

U

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis


The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

Date May 6, 1950 Harry Cohen
(signature of author)

The ~~below~~-named thesis was microfilmed on

5/10/60
(date)

For the Library


(signature of staff member)

AUTHOR Cohen, Henry.

TITLE	Reaction of the American Jewish community to major problems during the years 1929-1939, as reflected in the English-American Press. 1953.
-------	---

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

Reactions of the American Jewish Community to
Major Problems During the Years 1929-1939,
As Reflected in the Anglo-Jewish Press.

written by Henry Cohen
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: (☒)
cannot be considered for publication: (☐)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (☒)
may not be loaned by the Library: (☐)

Ellis Rivkin
(signature of referee)

Ellis Rivkin
(referee)

(date)

REACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY TO MAJOR PROBLEMS
DURING THE YEARS 1929-1939--AS REFLECTED IN THE
ANGLO-JEWISH PRESS

Summary of Conclusions

The problem: to examine the reaction of the American Jewish community to the events and social forces of the thirties; to ascertain if those reactions (institutional and ideological) were random reactions or were based on any discernable patterns.

The procedure: The community structure of the twenties and that of the thirties were compared. Problems of the thirties were seen to be: Depression, New Deal, Preparedness program; Centralization trends; Intra-Jewish Tensions; Hitler; Native American Anti-Semitism; Communism, Zionism, and Judaism were viewed as ideologies that attempted to meet the needs of some of the Jews.

The thesis: The reactions of American Jewish community could be best understood through class analysis, as the various socio-economic groups reacted to the above problems and ideologies according to a pattern indicated by their class position and interests. This thesis is proved by the abundant evidence which shows how old middle-class, new middle-class, manufacturers, Jewish "professionals," and different labor groups reacted to the problems confronting them.

Related conclusions: The major characteristics of the Jewish community are molded by the general environment of that community. Intra-Jewish tensions are based on social divisions within the community. Any issue, whether of objective insignificance or of paramount importance, may be clothed in these antagonisms. Within each class there is some difference between the interests and attitudes of the leadership and the interests and attitudes of the rank-and-file of the class. The attitudes of each class towards the social problems and ideologies within the Jewish community are

Summary of Conclusions

tremendously influenced by the needs and interests of that class. When members of a class become aware of those class needs and interests which are so important in shaping the class point-of-view, they are better able to understand reality.

REACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY
TO MAJOR PROBLEMS DURING THE YEARS 1929-1939--
AS REFLECTED IN THE ANGLO-JEWISH PRESS

by

Henry Cohen

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
January, 1953

Referee:
Professor Ellis Rivkin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	P a g e
Introduction	1
I.America, the Beautiful	1
II.The American Jewish Community: 1924-1929: Reflected Glory	9
III.The Thirties--Age of Groping	57
IV.Changes in the American Jewish Community: 1929-1939	71
V.Jewish Reactions to the American Economy: 1929-1939	79
VI.Tensions Within the Jewish Community: 1929-1939	128
VII.Nazi Germany--Repercussions in American Jewry	149
VIII.Anti-Semitism, USA	191
IX.Communism and the American Jewish Community	231
X.Zionism and the American Jewish Community .	253
XI.Judaism and the American Jewish Community .	273
XII.Conclusions	283
Notes	298
Bibliography	323
Appendix	326

REACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY TO MAJOR PROBLEMS
DURING THE YEARS 1929-1939--AS REFLECTED IN THE
ANGLO-JEWISH PRESS

INTRODUCTION

What were the problems--what were the reactions--importance of the reactions--problem of research--plan of analysis

The worldwide depression of 1929 wrought great changes throughout the world. Hitler gained power in Germany, and the fascist government prepared for war and persecuted the Jews. America was shaken by a severe crisis, and the New Deal attempted to restore prosperity. The new social forces unleashed by the depression wrought changes not only in society in general but also--as would be expected--in the American Jewish community in particular. For that community was suddenly faced with problems that were strange and new to the American Jewish scene. The Depression itself did not discriminate between Jew and Gentile. And the Jewish community was faced with hardship and poverty and with the task of finding a solution to the great crisis. Nazism ruined a tremendous Jewish community, and American Jewry tried to understand as they groped for an answer. Even in America Father Coughlin and William Dudley Pelley found a market for their bigotry. And American Jews in the land of the free wondered.

The first problem of this study is to determine the reactions of the American Jewish community to the forces unleashed by the Depression in general and to the problems created by those forces in particular. These reactions were

of three types: Changes in the social structure and general nature of the Jewish community...for example, an increase in antagonisms among Jews, an acceleration of the trend towards centralization in the Jewish community. Attempts to solve the particular problems of the Depression, anti-Semitism here and abroad. And modifications of already existing ideologies--Communism, Zionism, Judaism--to meet the changed conditions.

It is important not only to list these reactions but to understand them. For the problems that faced the Jewish community during the thirties are still very much alive today and may be with Jews for a long time to come. The problem of the capitalist crisis has not been solved. Jews, being the early victims of society in crisis, have a particular interest in this solution. (Although no group in society will in the long run escape from the results of a crisis that remains unresolved.) It is especially important for the middle-class (Jew and Gentile) to be aware of the social forces in capitalist crisis. For it was this middle-class in Germany's crisis which enabled Hitler to triumph. Anti-Semitism is a problem that presently engages several Jewish defense organizations, and Jews still quarrel about the most effective methods to combat it. There are many tensions within the Jewish community, and the substance of the argument seems to be an intellectual veneer that covers a deeper emotional antagonism. Centralization within the Jewish community is proceeding apace, and large organizations quarrel one with the other in order to gain wider jurisdiction or more funds.

The problem of this research was not the simple listing of different reactions. The problem was: how can these varied gropings be understood? Is there any pattern that will explain why some Jews found a solution in Hapoel Hamizrachi and others gave large gifts to Palestine but opposed Zionism? Is there any pattern that will explain why some Jews thought anti-Semitism in America was an idea imported from Germany while others thought it was born and bred in America by native social conditions? Is there any pattern that will explain why some Jews favored the boycott of Germany and mass meetings while others opposed both while still others favored the boycott but opposed mass meetings? Is there any pattern that will explain why some Jews were lured to Communist front organizations and supported Birobidzhan while others opposed both while still others opposed Communist front organizations but supported Birobidzhan? Is there any pattern that will explain why some Jews supported the New Deal in its early days and later turned against it and why other Jews opposed it in its early days and later supported it and why still other Jews never supported it?

Were these reactions simply differences of opinions among individuals, each of whom thought the problem through and came to his own conclusion? If so, this study might simply list all of the differences of opinion and disregard any factors other than personal motivation. This parade of facts could give no understanding of society and would ignore definite patterns of attitude and ideology.

Were these reactions based on religious beliefs? Undoubtedly a particular brand of Judaism influenced some of the reactions in the minds of many individuals. But could these reactions to the pressing problems of the thirties be intelligently considered under the categories of religious denominations. Would the ideologies of Reform, Conservatism, or Orthodoxy show clearly why one group would favor the boycott and another group would be partial to Community st front activity and why a third group would believe that the poor will always be with us while other Jews find social justice in an elimination of the capitalistic system? Organization along religious lines would explain very little.

Were these reactions based on geographical areas? No. It is found that in every geographical area there is the same broad range of reactions...with the exception of New York City where there are certain reactions not found elsewhere.

The only organization of these reactions that can throw considerable light on why Jews differed so in their attitudes is the organization along class lines! All of the questions asked above--from the boycott to Birobidzhan--can be explained through class analysis. The American Jewish community contains several distinct or almost distinct socio-economic groups--from the old middle-class of German background to the Bundists of the Workmen's Circle. These classes had periodicals that presented answers to the problems of the thirties. They had organizations that were formal spokesmen for the class point-of-view. They had leaders that guided the

class--although their attitudes were not always precisely shared by the rank-and-file of the class. That different periodicals represent class viewpoints was obvious as it became clear that different magazines sponsored by the same class all had the same attitude towards the problems of the thirties. And so, it was on the basis of the Anglo-Jewish press that the ideologies and attitudes of the different classes within the Jewish community were recorded and analyzed. It was found that each class had a series of reactions that could be explained--in large measure--by the needs and interests of that class in society. The parade of facts began to make sense.

The importance of this interpretation is that class members whose attitudes and ideologies are so influenced by class needs can gain more control over those same attitudes and ideologies by understanding how the class needs shape them.

The restriction to material in the Anglo-Jewish press somewhat limits the scope of this study. However, the limitation is not so serious as might be expected. For there are several classes (eg, the Communists, Labor Zionists, Labor anti-Zionists) that have several publications in both English and Yiddish. And for the purpose of ascertaining the class viewpoint one language is as good as another. The Forward and the Call speak with the same voice. However, the European Orthodox group centered in the Agudas Ha-rabanim had no available English publications and will not be in the scope of this study. However, this is the only class that

the limitation of the Anglo-Jewish press will eliminate from the class analysis.

It is unfortunate that the approach of class analysis creates considerable resentment in many people. The common reaction is the cry, "I am not determined by my class." Or, "there are many influences; why stress the class?" This analysis is not interested in demonstrating any abstract theory of historiography. It is interested in discovering an approach to the data that can throw the most light on understanding the reactions of the American Jewish community. Other "influences" are not denied. It is not the concern of this study to debate how primary those other influences are. But since it has been found that class analysis can give the most logical understanding of the data, that approach is being employed. The tremendous influence of class needs and interests will be shown. This is not to exclude other influences. It would be interesting for the critic of class analysis to take the data of all these reactions and explain that data through some other approach.

Class analysis does not assume that every member of the class is a carbon copy of the class program. For there are personal influences that affect different individuals and even shunt them from class to class. Ludwig Lewisohn, a German Jew raised in the South, had a personal life of rejection by the Gentile world and various personal factors uprooted him from his class and transplanted him into another social group. And there are some individuals who have really pulled themselves up by their social and

emotional roots and have gained sufficient self-understanding to achieve freedom of will. But it need not be labored that the mass of mankind follows in general terms his own class. For the members of a class support its institutions and read its periodicals. There is frequent friction between rank-and-file and leadership, but this is taken into account within the class analysis.

The plan of analysis will be the following:

- I. What was the nature of society in the roaring twenties?
- II. What was the nature of the American Jewish community towards the end of this decade? Its general trends and characteristics will be examined and it will be seen how they were influenced by the general environment. The socio-economic classes within the community will be analyzed, their spokesmen will be revealed--both men and magazines.
- III. What was the nature of the worldshaking changes that came about in the thirties due to the Depression?
- IV. How was the nature of the American Jewish community affected by these general changes? What were the new or accelerated trends? What were the pressing problems?
- V. An underlying characteristic that pervaded all disagreements and different reactions was the increased amount of intra-Jewish tension. And so, a class analysis of these tensions is given.
- VI. What were the reactions of the different Jewish classes to the Depression, to the early New Deal, the Supreme

Court controversy, the preparedness program? In what way (if any) did these reactions differ from the corresponding non-Jewish classes? (The general press is here used.)

How did the different classes react to the growing trend of centralization? The whole problem of centralization in the Jewish community will be discussed.

- VII. What understanding did each class have of the Hitler phenomenon? What classes were able through their analyses to predict the rise of Hitler? What program did each class have as an answer to the menace of Hitler? Did programs always flow from analyses, and why not?
- VIII. What did each class believe to be the cause of American anti-Semitism? What were the programs offered by each class to combat native anti-Semitism?
- IX. What classes seemed most sympathetic to the Communist front organizations? What were the Communist solutions to the problems facing the Jews during the thirties?
- X. What was the attitude of each class towards Zionism? How did its particular brand of Zionism or non-Zionism solve the problems of the thirties?
- XI. What were the religious attitudes of the various classes? In what ways did Judaism furnish answers to the problems?
- XII. The final chapter will be broad conclusions drawn from the data presented. But throughout the analysis the many relations between the class needs and interests

and the attitudes and ideologies of the class will be expressed.

I should like to express my infinite appreciation to Dr. Ellis Rivkin who has given me most of my training in the field of scientific historiography.

I. AMERICA, THE BEAUTIFUL

America as the twenties came to their roaring climax--this America was the social setting of the Jewish community that was affected by the depression. And so, this America must be described and understood in order that the Jewish community and the depression itself may be understood. For that Jewish community took a form indicated by American prosperity. And that depression had its roots in the roaring twenties.

"America, the beautiful"--that was the appearance to the man at the helm of American free enterprise in 1928. Calvin Coolidge was certain that America was in an "era of prosperity more extensive and of peace more permanent" than had ever been known. The reason was obvious: "The main source of these unexampled blessings lies in the integrity and character of the American people."¹ On occasion the American people would share with God the responsibility for their prosperity as they "prais'd the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation." There were a few discordant notes in the jazz age: the intuitive skepticism of a Cabell or a Lewis knew that the patient was not well but had no idea as to the nature of the sickness. Uncle Sam had become Jay Gatsby, and America was one big party of hilarious frustration.

To understand what was happening in America, to see from whence flowed the undercurrents of the depression America's economy must be viewed in its world setting. For

at this time the whole civilized world was gasping for air that would revive the capitalistic spirit.

The basic problem was that after World War I, capitalism in Europe began its decline and capitalism in America (while not on a decline) had consumed its possibilities for internal expansion. Since capitalism is based on the profit motive, the capitalist will continue producing so long as his profit is increasing. The demand of the market at home is insufficient for the supply provided by a highly industrialized economy. Since there is insufficient market at home, the capitalist will turn abroad. When he cannot find anymore foreign markets, he must curtail production--since he would be producing at a loss. So the wheels of the big producer-goods industries start slowing down and workers are laid off. This further reduces the purchasing power for the consumer-goods industries which are already well stocked, so they begin to lay off some workers. The result: a capitalist crisis. But does this theory explain what was happening to the world in the twenties?

English capitalism was struggling to reach its pre-World War I production level. Why? England had the blessing and the curse of being the first successful industrial capitalist nation. After the labor pains of 1825-1850 when handicrafters were forced into the proletariat and there were crises due to the resulting glutted labor market--after these labor pains, Britain gave birth to a bouncing baby capitalist. The labor problem was solved, because the export industries furnished many jobs as England helped

develop more backward capitalist countries such as Germany and the United States. England's home market could not absorb, for example, the textile products and the railroad construction materials; consequently colonies were founded throughout the world. These colonies were wonderful markets for her industrial expansion, since through alliances with the landed feudal elements Britain successfully prevented any native industry or native proletariat. In this way she had a large market for her goods, because the impoverished masses of India--not allowed to develop their own wealth--did have to be clothed by British textiles. And railroads were built throughout India. Furthermore, technological unemployment was forestalled by considerable immigration from Britain to America and other countries. There was even a shortage of labor at times, and the wages of the workers would rise.

But after the World War, British production was one-third below its pre-war level. And the expansion that began after the war looked in vain for the markets that were once abundant. Not only was imperialistic expansion at an end, but there were vague rumblings of discontent in far-away lands that showed no gratitude for the mother country... gone was the spirit of Gunga Din. Despite all efforts, native industry--financed by landed lords and rural rajahs--was growing and growling nationalism. The European countries to which Britain had exported capital were now her competitors. Colonial Russia was lost. And as for the markets that

remained, Britain had to vie with more modern German and American productive techniques. Still there was the Empire and the King and some markets.

Germany began its industrial development later than did England and so was enabled to use more efficient techniques of production. But this only made the German capitalist's problem more acute. With all of his greater efficiency, he entered the race too late to grab colonial markets. It was this need for foreign markets to meet the rapidly developing German industrial machine that plunged Germany into the first world war. From the aspect of world capitalism (says John Strachey) the wrong side won the first world war.² For after Versailles, Germany with its tremendous industrial potential was even more desperate: If its capitalist class was to continue in power, it must produce for somebody. And the few outlets that German capitalism had were now closed. Her colonies were confiscated and her markets in Eastern Europe were closed through the break-up of Austria-Hungary and the formation of small capitalist states there. The government was burdened by war debts, the population was impoverished; yet industry knew that to survive she must produce.

There being no outside market, there were only two ways by which industry could be stimulated (and this holds for all capitalistic depressions): a cut in wages through crushing the unions or a raise in prices (through inflationary measures). Dying German capitalism used both

measures which were bound to increase class antagonism so that there would be a revolution to the right or to the left. Through issuing of more money, the war loans bought by the middle and lower classes became practically valueless. Through a reduction of wages industry was stimulated and the working class became more class-conscious. So with these measures laden with political dynamite did German capitalism try to preserve itself. (And, to date, has succeeded).

But America was different! A capitalistic country prosperous while the rest of the world was on the decline. Naturally Americans were proud of this remarkable phenomenon. America was the Chosen Nation and her people must surely have a peculiar genius for industrial prosperity. But perhaps there were more rational reasons for the lingering prosperity.

American capitalism began its expansion after British capital had already been sunk in techniques of production that were becoming out-dated. America's early industrial progress was extremely rapid, since she was spared the crises caused by replacing of pre-capitalistic modes of production (there were no such modes). The technological tendency towards a glutting of the labor market was easily cancelled without the need for foreign expansion: Expansion was internal. Opening the frontier provided a large agricultural sector to which workers disemployed could move. There was endless investment in the new lands. And there was always another frontier. The large agricultural sector and the

tremendous opportunities for building up the country led to frequent labor shortages. This in turn meant higher wages and general prosperity in expanding American capitalism. America could afford to moralize about the imperialism of other nations who had no chance for such tremendous inner expansion. This inner expansion was steady and not so dependent on the jerking progress of imperialist exploitation. America thanked God and her ingenuity when she had more truthfully paid homage to the Mississippi Valley and the plains of Texas.

However, with the first world war America had crossed her last frontier. Inner expansion had ended, and the day of imperial expansion seemed to be over. But this country was still the most prosperous capitalist nation in the world. World War I was an industrial boom. And after the war America continued producing, hoping for a chicken in every pot. Unfortunately for American capitalism there were too many chickens for every pot.

There was, of course, prosperity. America was a populous country with well-paid workers. As industry produced for the home market, its products were bought in quantity by all classes (except the farmer) and wages were raised. But the increase in wages did not keep pace with the increase in productivity. And so, producing power gradually forged far ahead of consuming power. Two striking examples of this were the shoe and agricultural industries. During the twenties the boot and shoe industry had created three times the productive facilities necessary for the pedestrian needs of all

Americans.³ Meanwhile the farmers who had geared their crops to production for sale abroad had lost their foreign markets and were faced with overproduction and falling prices while they had to pay whatever the protected capitalists wrote on the price tags of their tractors. In America there was then naturally some technological unemployment.⁴ But there was still enough purchasing power to keep the wheels of industry going. Concentration of the nation's wealth in fewer hands was ignored, because there was still enough of a market to stimulate production for most Americans.

