they were prohibited from leaving the country without permission and were required to obtain licenses to engage in importing and exporting. On the advice of government officials who were relatively sympathetic and anxious to prevent violence and persecution, the Jewish community adopted a policy of unobtrusiveness.

There were only a few instances of violence. One followed the entry of a large number of refugees from Palestine and the occupation of some southern Lebanese territory by Israeli forces. In retaliation, Lebanese in the Sidon area seized Jewish property and homes and turned them over to the refugees. However, within a few days, the government ordered the police to provide protection for the Jews and to restore their properties.

Communal Activity

Although travel was restricted, it was not prohibited, and a certain amount of travel for business purposes was allowed, particularly between Lebanon and Syria. Thus, the president of the Jewish community of Beirut, Joseph
Dichy Bey, and his son were granted travel permits to visit other Arab countries, and the chief of staff of the government hospital, a Jew, was granted permission to study in the United States.

Lebanese Jewry, which was under pressure to contribute large sums to aid the Arab refugees from Palestine, also continued to provide extensive welfare services to the needy of its own communities. It maintained a number of schools, clinics, and centers, as well as places of worship. In addition to giving assistance to the Jewish needy, Lebanese Jews sent part of their own funds to help the Jews in Syria.

SYRIA

The situation of Syria's Jews, who had been the target of several violent outbreaks in 1947, improved somewhat after the coup d'état by which Colonel Husne el Zaim took over the reins of government on March 30, 1949. However, as the period under review drew to a close there was uncertainty as to whether the status of the Jews might not again deteriorate. At any rate, there was reason to hope that, barring unforeseen circumstances, the improved political situation of the Jews would continue under the regime which replaced Zaim's in August, 1949.

Population and Economic Status

There were some 9,000 Jews in Syria, almost equally distributed between the two main cities of Damascus and Aleppo. In Syria, as in the other Arab countries, the Jews belonged to the impoverished class of peddlers, small shopkeepers, and artisans. There was a small minority of wealthier bankers and merchants, most of whom emigrated to neighboring Lebanon and to Israel, as well as to other parts of the world, after the first outbreaks of anti-Jewish violence.

Anti-Jewish Acts

The boycott and discriminatory acts which accompanied the conflict with Israel brought economic ruin to the great majority of Syrian Jewry. After the pogrom in Aleppo,¹ the Syrian government provided police protection for the Jews; but this protection was accompanied by restrictions on travel and proved an economic disaster for most of the Damascan Jews who derived their livelihood from peddling and working throughout Damascus and the outlying villages. Thus, the "protection" actually led to suffering and hunger. The Jews of Aleppo also suffered from the boycott. Some financial assistance was extended to these communities by other, more fortunate, members of the communities, and by the Jewish community of Lebanon. But on the whole, their lot was miserable.

Under the short-lived regime of Colonel Zaim, many of the restrictions which had previously been imposed were relaxed. Jews were again permitted

¹ See AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50, p. 441.
to circulate freely within the country and to emigrate. But whether Zaim’s successor regime would respect the lifting of these restrictions was a subject of speculation as the period under review closed.

YEMEN AND ADEN

Aden, Yemen's biggest port, continued to serve as the springboard for emigration to Israel for Jews fleeing Arab persecutions. Included in this emigration were several thousand Jews who risked their lives to escape from Yemen's despotic regime. In Yemen the economic and social conditions of its estimated 40,000 Jews showed no improvement during the period under review. A state of uneasy quiet hovered over Aden after the violent pogroms of the Winter of 1947-48; Aden's Jewish community of approximately 8,000 Jews were uncertain when and where the next Arab outburst might erupt.

Yemen

One of the most downtrodden Jewish communities in the world, the Jews of Yemen suffered persecution long before the creation of the state of Israel aroused the Arab world. Scattered in towns and villages throughout the country, the Jews were represented principally by the rabbinate and several of the leading families. They were intensely religious, and most of the Jews of Yemen were literate, in contrast to the Yemenite Arabs, 95 per cent of whom were illiterate.

The economic, social, and legal status of Yemenite Jewry was defined by a host of discriminatory measures imposed by the Turks and enlarged by the Arabs when they gained control of the country after World War I. Agricultural work was proscribed completely; Jews were forbidden to ride camels or donkeys in the cities; most of the jobs open to them were those which the Arabs considered humiliating to handle.

In spite of the extreme penalties which accompanied the prohibition on emigration, many Jews escaped to the British protectorate of Aden en route to Israel with their belongings on their backs. A large number of those fleeing concentrated in the small town of Sheikh Osman near Aden, from which point they were flown to Israel.

Aden

Under the impact of recent developments the plight of the Jews of Aden became even worse than that of the Jews in other Arab countries, despite the fact that they were British subjects.

Although the Jewish community was not organized, direction of communal affairs was in the hands of an unofficial council of sixteen. The Beth Din and the rabbinate centralized religious activities and conducted certain charitable activities. In addition, some of the leading families represented the Jews when unified action was necessary.

1 See American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 50, p. 440.
Half of Aden's 8,000 Jews were Adenites and the other half were Jews from Yemen. Only about a third of the Jews of Aden were gainfully employed, of whom the largest group was engaged in trades, crafts, and services.

Following the pillaging, destruction, and slaughter of the Winter of 1947-48, many Jews fled to Israel. After the first wave of emigration the rate of exodus declined. A slight improvement in the economic situation in Yemen also induced some of the Yemenite Jews in Aden to return to their native country, but they returned to Aden after a short stay. The Hashid camp was set up to accommodate Yemenite Jews stranded in Aden en route to Israel. However, the British Governor of Aden prevailed upon the Yemen government to halt the immigration of Jews into Aden (March, 1949). On December 15, 1948, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) began an emergency operation to bring Yemenite refugees from Aden to Israel by air; by November, 1949, JDC reported, 29,000 Yemenite Jewish refugees had been evacuated.²

The Jews in Aden received a substantial amount of financial assistance from world Jewry for housing, clothing, education, and food, as well as for a special rehabilitation loan fund, during the period under review.

AFGHANISTAN ¹

The 5,000 Afghan Jews who belonged to the Bene-Israel—a Jewish group of uncertain historical origin—continued to face restrictions and oppression during the period under review, as a result of the policy of isolation and confinement initiated in 1933 by the new Afghanistan regime. Although emigration was strictly prohibited, some Afghan Jews managed to make their way into India where many of them found a temporary abode on the road to Israel. In fact, a group of 70 Afghan Jewish refugees, from among about 200 living in India on temporary visas, left for Israel in April, 1949.²

Concentrated in the northwest region of Afghanistan, the Jews were forced by the government to lead a ghettoized existence in three principal cities. The largest Jewish community, consisting of about 2,500 persons, was in Herat, while Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, contained 400 Jews, and Balkh had 200.

The Afghan Jews earned their living as tradesmen, by and large, but the restrictive laws introduced in 1936 had made steady inroads upon the permissible areas of activity, such as the export-import trades. Thus, in a country in which commerce was of central concern, the Jews found their ventures proscribed. There were a small number of artisans and a few farmers and cattle-breeders. However, there were a few Jewish farmers in Herat, Balkh, and Shiburgan, who operated their own vineyards or leased them to non-Jews. The production of wine and arrack was a virtual monopoly of the Jews because Islamic law prohibited Moslems from making or selling spirituous liquors.

In the Jewish communities a patriarchal system prevailed. The heads of

² See also Israel, p. 379.
¹ Based on Brauer, Erich, "The Jews of Afghanistan," Jewish Social Studies, IV, 2, April, 1942.
families formed the community councils, and each council elected a leader who represented the Jews vis-à-vis the government and who received a salary from both the community and the government.

There were eight synagogues in Herat and several in Balkh, but none in Kabul.
INTRODUCTION

The largest Jewish communities in the Moslem countries were situated in French North Africa during the period under review. Including Libya, which was under British military occupation, there were 525,000 Jews in North Africa, or roughly over one-half of the total number of Jews in Moslem lands (excluding the Asiatic part of the Soviet Union).¹

The nationalist agitation and social unrest that followed the events in Palestine affected French North African Jewish communities and led to violence and pogroms. In some respects, however, the Jews in French North Africa were better off than their co-religionists in other Moslem lands. Even the establishment of Israel and the military victories of the Israeli in the ensuing war had milder repercussions in French possessions than in the independent and semi-independent states of the Middle East. This was due, at least to a certain degree, to the traditional French policy of colonial assimilation and the moderating influence the French exerted on the local Arab authorities.

The friendly attitude of the French government toward the Jewish community may be understood in terms of practical necessity and certain cultural affinities. The Jews in North Africa not only represented the strongest pro-French sector, but were also economically and, to a degree, socially, the most active and dynamic group in the area. The policy of French cultural assimilation, diversified as it was in various areas, found a sympathetic and helpful understanding in the Jewish communities.

French North Africa was divided into three different political structures: Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria. The unique legal status of Algeria had an important bearing on the Jewish situation in that country. While Morocco and Tunisia had semi-independent status as French protectorates (under a Sultan and Bey, respectively), Algeria was an integral part of the French republic, having the same administrative and political set-up as existed in metropolitan France.² This difference in political status also profoundly affected Jewish-Arab relationships. For a time Arab nationalist leaders representing the Destour and neo-Destour parties in Tunisia, and Istaklal and Assanians in Morocco, tried to enlist Jewish support in their fight for national rights. Jews were promised equality and brotherhood—on the condition that they would not engage in support of Jewish Palestine. In Algeria, where the Jews enjoyed French citizenship under the Cremieux Law of 1870, the Arab

¹ Based upon JDC Review, IV, 25 (1948); and V, 1 and 2 (1949).
² Except for the "southern" territory, which was under a special semi-colonial regime.
nationalists associated them to a certain extent with the French. It may be interesting to recall that the re-establishment of the Cremieux Law by General Charles de Gaulle in October, 1943, met with no opposition from Arab circles.

During the war between Arabs and Jews in Palestine, Arab tempers rose high and nationalist groups throughout North Africa threatened both Jews and French with reprisals in the event the Jews should share Zionist aspirations and the French should favor the Jews by recognizing the state of Israel. At the time of writing, when the shock of Jewish victory in Palestine was over, local observers reported a marked slackening of anti-Jewish hysteria on the part of the Arabs and the disappearance of racial tensions. The following report from Morocco may be of interest by way of illustration: During the Summer of 1949, Jewish, Arab, and French camping groups spent their vacations side by side in the area of Ben Smin, Ein Kerzouza, and Ras el Ma, in the mountains about two hundred miles from Casablanca. There were Arab-Jewish games and exchange visits to one another's campfires, and a generally friendly atmosphere prevailed.

**MOROCCO**

The Jewish population of Morocco numbered some 280,000—of whom about 250,000 were located in French Morocco and the international zone of Tangiers, and some 30,000 in the Spanish zone.

Although the general condition of the Jews in Morocco had improved considerably after the country became a French protectorate (1912), the legal status of the Jews was still unclear and awkward. Jews were not full-fledged citizens. As subjects of the sultan, they were largely dependent on the good will of the local authorities.

As a result of the war in Palestine, anti-Jewish riots and violence occurred in several cities. In June, 1948, 43 Jews were killed and 155 wounded in Djerada and Oujda, two small cities with Jewish populations of 8,000 and 130, respectively. The authorities took measures to punish the participants in the violence, and in February, 1949, two perpetrators of pogroms in Oujda were condemned to death; eleven other defendants were given various prison terms, and twenty-one were acquitted. Furthermore, twenty-eight defendants in the trial of the participants in the Djerada pogroms received varying sentences, and thirty-one were acquitted (JTA, February 15-28, 1949).

**Communal Organization and Education**

Jewish communal life in Morocco was regulated by special laws enacted by the local authorities. In 1945 the Jews had received the right to elect their own communal council. However, only persons who contributed a minimum of 100 francs annually to the community were allowed to vote.\(^3\) The subsequent creation of the Council of Jewish Communities in Morocco was an important step in the direction of a more democratic organization of communal affairs. In 1948 six delegates of the Jewish communities were admitted to the native

Moroccan section of the Consultative Council of the government. Although this assembly had no legislative functions, the presence of Jewish delegates added considerably to the prestige of the Jewish community.

There was a large number of Jewish religious schools in Morocco—hedarim and yeshivot—some of which were affiliated with Ozar Hatorah, an agency promoting religious education in Oriental countries. In the Spring of 1949 about 4,400 children were attending various Ozar Hatorah schools. The activities of the Alliance Israélite Universelle were deserving of particular mention, for its schools in Morocco not only comprised the largest Jewish educational system but also played a considerable role in educating a more active and progressive Jewish generation to Western ideas and French culture. In June, 1949, the Alliance was conducting 60 schools with an enrollment of 23,320 pupils in Morocco (including Tangiers). These schools enjoyed the sympathetic support of the French government and were financed by the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC). JDC was promoting a special children’s feeding program in various schools, at the time of writing. New school canteens were functioning in Mogador, Sale, Safi, Mazagan, and Marrakech.

**Welfare Activities and Medical Aid**

The economic status and living standards of the majority of the Jews, particularly those living in the *mellahs* (ghettos), were very low, and large numbers were living on charity. Quite recently (October, 1949), the French authorities decided, in accordance with plans submitted by the Alliance, to start a vast slum clearance project in the *mellah* of Casablanca. It was expected that new buildings for 12,500 inhabitants of the *mellah* would be erected within eighteen months (JTA, October 13, 1949). When completed, the housing project was expected to ameliorate considerably the housing and sanitary conditions of the Jewish population. At this writing, however, overcrowding and disease were still prevalent, and a recent study by the Jewish health organization OSE showed a 30 per cent incidence of trachoma among Jewish school children in Casablanca. Other diseases which were widespread among both children and adults included tuberculosis and favus. JDC, which was engaged in a medical program in Morocco in cooperation with OSE, was financing a number of projects in preventive medicine, in the establishment of clinics, and in conducting anti-tuberculosis campaigns. Deserving of mention among the local agencies active in the field were *Maternelle*, the Anti-Tuberculosis Center, and the Jewish Association to Fight Tuberculosis. This work was sympathetically received by the government, which made forty beds available for tuberculosis cases in a government hospital at Casablanca and allocated 400 grams of streptomycin, which JDC supplemented with another 500 grams. During the period under review the JDC relief program in Morocco was expanded to include support of homes for the aged, vocational training, and increased cash relief allowances.

---

TUNISIA

The Tunisian Jewish community was diversified in composition. Numbering altogether about 90,000, it included some 70,000 native Jews who were subjects of the Bey of Tunisia. The rest were mostly of either French or Italian nationality. The largest Jewish centers were in Tunis, with a population of some 50,000 Jews, and in Sfax, Sousse, Djerba, and Gabes, with 5,500, 5,000, 4,500, and 4,000 Jews, respectively.

Communal Organization

Before 1921, the Jewish communities in Tunisia had been directed by the welfare committees (Comité de Bienfaisance) whose members were designated by the authorities. By the decree of August 30, 1921, the Jewish community of the city of Tunis received the right to elect twelve members to the Community Council. This arrangement existed up to 1937 and was re-introduced after an interruption of ten years, by a decree of March 18, 1947. The Council of the Community of Tunis, elected on June 8, 1947, was attempting to organize a countrywide Federation of Jewish Communities and to include the communities of such important cities as Sfax, Sousse, Bizerte, and Nabuel, under the liberalized election system. The efforts of the Tunis community council were crowned with some success, and the new electoral system was introduced in Sfax by a decree of August 4, 1949. The Jewish community in Tunisia was well organized and operated a number of welfare agencies patterned on the French Jewish community system. Deserving of note in the field of educational and youth activities were the Alliance Israelite Universelle which was conducting five schools with an enrollment of 3,000 pupils; the Eclaireurs Israélites Français (Jewish Boy Scouts); Sport and Joy; and others.

ALGERIA

It is estimated that the Jewish population in Algeria in 1949 was about 130,000. Available data based on the 1931 census throw light on the social organization of the Jewish community. In 1931, the Jewish population of 110,000 was distributed among 257 localities: There were 78 in the district of Algiers, including the Ghardaia territory; 75 in Constantine, including the Touggourt territory; 104 in Oran, including the Ain-Sefra territory. Jewish occupational data for 1931, covering some 28,700 gainfully employed persons, indicated that 16,000 were artisans, merchants, and commercial employees, 6,000 were manual laborers, 2,700 were in the professions, 2,500 were in civil service, and 1,500 were in courts, police, and public utilities.

5 La terre retrouvée, Paris, April 1, 1949.
Communal Organization and Welfare

Although geographically in North Africa, the Jewish community in Algeria belonged socially and culturally to France. Following the French law of separation of church and state, the communal life of Algerian Jews was centered around the cultuelles (voluntary religious associations), which were under the jurisdiction of the Consistoire Central Israélite de France et d'Algérie. In 1947 the establishment of the Federation of Jewish Communities constituted an important step in the evolution of Jewish communal life in Algeria by bringing a large measure of coordination and planning into Jewish religious activities in Algeria. Because the functions of the cultuelles were limited to religious matters, there was a number of welfare agencies in Algeria dealing with various social service activities. Among them were the Association d'Etude d'Aide et d'Assistance, Polyvalent Dispensary, ORT, Ecole Maimonide, Bikur Cholim, and the Training Project for Girls. All these agencies were receiving financial assistance from the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC).

During the period under review, thousands of refugees from Morocco passed through Algiers en route to Israel. They were sheltered in the Bab-el-Oued Community Center. Later, a tent colony was provided for them seven kilometers from the city, near the village of Buzarea. In addition, the local community acquired the Hotel Atlantide with the assistance of JDC and established a control center where transients were given general medical examinations.

LIBYA

The political status of the Italian colony of Libya (Tripolitania and Cyrenaica) had been under consideration by the Great Powers since the end of the war. Although all the powers favored the independence of Libya, France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States were divided as to the terms of independence and the conditions by which it could be attained. The extreme strategic importance of Cyrenaica (the eastern part of Libya) weighed heavily in the deliberations. On September 16, 1949, in an independent move, the British granted some autonomy to Cyrenaica, and authorized Emir Sayid Idran el Senussi to establish a semi-independent rule in that area.

The problem of the Italian colonies was under discussion before the United Nations at the time of writing, and Maurice L. Perelzweig was empowered by the Jewish community of Libya to represent its interests before the international assembly. The Jewish demands included not only the protection of property and cultural rights but also the right of emigration. It must be recalled in this connection that a wave of pogroms which broke out in 1945 in Tripoli and some isolated places caused great loss of life and inestimable damage to property. Considerable anti-Jewish agitation was felt in the country after the establishment of the state of Israel. On June 12 and 13, 1948, another
pogrom took place in Tripoli. Twenty-six Jews were killed, 13 were wounded, and 298 families in all suffered from the violence.

**Population**

According to the 1931 census, there were 24,534 Jews in Libya—21,342 in Tripolitania, and 3,192 in Cyrenaica. The Jewish community rose to some 30,000 in 1948 and fell to some 25,000 in 1949 as a result of emigration. The unusual demographic structure of the Jewish population in the colony may be perceived from the fact that in 1948, 8,533 out of a total of 29,241 Jews were under 12 years of age. The size of the age group under 12 is indicative of the continuing growth of the small Jewish community.

Tripoli was the largest Jewish center, with some 20,000 Jews, or four-fifths of the present Jewish population of Libya.

**Legal Status and Communal Organization**

Under Italian rule, the Jews were divided into three separate citizenship groups: Italian, consisting of Jews residing in Libya; Italian-Libyan, consisting of the native Jews; and foreign Jews. The Jewish community had a recognized legal status, and the right to levy taxes and the jurisdiction over religious and family matters was left in the hands of rabbinical tribunals.

The educational organization of the community reflected the traditional mores of the population. During the period under review, about 2,000 children were enrolled in the half-day Hebrew school; the rest of the day was spent by the children in the Italian school, which fostered a general educational program. Five hundred and seventy boys attended the talmud torah classes, and some 85 students were enrolled in the yeshiva. A Hebrew seminary for teachers was founded in Tripoli in 1947 to train educational personnel for the Jewish schools.

**Welfare Activities**

Already shaken by the German occupation during the war, after the war the Jewish community was ruined by recurring violence and riots, and appealed to outside Jewry for help. In 1943, JDC initiated in Libya limited relief operations which soon developed into a large-scale program. In 1949, 1,200 families, totaling 6,000 persons, received cash relief from JDC, which in addition supported refugees from the interior who were living in the Tripoli Community House. Some 2,000 children benefited from the feeding and other child-care programs.

**Emigration from North Africa**

It is obviously impossible in a brief survey of the Jewish situation in North Africa to give a well-rounded picture of the forces that were changing the structure of the old Jewish communities, some of which antedated the Christian era. Suffice it to say that in the last two years, partly as a result of riots and
violence, and essentially under the impact of the establishment of the Jewish state, the Jews of Libya and Morocco were on the move. The creation of Israel exerted so strong a messianic appeal in Africa that thousands of Jews, particularly those from far-away cities and villages, began a clandestine movement toward Israel. JDC was forced to provide for the Moroccan Jews who went to Algiers, then were transported to Marseilles, and thence embarked for Israel. Thousands of Jews left for Israel from Libya as well—at first via Italian ports, then, after April 8, 1949, directly from Libya to Haifa. From the time of the establishment of the state of Israel to October 20, 1949, 34,000 Jews from North Africa had been helped to emigrate to Israel by JDC. This number, which included about 6,000 from Cyrenaica, indicated that practically all the Jews of this eastern province of Libya were evacuated.

Leon Shapira

---

INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The General Assembly of the United Nations which met in Paris from September 21 to December 12, 1948, has been aptly characterized as the Human Rights Assembly. Its outstanding achievements, representing the completion of two and a half years of work on two fundamental documents, were the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

Adoption of Human Rights Declaration

The original International Bill of Human Rights was defined by the second session of the Commission on Human Rights in December, 1947, to include a declaration (statement of principles), a covenant (treaty), and methods of implementation. The declaration was to be a series of recommendations having no legal force but placing a moral responsibility on those governments which signed the document.

On June 18, 1948, the Human Rights Commission of the UN closed its third session at Lake Success, N. Y., with the completion of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Much preliminary debate over the covenant and, more important, over ways to implement it, took place at that meeting. The crux of the problem was then, and remained, the creation of an international law enforcement body acceptable to a majority of the members of the UN and capable of carrying out whatever legal measures were prescribed in a human rights covenant.

The declaration, which must be viewed as the first step toward an International Bill of Rights, was officially adopted by the General Assembly of the UN on December 10, 1948. In an effort to give the Declaration as much force as possible the Assembly passed the following resolution:

The General Assembly . . . 1. recommends Governments of member states to show their adherence to Article 56 of the Charter by using every means within their power solemnly to publicize the text of the Declaration and to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories;

2. requests the Secretary-General to have this Declaration widely disseminated and, to that end, to publish and distribute texts, not only in the official languages, but also, using every means at his disposal, in all languages possible;

3. invites the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations of
the world to do their utmost to bring this Declaration to the attention of their members.

The final vote was 48 to 0 with 8 abstentions: the Soviet bloc, Saudi Arabia, and the Union of South Africa. The thirty articles which appeared in the final document took almost three years of preparation and were subjected to innumerable revisions and criticisms. Upon its adoption the declaration was both applauded and deplored. The majority view of the General Assembly was expressed by its president, Herbert Evatt, in these words: "History will regard this proclamation as one of the outstanding achievements of the United Nations since its establishment. . . . This is the first occasion on which the organized international community of nations has made a declaration of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It therefore has all the authority of a collective body of opinion of the United Nations as a whole."

In opposing the declaration the Soviet delegate asserted that it seemed to negate the concept of sovereignty of governments. This opinion had been voiced several times previously by Soviet representatives in reference to specific articles of the declaration in which the rights of the individual appeared to take precedence over the rights of his country.

UNESCO and the Human Rights Declaration

The Third General Conference of UNESCO which met in Paris during December, 1948, voted immediate support of the General Assembly action by passing a resolution recommending its Director-General "to stimulate the dissemination of information about the International Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations, particularly through the projects division of the Mass Communications Department; to encourage the incorporation of the Declaration as subject-matter in the teaching about the United Nations which is given in schools; and to direct his programme sections to employ the Declaration wherever possible in their programme activities."

After adopting this resolution UNESCO concentrated a large part of its work in mass communications on a vivid, topical, and dramatic presentation of the theme of the significance and implications of the articles of the Declaration of Human Rights. It sponsored the preparation of discussion pamphlets and broadcasts on human rights. It was also planning a celebration for December 10, 1949, the first anniversary of the adoption of the declaration, one in which the press, the cinema, the radio, and schools and clubs throughout the world would participate.

Provisions of the Human Rights Declaration

The declaration set forth civil, political, economic, and social rights and freedoms. All of these were well known and many already are present in the laws of the various nations.

In summary, the thirty articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights listed these rights and privileges:

Right to life, liberty, and security of person
Freedom from slavery, torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
Freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention or exile
Right to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal
Presumption of innocence
Protection against *ex post facto* laws
Freedom from arbitrary interference with one's privacy, family, home, or correspondence
Freedom to leave any country
Freedom of movement and residence
Right of asylum from persecution
Equal rights in marriage
Right to own property
Freedom of religion, expression, assembly, and association
Right of the people to have their will serve as the basis of the authority of government
Right to work
Right to join trade unions
Right to rest and leisure
Right to social security
Right to education
Right to participate in the cultural life of the community
Right to equality before law and freedom from discrimination.

The declaration also made it clear that all these rights and freedoms were to be subject only to such limitations as were prescribed by law for the purpose of securing due recognition for the rights and freedoms of others and meeting the requirements of morality, public order, and general welfare in a democratic society.

As can be seen from the contents, the articles of the declaration reflected traditional libertarian attitudes of Western Europe and the United States and the newer concepts associated with socialist theory, such as the right to work, the right to social security, and the right to protection from unemployment.

**Draft Covenant of Human Rights**

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights ended its fifth session on June 20, 1949, after six weeks spent in drafting a covenant on human rights which would guarantee the provisions contained in the declaration.

In its tentative form the draft covenant consisted of more than a score of articles outlawing arbitrary arrest, torture, slavery, servitude, or forced labor, as well as provisions for fair trial for accused persons, freedom of religion, and rights of assembly and association. Under its terms all nations were to be obliged to accord freedoms and rights to all persons "without discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status."

The draft covenant went to all fifty-nine member governments for study and recommendations and was to be reviewed again by the commission at its session in the Spring of 1950. Proponents hoped that the final document, which would be legally binding on nations that signed it, would be ready for action by the General Assembly in 1950.

Along with the articles already in the covenant, which laid down broad political and civil rights, member governments would be asked to comment on
a series of articles that had been proposed by the Soviet Union and Australia to guarantee economic and social rights to individuals, but which had not been included in the draft covenant.

Implementation

In addition to the contents of the covenant, the fifth session of the Commission also discussed means of implementation; in other words, the method by which the provisions of the covenant could be internationally enforced. On May 11, 1949, the United States delegate proposed that disputes arising under the draft covenant be referred to specially constituted fact-finding panels empowered to decide on the merits of the case and make recommendations to states party to the treaty. These panels would be composed of one national from the states bringing the complaint, one national from the defendant state, and three persons chosen either by agreement of the parties or by the president of the International Court of Justice. Only states adhering to the covenant could bring complaints before such a special board.

Right of Petition

A problem which received considerable attention from Commission delegates was whether or not individuals and organizations as well as sovereign states could bring charges of human rights' violations before the world organization. The right to bring charges, known as the right of petition, was considered by its proponents to be the core of the entire human rights problem. No machinery for implementation would be adequate, they felt, unless the right of individuals or groups of individuals to initiate procedures for the protection of these rights was clearly recognized and provided for. The General Assembly made the importance of this issue definite by including a resolution at its third session, in December, 1947, which requested the Economic and Social Council to ask the Commission on Human Rights to give further examination to the problem of petitions.

At the time of writing the big powers (the United States, Soviet Union, and Great Britain) were against extending the right of petition to individuals; while France, Lebanon, India, Guatemala, Uruguay, Australia, Denmark, and the Philippines supported the idea. At a meeting held on June 17, 1949, the Commission decided to study the question of individual petitions and in the meantime to examine those already on file with the UN, with a view to submitting them to the Commission for consideration at its next session.

Proposals of Jewish Groups

From the very first UN discussions of a bill of human rights, Jewish groups pressed for inclusion of certain principles which they regarded as necessary to safeguard human rights.

On June 2, 1948, the World Jewish Congress requested the Human Rights Commission to declare the fundamental right of persons to seek asylum from persecution. The Agudas Israel World Organization on June 9, 1948, asked for
a provision safeguarding the freedom of religion and the right to "practice any form of religious worship, teaching and observance."

The Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations on May 16, 1949, submitted to the Human Rights Commission a ninety-six-page memorandum containing proposals on the structure, functions, and international machinery to protect human rights. This memorandum dealt with the most important and fundamental problem of implementation of the covenant. Members of the Commission were giving this document careful study as a possible guide to the final plan. The memorandum recommended that individuals or groups of individuals be permitted to initiate action before international bodies in order to protect human rights. It proposed the establishment of a permanent central control commission on human rights, in addition to permanent regional commissions composed of independent persons not subject to instructions from their governments. The Consultative Council suggested that members of the commissions be elected for a six-year term by the General Assembly of the United Nations or a committee appointed by it, or by the Economic and Social Council, or by contracting parties. It was further suggested that the procedure before the proposed commissions be governed as far as possible by the fundamental principles applied to civil law.

Another suggestion for the handling of human rights' violations was submitted to the Human Rights Commission by the World Jewish Congress on June 13, 1949. The WJC memorandum called for the establishment of special domestic and international human rights courts to deal with complaints. It was suggested that domestic courts be established within each of the states which signed the convention, and a higher court be set up for appeals from lower court decisions. The memorandum also proposed an International Court on Human Rights to hear appeals from decisions of the highest domestic courts, and with authority to invoke the assistance of UN organs for implementation whenever necessary. It asked, too, for the rights of petition and court hearing, as complainant or amicus curiae, for individual complainants and for organizations which had been granted consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

On May 16, 1949, the World Jewish Congress submitted other proposals to the Human Rights Commission. These were designed to remedy what the WJC termed "serious deficiencies" in the draft covenant. Among the recommendations made were these: Despite national emergencies no one was to be deprived of life without due process of law; mutilation, slavery, and torture were to be outlawed; liberty of movement was to be guaranteed; no one was to be deprived of liberty without a fair trial; retroactive criminal laws were to be prohibited; and freedom of religion and conscience and right of assembly and association were to be guaranteed.

On June 17, 1949, the World Agudas Israel, in conjunction with the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, proposed that the covenant contain a provision guaranteeing that children whose parents were killed in the late war or in other major catastrophes would be brought up in the religion of their parents.

Anticipating a delay of several years before any covenant on human rights took effect, the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations on May 17, 1949,
presented to the Human Rights Commission proposals which would enable immediate action on human rights by the UN. The Board proposed that:

1. a survey be made by each member nation of the present observance and protection of human rights within its territories and such measures be taken as are practicable to narrow the gap between existing practices and the standard established by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
2. the Secretary-General and the Commission be fully informed of the activities of these “watchdog” commissions, and be authorized to make independent studies of their own;
3. a procedure be established by which the Secretary-General and the Commission be enabled to examine the many communications now being received by the UN concerning human rights.

Sub-Commission on Discrimination and Minorities

The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities of the Human Rights Commission received a request from the General Assembly in December, 1948, to make a thorough study of the problem of minorities “in order that the United Nations may be able to take effective measures for the protection of racial, national, religious or linguistic minorities.” At this writing the Sub-Commission was examining means of protecting the rights of minority groups until such time as international protection would be enforceable through a covenant.

On May 19, 1949, this commission received a fifty-two-page document from the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations urging the commission to recommend bilateral or multilateral agreements among nations for the protection of the rights of minority groups. The memorandum asserted that certain states might be unwilling to establish religious freedom or religious equality, either for their own nationals or for aliens, but they might be willing to grant guarantees against ethnic discrimination. Other nations, because of historic factors, might be unwilling or unable to agree to a covenant pledging racial equality but might be eager to sign a covenant of religious freedom. Thus, according to the Consultative Council, human beings could be protected in areas vital to their group life against discrimination and against those injustices directed against them because they were members of religious, linguistic, and ethnic minorities, without creating political problems.

The Consultative Council defined those human rights which had a special bearing on the problems of minority oppression as, chiefly, freedom of religion, association, and communication; and freedom from racial, religious, and linguistic discrimination. After a survey of the history of past efforts made on the international level to protect minority rights, the memorandum concluded with a strong recommendation for a special UN agency charged with the resolution of these problems, and authorized to function in the special areas in which each nation delegated authority to it.

Public Reaction

The reception accorded the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the proposed covenant was by no means unanimous. Certainly the declaration
made much less of an impression on the American public than its proponents would have desired.

Newspaper editorials which took note of the event for the most part viewed the declaration with favor, holding with the *New York Herald Tribune* (December 8, 1948), that:

At the most it is a statement of ideals—"a standard of achievement" as the preamble states, which every nation and individual, "keeping constantly in mind," shall strive by teaching and education to promote and by progressive measures to make secure. It would be easy to say that such a declaration, having no legal weight, is merely an expression of hopeful platitudes. But the process of debate and discussion through which the statement has been hammered out has by itself enlarged the area of agreement and has intensified the resolve to make the basic rights an operative force. Throughout history, moreover, the setting forth of accepted ideals has served to influence and shape reality.

The more skeptical approach was perhaps exemplified by the New York *Daily News* (November 10, 1948), which wrote of the declaration: "We have a feeling that the UN will get nowhere fast in selling the . . . declaration throughout the world."

Protestant and Jewish groups raised their voices in immediate approval of the human rights document. Following adoption of the declaration by the General Assembly, expressions of approval were made public by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, and the Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church's Board of Missions. Prominent Protestant clergymen, including Bishop John J. Stamm and O. Frederick Nolde, spoke in support of the human rights document.

The Protestant Council in the City of New York, in an attempt to publicize the declaration and encourage debate and study of it, sponsored a conference for that purpose on February 12, 1949.

On February 14, 1949, the Joint Commission on Social Action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis issued a statement calling on the United States government to implement "to the fullest extent" the doctrine of the brotherhood of men and the principle of human equality embodied in the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

During the discussion held in the Social, Cultural, and Humanitarian Committee prior to the declaration's adoption, an amendment was offered reading "all human beings are created in the image and likeness of God." Upon objections from China, Russia, Britain, and India, because of their differing religious beliefs, the amendment was withdrawn. Subsequently an article in the Vatican newspaper *Osservatore Romano* criticized the UN for not having included any mention of God in its Declaration of Human Rights. Catholic groups were working for inclusion of acknowledgment of the divine origin of all human rights in the proposed covenant. On July 28, 1949, representatives of eight Roman Catholic organizations called at the British Foreign Office in London and presented a memorandum pledging support of the proposed covenant. They requested that the covenant show recognition of the divine
origin of human rights, that the rights of property be “more clearly defined,” and that the right of corporate ownership be safeguarded.

Legal Reactions

In the United States the declaration was sharply criticized by several legal groups. The American Bar Association took a somber view of the declaration’s intentions; and on January 31, 1949, at a meeting of its House of Delegates, warned that a covenant of human rights could wreck the American constitutional and legal systems. Leaders of the organization criticized what they called the undue haste with which the declaration was adopted by the Assembly in Paris on December 10, 1948. They alleged that a new procedure would be introduced whereby “... not only a city or a county or a state but any individual in this country may be complained against, not only by some pressure group in this country, but by some pressure group in Russia, and may be brought before an international tribunal and tried and punished by imprisonment or death.” The declaration and proposed covenant were described as “revolutionary” in that they “permit the United Nations to deal with the domestic affairs of a member nation.”

The American Bar Association’s fears concerning the human rights documents were shared by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and members of the New York State Bar Association. The international law committee of the New York City bar group recommended on May 10, 1949, that the Human Rights Declaration be abandoned, deeming it neither feasible nor desirable “at this time.” It pointed with suspicion at “so-called social and economic rights.”

At the New York State Bar Association’s annual meeting held on June 24 and 25, 1949, 500 members voted to appoint a special committee to study UN proposals for safeguarding human rights. A vigorous debate on the subject drew forth once more the opinion that UN action on human rights was precipitate, that few people in the United States had actually considered the proposals. The declaration was criticized on the grounds that it did not recognize the divine origin of human rights but assumed they were bestowed by the state.

Genocide

In Paris on December 9, 1948, the same General Assembly that proclaimed a Universal Declaration of Human Rights voted unanimously to adopt the Genocide Convention which had been two years in preparation. On the day the vote was taken—50 to 0, with no abstentions—delegates of twenty countries, including representatives of the major powers of the East and West, signed the convention. To become effective the treaty had to be ratified by the parliaments of twenty of the signatory countries. At the time of writing only Norway, Australia, and Ethiopia had voted ratification. In the United States the treaty had been submitted to Congress for its examination and approval.

The adoption of the Genocide Convention marked the climax in the career of Raphael Lemkin, member of the Yale Law Faculty, who had devoted more than fifteen years of his life trying to have a ban on the destruction of human
groups written into international law. Lemkin originated the word “genocide” as a new legal formulation for the ancient crime of annihilation of religious, racial, and national groups and worked on the preparation of the UN convention.

PROVISIONS OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The convention wrote into international law a prohibition on genocide—the destruction in whole or in part of a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group—as well as complicity in genocide and conspiracy to incitement or attempt to commit genocide.

Biological as well as physical destruction of human beings was foreseen in the document, which defined genocide as the killing of, or causing serious bodily or mental harm to, members of a group; deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about destruction; sterilization or other measures intended to prevent births within the group; or the forcible transfer of children from one group to another.

A four-step recourse was provided signatories who considered themselves victims of attempts at genocide. They might appeal to national courts, the International Court of Justice, any competent organ of the UN, or a special international penal tribunal whose establishment was envisaged in the convention.

The granting of asylum to persons charged with genocide, whether private individuals, public officials or responsible rulers, was forbidden, and contracting parties pledged themselves to extradite persons indicted under the convention for trial.

The UN International Law Commission requested prominent international jurists to draw up a report on the establishment of an international tribunal to try persons charged with genocide and similar crimes.

Public Reaction

When the UN decision was reached, Herbert V. Evatt, president of the General Assembly, urged ratification by all parliaments of member nations, telling the delegates that this was an epoch-making event in the development of international law.

Evatt's plea for ratification was supported by United States President Harry S. Truman, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, René Cassin of France, and statesmen of several nations.

A delegation of fifteen women's organizations, representing many members in all parts of the world, visited UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie on June 24, 1949, and pledged their influence to promote ratification of the convention by the parliaments and legislatures of the countries of the world. The organizations represented in the delegation included: the United States National Commission for the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; the National Council of Women of the United States; the International Council of Women; the International Children’s Emergency Fund of the UN; the National Women’s Forum; the United Council of Church Women; the
National Council of Jewish Women; the National Education Committee for Lasting Peace; the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs; the National Federation of Business and Professional Women; the National Council of Catholic Women; and the Women's Pan Pacific Association.