But as the wheels continued to turn and the profits came in, where could the money be re-invested? Not the shoe business. Foreign markets had no money for the tremendous producer-goods industries. There was already a fine system of railroads from New York to Frisco. Still through the twenties markets could be found, and holding companies held their breath. Throughout the late twenties any investment would pay off. For if production stopped expanding, the depression would start. And America played the stock market. Why not? Coolidge promised prosperity and big business had to keep moving faster and faster lest like a slowing top it lose its balance and collapse.

The American government folded its hands, sat back and smiled. This was true prosperity. To forestall a successful farm bloc the Agricultural Marketing Act was passed in 1929. A Federal Farm Board would lend a little money to cooperative

marketing associations, and the basic problems of tariffs and the world market could be ignored. Thus the government "pacified" the worst-hit class. All peoples were assured that there would be no more war. For in 1928 Uncle Sam joined with England, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan in signing the Kellogg-Briand pact of peace.

So, America was beautiful--to industrialists, to the middle-class, and to most workers. True, a poem by Emma Lazarus that officially welcomed immigrants was only recited on the fourth of July, for immigration laws had recognized the dangers of capitalistic maturity. Still the immigrants who were here could ascend the social scale from an unskilled worker to a skilled. And the American working class with its high wages had never taken too seriously a socialist ideology. The immigrant lost his revolutionary tinge, and the worker believed his son could join the middle-class. It was an age of optimism. God was in heaven, and all was right with America. And still...

This analysis has laid the groundwork for an examination of the Jewish community in the mature American capitalism. For that Jewish community--its attitudes and social structure--can be understood only in the light of the society of which it was an organic part.

II. THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY: 1924-1929: REFLECTED GLORY

An analysis of the social structure of the Jewish community that was hit by the depression is prerequisite to an understanding of the Jewish reactions to the crash. What were the general trends in the Jewish life of the period, trends that developed out of the social forces of the happy twenties?

It would be expected that the Jews should share in the general prosperity, and, of course, they did. Some indices of this prosperity are the building boom in small cities and the flourishing of schools supported by segments of the Jewish community.¹ The Yeshiva College was giving a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1928. In 1922 the Jewish Institute of Religion and the Hebrew Theological Seminary of Chicago were founded. Even more symptomatic of prosperity was the rapid rise of Jewish fraternities and sororities, and the American Jewish Committee was urging the president of Brown University to admit Jewish fraternal organizations. The Committee's census in 1928 showed that there were 4,230,000 Jews in America, 2,948 congregations, 554 Sabbath schools, and 604 weekday schools. This generalization about prosperity will later be modified by an analysis of what was happening to the different Jewish classes. However, since all America except a few workers and most farmers was "in the money" and since there were very few Jewish (non-gentlemen) farmers and Jewish workers were strongly unionized--it is understandable that

the American Jewish community would bask in the reflected glory of the glowing twenties.

How were the Jews treated in a maturing capitalistic society? In a rapidly expanding capitalist society--such as the United States from 1870-1914--there is relatively little anti-Semitism since there is relatively little frustration and ^{social forces} an increasing amount of economic surplus that can be shared by all. Furthermore the Jews are needed as laborers and middle-men in this period. Of course, there are always some dissatisfied elements--in this period notably the Populist party--that can never gain control, and these groups will frequently resort to anti-Semitism in their desperate efforts. But America did not have the complexities of an expanding France that expanded at the expense of powerful Catholic, Royalist, and army groups. No such feudal groups existed in America, groups that might be strong enough to stir up prejudice to the degree of the Dreyfus Case which was perpetrated by these dying feudal elements in France.

But in 1914 the inner expansion of American society had been completed. Still there was no obvious decline, and prosperity was the dominant note. So in this maturation period of prosperous American capitalism we see a continuation of the era of good feeling very slightly tempered by evidences of latent anti-Semitism. But these evidences simply gave good will organizations something to talk about--American Jewry was under Marshall Law, as Zangwill quipped, and this was a Law of Brotherhood with all mankind.

In the Spring of 1929, a scheduled Passion Play was

cancelled in New York City. Then Louis Marshall took the offensive and demanded that Christian groups cease proselytizing activities. That same spring the Supreme Court ordered the jury commission of Bryan County, Georgia to cease discrimination against Jews.

And yet, immediately after 1914 there were signs that the Jews were no longer indispensable to the economy. The klan attacked the Jews along with Negroes and Catholics. Tom Watson played on the bigotry of frustrated Southern whites as he led the lynching of Leo Frank. But this case was written off to "Yankee interference," and subsequent evidences of anti-Semitism were summarily and successfully dealt with by influential American Jews. In September, 1928 a four year old girl disappeared in Massena, New York, and the mayor ordered that the Jews be questioned as to their ritual murder custom. The girl was found, Louis Marshall received public apologies, and the Massena Affair seemed to prove that it could not happen here. The Council of Jewish Women held a panel discussion on unemployment discrimination, and a charge of discrimination in medical schools was brought up before the Association of American Medical Colleges by Dr. Schwitella. What happens in a democratic land of opportunity when there is a limit to the number of opportunities?

But most indicative of the latent anti-Semitism and the good feeling and the optimism all in one package was the case of repentant Henry Ford. In 1927 he accused--more correctly, the Dearborn Independent,--accused Aaron Sapiro of running

agricultural cooperatives for his own profit. Sapiro's famous suit against Ford brought forth a complete apology. This satisfied the Jewish community, and everybody was happy. Especially happy were the Happiness Boys who recorded the following musical reaction of the Jewish community:

Jake: I was sad and I was blue
But now I'm just as good as you
Since Henry Ford apologized to me

Isadore: That's why you threw away your little Chevrolet
and bought yourself a Ford coupee

Jake: I told the superintendent that the Dearborn Independent
Doesn't have to hang up where it use to be...

Isadore: He's got an aviator for his new machine
Instead of Charlie Lindberg he's got Charles Lewine

Jake: You've got a cold, now does it hoit

Isadore: No, I don't suffer in De-troit

Together: Since Henry Ford apologized to me!

And so with a song and a bad pun the Jewish community passed off the superficial manifestations of the latest frustration in a maturing capitalism.

There was among Jews generally little concern with anti-Semitism here. Two exceptions were the old middle-class of German background and (for a brief period) the neo-Orthodox wealthy Jews in New York City. Neo-Orthodoxy, as evidenced in The Jewish Forum,² was very much concerned in 1929 with a proposed Calendar Reform which would make impossible Sabbath observance. Naturally vigorous were the protests of wealthy neo-Orthodox Jews who had built their lives around acceptance of American culture and observance of Orthodox tradition. The old middle-class of German background with its history

of successful integration was naturally upset at the slightest evidence of anti-Semitism. And yet this group was the most optimistic about American society. On July 12, 1929, the American Hebrew's editor was certain that "the American people is so sane that no such sinister movement can long prevail or win other than benighted recruits." And on the surface there was no real cause for concern.

The Jewish community was America-centered. There was some philanthropy on behalf of Jews in Eastern Europe, but their problem was looked upon as perennial and it seemed certainly no worse in 1928 than it had been in years past. There was a famine in Bessarabia, but then all Bessarabians were affected and the liberal Peasant Party was in power. In February, 1929, the United Roumanian Jews of America raised special funds for the Bessarabian Jews. Jewish farm settlement in Russia was aided by John D. Rockefeller and ORT was sending duty-free tools and machines to Russian Jews. It was bemoaned that Yevseksia, the Jewish section of the Russian Communist Party, was trying to repress the Jewish religion. And a Polish minister named Filipowicz said that persecution of Jews in Poland was due to the fact that middlemen were being pushed out in a declining society. But this was the extent of concern abroad just before the crash. After all, Eastern Europe had always been a sore spot, and some remembered the really bad days of Kishineff.

This comparatively mild mistreatment of Jews in Eastern Europe was a sign of the times. It was something different from the old feudal persecution. For after World War I a

rising capitalist nationalism was felt in Eastern Europe outside of Russia. And the "liberal" nationalist parties found that it was in the interest of nascent capitalism to enlist the aid of all who had capital--especially the middle-men among whom were many Jews, so essential to the smooth working of the system. However, two factors prevented a completely tolerant society: The old anti-Semitic feudal elements were never completely pushed out. In addition, these embryonic nationalisms were barely staggering along in a world full of big strong nations. As there were crises in Eastern Europe, the traditional scapegoat was too convenient to be ignored. Still, the Jews were aided by "liberal parties" whose nationalistic programs copied the Western world and spoke of tolerance.

As for the lack of obvious anti-Semitism in the capitalist countries of Western Europe, the depression of world capitalism had not occurred and, although in decline, European capitalism was making its big bid for survival as was noted in the discussions of England and Germany in Chapter I. It was only when survival called for totalitarianism in Germany that anti-Semitism was invoked as national policy.

Thus far three general trends in the American Jewish community of the twenties have been observed: prosperity, just a tinge of anti-Semitism but generally an era of good feeling with the Gentile world, and relatively slight concern with anti-Semitism abroad. Within the internal life of the community there were three additional trends that characterized this period: a de-centralized Jewish com-

munity, a spirit of good feeling towards Jews in other groups, and a rise of Eastern European Jewry to wealth, power, and prestige.

Horace Stern, author of the Stern Plan for Centralization published in the American Jewish Year Book, 1933-4 spoke of the Jews as one of the "most individualistic and least organized peoples in the world." Writing of the "chronic lack of organization," he stated:

...we find no basic or comprehensive system whatever in our communal organization; indeed we have no communal organization. It is true that annually we improvise in more or less hasty fashion a sporadic and emotional campaign for local philanthropic purposes, but even in this matter...we have no really stable, permanent mechanism for obtaining in systematic and well-ordered fashion the charity contributions which should be regularly forthcoming...The religious school work of the community is carried on in still more chaotic fashion...³

Mr. Stern found the reason for this de-centralization in "the same differences that exist among the individuals and the groups that make up other peoples, races, and nations--the ordinary differences of education, wealth, and political economic, and social viewpoints" and he added the factor of different immigrant backgrounds. However, in view of later centralization that did take place under the same conditions that Mr. Stern listed--perhaps there are other factors that would explain why the community in the twenties was so much less centralized than was the case in the thirties--when the community was still composed of those same economic and national and immigrant groups.

The prosperity of the twenties was a de-centralizing factor. Prosperity means for non-economic social organiza-

tions a great surplus of funds to support many different organizations. Many different Jewish groups were striving for expression and in this lush decade they could pay their general secretaries and do their jobs. And yet in a world of standardization and centralized power, the advantages of bigness and efficiency will gradually creep into communal life. We see it in civic charities and even in the school system. But this social centralization is naturally preceded by the pattern in the economic sphere. It first pays off for businessmen and is then translated into all activity. So while the prosperity produced no immediate need for centralization of the Jewish community, the seeds of centralization were there as the whole world was headed in that direction. And kehillot were formed in Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

A further factor impeding centralization of the community was the small amount of anti-Semitism in the world at this time. What is often forgotten in current discussions of Jewish communal life is that its degree of centralization is affected not just by the progress of centralization in general society (although this influence is hailed as all-powerful by those in favor of a strong community). But just as important is the strength of the feeling of loyalty to a secular Jewish community that is induced by rejection from the outside world. And in the twenties, few Jews felt rejected.

The difference in kinds of centralizations induced by these two influences might be understood by imagining a

highly centralized economy in which the Jews are well-treated. There would still be the centralization within the Jewish class organizations--such as, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. But the kehilla idea that would bring together the Jewish classes into an organic community would make very little progress. So from now on, when one blithely speaks of "centralization," he must keep in mind: is this centralization of existing organizations representing specific social groups or is this centralization of the community as a whole--the organic community idea of the kehilla. An analysis of these two types of centralization will be found on pages 114-127. At any rate, in the twenties neither brand of centralization was current. Why? Because of the general prosperity (which hindered "class-centralization") and the lack of much anti-Semitism (which hindered organic centralization). But the seeds were there. Why? Because of the centralized economy and the latent anti-Semitism waiting for the crisis.

A second trend in the internal community was the general good feeling of Jews towards Jews. Evidence of this good feeling is found in periodicals that represent the various classes of American Jewry.

The B'nai B'rith Magazine warmly praised the American Jewish Congress when that body protested the anti-Semitism in Russia. The Congress spoke the "opinion of American Jewry with an authentic and confident voice!" Later will be noted a different attitude that the B'nai B'rith leadership (Upper middle-class German-background) had towards the predominantly

Eastern-European rising middle-class Congress when that body attempted to voice the "opinion of American Jewry with an authentic and confident voice."⁴ The participation of Zionists and non-Zionists on the Jewish Agency was hailed as work for the furtherance of the Jewish spirit.⁵ The editor did wonder what would happen should the Zionists go after political ends, but certainly the tone of the Magazine was free from tension. Henrietta Szold was mourned as the most "saintly Jewess in America" and B'rith Abraham (formed by German Jews but composed largely of Eastern Europeans who couldn't reach the B'nai B'rith level) was given warm felicitations for its actions in support of the American Jewish Congress.⁶ The American Hebrew--whose views and supporters parallel those of the B'nai B'rith leadership--went into ecstasy over the rapprochement on the Jewish Agency: "The coming of the non-Zionists to Zurich was like the coming of a fresh breath of spring."⁷ There were of course disagreements--the American Hebrew opposed an American Sanhedrin as proposed by the United Synagogues--but the preponderance of print was very kind.

The friendly feelings in the New Palestine would naturally revolve around the new policy of the Jewish Agency. It quoted Louis Marshall as saying that the upbuilding of Palestine is the task of every Jew "whose heart beats in unison with Israel."⁸ Felix Warburg blasted the rabid anti-Zionists with their 120 percent Americanism.⁹ Dr. Julian Morgenstern was quoted as saying that today's most pressing problem is unity in Israel.¹⁰ The Central Conference of

American Rabbis and the Zionist Organization of America exchanged cordial greetings.¹¹ Congratulations to Cyrus Adler on his new job as president of the American Jewish Committee and rejoicing that Felix Warburg had Palestine "in his bones"--these sentiments did overshadow occasional arguments with the American Hebrew regarding its attitude towards anti-Semitism.

The embryonic Reconstructionist movement naturally poured forth the spirit of friendship. After all, its whole philosophy was aimed at uniting all Jews. They had to be friendly. The SAJ Review hailed the establishment of a Shanghai B'nai B'rith as an admirable sign of the "catholic spread" of that organization which unites so many Jews.¹² The SAJ ideological call is that Reconstructionism is not a fourth denomination--but an all-embracing philosophy of Jewish life.

The Jewish Forum--representing neo-Orthodoxy--hailed the rapprochement on the Jewish Agency and the vigorous resolutions made by the American Jewish Congress offering harmony with the American Jewish Committee.¹³ The outstanding Jew of the month of June (1929) was David A. Brown, publisher of the American Hebrew and leader of the United Jewish Campaign.

The principal deviation from the spirit of harmony was found in the Zionist Labor group--its publication in the late twenties, The Vanguard. It blamed the American Jewish Congress for lacking constant contact with its members and for not being democratic--since its money only comes from a

few people.¹⁴ From this quarter was heard a warning voice to watch out for the non-Zionists on the Agency. The Vanguard feared that the bourgeois, non-Zionists will want to set up several Jewish landholders in Palestine. The ZOA was condemned for condoning British anti-labor interference in the Tel Aviv government and the proxy voting in the Zionist organization was considered non-democratic. The whole movement should bear the expenses of the delegates in the elections, so wealth will not have an advantage. So a still, small, voice of anger in an era of good feeling.

In a period of prosperity, of plenty for all, a great amount of harmonious feeling would be expected. There were no momentous issues that challenged the interests of the different Jewish groups. There was enough surplus--of money and prestige--so that many organizations could be satisfied. The capitalistic leaders of the Jewish community rejoiced together in their prosperity--just as bishop, knight, and duke once rejoiced when the feudal era was at its height. Further illustration could be found in the balmy days of Sura and Pumbeditha for examples...but that would be too digressive.

Just why the harmony should center around the affairs of Palestine is a matter that must wait until the chapter on Zionism. It would appear that there were some definiteX reasons for the return to the movement of Brandeis and the fine actions of such wealthy investors as Marshall and Warburg.

With this view of the reason for harmony, we need not be too surprised that a socialist labor group The Vanguard

did not share in the good feeling. Regarding the general society, this group was not sharing fully the prosperity of maturing capitalism. They evidently were socialists because they felt the sting of a contracting system. Indeed they did warn in January, 1929 of the Wall Street pools. Perhaps some of these workers knew at first hand the technological unemployment that was in evidence in the slump of December, 1928. Not only had they the frustration of not sharing the fruits of a maturing capitalism. But also the Jewish communal organization, built along the lines of this capitalist society, seemed to be overpowering their socialist brethren with wealth and oligarchy. And so, they complained about the only organizations they could join to identify themselves with the larger Jewish community--the American Jewish Congress and the Zionist Organization of America.

But this harsh voice of dissidents should not obscure the fact that for the American Jewish community of the twenties the general note was one of harmony. Senator Cohen and Louis Lipsky, Mordecai Kaplan and Isaac Rosengarten recognized the essential brotherhood of Jews.

The final trend to be discussed in this picture of the Jewish community of the twenties is the rise of Eastern European Jewry to wealth, power, and prestige. This rise is well documented in Rabbi Alvin Roth's Origins of the American Jewish Congress. The German immigrants of the 19th century rode in on the rising crest of American capitalism. Their wealth laid the basis for their children's wealth and social position and control of the Jewish community. The Eastern

European immigrants, arriving from 1890 to 1914 did not at first challenge this control. They were objects of philanthropy. But as they became integrated into the American scene and found their economic place in the sun, they began to organize. They had the practical advantage of numbers and the moral cry of democracy as they rallied behind the American Jewish Congress. The wealthier of this Eastern European group controlled the Congress, composed of the middle-class Eastern Europeans and some workers. The Eastern Europeans who had to stay in the proletariat founded their own unions and so rose in the social scale. Others left the laboring class and ran grocery stores or put on white collars. This sketchy account is simply a prelude to the analysis of the social structure of the Jewish community that was effected by the depression. But as the different social classes of Jews are discussed, it shall be kept in mind that the division is not only economic but also social (i.e., to what degree integrated and from what part of Europe). Furthermore, it is a dynamic community--with the Eastern European group gaining more power as it takes advantage of the prosperity of the twenties. The primary stabilizing influence was the limitation of immigration... from July, 1927, 150,000 per year was the total immigration allowed in the United States. And so, with this reminder of the maturation of capitalism in America, it is now possible to turn to a social analysis of the Jewish community that went through the depression.