The Church Peace Union at its semi-annual meeting on June 17, 1949, urged the Senate to approve the convention.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York also approved the Genocide Convention and urged the Senate to ratify it.

The American Bar Association through its House of Delegates spoke up as the one American organization opposed to ratification of the Genocide Convention. On February 1, 1949, this legal body voted unanimously in favor of a resolution which urged the United States Senate not to ratify the convention "until and unless there has been accorded the time and opportunity for adequate public discussion and understanding of the convention." Reacting as it had to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Bar Association envisaged a dangerous encroachment by the Genocide Convention upon the American constitution and domestic laws. The president of the bar group, Frank E. Holman, said he was informed that "certain pressure groups are urging early ratification" of the convention, but he refused to name any such groups.
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List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.B.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acad.</td>
<td>academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin.</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agr.</td>
<td>agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agril.</td>
<td>agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am.</td>
<td>America(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apptd.</td>
<td>appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asst.</td>
<td>assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atty.</td>
<td>attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.H.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bd.</td>
<td>board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibl.</td>
<td>biblical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chanc.</td>
<td>chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chmn.</td>
<td>chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll.</td>
<td>college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collabor.</td>
<td>collaborator, collaborated, collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com.</td>
<td>committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comdr.</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm.</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commr.</td>
<td>commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conf.</td>
<td>conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cong.</td>
<td>congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr.</td>
<td>corresponding, correspondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dept.</td>
<td>department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.H.L.</td>
<td>Doctor of Hebrew Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dir.</td>
<td>director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dist.</td>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>div.</td>
<td>division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Sc.</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S.C.</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S.M.</td>
<td>Distinguished Service Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>editor, edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>editl.</td>
<td>editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ.</td>
<td>educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educl.</td>
<td>educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exec.</td>
<td>executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fed.</td>
<td>federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grad.</td>
<td>graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hon.</td>
<td>honorary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hosp.</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl.</td>
<td>included, including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inst.</td>
<td>institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instn.</td>
<td>institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instl.</td>
<td>institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internat.</td>
<td>international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Jurisprudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDC</td>
<td>American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNF</td>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieut.</td>
<td>lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litt.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL.B.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med.</td>
<td>medical, medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mil.</td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mng.</td>
<td>managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgr.</td>
<td>manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nat.</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ord.</td>
<td>ordained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org.</td>
<td>organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgn.</td>
<td>organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys.</td>
<td>physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prof.</td>
<td>professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseud.</td>
<td>pseudonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pub.</td>
<td>published, publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publ.</td>
<td>publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep.</td>
<td>represented, representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ret.</td>
<td>retired, retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch.</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sci.</td>
<td>science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sec.</td>
<td>secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sem.</td>
<td>seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soc.</td>
<td>society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supt.</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temp.</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theol.</td>
<td>theological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transl.</td>
<td>translated, translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJA</td>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>univ.</td>
<td>university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol.</td>
<td>volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.p.</td>
<td>vice-president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOA</td>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Jewish Organizations

UNITED STATES

CIVIC DEFENSE, POLITICAL


AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE (1906). 386 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C., 16. Pres. Jacob Blaustein; Exec. V. P. John Slawson. Seeks to prevent infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews in any part of the world; renders assistance and takes remedial action where necessary. AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK; Annual report; Commentary; Committee Reporter.


JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE (1933). 175 E. Broadway, N. Y. C., 2. Chmn. Adolph Held; Exec. Sec. Jacob Pat. Aids Jewish and non-Jewish labor institutions overseas; aids victims of oppression and persecution; seeks

1 Includes national Jewish organizations in existence for at least one year prior to June 30, 1949, based on replies to questionnaires circulated by the editors. Inclusion in this list does not necessarily imply approval of the organizations by the publishers, nor can they assume responsibility for the accuracy of the data. An asterisk (*) indicates that the information is reprinted from Volume 50 of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK. This directory is arranged alphabetically by country following the United States listing which, in addition, is classified according to the function or activities of the organization.
to combat anti-Semitism and religious intolerance abroad and in the U.S. Facts and Opinions; Labor Reports; Voice of the Unconquered.


WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS (1936; org. in U.S. 1939). 1584 Broadway, N. Y. C., 23. Acting Pres. and Chmn. Exec. Com. Nahum Goldmann. Seeks to secure and defend the rights, status, and interests of Jews and Jewish communities; represents its affiliated organizations before governmental, intergovernmental, and other international authorities on matters which affect the Jewish people as a whole. Congress Digest; Current Events in Jewish Life; Information Series; Information Sheets; Periodical reports.

CULTURAL


AMERICAN BIBLICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA SOCIETY (1939). 262 W. 85 St., N. Y. C., 1. Pres. Irving L. Levey; Sec. William Mazer. Seeks to spread knowledge and inspire love of the Bible; collates and publishes Torah Shele-mah, a biblical encyclopedia.


ASSOCIATION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH SCIENTISTS (1947). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 11. Pres. Leo Wiesner; Sec. Libby Rosenbloom. Seeks to promote the orientation of science within the framework of Orthodox Jewish tradition and assist in the solution of all problems pertaining to Orthodox Jews engaged or interested in the scientific pursuits.


United Jewish Educational and Cultural Organization (Europe)—UJECO. See Great Britain.


OVERSEAS AID

American Beth Jacob Committee, Inc. (1928). 55 W. 42 St., N.Y.C., 18. Chmn. Leo Jung; Exec. Dir. Meier Schenkolewski. Aids the Beth Jacob Schools, which provide the vocational, religious, and academic training for Jewish girls in Europe and Israel.


———, Youth Division (1934). 270 Madison Ave., N.Y.C., 16. Chmn. S. Harry Galfand; Exec. Sec. Meyer Kunsky. Provides a pro-
grams of activity for youth and young adults in connection with the work of the JDC. JDC Youth Division Reporter.


Jewish Restitution Successor Organization (1947). 270 Madison Ave., N. Y. C., 16. Asst. Sec. Eli Rock. Acts to discover, claim, receive, and assist in the recovery of Jewish heirless, unclaimed, and other types of property in any part of the world; to utilize such assets or to assist in their utilization for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of surviving victims of Nazi persecution.

Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation, Inc. (1946). 673 Broadway, N. Y. C., 12. Chmn. Louis Segal; Sec.-Dir. Z. Baumgold. Maintains network of relief organizations throughout Europe; supports children’s homes, centers, libraries, cooperatives, cultural and educational centers; offers foster parents service. Call—Der Ruf.


**RELIGIOUS, EDUCATIONAL**


Agudath Israel of America, Inc. (1912). 113 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 18. Pres. Elijah M.

—, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF B'Nai B'RITH (1925). 113 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 18. Exec. Dir. J. Silbermanz. Seeks to unite Jewish youth; educates them to their responsibility to the Jewish nation according to the tenets of the Torah. *Our Outlook.*


—, YOUTH COUNCIL OF AMERICA, Inc. (1921). 113 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 18. Pres. Michael G. Tress. Seeks to unite Jewish youth in the spirit of the Torah and in that spirit to solve the problems that confront Jewry in the Diaspora and in Israel. *Darkeniu.*


CONGRESS FOR THE SABBATH (1942). 1133 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10. Chmn. Jacob Levinson; Sec. Aaron Pechenick. Seeks to strengthen Sabbath observance in the U.S.


—, ALUMNI ASSOCIATION (1884). 11 Eton St., Springfield 8, Mass. Pres. Julius Mark; Sec. Herman Eliot Snyder. Seeks to promote the welfare of Judaism, the College, and its graduates.


JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc. (1940). 15 W. 86 St., N. Y. C., 24. Pres. Leopold J. Sneider; Exec. Sec. Hannah L. Goldberg. Seeks to further the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization...
through the reconstruction of Jewish life; assists in the development of the state of Israel. Reconstructionist; Reconstructionist News; pamphlets; study guides; brochures.


JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA (1886; re-org. 1902). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C, 27. Pres. Louis Finkelstein; Provost Simon Greenberg. Trains rabbis and teachers; conducts research; maintains a library; spreads knowledge of Judaism within the Jewish and the general community.


NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE (Formerly National Farm School and Junior College) (1896). Farm School, Bucks Co., Pa. Pres. James Work; Sec. Miss E. M. Belfield. Prepares young men to become farmers or technicians in agriculture or allied industries, or agricultural teachers. Annual Report; Catalogue.


NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH CHAPLAINS (1916). 150 E. 196 St., St. Albans, N. Y. Pres. Emanuel Rackman; Sec. Abraham Ruderman. Seeks to promote fellowship among and advance the common interests of all chaplains in and out of the service.


NATIONAL COUNCIL OF YOUNG ISRAEL (1912). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C, 11. Pres. Eliezer Stein; Nat. Dir. Samson R. Weiss. Seeks to preserve and perpetuate traditional Judaism; to establish and strengthen institutions for adult Jewish studies; to help in the development of Israel and rebuild it in the spirit of Torah.


NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE YOUTH (1939). 54 W. 6 St., Cincinnati 2, Ohio. Pres. Arnold R. Levine; Dir. Samuel Cook. Unites youth of Reform congregations; promotes the cause of Judaism and the synagogue. Messenger; Youth Leader.


RABBINICAL ALLIANCE OF AMERICA (1944). 141 So. 3 St., Brooklyn 11, N. Y. Pres. Samuel A. Turk. Seeks to further traditional Judaism; helps support the Mesifita Talmudical
Seminary and other institutions of higher learning. *Egid Bulletin*.


**Society of Friends of Touro Synagogue National Historic Shrine, Inc.** (1948). 85 Touro St., Newport, R. I. Pres. B. C. Friedman; Sec. Irwin Schulman. Seeks to commemorate the Touro Synagogue.


**United Yeshivos Foundation, Inc.** (1938). 1133 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10. Supt. Jacob I. Hartstein; Acting Chmn. Jacob Demov. Acts as liaison between general educational bodies and secular departments of Jewish parochial schools, and seeks to raise their standards; serves as clearing house for information pertaining to general or secular education under Jewish auspices. *Weekly Circular*.


---. **Teachers Institute Alumni Association** (1942). 331 Madison Ave., N. Y. C., 17. Pres. Solomon Biederman; Sec. Max Halpert. Seeks to promote the Institute; pub-
SOCIAL, MUTUAL BENEFIT


**Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity** (1913). 4 N. 8 St., St. Louis 1, Mo. Pres. Frederick Katz; Exec. Sec. George S. Toll. Fraternal. *Lion; News Letter.*


**American Federation of Jews from Central Europe, Inc.** (1941). 1674 Broadway, N. Y. C., 19. Pres. Nathan Stein; Exec. V.P. Herman Muller. Seeks to safeguard the rights and interests of Central European Jews now living in the U. S. *Information bulletins.*


**B'nai B'rith News; Newsletter “Strictly Your Business”; Leadership Handbook; Program Calendar.**


**Vanguard.**


**B'nai B'rith News; Newsletter “Strictly Your Business”; Leadership Handbook; Program Calendar.**


**Vanguard.**


**B'nai B'rith News; Newsletter “Strictly Your Business”; Leadership Handbook; Program Calendar.**


Sigma Iota Zeta Veterinary Medical Fraternity (1933). 30-76 31 St., Long Island City 2, N. Y. Pres. Solonon Mirin; Sec. Allen A. Livingston. Fraternal; professional. Sigma Iota Zeta News.


SOCIAL WELFARE


CITY OF HOPE, A JEWISH NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER (Formerly Jewish Consumptive Relief Association) (1913; re-org. 1949). 208 W. 8 St., Los Angeles 14, Cal. Pres. Victor M. Carter; Exec. Dir. Samuel H. Golter. Seeks to establish a national medical center, under-graduate medical school, school for nurses and technicians; provides free care on non-sectarian basis to persons suffering from tuberculosis and other major chest diseases. Torch of Hope.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS (1929). 1834 Broadway, N. Y. C, 23. Chmn. Mrs. Anna Center Schneiderman; Sec-Treas. Mrs. Ida C. Farber. Promotes inter-organizational understanding and good will among the cooperating organizations.


Harris; Sec. Selma Mink. Offers relief and treatment to persons suffering from tuberculosis in all forms and stages. J. C. R. S. Bulletin; Sanatorium Bulletin.


National Association of Jewish Center Workers (1918). 55 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 18. Pres. Sanford Solender; Admin. Sec. Lillian Margolin. Seeks to promote the welfare, training, and professional standards of center workers. Jewish Center Worker.


National Home for Jewish Children at Denver (1907). 710 17 St., Denver 2, Colo. Pres. Mrs. Fannie E. Lorber; Exec. Dir. Gilbert Gordon. Maintains an institution for the physical and emotional rehabilitation of dependent Jewish children from all parts of the U. S. who are suffering from bronchial asthma or whose parents are tubercular. Home Journal.


ZIONIST AND PRO-ISRAEL

Academic Council for Hebrew University (1941). 9 E. 89 St., N. Y. C., 28. Chmn. Salo W. Baron; Exec. V.P. High Salpeter. Dissemnates information about activities of the Hebrew University; develops cooperation with academic circles in the U. S.


American Committee of Universal Yeshivah of Jerusalem (1924). 38 Park Row,
AMERICAN ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE, INC. (1932). 250 W. 57 St., N. Y. C., 19. Pres. Sidney Musher; Sec. Edna Kalstein. Seeks to develop the economy of Israel and provide employment opportunities for immigrants.


BRIT TRUMPEDOR OF AMERICA, Inc. (1929). 149 Second Ave., N. Y. C., 3. Pres. Seymour Rosenberg; Sec. pro tem Seldon R. Bard. Seeks to educate Jewish youth for life in Eretz Israel by the teaching of the Hebrew language, Jewish history and culture, and military preparedness. Altalena; Hadar; Tel Hai Newsletter.

FEDERATED COUNCIL OF PALESTINIAN INSTITUTIONS (1940). 38 Park Row, N. Y. C., 7. Pres. David L. Meckler; Exec. V.P. Abraham Horowitz. Raises funds from federations and welfare funds in America for the support of independent religious, educational, and welfare institutions in Israel which are not maintained by the various fund-raising agencies of the Zionist Organization. Annual report.

HARONIM LABOR ZIONIST YOUTH (1920). 45 E. 17 St., N. Y. C., 3. Exec. Sec. Arthur Gorenstein. Trains young Jews to become halutzim in Israel and to create a cooperative society there. Alot; Furrows; Haboneh; Iggeret.


HAPOEL HAMIZRACHI OF AMERICA (1921). 1133 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10. Pres. Bernard Bergman; Sec. Nathan Muchnik. Seeks to build up the state of Israel in accordance with the principles, laws, and traditions of...
the Torah and its precepts of social justice. *Hamichtau; Internal News Letter; Jewish Horizon; Kolenu; Sabbath Voice.


INTERCOLLEGIATE ZIONIST FEDERATION OF AMERICA (1945). 131 W. 14 St., N. Y. C, 11. Pres. Judith Neulander; Admin. Sec. Mrs. Alfred H. Levine. Seeks to integrate student Zionists of America in a program of education and action on behalf of Israel and American Jewish community through study groups, regional seminars, summer camps, a leadership institute, and political action and cultural programs. *Izfacts; Student Zionist; Zionist Times.

ISRAEL MUSIC FOUNDATION (1948). 11 W. 42 St., N. Y. C, 18. Pres. Oscar Regen, Sec. Oliver Sabin. Seeks to build a bridge of music between Israel and the broadest possible international audience; records outstanding musical groups and soloists in Israel; publishes creative works of Israeli composers; maintains a reference library of Israeli music; grants exchange scholarships.


LEAGUE FOR RELIGIOUS LABOR IN ERETZ ISRAEL (1941). 38 Park Row, N. Y. C, 7. Pres. Isaac Rivkind; Dir. Meir Sohetman. Promotes in the U. S. the ideals of religious labor in Israel; assists the religious labor movement in Israel.


Augusta L. Wein. Maintains schools and nurseries in Israel in an environment of traditional Judaism; conducts cultural activities for the purpose of disseminating Zionist ideals and strengthening traditional Judaism in America. Bulletin; Cultural Guide; Mizrahi Woman.


Palestine Symphonic Choir Project (1938). 3143 Central Ave., Indianapolis 5, Ind. Chmn. Myro Halpern; Nat. Exec. Dir. Norman Schanin. Perpetuates the ideals and traditions of Judaism among Jewish youth; seeks to inculcate a love for Israel and further democracy in the U.S. Leader; Senior; Young Judaean.

Zionist Archives and Library (1939). 41 E. 42 St., N. Y. C., 17. Dir. and Librarian Sophie A. Udin (on leave of absence); Acting Dir. Sylvia Landress. Serves as an archive and information service for material on Israel and Zionism. Palestine and Zionism.

Zionist Organization of America (1897). 41 E. 42 St., N. Y. C., 17. Pres. Daniel Frisch; Sec. and Exec. Dir. Sidney Marks. Seeks to safeguard the integrity and independence of Israel as a free and democratic commonwealth by means consistent with the laws of the U.S., and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity. Dos Yiddishe Folks; Inside Isreal; New Palestine.

NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

OTHER COUNTRIES

ADEN
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. S Banin House, Section A Street I, Crater. JDC administration office.

ALGERIA
B’nai B’rith Algiers Lodge. Algiers.
Centre d’Apprentissage ORT. 8, rue Léon Roches, Algiers. ORT training center. (For administrative office, see France: ORT Français.)
Comité d’Aide aux Réfugiés. 11, rue Dumont d’Urville, Algiers. (Cable address: Co-dairef, Alger) JDC affiliate.
Hias. 11, rue Bab-el-Oued, Algiers.
Union des Associations Cultuelles Israelites de France et d’Algérie (1906). 44, rue de la Victoire, Paris 9e, France. Pres. Léon Meiss; Dir. M. Sachs. Promotes Judaism in Algeria and France; maintains rabbinical seminary; serves as official representative of the members of the affiliated cultural organizations.

ARGENTINA
Asociación Filantrópica Israelita. Cangallo 1479, Buenos Aires. (Cable address: Asofis, Baires) JDC branch.
Federación O.S.E. Sudamericana. Pringles 774, Buenos Aires.
Hogar Israelita Argentino para Ancianos y Huérfanos. Viamonte 2341, Buenos Aires. Supports a home for aged and a home for orphan boys.
ORGANIZATION RELIGIOSA SIONISTA MIZRACHI.

SOCIEDAD CULTURAL ISRAELITA. Uriburu 650, Buenos Aires. Sponsors social and cultural activities among Jewish immigrants of German background.


SOCIEDAD HEBRÁICA ARGENTINA. Sarmiento 2233, Buenos Aires. Pres. Israel Dujovne; Sec. Emilio Sevlever. Sponsors cultural, social, and athletic activities for youth. Davar.


AUSTRALIA

AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION OF JEWISH WELFARE SOCIETIES. 145 Darlinghurst Rd., Sydney.


AUSTRALIAN JEWISH WELFARE SOCIETY. 415 Colonial Mutual Bldgs., Queen St., Brisbane. (Cable address: Welfsocy, Brisbane.) Dir. A. Newhouse. HIAS affiliate.

AUSTRALIAN JEWISH WELFARE SOCIETY. 644 Hay St., Perth. (Cable address: Welfsocy, Perth.) HIAS affiliate.


AUSTRALIAN JEWISH WELFARE AND RELIEF SOCIETY IN VICTORIA. 443 Little Collins St., Melbourne. (JDC cable address: Welfsocy, Melbourne.) JDC affiliate; handles local immigration affairs.

B'NAI B'RITH MELBOURNE LODGE. Melbourne.

B'NAI B'RITH SYDNEY LODGE. Sydney.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN JEWRY. 225 Collins St., Melbourne. (JDC cable address: Exauyry.) Pres. M. Ashkenazy. Representative body of Australian Jewry; has over-all responsibility for national policy on immigration and serves as JDC administrative office.

JEWISH COUNCIL TO FIGHT FASCISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM. 325 Collins St., Melbourne.

O.S.E. DELEGATION. 1 Garden Sq. Gordon, Sydney.

O.S.E. SOCIETY. 111 Collins St., Melbourne.

UNITED JEWISH OVERSEAS RELIEF FUND. 443 Little Collins St., Melbourne. (Cable address: Reliefund, Melbourne.) Dir. H. Fisher. HIAS affiliate.

UNITED JEWISH OVERSEAS RELIEF FUND IN NEW SOUTH WALES. Daking House, 23 Rawson Pl., Sydney. (JDC cable address: Reliefund, Sydney.) JDC affiliate; handles local immigration affairs.

WORLD ORT UNION COMMITTEE FOR AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. 443 Little Collins St., Melbourne.


BELGIUM

AIDE AUX ISRAËLITES VICTIMES DE LA GUERRE, SECTION ENFANCE. 10, rue de la Vallée, Brussels. O.S.E. affiliate.

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. 76, rue Mercelis, Brussels. (Cable address: Jointfund Brussels.) JDC administration and emigration affairs office for Belgium and Luxembourg.

HIAS. 10, rue du Palais, Antwerp.

HIAS. 10, rue Lesbroussart, Brussels. (Cable address: Belhias, Brussels.) Dir. H. Kellner. ORT BELGE. 78, rue de Trèves, Brussels.

BOLIVIA

ASOCIACIÓN BENEFICICTA ISRAELITA BOLIVIANA. La Paz. B'nai B'rith lodge.
Asociación ORT Bolivia. Casilla 281, Cochabamba.
*Círculo Israelita. Casilla 189, La Paz. Representative community organization.
Cochabamba Lodge—B’nai B’rith. Cochabamba.
Federación Sionista Unida de Bolivia. Casilla 1341, La Paz. Pres. Herszl B. Lederman; Sec. Francisco Susz.
Jewish Agency for Palestine. See Federación Sionista Unida de Bolivia.
Sionistas Unidos. Casilla 189, La Paz.
Sociedad de Protección a los Inmigrantes Israelitas. Casilla Cortece 975, La Paz. (Cable address: Sopro, La Paz) Dir. W. Goldberg. Branch of HIAS and JDC.
Unión Juvenil Sionista. Casilla 1341, La Paz.

BRAZIL

Amigos de Histadrut. Rua do Rosário 171, 3° andar, Rio de Janeiro.
Centro Hebrew Brasileiro. Rua Tenente Possolo 8, Rio de Janeiro.
Círculo Israelita de São Paulo (1946). Praça Ramos de Azevedo 302, Palácio Trocadéro, São Paulo. Pres. Leão Fefer; Sec. Rafael Markman. Coordinates activities of member institutions; represents the Jewish community of the city of São Paulo in matters of general concern; seeks to combat anti-Semitism; maintains contact and cultural exchange with world Jewish communities.
*Comitê Auxiliar do Joint em São Paulo. Rua Martim Francisco 59, São 2 Paulô. (Cable address: Jointfund, São Paulo) Pres. Horacio Lebensztejn; Sec. Jerry Sachs. Solicits support for JDC among all Jewish groups.
*Comité pro Palestina. Rua Enrique Díaz 73, Porto Alegre.
*Congregação Israelita Paulista. Rua Brigadeiro Galvão 181, São Paulo. Supports religious, social, and other community activities.

*Escritorio Latinoamericano do Joint, Sede Central para o Brasil. Rua Martim Francisco 50, São Paulo. Dir. (for Brazil) Emanuel Borenstein. Supervises and coordinates JDC work in Brazil as a regional center of the Latin American office.
Organización Poale Zion-Hitachdut. Rua do Rosário 171, 3° andar, Rio de Janeiro.
ORT Committee. Rua Bresser 1317, São Paulo.
Sociedades Israelitas O.S.E. Av. Rio Branco 277, Rio de Janeiro.
AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK

BRITISH WEST INDIES

HIAS of America. P. O. Box 213, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad. Dir. Ulrich Schaechter.
ORT Committee. 14 Hamilton St., Port-of-Spain, Trinidad.
O.S.E. Trinidad Branch. 5 Sydney St., Port-of-Spain, Trinidad.
Relief Fund. 3438 Church St., Kingston, Jamaica. (JDC cable address: Cornat, Havana, Cuba) Dir. O. K. Henriques. HIAS and JDC affiliate.
Joint Relief Society, Inc. P. O. Box 467, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad. (Cable address: Jures Port-of-Spain; and Cornat, Havana, Cuba) JDC affiliate.

BULGARIA

American Joint Distribution Committee. 119, rue St-Dominique, Paris 7e, France. European headquarters office.
HIAS. Ul. Alabinska 33, Sofia. (Cable address: Hias, Sofia.) Dir. A. Mailer.
ORT Bulgaria. Ul. Stefan Stamboulov 4, Sofia.

CANADA

Actions Committee of the Labor Zionist Movement in Canada (1939). 5392 Jeanne Mance St., Montreal, Quebec. Pres. M. Dickstein; Exec. Dir. Leon Chelifetz. Coordinates the activities and advances the program of Labor Zionist groups.
Hashomer Haddati of Canada (re-org. 1943). 5215 Hutchison St., Montreal, Quebec. Trains youth for life on Orthodox principles in Israel. Kol Hanoor.
Jewish Immigrant Aid Society of Canada (1919). 4221 Esplanade Ave., Montreal, Quebec. (Cable address: Jias, Montreal) Pres. J. Segall; Exec. Dir. Murray A. Solkin. HIAS affiliate.
Jewish Immigrant Aid Society of Canada. 145 Beverly St., Toronto, Ontario. Dir. Tobie Taback. HIAS affiliate.
Jewish Immigrant Aid Society of Canada. 1200 Main St., Winnipeg, Manitoba. Dir. I. Selchen. HIAS affiliate.
Mizrachi Organization of Canada. 5215 Hutchison St., Montreal, Quebec. Pres. B. Tannenbaum; Exec. V.P. S. M. Zambrowsky. Seeks to rebuild Israel as a Jewish commonwealth in the spirit of traditional Judaism. Mizrachi Voice.

United Jewish Relief Agencies of Canada (1939). 435 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, Que. Sec. (Cable address: Jewcon, Montreal) Pres. Samuel Bronfman; Exec. Dir. Saul Hayes. Federates Canadian organizations extending relief to Jewish refugees and other war victims; JDC affiliate.


Chile

Asociación Israelita Chilena ORT. Itatazaal 1951, Santiago.


Comité de Protección a los Inmigrantes Israelitas. Casilla 1196; Pedegral 230, Santiago. (Cable address: Chileicem, Santiago) Dir. M. Reinsburg. HIAS branch.

Comité Israelita de Soconos. Clasificador 0290, Santiago. (Cable address: Cisroco, Santiago).

Comité Representativo de la Colectividad Israelita de Chile (1940). Serrano 202, Santiago. Sec. Samuel Goren; Gen. Sec. Robert Lévy. Represents Jewish community of Chile in dealing with the government and the public; helps to integrate Jews into the Chilean national pattern; seeks to combat racial prejudice; coordinates activities of the country’s Jewish organizations. Bulletins.


Misraji. Tarapaca 1016, Santiago.


Sociedad Cultural Israelita. San Diego 216, Santiago.


Unión Juventud Judaí (1939). Cruz 355, Temuco. Sec. Gerardo Preminger; Sec. León Hassen. Seeks to disseminate Zionist ideals among youth; conducts social and athletic activities. Israel; Simiente.


China

American Joint Distribution Committee. P. O. Box 2317; 320 Szechuen Road, Shanghai. (Cable address: Jointco Shanghai.)

B’nai B’rith Renaissance Lodge. Shanghai.

B’nai B’rith Shanghai Lodge. Shanghai.

HIAS. P. O. Box 1425; 24 Central Road, Shanghai. (Cable address: Hias, Shanghai.)

Colombia


Centro Israelita de Beneficencia “Ezraht Israel” (1926). Avenida 3a, 858, Cali. Pres. Clemente Halton; Sec. Abraham Milhem. Seeks to promote the intellectual, moral, social, and religious interests of Jews.


Comité Central Hebreo de Colombia. Apartado Aéreo 3819, Bogotá.

Comité de Protección a los Inmigrantes Israelitas (1938). Apartado Aéreo 161, Barranquilla. (Cable address: Hias, Barranquilla) Pres. Alberto Cohen; Sec. Benno Hess. Represents HIAS and JDC.
**COSTA RICA**

**ASOCIACIÓN SIONISTA UNIDA.** Apartado 975, San José. Pres. Salomón Schyfter; Sec. León Giberstein.

**CENTRO ISRAELITA SIONISTA.** Apartado 1473, San José.

HIAS. 25 Varas al Este del Correo, Avenida de los Damas, San José. Dir. Louis Feigenblatt.

**JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE.** Apartado 975, San José. Dir. Israel Blumenfeld.

**JUVENTUD SIONISTA UNIDA.** Apartado 975, San José. Pres. Israel Blumenfeld.

**CUBA**


**CENTRO ISRAELITA DE CUBA.** Calle Egidio 504, Havana. (Cable address: Centiscub, Havana) Pres. Eugene Baikowitz. HIAS affiliate.


**COMITÉ CENTRAL DE LAS SOCIEDADES HEBREAS.** Murally 474, Dto. 200, Havana.


**JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE.** Sol 153, Havana. Dir. Sender M. Kaplan.

**JUNIO RELIEF COMMITTEE.** P. O. Box 2586, Havana. (Cable address: Cornat, Havana) Dir. Oscar Gurfitkel. JDC affiliate.

**LA BUENA VOLUNTAD.** Havana. Pres. Rafael Alde; Sec. Victoria Behar. Raises financial aid and other types of assistance to needy widows, orphans, and invalids.

**LIGA PRO HISTADRUT.** Prado 260, Havana.

**MAIMONIDES LODGE—B’NAI B’RITH.** Havana.


**WIZO—WOMEN’S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZATION.** Paseo de Martí 260, Havana.

**YIVO.** C/o Centro Israelita, Egidio 504, Havana. Bulletin.
NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

HIAS. Markovicova 29, Bratislava. (Cable address: Hias, Bratislava.) Dir. Tibor Barsony.

HIAS. Josefovska 7, Prague V. (Cable address: Hias, Prague.) Dir. Tibor Barsony.

JEWISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF HEALTH—O.S.E. Franziskanska Namestie 8/1, Bratislava.

JEWISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF HEALTH—O.S.E. Josefovska 7, Prague V.

ORT CZECHOSLOVAKIA. Hastalska 6, Prague I.

DENMARK

AMERICAN JEWISH JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
Rugmarken 42, Copenhagen. (Cable address: Jointfund Copenhagen.)

DANISH ORT. Sæveje 31, Hellerup, Copenhagen.

HIAS. Frederiksborggade 54, Copenhagen. (Cable address: Hiasdan, Copenhagen.) Dir. Julius Margolinsky.

O.S.E. COMMITTEE. Rebekkavej 49, Copenhagen.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Calle Abreu 102, Ciudad Trujillo. Dir. José Engel.

JOINT RELIEF COMMITTEE. Calle 19 de Marzo 41, Ciudad Trujillo. (Cable address: Jointrelief, Ciudad Trujillo) Dir. William Flam.


UNION SIONISTA DE LA REPUBLICA DOMINICANA. Calle Abreu 102, Ciudad Trujillo. Pres. José Engel; Sec. Jehuda Tajc.

DUTCH GUIANA

CENTRAL COMMITTEE FOR JEWISH AFFAIRS IN SURINAM. P. O. Box 512, Paramaribo. JDC affiliate.

ECUADOR

AMERICAN JEWISH JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. P. O. Box 554, Quito. (Cable address: Jointfund Quito) Sec. Max Weiser.

ASOCIACIÓN DE BENEFICENCIA ISRAELITA QUITO (formerly Comunidad Israelita del Ecuador) (1938). Venezuela 616, Quito. Pres. Abraham Polter; Sec. Juan Abrahamson. Represents Quito Jewish community in relations with government and Jewish organizations of other countries; conducts social, religious, cultural, and educational activities.

ASOCIACIÓN DE BENEFICENCIA ISRAELITA. C/o Pensión Helbig, Calle Luque Wizo; Casilla 1001, Guayaquil.

BNEI BRIT. Casilla 2572, Quito.

CENTRO ISRAELITA. Casilla Letra B, Guayaquil.

*COMITÉ DE PROTECCIÓN A LOS INMIGRANTES ISRAELITAS. Casilla 849, Guayaquil. (Cable address: Jointfund Quito) JDC affiliate.

COMITÉ ORT DE QUITO. Casilla 2505, Quito.

COMUNIDAD DE CULTO ISRAELITA. Casilla 1001, Guayaquil.

COOPERATIVA DE CRÉDITO PARA AGRICULTURA, INDUSTRIA Y COMERCIO. Casilla 2265, Quito. Jewish cooperative bank operated with assistance of JDC.


HIAS OF AMERICA. (1938). Venezuela 616 y Sucre; Casilla 2722, Quito. (Cable address: Hias, Quito) Pres. Oscar Rocca; Sec. Jorge Schwerin.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Apartado 758, Quito. Dir. Miguel A. Schwind.


SOCIEDAD DE DAMAS ISRAELITAS. Casilla 2873, Quito.

WIZO—ORGANIZACIÓN SONISTA FEMENINA ECUATORIANA. P. O. Box 2920, Quito. Pres. Idalind Mueller-Pollack; Sec. Dora Zanger.


EGYPT

COMMUNAUTÉ DU CAIRE CONSEIL COMMUNAL (1920). Office of the Chief Rabbinate, Cairo. Pres. Salvador Sicurel Bey; Sec. André Jabès. Administers the Jewish schools, hospital, synagogues, communal property, and welfare activities.

EGYPTIAN ORT COMMITTEE. 5 Nebi Daniel St., Alexandria.

EGYPTIAN PRODUCE TRADING COMPANY, S.A.E., P. O. Bag, Alexandria. HIAS affiliate.

EL SALVADOR

COMUNIDAD ISRAELITA DE EL SALVADOR (1944). Casa Goldtree, San Salvador. (Cable address: Jointfundmex, Mexico City, Mexico; and Goldtree, San Salvador) Pres. Eugenio Liebes; Sec. Edgar Schoening. Central organization of Jewish community; HIAS and JDC affiliate.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Apartado 195, San Salvador. Dir. Carlos Bernhard.
WIZO—WOMEN’S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZATION. Apartado 82, San Salvador.

FRANCE


HAS. 27, rue de Berri, Paris 8e. (Cable address: Hiasfrance, Paris.) Dir. Lewis Neikrug.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. 143, avenue de Wagram, Paris. Dir. A. Butkowski.


GREAT BRITAIN


AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. 199, Piccadilly, London W. 1. (Cable address: Jointfund, London.)


BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS (1760). Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, London W.C. 1. Pres. Abraham Cohen; Sec. A. G. Brozman. Guards the interests of British Jewry and acts on behalf of the welfare and improvement of their general position; aids Jewish communities and individuals abroad in cooperation with other organizations and persons. Concord.


NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

GERMANY

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Fischerhuettenstrasse 24, Berlin-Zehlendorf. (Cable address: Jointfund Berlin.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Osterdeichstrasse 17, Bremen. (Cable address: Jointfund Bremen.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Sandweg 7, Frankfurt. (Cable address: Jointfund Frankfurt.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Hochallee 79, Hamburg 13. (Cable address: Jointfund Hamburg.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Hohne Belsen Blechendorf, Kreis Celle, British Zone. (Cable address: Jointfund, Belsen Hohne.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Sieberstrasse 3, Munich. (Cable address: Jointfund Munich.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Reinsburgstrasse 26, Stuttgart. (Cable address: Jointfund Stuttgart.)

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE—HIAS. Friedrichstrasse 29, Frankfurt. (Cable address: Hajco, Frankfurt.) Coordinating committee for operations of both organizations in U. S. Zone.


HIAS. Osterdeichstrasse 17, Bremen. Dir. Gregory Meisler.

HIAS. Friedrichstrasse 29, Frankfurt. (Cable address: Hias, Frankfurt.) Dir. Henry Lippman.

HIAS. Am Lindener Berg 6c, Hanover. (Cable address: Hias, Hanover.) Dir. T. Pontzen.

HIAS. Mohlstrasse 37, Munich. (Cable address: Hias, Munich.) Dir. Henry Ortner.

HIAS. Theodor-Weisstrasse 119, Stuttgart. (Cable address: Hias, Stuttgart.) Dir. S. Juer.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Mariatheresastrasse 11, Munich.

JUDISCHES GEMEINDE ESSEN (1945). Essen-Stadtwald, Waldsaum 147, British Zone}


LANDESVERBAND DER JUEDISCHEN GEMEINDE VON RHEINLAND PALZF (1945). Koblenz/Rhein, an der Liebfrauenkirche 11, French Zone. Pres. Addi Bernd; Alternate Max Gruenfeld. Represents the Jewish communities in Rheinland Palz; affiliated with the World Jewish Congress.

ORT. c/o 102 (R) Military Government, Det. BAOR, British Zone. Administrative headquarters for British Zone.


AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. 199, Piccadilly, London W. 1. (Cable address: Jointfund, London.)


BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS (1760). Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, London W.C. 1. Pres. Abraham Cohen; Sec. A. G. Brozman. Guards the interests of British Jewry and acts on behalf of the welfare and improvement of their general position; aids Jewish communities and individuals abroad in cooperation with other organizations and persons. Concord.


CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS. See United States—Civic Defense and Political.

COORDINATING BOARD OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS. See United States—Civic Defense and Political.

HIAS. 37, Museum St., London W.C. 1. (Cable address: Britias, London.) Dir. Eva Aronsfeld.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, 77 Great Russell St., London W.C.1.


JEWISH COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION (1891). 46, Queen Anne’s Gate, London S.W. 1. Pres. Marquess of Reading; Dir.-Gen. Louis Oungre. Engages in charitable and educational work for Jews throughout the world; assists Jewish emigration and resettlement.


UNITED JEWISH EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (EUROPE)—UJECO (1946). 9, Mansfield St., London W. 1. Pres. Jules Braunschvig; Chmn. Mrs. Barnett Janner. Assists European Jewish communities in the reconstruction of their educational and cultural life; provides educational material; trains teachers. (Sponsored by Agudas Israel World Organization, Alliance Israelite Universelle, American Jewish Committee, Anglo-Jewish Association, and the Board of Deputies of British Jews.)


WORLD UNION FOR PROGRESSIVE JUDAISM (1926). 51, Palace Court, London W. 2. Pres. Leo Baecck; Hon. Sec. Lily H. Montagu. Serves as federation of organizations of Reform Judaism throughout the world; seeks to promote the teachings of the Reform movement.

GREECE

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Metropoleos St. 2, Athens. (Cable address: Jointfund Athens.)

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES. Ipiti St. 1, Athens.