The analysis of the social structure shall indicate the

class composition of each group, the secular organizations representing it, the periodicals published and read by its members, and the attitudes of the group towards Judaism, Zionism, and America's prospects in the year 1929.

The most integrated group was the old middle-class merchant of German background whose parents or grandparents came to this country in the nineteenth century. Of course, the term merchant is only conveniently characteristic. There were bankers and real estate men, and, of course, the professions (lawyers, doctors), writers, and "poor relatives" that are attached to every social class.

This group was led by the American Jewish Committee throughout the thirties. Louis Marshall was president of the Committee until he died in 1929. Marshall was by profession a lawyer of constitutional and corporation law with the firm Guggenheimer, Untermeyer, and Marshall, and a member of Congregation Emanu-el in New York. He was succeeded by Cyrus Adler, born in Van Buren, Arkansas but affiliated with the aristocratic Sephardic congregation, Mikveh Israel, and a leader in the Conservative movement...president of Dropsie College, he had taught Semitic languages at Johns Hopkins. Vice-president at this time was Julius Rosenwald, the merchant-philanthropist, born in Springfield, Illinois. He rose from the Rosenwald and Weil Manufacturing Company to the head of Sears and Roebuck. His religious affiliation, Temple Sinai of Chicago...the Classical Reform group on the south side. On the executive committee in 1928 was Leo Brown-- prominent in the fields of real estate, insurance, and law--

who practiced in Mobile, Alabama. There was Cyrus Sulzberger, the Philadelphia merchant and president of Erlanger, Blumgart, and Company. An active Republican, he was an anti-Tammany candidate and recipient of appointment by Charles Evans Hughes. There was Max Kohler, son of the theologian of Classical Reform Judaism, and a Detroit lawyer and writer. There was Abram Elkus, a lawyer who represented the Merchants Association and the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers. He was appointed ambassador to Turkey by Woodrow Wilson. Fill out the list with such names as Becker, Fuld, Lehman, Rosenau, Stern, Strauss, and Ullman. Out of twenty on the executive committee there was only one obviously non-German: A. C. Ratschesky, a Republican State Committeeman from Boston and president of the United States Trust Co. and the Armstrong Co.

It will be recalled that the Eastern European Jews were steadily growing in wealth and importance--so throughout the thirties--even in the American Jewish Committee--they gained positions in the older organizations. By 1940 Fred and Leo Butzel and Leo Finkelstein were on the Committee.

While the American Jewish Committee represents the leadership of the old middle-class, its views and interests do not always coincide with the views and interests of the rank-and-file of that class. This is a frequent phenomenon: there is often a gap between the leaders of the class and its members, since the leaders have interests granted them by their high position and withheld from the rank-and-file

of the class. The greater wealth and large investments of the leaders of this group in Germany and elsewhere abroad and their close connection with the financial interests behind the United States government would naturally at times affect their attitudes towards important problems. The result would then be a difference of opinion between these leaders and the rank-and-file of the old middle-class. Such differences will be seen when the problems of the boycott against Hitler and the attitude towards Zionism are discussed.

This same German-background old middle-class also dominated the leadership of the B'nai B'rith. Its president, Hon. Alfred M. Cohen, was a lawyer specializing in corporation and commercial cases, and was president of the People's Bank and Savings Companies. Here too was Sephardic background with Lucius L. Solomons of San Francisco an editor and public speaker, and son of Gershom Seixas. Another official was New Orleans philanthropist, Archibald Marx. Since the B'nai B'rith organization extended throughout the country and was not confined as was the American Jewish Committee to individuals elected "from above" from cities throughout the country plus Class B delegates from national Jewish organizations plus a few members at large--since the B'nai B'rith was much more of a "mass" organization (representing the best integrated of the middle-class in every community), there were many local organizations that were controlled by the rising Eastern European new middle-class. This would be only natural in a community where there are very few German merchants and where those of Eastern European

background were rapidly rising to civic prominence. During the thirties this trend took the form of revolt in the ranks, as individual chapters such as the order in Los Angeles would complain about the policies of the leadership. By 1937 the changed social complexion of the orders was felt in the leadership--as Henry Monsky, an Omaha lawyer became president and Sidney Kusworm, also of Eastern European background, was made treasurer.

However, the Anti-Defamation League the purpose of which was "to eliminate defamation of Jews and to counter-act un-American and anti-democratic propaganda" remained under the control of Sigmund Livingston, born in Giessen Germany; and the National Director in 1940 was Richard Gutstadt, a member of Temple Sinai of Chicago.

Thus far it has been shown that the American Jewish Committee and until 1937 the B'nai B'rith leadership represented the integrated German old middle-class. What periodicals expressed the views of this class? The American Jewish Year Book published by the American Jewish Committee, bears the imprint of that Committee and its class--although it is necessary to read between the lines, since this is primarily an informational periodical. The B'nai B'rith Magazine published by the Grand Lodge in Chicago is the organ for B'nai B'rith leadership. The voice of the rising Eastern European groups is heard in the B'nai B'rith Messenger of Los Angeles. The ADL Review begins in 1939 and so is a little late for the purpose of this study.

But the periodical giving the fullest account of the views of this group is the American Hebrew. The paper clearly represents a "class" point of view. Regarding the important issues of the thirties, the Hebrew praises the stand of the Committee and the B'nai B'rith and condemns their opponents. Its approach to anti-Semitism parallels that of the Anti-Defamation League. It is obviously addressed to the well-integrated old middle-class as there is frequent concern with discrimination in exclusive gentile social sets and a series entitled, "Intimate Glimpses of the Country Clubs."¹⁵ As its editorial views are discussed it will be seen how those attitudes are influenced by its class position. Further evidence of a class point-of-view is the more-than-coincidental identity of editorial opinion of all the aforementioned periodicals together with The American Israelite, The Jewish Woman, and The Council of Jewish Women Newsletter--also periodicals directed to the integrated old middle-class of German-background. Evidences of this identity of attitude will be given when the various problems that confronted the Jews in the period are discussed. For example, the attitudes towards mass demonstrations and the World Jewish Congress were so similar in these periodicals of the same social group that there must have been some reason other than a coincidence of subjective reasonings. And that reason is now perfectly clear: the identity of class background, needs, and interests!

It may be objected that Isaac Landman, editor of the Hebrew, was born in Russia and that Louis Rittenberg who replaced Landman in 1937 is a Hungarian who wrote a preface to Molnar's

plays. The preface has dealt with the cases of certain individuals who for personal reasons become aligned with certain class interests. In addition, it must be stressed that the "publicity men" for the class viewpoint are not necessarily from that class. That is, the journalistic middle-men who are supported by a class and whose welfare is determined by the continued market of that class very frequently do not spring from the class itself. Without inferring value judgments through the comparison, it is known that Gerald L. K. Smith in America and the brilliant French journalist Edouard Drumont were not members of the classes that supported them in their anti-Semitic tirades. Of more significance is the publisher of the Hebrew, David Brown, chairman of the Broadway National Bank and Trust Co., a banker and financier.

Briefly and without analysis of how the attitudes may be derived from the class position, what were the views of this class towards Judaism, Zionism, and America of 1929? As we noted, the majority were associated with classical Reform congregations such as Rabbi Jacob Mann's Temple Sinai of Chicago. A very few were prominent leaders in the Conservative movement. This group composed the "non-Zionist" camp and in January, 1929, the American Hebrew defined a "non-Zionist" as a person opposed to nationalism but interested in the cultural and economic rehabilitation of Palestine. The Hebrew looked forward with optimism to 1929 because of "two momentous occurrences" of 1928: the "pact of glory" between Zionists and non-Zionists and the functioning

of the Hebrew's Permanent Commission on Better Understanding. The B'nai B'rith Magazine stated that after sixty years of advance, the Jew now had equal rights.¹⁶ Senator Cohen was almost messianic in 1929: "Mankind enters a new year more lovely than in all the years of his long sojourn on earth."¹⁷ But then, this attitude would be expected from a group of integrated American Jews, reaping the fruits of the prosperity of the twenties. It seemed to them as though their whole philosophy of integration was paying off.

The rising Eastern European middle-class was pressing for national recognition in 1914. At this time--according to Rabbi Alvin Roth¹⁸--the shtadlanut of the American Jewish Committee was at a relatively low ebb, since there was a Democratic administration in Washington and the Committee was accustomed to dealing with the Republican party. The new middle-class was more closely associated with the Democrats. But the most powerful force behind the rise of the new middle-class at this moment was the need for the American Zionist Organization to have a powerful organization through which it could speak: Wrote Louis Lipsky:

The American Jewish Committee claimed hegemony in American Jewish life. That leadership might be challenged by the B'nai B'rith or the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. All three bodies could be relied upon not to be friendly to the Zionist cause. We therefore thought it to be of the utmost importance to bring into existence a new American representative body, all inclusive if possible, democratically elected, in order to ensure:

- 1) the creation of an authentic personality to speak for American Jewry,
- 2) to mold that body into a likeness satisfactory to Zionist hopes
- 3) to have a forum towards which our propaganda might be directed.

To that end after some hesitation we became parties to the organization of the American Jewish Congress. And thus we were plunged into the most interesting struggle American Zionism went through in all its history.¹⁹

The reason for this great need of the Zionist organization was probably that World War I had deadened the effectiveness of European Zionism with its center in Berlin. Therefore, Shmarya Levin, European Zionism's emissary in America, enlisted the aid of Louis Lipsky and Louis Brandeis. This group responded eagerly to the call for the Congress, which was issued on August 30, 1914 by Bernard Richards, Menahem Syrkin, and Baruch Zuckerman. The Provisional Committee for General Zionist Affairs invited the American Jewish Committee to cooperate. The AJC, probably seeing the inevitability of the Congress, joined on the provision that this was a temporary Congress, and in 1916 the Congress adopted its mild Philadelphia platform: it would operate for "defence" functions exclusively; it was a temporary organization; it was not a spokesman for all Jewish life. This group adjourned in 1920, and in 1922 a new American Jewish Congress that would be a democratic representative body for all American Jews to deal with all Jewish matters was organized. And so, this Congress of 1922 was based on the desire of the new middle-class to have a more important voice in American Jewish affairs. The most powerful ideological weapon used in the struggle for power was Zionism: the Zionist organization needed a spokesman. And the moral cloak for the struggle was the cry of democracy.

The Congress election in 1922 clearly shows the class

composition. ^{As} Delegates to the Congress were chosen on the local level and also on the organizational level. There were thirty-five delegates from the Zionist Organization of America, B'rith Shalom, the Jewish Progressive Order, and B'rith Abraham. There were twenty-seven delegates from fifteen other organizations including the United Roumanian Jews and the Federation of Hungarian Jews.²⁰ This division has significance when it is considered that the representatives of the dominant organizations were the wealthiest of the Eastern European middle-class and that these organizations themselves represented the best integrated of the Eastern European middle-class. For example, there was delegate Solomon Kraus of B'rith Shalom, born in Philadelphia, vice-president of the Congress and well established in the Building and Loan business. Aaron Levy of B'rith Abraham was a New York born lawyer and judge.

On the other hand, the delegates of the minority organizations in the Senate were less integrated and not as well established in the middle-class. Samuel Buchler, president of the Federation of Hungarian Jews, was a rabbi born in Budapest. Actually, the great majority of all delegates were foreign born, but the wealthier and best integrated seemed to control the Congress.

There was no attempt at a democratic election from 1922 through 1938. By 1928 the leadership group was well consolidated and throughout its whole history the same names are found: Stephen Wise born in Budapest was president and its guiding spirit. He was replaced from 1929 to 1935 by

Bernard Deutsch, Baltimore lawyer. There was no competition in the election. The suggestion of the nominating committee was accepted "unanimously" from the floor.²¹ Vice-president was Gustave Hartman, born in Hungary, a judge. Other vice-presidents were Dr. A. J. Rongy; Mrs. Archibald Silverman; lawyer Max Steuer; journalist and outstanding Zionist, Louis Lipsky; lawyer Carl Sherman; and fur-merchant George Fox was treasurer. Bernard Richards, journalist, was executive secretary.²² This leadership was middle-class, not quite so wealthy as that of the American Jewish Committee. The wealth that lay behind the Congress was being made by merchants and traders in liquor, jewelry, and scrap iron. The important fact is that the money was being made--and the wealthy backers had not accumulated enough to retire and serve on the Congress as had the German background upper-middle-class--witness such retired philanthropists as Julius Rosenwald and Archibald Marx' who served on the American Jewish Committee. And so the paid professionals of the class took over its leadership!

A more detailed comparison of economic roles of the old and new middle-classes will be later presented.²³

Further evidences of the rule by a section of the heterogeneous new middle-class are the complaints of those on the lower levels and the procedures in the election of 1938. Jacob Minkin, a Polish rabbi with a masters degree from Columbia and a spokesman for the New York neo-Orthodox group, stated that the Congress was "conceived as a democratic all-Jewry organization...It was vitiated from its very inception

by the fact that it was primarily the personal movement of one man, who though a leader of great power and ability, has never succeeded in making the voice of the American Jewish Congress the voice of a united Israel."²⁴ The man referred to is Stephen Wise. The Congress in its effort to unite American Jewry had some success with its appeal to labor. The strongly Zionist Jewish National Workers Alliance did join, as did Poale Zion (which overlaps the Workers Alliance). But this participation was with reluctance:

The American Jewish Congress should be reorganized on a broad, democratic basis, so that the Jewish masses in America--labor and folk organizations--may participate in its affairs.²⁵

Protesting that a non-democratic Congress cannot be a spokesman for American Jewry, the Alliance in hopes for eventual democracy did join the Congress.

Further evidence of oligarchy are the charges levelled against the ZOA with its twelve delegates in the Congress' Senate. The ZOA itself is not democratic according to the Vanguard...as stated above.²⁶ If this be true, then the organizational delegates would not represent their organizations! And in the local elections of 1938, there was, if anything, a decrease in the "democratic base" of the Congress; In 1918 with a Jewish population of three and one half million, 335,000 votes were cast in Congress elections. In 1938 with a 20 percent increase in population (four and one half million) there were only 351,000 votes cast in the election--a decrease in the democratic base.²⁷

Despite claims of democratic representation, the facts are that under 8 percent of the American Jewish community par-

participated in the elections of 1938, that the Congress represents the upper eschelon of the rising Eastern European new middle-class, and that the group leadership is composed of the most successful of that class which is striving for leadership in the American Jewish community.

What periodicals represent the views of this group? Obviously the organs of the Congress itself--The American Jewish Congress Index, The American Jewish Congress Courier, and The Congress Bulletin. The officials of the Zionist Organization of America are also officials of the Congress. So, the ZOA's official publication, New Palestine also contains the point-of-view of this group. Stephen Wise--the spirit of the Congress--and his son James Waterman Wise began publishing Opinion in December, 1931. This became a mouthpiece for Wise and intellectuals of his group, such as Ludwig Lewisohn and Maurice Samuel. Mordecai Kaplan--with the close of his SAJ Review--was on the board and wrote regularly expounding his philosophy which found most sympathy (excepting in the class from which it grew) in the Wise camp. Opinion also was an open forum for many divergent viewpoints. The B'nai B'rith Messenger--as has been noted--represented this rising class which had taken over the B'nai B'rith in Los Angeles. Any of the periodicals of the dominant organizations in the "Senate"--such as the B'rith Abraham Beacon--will give the same point of view. An interesting periodical was The Jewish Spectator--published by The School of the Jewish Woman in November, 1936. It would appear that it was directed to young New York Jews who were just becoming accommodated to

this country. Bernard Richards and Ludwig Lewisohn frequently wrote for the magazine and told its readers what a wonderful land was America and how great were the New Deal principles. Perhaps here was a conscious (or not) weaning of young immigrants away from European radicalism and into the respectable American liberal camp.

What was this group's attitude towards Judaism, Zionism, and America of 1929? The rank-and-file of the group was Orthodox: the rabbinic leadership of the Federation of Polish and Hungarian Jews point to this fact. But higher in the scale of leadership, more and more Conservative and even Reform Jews are found. The bulk of the Congress leadership is Conservative, followers of fellow Congress-ite Solomon Goldman and ZOA leader Israel Goldstein. The Reform leadership--Stephen Wise and the Reform Zionists--was not of the Classical Reform variety that represented the old middle-class. These were neo-Reformers who were constantly gaining strength with the rise of the Eastern European middle-class. The only prominent member from the German group was Nathan Straus who for whatever personal reasons at the beginning of the Congress movement lent his name and the dignity of Macy's to the movement, and, as a figure-head, gave more "respectability" to the new Congress. This class, as mentioned, was strong behind the ZOA, the general Zionist organization. However Mizrachi and Labor Zionism are represented--although they have an insignificant share in Congress leadership. Regarding America of 1929, there was a tempered optimism. The group looked forward to a "milestone of Zionist development,"²⁸ but

recent experiences in Eastern Europe and the (resulting) Zionist ideology precluded an extreme optimism that said the messiah was just around the corner--even in the prosperous twenties.

A local but important class in the American Jewish scene is located in New York City: wealthy manufacturers of consumer-goods, financiers, and real estate men--Eastern Europeans of recent immigrant origins. This class is not organized in a "defence" organization as are the old and new middle-class. Its members do belong rather reluctantly to the Congress. But this group--with its professional children and its rabbinic, legal, and medical appendages--does stand behind The Jewish Forum--a monthly magazine with a board of directors and an advisory council and a discussion society. Who are the members of the advisory council of The Forum? In September, 1932 (pp. 276-7) a list of the council was published and various Who's Who's rendered the following information:

Mr. David Podell was born in Russia, a lawyer who was counsel for the National Food Brokers Association, trustee of the Educational Alliance, member of the Bankers Club and the Trade and Commerce Bar Association. Mr. Clarence Y. Palitz was born in Lithuania--he was a financier, was president of the Credit Alliance Corporation and chairman of the American Foreign Corporation. Maurice Davidson was New York born, a lawyer and member of Property Owners Association. H. I. Wachtel, born in Cracow, was a doctor.