ESTHER ORPHANAGE OF KIFFISIA (1945). Kalamitou St. 4, Athens. Pres. Salomon Cambi; Sec. Raphael Constantinis. Founded by JDC to provide care for orphans en route to Israel.

HIAS. c/o Central Council of Jewish Communities; Ipiti St. 1, Athens. (Cable address: Kenisrail, Athens.) Dir. Canaris Constantinis.

ORT GREECE. Pirée St. 186, Athens. Administrative office for Greece.

GUATEMALA


SOCIEDAD CENTRO HEBREO. Guatemala City. Center for Yiddish-speaking Jews.

SOCIEDAD ISRAELITA DE BENEFICENCIA (1913). 8a Avenida Sur 7 (Oficina del Presidente), Guatemala City. (Cable address: Engel Sociedad Israelita; and Jointfundmex, Mexico City, Mexico) Pres. Enrique Engel; Sec. Guillermo Griffel. HIAS and JDC affiliate.

SOCIEDAD MACABI. Guatemala City.

SOCIEDAD “MAGUEN DAVID.” Guatemala City. Organization of Sephardic Jews.

WIZO. Guatemala City.

HAITI

JOINT RELIEF SOCIETY. P. O. Box 188, Port-au-Prince. (Cable address: Cornat, Havana, Cuba) Dir. Camilo Pincherle. HIAS and JDC affiliate.

HAWAII

ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE OF HAWAI. 1732 South Beretania St., Honolulu. JDC administrative and emigration affairs office.

HONDURAS

CENTRO ISRAELITA. Comayaguela D/C Calle Rueda, Tegucigalpa. (Cable address: Jointfundmex, Mexico City, Mexico) Dir. Erich Hirsch. HIAS and JDC affiliate.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. San Pedro Sula. Dir. Jacobo Weizenblut.

HUNGARY

American Joint Distribution Committee.
Sas-utca 14, Budapest 5. (Cable address: Jointfund Budapest.) Dir. Israel Jacobson.

Central Board of Jews in Hungary (1868).

Hias—Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.
Geza-utca 3, Budapest. (Cable address: Hias, Budapest.) Dir. Klara Szekely.

National Hungarian Jewish Welfare Committee (1945).

ORT Hungary.
Erzsebet-Koerut 32, Budapest.

Zentralkanzlei der Ungarlaendischen Autonom Orthodox Juedischen Confession (1871).

INDIA

Central Jewish Board of Bombay (1946).
P. O. Box 47, Bombay. Chmn. Meyer Nissim; Hon. Sec. F. W. Pollack. Represents the Jewish community of Bombay in all political and communal questions affecting the community as a whole; serves as HIAS and JDC administrative office.

Jewish Refugee Relief Association.
3 Theater Road, Calcutta. JDC administrative office.

World ORT Union.
P. O. Box 47, Bombay.

IRAN

ORT Committee.
P. O. Box 430, Teheran.

ISRAEL

Alliance Israélite Universelle (1873). Jerusalem. Abraham Elmaleh. Maintains an agricultural school and elementary schools in Israel, with French as principal language of instruction.

American Jewish Committee.
P. O. Box 4124; 4 Shapiro St., Tel Aviv. Israel Corr. Helmuth Lowenberg.

American Joint Distribution Committee (1919).
P. O. Box 640, Jerusalem. (Cable address: Jointfund, Tel Aviv) Dir. H. Vitales.

American Joint Distribution Committee.
22 Yavneh St., Tel Aviv. (Cable address: Jointfund, Tel Aviv)

Am Oved (1942). 45 Shenkin St., Tel Aviv.

Hebrew publishing company established by Histadrut.

Association O.S.E. in Israel. 27 Rothschild Blvd., Tel Aviv. Sec. L. Wolf.

B’nai B’rith (District Grand Lodge No. 14 of Israel).
P. O. Box 719, Jerusalem. Grand Pres. H. Frankel; Sec. Zalman Heyn.


Supervises member yeshivot.

Central Torah Foundation—Mifal Hatorah.
P. O. Box 7002, Jerusalem.

Mems. Isaac Herzog, H. P. Frank. Maintains evening courses along Orthodox lines in and for the kibbutzim.

Central Universal Yeshiva of Jerusalem (1902).
P. O. Box 5010, Jerusalem. Principals N. Raanan-Kook, D. Cohen, A. Shapiro.

Chief Rabbinate of the Holy Land.
P. O. Box 179, Jerusalem. Chief Rabbis Isaac Herzog (Ashkenazic), Ben-Zion Meir Hai Uziel (Sephardic); Sec. S. A. Weber. Supreme religious authority in Israel; has legal jurisdiction in matters of divorce, alimony, succession, and marriage.

P. O. Box 26, Rehovot. Principal Chaim Weizmann; Mng. Gov. B. M. Bloch; Sec. E. D. Bergmann. Institute for research in chemistry.

Federation of Collective Settlements—Hever Harvutzot. 18 Brenner St., Tel Aviv. Council of smaller collective settlements.


Hadassah Council.
P. O. Box 1607, Jerusalem.

Chmn. Mrs. Agron.

Hadassah Medical Organization (1918).
P. O. Box 499; Mount Scopus, Jerusalem. Dir. E. David; Asst. Dir. H. S. Halevi. Trains physicians and nurses, undergraduate and post-graduate; offers medical services; promotes health and hygiene.

Hebrew Technical Institute (Technion) (1912).
P. O. Box 910, Haifa. Principal Solomon Kaplan. Trains engineers; seeks to promote technical science.

MACCABI WORLD SPORTS ORGANIZATION (1898).

KEREN KAYEMET LE-ISRAEL, LTD.—JEWISH NA-
KEREN HAYESOD, LTD.—PALESTINE FOUNDATION (1929). P. O.
JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE (1936). 56
ISRAEL PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA 12 Frishman St., Tel Aviv.
IHUD SHIVAT ZION.
HISTADRUT.
OHEL.
AM OVED
See also
and
HISTADRUT—GENERAL FEDERATION OF JEWISH
HIAS. P. O. Box 2758, Tel Aviv. (Cable ad-
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HERZLIA SECONDARY SCHOOL (1906). Ahad
Ha-Am St., Tel Aviv. Principal H. Buga-
shov. Earliest and largest Jewish secondary
school in Palestine.

HIAS. P. O. Box 2758, Tel Aviv. (Cable ad-
dress: Hias, Tel Aviv) Dir. DavidWertheim.

HISTADRUT—GENERAL FEDERATION OF JEWISH LABOR (1920). 115 Allenby St., Tel Aviv.
Gen. Sec. Pinhas Lubianiker. Provides for all communal, economic, and cultural ac-
tivities relating to the working population of Israel. Bu-Histadrut; Davar.


--- HAPOEL SPORTS ASSOCIATION (1924).
Conducts physical training on a mass scale as well as land and aquatic sports for its
20,000 members.

--- KUPAT HOLIM—SICK FUND (1920). P. O. Box 12, Tel Aviv. Dir. Joseph Meyer. Maintains a health insurance system for Histadrut members and other workers.

--- MOATZAT HAPOALOT—WORKING WOMEN'S COUNCIL (1914). Sec. Beba Idel-
son. Maintains vocational training schools and homes for young girls and women.
Dvar Hapoelot.

HISTADRUT. See also Am Oved and Ohel.
IHUD SHIVAT ZION. 12 Frishman St., Tel Aviv. Execs. W. Lewy, Emil N. Levy. Religious national organization in the German Jewish tradition.

ISRAEL PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA (1936). 56
Allenby Rd., Tel Aviv. Dir. Paul Paray; Mgr. M. Mahler-Kalkstein.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE (1929). P. O.
Box 92, Jerusalem. Chmn. Berl Locker; Execs. B. Mintz, Kalman Kahane, A. Goldrat. Orthodox labor or-
organization; seeks to establish rule of Jewish law in all branches of national and com-
munal life. Hamevaser.

UNITED JEWISH EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION (EUROPE)—UJECO. See Great Britain.

UNITED KIBBUTZIM—HAKIBBUT HAMEUHAD (1927). 39 Montefiore St., Tel Aviv. Execs. B. Mintz, Kalman Kahane, A. Goldrat. Orthodox labor or-
organization; seeks to establish rule of Jewish law in all branches of national and com-
munal life. Hamevaser.

UNITED JEWISH EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION (EUROPE)—UJECO. See Great Britain.

UNITED KIBBUTZIM—HAKIBBUT HAMEUHAD (1923). 98 Allenby Rd., Tel Aviv. Dir.
Izhak Tobenkin. Council of 49 collective
settlements; settles members in kibbutzim; receives and assists new immigrant workers.

UNITED JEWISH EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION (EUROPE)—UJECO. See Great Britain.

UNITED KIBBUTZIM—HAKIBBUT HAMEUHAD (1927). 115 Allenby St., Tel Aviv. Execs. B. Mintz, Kalman Kahane, A. Goldrat. Orthodox labor or-
organization; seeks to establish rule of Jewish law in all branches of national and com-
munal life. Hamevaser.

UNITED YEMENITE ORGANIZATION. 1 Aliyah St., Tel Aviv. Pres. Jacob Giuska. Re-
sents the Yemenite Jews in Israel; aids
refugees from Yemen; supports a veshiva.

WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE (1947). Re-
Weisgal. Seeks to promote sciences in
Israel.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZA-
TION—WIZO (1920). 8 Beth Hashoeva Lane.
Tel Aviv. Seeks to unite Jewish women
throughout the world, except those in the
United States, in Zionist work. WIZO in
Israel.

WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION (1897). Raha-

YOUTH ALIYAH (1939). Rehavia, Jerusalem. Dir. Moshe Kol. Supervises immigration of
children and youth to Israel.

ZIONIST CENTRAL ARCHIVES (1919). P. O. Box
92, Jerusalem. Dir. George Herliitz.

MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF ISRAEL (1925). 13 Montefiore St., Tel Aviv. Pres.
A. Shenkar; Gen. Mgr. E. I. Echtman. Seeks to promote and protect Jewish indus-
try in Israel.

MIZRACHI ORGANIZATION OF ISRAEL (1918). 48
Ahad Ha-Am St., Tel Aviv. Pres. Wolf
Gold; Chmn. Exec. Com. Herman Hol-
lander. Seeks to build Israel in the spirit of
Orthodoxy.

MIZRACHI WORLD CENTRAL. Bet Meir, P. O.
Box 588, Jerusalem. Chmn. Leon Gell-
man. Supreme council of the Mizrachi world
movement; includes representatives of
Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi. Hatto-
feh.

NATIONAL KIBBUTZ OF HASHOMER HATZAIR (1927). Merhaviah, Post Office Afflula. Sec.
Meir Yaari. Directs Jewish youth into co-
operative settlements combining agriculture and industry; absorbs immigrants.

OHEL (1927). 6 Beilinson St., Tel Aviv. Mgr.
Moshe Halevi. Labor theater established by Histadrut.

ORT ISRAEL (1948). 2 Pinsker St., Tel Aviv.
Promotes handicraft and work in industry
and agriculture.

PALESTINE JEWISH COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION—PICA (1883). P. O. Box 2024, Haifa. Pres.
James A. de Rothschild (London). Prom-
otes the agricultural development of Jews in
Israel.

POALE AGUDAT ISRAEL (1922). 39 Montefiore
St., Tel Aviv. Execs. B. Mintz, Kalman
Kahane, A. Goldrat. Orthodox labor or-
organization; seeks to establish rule of Jewish law in all branches of national and com-
munal life. Hamevaser.

UNITED JEWISH EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION (EUROPE)—UJECO. See Great Britain.

UNITED KIBBUTZIM—HAKIBBUT HAMEUHAD (1923). 98 Allenby Rd., Tel Aviv. Dir.
Izhak Tobenkin. Council of 49 collective
settlements; settles members in kibbutzim; receives and assists new immigrant workers.

UNITED YEMENITE ORGANIZATION. 1 Aliyah
St., Tel Aviv. Pres. Jacob Giuska. Re-
sents the Yemenite Jews in Israel; aids
refugees from Yemen; supports a yeshiva.

WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE (1947). Re-
Weisgal. Seeks to promote sciences in
Israel.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZA-
TION—WIZO (1920). 8 Beth Hashoeva Lane.
Tel Aviv. Seeks to unite Jewish women
throughout the world, except those in the
United States, in Zionist work. WIZO in
Israel.

WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION (1897). Raha-

YOUTH ALIYAH (1939). Rehavia, Jerusalem. Dir. Moshe Kol. Supervises immigration of
children and youth to Israel.

ZIONIST CENTRAL ARCHIVES (1919). P. O. Box
92, Jerusalem. Dir. George Herliitz.
ITALY

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Piazza Umberto 57, Bari. (Cable address: Jointfund Bari.) Administrative office for southern Italy.

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Via di San Basilio 9, Rome. (Cable address: Jointfund Rome.) Central administrative office.

HIAS. Via Montenegro 2, Bari. Dir. O. Pollok.
HIAS. Via del Prato 7, Florence.
HIAS. Via Largo Zecca 10/4, Genoa. Dir. L. D. Alcalay.
HIAS. Via Unione 5, Milan. Dir. M. Herrmann.
HIAS. Viale Parioli 10, Rome. (Cable address: Italhias, Rome.) Dir. Gilbert Kahn.

O.S.E.-ITALIA. Lungotevere Sanzio 9, Rome.

UFFICIO CENTRALE ORT. Via Savoia 84, Rome.

LUXEMBOURG

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. 75, rue Mercis, Brussels, Belgium. JDC administration and emigration affairs office Neuve, Luxembourg. HIAS office.

ENTRAIDE ISRAELITE. 11, rue de la Porte for Luxembourg and Belgium.

MEXICO


CENTRO CULTURAL ISRAELITA. Cuba 81, México, D.F.
CENTRO ISRAELITA DE MONTERREY. 15 de Mayo 202 Ote., Monterrey.


COMITÉ DE DEFENSA. Independencia 72, Desp. 207, México, D.F.

COMITÉ DE EMERGENCIA PRO PALESTINA (1946). Calle de Puebla 212, México, D.F. Pres. Adolfo Fastlicht; Sec. José Silva. Representative body set up by Mexican Jewish organizations to engage in political action on behalf of, and disseminate information about, Israel.


COMUNIDAD SEFARDITA. Calle de Monterrey 359, México, D.F. Pres. José Benbassat; Sec. Ricardo Mazal. Represents Sephardic community; maintains a synagogue and Hebrew school.

DEMOCRACIAS INSURGENTES. Insurgentes 180, México, D.F. Zionist.


FEDERACIÓN JUVENIL SIONISTA. Chapultepec 300, México, D.F.


HIAS OF AMERICA. Cuba 81, Altos, México, D.F. (Cable address: Cocentis, Mexico) Dir. Jaim Lasdeiski.

HISTADRUT MIZRACHI. Amsterdam 234, México, D.F.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Calle de Puebla 212, México D.F. Dir. Adolfo Fastlicht.

LIGA POPULAR ISRAELITA DE MÉXICO. Paseo de la Reforma 503, México, D.F.

* LIGA PRO PALESTINA TRABAJADORA. Cuba 81, México, D.F. La Palabra.


ORGANIZACIÓN FEMENINA MIZRACHI. Amsterdam 234, México, D.F.

ORGANIZACIÓN "HASHOMER HATZAIR." Hamburg 138, México, D.F.

ORGANIZACIÓN MAPAM. Insurgentes 180, México, D.F.


ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTA DE MÉXICO. Apartado Postal 2700, México, D.F. Pres. Enrique Gitlin; Sec. Cemaj Portnoy.

ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTAS REVISIONISTAS DE MÉXICO. Amsterdam 229, México, D.F.

POALE SION. Insurgentes 180, México, D.F.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Calle de Puebla 212, México, D.F. Dir. Adolfo Fastlicht.

LIGA POPULAR ISRAELITA DE MEXICO. Paseo de la Reforma 503, Mexico, D.F.


FEDERACIÓN JUVENIL SIONISTA. Chapultepec 300, México, D.F.


HIAS OF AMERICA. Cuba 81, Altos, México, D.F. (Cable address: Cocentis, Mexico) Dir. Jaim Lasdeiski.

HISTADRUT MIZRACHI. Amsterdam 234, México, D.F.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Calle de Puebla 212, México D.F. Dir. Adolfo Fastlicht.

LIGA POPULAR ISRAELITA DE MÉXICO. Paseo de la Reforma 503, México, D.F.

* LIGA PRO PALESTINA TRABAJADORA. Cuba 81, México, D.F. La Palabra.


ORGANIZACIÓN FEMENINA MIZRACHI. Amsterdam 234, México, D.F.

ORGANIZACIÓN "HASHOMER HATZAIR." Hamburg 138, México, D.F.

ORGANIZACIÓN MAPAM. Insurgentes 180, México, D.F.


ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTA DE MÉXICO. Apartado Postal 2700, México, D.F. Pres. Enrique Gitlin; Sec. Cemaj Portnoy.

ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTAS REVISIONISTAS DE MÉXICO. Amsterdam 229, México, D.F.

POALE SION. Insurgentes 180, México, D.F.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Calle de Puebla 212, México, D.F. Dir. Adolfo Fastlicht.

LIGA POPULAR ISRAELITA DE MÉXICO. Paseo de la Reforma 503, México, D.F.


FEDERACIÓN JUVENIL SIONISTA. Chapultepec 300, México, D.F.


HIAS OF AMERICA. Cuba 81, Altos, México, D.F. (Cable address: Cocentis, Mexico) Dir. Jaim Lasdeiski.

HISTADRUT MIZRACHI. Amsterdam 234, México, D.F.
MOROCCO, FRENCH


CENTRE D’APPRENTISSAGE ORT ALLIANCE. 40, rue Barsac, Casablanca. ORT training center. (For administrative office, see France: ORT FRANÇAIS.)


HIAS. 61, blvd de Bordeaux, Casablanca. (Cable address: Hiasmaroc, Casablanca.) Dir. Maurice Feldman.

O.S.E.-MAROC. 13, Immeuble Tazi, Marrakech.

NETHERLANDS

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. c/o Stichting Joods Maatschappelijk Werk; Johannes Vermeerstraat 18, Amsterdam-Zuid. (Cable address: Jointfund Amsterdam.)

B’NAI B’RITH HILLEL LODGE. Amsterdam.

B’NAI B’RITH HOLLANDIA LODGE. The Hague.

HIAS. 56 D Scheweg, Rotterdam.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Johannes Vermeerstraat, 22 Amsterdam-Zuid.


ORT COMMITTEE. Nieuwe Kerkstraat 11, Amsterdam.

STICHTING ORT HOLLAND. Amstel 240, Amsterdam.

NETHERLANDS WEST INDIES


JOODSCH HULP-COMITE. CURAÇAO. (JDC cable address: Cornat, Havana, Cuba) Pres. I. J. Cardozo. HIAS and JDC affiliate.

ORT COMMITTEE. Devyterkade 24, Curacao.

ORT COMMITTEE. P. O. Box 54, San Nicolas, Aruba.

O.S.E.-COMMITTEE. San Nicolas, Aruba.


WOMEN’S COMMITTEE OF O.S.E. Hendrikplein 3, Curacao.

NEW ZEALAND

COUNCIL FOR WELLINGTON JEWRY. 6 Maire St., Lower Hutt, Wellington. Central coordinating committee for Wellington Jewry; handles emigration policy matters with the government.

O.S.E. DELEGATION. 1 Garden Sq. Gordon, Sydney, Australia.

O.S.E. SOCIETY. 111 Collins St., Melbourne, Australia.

UNITED COMMITTEE FOR RELIEF ABROAD. 304 Dilworth Bldg., Auckland. JDC affiliate; handles individual emigration cases.


WORLD ORT UNION COMMITTEE FOR AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. 443 Little Collins St., Melbourne, Australia.


NICARAGUA

COMUNIDAD ISRAELITA. Managua. (Cable address: Jointfundmex, Mexico City, Mexico) Dir. A. Gorn. JDC affiliate.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Apartado 9, Managua. Dir. Laszlo Weisz.

UNIÓN ISRAELITA. Apartado 67, Managua. HIAS affiliate.

NORWAY

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE. Waldemar Thranesgate 6, Oslo. (Cable address: Jointfund Oslo.)


PANAMA

BENEFICENCIA ISRAELITA DE PANAMÁ. Apartado 1866, Panama City. HIAS affiliate.

CENTRO ISRAELITA CULTURAL. P. O. Box 513, Calle 8 No. 8061, Colon. HIAS affiliate.

IRVING ZAPP LODGE—B’NAI B’RITH. Panama City.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. Apartado 1166, Panama City. Dir. Moises Freudmann.

ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTA DE PANAMÁ. P. O. Box 1624, Panama City.

USO CLUB “ESTHER WITKIN” (JEWISH WELFARE BOARD). P. O. Box 105, Balboa, Canal Zone. (JDC cable address: Jointfundmex, Mexico City, Mexico) Dir. Nathan Witkin. HIAS and JDC affiliate.
PARAGUAY

Comité Auxiliar del Joint en Paraguay para Socorro y Reconstrucción, Paraguay 272, Asunción. (Cable address: Coinicol, Asunción) Dir. Benjamín Socolosky.

*Unión Israelita de Beneficencia. Asunción. Central body of the Jewish community.


PERU

Asociación de Sociedades Israelitas del Perú. Apartado 2605, Lima. Pres. Max Heller; Sec. S. Levy Bchar. Represents all organizations of the community; seeks to combat anti-Semitism.


Asociación ORT PERÚ. Apartado 720, Lima.


PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Jewish Community of the Philippines, Inc. (1919), 1029 Taft Ave., Manila. (Cable address: Jewcom Manila.) Pres. Ernest E. Simke; Exec. Sec. Josef Schwarz. Seeks to promote Judaism in the Philippines, as well as the general welfare of its members; serves as JDC and HIAS offices. Information Bulletin.

POLAND


HIAS. Ul. Roosevelt 1, Lodz. Dir. B. Baumberg.

HIAS. Ul. Piusa 43, Warsaw. (Cable address: Polhias, Warsaw.) Dir. Leon Alter.


Towarzystwo Ochrony Zdrowia O.S.E.-TOZ. Ul. Sienna 60, Warsaw. Polish O.S.E. society.

Towarzystwo ORT. Narbutta 37, Warsaw.

PORTUGAL

American Joint Distribution Committee. Rua Rodrigo da Fonseca 76, Lisbon. (Cable address: Jointfund Lisbon.)

Comunidade Israelita de Lisboa. Rua do Monte Olivete 16 r/c, Lisbon. HIAS. c/o Comunidade Israelita de Lisboa; Rua do Monte Olivete 16 r/c, Lisbon. (Cable address: Tikva, Lisbon.) Dir. E. Baruel.

PUERTO RICO

Jewish Community Center. P.O. Box 1097, San Juan 5. Pres. Milton H. Farber. JDC and HIAS affiliate.

RUMANIA

American Joint Distribution Committee. 119, rue St-Dominique, Paris 7e, France. European headquarters office.

Centrul Evreesc de Protectie a Mamei si Copilului—O.S.E. Strata Stefan Mititelu 38, Bucharest. Rumanian O.S.E. society.

HIAS. Strata Gen. Eremia Grigorescu 16, Bucharest. (Cable address: Hias, Bucharest.) Dir. M. Zingher.


SINGAPORE


SPAIN

American Joint Distribution Committee. Pasco de Gracia 28, Barcelona. (Cable address: Jointfund Barcelona.) Joint JDC-HIAS office.
AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
Eduardo Dato 20, Madrid. (Cable address: Jointfund Madrid.) Joint JDC-HIAS office.

SWEDEN

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
Kindstugatan 11, Stockholm. (Cable address: Jointfund Stockholm.) JDC administrative office.

HIAS. c/o Mosaiska Församling; Malmskillnadsgatan 38, Stockholm. (Cable address: Himos, Stockholm.) Dir. W. Michaelli.


SWITZERLAND

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
Poststach 262, St. Gallen. Dir. Saly Mayer.

B’NAI B’RITH AUGUSTIN KELLER LODGE. Zurich.

B’NAI B’RITH BASEL LODGE. Basel.

HIAS. 6, rue Corretaria, Geneva. (Cable address: HiasEurope, Geneva.) Dir. G. H. Wells. HIAS European accounting office.

HIAS. c/o Verband schweizerischer juedischer fluechtlingshilfen; 10 Oldgastrasse, Zurich. (Cable address: Israv, Zurich.) Dir. Mrs. Theodora Dreyfuss.

OFFICE PALESTINIEN DE SUISSE—JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE. 1 Place de Holland, Geneva. Dir. Eron Laor.

UNION-OSE. 11, rue du Mont Blanc, Geneva.

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS (1936). 37, Quai Wilson, Geneva.

VERBAND SCHWEIZERISCHER JUEDISCHER FLUETTLINGSHILFEN. 10 Oldgastrasse, Zurich. Federation of Jewish refugee aid societies.

TANGIERS

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
c/o Comité Local d’Assistance aux Refugies; Paseo Cesarro 75, Tanger. (Cable address: Jointfund Tanger.)

COMITE LOCAL D’ASSISTANCE AUX REFUGIES. Paseo Cesarro 75, Tanger.

TRIESTE

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
P. O. Box 463; also, c/o Consulate of Portugal, 17 Via Caderna. (Cable address: Jointfund Trieste.)

TRIPOLITANIA

COMUNITA ISRAELITICA DELLA TRIPOLITANIA. Via Generale Caneva 2, Tripoli. Vice-Pres. Giuseppe Habib; Sec. Dino Iona. Provides religious and cultural education, as well as economic assistance, relief, medical care, and child care.

JOINT SECTION OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY. Via Generale Caneva 2, Tripoli. Pres. Ruben Hassan. JDC administrative and emigration office.

TUNISIA

CENTRAL RELIEF COMMITTEE. 13, rue St-Charles, Tunis. (Cable address: Paul Ghez Avocat.) Serves as JDC administrative and emigration office.


O.S.E. TUNISIENNE. 8, rue du 4e Tirailleurs, Tunis.

TURKEY

AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE.
c/o Grand Rabbinate Hahambasilik Beyoglu; Yemencici sokak 23, Istanbul. (Cable address: Grand Rabbinate Istanbul.) JDC administrative and emigration office.


HIAS. Posta Kutusu 2180; Kumbaraci 115/11, Beyoglu Istanbul. (Cable address: America, Istanbul.) Dir. H. Kossoy.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

COORDINATING BOARD OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS. See United States—Civic Defense and Political.

SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH APPEAL (1942). P. O. Box 5991; August House, 78 End St., Johannesburg. (Cable address: Buildup, Johannesburg.) Nat. Chmn. Max Spitz; Sec. G. Osrin. Seeks to establish fund for relief and rehabilitation in Israel of Jewish war victims; serves as HIAS and JDC office. Reconstruction.

SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES. (1912). Commercial House, 124 Fox St., Johannesburg. Pres. B. A. Ettinger; Gen. Sec. G. Saron. Seeks to safeguard the religious and civil rights, status, and welfare of the Jewish community; acts on behalf of the Jewish community in all matters affecting its relationship with the government and other authorities. Jewish Affairs.

SOUTH AFRICAN ORT-OZE. 10 Unity House, 100 Fox St., Johannesburg.
URUGUAY

Asociación Uruguaya ORT. Minas 1717, Montevideo.
Asociación Uruguaya O.S.E. Florida 1418, Montevideo.
Comité Auxiliar del Joint. Palacio Salvo Piso 8, Escritorio 1, Montevideo. (Cable address: Junta, Montevideo) JDC affiliate.
Comité de Protección a los Inmigrantes Israelitas en el Uruguay (1924). Minas 955, Montevideo. (Cable address: Soprotimis, Montevideo) Dir. Israel Israelson. HIAS office.
Comunidad Israelita (1916). Durazno 1118, Montevideo. Pres. Samuel Kobrin; Dir. León Halpern. Seeks to meet the religious, cultural, and social needs of the Jewish community.
Federación Sionista del Uruguay. Andes 1460, Montevideo.
Federación WIZO del Uruguay. Andes 1168, Montevideo.
*Organización Sionista del Uruguay. Durazno 1118, Montevideo.

ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTA FEMENINA MIZRAJI. Julio Herreray Obes 1170, Montevideo.
ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTA MIZRAJI. Julio Herreray Obes 1170, Montevideo.
ORGANIZACIÓN SIONISTA SEFARADÍ Dr. Teodoro Herzl. Sarandi 316, Montevideo.
Partido Hashomer Hatzair. Río Branco 1109, Montevideo.
Partido Unido Poale Zion Zeire Zion. Río Branco 1119, Montevideo.

VENEZUELA

*Asociación Israelita de Venezuela. Sur 17 No. 25, Caracas. Central organization of Jewish community.
Asociación ORT Venezuela. Torre a Madrices 17, Caracas.
*Centro Benéfico Israelita de Caracas. Plaza Candelaria a Alcabala 167, Caracas.
Centro Israelita de Caracas. Remedios a Caridad 32, Caracas.
Centro Social y Cultural Israel. Salas a Balconcito 33, Caracas.
Comité Israelita Pro Refugiados. Remedios a Caridad 32, Caracas. (Cable address: Coref, Caracas) Dir. Lázaro Zelwer. HIAS and JDC affiliate.
O.S.E. Madrices a Martínez 30, Caracas.
Organización Sionista Unida. Colón a Cruz Verde 63, Caracas.
WIZO—Women’s International Zionist Organization. Remedios a Caridad 32, Caracas.

YUGOSLAVIA

Federation of Jewish Communities. 71 Ulica Sedmog Jula, Belgrade. Serves as HIAS and JDC offices.
HIAS. 16 Palmoticeva Ulica, Zagreb.
Jewish Federations, Welfare Funds, Community Councils

This directory is one of a series compiled annually by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. It includes over 600 communities, virtually all of which are affiliated with the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, their national association for sharing of common services, interchange of experience, and joint consultation and action. This number compares with 305 communities in the 1943 directory, and reflects the development of Jewish communal organization in America.

These communities comprise at least 95 per cent of the Jewish population of the United States and about 90 per cent of the Jewish population of Canada. Listed for each community is the local central agency—federation, welfare fund, or community council—with its address and the names of the president and executive director.

The names “federation,” “welfare fund,” and “Jewish community council” are not definitive and their structures and functions vary from city to city. What is called a federation in one city, for example, may be called a community council in another. In the main these central agencies have responsibility for some or all of the following functions: (a) raising of funds for local, national, and overseas services; (b) allocation and distribution of funds for these purposes; (c) coordination and central planning of local services, such as family welfare, child care, health, recreation, community relations within the Jewish community and with the general community, Jewish education, care of the aged, and vocational guidance, eliminating duplication and filling in gaps in service; (d) in small and some intermediate cities, direct administration of local social services.

In the directory, the following symbols are used:

(*) Member agency of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
(?) Receives support from Community Chest.

ALABAMA

BESSEMER

1 Jewish Welfare Fund, P. O. Box 9, Pres. I. Sokol; Exec. Sec. J. S. Gallinger.

BIRMINGHAM

1 United Jewish Fund (incl. Ensley, Fairfield, Tarrant City) (1937); 700 N. 18 St., Pres. Alex Rittenbaum; Exec. Sec. Mrs. B. A. Roth.

DOOTHAN

1 Jewish Welfare Fund Committee (incl. surrounding communities) (1942); P. O. Box 742; Pres. Meyer Blumberg; Sec. A. L. Shack.

GADSDEN

Federated Jewish Charities (incl. Alabama City, Attalla) (1937); P. O. Box 244; Pres. Merlin Hagedorn; Sec. Hugo H. Hecht.

MOBILE

2 Federation of Jewish Charities (1914); Pres. A. C. Silverman; Sec. Nell R. Hess, 6 N. Pine St.

MONTGOMERY

1 Jewish Federation (1930); Clayton and Savre Sts., Pres. J. Marshuetz; Sec. Hannah J. Simon.

SELMA

1 Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. surrounding communities) (1936); P. O. Box 36; Chmn. Seymour Cohen; Sec. Seymour Palmer.

TRI-CITIES

3 Jewish Federated Charities (incl. Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia) (1933); Co-Chmn. Philip Olim, Louis Rosenbaum; Sec. Charles Mantinband, 206 N. Wood Ave.
FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

TUSCALOOSA

1 Federated Jewish Charities (1939); Pres. Morris Sokol; Sec. Mrs. S. Wiesel, 1610 Alaca Pl.

ARIZONA

PHOENIX

1 Jewish Community Council (incl. 33 surrounding communities) (1940); 915 N. 4 St.; Pres. Nat G. Silverman; Exec. Dir. Hirsch Kaplan.

TUCSON

1 Jewish Community Council (1942); 33 W. Congress St., Pres. Raphael Brandes; Exec. Dir. Benjamin Brook.

ARKANSAS

FORT SMITH

Jewish Charity Fund (1921); 20 S. 6 St., Pres. Louis Cohen.

HELENA

Federated Jewish Charities (incl. Holly Grove, Marvell) (1934); P. O. Box 162; Sec., David L. Meyers.

LITTLE ROCK


PINE BLUFF

Jewish Federated Charities (1941); Pres. Maurice Cohen; Sec. Rabbi M. Clark, Temple Anshe Emeth, 121 S. Popular St.

CALIFORNIA

BAKERSFIELD

1 United Jewish Welfare Fund of Kern County (incl. Arvin, Delano, Shafter, Taft, Wasco) (1937); P. O. Box 190, Pres. Morris B. Chain; Exec. Sec. Robert B. Strauss.

BAY CITIES

1 Jewish Community Council of the Bay Cities (1946); 2655 Main St., Ocean Park; Pres. George Beckerman; Exec. Dir. William Riback.

FRESNO

Jewish Welfare Federation, sponsors
1 United Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Fresno, Kings, Madera and Tulare Counties) 2356 Calaveras St., Pres. H. M. Ginsburg; Exec. Sec. David L. Greenberg, P. O. Box 1328.

LONG BEACH

Jewish Community Council (1945); sponsors

LOS ANGELES

1, 2 Federation of Jewish Welfare Organizations (1911); 610 Temple St. Pres. Leonard Chudacoff; Exec. Dir. Martin Ruderman.

1 Jewish Community Council (1934); sponsors United Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Los Angeles and vicinity) 590 N. Vermont Ave., Pres. Isaac Pacht; Exec. Sec. Leo Gallin.

MODESTO

Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Newman, Oakdale, Turlock) (1942); P. O. Box 825; Chmn. Isadore Kurland; Sec. M. Kirsch.

OAKLAND


ONTARIO

Ontario-Pomona United Jewish Appeal (incl. Uppland) (1939); 1960 S. Euclid Ave., Pres. N. Rightman; Sec. I. Langsner.

PETALUMA

United Jewish Appeal (incl. Healdsburg, Santa Rosa and Sonoma County) (1939); Pres. J. Girshenson; Sec. S. Jaffe.

RIVERSIDE

1, 2 Jewish Community Fund (1936); 3559–12 St.; Sec. Irving Olsan, 5927 Chapman Pl.

SACRAMENTO


SAN BERNARDINO


SAN DIEGO

1 United Jewish Fund (incl. San Diego County) (1935); 333 Park Plaza, Rm. 301; Pres. Eli Levinson; Exec. Dir. Albert Hutler.

SAN FRANCISCO

1, 2 Federation of Jewish Charities (1910); 1600 Scott St., Pres. Marcel Hirsch; Exec. Dir. Hyman Kaplan.

1 Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Marin and San Mateo Counties) (1925); Balfour Bldg., 351 California St., Pres. Lloyd Dinkelspiel; Exec. Dir. Sanford Treguboff.

SAN JOSE

1, 2 Jewish Federation and Community Council (incl. Santa Clara County) (1936); Pres. Kenneth Gordon; Sec. Mrs. Herbert Schwabbe, 1269 Magnolia Ave.

SANTA ANA

1 United Welfare Fund of Orange County (1939); 110 E. 4 St. Pres. Ivie Stein; Sec. Tam Hurwitz.

STOCKTON

1 Jewish Community Council (incl. Lodi, Tracy, Sonora) (1956); 210 W. Willow, Pres. Carl Sugar; Exec. Dir. Leonard Kri vonos.
VALLEJO  
Jewish Welfare Fund, Inc. (1938); P. O. Box 536, Pres. M. Zlot; Sec. Seymour Marcuse.

VENTURA  
Ventura County Jewish Council (incl. Oxnard, Santa Paula) (1939); 2500 Channel Dr., Camarillo; Pres. Ronald Banks; Financial Sec. Mrs. Irene Rich.

COLORADO

DENVER  
Allied Jewish Community Council (1936); sponsors Allied Jewish Council Campaign, 435 Empire Bldg., Pres. David B. Cook; Exec. Dir. Nathan Rosenberg.

CONNECTICUT

ANSONIA  
Jewish Community Center of Associated Towns (incl. Derby, Seymour, Shelton) Factory St., Pres. Herman Silberberg, P. O. Box 456.

BRIDGEPORT  
Jewish Community Council (1946); sponsors United Jewish Campaign, 360 State St., Pres. Jacob Margolin; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Clara M. Stern.

BRISTOL  
Jewish Community Center, 120 Laurel St., Pres. Irving Joseph.

DANBURY  
Jewish Federation (1945); 30 West St., Pres. Samuel Feinson; Sec. Leo Allen.

HARTFORD  
Jewish Federation (1945); sponsors United Jewish Appeal (incl. Ellington) 983 Main St., Pres. Abraham B. Bordon; Exec. Dir. Bernard L. Gottlieb.

MERIDEN  
Jewish Welfare Fund (1944); 38 Cedar St., Pres. Frederick S. Harris; Sec. Hyman Cohen.

NEW BRITAIN  
New Britain Jewish Federation (1936); 81 W. Main St., Pres. Samuel E. Mag; Exec. Dir. David Zeff.

NEW HAVEN  
Jewish Community Council (incl. West Haven) (1927); sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund (1939); 70 College St., Pres. Henry Caleckman; Exec. Dir. Norman B. Dockman; Pres. Samuel Botwinik, Jewish Welfare Fund.

NEW LONDON  
Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. surrounding communities) (1938); 60 Blackhall St., Pres. Samuel Zabarsky; Exec. Sec. Max M. Sokol.

NORWALK  
Jewish Community Council (1945); 17 West Ave., South Norwalk; Sec. Herbert Edison.

OLD SAYBROOK  
Jewish Community Center of Lower Middlesex County; Pres. Aaron Greenberg.

STAMFORD  

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL, 132 Prospect St., Chmn. Barney Malloy; Sec. Mrs. Ida Kahn.

WATERBURY  
Jewish Federated Appeal (1938); 111 Grand St.; Pres. Milton Engelman; Exec. Dir. Oscar A. Mintzer.

Jewish Community Council, 111 Grand St., Pres. Perry Graicerstein; Exec. Dir. Oscar A. Mintzer.

DELAWARE

WILMINGTON  
Jewish Federation of Delaware (Statewide) (1935); 100 E. 7 St., Pres. Milton Kutz; Exec. Dir. Ben V. Codor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON  
Jewish Community Council (1939); 1420 New York Ave., N. W., Pres. Hyman Goldman; Exec. Dir. Isaac Franck.