In 1936, J. L. Markel, born in Russia, was treasurer of the Forum. He also organized and was president of the Merchants Bank of New York. Louis Gold, with The Forum in 1936, was a real estate man.²⁹ Frequent literary contributions were received from Marcus Schloimovitz--a manufacturer from Manchester, England.

The advertisements of the magazine provide further evidence of class alignment. Shapiro's is the "most exclusive Kosher hotel in Atlantic City." However, The Lorraine Hotel claims to be the newest Kosher hotel in Atlantic City and classes itself as "The Jewish House Beautiful"--"all carpets factory fresh." Congratulations were offered to Mrs. Leah Pearlstein of 645 West End Avenue on the marriage of her daughter, Dorothy.

And so it is evident that here is a group of wealthy Jews who were born in Eastern Europe and who rapidly made money in manufacturing, real estate, and banking. However, these were small banking interests--not associated with the larger houses. This class with its professional appendages are not leaders of the American Jewish Congress or in the General Zionist Organization. They are "neo-Orthodox." Their religious spokesmen are Leopold Jung and Bernard Drachman. While they uphold Orthodox practice they favor absorption of American culture. Their Zionism is of the Mizrachi brand, and they speak fondly of HaPoel HaMizrachi--for reasons that bear investigating. Isaac Rosengarten, editor of the Forum, is an ardent Mizrachi Zionist. While the predominant policy of this group favored Mizrachi, there was an occasional non-

Zionist voice. And Betty F. Goldstein, president of the Woman's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (Jung and Drachman's group), stated in a 1937 Forum: "I do not believe in political Zionism and am therefore opposed to the establishment of a Jewish state."³⁰ There was a fear of smugness as the members were very much worried about the proposed calendar reform that would make Sabbath observance difficult. But decisive views on the prospects for American society at this time were not available.

A periodical that expressed approximately the same views as the Forum was The Jewish Outlook, the official organ of the Mizrachi party. This group is naturally English-speaking and favors some form of integration. In contrast to this group which might be called American-Orthodox there is the European-Orthodox group--Yiddish-speaking and composed of petty-bourgeoisie and laborers. This group had no spokesman in the Anglo-Jewish press, so knowledge about it in this study is derived through inference from The Forum. The European-Orthodox group is opposed to neo-Orthodoxy and is opposed to the Kashrut reforms proposed by the Forum group. It would seem that perhaps the poorer rabbis of the European group need the income that a centralization and non-profit kashrut program would eliminate. Furthermore, any centralization program would rob these rabbis of the control they need to exercise in local areas. However, since first-hand information is lacking this class will not be analyzed in this study.

There is a class that might be called "Jewish professionals." It includes all workers and directors of Jewish social welfare organizations. As in every so-called "class," there are differences in outlook between the leaders of the class and the workers. And in this class it is necessary to distinguish between the more integrated and the immigrant groups. These distinctions are vital to an understanding of the ideologies and attitudes of the "professionals."

There are four categories within this heterogeneous class. There is the worker or director successful in the general American scene---either through social work or through an academic position in a ranking university. Such a man was Harry Lurie who was with the Illinois State Public Welfare Commission and who taught at the universities of Chicago, California, and Michigan. Then there are rank-and-file workers, well-integrated, often of German background. Such a person was Charles Schottland, born in Chicago and a member of Zeta Beta Tau fraternity. These two groups, either not dependent on a strong Jewish community or with a social background of integration, formed the core of what we will call the universalist school among Jewish social workers: there is very little that makes Jewish social work "Jewish." There is no need for an "organic community." These groups would lean towards Reform Judaism (if any) and towards non-Zionism.

The third category of social workers which became more and more influential as the thirties progressed was a group of executive directors and federation heads: men like Samuel C. Kohs, executive director of the Federation of

Jewish Charities; Samuel Dinin, principal of the Bureau of Jewish Education; Israel Solomon Chipkin, educational director of the Jewish Educational Alliance, and on the board of the National Council for Jewish Education; Isaac Rubinow, director of the Conference on Jewish Social Welfare; Abraham Duker, research librarian for the graduate school for Jewish Social Work. To this group of men whose existence was bound up with a strong organic Jewish community, there must be added the fourth category: the nameless numbers of workers who were first generation or immigrant Eastern Europeans...the rank-and-file that are found working in every Jewish social agency. These two formed the core of the Reconstructionist movement in Judaism...the leaders of that movement already have been recognized from the names of many of the directors listed in this paragraph; some of the followers of the movement we can find among the immigrant or first generation Eastern-European to whom the group appeals. The inferences thus far made, of course, will receive more exact treatment.

The magazines that represent the last two categories and that indeed are written largely by the leaders of Jewish social service organizations--these are the SAJ Review--of the Society for the Advancement of Judaism--and the Reconstructionist. Chipkin, Dinin, Duker, and Kohs all served as associate editors on the Reconstructionist. And the SAJ Review was an early venture of the Reconstructionist philosophy in 1928-9.

For the diverse views of all participants in the Jewish

social welfare field there are the accounts of the annual meetings of the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare. This is the big meeting of what in the mid-thirties was Harry Glucksman's Jewish Social Welfare organizations, the National Association of Jewish Center Workers (A. Bloom), and the National Council for Jewish Education (J.S. Golub). These include family service agencies, hospitals, homes for the aged, welfare funds, big brother leagues, and orphan homes. Also representing these heterogeneous views is the Jewish Social Service Quarterly. So when the attitudes with which the Jewish professionals met the problems of the thirties--from depression to anti-Semitism--are discussed, the four categories mentioned above must be kept in mind. And two additional groups might be mentioned: One, those appendages so necessary to the social work fields--the wealthy philanthropists, who are financially behind much of the work and who address the meetings and may color the ideology, and, two, the academic allies like Morris Cohen and Milton Steinberg, university or rabbinic supporters from any one of the intellectual camps. But the workers themselves and their leaders are the prime consideration of this study.

It has been noted that the workers or directors, economically integrated in the non-Jewish social service world, and well-integrated rank-and-file workers of German background would tend towards Reform Judaism and non-Zionism--the universalist school. The directors or federation heads, dependent on a Jewish "civilization" in this country, and immigrant and first-generation Eastern Europeans tend towards

Reconstructionism with its philosophy of Judaism as a civilization that includes a humanistic religion and Zionism--either of the labor or general Zionist brands. No decisive view of America in 1929 was available: The Reconstructionists were busy developing their philosophy and the group as a whole was concerned with personal more than social problems. But this was to change.

The most complex class is Jewish labor in America. The two great "Jewish" unions were Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and David Dubinsky's International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Abundant material has been written on the development of these organizations.³¹ But what groups of Jews did they represent? The answer is--as can be seen from organizational affiliations of the unions' members and from the friendship of the union's publications to diverse and opposed Jewish organizations--that these unions covered in their membership the gamut of the Jewish organized working class; viz., union leadership (Hillman, Dubinsky), union radicals and spokesmen for the "masses" of workers (perhaps Charles Ervin), socialist anti-Zionists (The Workmen's Circle, the Forward Association, the Socialist Verband), socialist Zionists (National Workers Alliance, National Labor Committee for Palestine, Pioneer Women, and League for Labor Palestine), and the eclectic labor "defence" organization, the Jewish Labor Committee. Of course, other unions also ran the gamut of the above groups. The United Hebrew Trades leaned towards the socialist anti-Zionist

ideology. Before analyzing the class composition of these various sub-groups, we had best mention something of the condition the Amalgamated and the ILGWU were in on the eve of the depression.

The Amalgamated was being led by Sidney Hillman, Joseph Schlossberg, and Jacob Potofsky. These men had come up through the ranks of the labor movement. They were now the union leadership. And their union was in relatively sound condition. In December, 1927, Schlossberg and Potofsky's project of the Amalgamated Cooperative Apartments was begun, and in 1929 Hillman began his successful drive to organize the unions in Philadelphia. His success was timely--just achieved as the depression started.

The ILGWU had a new treasurer in 1929--David Dubinsky. At this time President Benjamin Schlesinger was trying to put the pieces back together again--after the union had been split asunder by Communist dual union policies. Just as the economies of Dubinsky were being put into practice, the crash came. Dubinsky, a product of the Bund movement in Russian Poland, served as both treasurer and president in 1932, and he guided the union through the New Deal days.

The organized Jewish workers were mostly immigrants and many of them were working for Jewish manufacturers of the class mentioned above. The union leaders--by virtue of their position--while also immigrants from Eastern Europe may be considered another social group. After all, they were brilliant administrators who were drawing middle-class salaries. Would their attitudes remain proletarian? They

had to receive such salaries--if one can judge by what happened to the German labor movement: the Social Democrats ruled that no leader would be paid more than the highest paid skilled worker; this led to a deterioration in the ranks of the leaders whose abilities could find more compensation elsewhere in the social system. This drift of labor leadership from the working class is perhaps the greatest problem of a successful working class movement. Evidences of the more middle-class attitude of the leadership will be abundant when the depression and New Deal are discussed. Those attitudes can be traced through the editorial pages of the Amalgamated's Advance and the ILGWU's Justice.

The views of the rank-and-file of the workers are not very articulate, since the leadership controls the periodicals. However, there are individual columnists, intellectuals who are making little money and who are not tied with the politics of the New Deal,--these men seem to be slower to change from their proletarian views even when the leadership has made a shift. Such a man it seems, was the brilliant analyst, Charles Ervin...for the Advance.

There were other labor sub-groups formed along strictly Jewish lines: the socialist anti-Zionist group and the socialist Zionist group. The anti-Zionists were centered in the Workmen's Circle. In 1935, this group had 70,000 members, many of whom were also members of the Amalgamated and the ILGWU. The Workmen's Circle was primarily a social service organization for the workers, providing a sanatorium, schools, social agencies, and a cemetery.³³ The core of the

Workmen's Circle were members of the General Union of Jewish Workers in Russia, Poland, and Lithuania--commonly known as the Bund. This was a strictly Socialist anti-nationalist group that carried on revolutionary activities in Russia especially in the 1905 embryonic revolution. The Bund provided the great bulk of immigrants who joined the Circle between 1901 (872 members) and 1912 (over 40,000 members). "The influx of these Bundists not only swelled the ranks of the Workmen's Circle, but profoundly affected its character and policies."³⁴ After some conflict with the cosmopolitan anti-Yiddishists of the 19th century circle, a more culturally-minded group took over the leadership and held it through the thirties. Further evidence is found by noting the individuals who were leaders in the Circle and in other anti-Zionist labor organizations. There was first and foremost the great adversary of Zionism during the thirties, B. Charney Vladeck--manager of the Daily Forward who met fellow-Bundist David Dubinsky in a Russian prison. There was Joseph Baskin, general secretary of the Workmen's Circle and editor of its publication, The Call. Born in Minsk in 1880, he helped organize the Bund in Wilna and came to the United States in 1907.

But what about the class composition of the socialist Zionists? Obviously they were non-Bundists from Eastern Europe, but can any more be stated about their social backgrounds? Some of them were members of Poale Zion--the socialist Zionist organization--in Russia and Poland: there was Louis Segal, secretary of the National Workers Alliance who joined Poale Zion in Poland in 1906. Just why some

Eastern European Jews joined the nationalist group and why others remained with the Bund is an interesting piece of research outside the immediate scope of this thesis. However this problem is examined in Appendix I. The conclusion, after examination of the rise of the labor movement in Russia, is that the Labor Zionist movement was an outgrowth of the pogroms in South Russia in the 1850's and 1890's. From its inception it moved towards conservatism, as its leaders to gain a voice in world Zionism had to cooperate with the Jewish capitalists. The Bundist group, centered in North Russia and Lithuania, did not develop a "Palestinism" as they were not so early subjected to pogroms and as they could more easily migrate to America. Since the Bundists had no organizational need to cooperate with the Jewish middle-class, they remained labor-led and retained a more consistently socialistic ideology.

By the 1930's American Labor Zionism was rapidly losing its socialistic character. Its leadership was middle-class. Jacob Katzman, secretary of the Young Poale Zion Alliance, was a consulting engineer. And other prominent leaders of Poale Zion were not working men at all: David Pinski, who came to America in 1888 with Joseph Schlossberg, was a writer of plays and novels--not an active laborer. And Reform rabbis of wealthy middle-class congregations added a bourgeois touch to the Labor Zionist movement--Jacob Weinstein and Samuel Wohl. In 1934, Rabbi Wohl made a plea for more "influential" leadership in Labor Zionism.³⁵ And he was heeded as the movement became more middle-class. Such leadership from a "higher"

class is a common social phenomenon: members of the higher class, not finding positions enough to go around in that group become spokesmen for the class below it. This phenomenon is evidenced by early Christianity, the Karaitic movement, and the Peasant Revolution. And it is true that an additional factor behind the conservatism of American Labor Zionism is that the American labor movement is distinguished, especially during the twenties, for its drift from "old world" radical ideologies. And so, those who were not committed Bundists would be very likely to accept the nationalist ideology of their culture...just as socialists accepted the respective nationalisms in the world wars.

Mention should also be made of the other Labor Zionist groups. About HaShomer Hatzair and Left Poale Zion: little information is suitable concerning their memberships. They are generally pale reflections of vital political movements in Palestine. Left Poale Zion probably represented the rank-and-file of the Labor Zionist movement. Hapoel Hamizrachi, on the other hand, met the needs of a definite group of American Jews. In Eastern Europe there were thousands of de-classed or classless Jews still loyal to Orthodoxy. Their Zionism would naturally be of the Mizrachi brand. Depending upon where they were in the new scheme of society, they would have sympathies towards labor. This represented a problem to the Orthodox rabbis who were losing many people to the non-religious labor ideology. And so, Hapoel Hamizrachi would meet the needs of the proletarianized Jews who were very much in the Orthodox community. And it would be

advocated by those rabbis who were afraid of losing these Jews. In this country, it would be expected that the children of Orthodox parents not at all sure of their class position would be attracted by this ideology and that young workers would be appealed to by the Orthodox rabbis. Evidence for this expectation is found in Rabbi Manuel Laderman's essay on Hapoel Hamizrachi in the Mizrachi Jubilee Volume of 1936: He praises Hapoel Hamizrachi because it brings youth into Mizrachi...and the movement "ceases being old stuff. It's very new, very exciting stuff. Mizrachi is not just an interest in kosher meat...(it is) interest in hard labor...(Hapoel Hamizrachi) should attract the marginal Jews (because it is) the most universal kind of Zionism... it will be good taste and not loss of caste to be a member." So the appeal is to young Jews--intellectuals and workers--who are rebelling against their parents' world. You won't lose caste! This is modern and exciting and universalistic stuff!

Within the laboring class there were, therefore, several sub-groups with different needs and consequently different ideologies: union leadership, radicals and spokesmen for the labor "masses," socialist anti-Zionists from the Bund, socialist Zionists, and de-classed immigrants loyal to Orthodoxy but drifting to proletarianism (Hapoel Hamizrachi). There was also the Jewish Labor Committee, formed in 1934 under the leadership of B. Charney Vladeck. Its treasurer was David Dubinsky, also a Bundist. But Zionist vice-chairman Max Zaritzky and Joseph Schlossberg gave it a

heterogeneous officialdom. Still in its official pronouncements it stayed away from Zionism. Its member organizations were the Workmen's Circle, ILGWU, ACWA, the Cap and Millinery Workers Union, United Hebrew Trades, Forward Association, and the Jewish Socialist Verband. With this membership it is natural that America would be stressed as a homeland as the Committee attempted "to fight Fascism and Nazism...to represent organized Jewish labor to all Jewish problems."

We have seen how the different labor groups viewed Zionism. The socialist view towards Judaism is either indifference or hostility. Later the Socialist's philosophy of Jewish life will be examined, but religion-wise there is nothing to discuss. Many non-Socialists and the Hapoel Hamizrachi were naturally attached to Orthodoxy. The Reconstructionist Movement had some following among their workers.

The worker's view of America in 1929 hinted of the days to come. Justice--the ILGWU paper--complained that Hoover was doing nothing about the four million unemployed:

Today we have a large army of unemployed even in time of prosperity when all factories are open and running day and night. New inventions and labor-saving devices are constantly throwing large numbers of workers out of work.³⁶

There is the claim that prosperity has been for the \$5,000 and over class, and that the textile workers and miners have been especially hard hit.³⁷ But in July, 1929, a general strike in the clothing industry was called and victory was achieved in two weeks--just in time for the Crash.

What periodicals represent the viewpoints of the layers

within the working class? The editorials of Justice and Advance speak for the leadership of ILGWU and ACWA. A columnist like Charles Ervin in Advance might provide something closer to the rank-and-file opinion. The Call and The Call of Youth are official organs of the Workmen's Circle. The Jewish Frontier and Labor Palestine and The Vanguard represent the Labor Zionist groups. No periodical was found representing the HaPoel HaMizrachi program: the parents of these youth were with the Mizrachi group. The Jewish Labor Committee had no periodical in this period.

A group of Jews very vocal during the thirties was those members of the New York State Buro, Communist Party. Its official publication for Jews was Jewish Life. But was this a class? It seemed to attract dissatisfied members of the laboring and middle classes. The front line of the Stalinist group were the workers who in 1927 plagued the ILGWU with its dual union movement. This revolutionary program was adopted probably to prevent the working class--by now disappointed with the collaborationist policy of the mid-twenties--from deserting the movement. In 1928 the Trade Union Educational League was formed in order to rival the AFL as a federation of dual unions.³⁸ By 1929 the Stalinist National Organization Committee began a dual union movement in the needle trades, including furriers, milliners, and men and women's clothing. The furriers were the strongest led by Ben Gold. These groups formed the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union--its chairman was Louis Hyman.

Meanwhile the Communist Party, needing scapegoats because of its quick reversal of policy, chose Jay Lovestone, secretary of the party, and his aide, Ben Gitlow. These unionists, now in disgrace, were called right-wingers and soon gathered around them a group known as the Lovestonites. One of these was Charles Zimmerman, who later became a vice-president of ILGWU. He disagreed with the change in line and dropped finally from the Lovestonite rightists out of the party altogether. He led part of the dissident Communist group back into the ILGWU in May, 1931.

But who were these people who were attracted to the Communist Party? Information is very scarce, and even the Who's Who seems to have been censored so that useful facts concerning the backgrounds of Party members may be forever obscured. We do know of Charles Zimmerman that he was born in Russia in 1897 and in 1913 came to New York and began work as a knee-pants worker. He joined ILGWU and from 1916 on drifted towards the Communist Party. After all, this was a period when few could actually judge the happenings in Moscow. He bit the bait and was caught on the hook for fifteen years. So groping workers, looking for a solution to their problems that the mild American labor movement was not answering,--yes, men like Zimmerman may have become Communists. And these Jewish workers--mostly Yiddish speaking--were constantly appealed to by the Communist press, especially after 1934, by playing on concern with anti-Semitism and the survival of the Yiddish language.

But the "cream" of the Communist crop was its intellectual

bourgeois writers. The New Masses could boast among their writers Upton Sinclair, Theodore Dreiser, Malcolm Cowley, Sherwood Anderson, Clifton Fadiman, John Dos Passos, Louis Adamic, and Whittaker Chambers. These were literary men with sensitive souls and keen imaginations. They perhaps sensed the rumblings in our society, but they were accustomed to dealing in metaphors and not economic science. Certainly a dramatic solution was the Communist party line.

The Jewish intellectuals of a middle-class variety also joined the stream. Waldo Frank was the most prominent. Joseph Freeman--editor of the New Masses--told in his autobiographical An American Test how he, as an artist, found Communism. Robert Gessner in Some of My Best Friends are Jews (1937) came to Communism because he found it to be the answer to anti-Semitism.³⁹ The Call of Youth wrote satirically of these Communist intellectuals, many of whom did leave the party after a riotous February, 1934 Madison Square Garden meeting at which blows were struck.⁴⁰ The Call in 1939 characterizes the fringe-Communists as unemployed middle-class: "Lumpen bourgeoisie, the jobless spawn of steam-heated, electrically refrigerated and radio equipped apartments."⁴¹

So it seems as though there were several types attracted to the Communist movement: workers groping for a solution that the American labor movement did not seem to offer: litterateurs and artists sensing the illness of society more than their fellow-middle-class members but going to a quack doctor; de-classed bourgeoisie accustomed to middle-class

existence now able to be leaders in an outcast party. Perhaps underlying all the personalities from whatever class who were drawn to Communism was a frantic search for an absolute in a world of infinite uncertainty. And the dogma of Communism furnished this absolute.

In addition to Jewish Life, the Jewish People's Voice expressed the view of the United Front's League against Fascism and anti-Semitism...in the late thirties. The Communist solution during the thirties will be dealt with in a separate chapter. Suffice it to say for now that the policy of the party as dictated from Moscow was always to defeat a successful working class movement in the capitalistic world. Only in this way could the Russian hierarchy keep control of its own people. A successful revolution outside Russia would give the lie to the Bolshevik regime. This policy meant different tactics in different countries. In America before the depression it meant dual unionism and an offensive against American labor.

Regarding Judaism, the Jewish Communists, of course, were anti-religious. Being strictly revolutionary in this period, they were anti-Zionist although it will be seen that this anti-Zionism was tempered in the late thirties. In America the Communists hoped that the bomb of prosperity would not set off too big a blast as would destroy the capitalist system. But they preached revolution to dissident workers and mocked the gay twenties in a hymn to prosperity:

Speed, speed, speed
 Racket and rush and strife
 Faster for profiteering greed,
 Louder above the workers' need,
 Clangs the mill of life.⁴²

This dissonant note concludes the class analysis of the American Jewish community that was confronted by the depression.

It has been shown that the American Jewish community emerged out of the social pattern of the twenties. Its six major characteristics--as has been demonstrated--flowed from a boom period in a matured capitalism that had seen the last days of its steady expansion: the prosperity of the community; the latent anti-Semitism not dangerous or threatening but very much under the surface of all the good will meetings; the relatively slight concern with anti-Semitism abroad; the decentralized Jewish community; the lack of tension among Jews; and the rise of Eastern European Jewry to wealth and power. All of these trends were grounded in the conditions of America's roaring twenties. It will be shown that under the different conditions of the thirties, most of these trends will fade away...and the Jewish community will take on different characteristics.

A class analysis of the American Jewish community has been attempted. Distinctions of economic status and length of residence in America separate the Jews into different groups represented by certain organizations and periodicals. The attitudes these social groups held towards Judaism, Zionism, and society in general have been noted. That the

various groups tend to express themselves along particular ideological patterns shall be demonstrated throughout the remainder of this study. But the importance of this analysis thus far has been to show that there are definite class divisions within the American Jewish community and that those divisions find outlets in different organizations and, further, that those divisions express their views officially or unofficially in one or more periodicals. That these views become the centers of controversy in the thirties will later be seen. How these views often spring from the needs of the different classes will also be seen. But that there are such classes that do speak out in the Anglo-Jewish press and that do represent not isolated individuals thinking but groups bound socially and economically--this much has been demonstrated in this chapter. The following chart more clearly indicates the class lines, organizations, and periodicals.

background middle-class	American Jewish Committee B'nai B'rith Leadership	ATC Year Book 56 American Hebrew B'nai B'rith Magazine Jewish Woman
Middle-Class Eur. background	American Jewish Congress Zionist Org. of America — many B'nai B'rith members	Congress Bulletin Index - Courier New Palestine Opinion B'nai B'rith Messenger Jewish Spectator
Manufacturers Creditors	Mizrachi Neo-Orthodoxy	Jewish Forum Jewish Outlook
Professionals " Universalists " Reconstructionists "	Nat. Conf. of Jewish Social Service	Jewish Social Service Quarterly SAT Review Reconstructionist
General labor Middle-class led, from South Russia Classed youth, Actuals, — Orthodox ties Socialists	AGWA — ILGWU National Workers Alliance Poale Zion Hapoel Hamizrachi Workmen's Circle Jewish Labor Committee	Advance — Justice Vanguard Labor Palestine Jewish Frontier Mizrachi Tuhike Volume Call — Call of Youth
Communist Organizing workers, Peasants, de- pressed bourgeoisie	Jewish Boro of New York State Communist Party League Against War and Fascism	Jewish Life Jewish People's Voice

American Jewish Social Pattern
— secular organizations and
their periodicals

III. THE THIRTIES--AGE OF GROPING

The crash and "recoveries" brought a series of new problems to the world in general and to the Jewish community in particular. But in order to understand these problems, it is necessary to examine the crash and its reverberations throughout the thirties.

It was a world-wide depression that shook the American Jewish community in the thirties. It was a world-wide depression that produced a Hitler who was to obliterate German Jewry and stir anxiety and internal dissension among American Jews. So first it is necessary to examine the depression in Europe. Fritz Sternberg notes several distinguishing characteristics of the great depression: there were crises simultaneously in industry and agriculture for the first time--except in France--(hence there was more overproduction and a larger sector of the economy was hit); the depression hit the whole capitalistic world for the first time; fixed income groups, previous aids to recovery, suffered; capitalism throughout the world was the dominant form of production wherever there was production (except in the Soviet Union).¹ The factors that led to this situation have been discussed: operators of heavy industry throughout the world--and this industry is the basis of capitalistic production--must find markets if they are to produce according to the profit motive; when they cannot find new markets, they stop producing; at this juncture in history no nation could find enough new markets; and when world-wide production was so

stymied, there was world-wide unemployment. Some economists state that a capitalistic nation can find an equilibrium within itself based on the consumer-goods market. However, this market is relatively small compared with the producer-goods market and compared with the means of production in developed capitalism. For whatever reason, no capitalistic nation has yet succeeded in finding this equilibrium once the expansion period has ended. And the world-wide depression was caused by the failure of world capitalism to find such equilibrium.

The various factors that made Germany the most desperate of the capitalisms after world war one have been discussed. Its markets at home and abroad, were gone and it had the largest industrial apparatus in Europe. So impoverished were the masses and so in debt was the nation that inflationary measures could not stop the depression. The only way remaining ^{to} restore the profit motive, so necessary to recovery was through wage cuts. But when wages are already low, only in a totalitarian regime can there be additional slashes (and then not indefinitely); and that is what happened in Germany. The German middle-class (50 percent of the population) feared a workers' revolution more than a state capitalism and so threw in their lot with Hitler and the big industrialists in 1933. A militant workers movement that may have been successful was weakened by Stalinist conspiracy, for Stalin did not want a successful working class movement in Germany that would show the Russian people what a real class movement was like and that would threaten

his regime.²

What was the Hitler "recovery" program? He crushed labor organization and despite the German war boom, there was a 7 percent fall in real wages of an already poverty-stricken working class. He "solved" the crisis by a peacetime war economy stimulated by the wage slashes. This enabled him to aid the farmers through state control of agricultural imports. Independent existences in the middle-class lost out through the rapid centralization process, but a dependent middle-class based on trade and white collar work actually prospered during this period. Even some workers, now employed, gathered around the Nazi banner. But the wage slashing did alienate most of the labor movement. There were purges that eliminated industrialists who had thought in a controlled capitalism they could control Hitler. Also purged were those under the illusion that this government was for the benefit of the petty bourgeoisie. But the important factor is that even with the Nazi state there must be minimum wage standards and new markets and, therefore, war. To gain power and to divert the frustrations of the German people during "recovery" and to blame somebody for the trials of the coming war--Hitler used the Jew.

Britain was less severely hit by the depression because of a fall in the price level of the world market for agricultural products. She bought her life's blood through these imports, and the fall in their prices was greater than the fall in the prices received for Britain's monopolized export industries. Furthermore, there were new industries being

developed: chemicals, electricity, and cars. Still the outdated coal industries were in chronic depression, unemployment was at the million mark throughout the thirties, and the crisis was not resolved. The Labor Party grew stronger, but not strong enough to threaten Tory rule after the crest of the crisis. And it was the Tories who feared social revolution in Europe and who, therefore, appeased Germany through Munich.

France was given some stability by a large agricultural sector which was not tied up with the new capitalistic apparatus. However, France had more constant capital than did England and could find no new markets. So also in France there was no way found to resolve the crisis. Leon Blum's Popular Front government did not change the essential structure of the society and soon gave way to a frightened rightist clique. And these parties of the right...(according to a theorist of the French monarchist movement):

These parties (of the Right) felt that in the event of war not only would the disaster be immense, involving perhaps the defeat and devastation of France, but that a German defeat would mean the crumbling of the authoritarian systems which constitute the main obstacle to the communist revolution, and perhaps the immediate bolshevization of Europe.²

And then there was Munich.

And after Munich, events marched quickly. The failure of the Anglo-French talks in Moscow, the resulting Stalin-Hitler pact--as Stalin was rightly fearful of a one-front war against him--and the invasion of Poland.

And there was depression and "recovery" in America.

American capitalism it will be recalled, was spinning faster and faster like a top that sooner or later had to slow down and collapse.³ It has been noted why the crash had to come: There was an end to America's inner expansion, and she could not expand outwardly as the day of imperialism was over; there was an overproduction of consumer goods (eg, shoes and foodstuffs, and textiles) and especially of producer goods for which no foreign markets could now be found; there were no places for profitable re-investments. So the wheels stopped turning and there were millions unemployed. What could be done?

President Hoover at first thought that nothing need be done, as the crisis was temporary and the result of a few speculators. When he recognized that it was a real depression, he invoked the only formula America had known:

We have passed through no less than fifteen major depressions in the last century. We have learned something as the result of each of these experiences. From this one we shall gain stiffening and economic discipline, a greater knowledge upon which we must build a better safe-guarded system. We have come out of each previous depression into a period of prosperity greater than ever before. We shall do so this time... Surplus money does not remain idle for long... We should have full faith and confidence in those mighty resources, those intellectual and spiritual forces which have impelled this nation to a success never before known in the history of the world. Far from being impaired, these forces were never stronger than at this moment. Under the guidance of Divine Providence...⁴

This was in 1931. Surely Hoover was counting on more than intellectual forces and Providence. He was counting on the classic answer to depressions as stated by Dr. Hayek and his school of economists.⁵ The profit rate had to be restored,

and this could best be done by cutting wages. The most efficient industries when they cut wages would force out of business less efficient industries; the most rugged individualists would start producing for profit again; there would be new markets; the less rugged individualists would get back in the running; and there would be prosperity.

This theory could scarcely be applied in the face of the realities of the depression. Industrial capitalism was at this time so monopolized that the greater proportion of productive potential was tied up in a few hands. Therefore, the oligopoly in a given industry restricted competition by maintaining an artificially high price structure. This assured the producers that no one would be forced out. Furthermore, severe wage cutting with ten million already unemployed is politically inexpedient and impossible in a democratic society. Such cuts may restore their profit rate, but they may also cause revolution unless a totalitarian state is established. And finally, once industry would be revived, where would be the new markets for the greater-than-ever prosperity? In the world of the thirties those markets would be all too few for the great industrial apparatus. So the deflationist solution of Hayek and Hoover--while never seriously attempted--had these inherent weaknesses which have been pointed out by various economists?

Hoover did try in 1932 mild inflationary government intervention. Through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation he lent money to banks, farmers, and railroads...but not enough to stimulate industrial activity. In July,

1932, discontent reached a peak as the "bonus army" was dispersed on the fields of Washington by General Douglas MacArthur. Between June, 1931 and June 1932--so great was the run on the banks by people who had lost confidence or who needed money for the rainy days that--bank resources dropped from seventy to fifty-seven billion dollars. But this was not known to the people as they voted for Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his mild program of social reform.

When Roosevelt came in, he found the situation more serious than had been anticipated so the New Deal--more radical than the Democratic platform--was begun. The banks were closed and the moneychangers were investigated. J. P. Morgan was held out as a scapegoat to the people to assuage their frustrations and to give time for the New Deal program to get underway.

The New Deal can best be understood in the light of the economic theory on which it was based. The advocates of New Deal economics were known as "under-consumptionists." Since there is not sufficient purchasing power (in view of unemployment), more money is needed in society. More money can be injected in various ways, but the underconsumptionists differed as to how: government loans and contracts to industry, wage hikes, new money minted. Once there is more money in society, producers can raise their prices and the profit rate will be restored. This is based on Irving Fischer's Quantity Theory of Money: if a society produced more commodities, there must be more money in that society to buy them; since workers are not paid in keeping with their

productivity, more money should be created.⁶ In this way the price level and profit rate are maintained. The depression-cure: restore the price level and profit rate through more money.

The inherent weakness in this economic theory underlying the New Deal has been pointed out by critical economists.⁷ It is true that production will be stimulated by new money and higher prices. But as soon as the wheels of industry begin turning again, the economy will again be faced with the problem of overproduction. For the producers in giant industries will have found no new markets for their goods. Issuing more money cannot solve the problem of a saturation of markets. This theoretical critique was supported by subsequent developments; Even though production never reached the 1929 level (in fact, it remained 17 percent below throughout the thirties), there was still in 1937 a lack of markets and, therefore, a recession...despite the renewed efforts of the New Deal.

This discussion of the theory behind the New Deal provides ample background for an examination of the events themselves. These are divided into three phases: early policies of inflation and of restriction of production; the resistance of some segments of the economy from 1935-6; the recession and preparedness program.

America was gradually taken off the gold standard. This meant cheaper money; farmers could pay off their mortgages, and prices could rise. More money was brought into society by the Citizens Civilian Conservation Corps: 300,000 fought

fires and erosions and helped stave off economic disaster. The Civil Works Administration employed four million, and big business feared competition. But more money meant higher prices and more profits. The Chamber of Commerce sponsored the National Industrial Relations Act which saw labor and management swear that their interests were one. Hillman and Dubinsky joined in forming a Code of Fair Practices and secured a thirty-hour week and rights to collective bargaining...and told their unions that the New Deal was salvation. The Code controlled prices and wages. It permitted higher prices with strategic wage hikes that would in turn put more money in society and allow even higher prices. These policies pump-primed the economy and stimulated profits. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration fostered higher prices through government subsidies to farmers who would curtail production. The Public Works Administration, suggested by Hearst and heavy industry, allowed the government to give money directly to industry, primarily to the low-cost housing industry. More money was pumped in through the Tennessee Valley Authority. All this, in 1933. In 1935 there were the Social Security Act, the Wagner-Connery Labor Relations Act, and Harry Hopkins' Works Progress Administration...all with the same purposes as the rest of the New Deal: to add more money to the society so that prices might be raised and the profit rate restored. Through such inflation and restriction of production was business stimulated.

There was also the pseudo-economics of Father Coughlin who first supported Roosevelt and advocated giving credit to

the petty bourgeoisie through an even more inflationary policy. Also there was the Townsend Plan which said a \$200 per month old age pension should be spent within a month. (The drawback: revenue for the pension would be gathered through a sales tax). And, finally, the technocrats: The machine cannot re-absorb the workers it disemploys. The only answer is for the engineers and scientists (hence, technocracy) to set up a standard of measurement that would give the relative value of all commodities (relative to what, is not made clear). This would eliminate the present price system and raise the standard of living.⁸ Obviously this messianic vision had no real economic program, but it did attract visionaries in the middle-class--including, of course, some engineers.

By 1935 there was rising dissatisfaction with the progress of the New Deal. Radical workers were complaining that price rises and continued unemployment have given the lie to the Roosevelt policies. William Saroyan wrote a story called, "Aspirin is a Member of the NRA." But these segments of society had no big voices. Who was making all the noise? In May, the Supreme Court declared the NIRA unconstitutional. In 1936, the Court nullified the AAA and the Guffey-Snyder coal bill--the latter action throwing John L. Lewis on the side of the President. But where was this opposition coming from?

Some segments of industry had been stimulated enough. They were back in the saddle again, and they wanted Washington to stop this "socialistic" pump-priming that they themselves had originally advocated. Which were the segments that would

first no longer feel the need of Washington? Statistics reveal that the 200 largest corporations gained--during the depression--more control over the economy. In 1929, they controlled 49.4 percent and in 1933, 57 percent.⁹ The middle-men suffered. It would be expected that these powerful combinations that actually profited from the depression would be the first to rebel against the New Deal. They were sound once again: there was money in America; larger profits could be made by eliminating wage hikes and government competition; the NRA which fixed prices and restricted competition limited "free" capitalism. And who were these people? Primarily the big producer-goods industries...like steel and chemicals. Also the chain stores opposed Roosevelt, as they had been part of this group which gained through centralization. And the firms of Morgan, Kuhn-Loeb, and Chase--smarting from their persecution--were ready to branch out again.¹⁰ Among the producer-goods industries, Little Steel was particularly rabid in its opposition to any aid to unions. While Big Steel had investments abroad and more reserves in general, Little Steel was fighting all the way against labor. In 1937, at Tom Girdler's Republic Steel plant outside of Chicago, armed police killed seven workers and injured over a hundred others in the worst labor riot since the Haymarket. But the opposition to the New Deal went beyond these large producers. For many Americans had interests connected with the big industries; for example, the middle-class owned much stock in producer-goods industries. Those people living off a fixed income were being hard hit by the inflation and price

rise. And, above all, the American petty bourgeoisie--hardest hit by the depression--was perhaps the most frustrated class. They now found themselves dispossessed by the trend of centralization. So the chain stores and their victims looked askance at the New Deal. And there were still a few socialists, but the radicalism of the early depression years had given away to well-respected union leaders urging the workers to support their only practical hope, the New Deal.