United Jewish Appeal (1935); 1529—16 St., N. W., Co-Chmn. Isadore Breslau, Milton King; Dir. Louis E. Spiegler.

FLORIDA

FORT LAUDERDALE  
Broward County United Jewish Appeal (1941); Pres. Charles Reiss; Sec. S. H. Baron, c/o Temple Emanu-El.

HOLLYWOOD  
Jewish Welfare Fund; Chmn. A. J. Diamond; Sec. S. J. Beckerman.

JACKSONVILLE  
Jewish Community Council (incl. Fernandina, Jacksonville Beach, Starke) (1935); Heggie Bldg., 212½ W. Forsyth St., Pres. Leonard Moss; Exec. Dir. Benjamin Stark.

MIAMI  

ORLANDO  
Central Florida Jewish Community Council (1949); Pres. Morton Levy, 6 Lucerne Circle S.
FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

IDAHO

BOISE
1 Southern Idaho Jewish Welfare Fund (1947); Pres. Leo J. Falk, c/o Falk Mercantile Co.

ILLINOIS

AURORA

CHAMPAIGN
2 Champaign-Urbana Federated Jewish Charities (1934); 510 W. Delaware, Urbana, Ill., Pres. Stephen N. Tager; Sec. Mrs. Charles Loeb.

CHICAGO
1, 2 Jewish Federation (1900); 231 S. Wells St., Pres. Joseph L. Block; Exec. Dir. Samuel A. Goldsmith.
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Fund (1936); 128 N. Wells St., Pres. A. Richard Frank; Exec. Dir. Samuel A. Goldsmith.

DECatur
1 Jewish Federation, 142 N. Merchant St., Sec. Jack Melnick.

ELGIN
1 Jewish Welfare Chest (incl. St. Charles) (1938); 57 Douglas Ave.; Chmn. Charles Singer; Sec. M. Petrick, 137 Tennyson Ct.

JOLIET
2 Jewish Welfare Chest (incl. Coal City, Dwight, Lockport, Morris, Wilmington) (1938); 228 E. Clinton St., Pres. Morse P. Hershfield; Sec. M. M. Hershman.

PEORIA

QUINCY
United Jewish Appeal, Co-Chmn. L. Kuppin, Irving Rosen.

ROCK ISLAND

ROCKFORD
1 Jewish Community Board (1937); 206 S. Main, Pres. Ben Fink.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

SPRINGFIELD
1 Jewish Federation (incl. Ashland, Athens, Atlanta, Jacksonville, Lincoln, Pana, Petersburg, Pittsfield, Shelbyville, Taylorville, Winchester) (1941); 222½ S. 5 St., Pres. Eric Nadel; Exec. Dir. Dorothy Wolfson.

PENSACOLA
1 Federated Jewish Charities (1942); P. O. Box 602, Chmn. Sam Rosenbloom; Sec. Jerome L. Holtzman.

ST. AUGUSTINE
Federated Jewish Charities (1938); 165 Cordova St., Pres. L. Bernstein; Sec. H. H. Eff.

ST. PETERSBURG
United Jewish Appeal (1938); 872 Central Ave., Chmn. I. E. Bermant; Sec. Harry Magil.

TALLAHASSEE
Federation of Jewish Charities (1943); P. O. Box 346; Chmn. Sam Mendelson.

TAMPA

WEST PALM BEACH
Federated Jewish Charities of Palm Beach County (1938); 506 Malverne Rd., Chmn. Jack Kapner; Exec. Sec. Sam A. Schutzer.

GEORGIA

ATLANTA
1, 2 Federation for Jewish Social Service (incl. DeKalb and Fulton Counties) (1905); 614 Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Pres. Barney Medintz; Exec. Dir. Edward M. Kahn.

AUGUSTA
1 Federation of Jewish Charities (1943); 1001 Southern Finance Bldg., Pres Leo Blum; Exec. Sec. Nathan Jolles.

COLUMBUS
1 Jewish Welfare Federation (1941); P. O. Box 1583, Pres. Albert Wise; Sec. Lawrence Rosenrauch.

MACON
1 Federation of Jewish Charities (1942); P. O. Box 237, Pres. Gus Kaufman; Sec. Morris Michael, Jr.

SAVANNAH
1 United Jewish Appeal and Federation (1934); 328 Barnard St.; Pres. Albert Tenenbaum; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

VALDOSTA
1 Jewish Joint Communities Charity Fund of the Georgia-Florida Border Region (incl. Adel, Homerville, Moultrie, Nashville, Quitman, Tipton, Ga.; Jasper, Madison, Fla.) 111 Wells St., Chmn. Abe Golivesky; Sec. Myer Rhode.
IOWA

CEDAR RAPIDS
1 Associated Jewish Charities (1941); 215—2 St., S. E., Pres. Herbert Levin; Sec. H. E. Schaalman.

COUNCIL BLUFFS
1 Associated Jewish Federation (incl. Southwest Iowa) (1941); Pres. Louis Bernstein; Sec. Harry L. Cherniss.

DAVENPORT
1 Jewish Charities (1921); 333 Union Bank Bldg., Pres. Frank A. Alter; Exec. Sec. Betty Klein.

DES MOINES
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1914); 615 Empire Bldg., Pres. Ellis I. Levitt; Exec. Dir. Sidney Speiglman.

MASON CITY
Jewish Council of Mason City (1937); 620 N. Adams St., Pres. N. Levinson; Sec. H. M. Richer.

SIoux CITY
1 Jewish Federation (1943); P. O. Box 1468, Pres. E. N. Grueskin; Exec. Dir. Ralph Segalman.

WATERLOO
1 Federated Charities (1941); 729 Scamore St., Pres. David Bernstein; Sec. Herman Unger.

KANSAS

TOPEKA
United Jewish Appeal (incl. Emporia, Lawrence, St. Marys) (1939); 822 Topeka Blvd., Pres. Harry Endlich; Sec. Sam Cohen.

WICHITA

KENTUCKY

ASHLAND
Federated Jewish Charities (incl. Ironton, Ohio) (1937); P. O. Box 184, Co-Chmn. Saul Kaplan, Jack Polan, I. L. Schradski; Treas. S. Kaplan.

LEXINGTON
Federated Jewish Charities (1917); 219 Dudley Rd., Pres. I. Allen Paritz.

LOUISVILLE

LOUISIANA

ALEXANDRIA
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Central Louisiana (1938); 215 Johnstown St., Pres. Barnet Bregner; Exec. Dir. Louis Altschuler.

IOWA

CEDAR RAPIDS
1 Associated Jewish Charities (1941); 215—2 St., S. E., Pres. Herbert Levin; Sec. H. E. Schaalman.
Baton Rouge Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. surrounding territory) (1937); 234 Main St., Chmn. A. M. Weiss.

Monroe United Jewish Charities of Northeast Louisiana (1938); P. O. Box 1211; Pres. Percy Sandman; Sec. David M. Kaplan.

New Orleans 2 Jewish Federation (1913); 211 Camp St., Pres. Fred Kullman; Exec. Dir. David Fichman.

Jewish Welfare Fund (1933); 211 Camp St., Pres. Emil W. Leipziger; Exec. Sec. David Fichman.

Shreveport Jewish Federation (1941); 802 Cotton St., Pres. Isadore Lieber; Exec. Sec. Louis Altschuler.

Maine Maine Jewish Council (1938); 14 Lisbon St., Lewiston, Pres. Philip S. Lown.


Lewiston Lewiston-Auburn Jewish Federation (1942); Chmn. Philip W. Lown; Sec. William Cohen, P. O. Box 37, Auburn, Me.


Waterville Jewish Federation (1947); Pres. George Sterns; Sec. Mrs. Myra Sterns.

Maryland

Baltimore Associate Jewish Charities (1920); 319 W. Monument St., Pres. J. Benjamin Katzner; Exec. Dir. Harry Greenstein.

Jewish Welfare Fund (1941); 319 W. Monument St., Pres. Henry S. Frank; Exec. Dir. Harry Greenstein.

Cumberland Jewish Welfare Fund of Western Maryland (incl. Frostburg, Md. and Keyser, W. Va.) (1939); 15 S. Liberty St., Pres. Robert Kaplon; Sec. Robert Gerson.

Massachusetts


Boston 2 Associated Jewish Philanthropies (sponsors jointly with the Combined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston, campaign for the support of local and non-local activities for Boston and surrounding communities) (1896); 72 Franklin St., Pres. Milton Kahn; Exec. Dir. Sidney S. Cohen.


Canton United Jewish Appeal (incl. in Combined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston) Chmn. Isadore Ulman, 31 Rockland St.


Everett United Jewish Appeal (incl. in Combined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston) Chmn. Harold Karp, 6 Beacon St., Boston.

Fall River Jewish Community Council (1938); sponsors 2 United Jewish Appeal, 301 Granite Block, Pres. Alfred L. Sherwin; Sec. David L. Gourse; Pres. United Jewish Appeal, David Schneierson.

Fitchburg 2 Jewish Federation of Fitchburg (1939); 66 Day St.; Pres. A. I. Rome; Sec. Miss Slaomoth Krevoruck.

Holyoke United Jewish Appeal (incl. Easthampton) (1938); 378 Maple St., Pres. Harry Blum; Sec. David Kronetsky.

Hull United Jewish Appeal (incl. in Combined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston) Pres. Maxwell Sherman, 13 Main St.


Leominster Jewish Community Council (1939); Pres. Jacob Margolin; Sec. Mrs. M. Kaufman, 275 Grove Ave., Fitchburg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Jewish Community Chest (1941); 105 Princeton St., Treas. Calvin Robinson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Combined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston (1938); 388 County St., Pres. Jacob Minkin; Exec. Sec. Louis Bershen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>United Jewish Appeal (1939); Chmn. Samuel B. August; Sec. Herman Wolfe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>United Jewish Appeal, Chmn. David Kirschen; Sec. Samuel Snider.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>Jewish Welfare Federation (1949); 388 County St., Pres. Jacob Minkin; Exec. Sec. Louis Bershen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**American Jewish Year Book**
FLINT
1. 2 Jewish Community Council (1936); Still Bldg., Pres. B. Morris Pelavin; Exec. Dir. Philip Skorneck.

GRAND RAPIDS
1. 2 Jewish Community Fund (1940); 259 Front St., Pres. Hyman J. Bylan; Sec. Abe Drasin.

JACKSON
Jewish Federation (1937); Sec. Sam Meisel, 125 E. Michigan Ave.

KALAMAZOO
1 Jewish Welfare Council (1949); 610 Kalamazoo National Bldg.; Pres. Andrew H. Levene; Sec. David Davidoff.

LANSING
1 Federated Jewish Charities (1939); Chmn. Marston Busch; Sec. Mrs. W. L. Karpf, 233 S. Washington Ave.

MUSKEGON
1 United Jewish Charities of Greater Muskegon (1941); P. O. Box 55; Chmn. Harry S. Berman; Sec. Martin L. Friedenberg.

PONTIAC
1 Federated Jewish Charities (1936); 305 National Bldg., Pres. Irving Steinman; Sec. Harry Arnoff.

SAGINAW
1 Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. surrounding communities) (1939); 102 S. Washington St., Pres. Robert Lurie; Sec. Mel Raphan.

MINNESOTA

DULUTH
1 Jewish Federation and Community Council (1937); 403 Bradley Bldg., Pres. Nathan Kremen; Acting Exec. Dir. Mrs. Harry Davis.

HIBBING
Federation of Jewish Charities, Pres. M. Sapero; Sec. S. T. Cohan.

MINNEAPOLIS
1 Federation for Jewish Service (1930); 633 Andrus Bldg., Pres. Louis R. Weiss; Exec. Sec. Charles I. Cooper.

ST. PAUL

VIRGINIA
Federation for Jewish Service (1939); P. O. Box 965, Pres. Lewis Deutsch; Sec. Monroe Shanedling.

MISSISSIPPI

CLEVELAND
Consolidated Joint Drive (incl. all towns in Bolivar and eastern part of Sunflower counties) (1936); Chmn. Moses Hyman, 706 5 Ave.

HATTIESBURG
Jewish Welfare Fund (1937); Pres. Max M. Mabel; Sec. Simon London.

JACKSON
Jewish Welfare Fund, Pres. Sam Millstein; Sec. Meyer Lovitt, Beth Israel Congregation.

NATCHEZ
United Jewish Appeal (incl. surrounding communities in Louisiana and Mississippi) (1938); Commerce St., Pres. Paul Steinberg; Sec. Abe Millstein.

VICKSBURG
1 Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. Anguilla and Cary) (1937); 1209 Cherry St., Pres. Sam L. Switzer; Exec. Sec. Samuel R. Shillman.

MISSOURI

JOPLIN
1 Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. surrounding communities) (1938); P. O. Box 167; Pres. Samuel Miller; Sec. Dexter Brown.

KANSAS CITY
1, 2 Jewish Federation and Council of Greater Kansas City (incl. Independence, Mo., Kansas City, Kan.) (1933); 20 West 9 St. Bldg.; Pres. E. J. Trainig; Exec. Dir. Abe Sudran.

ST. JOSEPH
Federated Jewish Charities (1916); Pres. Basil Kaufman; Exec. Sec. Mrs. S. L. Goldman, 1202 S. 23 St.

ST. LOUIS
1, 2 Jewish Federation (incl. St. Louis County) (1900); sponsors 1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1934); 613 Locust St., Pres. Ben L. Shifrin; Exec. Dir. Herman Kaplow.

SEDALIA

MONTANA

BUTTE
Jewish Welfare Chest (incl. Anaconda) (1939); Chmn. Earl N. Genzberger; Sec. Phil Judd, 83 E. Park St.

HELENA
Jewish Community Chest (1938); 361 N. Main St., Co-Chmn. Norman Winestine, George Grossberg.

NEBRASKA

LINCOLN
1 Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. Beatrice) (1931); 1116 South 15 St.; Pres. A. Q. Schimmel; Dir. Louis B. Finkelstein.
OMAHA
1. 2 Federation for Jewish Service (1903); sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund (1930); 181 N. 20 St., Pres. Joe M. Rice; Exec. Dir. Paul Veret.

NEVADA
RENO
United Jewish Appeal (incl. surrounding communities) (1936); P. O. Box 2402, Chmn. Bert Goldwater; Sec. A. H. Melner.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
MANCHESTER
New Hampshire Jewish Committee; State Chmn. Abraham Machinist, Hotel Carpenter, Manchester.

NEW JERSEY
ATLANTIC CITY
1, 2 Federation of Jewish Charities (1925); 1516 Atlantic Ave., Pres. Samuel Backer; Exec. Dir. Irving Spivack.

BAYONNE
1. Jewish Community Council (1938); sponsors United Jewish Campaign, 21 Lincoln Parkway, Pres. Sam Belinkoff; Exec. Dir. Max Kleinbaum.

CAMDEN
1. Jewish Federation of Camden County (incl. all of Camden Community) (1936); sponsors Allied Jewish Appeal, 112 N. 7th St., Pres. Moses Lavinsky; Exec. Dir. Bernard Dubin.

ELIZABETH
1. Jewish Council (1940); sponsors United Jewish Appeal, 1034 E. Jersey St., Pres. R. E. Lieben; Sec. Harry Lebau.

ENGLEWOOD

HACKENSACK

JERSEY CITY
1. United Jewish Appeal (1939); 604 Bergen Ave., Chmn. Emanuel Weitz; Exec. Sec. Samuel Shair.

LONG BRANCH
United Jewish Appeal, Second and North Bath Aves., Co-Chmn. Leo Levin, Leopold Hechtor; Campaign Dir. S. Edwin Kamy.

NEW BRUNSWICK

NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE
1. Federation of Jewish Charities (Albuquerque and vicinity) (1938); P. O. Box 564, Pres. Arthur Ravel; Exec. Sec. Clarence Hertz.

NEW YORK
ALBANY
Jewish Community Council (1938); 111 Washington Ave., Pres. Harry Marks; Exec. Dir. Sydney Abzug.
FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

2  
JEWISH WELFARE FUND (incl. Rensselaer)  
78 State St., Chmn. E. A. Koblenz; Exec. Dir. Sydney Abzug.

BEACON  
UNITED JEWISH APPEAL, Chmn. Israel Le Wittes.

BINGHAMTON  
1  JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (incl. Endicott) (1937); sponsors UNITED JEWISH CAMPAIGN, 155 Front St., Pres. A. M. Pierson; Exec. Dir. Isidore Friedland, Chmn. Alec Rosefsky, United Jewish Campaign.

BUFFALO  
1  UNITED JEWISH FEDERATION OF BUFFALO, INC. (1903); 70 West Chippewa St., Pres. Howard T. Saperston; Exec. Dir. Arthur S. Rosichan.

ELMIRA  
1  JEWISH WELFARE FUND, Federation Bldg., Chmn. LeRoy Stein; Exec. Dir. Alex Rosen.

GLENS FALLS  
UNITED JEWISH APPEAL, Chmn. Charles Carlen.

GLOVERSVILLE  
JEWISH COMMUNITY FUND (incl. Johnstown), 28 E. Fulton St., Chmn. Daniel H. Higier; Sec. Emanuel Schenk.

HUDSON  
1  JEWISH WELFARE FUND, 715 Warren St., Pres. Adolph Lorch; Sec. Joel Epstein.

KINGSTON  
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, Pres. Raphael Klein.

MIDDLETOWN  
1  UNITED JEWISH APPEAL (incl. Florida, Goshen and Warwick) (1937); 2 North St., Pres. Charles Geisenheimer.

MONTICELLO  
UNITED JEWISH APPEAL (1939); 186 Broadway, Chmn. J. M. Rosenthal, Sec. Bernard Weiss.

MOUNT VERNON  
UNITED JEWISH APPEAL (incl. in New York City, N. Y.)

NEW YORK CITY  
1  FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES (1917); 71 W. 47 St., Pres. Ralph E. Samuel; Exec. V. P. Maurice B. Hexter, Joseph Willen.
2  UNITED JEWISH APPEAL OF GREATER NEW YORK (incl. New York City and metropolitan areas) (1939); 250 W. 57 St., Pres. Monroe Goldwater; Exec. V. P. Henry C. Bernstein, Samuel Blitz.
3  BROOKLYN JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, 16 Court St., Brooklyn; Pres. Maximilian Moss; Exec. Dir. Arthur Rosenbaum.

NEWBURGH  
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1938); sponsors 1  JEWISH CHARITIES (1925); 38 Water St., Pres. Louis Shatz; Exec. Sec. Oscar Littlefield; Pres. Morris Lascher, United Jewish Charities.

NIAGARA FALLS  
1  JEWISH FEDERATION (1935); 685 Chilton Ave., Pres. Franklin C. Wisbaum; Exec. Sec. Mrs. J. H. Chinkers.

PORT CHESTER  
1  JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1941); sponsors JEWISH WELFARE FUND, 258 Willett Ave., Pres. Joseph Miller; Exec. Dir. Walter Zand.

POUGHKEEPSIE  
1  JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1941); 54 N. Hamilton St., Pres. Charles D. Rosenberg; Exec. Dir. Samuel Kurzon.

ROCHESTER  
1  UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1937); 129 East Ave., Pres. Philip M. Liebshutz; Exec. Dir. Elmer Louis.

SARANAC LAKE  
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER, 13 Church St., Pres. Morris Dworski.

SCHENECTADY  
1  JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (incl. surrounding communities) (1938); sponsors SCHENECTADY UJA AND FEDERATED WELFARE FUND, 300 Germania Ave., Pres. Walter S. Gross; Exec. Sec. Samuel Weingarten.

SYRACUSE  
1  JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION (1918); sponsors JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1933); 201 E. Jefferson St., Pres. Bernard G. Rudolph; Exec. Dir. Milton Fromer.

TROY  
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1935); 87 First St., Exec. Sec. Fred A. Glass.
1  JEWISH WELFARE FUND (incl. Green Island, Mechanicville, Waterford, Watervliet) (1936); 87 First St., Pres. David Lipsky; Exec. Sec. Fred A. Glass.

TUCKAHOE  

UTICA  
1  JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1933); sponsors UNITED JEWISH APPEAL; 110 Foster Bldg., 131 Genesee St., Pres. Martin Abo love; Exec. Dir. David Goldenberg, Chmn. Barney Abe love, United Jewish Appeal.

WATERTOWN  
JEWISH FEDERATION OF CHARITIES (1930); 142 Court St., Chmn. Isadore Herr; Sec. Edward H. Lebovsky.
WHITE PLAINS
Jewish Community Council (incl. Scarsdale) (1927); Pres. Harold M. Miller; Sec. Mrs. Leonard G. Rhodes, 85 Main St.

YONKERS
Jewish Federation (1936); 122 S. Broadway, Pres. Louis Grand; Exec. Dir. Ben A. Siegal.

NORTH CAROLINA
ASHEVILLE
Federated Jewish Charities (1935); Pres. L. H. Feldman; Exec. Sec. Mrs. R. Gumpert, 5 West Avon Parkway.

CHARLOTTE
1 Federation of Jewish Charities (1940); P. O. Box 2612, Pres. Morris Speizman; Sec. I. A. Madalia.

DURHAM
Federation of Jewish Charities, Pres. E. J. Evans; Sec. Mrs. George Lewin, 1705 G. St.

GASTONIA
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1944); c/o Temple Emanuel, 520 South St., Pres. Robert Gunney.

GREENSBORO

HIGH POINT
Jewish Federated Charities (1945); Pres. Samuel Shavitz; Sec. Stanley Taylor.

RALEIGH
Federated Jewish Charities (1936); Sponsors United Jewish Appeal; Chmn. Daniel Satisky; Sec. Mrs. Harry Shor, 229 S. Wilmington St.

WINSTON-SALEM
1 Jewish Community Council (1937); 219½ W. 5 St., Pres. William P. Robin; Exec. Sec. Ethel Levin.

NORTH DAKOTA
FARGO
1 Fargo Jewish Federation (incl. Jamestown, Moorhead, Valley City, Wahpeton) (1939); Pres. Jack Levitz; Sec. M. H. Aved, 55½ Broadway.

OHIO
AKRON
Jewish Community Council (incl. Barberton) (1939); 318 Delaware Bldg., 139 S. Main St., Pres. H. B. Harris; Sec. Nathan Pinsky.
1, 2 Jewish Social Service Federation (1914); 318 Delaware Bldg., 139 S. Main St., Pres. Nathan Koplin; Exec. Sec. Nathan Pinsky.
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Barberton, Cuyahoga Falls) (1935); 318 Delaware Bldg., 219½ S. Main St., Pres. Sidney L. Albert; Sec. Nathan Pinsky.

BELLAIRE

CANTON

CINCINNATI
Jewish Community Council (1929); 1430 Central Parkway; Pres. James G. Heller; Sec. Maurice J. Sievers.
1 Jewish Welfare Fund, 1430 Central Parkway; Pres. Sol Luckman; Exec. Dir. Maurice J. Sievers.
1, 2 United Jewish Social Agencies (1896); 1430 Central Parkway; Pres. Jeffrey L. Lazarus; Exec. Dir. Maurice J. Sievers.

CLEVELAND

COLUMBUS
Jewish Community Council (1940); 555 E. Rich St., Pres. Fred Yenkin; Sec. Allen Tarshish.
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. adjacent counties) (1908); 555 E. Rich St., Pres. A. I. Yenkin; Exec. Sec. Rose Sugarman.
1 United Jewish Fund (1925); 150 E. Broad St., Pres. Robert W. Schiff; Sec. Leah Rosenfeld.

DAYTON

EAST LIVERPOOL
Jewish Federation (incl. Wellsville) (1940); 130 W. 5 St., Pres. J. W. Schoolnic; Sec. Ben Berman.

LIMA
1 Allied Jewish Appeal (1935); 408 Dominion Bldg., Pres. Ben B. Cogen; Exec. Sec. Albert L. Negin.

LORAIN
Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); Cleveland Trust Bldg., Pres. Edward J. Gould; Sec. Jacob Levin.

MASILLON
Jewish Welfare Fund, Pres. Max Kanner, 32 Lincoln Way N.
FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

PORTSMOUTH

SALEM
Jewish Federation, Pres. N. I. Walken; Sec. J. Bloomberg, 420 E. State St.

SPRINGFIELD
United Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Bellefontaine, Urbana, Xenia, Yellow Springs) (1941); Sec. Mrs. Fred R. Leventhal, 1910 East High St.

STEUBENVILLE

TOLEDO
Jewish Community Council (1936); sponsors United Jewish Fund, Madison Bldg., Rm. 2, Pres. Jules Lippman; Exec. Sec. Julian Stone.

YOUNGSTOWN
1 Jewish Federation (incl. Niles) (1938); 665 Union Bank Bldg., Pres. Dr. H. H. Bender; Sec. Robert Heller.

OKLAHOMA
ARDMORE
1 Jewish Federation (1934); Pres. Louis Fischl, Gorman Bldg.

OKLAHOMA CITY
1 Jewish Community Council (1941); 312 Commerce Exchange Bldg., Pres. Lester Shoshone; Exec. Dir. Julius Graber.

TULSA
1 Tulsa Jewish Community Council (1938); sponsors United Jewish Campaign, P. O. Box 396; Pres. Benedict Lubell; Exec. Dir. Emil Salomon.

OREGON
PORTLAND

PENNSYLVANIA

ALLENTOWN
1 Jewish Federation of Allentown, 6 and Chew Sts., Pres. Moritz M. Gottlieb; Sec. George Feldman.

ALTOONA
1, 2 Federation of Jewish Philanthropies (1920); 3004 Union Ave.; Pres. Frank M. Titelman; Exec. Dir. Alexander J. Stein.

BUTLER
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Butler County—Chicora, Evans City, Mars) (1938); 410 N. McKean St., Chmn. M. A. Berman; Sec. Maury Horwitz.

CANONSBURG
Jewish Charities (1934); 45 E. Pike St., Pres. B. Cantor; Sec. Albert Fickman.

CHESTER
Jewish Community Council (1939); sponsors United Jewish Appeal, 8 and Welsh Sts., Chmn. M. J. Freed; Dir. Louis Grossman.

COATESVILLE
Jewish Federation, 115 Oak St., Pres. Mark Sugarman; Sec. Abe Margolis.

EASTON
1 Jewish Community Council (1939); sponsors United Jewish Appeal, 860 Ferry St., Pres. Meyer Feinberg; Sec. Jack Sher.

ERIE
1 Jewish Community Welfare Council (1936); 133 W. 7 St., Pres. Mack Schoenberg; Exec. Dir. Herman Roth.

HARRISBURG
1 United Jewish Community (incl. Carlisle, Middletown, Steelton) (1933); 1110 N. 3 St., Pres. Lewis M. Aronson.

HOMESTEAD
Homestead District Aid Committee (1939); Chmn. Samuel H. Gordon; Sec. Sam Grossman, 526—9 Ave., Munhall, Pa.

JOHNSTOWN

LANCASTER
1 Organized Jewish Charities (incl. Lancaster County excepting Ephrata) (1928); 205 Church St., Pres. Lewis Siegel; Exec. Dir. Sigmund Taft.

LEWISTOWN
Jewish Community Council; sponsors United Jewish Appeal of Lewistown, Pa., c/o Ohev Sholom Synagogue, 20 E. 3 St.,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Allied Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1511 Walnut St., Pres. Samuel Daroff; Exec. Dir. Ephraim Gomberg</td>
<td>Federation of Jewish Charities (1901); 1511 Walnut St., Pres. Elias Wolf; Exec. V.P. Kurt Peiser; Exec. Dir. Frances Harrison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Shenango Valley Jewish Federation</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Pres. Oscar B. Rosenbaum; Sec. Nathan Routman, 8 W. State St.</td>
<td>Jewish Community Council (1935); sponsors United Jewish Campaign, 134 N. 5 St., Pres. Larry M. Wurman; Exec. Dir. Harry Sack.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>249 Arch St., Pres. Leo Friedman; Sec. A. H. Israeliman.</td>
<td>Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. 19 communities in Middle Tennessee) 3324 West Broadway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>Wyoming Valley Jewish Committee</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>60 South River St.; sponsors United Jewish Appeal, Chmn. Nathan I. Kuss; Sec. Louis Smith.</td>
<td>WILLIAMSPORT Federation of Jewish Charities (1930); 25 W. 3 St., Pres. Aaron Stainman; Exec. Dir. N. H. Bronman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Sec. Siegmund Berger, 381 Blackstone St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Jewish Community Council</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>3324 West Broadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Jewish Community Council</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>3324 West Broadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

End Ave.; Pres. Albert Werthan; Dir. Harold Katz.

TEXAS

AMARILLO
United Jewish Appeal, Chmn. Abe Feferman; Sec. S. J. Braunig, 1510 Tyler.

AUSTIN
1. Jewish Federation (1939); Pres. Milton T. Smith; Sec. R. N. Hanau, 1801 Enfield Road.

BEAUMONT
United Jewish Appeal, Chmn. Walter Meyer; Treas. Morris Jacobs, c/o Gem Jewelry Co.

CORPUS CHRISTI

CORSICANA
1. Jewish Federation (1936); P. O. Box 1153, Pres. Sidney Marks; Sec. Gabe Goldberg.

DALLAS
1. 2. Jewish Welfare Federation (1911); 1817 Pocahontas St., Pres. E. M. Solow; Exec. Dir. Jacob H. Kravitz.

EL PASO

FORT WORTH

GALVESTON

HOUSTON
1. Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Houston (incl. neighboring communities) (1937); sponsors United Jewish Campaign, 4701 Caroline St., Pres. Irvin M. Shlenker; Exec. Dir. Albert Goldstein.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); 548 Mobile Ave., Pres. Robert Diamond; Exec. Sec. Lothar Lubasch.

SAN ANTONIO
1. 2. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); County Courthouse, Pres. William R. Sinkin; Exec. Dir. Hannah Hirshberg.

TEXARKANA
Jewish Federation (1941); Sec. Leo Walkow.

TYLER
1. Federated Jewish Charities (1938); Sec. Leslie Adels, 119 N. Spring St.

WACO
1. 2. Jewish Welfare Council (1929); P. O. Box 1442; Pres. Ben H. Green; Sec. Archie Hoppenstein.

UTAH

OGDEN
Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Brigham City) (1939); 1350–28 St., Pres. Sam A. Herscovitz; Sec. Sam Brickner.

SALT LAKE CITY
1. United Jewish Council (1936); 500 Pacific National Life Bldg., Pres. James L. White; Sec. Sigmund Helwing.

VERMONT

VIRGINIA

CHARLOTTESVILLE
United Jewish Appeal (1939); Pres. Isaac Walters; Treas. Barney Janow.

HAMPTON
1. Hampton-Phoebus Jewish Community Council (incl. Phoebus) (1944); Pres. Isaac A. Saunders; Sec. Allan Mirvis, 51 Victoria Ave.

LYNCHBURG
1. Jewish Community Council (1941); 414 Norfolk Ave.; Pres. Aron Somers; Exec. Mrs. Phil Goldstein.

NEWPORT NEWS
1. Jewish Community Council (1942); 98–26 St., Pres. Theodore Beskin; Exec. Dir. Charles Olshansky.

NORFOLK

PETERSBURG
1. United Jewish Community Fund (1938); 9 Centre Hill Ct., Pres. Philip Jacobson; Sec. Phil S. Haimovit.

PORTSMOUTH
United Jewish Welfare Fund (1941); 723 Dinwiddi St., Chmn. Leonid G. Karp; Sec. E. Greenfield.

RICHMOND
1. Jewish Community Council (1935); 705 E. Main St.; Pres. Lewis C. Markel; Exec. Dir. Irving Furst.

ROANOKE
1. United Jewish Appeal (1940); 309 S. Jefferson St., Chmn. N. William Schlossberg; Sec. Udell Brenner.

SUFFOLK
Jewish Federation of Suffolk (1942); Chmn. Louis Friedlander; Dir. H. B. Wernick.
WASHINGTON

ABERDEEN
Jewish Community Fund (incl. Hoquiam) (1936); Box 1020; Sec. Joel Wolff.

CENTRALIA
Centralia-Chalahis Jewish Welfare Fund (1937); Pres. N. Schwartz; Sec. J. Shandel-
ing.

SEATTLE
Council of Jewish Social Agencies (1944); 725 Seaboard Bldg., Chmn. Mrs. John
Dantz; Sec. Samuel G. Holcenberg.

CENTRALIA-CHAHALIS JEWISH WELFARE FUND
(1937); Pres. N. Schwartz; Sec. J. Shandel-
ing.

SEATTLE
Council of Jewish Social Agencies (1944); 725 Seaboard Bldg., Chmn. Mrs. John
Dantz; Sec. Samuel G. Holcenberg.

FEDERATED JEWISH WELFARE FUND (incl. surrounding
communities) (1937); 725 Seaboard
Bldg., Pres. Leo Weisfield; Exec. Dir. Sam-
uel G. Holcenberg.

SPOKANE
1 Jewish Welfare Association (1927); sponsors United Jewish Fund (incl. Spokane
County) (1936); 221 Rookery Bldg., Pres.
Joseph Rosenfield.

TACOMA
1 Federated Jewish Fund (1936); Suite 520
Perkins Bldg., Pres. Leslie Sussman; Sec.
Mrs. Bernard D. Rosenberg.

BLUEFIELD
Princeton Jewish Charities (1939); 2003
Jefferson St., Sec. Julius Kravitz.

CHARLESTON
1 Federated Jewish Charities (incl. Dunbar,
Montgomery) (1937); 923 Virginia St. E.;
Pres. Samuel D. Lopinsky; Exec. Sec. Harry
Cohen.

HUNTINGTON
1 Federated Jewish Charities (1939); P. O.
Box 947; Pres. Maurice Rosen; Sec. E.
Henry Broh.

WHEELING
1 Jewish Community Council (incl.
Moundsville) (1933); Presidium: Sam Good,
Max Horne, H. S. Levin; Recreational Sec.
Meyer Franklin, 22 Lenox Ave.

APPLETON
United Jewish Charities (incl. Neenah and vicinity)-Pres. Adolph Hamilton; Sec. Abra-
ham Sigman.

KENOSHA
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); 308 Ke-
osha National Bank Bldg., 625–57 St.,
Pres. Harold Brosk; Sec. Frederick K. Plous.

LA CROSSE
Jewish Welfare Fund (1941); 125 N. 3 St.,
Chmn. H. Locketz; Sec. Bernard Sharp.

MADISON
1 Madison Jewish Welfare Fund, Inc.
(1940); 201 Tenney Bldg., Pres. Max Weinst-
stein; Sec. S. B. Schein.

WISCONSIN

MILWAUKEE
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); 135 W.
Wells St., Pres. Norbert Enzer; Exec. Dir.
Elkan C. Voorsanger.

OSHKOSH
Oshkosh Jewish Welfare Fund (incl.
Ripon) (1942); 221 Oshkosh National Bank
Bldg., Pres. Isadore M. Block; Exec. Sec.
Simon Horwitz.

RACINE
1 Jewish Welfare Council (1946); 2414
Charles St., Pres. Herman B. Noll; Sec. J.
Alperovitz.

SHEBOYGAN
1 Federated Jewish Charities (1927); 2513
Elizabeth Ct., Co-Chmn. Harry Holman,
David Rabinovitz; Sec. Charles Levy.

SUPERIOR
1 Jewish Federation, Pres. Milton Finn;
Sec. B. D. Schneider, 115 Hammond Ave.

CANADA

ALBERTA

EDMONTON
Jewish Federation (1938); 10261–108 St.,
Pres. W. Margolus.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

VANCOUVER
1 Jewish Administrative Organization
(incl. New Westminster) (1932); 2675 Oak
St., Pres. Norman Brown; Exec. Dir. Louis
Zimmerman.

WINNIPEG
2 Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); 212 Con-
federation Life Bldg., Pres. David P. Got-
lieb; Exec. Sec. A. B. Feld.

ONTARIO

GUELPH
1 United Jewish Welfare Fund, 138 Water-
loo Ave., Pres. C. H. Rosen; Recreational
Sec. S. Smurlich.

HAMILTON
Council of Jewish Organizations (1934):
269-271 John St. N., Pres. Morris H. Levine;
Exec. Dir. Manuel Batshaw.

HAMILTON
2 United Jewish Welfare Fund (1939); 269-
271 John St. N., Pres. Samuel Smurlich;
Exec. Dir. Manuel Batshaw.

KINGSTON
1 Jewish Community Council (1947); Pres.
Sheldon J. Cohen; Sec. Harvey Millman,
117 Earl St.
KITCHENER
1 Jewish Federated Charities (1943); Pres. David Acker; Sec. Joseph Brown, 179 King St. W.

LONDON
London Council of the Canadian Jewish Congress (incl. western Ontario) (1936); Pres. Irving Ainsley; Sec. Isaac Siskind.

NIAGARA FALLS
1 Jewish Federation, Pres. H. D. Rosberg; Sec. Joseph Greenspan.

ST. CATHARINES
1 Jewish Federation of St. Catharines (1939); 174 St. Paul St., Pres. Murray Fish; Sec. Shirley Caplan.

TORONTO
1 United Jewish Welfare Fund (1937); 150 Beverly St., Pres. Frank Godfrey; Exec. Dir. Florence Hutner.

WINDSOR
1 Jewish Community Council (1938); Palace Theater Bldg., Ouellette Ave., Pres. Reuben Madoff; Exec. Dir. Louis Lieblich.

QUEBEC

MONTREAL
1 Federation of Jewish Philanthropies (1916); 493 Sherbrooke St. W.; Pres. Samuel Bronfman; Exec. Dir. Donald Hurwitz
Jewish Periodicals

UNITED STATES

ARIZONA

CALIFORNIA

COLORADO

CONNECTICUT

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FLORIDA
Southern Jewish Weekly (1924). P. O. Box 905, Jacksonville. 1. Isadore Moscovitz. Weekly.

GEORGIA

ILLINOIS
Chicago Jewish Chronicle (1918). 139 N. Clark St., Chicago. 2. I. J. Meites. Bi-weekly.

DELAWARE

Periodicals which have been in existence at least one year prior to June 30, 1949, are included in this directory. Information is based upon answers furnished by the publications themselves and the publishers of the Year Book assume no responsibility for the accuracy of the data presented; nor does inclusion in this list necessarily imply approval or endorsement of the periodicals. The information provided here includes year of organization and the name of the editor, managing editor, or publisher; unless otherwise stated, the language used by the periodical is that of the country in which it appears. An asterisk (*) indicates the information is based on data received in 1948. For organizational bulletins, consult organizational listings.
JEWISH PERIODICALS

MINNESOTA


MISSOURI


NEBRASKA


NEW JERSEY


NEW YORK


NEW YORK CITY

ALLIANCE VOICE—FARBAND STIMME (1912). 45 E. 17 St., 3. Louis Segal. Bi-monthly; Yiddish-


JEWISH PERIODICALS


Seven Arts Feature Syndicate. See News Syndicates, p. 496.


NORTH CAROLINA


OHIO


JEWISH TEACHER (1932). 34 W. 6 St., Cincinnati, 2. Emanuel Gamoran. Quarterly.
JEWISH VOICE-PICTORIAL (1938). P. O. Box 6116, Cleveland, 1. Leon Wiesenfeld. Quarterly.


OKLAHOMA

PENNSYLVANIA

RHODE ISLAND

TENNESSEE

VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON

WISCONSIN

OTHER COUNTRIES

ALGERIA

ARGENTINA
BOLETIN INFORMATIVO—JKG NACHRICHTEN. Araoz 2894, Buenos Aires.

RHODE ISLAND

TENNESSEE

VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON

WISCONSIN

NEWS SYNDICATES

OTHER COUNTRIES

ALGERIA

ARGENTINA
BOLETIN INFORMATIVO—JKG NACHRICHTEN. Araoz 2894, Buenos Aires.

RHODE ISLAND

TENNESSEE

VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON

WISCONSIN

NEWS SYNDICATES

OTHER COUNTRIES

ALGERIA

ARGENTINA
BOLETIN INFORMATIVO—JKG NACHRICHTEN. Araoz 2894, Buenos Aires.
JEWISH PERIODICALS


SHUL BLETER. Rua 13 de Maio 23, Rio de Janeiro. Yiddish.


AUSTRIA

AUSTRALIAN JEWISH FORUM. 149 Castlereagh St., Sydney, Monthly.

AUSTRALIAN JEWISH HERALD. 44 Queen St., Melbourne. Weekly.


AUSTRALIAN JEWISH NEWS. 417a King St., Sydney. English-Yiddish.


BELGIUM


BRAZIL

A IMPRENSA ISRAELITA. Rua Conselheiro Josinho 26, Rio de Janeiro. A. Bergman.

AONDE VAMOS. Rua 13 de Maio 23, Rio de Janeiro.


SHUL BLETER. Rua Ribeiro de Lima 592, Sao Paulo. Yiddish.

BULGARIA


CANADA


JEWISH DAILY EAGLE (1907). 4075 St. Lawrence Blvd., Montreal, Quebec. H. Wolof-sky. Daily; Yiddish.


AUSTRIA

DER NEUE WEG. Alserstrasse 18, Vienna IX. Semi-monthly.
WINDSOR JEWISH COMMUNITY BULLETIN

CHILE

COLOMBIA
Boletín Informativo Sionistas Revisionistas. Apartado 1310, Bogotá.

CUBA
Yedies Fun YIVO. Egido 504, Havana. Yiddish.

DENMARK

ECUADOR
Informaciones. Casilla 758, Quito. Sigfrid Schwind. Fortnightly; German.
Unidad, Tarqui 51, Quito.

FRANCE
Arbeter Wort—La Parole Ouvrière. 15, rue Beranger, Paris 5e. Weekly; Yiddish.

GERMANY

GREAT BRITAIN

GREECE

HUNGARY
INDIA


ISRAEL

DAILY NEWSPAPERS

AL HAMISHMAR (Formerly Mishmar) (1943). P. O. Box 806; 7 Hashahar St., Tel Aviv. Mordecai Ben Tov; Eleazar Priai. Mapam.

DAVAR (1925). P. O. Box 199; 45 Shenkin St., Tel Aviv. Zalman Shazar (Rubashov). Ha-arets.

HA-ARETZ (1918). P. O. Box 253; 56 Maze St., Tel Aviv. Gustav Schocken. Independent; liberal-progressive.


HATZOFEH (1939). P. O. Box 2045; 16 Herzl St., Tel Aviv. Yeshaya Bernstein. Mizrachi.


HERUT (1948). 22 Mikveh Israel St., Tel Aviv. J. Bader. Herut.

KOL HA-AM (1946). P. O. Box 2675; 12 Nachmani St., Tel Aviv. M. Biletzky. Communist.


PALESTINE POST (1925). P. O. Box 81, Hassolel St., Jerusalem. T. R. Lurie. Independent; English-language.

YEDIOT AHARONOT (1939). P. O. Box 109; 7 Fin St., Tel Aviv. Noah Moses. Independent.

YEDIOT HADASHOT-NEUSTE NACHRICHTEN (1955). 36 Ahad Ha-Am St., Tel Aviv. I. Lilienfeld. Independent; German-language.

YEDIOT HAYOM (1936). P. O. Box 11, Bialik St., Tel Aviv. F. Reichenstein. Independent; German-language.

MOROCCO, FRENCH


NETHERLANDS

WEST INDIES

MIKVE ISRAEL. Pietermaai 29A, Willemstad, Curacao. Irregular.

PERU

*LA VOZ ISRAELITA. Pasaje Piura 18, Lima. Alejandro Levy Toby.


PHILIPPINE ISLANDS


POLAND


QYFGANG. Ul. Sienna 60, Warsaw. (Pub. by Youth Division of Central Committee of the Jews of Poland.) Monthly; Yiddish-Polish.

RUMANIA


**SOUTHERN RHODESIA**


**SWEDEN**


**SWITZERLAND**

**Das Neue Israel** (1948). 78 Bederstrasse, Zurich. Semi-monthly; German.


**TUNISIA**


**TURKEY**


**La Boz de Turkiye** (1939). P. O. Box 1067, Galata, Istanbul. Albert Cohen. Bi-monthly; Ladino-Turkish-French.

**UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**African Jewish Newspaper—Afrikaner Yidishe Zaytung**. Old Arcade Bldgs., 100 Market St.; P. O. Box 6169, Johannesburg. Weekly; Yiddish.


**Hasholom**. P. O. Box 2198, Durban, Natal. (Pub. by Durban Jewish Club.) Monthly.


**Zionist Record** (1909). P. O. Box 150, Johannesburg. C. Gershater. Weekly.

**URUGUAY**

**Boletín Informativo—Gemeindeblatt**. Maldonado 1130, Montevideo. German.


**Voz de Montevideo**. Río Branco 1119, Montevideo.

**VENEZUELA**

American Jewish Bibliography

HISTORY

Revision of a standard text.

The first of a projected series of five volumes, this covers the period from the Creation to the time of Abraham.

A study of the civilizations of the Old Testament world as a background to the history of the spiritual and national development of the Jews and the writing of the Jewish Bible.

From Biblical times to the establishment of the state of Israel.


Covers the period from the time of the Semites of western Asia 4000 years ago to the founding of the state of Israel.

A social history which brings the story of the Jews to the end of World War II.

Includes events since 1940, the date of the last revision.

An expansion of a work first published in 1933.

JEWS IN THE U. S.

Includes discussions of the plenary sessions, lists of committees, resolutions, and a roster of delegates.

A report of the work of the Committee in aiding Jewish and non-Jewish scholars to become established in this country.

Includes a brief biographical sketch of Julius Rosenwald, the Sears-Roebuck executive, who contributed millions of dollars for the advancement of Negro education.

American Jewish contributions to the cultural and economic life of the nation. A companion volume to Jewish pioneers and patriots.

An account of the founding and accomplishments of a non-sectarian institution organized to assist the needy of the fur industry.

RABINOWITZ, BENJAMIN. The Young Men's Hebrew Associations (1854-1913). New York,

1 Books of Jewish interest published in English in the United States during the period June 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949.

501
Jews in Europe

A Jewish socialist leader chronicles the tragic history of the Warsaw Jewish community during the years of German occupation.

An American reporter describes the battle between the British and the people on board the refugee ship and its tragic outcome.

Incorporates a denunciation of the mis-management of UNRRA in Europe.

The horrifying experiences of a Hungarian gynecologist in the concentration camps of Auschwitz and Bergen Belsen.

An account of the destruction of the Jews of Poland by the Nazis and the attempts of the few survivors to rebuild their lives.


Contemporary Problems

A psychological portrait of the anti-Semite and his victim, with recommendations to the Jew to strike at what the author considers to be the two root causes of anti-Semitism.

A documented study of gains and losses in education, employment, housing, and other areas.

Intergroup Relations

A collection of monographs and articles on social psychology written between the years 1935 and 1946.

Points out the discrimination that exists on the economic, political and educational fronts, and offers practical suggestions for fighting it.

Based on lectures for a course on "The costs of discrimination to the United States."

A non-technical analysis of federal and state laws and decisions protecting the fundamental freedoms.

A description of the minority group position in the economic, legal, political and social life of the country.

Schermhorn, Richard Alonzo. These our people; minorities in American culture. New York, Heath, 1949. xii, 635 p. (Heath's social relations series)
Intended for the layman as well as for the student.

Religion and Philosophy

Agnon, Samuel Joseph. Days of awe; being a treasury of traditions, legends and learned commentaries concerning Rosh ha-Shanah, Yom Kippur and the days between; culled from three hundred volumes, ancient and new. New York, Schocken Books, 1948. 300 p.
Abridged version of the author's Yamim noraim.

Baek, Leo. The essence of Judaism. [Rendition by Irving Howe, based on the tr. from...

A revision of the first English edition, incorporating the author's latest formulations.


In English and Hebrew. Includes the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther.


A definitive study of the origin and influence of Hasidism, a nineteenth-century mystical reform movement.


"A discussion of the encounter between the historic spirit of Israel and a world which regards it as foreign, incomprehensible, or irrelevant."


Legends and teachings that grew up around the nineteenth-century Hasidic rabbis.


American edition of a definitive summary of the Talmud.


"Tell's of the sources of the Jewish religion, the synagogue, theology, ethics, rituals and holy days" as they apply to Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative Judaism equally.


A Reform Jewish rabbi undertakes to define and chart the religious life from the standpoint of modern Judaism.


Studies the relation between the Jewish Bible and the beliefs of the early Christians and the consequences in terms of the Christian faith of today.


"Endeavors to present the Jewish standards of sex conduct outside of marriage."


The Apocryphal story of the uprising of a tiny band of Jews under the leadership of the Maccabees against the kings of Syria.


Five studies intended to further the understanding of the Book of Daniel.


A selection of representative passages from the non-legal part of the Talmud.


An anthology of ancient, medieval, and modern readings and other material about the Jewish festival of Purim.


An examination of the laws and customs which govern the dietary practices, and an analysis of the nutritional value of the Orthodox diet, by a non-Jewish social worker.

KOHLER, KAUFMANN. A living faith; selected sermons and addresses from the literary remains. Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1948. vii, 312 p.

By one of the foremost exponents of Reform Judaism.


The first translation of this work setting forth Jewish law.

MAYER, MORDECAI. Israel's wisdom in modern life; essays and interpretations of religious,
An Orthodox exposition.

Takes for its thesis "the equal permanence and validity of the revelations of Sinai and Calvary."

An illustrated edition, in English and Hebrew, of the Song of songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther.

Includes the major addresses delivered at the inauguration.

A compilation of ethical teachings from Biblical times to the present.

LITURGY AND RITUAL

The first one-volume edition.

Children's services for Sabbath, holiday and special occasions, prepared by Libbrie L. Braverman and Nathan Brilliant. Cleveland, Euclid Avenue Temple, 1948. 244 p.
A compilation for young people based on the Union prayer book.

For Orthodox services. In English and Hebrew.


SERMONS


Maxims, largely from Biblical sources, of particular value for synagogue use.


ZIONISM AND ISRAEL

Chronicles those events in Jewish history which led to the development of Zionism and the emergence of the Jewish state.

Combines the past and the present in a graphic portrayal of the state of Israel.

By the Guatemalan member of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine.

A comprehensive handbook of the idea of Zionism in all its aspects, discussing the national, religious, social, and ethical factors which brought about the movement.

Describes conditions in the Arab countries and suggests that they might be improved by adopting methods, agricultural and social, already in practice in Palestine.

A critical examination of the nature of British administration from 1917 to the end of the mandate, by an Israeli official.

A study of American interest in Palestine from 1892 to the present, based on an exhaustive study of State Department documents.

Stresses the geographical, cultural, and religious influences that have affected Palestine's history.

An eye-witness account of the fighting in Palestine and the growth of Israel, based on interviews with leading political and military figures as well as lesser-known men and women.

Presents the case for the Arabs.


Speeches made during the years immediately preceding the birth of Israel.


A photographic history of the accomplishments of the last twenty years.

STONE, ISIDOR F. This is Israel; foreword by Bartley C. Crum. Photographs by Robert Capa, Jerry Cooke, and Tim Gidal. New York, Boni & Gaer, 1948. 128 p.

A contemporary history, in text and pictures.


Selections from little-known accounts of journeys and from letters and documents written by Jews who traveled to Palestine.

BELLES-LETTRES AND CRITICISM


A collection of stories written to commemorate the Jews exterminated by the Nazis. Includes one short novel.


An anthology covering some 3,000 years of Jewish lore.

BAJEL, ISAAC. Benya Krik, the gangster, and other stories; ed. by Avraham Yarmolinsky. New York, Schocken Books, 1948. 122 p. (Schocken library, 15)

The exploits of some picaresque Jewish characters in pre-revolutionary and revolutionary Odessa.


The first of two volumes which will afford the first complete translation into English of Bialik's poetry.


A fictionalized portrayal of the revolt of the Maccabees, told in the first person by Simon, oldest of the five brothers.


A new interpretation of the story of Jessica and Shylock, her father, based on historical research.


Portrayal of the efforts of some pious mystics in medieval Poland to hasten the coming of the Messiah.


Stories about Jewish life in Czarist Russia, most of them concerned with Tevye, the dairyman, and his seven daughters.


Includes a section entitled Prison within prison, Three Hebrew elegies, 1931-1938.


Includes a biographical sketch of Isaac Loeb Peretz, together with a collection of his stories in translation from the Yiddish, and two chapters on the Yiddish language.

SEFORIM, MENDELE MOCHER. The travels and adventures of Benjamin, the third. [Tr. from the Yiddish by Moshe Spiegel] New York, Schocken Books, 1949. 124 p. (Schocken library, 18)

The exploits of two Jewish equivalents of Don Quixote and his servant, Sancho Panza, who set out to find the land of the legendary Red Jews.

SHENBERG, YITZHAK. Under the fig tree; Palestinian stories. [Tr. from the Hebrew by I. M. Lask] New York, Schocken Books, 1948. 122 p. (Schocken library, 13)

Tales which reflect everyday life in modern Palestine.


Four playlets with Jewish themes.

SYPERD, WILBUR OWEN. Jephthah and his daughter; a study in comparative literature. Newark, Del., Univ. of Delaware, 1948. xiii, 277 p.

The Jephthah story in literature, music, and the other arts.


Poems largely autobiographical in nature, most of which are on Jewish themes.
WIT AND HUMOR

A dramatization of the program familiar to radio listeners.

Much of the material is reprinted from the author's syndicated column entitled Live and laugh.

Some of the stories have a European background, others cover the American scene.

Stories in Yiddish, transliterated into the Roman alphabet. A companion volume to Royte pomerantsen.

A series of connected episodes about an eighty-year-old Jew from Brooklyn and his family and friends.

The experiences of an eleven-year-old boy from the Bronx at home, at school and at camp, recounted for adults.

THE JEW IN RECENT FICTION

An artist's battle against anti-Semitism in his community.

A small New England island is the setting for discrimination against a German-Jewish refugee and her American husband.

The tragic story of a Negro with the American occupation troops in Germany. Sentenced to die for a murder he has committed, he comes to realize that his prejudice against Jews has been as irrational as that of whites against Negroes.

A Texan with a group of ski-troops, American and European, training in the Colorado mountains is prejudiced against all foreigners. In particular his bias is violently manifested against a German Jew in the company.

The marriage of a young woman of New England ancestry to a Jewish doctor survives the attempts made by her mother and some anti-Semitic townspeople to disrupt it.

Life at a private academy for boys and girls which numbers among its student body one Jewish and one Negro boy, both of whom suffer great humiliation in their senior year.

The supposed murder of a former city official, following the kidnapping of a child at his instigation, brings to light the true character of the man, including his anti-Semitism.

A novel, set in California between the years 1929 and 1941, which embraces labor-management difficulties, anti-Semitism, and Nazi undercover activities.

The experiences of a Jewish poet who returns to his family in a North African city just as its ghetto is being closed by the German occupation forces.

A Northerner makes a futile attempt to escape from his Jewishness in a southern community.

The experiences of a young man from the Brownsville section of Brooklyn from the depression through World War II. From active participation in the Communist Party he turns to a repudiation of its methods.

A Jewish soldier with the American occupation forces in Austria falls in love with a Nazi.

A novel about American troops in Luxembourg, centering about a Jewish soldier whose emotional reaction to the Dachau Concentration Camp precipitates a crisis in his life.

The men's free ward in a municipal tuberculosis sanitarium is the scene of a novel which contains two Jewish characters, one a young Marxist, the other an older man of Orthodox beliefs.


A novel of the relationships, business and personal, between a Prussian Junker and a Jewish family during the decade from 1910 to 1920.


Portrays the love of a Jewish girl for an Arab in the new state of Israel.


Depicts the marital relations of three couples: only the Jewish husband and wife make a successful mutual adjustment. Pub. in 1930 by Harper under title Stephen Escott.


The return of an ex-serviceman to his small midwestern home town for one week drastically affects the lives of three of its residents, among whom one is a Jewish librarian.


A South African novel in which a Jewish financier plays a part in a plot involving domestic as well as political complications.


Portrays the reactions of the members of an American platoon to their part of the invasion and occupation of a Japanese-held island. Two Jewish soldiers are among the men of various backgrounds and communities represented.


A novel portraying the conflict between Catholicism and science which engaged the minds of the youth of France during the decade between 1880 and 1890. The Dreyfus case is an important episode in the story.


The story of a boy from the Williamsburg slums during the depression and the conflict between shopkeepers and employees over unionization in which he plays an important part.


Prejudice at a New England junior college for girls is so strong that a Jewish student conceals her faith because of it.


The illegitimate son of a Jewish banker and a native woman of Curacao, an outcast in his community, avenges the death of his Jewish half-brother at the hands of the Nazis in occupied Holland.


Five stories of which one, "The childhood of a leader," portrays an anti-Semite.


Fiction, based on fact, of the experiences of a partly Jewish family in Berlin under the Nazis, as told to an American correspondent for The New Yorker.


Two short novels and five stories, most of which are about middle-class American Jews during the depression.


Tales of the postwar Far East, of which the title story concerns a German refugee doctor who practices democracy in a region unaccustomed to it.


Episodes in the lives of three men, one a non-Jew from New York, one a Jewish youth from the Midwest, the third an Austrian Nazi, are recounted from 1938 until their paths cross during World War II and the early days of the occupation of Germany.


The principal character of the Brownsville gang depicted in The Amboy Dukes returns from prison determined to go straight as his family wishes but the lure of easy money draws him back to the old life.

Taylor, Daniel, pseud. They move with the sun. New York, Farrar, Straus, 1948. 278 p. (Man, a many-sided mirror, v. 1)

Encounters with bigotry in many forms from youth through medical training and internship determine a young Jewish man to become a psychiatrist so that he may help to find the cause of hate.


A wounded American-Jewish navy flier, shot down in action in the Pacific, who is haunted by fear of life, of love, and of
death, finds release through observing the sacrificial act of another American soldier.

**THE ARTS**


**GRADENWITZ, PETER.** The music of Israel; its rise and growth through 5000 years. New York, Norton, 1949. 334 p. Traces the development of Jewish music from its earliest origins to the recent developments in Israel, including contributions of many of the outstanding composers.


**WISCHNITZER, MRS. RACHEL (BERNSTEIN).** The messianic theme in the paintings of the Dura Synagogue. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1948. xii, 135 p. Describes and interprets the wall decorations to show that each was part of a cycle depicting the messianic idea of return, restoration, and salvation.

**BIOGRAPHY**


**BLOOM, SOL.** The autobiography of Sol Bloom. New York, Putnam, 1948. 345 p. An account of a long and colorful life in business, the theater, and politics by the late Congressman from New York.

**BONN, MORITZ JULIUS.** Wandering scholar [autobiography] New York, John Day, 1948. 403 p. Recollections of a German-Jewish political economist, descendant of a well-known banking family of Frankfurt, whose life was uprooted by the Nazi regime.


**FINKELSTEIN, LOUIS, ed.** American spiritual autobiographies; fifteen self-portraits. New York, Harper, 1948. xvi, 276 p. Among the fifteen self-portraits are three of Jews: the late Rabbi S. J. Finkelstein; Raphael Isaacs, hematologist; and Jacob S. Potoński, labor leader.


**LANG, MRS. LUCY (FOX) ROBINS.** Tomorrow is beautiful. New York, Macmillan, 1949. 303 p. The personal story of a labor leader of immigrant background, who first allied herself with left-wing movements and later became a very active worker with the A. F. of L.

**ROTH, CECIL.** The house of Nasi: the duke of Naxos. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948. xvi, 250 p. (Gitelson library) A companion volume to the biography of Doña Gracia Nasi which tells the story of her nephew and son-in-law, Jewish statesman and favorite of the then Sultan of Turkey.

Recollections, in the form of sketches, of events in the lives of the author's family in New York at the turn of the century.

A biographical sketch with emphasis on his career as a Confederate statesman and later life in Great Britain and France.

The first volume of the recollections of the Hasidic rabbi now established in Brooklyn.

Includes a biographical essay on Sabbatai Zevi, Cabalist and pseudo-messiah of the seventeenth century.

Sketches embodying recollections of the author's youth in Czechoslovakia.

The life story of the eminent scientist and first president of Israel.

A tribute to the late Jewish leader, active in the cause of social and civic welfare, and wife of the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.

JUVENILE

The story of the Creation and the Flood for small children.

Stories of famous characters and events in Biblical history and descriptions of the holidays, each illustrating a letter of the alphabet.

The experiences of a Jewish youth at a naval training station during World War II.

A day-by-day picture of camp activities described through the medium of letters from a small boy to his parents.

The story of a bright new tractor which was shipped from the United States to Israel and of how it helped to build a cooperative settlement. For small children.

Jewish fairy tales, legends, and stories with historical backgrounds.

Stories for children, some of the stories with historical backgrounds, others of the present day.

A story of the earlier part of David's life ending with his accession to the throne of Israel. For young people aged eleven to fifteen.

A biography of the famous physicist for young people.

Emphasizes the early influences that directed his interest towards science and mathematics.

A fairy tale by the noted Yiddish writer.

A biography of the founder of the Zionist movement for young people.

Nineteen stories based on Jewish folklore for children from eleven to fourteen.

WILLIAMS, BERYL (MRS. SAMUEL EPSTEIN). Lillian Wald; Angel of Henry Street. Illus.

An account for young people of the life of the founder of the Henry Street Settlement and organizer of the Visiting Nurses Association.

TEXTBOOKS


An attempt to integrate modern Jewish history with literature through the presentation of selections from the Jewish literature of the past fifty years.


Legends from the Midrash relating to the stories in the Book of Genesis.


Covers the period from Joshua to the Babylonian exile. Presents the Orthodox viewpoint.


Covers American and Jewish days of celebration, and life in Palestine and the United States.

REFERENCE AND ANNUALS


In addition to reports, lists, etc., includes: Date of the composition of Maimonides' code, by Solomon Gandz. —Studies in the Hebrew calendar, by Solomon Gandz. —Documents selected from the Pinkas of Friedberg, a former free city in Western Germany, by Adolf Kober. —The ethical teachings of Moses Hayim Luzzatto by Abraham Menes. —How to study Spinoza's 'Theologico-political treatise', by Leo Strauss. —The religious life of the Jews in Italy during the Renaissance, by M. A. Shulvass [In Hebrew]


Besides the usual reference features and the Review of the year 5708 (1947-48), the following special articles are included: A century of Jewish immigration to the United States, by Oscar and Mary Handlin. —American Jewish year book, 1899-1948, by Harry Schneiderman.


Text in English, Hebrew, and Yiddish. Besides bibliographies, book reviews, etc., the English section includes: Alexander Marx at seventy, by J. S. Minkin. —The 100th birthday of Emma Lazarus, by Albert Mordell. —Two generations of Jewish literary labor, by Maurice Jacobs. —The fifty years of the American Jewish year book, by C. S. Bernheim. —They who have gone to
the academy on high, by Harry Schneiderman.


Includes monographs on such subjects as the Jewish population, colonization, education, communal organization, Zionism, and socialist and labor movements in various parts of the world.

KOLATCH, ALFRED J. These are the names. New York, J. David, 1948. x, 288 p.

Gives the original meaning of many popular masculine and feminine names with their English and Hebrew equivalents.


In addition to a survey of recent developments in Israel, includes bibliographies, lists, and a directory of American Zionist organizations.


In addition to lists, reports, resolutions, etc., the following addresses and papers are included: The Zionist scene—an outlook for the future.—The rabbi—some aspects of his life and work.—Siyyum hashas—academic studies.—Conservative Judaism—its program and progress.—The rabbi and Jewish art.


In addition to lists, reports, resolutions, etc., the following addresses and papers are included: Synagogue ritual survey, by M. S. Goodblatt.—Towards a philosophy of Conservative Judaism, by Theodore Friedman, William Greenfeld, and Isaac Klein. The future of the American Jewish community, by B. Z. Bokser.—American Jewry and the new Jewish state, by Simon Greenberg.


A selection of articles which appeared previously in Yiddish in various Yivo publications.

Compiled by IVA COHEN
JUDAH L. MAGNES

JUDAH L. MAGNES was a California boy brought up in the strong democratic traditions of the American West and the ancient faith and learning of the Jewish people. His life represented a synthesis between the idealism of America and the idealism of Judaism. He had the independence and courage of the pioneer and the faith and fortitude of the Jewish martyr.

Had he been a Christian, the social thinking of Judah Magnes could have been described as Christian Socialism. His socialism was not Marxian or doctrinaire in any sense. It was rather derived from the teachings of the Torah, from the inspiration of the prophets, from the ancient Jewish laws relating to the year of Jubilee and the old Jewish faith in a Messianic era. He believed firmly that those who placed their selfish interests above the interests of the people as a whole, who used their special interests or their desire for personal aggrandizement as their motivation, were not the kind of people who should be in high places or govern the world. “If the democratic society is serious about enabling all people to live the good life, the private profit motive can no longer be permitted to dominate this society. . . .”

To him, those who were selfish in their intellectual life were just as reprehensible as those who were selfish in the economic and political life of the world. “Do the professors write books and the teachers raise up disciples in support of a freer and juster world? Almost complete silence in the pulpit and the chair. No, the profiteers in war and in peace, be they of the right or the left, are not the men to rule the destinies of mankind. . . .”

Judah Magnes was a pacifist. He did not believe that good ends and noble aspirations could be achieved through violence and hatred. In World War I he was a pacifist. He spoke openly against the war, so openly as to embarrass his friends and admirers and those who supported him as the president of the New York Kehillah. Then he learned the agonies suffered by one who refused to be suborned by mass hysteria. For some years he had lived at Cos Cob, Conn. Such was the humiliation which he suffered from his neighbors that he was forced to move. He went to live at Chappaqua, N. Y., where he found acceptance among a group of Quakers.

World War II created a moral crisis in his life. The atrocities of the Nazis and the evil of Hitlerism made it impossible for him to oppose the war. For to him Hitler was Satan incarnate and as such had to be destroyed.

Ever since the inception of the Zionist movement Judah Magnes had been a Zionist. He was one of the founders and for a while was the honorary secre-

---

1 For biographical details, see also pp. 522-23.
tary of the Federation of American Zionists. Such was his faith and his hope for Zion that he moved with his family to Palestine in 1922 and made his residence in Jerusalem for the remainder of his life. Nevertheless, it did not appear to him that Zionism required the establishment of a state, for a state in the long run must be founded upon force. And because he believed so strongly that violence and warfare would not accomplish noble purposes, he opposed the violence of the Jewish underground and the war against the Arabs. Out of this came his theory that Palestine should be organized as a bi-national state in which Jews and Arabs would be equally represented, in some such manner as the Swiss federation is composed of different cultural groups having equality with one another. Later when Israel was established he accepted the existence of the Israeli state as a fait accompli, but pleaded that there could be no peace for Israel until effective cooperation with the Arabs in Israel and the Arab states surrounding it could be achieved. So he urged a confederation of the Middle East, of the state of Israel with the surrounding Arab states. His political views with respect to Palestine were expressed through Ihud ("Union"), the organization which he founded and of which he was the president.

While Judah Magnes hated force and violence and the atrocities of the underground, it was not the young men and women of the Irgun and the Stern groups whom he condemned. Rather it was the politicians who said in effect that "a little violence won't hurt." "It is very easy," he wrote, "to join in the cry that the Jewish terrorists are responsible for this atrocious crime. But who has been responsible for the terrorists? We all bear some responsibility. . . ."

From the time that he was ordained a rabbi by Hebrew Union College in 1898, Judah Magnes was always interested in education, Jewish education in particular. He was an instructor and librarian at Hebrew Union College and afterward, when he became president of the New York Kehillah, he joined with Samson Benderly in establishing the Jewish Education Bureau, to improve the standards of Jewish education. Both the Kehillah and the Jewish Education Bureau are no more. But each in its way set a pattern for American Jewish communal activity.

In Palestine he became the chancellor and later the president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the founder of the Hebrew University Press. The University represents perhaps his greatest concrete achievement. He nurtured all of its departments with love and imagination. He was proud of its scientific work and of the Medical School and Hadassah Hospital, which were associated with the University. He was interested in and hopeful for the development of the social sciences. He had great pride in the school for Islamic studies and the great Islamic library on Mount Scopus. But above all, his heart was in the Institute of Jewish Studies. Whatever might be the situation in the world or in Palestine with respect to war and peace, Judah Magnes believed that the study of Torah must continue. He rejected the idea that such studies were superfluous because they did not make scientific contributions to the winning of the war.

Judah Magnes' devotion to the Jewish people is further illustrated by the active part he played during the years of his residence in New York as a
member of the American Jewish Committee and as a founder of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. After World War I he traveled in Europe for the JDC, and on his return he made a report to the Jews of New York concerning the condition of their brothers in Eastern Europe.

During the recent war he represented the JDC in the Middle East, traveling about that part of the world as the chief adviser of the JDC on its problems and the needs of its Jews. Shortly before he died, in the spirit of the biblical injunction to the Jews to remember that they were strangers in Egypt, he urged unsuccessfully that the JDC should use some of its funds for the benefit of Arab refugees from Israel. He could not justify the contradiction of establishing a home for refugees from Europe at the expense of creating refugees from Israel.

This feeling of fellowship, of brotherhood, is exemplified by an extract from a letter which he wrote shortly before his death but never mailed, in which he said:

For peace can come there [in Israel] only if Israel and Ishmael can feel they are brothers. It was an opportunity of stretching out the helping hand of a Jewish brother to thousands in distress—in the same way the JDC has appealed to others to do for Jews in distress. It would have been in many ways the most glorious chapter in the glorious history of the JDC.

With the late Henrietta Szold, one of his dearest and closest friends, he was a founder of Hadassah. After her death he was for many years its representative in Palestine. And however much he differed from official Zionism on political issues, he cooperated with Hadassah and contributed greatly to the success of its work.

The social views, the pacifism, the Zionism, the educational and welfare efforts of Judah Magnes were firmly rooted in his deeply religious Jewishness. While he felt the atmosphere of his congregations to be in large measure stuffy and irreligious, while he felt uncomfortable in formal religious observance, week after week he celebrated the Sabbath and the holidays in his home and until his very death studied religious literature.

He was dedicated to the idea that we Jews have a mission in the world, a mission to preach our moral faith and the necessity of oneness, a mission to preach to the world that it is through ideals and moral ends that the world can be re-created, not through destruction or aggression or hatred.

The conservation of Jewish piety and learning, and a thoroughgoing social radicalism are not antagonistic but are complementary, and are both the outcome of the tradition of the prophetic morality. It is one of our tasks to find the bridge connecting them. They are symbolic of the moral law and of the mission for mankind which has been inscribed from the beginning in the prophets' scroll.

He did not see any dichotomy between the tasks of his people as Jews and as citizens of the world.

We have a double task [he wrote] in which there is no first and last: to be steadfast as Jews and to labor on behalf of a better world. . . . It should be clear that our rights and our obligations as Jews are inextricably interwoven with our rights and obligations as human beings.
The life of Judah Magnes was not one-sided. It was not composed entirely of prophecy and religion. He found pleasure and satisfactions in many of the things that other people have enjoyed. He loved to talk to friends, he loved family life, he was excited by travel, by his trip of exploration across the desert. All who knew him recall his passion for baseball.

Judah Magnes’ love of life, of laughter, and of the humanity in all people made him the friend and confidante all his life of hundreds of people who disagreed with him or who, agreeing, were afraid to step out of line and join him. Time and again people would bring their troubles to him and be certain of understanding. Many a young man and woman of the Irgun and the Stern group, whose terrorism he abhorred, would come to him after some enterprise in which they had been engaged, confide in him, and talk to him about their motivations and their feelings. He was to many a personal friend in distress, a beloved father-confessor, who, if he could not grant absolution, could at least give a sense of integrity.

Sholem Asch has written:

I consider Dr. Magnes the most characteristic example of Jewish idealism which America has produced. He had the passion of love for truth like a prophet and he had the courage to stand by his truth like a hero and he was graced by God with innocence and cleanliness like a child. His youthful belief in righteousness and fighting for it was always a great inspiration for all the people who had the privilege to be associated with him in his work.

JAMES MARSHALL

STEPHEN S. WISE

Prophetic Judaism exerted the profoundest influence on the life and thought of Stephen S. Wise. The ancient Hebrew prophets loved Israel even as they reproached him. They courageously fought for justice. They were sustained in their basic attitudes and activities by an overpowering religious faith.

Stephen Wise loved Jews, especially the Jewish masses, and they knew it. His name became a byword in Europe. In the concentration camps, Stephania was the code word for America and for liberation. Apart from Chaim Weizmann, perhaps no other Jew of our generation exercised such mass appeal and achieved such mass response.

It was inevitable, therefore, that the instruments through which he sought to serve Jewry would be of a broad-based democratic character. He was a founder of the American Jewish Congress which was organized on the basis of popular elections. He was the moving spirit and the president of the World Jewish Congress from its organization in 1936 until his death. This provided him both with a sounding board for his magnificent eloquence in defense of Jewish rights and with steady contacts with the masses of Jewry.

He regarded the Jews as a people, never as a sect. Devoted from his early youth to Jewry’s historic hope of national restoration in Zion, he responded immediately to Theodor Herzl’s call to the Second Zionist Congress in Basle.

\[1\] For biographical details, see also pp. 525-26.
A year earlier, in 1897, as an organizer and secretary of the Federation of American Zionists, Stephen Wise ushered in a career of leadership in Zionism which brought him to many high offices in the movement in America and throughout the world. Differences with other Zionist leaders, particularly Chaim Weizmann and Abba Hillel Silver, briefly removed him from active leadership at one time or another. Yet more than any other American he was the outstanding symbol and advocate of Zionism, not only in the eyes of American Jews but also to the entire American people and its leaders, including Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In a real sense, Dr. Wise’s Zionism was an extension of his American democratic outlook, for he saw Zionism not as escapism or defeatism or “refugeeism” but as the application of the progressive democratic process to the Jewish problem. There is no doubt that his experience with freedom and democracy in this country shaped his entire outlook. He loved America.

Intensely patriotic, he was not a chauvinist. He found much to criticize in the land he loved and in its people. Its treatment of the Negroes and the Indians aroused his wrath. The exploitation of women and children in industry, which in the early years of his ministry he found so widespread, not only evoked his denunciation but compelled him to advocate trade unionism and welfare legislation. As early as 1903 he served on the Oregon State Child Labor Commission. He publicly supported organized labor in major conflicts, sometimes at considerable sacrifice. While he was organizing the Jewish Institute of Religion, a cherished project for the training of liberal rabbis, the strike of 1919 broke out in the steel industry. The workers were fighting for union recognition and for the improvement of working conditions. Judge Elbert Gary, head of the United States Steel Corporation, was adamant. In a much-publicized sermon—and everything said by the leader of the Free Synagogue in his services at New York City's Carnegie Hall took on a public character—Rabbi Wise denounced the steel corporation for its dictatorial policies and for giving incitement to Bolshevism. Although enthusiastically received by workers and liberal groups, Dr. Wise's statement evoked the wrath of wealthy businessmen and bankers. Among these were men who had previously indicated their support of Dr. Wise's proposed institute. They now withdrew their promised support. Dr. Wise subsequently stated that although this withdrawal postponed the founding of the seminary, he would not have acted differently.

In association with his lifelong friend, Dr. John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church of New York City, Rabbi Wise assumed a prominent role in the movement to oust James J. Walker as mayor of New York. The committee aroused the ire of the Democratic governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who advised the clergymen to stay in their churches and mind their own business. Nevertheless, Rabbi Wise and Dr. Holmes continued to excite public opinion with the aim of exerting pressure upon the governor. That their efforts were successful is a matter of history, and despite the sharp exchange, Rabbi Wise and Franklin D. Roosevelt later became good friends.

Toward the end of his life Rabbi Wise was greatly disturbed about the foreign policy of the United States, which he felt was leading toward war with the Soviet Union. Although he was opposed to the methods and certain of the
policies of Soviet Communism, he believed that peace between the United States and the Soviet Union should be the major objective of the twentieth century. The last addresses he delivered in the weeks before his death were highlighted by attacks on those forces which he maintained were pushing his country toward war with Russia and which, he claimed, were attempting to suppress him. "I will not be silenced!" were the last words this writer heard Rabbi Wise speak publicly, and they were most typical.

Sustaining Rabbi Wise's Jewishness and prophetic idealism was his profound religious faith. Innumerable people were deeply touched and helped by it. His personal prayers before the recitation of the Kaddish were a soul-stirring religious experience. Even in the darkest moments of his own life or when the fate of Israel and the entire civilized world hung in the balance, he never lost faith. A typically dramatic but genuine expression of unquenchable hopefulness was witnessed during a visit by Rabbi Wise in August, 1946, to the displaced persons camp at Zeilsheim, near Frankfurt, Germany. Although he was accompanied by other Jewish leaders, the chief interest of the people was in the renowned American rabbi. The entire population of the camp gathered in the memorial square to hear him. As he was about to conclude his address he saw a little girl standing before him. He lifted her up with one arm and with the other pointed to himself and said: "Die juedische Vergangenheit," then, pointing at the child, he said, "Die juedische Zukunft." In the same spirit, despite all reverses, Dr. Wise consistently maintained that he would live to see the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Stephen Wise's spirituality was the product of a rabbinic tradition and a pious Jewish home. He was a direct descendant of seven generations of rabbis. His father, Aaron Wise, was minister of Temple Rodeph Sholem in New York City. The son, Stephen, did not attend a seminary but received his training in rabbinics from his father as well as from other outstanding rabbis of the period in the United States and Europe.