Especially when the New Deal was challenged in 1936 did labor rally round. The farmer, angry at the recent Supreme Court action, supported Roosevelt. Also the consumer-goods industries such as motion pictures and liquor and tobacco: for the Roosevelt regime had pumped more money for consumption in the hands of the masses. And also behind FDR was a solid South.

Despite the appeals of Landon and the demagoguery of the Lemke-Coughlin party with its appeal to the frustrated lower middle-class--Roosevelt won a handy victory and proceeded in 1937 with more New Deal measures. He appointed to the Supreme Court men sympathetic to his program, and his methods brought violent criticisms from all his enemies. But the Wagner Labor Relations Act was upheld.

However, with all the New Deal policies, the spring of 1937 saw what is politely called a "recession" in business activity. Ten million men were unemployed. Between 1933 and 1938 production averaged 17 percent below the 1929 level. In 1937 it was 20 percent below. So even though production had not reached the 1929 peak (for the economy did not come

out of the depression into an age of more prosperity and greater production), by 1937 markets were still lacking and profitable places for re-investment were few. And how did FDR meet the recession?

There was a renewal of more New Deal policies: to put more money in the economy and to restrict production. A new AAA and a Fair Labor Standards Act were enacted. But this pump-priming could produce no new markets. The New Deal had taught that lesson. There then followed a more-than-coincidental change in foreign policy. The nation had been maintaining strict neutrality. In 1936 the Neutrality Act that prohibited the export of munitions to belligerents was amended to read that not even loans could be floated to belligerents. But just as the economy faced the paradox of the 1937 recession, a new "neutrality" act was pushed through Congress. There would be embargoes on foreign belligerents at the President's discretion; and the cash-and-carry provision allowed foreign nations to be helped---with corresponding benefits to our big industries. Japan and China were not listed as belligerents. On October 5, 1937, Roosevelt made a dramatic anti-fascist speech in Chicago. This aroused the nation and set the tone for other speeches and the super-navy bill that was passed in 1938. The preparedness program was underway, and America had prosperity again.

(That America would have entered the World War II to save itself is undoubtedly true. Therefore, the preparedness program was in the national interest and opposed to Hitler.)

The historical forces just described had tremendous impact on every strata of society. Of primary interest in this study is the effect of these forces on the Jewish community. For the world-wide depression changed the face of the American Jewish community and confronted its members with pressing problems.

IV. CHANGES IN THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY: 1929-1939

What were the changes wrought in the American Jewish community by the world-wide depression? The nature of the Jewish community is molded by the conditions in the general society. So naturally, when the prosperity of the twenties was no more and a world-wide depression was raging, there were marked changes within and many problems for the Jewish society. What were those changes and problems?

It has been observed that Prosperity was a mark of the Jewish community. With the depression came poverty for many Jews--naturally, for this was the way of all flesh at the time. Since all segments of society were hit by the depression, except the giant producer-goods industries and chain stores,--the Jews, being by and large¹ in all strata except that one which was not hurt, suffered along with the rest. How did the financial reaction in the Jewish world parallel the reaction in America generally?

As in the larger society, the wealthier Jewish organizations were not seriously weakened (and some even expanded) while the poorer groups were going bankrupt! In 1930, the American Hebrew hails the growth in Reform Synagogue building.² In the midst of the depression a Houston philanthropist endowed the Wolff Home for homeless children. The Jewish Forum bemoans the "rather strained economic conditions which brought disastrous results to the less organized charitable and educational institutions." And after listing enviously the big philanthropic groups, the Forum states: "The

situation was entirely different with the Orthodox institutions of learning and Hebrew schools which have no endowment fund." There then follows a list of yeshivas in financial distress. All this difficulty while the Jewish Theological Seminary is building a library, a teachers' institute, and a dormitory!³ The Forum constantly makes pleas for the aid of Yeshiva College and praises Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver for his agreement to stop a building project while others do not have the funds.

With the New Deal the Jewish laborer seemed to prosper with the Gentile. The Hillman and Dubinsky movements grew with labor in general and both hailed the revolt of the CIO. There was even a labor movement among the social workers: The curtailment of funds meant not only less activity when there was greatest demand; it also meant lower salaries for many workers. So the poorer Jewish social workers between 1932 and 1938 formed industrial unions which were known as the Rank-and-File movement.⁴ It is interesting to note that the same rank-and-file movement existed simultaneously in the non-Jewish social worker-world. Their meeting was described as under-thirtyish and composed also of some clerical workers--all demanding higher standards and the right to collective bargaining under the NIRA.⁵ Industry was given smelling salts. And much of America Jewry was on its feet again.

So the bright prosperity of the twenties--takes on the dull tone of hardship followed by increased labor organizations and partial recovery. And the pattern of the picture--marginal groups being pushed out while wealthier

prosperity-rank-and-file movements--the pattern is the same for Jew and Gentile.

In the next chapter the reactions of the different classes of Jews to the financial distress that was hitting them shall be examined. More precisely, this analysis will consider what each group thought of the cause of the depression and how each group felt about the Roosevelt remedy--the New Deal and the preparedness program. The Jewish class reactions shall be compared to the corresponding non-Jewish class reactions.

But returning to the changed characteristics of the Jewish community of the thirties: It will be recalled that the twenties was a period of a de-centralized social structure: Social factors behind de-centralization have been mentioned: The centralization in the economic sphere had not crossed over into social organizations; there was prosperity for all organizations, so no need for curtailment of expenditures through centralizing-efficiency measures--hence, there was only limited centralizing within already existing organizations. Furthermore, there was not sufficient anti-Semitism to bring the Jews together with a community feeling, sufficient for the kehilla-type of centralization. However, with the depression, the centralization in the economic sphere had permeated all American society. There was dire need for efficiency, for curtailment of expenditures that is always achieved by centralization and consequent elimination of duplication. Furthermore--with Hitler and Coughlin--there

was sufficient outside pressure to bring the Jews together and to stimulate the kehilla idea. Furthermore, the continued rise of the Eastern European Jewish community in the U. S. meant a rise in their idea of tight Jewish community life and culture as did exist in Eastern Europe. So the thirties naturally saw a great increase in the class-centralization and in the organic centralization of the Jewish community. In the next chapter the reactions of the different classes of Jews to the trend of centralization will be discussed.

It will be recalled that the twenties was a period remarkably distinguished for lack of serious tensions within the Jewish community. It was concluded that this was to be expected since for all Jews, excepting a few socialists, there was plenty of positions and prestige and wealth to go around. But, after a depression that worked hardship on the whole Jewish community, that robbed many leaders of their jobs in organizations, that curtailed the salaries of others, that placed the issue of survival before many in the organized Jewish structure, that set organization against organization to see which could get the funds necessary to live and maybe prosper--in such a world and after such a depression, there would naturally be many and bitter tensions among the Jews. And Chapter VI will be devoted to the analysis of these tensions.

It was also noted that American Jewry in the twenties was primarily concerned with anti-Semitism and public relations in this country--if at all. There was little concern with Jewry abroad. The world-wide depression, of course,

changed this outlook, and American Jewry was shocked and shaken by the brutality of Hitler. In Chapter VII is an analysis of what the different classes of Jews thought to be the cause of Nazism and the proper remedy for the German Jewish tragedy. To what degree, it will be asked did their "understanding" of Hitler show limitations springing from their respective positions in society?

Finally it was noted that the twenties was free from really effective anti-Semitism in America. However, in the thirties there was great frustration due to the depression. And bigotry feeds on frustration. Who were the most frustrated Americans? The petty bourgeoisie--as was noted above. William Dudley Pelley and his Silver Shirts were the first to gain considerable success in holding the Jew out as a scapegoat for this dissatisfied lower middle-class. While probably subsidized by the Nazis, Pelley's audience were Americans. In 1934, he wrote that the NRA was a "smooth Jewish scheme for the setting up of a vast bureaucracy that would approximate in its final features the Politbureau of Moscow."⁶ And it was the communist devil of which the lower middle-class was most afraid. But anti-Semitism in America really took on serious proportions when the halo over Roosevelt was pulled down around his neck by important segments of the population. By 1936 the great experiment was not working too well. There was even more dissatisfaction among the lower middle class; also in the ranks of labor. And this dissatisfaction was the delight of some producer-goods industrialists who were behind--it can be shown--much

of the anti-Semitism. For by 1936, the anti-Semitism had a dual purpose: It could take the minds of the people off the real causes of their unhappiness and it could be used as an attack against the Roosevelt administration by the interests opposed to it. Parenthetically, it could also enrich men like Smith and Coughlin...for the market furnished a great demand.

So in February of 1936, a magazine called Social Justice appeared. It began by attacking DuPont and Swift, and General Motors and the bankers--this naturally pleased the lower middle-class. Gradually it shifted its attack to the New Deal. Cleverly, Bernard Baruch's name was linked with the House of Morgan. Then Felix Frankfurter was called a Communist. By August, 1936, Father Coughlin had built up the myth of a banker-Communist-Jewish conspiracy behind the government in Washington. Montague, Morgenthau, and Blum were called those "international bankers" who "are again in the saddle riding the red horses of communism to destruction."⁷ Here again Coughlin appealed to those groups of whom the lower middle-class was very much afraid. They were also afraid of their proletarian competitors, the CIO. So, Coughlin claimed that it was controlled by Hillman and a "comrade by the name of Dubinsky."⁸ Of course, there were others: In 1936, Rev. Gerald Winrod's The Defenders reached 100,000 people and combined Protestant fundamentalism with the Bolshevik charge.⁹ And Col. E. N. Sanctuary claimed that "Karl Mordechai, alias Karl Marx" was behind the New Deal actions.

Coughlin claimed that if the Lemke ticket did not get three million votes he would leave the air. The ticket gained one million votes, so Coughlin left the air only to come back by "popular request." His tirades continued through 1937-8, but with the rising tide of prosperity due to the preparedness program, his market dwindled and he gradually faded away.

To this overt anti-Semitism was added the continued discrimination in the middle-class professions which were hit very hard during the depression.¹⁰ The importance of this phenomenon is that here was native American anti-Semitism...overtly expressed in great quantity for the first time in American history. It was native, because it was made in America, by Americans, for American consumption. And as has been seen from the million votes and the magazine subscriptions, it was consumed. This phenomenon should not be surprising in view of the changed conditions in society--the great frustrations unleashed by the depression, the great market for bigotry. What were the Jewish reactions to this anti-Semitism as the Jewish community was jolted from its security--not only by the depression itself or by the spectacle of Hitler, but by bigotry in its own red, white, and blue backyard? This problem will be examined in Chapter VIII.

It has been observed that different social conditions create different characteristics and problems within the Jewish community. This basic axiom of historiography explains the great change in the nature of American Jewish com-

munity of the thirties. From the social soil of the twenties grew a Jewish community of prosperity, of decentralization, of harmony, of little concern with native or distant anti-Semitism. But the social soil of the thirties was very different. So there were vast changes within the Jewish community: from prosperity to poverty and partial recovery, from de-centralization to centralization, from harmony among Jews to bitter tensions, from little concern with anti-Semitism abroad to Adolf Hitler, from no avert and serious American anti-Semitism to Pelley and Coughlin!

The remainder of this study will deal with the question: How did the different classes of Jews react to these problems that suddenly confronted them?...to the centralization, the Depression, the New Deal, the preparedness program, the intra-Jewish tensions Hitler, native anti-Semitism. This study will conclude with an examination of three ideologies that tried to meet the needs of the Jews during this period: Communism, Zionism, and Judaism.

V. JEWISH REACTIONS TO THE AMERICAN ECONOMY: 1929-1939.

The ideological reactions of the various Jewish groups to the depression itself (1929-1932), to the New Deal (1933-1937), and to the Recession and Preparedness program (1937-1939) shall first be examined. This will be followed by an analysis of the attitudes regarding centralization of the Jewish community.

Questions that would occur when dealing with the reactions of the Jews to the changing American economy are: Is there any peculiarly Jewish reaction? Do the Jews, because of their being in the minority and therefore being more susceptible to the travails of the crisis, do they have a keener perception of the economy than do their non-Jewish class counterparts? A religionist may be concerned with the theory that Judaism has given the Jews a keener view towards social justice. A culturist may say that this perception lies in the spirit of democracy that pervades Jewish customs and mores.

When one examines the Jewish reactions to the economy in the thirties, he sees that with very slight deviation the Jews follow the American economic class line. That very slight deviation seems to be due to the large proportion of immigrants with proletarian ideologies that compose Jewish labor and social welfare groups. But let the evidence speak for itself. During the Depression period (1929-1932), what did each group think to be the cause of the depression, what was the general tone of its comment and what immediate reme-

dies did the group advocate before the New Deal had begun?

The German-background businessmen (American Hebrew) maintained for the public at any rate the front of optimism through 1930 and 1931:

We believe that the so-called depression will be short-lived and that the country with its excellent recuperative powers will be in excellent shape within a few months.¹

Present problems (are) not from weakness, but from the profound strength of our country. Time has always been a great healer, and it is no different in the stock market.²

By the Summer the crash of last October and its effects will be pretty much out of the picture.³

And in 1931:

We face 1931 with a spirit of optimism grounded in our past and in the faith we have in the economic and cultural soundness of our country.⁴

In November:

Whatever the cause of the setback that has hit so many so hard, virile America will not long indulge in lamentation. Though, alas, too many are jobless, the world is still on the job and the universe spinning in its groove.⁵

And even in March, 1933:, publisher David Brown admits that he is optimistic and that America will come out of this depression, because it came out of the others.⁶

From these examples we see not only optimism but also the belief that the cure is in the very virility of America, in the past, and in a universe which will continue spinning in its groove. The charge that America is indulging in lamentation indicates that the cause is emotional, is one of undue fear. And in 1932, Brown believed that the cause lay to a great extent in the fear of the consumer (especially the worker) of buying! The length of the depression has a

"close relationship to the psychology of the worker." It seems that there is some unemployment and this instills fear in the worker. He is so afraid that he cuts down his living expenses and buys less. This only makes further unemployment.⁷ And this is unfortunate because capital--and this means, the people--suffer. For "Industry today, great public utilities, railroads, are all being financed by the people of modest means."⁷

But what should be done for the depression? Industries should expand.⁸ The government should not interfere with business; in fact, the decline in grain and cotton in 1930 was due to the interference of the Farm Labor Board which refused to let the law of supply and demand operate.⁹ In 1931 with more unemployment, 200 million for relief purposes was favored. This might even start the wheels of business turning.

It is very clear that here is the upper middle-class point-of-view. The view of investors...big investors. And the German-background Jews who had accumulated money for two generations or more would naturally have this view of the depression. It flows quite logically from their position in society. Neither the spirit of the prophets nor their minority status increased their understanding of the plight of society. Naturally they espoused the theory of fear, the brave public optimism, the faith in the nature of America and in the past repeating itself, and the remedy of renewed confidence of investor and worker. All of these attitudes we can find in the non-Jewish counterpart of this

class position. The members of the Chamber of Commerce were the most successful businessmen in America with accumulations sufficient for considerable investments. Their president, Silas H. Strawn, in one statement capsulizes all of the views just given in the American Hebrew:

Nations and individuals all over the world are in a state of nervous hysteria...What is needed most is the restoration of confidence. Why should we not have this confidence? We have had at least seventeen of these cycles of depressions in the last 120 years. The depression of 1837 was, in many respects, much worse than this and lasted five years...While I would not minimize present conditions, I feel very strongly that we are emphasizing too much the evil factors and that we are overlooking the great natural resources of our country and the splendid courage and enterprise of our people...let us awaken in ourselves the latent spirit of our forefathers...let those who are complaining of their lot here go to some other country and see how much better off we are than the people of any other nation on earth.

Let us cease to whine about depression and devote ourselves to the diligent performance of our daily duties, confident that the day is not far off when the sun will again begin to cast its warm rays upon a happy and prosperous people.¹⁰
(Italics Mine)

The Eastern European middle-class had not been in America long enough to accumulate large sums for that investment in the large industries...which would virtually give them the view-point of those large industries. However, many did lose their new-found gains and when they were hit were sent back down into the lower middle-class. But this was the fate of much of the American "new middle-class."

It is now necessary to distinguish further between the economic roles of the Eastern Europeans and the Jews

of German background: In his sociological analysis of the White Collar, Mills distinguishes between the old middle-class (established merchants, some of whom have been pushed out by the centralization trend) and the new middle-class (white collar people on salaries--managers, salaried professionals, salespeople, office workers). Because of the newness of Eastern European Jews to the American economy, most of them would fall into the new middle-class (while a few were able to work themselves up to the "old"). The Jews of German background are, of course, members of the old middle-class. Stressing that the middle-classes are too heterogeneous to have any unity of social philosophy, Mills does make distinctions according to the economic roles of members of those middle-classes:

In matters of wages and social policies, new middle-class people increasingly have the attitude of those who are given work; old middle-class people still have the attitude of those who give it...Small businessmen, especially retailers, fight chain stores, government, and unions--under the wing of big business. White collar workers, in so far as they are organized in unions in all essentials are under the wage workers. Thus old and new middle-classes become shock troops for other more powerful and articulate pressure blocs in the political scene.¹¹

It may be concluded from a general analysis of American society that the Eastern European Jews--being in the new middle-class having little controlling interests in corporations, would (as Mills puts it) have the "attitude of those who are given work."

The very meager evidence available for the period, 1929-

1932, points in this direction. Opinion is non-socialist but very friendly to Norman Thomas.¹² It attacks the Republican platform of 1932.¹³

The counterpart of Opinion in the non-Jewish world was the Nation. In fact, Horace Kallen and Ludwig Lewisohn wrote for both. The liberal middle-class view at this time was drifting to the Left. But a question and answer game between Norman Thomas and Oswald Garrison Villard showed that the middle-class was friendly to socialism but still clung to Hobson's theories of economics: just put more spending power in the hands of those who will buy--here is the voice of the underconsumptionists who would soon spearhead the New Deal.¹⁴

This class will be analyzed in greater detail during the New Deal period when evidence was more abundant.