In 1905, Stephen Wise was invited to become the rabbi of New York's Temple Emanu-El, the wealthiest and most influential Reform congregation in America. An irreconcilable difference developed when Rabbi Wise was informed that the pulpit would "always be subject to and under the control of the board of trustees." He not only rejected the position but decided that New York and the East needed a truly free synagogue. Shortly thereafter he resigned from his post at Congregation Beth Israel in Portland, Oregon, and returned to New York City to establish the new institution. Meeting first in a theater and later in Carnegie Hall, the new house of worship which he called the Free Synagogue, was founded on the principles of absolute freedom in the pulpit and the unassigned, democratic pew system. This process of democratization of the synagogue, in which he was one of the pioneers, was later adopted by many of the more progressive congregations. It became one of the instruments through which Reform temples ceased to be identified with wealthy Jews of German origin.

Wise's free pulpit also exercised a profound influence on American religious leadership. He inspired and strengthened a whole generation of American rabbis, who took courage from his strength, to stand up publicly for their convictions. The Reform temples had tended to become upper middle-class in-
stitutions with a conservative and frequently timid leadership which had lost touch with the Jewish masses. Wise's Zionism, his all-embracing Jewishness, and his social idealism attracted popular support. In this area too, he led in the democratization of Judaism in America.

Convinced of the need for a seminary which would train rabbis without regard to denomination, Rabbi Wise opened the doors of the Jewish Institute of Religion in 1922. He felt the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, adhered too rigidly to German Reform Judaism while the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York was, in his eyes, too limited in its Conservatism. At the Institute great scholars who, like the students, cut across all Jewish denominational lines, were assembled as teachers. It was a catholic Judaism which students encountered at the Institute, with Zionism and social liberalism providing dominant motivations.

In the years before his death, Dr. Wise reached the conclusion that his basic objectives in founding the Jewish Institute of Religion had been largely fulfilled. He noted changes in the Hebrew Union College and in American Reform Judaism generally which led him to believe that there was little justification for maintaining two separate institutions for the training of liberal rabbis. He therefore entered into negotiations with the executives of the Hebrew Union College which led to a merger of the two institutions in 1948.

An evaluation of Rabbi Wise by a devoted student and friend would not be complete without some personal comments. Although Dr. Wise wrote a number of books, he will not be remembered for his gifts as a writer. Frequently, in writing as in preaching, his style would become somewhat turgid and involved. Nor was he, as some charged, an actor. Actually, he was not an eloquent reader of others' lines nor even of his own. His eloquence was spontaneous and dynamic. A sense of the dramatic was in his inmost personality, expressing itself in all his actions, not superimposed by artifice. His leonine head, his sonorous voice, his flashing wit made him at his best one of the superb orators of our time.

Those who knew him personally, as did the writer, loved him as a human being. Even in the arena of controversy he was capable of generosity and charity. Outside that arena, in his personal relations, he was a sweet, considerate, warm-hearted, loving, and lovable human being.

PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN


ADLER, EMANUEL PHILIP, newspaper pub., diplomate Am. Bd. of Dermatology; mem. banking official, civic leader; active in interfaith movement; b. Chicago, Ill., Sept. 30, 1872; pres. Lee Syndicate of Midwest news-

1 Including Jewish residents of the United States who died between June 1, 1948, and June 30, 1949.
papers, 1907--; received award for distinguished service to journalism from Univ. of Minnesota, 1948; d. Davenport, Iowa, March 2, 1949.

ANTIN, MARY (Mrs. Amadeus W. Grabau), writer on immigrant experience; b. Polotzk, Russia, June 13, 1881; came to U.S. 1894; author From Polotzk to Boston (1899), The Promised Land (1912), They Who Knock at Our Gates (1914); d. Suffern, N.Y., May 13, 1949.


BORAIsha, MENAHEM (surname Goldberg), one of world's foremost Yiddish poets, journalist; b. Brest-Litovsk, Poland, 1888; came to U.S. 1915; author several book-length poems, incl. Poylen (1913 and Der Geyzer, 2 vol., 1933; assoc. ed. and editl. writer Congress Weekly, 1934—; mem.


COOPER, HARRY, ret. U. S. Army officer, bodyguard of four U. S. Presidents; b. Russia, Feb. 15, 1896; enlisted in U. S. Army 1914; orderly on staff of Gen. John J. Pershing; bodyguard to Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert H. Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; accompanied Pres. Roosevelt on tour of South Am. 1936; supervisor Washington, D. C., dist. of Secret Service 1936-42; coordinator of Treasury Dept. 5th enforcement dist. 1940-42; recalled to duty in U. S. Mil. Police 1942; served in China-Burma-India theater of operations under Gen. Joseph Stilwell; promoted to colonel 1944; awarded Legion of Merit 1945; as provost marshal in China-Burma-India area uncovered and smashed a $100,000 smuggling ring; assoc. with export company after return to U. S. 1945; d. Baltimore, Md., June 17, 1949 (suicide).


GRF. ENBERG, JACOB HIRSCH, rabbi, educator, artist; b. Vinnitza, Russia, GELLER, TODROS, Zionist, mechanical bibliographer of Hebrew FREIMANN, ARON, Talmudic scholar, authority on Hebrew FRANKLIN, LEO MORRIS, rabbi, civic leader; b. Antopol, Poland, Dec. 15, 1879; worked in oils, tempera, water color, stained glass, metal; did wood carving, etching, lithography, wood engraving; author: Jewish Motifs (1926), the Rabbi—The Man and His Message (1938), The Way to Understanding Between Christian and Jew (1939); d. Detroit, Mich., Aug. 8, 1948.


GELLER, TODROS, artist; b. Vinnitza, Russia, July 1, 1889; emigrated to Canada 1906, to Chicago, Ill., 1918; studied at Chicago Art Inst. 1918-23; taught at Jewish Peoples Inst., Chicago, 1920-27; former supervisor of art for Bd. of Jewish Studies, Chicago; rep. in collections of Library of Congress, Chicago Art Inst., Tel Aviv Museum, Birobidjan State Museum, U. S. S. R.; Jewish Museum of N. Y. City, and elsewhere; worked in oils, tempera, water color, stained glass, metal; did wood carving, etching, lithography, wood engraving; author: Jewish Motifs (1926), Palestine (1930), From Land to Land (1937), Had Gadya (1946); d. Chicago, Ill., Feb. 25, 1949.


HIRSHEIN, PERETZ, author of plays, poems, novels, travel books in Hebrew and Yiddish; journalist; transl.; b. Kletshell, Lithuania, Nov. 17, 1880; came to U. S. 1911; author many plays incl. Die Puste Krethsme (1911) produced in English in N. Y. City as The Idle Inn (1922), and Grine Felder (Green Fields), produced as a movie in 1937; collected works pub. in 5 vol. by Dramatic League of Am., 1917; in 9 vol. in Poland, 1930; wrote for many Yiddish journals in Am., especially The Day, N. Y. City; d. Los Angeles, Cal., Aug. 16, 1948.


Zionist leader, insurance.


Kahn, Florence Prag, 1st Jewish woman to serve in U. S. House of Reps., Republican; b. Salt Lake City, Utah, Nov. 9, 1866; apptd. to succeed her husband, Julius Kahn, as Rep. from San Francisco, Calif., upon his death; served 1925-36; d. San Francisco, Calif., Nov. 16, 1948.


MARBURG, OTTO, neurologist, univ. prof.; b. Roemerstadt, Austria, May 25, 1874; M. D. Univ. of Vienna 1898; assoc. with Neurological Inst. of Univ. of Vienna 1900-38, dir. 1919-38; came to U. S. 1938; clinical prof. of neurology Columbia Univ. 1929—; author several books and med. articles; d. New York, N. Y., June 13, 1948.

MARCUS, DAVID, mil. adviser to Israeli army, former colonel in U. S. Army, atty.; b. Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 22, 1902; grad. U. S. Mil. Acad., West Point, N. Y., 1924; LL. B. Brooklyn Law Sch. 1927, J. D. 1928; asst. atty. Dept. of Justice 1929-30; asst. U. S. atty. in Southern Dist. of N. Y. 1931-33; 1st dept. commnr. N. Y. City Dept. of Correction 1934-39; apptd. Commr. of Correction 1940; upon outbreak of World War II re-entered Army, serving as judge advocate and provost marshal in 27th Div., later in civil affairs div.; served as legal aide at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam confs.; aided in drafting surrender terms for Germany and Italy for which he was awarded D. S. C.; went to Palestine in 1948 as mil. adviser to Haganah; decorated by British Empire for his activities in World War II, 1948; also received Bronze Star Medal from the U. S. govt. for gallantry in action; killed in action on Israeli-Arab front in Jerusalem area, June 10, 1948.


ROSEN, JOSEPH, agronomist, consultant, colonization authority, discoverer of Rosen winter rye used widely in U. S.; b. Moscow, Russia, 1877; came to U. S. 1903; dir. Baron de Hirsch Agrl. Sch., Woodbine, N. J., 1915-18; dir. Am. bureau of Kharkov agrl. office of Internat. Bank of Commerce of Petrograd, Russia, 1916-18; consultant to

Schwimmer, Rosika, pacifist, feminist, author, lecturer, ambassador; b. Budapest, Austria-Hungary, Sept. 11, 1877; org., exec. of several internat. women's suffrage and peace congresses; dir. Henry Ford "peace mission" 1915-16; became mem. of Count Michael Karolyi's Council of 15 which assumed power in Hungary when King Charles abdicated in 1918; Hungarian Ambassador to Switzerland 1918-19; d. New York, N. Y., Aug. 3, 1948.

Segalovitch, Zussman, Yiddish poet and novelist, journalist; acclaimed as the poet who captured in his poetry the tragedy of the destruction of the Jews under Nazism; b. Bialystok, Poland, Feb. 27, 1884; lived in Poland, Russia, Palestine; poems incl. Dorten and Nishta (1946); came to U. S. 1947; d. New York, N. Y., Feb. 19, 1949.


Shapiro, Lamed, Yiddish short story writer, essayist, novelist; acclaimed as one of the great prose stylists; b. Kiev, Russia, 1878; lived in U. S. 1906-09, 1916—; ed. pub. The Studen. Yiddish literary quarterly, N. Y. City; among his works are The Cross, The Kiss, In the Jewish Empire, New Yorkish; transl. Dickens, Kipling, Scott, Hugo into Yiddish; d. Los Angeles, Cal., Aug. 25, 1948.


Torczyner, Numa, Zionist, industrialist; b. Brody, Poland, Oct. 9, 1885; lived in Austria, then Belgium where he entered dia-
mond industry; pres. Belgian Jewish Com. of Reps. assoc. with World Jewish Congress; pres. Zionist Orgn. of Belgium; pres. Belgian Jewish communal relief orgn.; mem. Consistoire Central of Jews of Belgium; came to U. S. 1940; pres. Diamond Center, Inc., N. Y. City; mem. nat. bds. UJA, United Palestine Appeal, JNF; mem. Zionist Actions Com.; served as consultant for American-Israeli diamond trade; elected "virilist member" of Zionist Actions Com. at World Zionist Congress in 1946 for assoc. with movement for more than 45 years; d. Amsterdam, Holland, Oct. 8, 1948, during return trip to U. S. from Israel.


CALENDARS
## Monthly Calendar

**1949, Dec. 21-1950, Jan. 18**

### TEBET 29 DAYS

#### SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS פֵּרֶשֶׁיָה</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS הַפְּרִישׁוֹת</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>[Num. 7:48-59]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eighth Day of Hanukkah</td>
<td>Num. 7:54-8:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eighth Day of Hanukkah</td>
<td>Gen. 41:1-44:17</td>
<td>I Kings 3:15-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eighth Day of Hanukkah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fast of Tebet</td>
<td>Ex. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Is. 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 44:18-47:27</td>
<td>Sephardim none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS פֵּרֶשֶׁיָה

- Num. 28:1-15; 7:42-47
- Num. 7:48-59
- Num. 7:54-8:4

#### PROPHETICAL PORTIONS הַפְּרִישׁוֹת

- Gen. 41:1-44:17
- I Kings 3:15-28
- Ex. 32:11-14; 34:1-10
- Is. 55:6-56:8
- Sephardim none

#### 1950, Jan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS פֵּרֶשֶׁיָה

- Gen. 47:28-50:26
- Ex. 1:1-6:1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Shvat 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. 6:2-9:35</td>
<td>Ezek. 28:25-29:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>New Year for Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>bashat shelah Shirah</td>
<td>Ex. 13:17-17:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. 18:1-20:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MONTHLY CALENDAR

**531**

**1950, Feb. 18—Mar. 18**

**ADAR 29 DAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS פּוֹרֶשׁ</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS הַפּוֹרֶשׁ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>תַּרְדִּימָה, מִשְׁרָח</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fast of Esther</td>
<td>Ex. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Is. 55:6-56:8 Seph. none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purim, Feast of Esther</td>
<td>Ex. 17:8-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. 27:20-30:10</td>
<td>Ezek. 43:10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>כִּי תְשִׁאָה, מִשְׁרָח</td>
<td>Ex. 30:11-34:35 Num. 19</td>
<td>Ezek. 36:16-38 Seph. 36:16-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Book of Esther is read*
**1950, Mar. 18—Apr. 17**  
**NISAN 30 DAYS**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 19</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev. 6:1–8:36</td>
<td>[Mal. 3:4–24; or]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 1</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[II Kings 7:3–20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>[Ex. 12:21–51]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Ex. 13:1–16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>הול המועד</td>
<td>[Num. 28:19–25]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Num. 28:19–25]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>י' רפשת</td>
<td>[Num. 9:1–14]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Passover*</td>
<td>[Num. 28:19–25]</td>
<td>II Sam. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ה' רפשת</td>
<td>[Ex. 13:17–15:26]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>אסרו תן</td>
<td>[Num. 28:19–25]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>שפנו, (מע', ההדשה)</td>
<td>Lev. 9:1–11:47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>א' דרשות חWhiteSpace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Song of Songs is read*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Iyar 1</td>
<td>נב, ראשית חודש</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>נחורה, מצארא</td>
<td>Lev. 12:1-15:33</td>
<td>II Kings 7:3-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ס个百分 מות, קדשים</td>
<td>Lev. 16:1-20:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>פרשו ספי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ליום עומר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33d Day of ‘Omer</td>
<td>Lev. 21:1-24:23</td>
<td>Ezek. 44:15-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>סאמר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>בשר, בכסחית, ומבר' החת</td>
<td>Lev. 25:1-27:34</td>
<td>Jer. 16:19-17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>יום כפור קסן</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Month</td>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td>Jewish Month</td>
<td>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</td>
<td>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</td>
<td>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feast of Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feast of Weeks*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Book of Ruth is read.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tam. 1</td>
<td>'ב יראת הוהי (New Moon)</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td>I Sam. 11:14–12:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>כרת</td>
<td>Num. 16:1–18:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 19:1–22:1</td>
<td>Judges 11:1–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>בלק</td>
<td>Num. 22:2–25:19</td>
<td>Micah 5:6–6:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>זומ ס/Area חס חות (Fast of Tammuz)</td>
<td>Ex. 32:11–14;34:1–10</td>
<td>Is. 55:6–56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seph. none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>פינחס (מב' הד')</td>
<td>Num. 25:10–30:1</td>
<td>Jer. 1:1–2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ים כפור (סן ומוקרם)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Civil Month

| July | August |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[Num. 30:2–36:13]</td>
<td>Is. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deut. 1:1–3:22</td>
<td>Is. 1:1–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Deut. 4:25–40]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>9 (Fast of Ab)</td>
<td>[Afternoon: Ex. 32:11–14; 34:1–10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Morning: Jer. 8:13–9:23]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[Seph. Hos. 14:2–10; Micah 7:18–20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[Is. 40:1–26]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Deut. 3:23–7:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deut. 7:12–11:25</td>
<td>Is. 49:14–51:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>[I Sam. 20:18–42 or Is. 54:11–55:5]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Deut. 11:26–16:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30 (New Moon)</td>
<td>Num. 28:1–15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Book of Lamentations is read*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>וְרַאָשׁ הַשָּׁעִיר / New Moon*</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>נְצָבִים</td>
<td>Deut. 16:18-21:9</td>
<td>Is. 51:12-52:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>כֵי תכשֵׁת</td>
<td>Deut. 21:10-25:19</td>
<td>Is. 54:1-10 or 54:1-55:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>כֵי חַבָּא</td>
<td>Deut. 26:1-29:8</td>
<td>Is. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>מְשָׁבֵיטִים לֶסְלֵיחָה / Selihot*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>נְצָבִים</td>
<td>Deut. 29:9-30:20</td>
<td>Is. 61:10-63:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Sephardim say Selihot during the whole month of Elul
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Year תארטש השנה</td>
<td>(Gen. 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Gen. 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Year תארטש השנה</td>
<td>(Num. 29:1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>סופרלאה</td>
<td>(Num. 29:1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fast of Gedaliah</td>
<td>Ex. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>לילך, שבת שמחה</td>
<td>Deut. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Day of Atonement</td>
<td>(Lev. 16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lev. 29:7-11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lev. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>요コミ</td>
<td>Deut. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Day of Atonement</td>
<td>(Is. 57:14-58:14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon: Jonah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>דואני</td>
<td>II Sam. 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tabernacles ת▷כבה</td>
<td>(Lev. 22:26-23:44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tabernacles ב▷כבה</td>
<td>(Lev. 22:26-23:44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>חול המועד</td>
<td>(Num. 29:20-28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Num. 29:20-25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ex. 33:12-34:26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Num. 29:23-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eighth Day of Feast השבעה</td>
<td>(Num. 29:26-34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rejoicing of the Law כספראת</td>
<td>(Num. 29:26-29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut. 14:22-16:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Num. 29:35-30:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>бארשיט, תמה</td>
<td>Gen. 1:1-6:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>תארטש חמש</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon תארטש החמש</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Book of Ecclesiastes is read*
### 1950, Oct. 12—Nov. 9 [השון 5711]

#### HESHVAN 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Hebrew Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ניוון</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 12:1-17:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is. 40:27-41:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 18:1-22:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II Kings 4:1-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seph. 4:1-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Kings 1:1-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 23:1-25:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS**
- New Moon

**PENTATEUCAL PORTIONS**
- Num. 28:1-15
- Gen. 6:9-11:32
- Gen. 12:1-17:27

**PROPHETICAL PORTIONS**
- Is. 40:27-41:16
- Gen. 18:1-22:24
- II Kings 4:1-37

**PROPHETICAL PORTIONS**
- Seph. 4:1-23
- I Kings 1:1-31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kislev 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 12</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 16</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 28:10-32:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 19</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 21</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 22</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 23</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 25</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 32:4-36:43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 26</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 28</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Feast of Dedication</td>
<td>Num. 7:1-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 7:18-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 6</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 8:24-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 7</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seph. 7:24-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 7:30-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 7:30-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KISLEV 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Moon</th>
<th>Ṭeruah</th>
<th>Num. 28:1-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Gen. 25:19-28:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 28:10-32:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Gen. 32:4-36:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 37:1-40:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 7:1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 6:6-7:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 7:18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 8:24-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Seph. 7:24-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 7:30-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Seph. 7:30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 7:36-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Seph. 7:36-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Gen. 41:1-44:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 48:9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Num. 7:42-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Ṭeruah</td>
<td>Zech. 2:14-4:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MONTHLY CALENDAR

**1950, Dec. 10—1951, Jan. 7**

**TEBET 29 DAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Month</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Month</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL PORTIONS</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL PORTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eighth Day of Hanukkah</td>
<td>Num. 7:54-8:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 44:18-47:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fast of Tebet</td>
<td>Ex. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Is. 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is. 55:6-56:8</td>
<td>Seph. none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. 1:1-6:1</td>
<td>Is. 27:6-28:13; 29:22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 Jan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. 6:2-9:35</td>
<td>Ezek. 28:25-29:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Sept. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Atonement</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Sept. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabernacles</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Day of Feast</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heshvan</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Oct. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Oct. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanukkah</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebet</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Nov. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Tebet</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Nov. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shebat</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Nov. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar Sheni</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purim</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Mar. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Mar. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Apr. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyar</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Apr. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th of Iyar</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Apr. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Weeks</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>May 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>June 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Tammuz</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>June 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>July 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Ab</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>July 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Aug. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Second day of New Moon.
† Fast observed on following day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Year</td>
<td>Sept. 28 Sa</td>
<td>Sept. 17 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 6 M</td>
<td>Sept. 26 M</td>
<td>Sept. 14 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 22 M</td>
<td>Sept. 12 Sa</td>
<td>Sept. 30 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 18 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heshvan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Nov. 27 W</td>
<td>Nov. 15 S</td>
<td>*Nov. 5 F</td>
<td>Nov. 24 Th</td>
<td>*Nov. 13 M</td>
<td>Dec. 1 S</td>
<td>*Nov. 21 F</td>
<td>Nov. 10 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
<th>1944</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shebat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Feb. 24 M</td>
<td>*Feb. 12 F</td>
<td>*Feb. 2 W</td>
<td>*Feb. 20 M</td>
<td>*Feb. 10 Sa</td>
<td>*Feb. 28 F</td>
<td>*Feb. 18 W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar Sheni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>*Mar. 4 F</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>*Mar. 11 M</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>.............</td>
<td>.............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>Mar. 24 T</td>
<td>Mar. 13 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 2 Sa</td>
<td>Mar. 21 T</td>
<td>Apr. 9 T</td>
<td>Mar. 29 Sa</td>
<td>Mar. 19 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 6 T</td>
<td>Mar. 25 Sa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr. 7 T</td>
<td>Mar. 27 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 16 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 4 T</td>
<td>Apr. 23 T</td>
<td>Apr. 12 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 2 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 20 T</td>
<td>Apr. 8 Sa</td>
<td>Mar. 29 Th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Apr. 23 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 12 M</td>
<td>*May 2 M</td>
<td>*Apr. 20 Th</td>
<td>*May 9 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 28 M</td>
<td>*Apr. 18 Sa</td>
<td>*May 23 M</td>
<td>*Apr. 24 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 33rd Day of Omer</td>
<td>May 10 S</td>
<td>Apr. 29 Th</td>
<td>May 19 Th</td>
<td>May 7 S</td>
<td>May 26 S</td>
<td>May 15 Th</td>
<td>May 5 T</td>
<td>May 23 T</td>
<td>May 11 Th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>May 22 F</td>
<td>May 11 T</td>
<td>May 31 T</td>
<td>May 19 F</td>
<td>June 7 F</td>
<td>May 27 T</td>
<td>May 17 S</td>
<td>June 4 F</td>
<td>May 23 T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feast of Weeks</td>
<td>May 27 W</td>
<td>May 16 S</td>
<td>June 5 S</td>
<td>June 24 W</td>
<td>June 12 W</td>
<td>June 1 S</td>
<td>May 22 F</td>
<td>June 9 W</td>
<td>May 28 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*June 21 S</td>
<td>*June 10 Th</td>
<td>*June 30 Th</td>
<td>*June 18 S</td>
<td>*July 7 S</td>
<td>*June 26 Th</td>
<td>*June 16 T</td>
<td>*July 4 S</td>
<td>*June 22 Th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Fast of Tammuz</td>
<td>July 7 T</td>
<td>June 26 s</td>
<td>July 16 fSa</td>
<td>July 4 Th</td>
<td>July 23 T</td>
<td>July 12 fSa</td>
<td>July 2 Th</td>
<td>July 20 T</td>
<td>July 8 fSa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>July 20 M</td>
<td>July 9 fF</td>
<td>July 29 fF</td>
<td>July 17 M</td>
<td>Aug. 5 M</td>
<td>July 25 fF</td>
<td>July 15 W</td>
<td>Aug. 2 M</td>
<td>July 21 fF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Fast of Ab</td>
<td>July 28 T</td>
<td>July 17 fSa</td>
<td>Aug. 6 fSa</td>
<td>July 25 T</td>
<td>Aug. 13 T</td>
<td>Aug. 2 fSa</td>
<td>July 23 Th</td>
<td>Aug. 10 T</td>
<td>July 29 fSa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Second day of New Moon.
† Fast observed on following day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Year</td>
<td>Sept. 8</td>
<td>Sept. 26</td>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td>Oct. 4</td>
<td>Sept. 24</td>
<td>Sept. 12</td>
<td>Oct. 1</td>
<td>Sept. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>Nov. 24</td>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
<td>Dec. 3</td>
<td>Nov. 22</td>
<td>Dec. 4</td>
<td>Nov. 30</td>
<td>Nov. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Feb. 2</td>
<td>Feb. 21</td>
<td>Feb. 11</td>
<td>Feb. 18</td>
<td>Feb. 23</td>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>Feb. 23</td>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adar Sheni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Mar. 4</td>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>Mar. 9</td>
<td>Mar. 5</td>
<td>Mar. 27</td>
<td>Mar. 27</td>
<td>Mar. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Apr. 2</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Apr. 31</td>
<td>Apr. 14</td>
<td>Apr. 2</td>
<td>Apr. 21</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Apr. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 16</td>
<td>Apr. 5</td>
<td>Apr. 24</td>
<td>Apr. 14</td>
<td>Apr. 2</td>
<td>Apr. 21</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Apr. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Apr. 21</td>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>Apr. 30</td>
<td>Apr. 18</td>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>Apr. 26</td>
<td>May 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33rd Day of 'Omer</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>May 24</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>May 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>May 20</td>
<td>May 28</td>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 21</td>
<td>May 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Weeks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>June 3</td>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>June 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>July 8</td>
<td>July 28</td>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>July 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fast of Tammuz</td>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>July 24</td>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>July 2</td>
<td>July 21</td>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>July 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>July 29</td>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Aug. 6</td>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>July 23</td>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>July 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Aug. 28</td>
<td>Aug. 17</td>
<td>Sept. 5</td>
<td>Aug. 26</td>
<td>Sept. 2</td>
<td>Aug. 22</td>
<td>Aug. 12</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Second day of New Moon.
† Fast observed on following day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>1 New Year</td>
<td>Sept. 16 Sa</td>
<td>Sept. 6 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 26 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 15 M</td>
<td>Oct. 3 Sa</td>
<td>Sept. 22 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 11 M</td>
<td>Sept. 29 Sa</td>
<td>Sept. 19 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Nov. 16 W</td>
<td>*Nov. 5 W</td>
<td>Nov. 15 S</td>
<td>Nov. 13 Th</td>
<td>*Dec. 2 W</td>
<td>Nov. 20 T</td>
<td>Nov. 9 Th</td>
<td>Nov. 28 W</td>
<td>Nov. 17 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Hanukkah</td>
<td>Dec. 10 Sa</td>
<td>Nov. 29 Th</td>
<td>Dec. 9 W</td>
<td>Dec. 7 S</td>
<td>Dec. 26 Sa</td>
<td>Dec. 14 W</td>
<td>Dec. 3 S</td>
<td>Dec. 22 Sa</td>
<td>Nov. 30 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Mar. 4 M</td>
<td>*Feb. 27 F</td>
<td>*Feb. 20 M</td>
<td>*Mar. 4 S</td>
<td>*Feb. 10 M</td>
<td>*Feb. 28 F</td>
<td>*Feb. 20 S</td>
<td>*Mar. 5 F</td>
<td>*Feb. 16 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>Mar. 13 T</td>
<td>Apr. 2 T</td>
<td>Mar. 13 S</td>
<td>Apr. 9 T</td>
<td>Mar. 29 T</td>
<td>Mar. 18 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 5 Th</td>
<td>Mar. 26 T</td>
<td>Apr. 3 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Passover</td>
<td>Mar. 27 T</td>
<td>Apr. 16 T</td>
<td>Mar. 27 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 23 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 12 T</td>
<td>Apr. 1 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 19 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 9 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 17 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyar</td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Apr. 12 Th</td>
<td>*May 2 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 12 M</td>
<td>*May 9 Sa</td>
<td>*Apr. 28 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 17 M</td>
<td>*May 5 Sa</td>
<td>*Apr. 25 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 13 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 3rd Day of 'Omer</td>
<td>Apr. 29 S</td>
<td>May 19 S</td>
<td>Apr. 29 Th</td>
<td>May 26 T</td>
<td>May 15 S</td>
<td>May 4 Th</td>
<td>May 22 T</td>
<td>May 12 S</td>
<td>May 30 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>May 11 F</td>
<td>May 31 F</td>
<td>May 11 T</td>
<td>June 7 S</td>
<td>May 27 F</td>
<td>May 16 T</td>
<td>June 3 S</td>
<td>May 24 F</td>
<td>May 12 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Feast of Weeks</td>
<td>May 16 W</td>
<td>June 5 W</td>
<td>May 16 S</td>
<td>June 12 F</td>
<td>June 1 W</td>
<td>May 21 S</td>
<td>June 8 F</td>
<td>May 29 W</td>
<td>May 17 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*June 10 S</td>
<td>*June 30 S *June 10 Th</td>
<td>*July 7 F</td>
<td>*June 26 S</td>
<td>*June 15 Th</td>
<td>*July 3 T</td>
<td>*June 23 S</td>
<td>*June 11 Th</td>
<td>*July 1 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>17 Fast of Tammuz</td>
<td>June 26 T</td>
<td>July 16 T</td>
<td>June 26 Sa</td>
<td>July 23 Th</td>
<td>July 12 T</td>
<td>July 1 Sa</td>
<td>July 19 Th</td>
<td>July 9 T</td>
<td>July 17 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>July 9 M</td>
<td>July 29 M</td>
<td>July 9 F</td>
<td>Aug. 5 W</td>
<td>July 25 M</td>
<td>July 14 F</td>
<td>Aug. 1 W</td>
<td>July 12 M</td>
<td>July 10 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Fast of Ab</td>
<td>July 17 T</td>
<td>Aug. 6 T</td>
<td>July 17 Sa</td>
<td>Aug. 13 Th</td>
<td>Aug. 2 T</td>
<td>July 22 Sa</td>
<td>Aug. 9 Th</td>
<td>July 30 T</td>
<td>July 18 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 New Moon</td>
<td>*Aug. 8 W</td>
<td>*Aug. 28 W</td>
<td>*Aug. 8 S</td>
<td>*Sept. 4 F</td>
<td>*Aug. 24 W</td>
<td>*Aug. 12 S</td>
<td>Aug. 31 F</td>
<td>*Aug. 21 W</td>
<td>*Aug. 9 S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Second day of New Moon.
† Fast observed on following day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Year</td>
<td>Sept. 27 M</td>
<td>Sept. 28 M</td>
<td>Sept. 29 M</td>
<td>Sept. 30 M</td>
<td>Oct. 1 Th</td>
<td>Sept. 20 M</td>
<td>Sept. 9 M</td>
<td>Sept. 17 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heshvan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>*Oct. 27 W</td>
<td>*Oct. 15 Sa</td>
<td>*Nov. 4 Sa</td>
<td>*Oct. 23 W</td>
<td>*Oct. 13 M</td>
<td>*Oct. 31 Sa</td>
<td>*Oct. 17 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Nov. 25 Th</td>
<td>Nov. 14 M</td>
<td>Dec. 3 S</td>
<td>*Nov. 22 F</td>
<td>Nov. 19 S</td>
<td>Nov. 9 M</td>
<td>Nov. 15 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>*Feb. 21 M</td>
<td>*Feb. 11 Sa</td>
<td>*Mar. 1 F</td>
<td>*Feb. 19 W</td>
<td>*Feb. 7 Sa</td>
<td>*Feb. 5 Sa</td>
<td>*Feb. 3 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Mar. 22 T</td>
<td>Apr. 11 T</td>
<td>Mar. 30 Sa</td>
<td>Mar. 20 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 7 T</td>
<td>Apr. 17 T</td>
<td>Apr. 3 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>Apr. 5 T</td>
<td>Apr. 25 T</td>
<td>Apr. 13 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 3 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 21 T</td>
<td>Apr. 10 Sa</td>
<td>Apr. 30 Th</td>
<td>Apr. 21 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iyar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>*Apr. 29 Th</td>
<td>*May 11 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 29 M</td>
<td>*Apr. 19 Sa</td>
<td>*May 7 Th</td>
<td>*Apr. 26 M</td>
<td>*Apr. 15 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33rd Day of 'Omer</td>
<td>May 8 S</td>
<td>May 28 S</td>
<td>May 16 Th</td>
<td>May 6 T</td>
<td>May 24 S</td>
<td>May 13 Th</td>
<td>May 2 T</td>
<td>May 20 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>May 20 F</td>
<td>June 9 F</td>
<td>May 28 T</td>
<td>May 18 S</td>
<td>June 5 F</td>
<td>May 25 T</td>
<td>May 14 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Feast of Weeks</td>
<td>May 25 W</td>
<td>June 14 W</td>
<td>June 2 S</td>
<td>May 23 F</td>
<td>June 10 W</td>
<td>May 30 S</td>
<td>May 19 F</td>
<td>June 6 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>*June 19 S</td>
<td>*July 9 S</td>
<td>*June 27 Th</td>
<td>*June 17 T</td>
<td>*July 5 S</td>
<td>*June 24 Th</td>
<td>*June 13 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fast of Tammuz</td>
<td>July 5 T</td>
<td>July 25 T</td>
<td>July 13 Sa</td>
<td>July 3 Th</td>
<td>July 21 T</td>
<td>July 10 Sa</td>
<td>June 29 Th</td>
<td>July 17 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>July 18 M</td>
<td>Aug. 7 M</td>
<td>July 26 F</td>
<td>July 16 W</td>
<td>Aug. 3 M</td>
<td>July 23 F</td>
<td>July 12 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fast of Ab</td>
<td>July 26 T</td>
<td>Aug. 15 T</td>
<td>Aug. 3 Sa</td>
<td>July 24 Th</td>
<td>Aug. 11 T</td>
<td>July 31 Sa</td>
<td>July 20 Th</td>
<td>July 8 T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Second day of New Moon.
† Fast observed on following day.
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OBJECTS OF THE COMMITTEE

The objects of this corporation shall be, to prevent the infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews, in any part of the world; to render all lawful assistance and to take appropriate remedial action in the event of threatened or actual invasion or restriction of such rights, or of unfavorable discrimination with respect thereto; to secure for Jews equality of economic, social and educational opportunity; to alleviate the consequences of persecution and to afford relief from calamities affecting Jews, wherever they may occur; and to compass these ends to administer any relief fund which shall come into its possession or which may be received by it, in trust or otherwise, for any of the aforesaid objects or for purposes comprehended therein.

—Extract from the Charter
FUTURE historians may well look back on 1948 as a crucial year, if not indeed as a year of decision. Certainly events have moved at an accelerating rate both with respect to world affairs generally and to Jews in particular.

Since Jews are members of the world community the two cannot be dissociated. What affects everyone, naturally affects Jews, too, and as 2,000 years have made tragically plain, only too often affects Jews to a greater degree.

It is only in the last few years, however, that the world has realized that the converse is equally true, that whatever touches the Jew or any other minority group has an immediate reaction upon the concerns of the world. If Nazi persecutions and consequent cataclysm did not prove that point, the headlines of the past 12 months have clinched it. Palestine has competed with Berlin and China for top billing; civil rights at home with taxes and inflation.

The work of the American Jewish Committee (organized to safeguard and further the civil, political, economic and religious rights of Jews wherever they may be over the world) has had to keep pace with the ever increasing complexity of events.

A score of major fronts, all vital to the interests of Jews, now exists where only a bare handful existed a decade ago. What happens in England, in Egypt, in Morocco, in China, in the Argentine and Peru must concern us as much as the latest trends in German anti-Semitism. The admissions policy of a fresh-water college in the Middle West and the denial of decent housing facilities to Negroes on the Eastern seaboard compete in interest with yesterday’s manifestation of the Ku Klux Klan’s strength in Georgia. The cultural health and spiritual dignity of the Jews themselves demand the closest consideration.

No single item can be lifted out of context and adjudged the most important; that is, the one in which all the attention should be centered to the exclusion of others.

Therefore, the Committee (to fulfill its global responsibility conscientiously) has had to expand its field of operations and enter upon areas which formerly had been touched on only lightly or not at all. Yet such expansion has not led, as some might think, to overextension and spreading thin. It has been accompanied at the same time by a concentration in depth and a grouping of logically related subjects into major categories which can be handled as units with all the resources and skills at our disposal.

Every department of the Committee, every subdivision, works in harmonious coordination with its fellows to bring the maximum effort to bear upon the particular problem in order to achieve the maximum success.

Nor do coordination and teamwork stop at the doors of the Committee. Each group of experts within the Committee and each lay functional committee have special contacts on the outside, other organizations and influential people, both Jewish and non-Jewish, who are brought into the picture and set to work. With

* Mr. Blaustein was elected president of the American Jewish Committee at the 42nd Annual Meeting.
such a total effort, results are often achieved that no single specialized group, no matter how expert, could possibly have obtained.

In the account of stewardship which Judge Proskauer presented to you, he outlined some of the problems and accomplishments of the Committee over the past six years. This Report will be devoted chiefly to an examination of the major objectives that have claimed the attention and energies of the Committee during 1948.

Even within these limits only the highlights can be considered if this Report is not to become a full-length book. For detailed coverage of our manifold activities, the minutes of our Executive and Administrative Committees and our other committees, the files of the Committee Reporter, our press releases, our special reports and publications, our mailings to chapter members and to local community relations agencies must be consulted.

Let us turn our attention to some of these major 1948 projects.

**Human Rights and Genocide**

In the closing days of the United Nations session at Paris last month, the General Assembly adopted two epoch-making documents: the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the Declaration of Human Rights. Passed in swift succession on December 9 and 10, they marked the end of a long, arduous struggle that began in 1945, a struggle in which the American Jewish Committee played a significant part.

The term "genocide" to denote any deliberate attempt to destroy national, ethnic, racial or religious groups as such, was coined by Dr. Raphael Lemkin, a Polish refugee now on the faculty of Yale Law School. His idea that genocide be made an international crime, punishable by international action, enlisted our interest. As a member, along with an English and a French Jewish organization, of the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, which has consultant status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council, we were in a position to press within the United Nations for a genocide convention as well as for other proposals in the field of human rights. For over a year and a half, a staff member of the American Jewish Committee was engaged primarily in promoting the Genocide Convention. Resolutions were drafted and redrafted. Delegates were briefed with factual material and arguments, and slowly but surely a workable convention was hammered out.

At the same time, we embarked upon an extensive publicity campaign utilizing our full staff resources, the manifold channels of public opinion—press, magazines, radio, forums—and the cooperation of appropriate organizations including labor, veterans, church and youth groups.

Widespread support for the outlawing of the horrible crime of mass exterminations developed. And now the world, through its organization, the United Nations, has acted; genocide has been declared to be an international crime and, what is particularly important, is under the jurisdiction of an international tribunal, not just domestic state courts.

An even more important role was played by the American Jewish Committee in the final passage of the Declaration of Human Rights. In this field the Committee was on the job from the very beginning. When the United Nations was first organized at San Francisco in 1945, Judge Proskauer and your Chairman were there on behalf of the Committee as consultants to the American Delegation to plead the cause of human rights.

It was largely through those efforts that the Charter of the United Nations incorporated the provisions making respect for the dignity of the human being and protection for the human rights of each individual, regardless of race, language, religion or sex, a special province of the new-born organization, and provided for the creation of the Commission on Human Rights.
This was a great step forward; but only a step. The general declaration had to be made concrete. For nearly three years we labored with various United Nations bodies, with delegates and public officials, and with the folks back home. Here, again, a broad campaign of public education was initiated, on our own and in conjunction with non-Jewish groups, to make the average American understand the fundamental concepts involved and aware of the necessity for United Nations action.

That action has now been taken. In approving a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, defining the political, social, economic and other rights of the individual, the United Nations has put its full weight squarely behind the rights and freedoms of all human beings everywhere in the world.

In summing up the impact of these accomplishments, a recent statement by your President and your Chairman might be quoted: "The adoption of both the Human Rights Declaration and the Genocide Convention is an historic achievement. For these measures usher in an era of international relations in which the welfare of men supersedes all other considerations—an era of law and justice in human affairs."

There still remains to be adopted a Covenant on Human Rights, an International Bill of Rights itself—and it is expected that this will be forthcoming at the next regular Assembly of the United Nations.

Palestine

Other historic events occurred in the halls of the United Nations during the year. Of special interest to us was the matter of Palestine. A year ago we hailed the decision of the United Nations to partition Palestine as perhaps the most momentous in many years. We thought that the power and prestige of the world organization, in spite of temporary difficulties, would be able to make that decision stick.

But shortly thereafter the situation in Palestine began rapidly to deteriorate. Even while the British remained ostensibly in control, bloody fighting broke out between Arabs and Jews. By the time the mandatory power officially withdrew, the fighting had turned into full-scale warfare. The surrounding Arab states, in open defiance of a decision of the United Nations, gathered their armies and simultaneously invaded those areas which had been formally allotted to the Jews. The Old City of Jerusalem, which under the partition plan was supposed to have been internationalized, was seized by the Arab forces and the great Jewish population of both the old and the new cities placed in desperate danger. Also, violence or threats of violence against Jews occurred in Egypt and other Arab lands.

In the face of these clear and open violations of its decisions, the United Nations, which in the meantime had been making very good progress in other essential functions, did little more, besides arguing and debating, than to send observers and mediators.

The muddled situation was a matter of the deepest concern to the Committee. For one thing, your officers, in conference with members of our government, urged our State Department to use its good offices to secure protection for the Jews in the Near Eastern countries. Further, both alone and in conjunction with other organizations, we continued to support full implementation of the Partition Plan. We also urged our government to grant de jure recognition to the Israeli Provisional Government and to repeal its embargo on arms.

Meanwhile, the beleaguered Jews in Palestine, surrounded and invaded by tremendously superior forces, amazed the world by their initial defense and ultimate smashing victories.

An uneasy truce intervened as a result of United Nations action, and an official mission headed by Count Bernadotte entered the Holy Land both to supervise the truce and to seek a permanent solution. The Count's assassination by a small group of terrorists shocked the world and brought immediate expressions of
sorrow and indignation from the Israeli Government, in which the American Jewish Committee concurred.

The course of our own government toward Israel at this time was unclear and evidenced what later proved to be a temporary shift in policy. During the darkest days of the Arab invasion, an invasion that flouted and sought to set aside by force of arms a decision of the United Nations Assembly, neither our government nor the United Nations itself sought to invoke the sanctions which the Charter contemplated in cases of unprovoked aggression. Instead, the U. S. Government Delegate at the United Nations proposed a modification of the original resolution on partition in favor of a trusteeship.

The Committee promptly pointed out that any such modification was unwarranted and unwise and demanded that the partition be adhered to and the full weight of the United Nations' authority be employed to repel the invasion and punish the aggressors.

American policy shifted back when, upon proclamation of the creation of the State of Israel, President Truman immediately accorded *de facto* recognition to it. At the meeting of our Executive Committee on October 17, 1948, after a review of the situation, three resolutions were adopted.

The first requested the American Government to help effectuate partition; to support an adequate territorial settlement that would make possible the immigration, settlement and rehabilitation of a large number of Jews in Israel; and urged speedy action to grant the new State *de jure* recognition, appropriate reinforcement of its economy and active support of its admission to the United Nations.

The other two resolutions were addressed to Israel itself. One expressed the hope that the political structure and practices of the state would be in harmony with the basic tenets of Western democracy. The other urged on its representatives the importance of avoiding any pronouncements from which it might be inferred that the State of Israel regards itself as the spokesman for the Jews of the world or for any Jewish community outside of its own borders.

Your officers were afforded the opportunity of making suggestions to Israeli officials concerning the constitution of the new state, and we are pleased to note that a number of our views have been met in the constitution now proposed.

The entire problem of Palestine occupied a major spot in United Nations deliberations at Paris during the closing months of 1948. The United States stood, and stands, firm for partition. But it cannot be said that any bold or decisive actions were taken by the United Nations.

Eventually a compromise resolution was adopted, setting up a three-nation conciliation commission for Palestine with a frame of reference which excludes both the original Partition Plan and the Bernadotte Plan. The United States, Turkey and France were named on the commission. Consideration of Israel's application for membership in the United Nations, which the United States supported, was denied for the time being by the Security Council.

From the complexity of the events of the past year one indubitable fact emerges: the State of Israel is solidly established and is here to stay. It can also be safely predicted that, in spite of certain twistings and turnings necessitated by world politics, Israel will eventually enter into the community of nations as an equal partner and an example of true democracy. To that end the American Jewish Committee has worked and will continue to work in the future.

To avoid misconceptions, to place the State of Israel in its true light, and to help influence the impact of Israel on American Jewish life, the Committee embarked on a major campaign to enlighten the American people. Four things have been stressed through every medium of mass communication and through the great special groups to which most Americans belong, such as religious, veteran, labor, and youth:

One, that the State of Israel is a democracy similar in background and institutions to the United States;
Two, that Palestinian Jews and Arabs have lived together in the past and can continue to live in peace and harmony in the future once the invading Arab armies are withdrawn;

Three, that the Jews are fighting and dying bravely for the same fundamental rights for which our own revolutionary patriots fought and died, and

Four, that the Jews have immeasurably raised the standard of living in Palestine for both Jews and Arabs, and have made the desert blossom and bring forth fruits.

At the same time, we have been undertaking a continuing survey—through special polls, analyses of newspaper comments and first-hand observations at the local level—of American public opinion regarding Israel and its impact on American Jews. All reports indicate a generally sympathetic and favorable reaction, which was not broken even by the terrific shock of Count Bernadotte's assassination.

It is the intention of the Committee to continue its studies and efforts along these lines and to make plain to the American people—what is a fact—that American Jews, while sympathetic to the State of Israel, are first, last and always American citizens, undivided in their loyalties to the United States of which they are an integral part.

**Displaced Persons—Immigration**

With the establishment of Israel, the Jews in the displaced persons camps of Europe are beginning to move. Even under the discriminatory terms of the United States Displaced Persons Act, it is estimated that some 15,000 to 20,000 will be admitted to this country. It is also estimated that a somewhat smaller number will go to other countries, but the great majority must look to Israel as a haven. It is on that inescapable fact that the fundamental and realistic position of the American Jewish Committee on Palestine has always been predicated.

An unofficial report from an Israeli spokesman indicates that during 1948 well over 100,000 Jews, of whom a considerable portion are from the DP camps, have already entered its gates and are being absorbed.

It is hoped that the continuation of this movement, together with an anticipated liberalization of the United States DP law by the new Congress (to which further reference will later be made) will essentially empty the camps, within the next year.

**Rehabilitation of European Jews—Restitution—Protection of Rights**

But there will still remain Jewish communities in Europe whose necessities and future welfare must continue to merit, as they have in the past, the closest attention and assistance of the Committee. While other organizations have devoted themselves to the relief needs of these communities, the Committee has concentrated on a long-range program of rehabilitation and the protection of Jewish rights.

Through our Washington, Paris and London offices we are set to do the things necessary to make living conditions better for Jews remaining overseas, and to make them more self-supporting so that, from an economic standpoint among other things, we may look forward to the day when the overseas relief load on the American Jewish community can, as it must, be substantially reduced. It would be folly, while giving emergency relief, not to do those things designed to bring about more permanent solutions.

We have been particularly interested in effecting restitution to Jews of the property illegally seized from them during the period of Nazi control, and in the return, administration and disposition of Jewish property to which there are no known heirs or claimants.

After extensive efforts, a Jewish Restitution Successor Organization was finally set up by General Lucius D. Clay in the American-held zone of Germany, composed of the major Jewish agencies in the United States, France, Great Britain and Germany concerned with the problem, to which the heirless and unclaimed
property is to be conveyed for administration on behalf of the surviving European Jewish communities. Three members of the American Jewish Committee have been named to the Board of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, one as a Vice-President and another as Treasurer. Efforts for similar arrangements in the other German zones and in Austria are being made.

As regards the internal civic defense of European Jewish communities, we maintain through our Paris and London offices close contact with the community leadership of the countries of Western Europe.

Germany itself remains a sore spot. We consider projects for German re-education to democratic thinking vital not so much for the Jews in Germany—few intend to remain—but for the peace and security of the world at large. On the theory that such projects will be most acceptable if they stem from Germans themselves, we have aided and supported the Lessing Association formed by liberal Germans there to combat anti-Semitism.

**Latin America**

In Latin America, too, we are extending our working relations with leaders of the Jewish communities, at their request. Our office in Buenos Aires is now functioning. Our objectives are the better integration of the Latin American Jewish communities in their respective countries and the safeguarding of their full civil and political rights.

**Domestic Scene**

So much for the world scene. If we have stressed it so much, that does not mean that the domestic scene is not equally important. In fact, as Americans, we might consider that what goes on here in the United States is of primary importance. It is here that we live and have our being; the U.S.A. is closest to our hearts and our interests. But, as has been pointed out time and again in these Reports, the two cannot be untangled. What happens in Europe, in Asia, in Latin America, or anywhere else in the world has its repercussions, and almost immediately, on the American scene, and vitally affects us both as American citizens and as Jews. Hitler and World War II proved that for all time.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight has witnessed some major developments here. And we have largely concentrated our campaigns on the major issues, though never for a moment omitting other issues as they unfold, or skimping on the day-by-day activities believed necessary to lay a solid foundation for neighborly and cooperative living by all the groups that make up this America of ours.

This work, essentially undramatic and long-range, employs every conceivable channel of communication, including television, for bringing our message to the general public and, in terms of their special group interests, to important special segments thereof. Obviously, effects of this program cannot be gauged with precision, but we have every reason to believe that it is doing a job that has to be done.

**Civil Rights**

By all odds, the broadest specific issue that developed during the year was that of Civil Rights. Originally brought to the fore with telling impact by the Report of the President’s Committee on Civil Rights, this became the crucial issue at the Democratic National Convention. The inclusion of strong civil rights planks in that party’s platform led to a split in its ranks and the creation of a new national party. The ensuing political campaign was fought to no small extent over this issue, and the result was a clear-cut mandate to President Truman to pursue his program of bringing American practices into closer conformity with American principles.

The American Jewish Committee, of course, took no position on political
candidates or party platforms. However, before, during and since the campaign, it pursued its non-partisan educational task of explaining to the American people the meaning of, and necessity for, a Civil Rights program. Some particulars of what was done in this area will serve to indicate the way in which the Committee handles this type of campaign.

We moved into action immediately on release of the Report of the President's Committee. Or rather, we had not waited for its release, for as indicated in last year's Report, while the President's Committee was still studying the problem, we were asked to and did furnish it, through your Executive Vice-President at its hearing, a suggested program and plan of action. All of our suggestions were embodied in its official Report.

Upon release of the Report, comprising 173 printed pages, all our facilities were utilized to get its contents to the American people in usable, digestible form. A summary for popular consumption was written and 200,000 copies distributed. We sent copies of the full Report to key groups and individuals all over the country. We helped prepare the Public Affairs Committee's pamphlet on the subject. We sent out fact sheets to editors, commentators and publicists generally, and prepared literally hundreds of articles, speeches, plays, cartoons, resolutions, posters, comics, radio scripts, etc., which had a tremendous distribution through both the usual mass outlets and in the veterans', labor, women's, religious, fraternal, cooperative and youth publications and conventions. Turnover Talks for CIO and AFL unions were prepared and sold to them at cost. We worked with radio programs, and in particular with the Mutual Network, to dramatize the Report on the air.

We publicized on a nation-wide basis, through pamphlets and kindred means, the work of Montclair, N. J., in investigating its own backyard in the light of the Civil Rights Report—and through our chapters, through local Jewish Community Relations Councils, Mayors' Unity Committees and similar non-sectarian local groups, we urged that similar surveys be taken in other communities.

We did this, and more. A National Citizens' Council on Civil Rights was formed with Dean Ernest O. Melby of New York University as chairman pro tem to keep "the American heritage of civil rights before the American people as a non-partisan, non-political issue." With an impressive list of sponsors, and with the closest cooperation of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, this Council has performed yeoman service. So have the Advertising Council of America, the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions and Church Extension, the American Legion, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and a host of other organizations.

But this is not all. Last year, for the first time, we initiated at our Annual Meeting a series of Workshops at which chapter leaders met to discuss how best to bring matters on the Committee's agenda back to their communities for local action, and in turn bring to the attention of the national organization the thinking of those communities on these same matters. In the area of Civil Rights, as well as in other areas, the Workshops developed important recommendations for action on both of these fronts.

Our Legal Department, while of course still keeping a weather eye out for, and dealing with, subversive activities and organized anti-Semitism generally, this year completed a major reorganization directed toward increased emphasis on legal, legislative and social action. Civil Rights naturally took first place. The problem was broken down into four general areas, of prime importance to Jews as well as to other minority groups.

The problem of discrimination in employment was considered the key issue, and the one in which legal action and legislation were most feasible. New York had already pioneered with the Ives-Quinn bill, and New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut followed suit. In four other large states, efforts, which we are vigorously supporting, are under way with reasonable prospects for success to secure passage of similar legislation this year. Where such laws are already in being, the Com-
mittee is on the alert to see that they are properly enforced. It is, of course, also continuing its support of a Federal FEPC bill.

The second area relates to Discrimination in Higher Education. Here again New York led the way with a Fair Educational Practices Act and a bill to establish a State University open to all. In the promotion of these bills, which represent notable progress in a hitherto untouched field, the Committee played an outstanding role. We are now engaged in efforts to ensure their adequate implementation. Similar legislation is expected to follow in other states, while a Federal Education Bill (stemming from the President's Commission on Higher Education) with essential safeguards, is being advocated.

The third area involves the relations of Church and State, particularly in the field of public education. The growing tendency of religious groups to encroach upon the public school system and to invoke state aid in behalf of their own sectarian schools is viewed with considerable concern. It is felt, after almost a century of agreement that both the Constitution and the American spirit have barred any connection between Church and State, that these barriers are now being successfully breached by interested denominational groups. Released time programs, free bus transportation and textbooks, Bible teaching, sectarian hymns, the employment in public schools of teachers clad in the garb of religious orders, and increasing pressure for Federal and State subsidies to parochial schools are all symptomatic of this trend.

In only one phase of this area has the Supreme Court of the United States thus far called a halt—released time. In a momentous decision in the Champaign, Illinois, case, in which the American Jewish Committee was among the organizations intervening as *amicus curiae*, the Court declared that the practice of using public school classrooms for religious instruction was unconstitutional. Whether the prohibition applies to all released time programs, no matter how conducted, will soon be tested through cases being brought in New York and elsewhere. In these cases, too, we, as well as the other Jewish organizations affiliated with the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), have a deep concern.

In only one phase of this area has the Supreme Court of the United States thus far called a halt—released time. In a momentous decision in the Champaign, Illinois, case, in which the American Jewish Committee was among the organizations intervening as *amicus curiae*, the Court declared that the practice of using public school classrooms for religious instruction was unconstitutional. Whether the prohibition applies to all released time programs, no matter how conducted, will soon be tested through cases being brought in New York and elsewhere. In these cases, too, we, as well as the other Jewish organizations affiliated with the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), have a deep concern.

The fourth area of specialized action in behalf of Civil Rights is housing. The use of restrictive covenants to enforce racial and religious discriminations against tenants and would-be purchasers of dwellings has spread to large sections of the country.

Fortunately, a campaign to put a stop to this serious evil has recently come to a successful conclusion. In May, 1948, a case initiated in New York went up on appeal to the United States Supreme Court. The American Jewish Committee prepared the brief *amicus curiae*, and was joined in it by other Jewish organizations. The Court denied the use of the courts for the enforcement of restrictive covenants. This represents a notable advance.

To sum up the situation in Civil Rights: In all of these special areas and in the field of personal freedoms generally—such as security of person, the right to vote, freedom of conscience, and equality of opportunity—the Committee is conducting an all-out campaign. It is a campaign in which every agency and department is coordinated for fullest impact; and in which long-range educational efforts move side by side with instant action—on particular violations, and with the drafting and promotion of legislation to enforce these rights by law. It is an immense field, but one in which it can be said that fruitful progress is being made.

**U. S. Displaced Persons Immigration Legislation**

Another major activity of the last year was concerned with the United States DP immigration legislation. When first we urged such legislation over two years ago, apathy, not to say hostility, was rife both in the country and in the Congress. Only a vigorous and extensive program of public education made possible the passage of any such legislation at all. But the herculean efforts of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons—efforts into whose planning and execution our
members threw themselves whole-heartedly—eventually created a public demand that Congress could not resist.

Unfortunately, the bill adopted in the last-minute rush before adjournment of the Eightieth Congress contained discriminatory features that led it to be denounced—not only by us and other Jewish organizations, but by many Christian and non-sectarian groups, by a large portion of the nation's organs of public opinion, and by leading members of both political parties—as an anti-Semitic measure unworthy to stand on American statute books. The President of the United States, in signing the Act, served notice that he would call at the earliest possible occasion for its modification, and has since done so. We are now bending our utmost efforts to ensure that result. The present composition of Congress augurs well for success.

Basic U. S. Immigration Act

The educational program undertaken in connection with the DP Bill should also aid us to realize our hope that the basic immigration policy of our country will some day be liberalized. The testimony submitted to the Senate Committee last fall by Irving M. Engel, my successor as Chairman of your Executive Committee, was an impressive first step toward that end.

The cardinal feature of the general Immigration Act (which has been in force for a generation) allocates quotas to countries in the Eastern Hemisphere in a way that weighs heavily against prospective immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe. We have always regarded as wrong in principle this "national origins" basis for immigration. It is equally reprehensible in practice, for the favored countries have used nowhere near their theoretical quotas, while the quotas of the disfavored countries are pitifully inadequate.

The Immigration Act is now due to be reconsidered. The time may not yet be ripe for elimination of the national origins provision, but, as we urged in our testimony, at the very least, quotas unused by Western and Northern European nations should be pooled and made available to nations of the small-quota countries. We have reason to hope that this recommendation, which was well received by the staff of the Senate Immigration Committee, will gain the support of Christian and non-sectarian groups.

Cooperation with Non-Sectarian Groups

Not only in connection with immigration matters, but generally, we seek to the fullest extent possible to work with non-Jewish and non-sectarian groups to achieve those objectives which we believe vital.

For example, we have always worked closely and constructively with many church organizations. One area has been of special concern to us—that of the texts and lesson books used in Christian denominational schools. Over a decade ago we instituted a study of the materials employed in the Protestant schools, and discovered much that was harmful and prejudicial to Jews. As a result of that study certain changes were made. But the core of the problem remained.

Accordingly a new study was recently initiated, and we are now undertaking a major campaign, with highly encouraging results—not only to eliminate harmful matter, but to cause the inclusion of positive, favorable material—which will make for a better understanding of Judaism and the Jew and thereby create better relations between Christians and Jews. A similar attempt is being made in connection with Catholic texts. This most important project is already well advanced,

Scientific Approach

Permeating all our activities is what may be called the scientific approach. We test the techniques we are using to determine whether they are effective or not.
Of more fundamental importance than that, we want to know what makes the anti-Semite "tick"; we are interested in discovering the roots of anti-Semitism and the reasons for its persistence for so many centuries. With more exact knowledge we can do a better job of fighting and eliminating the causes. While obviously success is not just around the corner, we have made measurable strides.

You have already heard about the elaborate psychological studies we planned and had carried out which are now ready for publication. These will illuminate some of the dark corners of what has hitherto seemed an impenetrable problem. In addition, carefully devised community polls in Baltimore, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, and similar polls to be taken in other selected communities, are already yielding us, and will increasingly yield, a wealth of material on which to base our campaign of countering anti-Semitism.

**Relations with Other Jewish Organizations**

A word must now be said about our relations with other Jewish organizations. You know our policy to work with other organizations wherever possible within the areas of our respective agreements and without sacrifice of principle. Our relations are, of course, particularly close and cordial with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Representatives of the two organizations work in close harmony in the committees of their Joint Defense Appeal. In addition, the top staffs of both agencies hold periodic meetings for exchange of views and information and for joint program planning. We have also worked loyally since its creation (in which we took a leading role) with the National Community Relations Advisory Council. The NCRAC, as is generally recognized, has had notable success in bringing together and working out common policy among the agencies engaged in community relations work.

In some respects, however, it is felt that its operations could be even more effective; and the American Jewish Committee has been giving close attention to this problem. We ourselves have made certain constructive suggestions; and we are prepared to accept those of others to the extent that the proposals respect our autonomy and the legitimate needs of our total program.

We have also had negotiations with representatives of some of the country's largest Welfare Funds, which last summer formed themselves into a group known as the Large City Budgeting Conference. Our first meeting with them was marked by misunderstandings on both sides. These have now yielded to more sympathetic mutual understanding.

At the outset, we had reason to fear that an attempt might be made to encroach upon our autonomy. Firmly serving notice that any such attempt would be resisted, we at the same time urged the group to meet with our lay members and staff with a view to obtaining a clearer picture of our operations and the rationale underlying them. Their representatives did meet with us last month at our offices, and we understand that the information we imparted was found by them to be highly enlightening.

We believe that this conference did much to clear up certain persistent misconceptions, especially as regards so-called "duplication" between national organizations, although the time available did not permit us to cover the whole of our program nor to answer all of the questions in their minds.

**'Commentary' and Library of Jewish Information**

Nor has the time available to me here been adequate to do more than touch sketchily on our operations which I have recounted. I cannot touch even sketchily, yet am unwilling not at least to mention, our publication *Commentary*, now firmly entrenched in the esteem of molders of opinion in all sections of the Jewish community, and beyond; and our Library of Jewish Information, whose researches are indispensable to us and to those active in our field generally; and the work of
our Community Service Department, for whose advice and materials there is widespread demand by the workers in the field of community relations throughout the country.

**Loyal and Effective Services of Lay Members and Staff**

Nor can I begin to do justice to the loyal and effective services of our lay members and staff.

Dr. Slawson and the others of our professional group are doing consecrated and devoted work. They are a loyal, intelligent, hard-working group of fine men and women.

The devotion and skills of the chairmen and members of our national committees provide the keystone of our achievements.

**Chapters**

And we have reason to be no less proud of our Chapters. Now 35 in number, with an aggregate membership of 14,000, they enable us to extend our philosophy of Jewish life to ever-widening circles, and the programs evolved under their aegis represent an invaluable extension of our activity. To a degree unusual among organizations, the members of the American Jewish Committee are the American Jewish Committee.

**Conclusion**

To sum up, we have had in 1948 many heartening victories and no lasting setbacks for the cause which so vitally concerns us. Throughout, we have aimed and we believe managed to hold to essentials, and to be level-headed even when at times siren voices lured toward the easy if dangerous paths of passion and emotional distortion.

We believe that the results prove that this policy of ours over the years has been correct. It is therefore on a note of optimism and with a determination to persevere in the same spirit of zeal, tempered by statesmanship, that we bid farewell to 1948, and greet 1949.
THE STATEMENT OF VIEWS

We of the American Jewish Committee are associated under the mandate of our Charter, adopted in 1906, to prevent the infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews in any part of the world and to secure equality of economic, social and educational opportunity.

We join with all Americans, of whatever creed or color, who devote themselves to the continued fight against those who through bigotry and prejudice endeavor to imperil the rights of any group in this land and thus divide our country and undermine the foundations of American liberty.

We join with men of good will everywhere in the effort to obtain for all mankind the essential human rights, as set out in America's basic documents of freedom. We hail the historic Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and the Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

We call upon our own nation and the nations of the world to protect and enforce these rights by every appropriate means, domestic and international. We urge upon our own and all other countries the adoption of liberal, just and non-discriminatory immigration laws.

United with our brethren of all faiths in the bond of American citizenship, we cherish the ideals and traditions of America and dedicate ourselves to the common effort to develop and enrich its cultural and political life.

We reaffirm our devotion to our religion and pledge ourselves to maintain and perpetuate the vitality of our spiritual heritage, which has constituted and will continue to constitute a basic contribution to the development of civilization and democracy.

We hold the establishment of the State of Israel to be an event of historic significance. We applaud its recognition by our own and other governments. We look forward to Israel's assumption of its full place among the family of nations as a government guaranteeing complete equality to all its inhabitants, without regard to race, creed or national origin, and as an advocate of liberty and peace in the Near East and throughout the world. Citizens of the United States are Americans and citizens of Israel are Israelis; this we affirm with all its implications; and just as our own government speaks only for its citizens, so Israel speaks only for its citizens. Within the framework of American interests, we shall aid in the upbuilding of Israel as a vital spiritual and cultural center and in the development of its capacity to provide a free and dignified life for those who desire to make it their home.

In these critical times, when totalitarian forces and ideas again threaten the liberties of the world, we rededicate ourselves to the struggle for the maintenance and advancement of individual dignity and freedom.

---
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The Sixty-first Annual Meeting of The Jewish Publication Society of America was held at the YM & YWHA, Broad and Pine Streets, Philadelphia, on Sunday evening, March 13, 1949, at 6:30 p.m. with a dinner attendance of 250. The meeting was preceded by an all-day joint meeting of the Board of Trustees and the Publication Committee. Mr. Edwin Wolf, 2nd, a member of the Publication Committee and Board of Trustees, acted as Chairman of the dinner and introduced Rev. Dr. Abraham J. Feldman, President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, a member of the Publication Committee, who delivered the Invocation.

Immediately after the dinner, Mr. Wolf introduced the members of the Publication Committee who were present: Dr. Mortimer J. Cohen of Philadelphia, Dr. Abraham J. Feldman of Hartford, Conn., Mr. Bernard Frankel of Philadelphia, Dr. Max Klein of Philadelphia, Dr. Felix Levy of Chicago, Dr. Alexander Marx of New York, Mr. Albert Mordell of Philadelphia, Dr. Abraham A. Neuman of Philadelphia, Dr. Joseph Reider of Philadelphia, and Mr. Harry Schneiderman of New York.

Mr. J. Solis-Cohen, Jr., President, conducted the business section of the Annual Meeting. The reports of the President (pp. 567 ff.) and the Treasurer (pp. 573 ff.), which had been distributed, were accepted as printed. A new Constitution was presented for ratification and adopted (pp. 576 ff.).

Mr. Jacob C. Gutman presented the report for the Nominating Committee.

Report of the Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee takes pleasure in presenting this report. We unanimously recommend the following as officers, honorary officers, and trustees of The Society, the officers and honorary officers for a one-year term, and the trustees for one, two and three years as designated opposite their names.

OFFICERS

Judge Louis E. Levinthal, President
Justice Horace Stern, 1st Vice-President (38th term)
Edwin Wolf, 2nd, 2nd Vice-President
Sol Satinsky, Treasurer
Dr. Maurice Jacobs, Executive Vice-President and Secretary (14th term)
Dr. Jacob R. Marcus, Chairman, Publication Committee
HONORARY OFFICERS

J. Solis-Cohen, Jr., Honorary President

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore
Samuel Bronfman, Montreal
Rev. Dr. Henry Cohen, Galveston
Lee M. Friedman, Boston
Frank Goldman, Lowell
Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin, New York
Mrs. Barnett E. Kopelman, New York
James Marshall, New York
Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, Philadelphia
Mrs. Louis A. Rosett, New Rochelle
Murray Seasongood, Cincinnati
Michael A. Stavitsky, Newark
Frank L. Weil, New York
Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, Detroit

TRUSTEES

Philip W. Amram, Washington (2 years)
Walter H. Annenberg, Philadelphia (3 years)
Dr. Benjamin Fine, New York (1 year)
Bernard L. Frankel, Philadelphia (3 years)
Dr. M. Leo Gitelson, New York (2 years)
Al Paul Lefton, Philadelphia (2 years)
Howard S. Levy, Philadelphia (3 years)
Sidney Neumann, Philadelphia (3 years)
Frank L. Newburger, Philadelphia (1 year)
Edward A. Norman, New York (1 year)
Gen. Eugene Oberdorfer, Atlanta (2 years)
Louis M. Rabinowitz, New York (2 years)
Frank J. Rubenstein, Baltimore (3 years)
Louis H. Silver, Chicago (2 years)
Harry Starr, New York (1 year)
Dewey D. Stone, Brockton (1 year)
Roger W. Straus, Jr., New York (1 year)
Howard A. Wolf, Philadelphia (3 years)

Respectfully submitted,

Abram S. Berg
Samuel H. Daroff
Jacob C. Gutman
Marc Katzenberg
Howard A. Wolf

The report of the Nominating Committee was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Wolf then introduced Justice Horace Stern, 1st Vice-President of The Society, who presented engrossed resolutions to the following: the retiring President, Mr. J. Solis-Cohen, Jr.; the retiring Chairman of the Publication Committee, Judge Louis E. Levinthal; Dr. Solomon Grayzel, upon the completion of ten years as Editor of The Society; Mr. David Skaraton, Superintendent of the Press, upon the completion of twenty years of service with the Press; Mr. Howard A. Wolf, in recognition of fifteen years as Treasurer of The Society and to the Executive Vice-President, Dr. Maurice Jacobs.
JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY

Judge Louis E. Levinthal, the new President, assumed the Chair and introduced the panel of three speakers, Dr. Jacob R. Marcus, Professor of History at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati; Dr. Solomon Goldman, of Chicago; and Dr. Cecil Roth of Oxford University, England.

At the conclusion of three splendid addresses, Mr. Edwin Wolf, 2nd, made a plea for the financial support of The Society.

The meeting adjourned at 11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MAURICE JACOBS,
Secretary

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT FOR THE YEAR 1948

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

This is the sixteenth and last year in which I shall have the privilege of submitting my annual presidential report. It is difficult for me to realize that so many years have passed since I succeeded the late Simon Miller who so ably filled the presidency for 20 years. Time marches on and I have asked to be relieved of the duties of office, still retaining my interest in the work of The Society. While a great deal has been accomplished since 1933, let it be frankly understood that there is much unfinished business to be completed. Yet I think you conclude with me that we have made substantial progress in producing a splendid Jewish library in English that is available for the scholar, the layman and our children. We have progressed in increasing the number of new books and reprints annually sold and distributed, with a membership roll that has grown from under 3,000 in 1933 to 12,139 in 1948.

1948 Publication Program

I reported to you last year that because of our 60th anniversary, we planned to publish ten titles to be counted as nine book units, the largest program ever attempted by The Society in its history. Mr. Benjamin's Sword by Robert D. Abrahams was distributed in the early spring, of which 4,000 were printed and 2,593 were distributed during 1948. This juvenile was very well received. We published an edition of 5,000 of Book of Books by Solomon Goldman, a joint publication of The Society and Harper & Brothers. Before the end of the year, our printing of 5,000 copies was exhausted, and we were forced to draw on Harper & Brothers prior to a joint second printing. The House of Nasi: Duke of Naxos by Cecil Roth, the first book in our new Gitelson Library had an initial printing of 5,000 copies, of which 2,385 were distributed.

Among the Nations by Ludwig Lewisohn, published jointly with Farrar, Straus & Company, received an enthusiastic response from our members and our printing of 6,000 copies was exhausted before the end of the year, 1,000 having been purchased by the Hillel Foundations. Prince of the Ghetto by Maurice Samuel, which we published jointly with Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. was praised far and wide. Our first printing was 11,000 copies of which 4,000 were for an edition bearing the joint imprint of The Society and the Hillel Foundations. We distributed 4,360 copies to our members. Pilgrims in a New Land by Lee M. Friedman, the companion volume to Jewish Pioneers and Patriots, came off press late in the year with a printing of 6,000 copies for The Society and 2,000 copies for our trade publisher, Farrar, Straus & Company. 3,093 copies were distributed. This was a second book in the Gitelson library and has been well received. Boot Camp, Dr. Henry J. Berkowitz' companion volume to The Fire Eater was printed in an edition of 4,000
copies and 2,404 copies distributed. We have been more than gratified by our members' and customers' reactions to this book.

Three additional books of the 1948 program could not be completed during the calendar year 1948, but as this report is being given should be in the hands of our members. There are still many factors which work against the completion of a program during the year it is planned. Volume 50 of the Year Book is finally on press and will appear later than ever before. We are only the publishers of the Year Book and the delay resulted from the material not being in final form by the Editors until after January 1, 1949. However, we feel quite certain that the value of Volume 50 will more than offset its delay in publication. The Purim Anthology by Philip Goodman, the third volume in our Holiday Series, is on press and will be distributed by the Holiday. This will be a fitting companion to our Hanukkah and Sabbath books, and will be a basic book for many years to come. The final book To Dwell in Safety by Mark Wischnitzer is the story of Jewish immigration. It is on press and will probably be distributed during the month of March. It is very gratifying to see the number of our books which are recommended by the Book-of-the-Month Club and specially mentioned in their magazine. It is an indication that The Society is on the right track.

Reprints

During 1948 we continued to reprint those books for which there is a demand, and this program included 33 titles and over 98,000 copies of which 25,000 were the Bible. Due to The Society's financial position and the present condition of the book market the reprint program for 1949 has been temporarily and reluctantly curtailed. The books reprinted during 1948 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No. of Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany's Stepchildren</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fire Eater</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbook, Vol. 49</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayzel—A History of the Jews</td>
<td>9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreamers of the Ghetto</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed is the Match</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrims to Palestine</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Herzl</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Pioneers and Patriots</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashi</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Essays of Ahad Ha'Am</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of People in Biblical Times</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story of Bible Translations</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Scriptures in the Making</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature, Vol. 2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memoirs of My People</td>
<td>2,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Schechter</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on Deuteronomy</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stars and Sand</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlines of Jewish History</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Jewish Medieval Philosophy</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasriel the Watchman</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Assyrian Tents</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary on Numbers</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messiah Idea</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale's Song</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Tales</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jewish Community—3 Volume Set</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publication Distribution

The sale of books declined during the year, in common with the general trend around the country. We have re-studied our methods of wholesale distribution and find that The Society will be better off financially by distributing its books directly to book dealers all over the world rather than through designated agents. The extra income accruing to The Society from this direct dealing will help the operation of The Society, in black instead of in red for 1949. In 1948 the sale of our books declined but there was an increase in the number of books which were distributed on membership. The total number of books distributed during the year was 124,500 of which 61,973 were distributed on membership, the largest ever in our history, and 55,755 on sale. The Bible, Graetz's History of the Jews, Pathways Through the Bible, and Grayzel's History of the Jews continue to be our best sellers.

Jewish Book Month and Religious Book Week

Jewish Book Month has become a regular part of our Jewish calendar. We are very proud of the part we have played in fostering the promotion of this splendid festival. Our Editor, Dr. Solomon Grayzel, continues to serve as President of the Jewish Book Council which is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board. Dr. Mortimer J. Cohen, a member of our Publication Committee, continued as the Editor of In Jewish Bookland which has grown in size and influence, and our Executive Vice-President remained as a member of the Executive Committee and Chairman of their Publication Committee, and in the spring of 1948, received a citation from the Book Council for his services. The Jewish Publication Society wholeheartedly endorses Jewish Book Month and congratulates the National Jewish Welfare Board on its foresight in sponsoring Jewish Book Month and other worthwhile cultural projects. During the celebration of Religious Book Week, attention is called to the best books of all religions. Among our books mentioned were: Blessed is the Match by Marie Syrkin; Book of Books by Solomon Goldman; House of Nasi: Doña Gracia by Cecil Roth; Prince of the Ghetto by Maurice Samuel; A History of the Jews by Dr. Solomon Grayzel; and Pathways Through the Bible by Dr. Mortimer J. Cohen. Our Society has again been honored in the selection of such a long list of our books.

The financial report of The Society for 1948 was again discouraging. I call your attention to the printed report of our Treasurer, Mr. Lester Hano, who has completed his third year as Treasurer of The Society. Due to the press of new business activities, Mr. Hano has requested to be relieved of his duties and on behalf of the Board of Trustees I want to thank him sincerely for his work for The Society.

An analysis of the Treasurer's report shows The Society has had the largest loss in recent years which was due to a number of causes,—an increase in the 1948 publishing program from six books in 1947 to ten books in 1948; unforeseen rise in costs of publication; and decreased sales made the publishing business in America a very difficult year for all. With inadequate working capital, capital funds tied up in inventory, stock and plant, your Society had to increase its bank loans and indebtedness and was unable to take the same cash discounts as in previous years. Your Officers and Trustees have carefully reviewed our 1949 program and have budgeted the affairs of The Society so that we definitely expect to operate in the black.

By adding a mailing fee of 25c per book, we will be netting an additional $10,000. Incidentally, this mailing charge is the common practice with all book clubs. By
carefully budgeting the cost of new books and eliminating the number of reprints in proportion to our needs, the budget for 1949 will definitely be balanced, and we hope to return some of the money borrowed to carry on in 1948.

To help solve The Society's financial problem, a campaign has been started with the ultimate hope of raising $150,000.00 which will make it possible for us to pay all of our bills, lift the mortgage on our building, provide the wherewithal for our Hebrew-English Bible, and give The Society a sufficient amount of working capital to operate in a businesslike manner. I had hoped that this fund would be completed during my administration, but circumstances have prevented the launching of the campaign on the scale we anticipated. This Society has not made a public appeal for funds in 35 years. We have asked less from the American Jewish Community than any other organization, and I feel that we have given more in return for what we have received. This capital sum will make it possible for The Society to work freely, to plan intelligently, and to rightfully take its place among the cultural Jewish organizations in America.

Public Relations

We are indeed indebted to the Anglo-Jewish Press, the Yiddish Press and the Hebrew Press for their cooperation in spreading the story of The Society from coast to coast and for reviewing our books as they were issued. Handicapped by the lack of an advertising budget since we put all our funds into books, we must depend upon our newspaper and magazine friends to keep our name before the public and I desire to express again my appreciation for the publicity The Society's activities and our books have received.