The neo-Orthodox manufacturers and financiers of New York and their appendages were at the top of a social pyramid of Eastern European Jews organized in a loose community of many small organizations run on a shoe-string basis. It has already been noted how the Forum bemoaned the plight of these organizations. But here again information is sparse: a letter to the editor advocates the Sabbatical Year as an answer to unemployment--a clear case of ideology distorting reality.¹⁵ More characteristic of the Forum's view of the depression are numerous articles which will be examined in the New Deal period. For now, no conclusions at all.

What were the attitudes of the social welfare workers? The heterogeneous character of their group naturally gives rise to many different views. There is the repentant businessman who has backed social welfare work--he is repentant but has some optimism: This is not our worst depression, said Louis Kirstein of Filene's. "Sooner or later revival sets in and...even prosperity returns." Businessmen should study their own productive schedules with more care.¹⁶ Rabbi Edward I. Israel advocates permanent preventives for unemployment: how? By employing everybody for fewer hours. This--as shall be seen--is the Hillman plan. Joseph Schlossberg presents the laborer's view.¹⁷ Finally, a resolution of the National Conference of Jewish Social Service

views the present economic situation as an opportunity for, and an obligation on, the social economic, and political leadership of this country to re-examine and if necessary to modify our social structure, so that human life and happiness...be not destroyed.¹⁸

Further examples of the wide range of attitudes will be noted when the New Deal period is analyzed. The same range of solutions are found in the non-Jewish agencies. The Squibbs Shorter Hours Plan is hailed as a product of enlightened business,¹⁹ and Russel Smith advocates preparing for slumps during prosperity through unemployment insurance and long-range planning by industry.²⁰ The Russian Five Year Plan is hailed, for there everybody is working, and Hoover's plans are deemed insufficient.²¹ So, it would seem that Jewish and Gentile social workers during these three years had the same range of reactions. Conclusions will be postponed until evidence from the New Deal period

is discussed.

In the reactions of labor from 1929 through 1932, there is a clear distinction between the conservative and radical views in the labor camp. (Sufficient information is not available for a comparison of the Jewish sub-groups within the working class.) It is enlightening to examine what the labor spokesmen considered to be the cause of and the cure for the depression. There is either basic confusion or knowing deception in the discussion of the causes of crises. At one time the leaders tell their workers that the cause is the capitalistic system with its overproduction and technological unemployment. Unemployment is due "to the rapid advance of technology (and)...constantly increasing output."²² That is what Justice was saying. Along the same line, the Advance claimed that depression would no longer produce prosperity because technological unemployment means that prosperity will return fewer and fewer people to work.²³

Six months later the Advance stated that the depression was not due to overproduction but to underconsumption!²⁴ This implies the whole capitalistic school of inflationary economics.²⁵ And it is on the basis of underconsumptionist theories that social reform later replaced radical transformation of society as the labor program.

Regarding the remedies for the crisis there were two similar divisions of opinion. Following from the view that the cause of the crisis lay in the social system, public works

was discounted as "a solution of the problem which is inherent in our social system."²⁶ (But in the same breath a six hour day and a five day week and unemployment insurance would be some aid). In editorials the dominant opinion favored a re-working of the whole economy:

(We need) socialization of the products of human ingenuity.²⁷

No humanitarian point of view can possibly justify a system that breeds poverty because that system also creates millionaires who cast some of their surplus bread upon the waters...The existing order with its chaotic distribution of wealth by the interplay of chance, chicanery, oppression and submissiveness, is an absurdity and is indefensible from the viewpoint of economic sense and ordered progress.²⁸

Charles Ervin, a consistently radical columnist well into the New Deal, blasted Republican and Democratic platforms and said that labor will be the loser no matter who is nominated.²⁹ And the Advance's editorial policy in 1932 was pro-socialist in the election! Clarence Darrow's remark that he favored Roosevelt because of four years of Hoover was (according to the editorial) like the man who said he preferred stale bread because he had just drunk four cases of hooch. The alternative to bad hooch is good whiskey--not stale bread!³⁰

Despite the official socialistic ideology of the unions during the depression period, Sidney Hillman and Jacob Potofsky came up with concrete programs that were anything but socialistic. The Hillman Plan, that eventually sent Hillman to the conference rooms with the Chamber of Commerce to plan the NIRA, advocated "staggered employment," shorter work days and hours, unemployment insurance from the funds of industry, and a Board of Industry for long-range planning.³¹

Potofsky's program added to this high wages, public works, and housing projects.³² These liberal social reforms were the stale pieces of bread that were being offered when good whiskey was really needed...according to what the Advance had previously told the workers.

What conclusions can be drawn from these conflicting views? It is known that the Jewish workers were largely from the socialist (Bund or Labor Zionist) groups of Eastern Europe. But their leaders we also know became leaders in the anti-socialist New Deal. Would it not be a logical policy of union leaders (who for whatever reasons had more middle-class views) to write about the evils inherent in our society, to say that only a radical transformation could do any good at all?...this they must say to keep the support of the workers. But to be true to their more middle-class attitudes and to gain important positions in a capitalistic society, positions in keeping with their undoubted abilities (and perhaps to give temporary alleviation to some workers)--they must talk out of the other side of their mouths in terms of underconsumption and must launch a respectable program of social reform. This they were doing while the official policy of their periodicals was socialist.

Exactly the same trend can be seen in the non-Jewish unions. True, socialist sentiment was stronger among Jewish workers than among non-Jewish workers--because only a small percentage of the general American proletariat was fresh from European socialist movements; whereas, practically all of the Jewish workers had just emigrated from such movements in

Eastern Europe. In the American Federationist, edited by William Green, official organ of the AFL, are found statements of the capitalistic underconsumptionist theories:

The purchasing power of consumers will determine the level of production. [Since this power has dropped,] business must turn its attention to the deliberate development of consumer buying power in order to restore and maintain prosperity. Every employer, public or private, who cuts wages is working against revival of business and a restoration of production activity.³³

It would seem that Green could afford to be less radical in his publications than could the ACWA or ILGWU since he had a much smaller percentage of radicals in his unions. However, before the 1932 AFL Convention Green spoke radical words that shocked the New York Times and pleased the left-wing publishers of Labor Age when he made the following statement concerning the six hour day and five day week:

The world must know we must be given it in response to reason or we will secure it through forces of some kind!^{34a}

But by and large Labor Age was dissatisfied with Green's analysis and claimed that capitalism was collapsing. The only answer of capitalism is wage cuts, and these will only deepen the crisis. "Across the whole industrial world falls the shadow of Karl Marx."^{34b}

As the New Deal is followed to its conclusion four indices of opinion will be used: attitude towards the New Deal in its early days and then in 1935-36 when certain segments of the population were hostile to it; awareness of the failure of the New Deal during the recession and eagerness to join the preparedness program.

It will be recalled that the "old middle-class" Jews of German background echoed the voice of the Chamber of Commerce (or visa-versa). And in 1933 as the American Chamber of Commerce helped write the NIRA, the American Hebrew was shifting to the New Deal position. David Brown attacked the opponents of the NRA with their stand-pat capitalism of another day!³⁵ And Brown is all praises for Hugh "Sock-in-the-nose" Johnson.³⁶ Brown admits having been a Hooverite-Republican but explains that he has been pleasantly surprised by Roosevelt.³⁷ Then begins the idolization of Roosevelt that was to continue throughout the thirties as the Hitler menace grew: "This is incontrovertible: the Roosevelt Americanism has revived the dead principle of the United States as a Refuge for the Oppressed and is making it live again."³⁸

In the stormy years of 1935-6, when H. L. Mencken in the American Mercury was leading his last barbed attacks... against Roosevelt ("Quacks are always friendly and ingratiating fellows...")³⁹ on behalf of the groups mentioned above⁴⁰ (steel and chemical industries, chain stores, individuals connected with these interests, wealthy men who wanted a decrease in taxes, people living off fixed incomes, etc.)-- he spoke for many Jews in the old German middle-class. Not for all, by any means, because as Mills points out, "the political psychology of any social stratum is influenced by every relation its members have, or fail to have with other strata..."⁴¹ And there was great diversity, even in the old middle-classes. Still, many members of the old

middle-class would naturally oppose the New Deal at this time. They possessed the reserve of middle-class wealth. They were the people more closely affiliated with the larger corporations. They were the businessmen in real estate and retailing who were now in relatively sound financial conditions. Some were living on fixed incomes from an accumulation of capital (they wanted to stop the inflation). And, as Mills pointed out, the members of this group would tend to have the attitude of those who give jobs.⁴¹

There is very little evidence to throw light on this conclusion. The German Jewish dependence on Roosevelt because of the Hitler tragedy may very well have affected the views of many in favor of the New Deal. The American Hebrew editorially took no sides in the election. Some wealthy Jews of this class campaigned on Landon's behalf.⁴² James Warburg in his Hell Bent for Election calls the New Deal socialism!⁴³ An American Hebrew columnist opposes Roosevelt's Supreme Court Plan as he praises Governor Lehman for not swallowing "the court reform plan, hook, line, and sinker, for the sake of good old democracy."⁴⁴

There is no record of this group's endorsing the preparedness program--despite the Hitler menace to the Jews--any sooner than did the Gentile old middle-class. In 1937 the American Hebrew hailed the appeasement policy of Leon Blum: Instead of aggression,

Blum proposes to reverse the process and to pull the Hitler fangs in the international scene with kindness and conciliation. That is the Jewish way.⁴⁵

But as the International Chamber of Commerce was told that

The potential strength of the peace-loving nation
is the essential stabilizing influence in the
world today...⁴⁶

and that

the super-nationalism which seeks a self-contained
economy as the greatest good (is) unsound...⁴⁶

the American Hebrew gradually came over to a policy of firm-
ness towards Hitler. A United States preparedness program
would make the Fascists think twice before beginning a war.⁴⁷

The abundant evidence warrants the conclusion that the
attitudes of the old middle-class Jews were based on their
social positions. From their view of the early depression
that so exactly paralleled the Chamber of Commerce state-
ments to their riding the waves of the preparedness program,
there is a view-point in consistency with their class posi-
tion. There is also a misunderstanding of society's greatest
problem, a misunderstanding that flowed from their social
status. After all, the most prosperous elements of the
middle-class--those who had the reserves to come out of
the crisis with something--would naturally not see flaws
in the capitalistic system. Because of the frustrations con-
fronting them, they might shout all the louder its virtues.
Perhaps their being Jews even re-inforced their faith in the
existing order! For as integrated Jews of the upper middle-
class, their pattern of Jewish life was directed towards
the proposition: American society is our salvation; as we
integrate into American society, we can share its magnifi-
cent prosperity. If they should believe for a moment that
American capitalism was in any serious difficulty, they would

undermine their whole position as American Jews and would be without a Jerusalem.

What were the attitudes of Eastern European new middle classes during the New Deal? Of course along with the majority of Americans they supported the 1933 New Deal program.⁴⁸ Opinion was very sympathetic to technocracy and claimed that Roosevelt and the NRA were moving towards the goals envisioned by the technocrats.⁴⁹ As seen above, technocracy was a vague and messianic brand of economics that for a while attracted the liberal middle-class and engineers. These groups were hard hit by the depression: especially the new middle-class which is often victim to chain stores and other centralizing forces. So when security was badly shaken in America, a new society was envisioned through a sort of bourgeois radicalism. The same trend is found in the Nation. However after devoting many articles to examination of technocracy, The Nation decided that this pseudo-economics was all "scrambled eggs."⁵⁰

When some segments of the population turned against the New Deal, the liberal new middle-classes remained loyal. In 1936, Bernard Richards wrote in the Jewish Spectator about "Roosevelt--Friend of the Oppressed" and Lewisohn in the same issue called his voice "the voice of reason, humanity, and authentic hope."⁵¹ Even as did The Nation.

Regarding the preparedness program, The Congress Bulletin maintained that "the United States does not turn militarist because the President demands a greater air force

and equipment for a minimum army." This was on Armistice Day, 1938. The Nation had already advocated the cash-and-carry program⁵²...despite the cries of Oswald Garrison Villard who saw very clearly the relation between the recession and the re-armament. He even quoted the Roosevelt of 1936:

[Employment through armament] is false employment, it builds no permanent structure and creates no consumers' goods for the maintenance of a lasting prosperity. We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day when either their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors or when an unsound economy like a house of cards will fall apart.⁵³

The evidence shows that the Jewish new middle-class followed generally the same lines as the non-Jewish. If anything, they seemed a little more naive with their gullible acceptance of technocracy. More important is the eagerness for preparedness. Because of the keenness with which they felt the Hitler tragedy, the Villardian element was absent in their counsels.

In what way did their social position prevent their having a more accurate picture of what was happening to them? The middle-class is the baby of capitalism. A child may become rebellious towards his father, but few children run away from home...even under the worst conditions. Even in Germany when the house was about ready to fall down, the middle-class rallied around Hitler to prevent the proletariat from taking over. For, the glory of the new middle-class is his white collar and desk. He is liberal, because he wants the continuation of this society in which he is doing so well, in which he does not have to fall to the status of

worker. Because he suffers more in a depression, he is likely to look desperately for radical solutions within the framework of his society. He might even mouth socialistic-sounding phrases as he goes on his quest. But he would never develop a program that would basically change the structure of his society. He is content with a utopian idea called techocracy. For despite the radical phrases, the ultimate commitment of the new middle-class to the system in which it has just found its place in the sun--this commitment precludes serious acceptance of an economic ideology that would call into question the basis of the existing society.

The Jewish Forum presents the views of the Eastern-European neo-Orthodox manufacturers, small creditors and real estate agents of New York City. No general publication representing the same (non-Jewish) class was available.

What caused the depression? In a fantastic article in the January, 1936 Forum, a yiddishist-midrashist-economist discusses the crisis, and the article reads like a page from the Soncino Talmud. It seems to be an attempt to lay the blame on a group of large property-owners and big bankers--not on the manufacturers, smaller creditors, and labor. (This sounds as though it was written for worker consumption). He first talks about "the so-called 'upper-strata' of society, the property or land-owners." Then he throws in from Midrash Rabba a homily about the land-owner Cain versus the good producer, Abel. These Cain-ites..."These lords of the land withhold the opportunity of using (money) intensively until

capital and labor are compelled to give up the lion's share of the future products for the mere permission jointly to produce wealth." Through high taxes the government then takes too much of the wealth that is produced. Therefore, Jews (capital and labor) should unite against the property class and the government. Who are these property classes? Do they own property which the producers must rent? Or are they the bankers and holding companies who have power over "the opportunity of using money." Probably they are the latter, as the author condemns them: "The so-called owners of these opportunities create fictitious booms guilefully to entice the simpletons to invest their last savings in their holdings."⁵⁴ So, the bankers and the government become scapegoats for the depression.

Remember that this was written in 1936 when textile manufacturers whose workers were rapidly organizing and demanding higher wages were viewing the New Deal with less favor. Also manufacturers would naturally be hostile to big bankers on whom they were dependent for credit. Furthermore, small creditors were now at a great disadvantage compared with the big bankers with their large accumulations. But the Forum was, of course, enthusiastic about the early programs of the New Deal. In fact, the idea of a five-day week (the NRA) had its origins--says the Forum--in Jewish circles: a Dr. Sam Friedman brought it to the attention of the AFL.⁵⁵ In addition to the NRA, the Torah was spoken of as a solution to the economic problems: When Israel is at home with the Torah, then will their problems be solved.⁵⁶

The existing social system is never questioned. Since trade will always reward the industrious and deny those lacking in industry, the problem of interaction between wealth and property will always be present. Since there will always be rich and poor, the poor should not be "envious of the possessions of the rich," and the rich should not be "self-centered and greedy."⁵⁷ The proletariat should not lose hope: as Rabbi Jung put it--hereditary proletarianism should be an impossibility; this is the meaning of the Jubilee Year.⁵⁸ This seems to be a call to the worker not to collapse into proletarian ideologies. Dr. H. I. Schenker writes that all current political programs are simply catch phrases to ease the poor man's soul. What is needed, he says, is improvement of the ethical individual:

Superman, in the Biblical sense, enters into the formation of a supercommunity: the supercommunity enters into the formation of a supnation; and a supnation serves as the nucleus for a superhumanity--that is, in short, the Judaic scheme of social justice.⁵⁹

Regarding preparedness, the Forum said of Roosevelt's Chicago speech that a "great service has been rendered humanity." And from that point on the Forum supported preparedness.

It is evident that these attitudes flowed from the class position of the manufacturers, and small creditors of New York. They are in control of a large decentralized orthodox community. To keep control, they must be sure that the masses do not lose faith in Orthodoxy and that they do

not turn to irreligious ideologies that would take them away from the Orthodox institutions and that would undermine the capitalist system. Consequently, a whole series of explanations and distortions of reality. The depression is caused by neither capital nor by labor (they are united), but by some "property class." The American system is eternal, since there will always be economic inequality. Social programs are not the answer (they were in 1933 but were not in 1935). But if men are good individuals (the rich should be good rich and the poor should be good poor) and follow the Torah, then they will be happy. The role played by HaPoel HaMizrachi in this whole scheme will later be examined.

It will be recalled that the Jewish "professionals" from 1929-1932 had an extremely eclectic view of the depression--so many interests were bound up with Jewish social welfare work. (And it was seen that this held true for the corresponding non-Jewish group). Throughout the New Deal there was the same phenomenon of eclecticism.

Louis Kirstein of Filene's, after urging Jewish support of the New Deal, gives an interesting reason:

I think that it is particularly fitting for Jews to help in this program because certainly the NRA has done a great deal for the industry in which so many Jews are interested and engaged in, and that is the needle industry, and the distributive trades, to say nothing of the great good that has been accomplished in elimination of sweat shops.⁶¹

This was the old middle-class in January, 1934.

In June of that year the new middle-classes are addressed and encouraged by Morris Krugman. In true new middle-class

tradition, he shows technocratic sympathies:

...engineers and economists are just beginning to realize that they are working towards the same ends.

He then encourages the white collar workers: "Wholesale redirection" of vocations will not be necessary, for "when employment opportunities occur again, the proportion of white collar workers to others will probably be greater than it has been in the past."⁶²

There is also the pessimism of the detached academic theorist:

...capitalism cannot solve its own problems of employment (and) has entered into a stage of contraction therefore. Those that don't like the word 'contraction' call it 'stabilization.'...The NRA is... a sort of return to the guild psychology. It is a manifestation of a scarcity consciousness, and perhaps that scarcity consciousness is there with very good reason. It is an intelligent attitude, because, as I look upon it, I think that capitalism has seen its best days.