Membership Statistics

At the end of the year, we had a total of 12,139 members as against 11,882 members at the end of 1947. 7,752 were Annual members, 3,764 were Library members, 271 were Contributing members, 822 were Patron members, and the balance were in miscellaneous brackets. 6 new Life memberships were added during the year making a total in the Life Membership Fund of $18,000. 4,252 new members were secured in 1948 and 7,887 old members renewed. Each year our membership list is growing, and it is most gratifying that more and more of our members are moving up to the higher brackets. The lower price membership barely carries itself, and we are hoping that more and more of our members will gradually move up to the $10.00 or higher membership status.

Many of the book clubs of America suffered severe membership losses last year. We did not. We worked harder than ever before on new members, sent out more prospect letters than ever before with the result that instead of having less members at the end of the year, we had more members.

1949 Program

For 1949, we have planned a very interesting and slightly different program. For the first time in our history, the majority of the books will be co-published with other publishers. The books selected for the year are: Trial and Error, the autobiography of Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel, which will be published in a two volume edition which was arranged with Harper & Brothers, the trade publisher. A set of four books Judaism and the Jews, edited by Dr. Louis Finkelstein, the President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, will provide us with basic books on our people written by contemporaneous authors. This set of close to 2,000 pages will also be co-published with Harper & Brothers. The second of Dr. Goldman's books on the Bible, the Book of Genesis, will be co-published with Harper. As a Mighty Stream, a series of essays by Dr. Julian Morgenstern, President-Emeritus of the Hebrew Union College, will be our eighth publication, and Volume 51 of the American Jewish Year Book will be our ninth
and final publication of the year. The co-publishing of the major part of this program with a single publisher has reduced our costs for the coming year and has made it possible for us to give more to our members without involving The Society in further large deficits.

The Press

At our Annual Meeting in 1947, I read a paper on the Hebrew Press which reviewed the excellent work it had done since its founding in 1920. We are very proud of the part which the Press has played in making it possible for scholars and scholarly institutions to prepare their researches economically and artistically. The Press completed the largest business in its history when we billed $163,383.00 worth of work in 1948, of which $145,569.00 were for customers and $17,814.00 for The Society. At the beginning of 1949, we had enough work on hand to keep our entire staff busy for the entire year, and when we can move our Press into our own building, its facilities can be expanded still more.

During the year 1948, we filled the following contracts at the Press:

Four issues of the Journal of Biblical Literature; four issues of the Jewish Quarterly Review; two issues of the Westminster Theological Journal; Volume VII of the Jewish Book Annual; Year Book 58 for the Central Conference of American Rabbis; New Year Prayer Book and Day of Atonement Prayer Book for the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation; Studies in Daniel by H. L. Ginsberg for the Jewish Theological Seminary Of America; the Year Book and several pamphlets for the National Interfraternity Conference; Hebrew Union College Annual XXI; Proceedings XVII of the American Academy for Jewish Research; a reprinting of the all-Hebrew Daily and Sabbath Prayer Book for the Union of Sephardic Congregations; two parts of the American Jewish Historical Society Publications XXXVIII: Kisch's Jewry Law in Medieval Germany for the American Academy for Jewish Research; several reprints of the Harishon pamphlets for the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education; a reprint of Scharfstein's Hebrew Self-Taught for the Zionist Organization of America; Balaban's Mini Kedem for the Histadruth Ivrit of Philadelphia; Kaufmann Kohler's A Living Faith for the Hebrew Union College; Tabak's Yisrael b'Artzo and other work for the Bloch Publishing Company; Proceedings XI of the Rabbinical Assembly of America; a monograph for the Journal of Biblical Literature; a reprint of Sippuri I & II for Gratz College; a Hanukkah pamphlet plus the composition on an additional book for the Board of Jewish Education in Baltimore; Our Prayer Book by Mordecai Soloff; a reprint of Reshith Binah by Sidney Fish; Efros' volume of Hayyim Nahman Bialik's Selected Poems for the Histadruth Ivrit of America; Kerr's Portuguese-Hebrew Grammar; Proceedings of the Educational Conference for the Rabbinical Assembly of America; a reprint of Elements of Hebrew I for the Jewish Education Committee of New York; the composition on Goldman's Book of Books for Harper & Brothers; a reprint of the New Year Prayer Book for the Union of Sephardic Congregations; the composition for four Hebrew text books for the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and a Hebrew booklet by Frishberg for the Mizrachi National Education Committee; plus a long list of miscellaneous smaller contracts.

It is most gratifying to realize that the Hebrew-English Bible is about to be started after having been talked about since 1892, that The Society has its own typesetting facilities which will make it possible to set this sacred book in its own plant.

The past and the future are of equal interest with the present. The Publication Society has had many changes since I became President in 1933. I can now confess those were gloomy days. The Board met in a third rate building where our offices and shipping room jointly had about a 1,000 sq. ft. of space. To the directors were assigned names of those resigning from The Society, to endeavor to get them to remain. Our program was three books a year, cheaply printed, poor
format and unattractive bindings that caused the famous remark to be made that our books were “red from cover to cover.”

The Press was a 2 x 4 organization with five employees. I had to accept the condition of The Society, either to be liquidated or a challenge of rebuilding The Society as a positive force in American Jewry, and I accepted the latter. Our business has increased over five-fold during that period. We have become the outstanding Jewish publication organization of the world. We own our own building, subject to a good mortgage. We own a typesetting plant worth over a quarter of a million dollars. The assets of The Society are carried on the books at almost next to nothing, having a going value of a substantial figure. These results were not achieved by your President but by a group of devoted and loyal workers of the Publication Committee and the Board of Trustees and staff members to whom a debt of gratitude is owed for their cooperation. Some have passed on to the Academy on High: Dr. Cyrus Adler, Dr. Solomon Solis-Cohen, Mr. Simon Miller and Dr. Isaac Husik, who was Editor when I assumed the Presidency of The Society. Their places were taken by others who carried the torch of Jewish literature with the same devoted spirit that did their predecessors.

Judge Louis E. Levinthal has completed ten years as Chairman of the Publication Committee, Dr. Solomon Grayzel a decade as the Editor of The Society. It is during this period The Society made its greatest strides, enlarged the scope of its publishing program, presented its books with a modern attractive format. To these men may I express my personal appreciation of their efforts on behalf of The Society.

Maurice Jacobs, our Executive Vice-President, worked under the most trying circumstances during 1948. In addition to running the office, supervising new membership promotions, manufacturing books at the Press, he operated a very sizeable business with insufficient capital. With the patience of Job he carried on and I want to express to him and our staff the appreciation of the entire Board of Trustees, and my own, for their loyal and capable services.

The growth of the Press attests to the abilities of David Skaraton, the Press Superintendent. I know that when the Press moves to its own building Mr. Skaraton and his staff will be able to do even more work.

Our field staff, headed by Mrs. Pearl Foster Roseman and Sidney Marcus continue to bring in new members.

No man can relinquish the leadership of an organization without passing on to his successor some plan for The Society’s future growth. What we have done in the past is but a small part of what we can do in the future. Our membership should be five times what it is today. Our total business can be developed until it reaches the million dollar figure. Our Press can grow larger and larger. We need more and more basic books originally written for The Society or translated from those languages which are no longer in common use. Some of the projects I hoped would be completed during my administration are still in the making; the Hebrew-English Bible; unabridged Graetz’s; the American Jewish Community series; the revision of our special translation of the Bible; etc. Our immediate needs are for funds to insure our continued existence. The necessary alterations must be made in our building to provide for the immediate transfer of the Press to its own quarters. The Society should be free and clear of all its debts. Sufficient money should be on hand for all of the Zangwill books. We need more Dr. M. Leo Gitelsons, who came to the aid of The Society during this past year and provided a working capital fund from which The Society could finance some of its publications. We need the infiltration of new blood into our Board and Publication Committee, to relieve some of those who have worked for many years and to bring in a fresh point of view and a new enthusiasm. While other Jewish publications and other Jewish book distributing agencies have risen in recent years The Jewish Publication Society is still the outstanding publisher of Jewish books in America. It is my hope that what we have done during these past 16 years and before that period will serve as a pattern for what can be done tomorrow. Books
can be published, but that is only half of the problem. Books must also be read. The Jewish Publication Society has done and is doing its share. It should be possible for us to expand our facilities and respond to every call which comes to us.

As I retire from this great office with which you have honored me, I offer you my sincere thanks for the privilege you have given me to serve the call of Jewish culture through The Jewish Publication Society. To few men is granted the privilege which I have had.

I voice my gratitude to Dr. Jacobs, our staff, and my other colleagues in this organization. From them I ask their continued self-sacrificing dedication to The Publication Society under their new leader.

Respectfully submitted,

J. SOLIS-COHEN, Jr., President

TREASURER'S REPORT

COMBINED BALANCE SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Dec. 31, 1948</th>
<th>Dec. 31, 1947</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$1,680.82</td>
<td>$3,289.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>42,320.39</td>
<td>44,515.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>118,220.33</td>
<td>94,202.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan to Classics Fund</td>
<td>5,818.24</td>
<td>4,859.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>57,405.86</td>
<td>57,405.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates, Copyrights, Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Publication Costs</td>
<td>6,855.12</td>
<td>5,365.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Insurance</td>
<td>4,485.70</td>
<td>2,502.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Employees</td>
<td>984.33</td>
<td>859.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Assets: $237,772.79

| Liabilities | | |
| Notes Payable to Bank | $33,000.00 | $24,653.00 |
| Notes Payable to Others | 27,261.08 | — |
| Loans Payable to Funds | 62,873.05 | 57,920.49 |
| Accounts Payable | 60,745.69 | 34,040.01 |
| Customers' Credit Balances | 2,179.53 | 9,216.96 |
| Accrued Expenses | 862.98 | 3,279.99 |
| Mortgage Payable | 28,000.00 | 31,500.00 |
| Reserve for Hebrew-English Bible | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 |
| Reserve for Uncompleted Contracts | 27,530.72 | 20,594.53 |
| Reserve for New Equipment | 3,493.55 | 9,860.31 |
| Surplus | — | 6,936.15 |
| Deficit | (23,496.81) | — |

Total Liabilities: $237,772.79

( ) Denotes red figure.
STATEMENT OF FUNDS

Principal and accumulated income of Funds ........ $ 71,969.33

Invested as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$ 2,163.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Loeb Fund Publications</td>
<td>$ 4,174.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Classics Fund Publications</td>
<td>$ 8,576.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to The Society</td>
<td>$ 62,873.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less, Loan by The Society to the Classics Fund .. $ 5,818.24  $ 71,969.33

COMBINED PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended</th>
<th>Dec. 31, 1948</th>
<th>Dec. 31, 1947</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>$ 91,013.27</td>
<td>$ 86,760.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Welfare Funds</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,286.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>748.41</td>
<td>1,805.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixtieth Anniversary Fund</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, Hebrew Press</td>
<td>145,569.06</td>
<td>112,838.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>91,744.30</td>
<td>131,160.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,596.96</td>
<td>1,264.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,345.35</td>
<td>3,447.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$336,017.35</td>
<td>$339,563.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenses and Publication Costs                   | $366,450.31   | $350,655.35   |
| Loss to Surplus                                  | $ 30,432.96   | $ 11,091.36   |
| Contributions by Funds for publications          | —             | $ 2,503.36    |

Sales proceeds of fund publications credited to funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classics Fund</td>
<td>$ 857.59</td>
<td>$ 2,378.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loeb Fund</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,528.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales proceeds of fund publications credited to funds:

Respectfully submitted,

LESTER HANO, Treasurer
In Memoriam

Since we met at our last Annual Meeting, The Jewish Publication Society of America suffered the loss by death of one of its distinguished authors and two members of its "Official Family":

**DR. HENRY BERKOWITZ**, the author of *The Fire-Eater* and *Boot Camp*, who died on March 1, 1949.

**DR. STEPHEN S. WISE**, Honorary Vice-President of The Society since March 31, 1946, who died on April 19, 1949.

**DR. DAVID PHILIPSON**, a member of our Publication Committee since June 10, 1897, a member of our Jewish Classics Committee from May 7, 1916, a member of the Board of Editors of our Bible translation, and the author of our *Old European Jewries* and *Letters of Rebecca Gratz*, who died on June 29, 1949.

The Jewish Publication Society of America deeply mourns the loss of this outstanding Jewish author and these two members of our "Official Family" who have contributed their writings and labors to our Society and have thus enriched the cultural life of American Jewry. It cherishes their memories. In grateful recognition of their part in the fellowship of Jewish authors and members of the "Official Family" of our Society, it has been

RESOLVED that The Jewish Publication Society of America extends to the families of this departed author and departed members of our "Official Family" its heartfelt sympathy; that these Resolutions be spread on the Minutes of The Jewish Publication Society; and that they be published in Volume 51 of the *American Jewish Year Book*.

**LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL**, *President*

**MAURICE JACOBS**, *Secretary*
BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I

Members

SECTION 1. Any person or organization paying the annual dues fixed by the Board of Trustees for any class of membership shall be a member of The Society.

SECTION 2. The Board of Trustees may classify members and prescribe the benefits and dues pertaining to each class of membership.

ARTICLE II

Meetings of Members

SECTION 1. The annual meeting of the members of The Society for the election of officers and trustees and the transaction of such other business as may properly be brought before the meeting shall be held at such time and place as the Board of Trustees may designate.

SECTION 2. Special meetings of the members of The Society may be held at any time at the call of the President or by a vote of a majority of the Board of Trustees, or upon the written request of fifty members of The Society, setting forth the purpose or purposes of such meeting.

SECTION 3. All meetings of the members of The Society shall be held at such place and at such time as the Board of Trustees may designate.

SECTION 4. Notice of all meetings of members shall be sent by mail to each member at his address appearing on the books of The Society. Notice of the annual meeting of members shall be mailed at least twenty days prior to the date of such meeting, and notice of any special meeting of the members setting forth the purpose or purposes for which such meeting shall be called, shall be mailed at least ten days prior to the date of such meeting.

SECTION 5. At any meeting of the members of The Society twenty-five members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. If there be no quorum the members present may adjourn the meeting from time to time until a quorum is secured.

ARTICLE III

Board of Trustees and Officers

SECTION 1. The affairs, administration and property of The Society shall be in the charge, management and control of a Board of Trustees which shall consist of eighteen trustees together with the elective officers provided for in Section 7 of Article III of these By-Laws. The trustees and said elective officers, all of whom shall be members of The Society, shall be elected by the members at the annual meeting of members.

SECTION 2. The trustees elected by the members shall serve for terms of three years each; provided however, that the eighteen trustees first elected pursuant to these By-Laws shall be divided into three groups of six trustees each; the term of office of the respective groups shall be fixed to expire at the end of the first, second and third years from the date of their election.

SECTION 3. Regular meetings of the Board of Trustees shall be held at such times as the Board of Trustees shall designate. Special meetings of the Board of Trustees shall be held whenever called by the President, and he shall call a special meeting of the Board of Trustees upon the written request of five of its members, setting forth the purpose or purposes of such meeting.

SECTION 4. Ten members of the Board of Trustees shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SECTION 5. Written notice of all meetings of the Board of Trustees shall be given
to each member of the Board at least five days prior thereto. The notice of any special meeting shall set forth the purpose or purposes for which such meeting shall have been called.

SECTION 6. Any vacancy in the Board of Trustees (whether among the trustees or the officers) shall be filled by the Board of Trustees until the next annual meeting of the members.

SECTION 7. The officers of The Society shall consist of a President, two Vice-Presidents, Secretary, Treasurer, Chairman of the Publication Committee, and such other officers as the Board of Trustees may from time to time deem necessary.

SECTION 8. The officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of members and shall serve for the term of one year and until their respective successors shall have been elected.

SECTION 9. The President shall preside at all meetings of the members; of the Board of Trustees, and of the Executive Committee. He shall sign, together with the Secretary, all documents, contracts, and papers necessary for the conduct of the business of The Society, and perform all other duties usually pertaining to the office of President.

SECTION 10. The Vice-Presidents shall in order of their seniority, during the absence or disability of the President, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of President, have the same duties and powers as the President.

SECTION 11. The Secretary shall have the usual duties and powers pertaining to the office of Secretary. He shall attend and keep minutes of meetings of the members and of the Board of Trustees and record all such minutes in books to be kept for that purpose. He shall give all notices required by law or these By-Laws.

SECTION 12. The Treasurer shall have the custody of and shall administer all funds and investments of The Society. He shall keep proper books of account and perform all other duties usually pertaining to the office of Treasurer.

SECTION 13. The Chairman of the Publication Committee shall preside at all meetings of the Publication Committee. He shall appoint, and be ex-officio a member of, all sub-committees of the Publication Committee.

SECTION 14. The funds of The Society shall be placed in such depositories as the Board of Trustees designates and checks for the withdrawal of such funds shall be signed by such persons as are designated by the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE IV

Committees

SECTION 1. The Board of Trustees shall appoint a Publication Committee to serve for one year. The Publication Committee shall include the Chairman of the Publication Committee and at least four other members of the Board of Trustees. It shall be the duty of the Publication Committee to read manuscripts and make recommendations for the publication thereof to the Board of Trustees.

SECTION 2. The Board of Trustees shall appoint an Executive Committee which shall have the power to act for the Board of Trustees between meetings of the Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee shall consist of those members of the Board of Trustees who are members of the Publication Committee together with the officers of The Society.

SECTION 3. The President shall appoint from the members of The Society all other standing or special committees with such rights and powers as the Board of Trustees may from time to time determine. The Chairmen of all such committees shall be members of the Board of Trustees, but otherwise membership shall not be limited to members of the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE V

Fiscal Year

SECTION 1. The fiscal year of The Society shall begin on January 1st of each year.
ARTICLE VI

Nominations and Elections

SECTION 1. At least thirty days before the annual meeting of members the President shall appoint a Nominating Committee of not less than five members. The Nominating Committee by a majority vote of all its members shall nominate candidates for trustees and officers to be elected at the annual meeting and shall submit its report of such nominations at such annual meeting.

SECTION 2. Fifty members of The Society may, independently of the Nominating Committee, also nominate candidates who have consented to have their names placed in nomination. Such nominations shall be given to the Secretary in writing accompanied by the written consent of the candidates, at least twenty days before the annual meeting.

SECTION 3. The election of trustees and officers at the annual meeting shall be only from among the candidates so nominated.

SECTION 4. Election of trustees and officers shall be by ballot unless otherwise determined at the meeting at which the election is held.

ARTICLE VII

Amendments

SECTION 1. These By-Laws may be amended by the vote of a majority of the entire Board of Trustees at any regular or special meeting. Any amendments so adopted shall be submitted for ratification at the next annual meeting of members. Such ratification shall require the vote of at least two-thirds of those members present at such annual meeting.
INDEX
Index

Abbreviations, list of, for directories and obituaries, 444
Abdullah, King, 381, 393, 415
Aberg, Einer, 312
Abramowitz, Elias William, obituary, 518
Academic Council for Hebrew University, 455
Achdut Haavodah-Poale Zion (see United Labor Zionist Party)
Aden, 423-24; economic life, Jewish, 423; emigration to Israel, 423-24; Hashid camp, 424; organizations, Jewish, 459; population, Jewish, 423
Ades, Shafiq, 420
Adler, Emanuel Philip, obituary, 518
Adler, Yankel, 224
Adult education in intergroup relations, 123-24
Afghanistan, 424-25
Africa (see North Africa; Union of South Africa)
Aged, care of, Jewish, 188-89
Agnon, S. Y., 221
Agudas Israel World Organization, 436, 437, 448
Agudas Israel World Organization, Research Institute, 448
Agudath Israel of America, 448-49
Agudath Israel, National Council of Pirchei, 449
Agudath Israel Women's Organization, 449
Agudath Israel Youth Council of America, 449
Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 446
Algeria, 426, 429-30; communal life, Jewish, 430; Jewish refugees from Morocco, 430; organizations, Jewish, 459; periodicals, Jewish, 496; population, Jewish, 429; welfare services, Jewish, 430
Alliance Israelite Universelle, 302, 418-19, 428, 429 (see also American Friends of
Alliance Voice-Farband Stimme, 493
Alpha Epsilon Phi Women's Fraternity, 452
Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity, 452
Alpha Omega Fraternity, 452
Alpha Zeta Omega, 452
Altalena, S. S., 389
AMEIC—American Eretz Israel Corporation, 455
American Academy for Jewish Research, 218, 446
American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers, 446
American Association for Jewish Education, 449
American Bar Association, 440, 442
American Beth Jacob Committee, 447
American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, 446
American Birobidjan Committee—AMBIAN, 447
American Chapter of Religious Emergency Council of the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, 449
American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists and Scientists, 445
American Committee for National Sick Fund of Israel, 445
American Committee of O.S.E., 447
American Committee for Relief of Yemenite Jews, 447
American Committee of Universal Yeshiva of Jerusalem, 455-56
American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, 455
American Council on Education, 121
American Council of Jewish Fraternal Organizations, 452
American Council for Judaism, 172, 445

1 The index has been compiled primarily with a view to bringing out those fields of activity which were of concern to American Jews during the period under review, as well as those individuals who participated in these activities. As a consequence, references to organizations active in these various areas have been kept to a minimum. Organizations listed in the classified United States directory of national Jewish organizations are cited in the index. Unless otherwise noted, the entries refer to the United States. For references to Jewish life in foreign countries, the reader is referred to the entries under the particular country.
American Council on Race Relations, 127
American Council for Warsaw Jews, 452
American Economic Committee for Palestine, 456
American Eretz Israel Corporation, 455
American Federation of Jews from Central Europe, 452
American Federation for Lithuanian Jews, 452
American Federation for Polish Jews, 452
American Friends of Alliance Israélite Universelle, 447
American Friends of the Hebrew University, 456
American Fund for Palestinian Institutions, 456
American Hebrew, 493
American Hungarian Jewish Federation, 452
American Israelite, 495
American Jewish Archives, 218, 495
American Jewish Committee, 445; Forty-second Annual Report, 551-61; objects, 550; officers, 549; Statement of Views, 171, 562
American Jewish Conference, 138
American Jewish Congress, 445 (see also World Jewish Congress)
American Jewish Congress, Women’s Division, 445
American Jewish Historical Society, 218, 446
American Jewish Joint Agricultural Corporation, 447
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Youth Division, 447-48
American Jewish Journal, 492
American Jewish Labor Council, 173, 445
American Jewish League Against Communism, 445
American Jewish Outlook, 496
American Jewish Physicians’ Committee, 456
American Jewish Times, 495
American Jewish World, 493
American Jewish Year Book, 498
American Jewish Youth (Seniors), 452
American Jews and Israel, 554-55; religious issues, 148
American Joint Distribution Committee (see American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee)
American Memorial to Six Million Jews of Europe, 446
American ORT Federation, 448
American ORT Federation, Young Men’s and Women’s Division, 448
American ORT Federation, Women’s American ORT, 448
American Palestine Trading Corporation, 456
American Pro-Falasha Committee, 448
American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel, 456
American Schools of Oriental Research, 221
American Section of Jewish Agency for Palestine (see Jewish Agency for Palestine)
American Society for the Advancement of the Hebrew Institute of Technology in Haifa, Palestine, 456
American Technion Society, 456
American Trade Union Council of National Committee for Labor Israel, 458
American Zionist Council, 167, 456
American Zionist Emergency Council, 167 (see also American Zionist Council)
American Zionist Youth Commission, 456
Amidar corporation, Israel, 401
AMPAL—American Palestine Trading Corporation, 456
Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, 209, 445, 560 (see also Joint Defense Appeal)
Anglo-Jewish Association, Great Britain, 280
Anglo-Palestine Bank, 402, 403
Antin, Mary, obituary, 519
Anti-Semitism, agitators and organizations, 110-16; international collaboration, 115-16; new periodicals, 116; scientific approach to, 559-60 (see also Intergroup relations and individual countries)
Anti-Tuberculosis Center, French Morocco, 428
Anti-Zionists, 172
Aqabah, 392
Arab League, 414, 415
Arab Legion, 390
Arab refugees, 385, 386, 387-88, 398, 414, 415, 420, 421, 422; in Iraq, 420; in Lebanon, 421; Protestant reaction, 172 (see also Israel, Arab minority; United States and Israel; Israel and U.N.)
Arab territory, Palestine, 380, 387-88
Arbeitsgemeinschaft Juedischer Gemeinden Deutschlands, Germany, 329
Arcand, Adrien, 273
Argentina, 264-67; anti-Semitism, 266; communal life, Jewish, 265-67; edu-
cation, Jewish, 265; emigration, 267; and Israel, 266-67; organizations, Jewish, 459-60; periodicals, Jewish, 496-97; population, Jewish, 264-65; — tables, 264; Sephardic community, 265, 267; Zionist activities, 266

ARIF, 448
Armstrong, George W., 113
Art and artists, Jewish, 223-25
Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Slovakia, 357
Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Yugoslavia, 378
Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists, 446
Association pour la Reconstruction des Institutions Israélites en France, 448
Association of Yugoslav Jews in the United States, 452
Aufbau, 493
Austin, Warren R., 386
Australia, 282-88; anti-Semitism, 282-83; communal life, Jewish, 283-88; displaced persons, 286; education, Jewish, 284; immigratiou, Jewish, 286-88; and Israel, 285; organizations, Jewish, 460; overseas relief, 284; periodicals, Jewish, 497; population, Jewish, 282, 283; Shehitah, 283; Zionist activities, 285-86
Australian Jewish Welfare Society, 287
Austria, 333-35; anti-Semitism, 333; communal life, Jewish, 334-35; displaced persons, Jewish, 315-16, 334; Gemeinden, Jewish, tables, 333; organizations, Jewish, 460; overseas relief, 284; periodicals, Jewish, 497; population, Jewish, 333-34; —tables, 333; restitution of Jewish property, 335
Austriak, I., 260
Bar Ilan (see Berlin, Meyer)
Baron de Hirsch Fund, 454
Barzilai, Israel, 351
Battersby, J. Larrat, 292
Bearstead, Walter H. S., 281
Beigin, Menahem, obituary, 519
Berk, Fred, 225, 226, 227
Berkowitz, Henry Joseph, obituary, 519, 575
Berlin, Meyer, obituary, 519
Blinner, Isaac, 260
Berman, Harold, obituary, 519
Bernadotte, Folke, 300, 311, 379, 381, 386, 390; assassination, 391 (see also Israel and U. N.)
Bertonoff, Deborah, 227
Beta Sigma Rho, 452
Beth Din of America, 449
Beth Jacob Committee (see American)
Bevin, Ernest, 380, 400
Bialostotsky, B. J., 215
Bibliography, books of Jewish interest, U. S., 501-11
Bick, Abraham, 212
Bickel, S., 212
Birobidjan, 340 (see also American Birobidjan Committee)
Bitzaron, 493
Blaustein, Jacob, report of American Jewish Committee Executive Committee, 551-61
Blitzstein, Marc, 227
Bloom, Sol, obituary, 519
B'nai B'rith, 452 (see also Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations; B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau; B'nai B'rith Women's Supreme Council; B'nai B'rith Youth Organization)
B'nai B'rith, Anti-Defamation League of (see Anti-Defamation League; also Joint Defense Appeal)
B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, 449
B'nai B'rith Messenger, 492
B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau, 454
B'nai B'rith Women's Supreme Council, 452
B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, 452
Bnai Zion, 452
Bnei Akiva Organization of America, 456
Board of Deputies of British Jews, 280-81
Board of Secular Education, United Yeshivos (see United Yeshivos, Board of Secular Education)
Boehm, Gunther, 222
Bolivia, organizations, Jewish, 460-61
 Bomse, Nahum, 211
Books of Jewish interest, U. S., 501-11
Boraisha, Menahem, obituary, 519
Braille Musician, 493
Brandeis Youth Foundation, 456
Brazil, 267-71; communal life, Jewish, 269-71; cultural life, Jewish, 270-71; economic life, Jewish, 268; — tables, 268; education, Jewish, 269-70; organizations, Jewish, 461; periodicals,
INDEX

Jewish, 497; population, Jewish, 267-68;—tables, 268; religious life, Jewish, 270
Brit Trumpeldor of America, 456
Brith Abraham, Independent Order of (see Independent Order)
Brith Sholom, 452
British West Indies, organizations, Jewish, 462
Brodetsky, Selig, 279, 281, 285, 405
Bronfman, Samuel, 274
Bronx Jewish Review, 494
Brooklyn Jewish Center Review, 494
Browne, Lewis Allen, obituary, 520
Buber, Martin, 151, 221
Buffalo Jewish Review, 493
Bulgaria, 373-77; communal life, Jewish, 375-76; communists and Zionism, 377; cooperatives, Jewish, 375; economic life, Jewish, 374; education, Jewish, 376; emigration, 377; organizations, Jewish, 462; periodicals, Jewish, 492; political life, 373-74; population, Jewish, 374
Bunche, Ralph J., 110, 379, 381, 382, 383, 393
Bund, Poland (see Jewish Socialist Bund, Poland)
Bureau for Intercultural Education, 120
Bums, John Horne, 204
Calendars, fifty-year, 542-46; monthly, 529-41
California Jewish Voice, 492
Compania Unida, Mexico, 257, 259
Campaa Unida pro Israel, Argentina, 265-66
Canada, 272-78; anti-Semitism, 273, 274; communal life, Jewish, 275-76; community councils, Jewish, by provinces, 490-91; discrimination, anti-Jewish, 274; displaced persons, 277; economic life, Jewish, 272-73; federations and welfare funds, Jewish, by provinces, 490-91; immigration, Jewish, 276-78; immigration, Jewish, statistics, 277-78; and Israel, 273, 275; Jews and French-Canadians, 273-74; organizations, Jewish, 462-63; periodicals, Jewish, 497-98; population, Jewish, 272; welfare funds, Jewish, by provinces, 490-91; Zionist activities, 275
Canadian Jewish Congress, 274, 275, 276
Cantors Assembly, 449
Carolina Israelite, 495
Cassablanca, 428
Cassin, Rene, on genocide convention, 441
Catholics and human rights, 439-40
Catholic reports on desecration in Israel, 303, 306 (see also Christian interests in Israel)
Celler bill on displaced persons, 132
Central America, 255-57; economic life, Jewish, 257
Central Board of Jews in Hungary, 362
Central Committee of Liberated Jews in Germany, 318, 322, 330
Central Committee of Polish Jews, 344, 345, 346, 347, 349, 350
Central Conference of American Rabbis, 439, 449
Central Council of Jewish Communities in Greece, 313
Central Sephardic Jewish Community of America, 452
Central Yiddish Culture Organization (CYCO), 446
Central Jewish Committee of the Fatherland Front in Bulgaria, 375
Chagall, Marc, 224
Chalutz, 494
Chaplains (see National Association of Jewish; National Council of Jewish)
Chernoff, Victor, 213
Chicago Israelite, 492
Chicago Jewish Chronicle, 492
Chicago Jewish Courier, 492
Chicago Jewish Forum, 492
Child care, Jewish, 189-90
Children, aid to immigrant, Jewish, 196, 198-99
Chile, organizations, Jewish, 463; periodicals, Jewish, 498
China, organizations, Jewish, 463
Chochem, Corinne, 226, 227
Christian interests in Israel, 398-99 (see also Holy Places, Israel)
Christian textbooks, U. S., 559
Christians in Lebanon, 421
Church and state, separation of, 96-99, 155, 558
Church Peace Union, 442
Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 558
Citizenship (see Population, Jewish, U.S.)
City of Hope, 454
Civil liberties, 80-82
Civil rights, 77-82; administrative action, 78-80: community organization for, 119-20; review, 558; Ku Klux Klan opposition, 113-14; legislation in Congress, 77-78
Clay, Lucius D., 322, 332
Cohen, A., 223
Cohen, Abraham, 281
Cohen, Alfred Morton, obituary, 520
Cohen, Charles, obituary, 520
Cohen, George Harry, obituary, 520
INDEX

Cohen, Louis, obituary, 520
Cohen, Morris Raphael, 209
Cohen, Samuel, 288
College of the City of New York, 94-95
Colombia, organizations, Jewish, 463-64; periodicals, Jewish, 498
Comité Representativo, Chile, 254
Commentary, 494, 560
Committee of Religious Congregations in Poland, 344, 346, 350
Communism and Zionism, U.S., 172-73 (see also individual countries)
Community centers, Jewish, 191
Community councils, Jewish, directory, by states, 476-90
Community organization, Jewish, 138-46; coordination of efforts, 139, 140; fundraising, 143-44; local developments, 142-46; personnel, 146; religious basis, 139
Community relations (see Intergroup relations)
Community surveys, 3-4, 144
Conference Committee of National Jewish Women's Organizations, 454
Conference on Jewish Relations, 446
Congress for Jewish Culture, 446
Congress for the Sabbath, 449
Congress Weekly, 494
Consejo Central Sionista, Argentina, 266
Conservative Judaism, 494
Consistoire Central, Algeria, 430
Consistoire Central, France, 302
Consistoire Central, Belgium, 305
Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations, 437, 438, 445, 552
Cooper, Harry, obituary, 520
Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, 437, 445
Corn, Rachel, 276
"Cosmopolitanism," 336 (see also Communism and Zionism)
Costa Rica, 256; organizations, Jewish, 464
Council of the Community of Tunis, 429
Council of Jewish Communities, French Morocco, 427
Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, U.S., 139, 140, 141, 142, 144-45, 454
Council of Jewish Religious Communities in Bohemia and Moravia, 357
Croll, David, 273
Cuba, 260-64; anti-Semitism, 261-62; communal life, Jewish, 262-63; economic life, Jewish, 261; immigration, Jewish, 263; and Israel, 263-64; organizations, Jewish, 464; periodicals, Jewish, 498; population, Jewish, 260-61
Cultuelles, Algeria, 430
Culture and Education, 494
CYCO, 446
Cyprus, emigration to Israel, 321, 399-400; Jews detained on, 278
Cyrenaica, 430-32
Czechoslovakia, 355-60; anti-Semitism, 359; communal life, Jewish, 357-59; communism and Zionism, 360; economic life, Jewish, 356-57; emigration, Jewish, 360; and Israel, 359-60; nationalization, 357; organizations, Jewish, 465; political life, 355; population, Jewish, 356; restitution of Jewish property, 356-57
Damesek, Shlomo, 216
Dance and dancers, Jewish, 225-27
Danilo, 227
Davidovici, Paul, 373
The Day, 494
Delta Phi Epsilon Sorority, 452
Denver (see Ex-patients' Tubercular Home of; Jewish Consumptive Relief Society of; National Home for Jewish Children at; National Jewish Hospital at)
Delakova, Katya, 225, 226, 227
Demography (see Population)
Displaced persons, 315-24; camp consolidation, 317; care of, 318, 319; review by American Jewish Committee, 555; "hard core" problem, 324; population and citizenship, tables, 316 (see also Austria, displaced persons; Germany, population, Jewish; Israel, immigration)
Displaced Persons Act, 129, 130, 194, 320; review by American Jewish Committee, 555, 558-59; as election issue, 231; legislation in Congress, 131-33
Denmark, 311; organizations, Jewish, 465; periodicals, Jewish, 498
Detroit Jewish Chronicle, 493
Dichy Bey, Joseph, 422
Discrimination in education, 89-96; in employment, 99-110; in housing, 82-88 (see also Anti-Semitism)
Displaced persons, Jewish, assistance by voluntary organizations, 321, 322; attitude of occupation authorities, 322-23; caloric rations for, tables, 319; geographic distribution, tables, 315, 316; emigration to Israel, 320, 321, 323; and Italy, 323; population, birth rate, 317; resettlement, 319, 320 (see also Resettlement, Jewish immigrants)
Displaced persons, U.S., 68, 69, 74, 76; Jewish, 320; legislation in Congress, 558-59; occupations, 68-70; public opinion about, 130-31; religious affiliations, 128-29; social and economic conditions of, 129-30 (see also Immigration; Immigration, Jewish)

Displaced Persons Commission, 194

Djerada pogrom, 427

Dluzhnowsky, M., 212

Dominican Republic, organizations, Jewish, 465

Dominican Republic Settlement Association, 448

Domonkos, Max, 364

Dorfman, Zelig, 211

Drury, Betty, 208

Druzis, 398

Dual loyalty, 137

Duggan, Hayden, 208

Dutch Guiana, organizations, Jewish, 465

Dutra, Enrico Gaspar, 268

Dropsie College Alumni Association, 449

Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 449

Eban, Aubrey, 379, 381, 383, 386, 388, 399

Eclaireurs Israélites Français, Tunisia, 429

Economic conditions of Jews, 53-70; theories on security, 70

Ecuador, organizations, Jewish, 465; periodicals, Jewish, 498

Ede, Chuter, 279

Eddin, Ben M., obituary, 520

Education, discrimination, 89-96; in fraternities, 93-94; legislation, in states, 89-91; and Negroes, 91-93 (see also Employment, discrimination; Population, Jewish, occupations, professional)

Education, federal aid to, 97-98

Education, intercultural, 120-22, 166

Education in intergroup relations, mass programs for, 125-26

Education, Jewish, 33-36, 157-67; conferences, 164-65; enrollment tables, 157, 158, 159; finances, 163-64;—tables, 164; influence of Israel on, 161; literature on, 165-66; parent-teacher associations, 162-63; personnel changes, 167; religious, tables on, 36, 37; secular, 33-35;—tables, 34; teacher shortage, 157; teacher training, 160; textbooks, 166 (see also Rabbinical seminaries)

Efron, Benjamin, 206

Efroykin, Y., 213

Egypt, 415-17; communal life, Jewish, 417; communism, 416; discrimination, anti-Jewish, 415-16;—against foreigners, 416; emigration, 417; future of Jews, 417; organizations, Jewish, 465; population, Jewish, 416; social conditions, 416

Ehrenburg, Ilya, 173, 336-37, 354, 360

Einstein, Albert, 405

Eisen, A., 212

Elath, Eliahu, 135

Elfenbein, Israel, 223

Eliash, Mordecai, 278

Eliashar, Eli, 267, 416

El Salvador, 256; organizations, Jewish, 465-66

Embree, Edwin Rogers, 208

Employment, discrimination, 99-110; in armed services contracts, 108; employers’ action, 108-09; Executive Order 9980, 106-08; and government service, 109-10; legislation, 101-04; legislation, administration of, 104-06; legislation, in Congress, 102; legislation, in states, 103; pilot placement projects, 109; in professions, 109; surveys, 99-101 (see also Education, discrimination; Population, Jewish, occupations affected by discrimination)

Engel, Irving M., 559

Engelman, Morris, obituary, 520

Di Epoche, 494

Epstein, Albert K., obituary, 520

Epstein, Isadore, 281

Epstein, Louis M., 223; obituary, 520

Ethridge, Mark F., 388

Evatt, Herbert V., 285, 383, 434, 441

Every Friday, 495

Executive Council of Australian Jewry, 283, 286

Europe, Central, 315-35 (see also individual countries)

Europe, Eastern, 336-51 (see also individual countries)

Europe, Southeastern, 352-78; anti-Semitism, 353-54; communism and Zionism, 354; cultural life, Jewish, 353; economic life, Jewish, 352-53; emigration to Israel, 354-55; and Israel, 354; population, Jewish, 354-55 (see also individual countries)
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