But socialism will not be next:

I do not share that optimistic view. I look upon the modern western world as a society which if the world were governed by logic, would have to go on to socialism but the world, not being governed by logic, but by psychology and by the fear of strong vested interest groups, I am afraid that the trend or the next step does not lie in the direction of socialism or communism, outside of Russia.⁶³

And so the academic world has gone left.

What would be the attitudes of that group of immigrant social workers and federation heads who spearheaded the Reconstructionist movement? Dependent on support of the Jewish communities, these federations suffered tremendously during the depression. Salaries had to be cut to such an extent that a threatening "rank-and-file" movement grew up among the workers. The financial reports and problems of the federa-

tions told them that the New Deal was not succeeding. The groups furthermore were in close touch with the relief needs of America. Since they were in touch with the vast number of unemployed, they had an increased awareness of the failures of the New Deal. And finally, the field of social work was often entered by Jews from an Eastern European proletariat background or by academicians from the YIVO historical school--such as Abraham Duker. Duker was on a committee with Harry Barron and Nathaniel Bronstein and others, a committee that drew up a paper at the Practitioners' Session of the 1935 National Conference of Jewish Social Service. In view of the influences noted above, the following skepticism towards the New Deal might be expected:

...After two years of the New Deal, we can see that this attempt to benefit the forgotten man and business has resulted only in bringing benefits to industrial owners...

Profits and dividends of the large industrial concerns were not only safeguarded, but increased as much as 600 percent in 1934 over 1932. In contrast to this we find that during this period the (real) wages of the industrial worker declined... Speed-up and mechanization have further intensified the problem of unemployment and have helped considerably in swelling the number of unemployed. In agriculture under the New Deal we find the lowering of income, reduction of standards of living, increase of tenancy, forced sales, mortgage indebtedness, and heavy taxes. Unemployment stood at 17,157,000 men, women, and young workers in November, 1934. This is 800,000 more than the estimate for November, 1933.⁶⁴

An examination of The Reconstructionist gives abundant evidence of this group's views. What do they want?

...a thoroughgoing change in our social and economic order...establishment of a cooperative society, the elimination of the profit system and the public ownership of all natural resources and basic industries.⁶⁵

Meanwhile, however, they will struggle with labor for more equal distribution of the income of industry. So a radical program is to be achieved through reformist measures--but true reforms, not the fake-reforms of the New Deal.

The Reconstructionists reverse the pattern of the old middle classes with the latter's initial support and later attack against the New Deal. The avid disapproval of the Reconstructionist gives way by 1937 to acceptance and even support of the New Deal program. Roosevelt is unpacking the Court, cries the Reconstructionist.⁶⁶ And the social justice committee of the Rabbinic Assembly, a committee composed mostly of Reconstructionists, admits that the New Deal is often inconsistent but should be supported because it is in the right human spirit.⁶⁷ Mr. Taylor of U. S. Steel is hailed as "far-sighted" in his acceptance of the CIO organization.⁶⁸

The attacks against the New Deal program have been explained. But why this change in attitude? It may be compared with the shift of many French Socialists who supported the Republic when it was seriously threatened by the Catholics and Monarchists in the last years of the 19th century during the Dreyfus Case. They knew they would be crushed, should the rightist elements gain control. In a similar manner, the leftist groups rallied around the New Deal when it was seriously attacked in 1936 and 1937. After all, these Reconstructionists were not leaders of a movement that challenged the present structure of society. They were part of the capitalistic society, gaining funds from that society and

bestowing funds on its victims. They did not want the rightist elements that would rob the middle-class supporters more efficiently than would the New Deal--they did not want those elements to gain control. And as soon as there was the serious possibility that they would, the Reconstructionists rallied to the support of the New Deal. Their most "radical" goals were always to be achieved by reformist methods. Other factors behind this change are offered as conjectures. A complete awareness of the class conflict in America is lacking as they naively hail U.S. Steel--with its foreign investments and surplus that enabled them to give a little to the unions--as "enlightened" and "far-sighted." Their philosophy of a democratic organic, Jewish community constantly minimizes class conflict within Jewish society. At this time native American anti-Semitism was opposed by the New Deal, which more and more was becoming the symbol of Jewish salvation. Little wonder then that the Reconstructionists--with all their reasons for awareness of the defects of the New Deal--turned from opposing it to supporting it with ardor.

The Reconstructionist was slow to shift away from its stand on neutrality. After the President's Chicago speech, it stated:

Our real danger is that the interests that would profit by our participation in the war, both those of Americans and of foreigners, will be able to beguile us with plausible idealistic reasons for joining it.⁶⁹

Recognizing preparedness as an attempt to solve an economic problem:

No economic crisis can be as tragic as the death of a single man on the battle field.⁷⁰

And of the possible war:

(It will be a war of) conflicting imperialisms and there is mighty little moral principle at stake.⁷⁰

After Munich, this attitude changes and the Christian Century is attacked for its pacifism:

If military aggression is a crime, then to invite such aggression by military weakness is to make oneself in part responsible for the crime...Until the fiasco of the Munich pact the Reconstructionist favored a policy as is now advocated by the Christian Century.

But now America must be strong. This was February 10, 1939.

Torn between awareness of the use of preparedness in solving national economic problems in an ultimately unhealthy way and the menace of Hitler to the world in general and to the Jews in particular--the Reconstructionist slowly gave its support to a strong America. Lying somewhere in between the new middle-classes and the Socialist organizations on the political spectroscopy, the Reconstructionists--more quickly than the Socialists but more slowly than the new middle-classes--came to the support of the greatest military effort of the American society.

In the world of Gentile social work, there is the same divergence of opinion as in the Jewish group: New Dealer Harry Hopkins addressed the National Conference of Social Work in Detroit--July, 1933.⁷¹ The radical voice was that of Miss Mary Van Kleeck, whose fiery speech set the tone of the 1934 conference: Social workers should dispel the illusion that the New Deal is trying to create. She thus characterizes the New Deal: "How far must government yield

to the demand for change in the status quo in order to maintain the status quo?" We need, she said, a form of collectivism that is neither fascism or communism. Miss Van Kleeck was director of the department of industrial studies at the Russel Sage Foundation. She found support from a large minority at the conference.⁷²

While there is no method of accurate measurement, it appears that there was a smaller amount of radicalism in the ranks of Gentile social workers than in those of the Jewish. Two factors may account for this: The Gentile federations received their backing not just from old middle-classes but from big industrialists who were not hard hit by the depression. So non-Jewish federation leaders were in better financial condition than were the Jewish and were not so likely to see the inadequacies of the New Deal. Furthermore, the radical influences of an Eastern European proletarian ideology did not appear in the non-Jewish group.

It has been demonstrated that the attitudes of the "Jewish professionals" flowed in large measure from their social positions. Especially it was shown that Reconstructionists because of their place in society were unable to maintain a consistent view of society or of their problems; instead, they changed as circumstances demanded of their group. And finally, that the peculiar "Jewish" view in the case of Jewish social workers is due to social factors that did not exist in the case of their non-Jewish counterparts.

The Jewish workers, shall be analyzed in terms of the following sub-groups: Union leadership, Labor-Zionists, and socialist-antinationalists (Bundists). What were the

reactions of these groups to the New Deal and to the preparedness program? What significant comparisons might be drawn from the non-Jewish labor movement? (eg. why are there so many liberal Jewish labor leaders?)

The dual attitude of the union leaders from 1929 to 1932 has been observed: an official socialism and yet a social reform program based on underconsumptionist theories. It was seen that the radical front was needed to keep the support of the workers. But with the New Deal's labor program and propaganda, it was finally possible to drop the pretense of radicalism and to hail the New Deal.

Still, from January through May, 1933, the voice of Jacob still was radical while the hands of Esau were clasping the New Deal eagerly. Technocracy was looked upon as a complete neglect of social and political power problems and as a distracting influence from the real problem of how to wrest social control from the anti-social elements (This would make it seem that the new middle-classes welcomed the opportunity to dodge the real problem).⁷³ While the Hillman Plan for social reform was being hailed on the editorial page, Charles Ervin was writing (as if on behalf of the forgotten workers) that Roosevelt does not understand that the hull of the ship of state is too broken down for any kind of patch-up job.⁷⁴

In June, 1933, there is the first official endorsement of the New Deal—"an entirely new departure from American legislative practice"⁷⁵ The NRA was adopted, because the depression showed that if

businessmen and bankers were left to lead the country to recover by their own wisdom and considerations, there would never be any recovery.⁷⁶

But surely Sidney Hillman, who had been let in the room to speak for labor as the Chamber of Commerce molded the NRA, knew that it was the businessmen who were behind the NRA and the 1933 New Deal! The June issue was New Deal all-the-way. Even Charles Ervin writes that if the workers organize well as a result of provision 7a, they will come out of the period with gains in conditions and wages.⁷⁷

It is from Ervin--a labor intellectual--that we hear the last expressions of the old radicalism. In October, 1933, he remarks that the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have their new offices in the NRA.⁷⁸ And in February, 1934, he stresses that the purpose of the NRA is to re-create the pro-business conditions of the twenties--the NRA is an uphill struggle.⁷⁹

Hillman, meanwhile, argues that while the NRA may have been meant as aspirin, it will still help change the system; that one should distinguish between what was meant and what will happen.⁸⁰ In the Fall of 1934, Hillman was appointed to the National Industrial Relations Board. And from 1935 on, the progress made by the New Deal was stressed.⁸¹ In 1936, progressive labor is committed to the re-election of Roosevelt and even Charles Ervin wrote warmly of FDR's convention speech.⁸²

Now completely in the New Deal orbit, the Advance saw the recession only as the result of not enough New Deal! "Is

it possible that so soon the lessons of yesteryear are forgotten!" Therefore, enact more labor legislation.⁸³ And, in September, 1938, America should call the bluff of the Fascists. There was all praise to Roosevelt's "clear and clean reaction to the German gangster-government's savage campaign of destruction of the defenseless Jews of Germany."⁸⁴ It is interesting that the Hitler campaign against the Jews was not mentioned in the Advance until non-Jews of the same class were ready to take up arms.

In the Workers Alliance there has been noted a more middle-class outlook than the more thoroughgoing revolutionary anti-nationalism of the Bund. For the leadership of Labor Zionism was not composed entirely of workers. As was noted in Chapter II, many members of the middle-class were very prominent in the circle of leaders. Still it was socialism, and while Hillman was supporting the New Deal, the Frontier said in 1935 that a vote for the administration was a vote for a relief program and not for intelligent economic planning.⁸⁵ The Frontier bemoaned the fact that the socialist vote was only a protest.⁸⁶ Still some Labor Zionists supported Roosevelt--and these Labor Zionists were not only Reform rabbis in the movement's leadership. The Labor-Zionist Newsletter stated in 1937 that the New Deal should be supported against reaction, as long as one is not fooled by the "amorphous sea of Rooseveltism."⁸⁷

So here was a much more firm socialist reaction than was the fickle Reconstructionist attitudes. Still there is

evidence of some compromise with basic socialist principles especially in the latter New Deal. This can be explained by the part-middle-class leadership and by the organizational needs of Labor Zionism that (since the beginning of the movement) have caused it to minimize the working class program. Appendix I presents evidence for this conclusion. It is significant that this right-wing socialist group follows the left-wing capitalist groups (Reconstructionists and new middle-class) in a drift from radical talk (1933) to more conservative theory (1937). For the New Deal was under attack from the far Right. Then did the middle-class influence in Labor Zionism make itself clearly felt.

In 1939, this group supports a "benevolent neutrality." Military expenditures are approved, for they may inspire fear in the fascist nations. Besides, the world is not black and white, and in the event of war, the democratic countries should win.⁸⁸ Again, a departure from the strictly socialist line. This departure was made with very explicit qualifications by the Left Poale Zion group:

The struggle against fascism must...be permeated with the struggle against capitalism. Although the blade may temporarily be dulled by tactical motives, we must not for one single moment lose sight of the fact that the final struggle is the struggle against capitalism, the evil of evils.⁸⁹

Still the departure was made.

In the Workmen's Circle (its youth magazine, Call of Youth and its official Workmen's Call) there is found the most consistent social philosophy of all Jewish groups. Consistency does not prove truth, but at least the Circle begins the depression with a radical revolutionary philosophy

and is never drawn before the outbreak of World War II (along with the other leftist groups) into the New Deal orbit. There was very bitter satire in the attitude expressed towards the New Deal:

Bobby Shafto's gone CWA
Glad to work once more for pay
Will he get his just deserts?
The answer, to be brief, is--nertz!⁹⁰

Following are excerpts from the "Diary of a President's Cook" by Larynx:

The President is in a very bad mood today. He threw my wonderful dessert, lemon meringue with whipped cream out the window. He said it tasted like cotton in his mouth. Can it be there is a textile strike imminent?

The islands [Hawaiian] are in an uproar. A suspicious man was found wandering through the city. He claimed he was an American, but as he could not prove he was working for the Sugar Interests, he has been arrested and is to be deported.⁹¹

And in a more sober mood:

In its appraisal of the New Deal, youth must comprehend that the NRA does not go to the roots, does not meet the difficulties involved in capitalism: the profit motive and the failure to plan industrial enterprises to meet the needs of the nation.⁹²

While it is stated in August, 1935 that "the recent Supreme Court decision on the NRA burst the rising balloon of progressive labor legislation,"⁹³ this lapse into inconsistency is quickly corrected by a play entitled "Five out of Nine Have It."

Hughes: I am Big Chief Justice
Charley Evans Hughes
I'm quite a reactionary
With very liberal views;
The dear old Constitution
At last has reappeared.
It really wasn't lost at all,
It was hiding behind my beard.

Brandeis: And I am Louis Brandeis
 A liberal I'm supposed to be
 It never does you any good
 Because I'm in the minority.
 It makes a perfect set-up
 For Morgan and his minions.
 The masses are demanding bread
 And they get dissenting opinions!!⁹⁴

The intimation of the Brandeis speech is significant since it shows the liberal and conservatives conspiring against the people.

The Workmen's Call shows an accurate understanding of the recession period:

...the palliative measures enacted (by the New Deal)... did much to alleviate the suffering of the destitute... and they undoubtedly did give a fillip to industry which for a while sent production levels soaring and provided increased employment and purchasing power for millions--a not inconsiderable achievement; but alas, his methods were nonetheless palliatives. [The crash came] with punctual fidelity.

Despite the illusion of purposeful activity so ingenuously created by his tirades against big business, Roosevelt's policy in this second stage of the New Deal is essentially one of drift. He has submitted no new legislation of importance in the past month, nor is any in the offing. His positive measures have been limited largely to reducing relief appropriations and sky-rocketing armaments expenditures. The latter--a sop to heavy industry--may serve to relieve economic distress, but at best it is a temporary expedient which must inevitably lead to a new and more precipitate decline and which enhances a thousand-fold⁹⁵ the danger of embroiling this nation in world conflict.

Following this analysis of the relation between recession and preparedness and in consistency with the Workmen's Circle's anti-nationalist ideology, Harry Gersh in January, 1939, attacks the "Dangerous Applause" with which the confused Jewish community greets Roosevelt's anti-Hitler speeches. This bravado is simply a means by which the American ruling powers can edge the people towards militarism.⁹⁶

The Workmen's Circle was the only Jewish group that did not accept the preparedness program before the outbreak of World War II. After the invasion of Poland, there was dissension in the ranks as to whether or not to support preparedness: some said the socialists could get concessions from the capitalists in return for their support;⁹⁷ others countered that a victory for the Allies would mean defeat of revolution in the defeated nations and continued exploitation of colonial people.⁹⁸ The editorial policy took eventually the former view.

In view of the social background of the Circle, it would certainly be expected that this group would have the most effective and consistent analysis of the capitalist system. A group enjoying few benefits from the capitalist system need not rationalize on that system's behalf. And the Circle was workman born, bred, and led, with none of the New Deal connections of the Advance and with none of the middle-class leaders of the Alliance. The Circle was a proletarian group of long-standing. While Labor Zionism had to cooperate with Zionist capitalist leaders in its quest for power in the world Zionist movement, the Bund did not have a similar organizational need. Reality was harsh, and this group understood why. Should they develop a successful positive program that would grant their leaders social status, they would possibly go the way of all classes. But for the New Deal period, their analysis--while often overstated and satirical--was from a proletarian point of view, sound. This does not mean that their understanding of all the pro-

blems facing them was sound (as shall be seen in the discussion of their answers to anti-Semitism) or that the actions they advocated (for example, regarding the war) were really in accord with the logical conclusions of their views. But regarding the New Deal and its policies, the Circle was in a position to know and to speak.

What was the attitude of the non-Jewish unions towards the New Deal? The information available to me was too sketchy to warrant many conclusions. But it is clear that the AFL leadership (with Hillman) hailed the NRA enthusiastically:

Ride on! To the stars throw thy pinions
With light of truth blaze thou the way,
Thy call reaches all man's dominions,
Proclaim a new age, NRA!⁹⁹

But then the reason for this early and open non-Jewish New Dealism compared with Hillman's slow drift from radicalism has been noted: the different social compositions of the AFL and the ACWA. But Green, it will be recalled also had his radicals to placate.¹⁰⁰

Much is heard about radicalism in Jewish labor. It is true that there is such radicalism. But the reason does not lie in the influence of Judaism (most of the radical workers are not interested in religion). The reason, as has been seen, does lie in the social backgrounds of a Jewish workingclass movement composed primarily of Bundists and declassed Eastern European Jews.

This concludes the analysis of the reactions of the different groups of Jews to the depression and New Deal. It has been shown that the attitudes of each group of Jews

flowed directly from that group's social source. The old middle-class could not doubt the merit of the system that had produced such prosperity and which had bestowed so many palpable benefits; and so it spoke of faith in America and opposed preparedness until the International Chamber of Commerce condemned a "self-contained economy" as super-nationalism. New York bankers and manufacturers could blame neither manufacturers nor the workers they employed, so they said that the government and bankers caused the depression and they used a strong religious ideology to cover up the problems of society. The new middle-class, the Reconstructionists, and the Labor Zionists (reading from right to left) all expressed varying degrees of political ambivalence. They all felt keenly the crisis and spoke of radical solutions. The new middle-class, dependent on the existing order for its new-found status, was the first to support the reforms of the New Deal. The Reconstructionists, although hard hit and in touch with the needy, were more reluctant but finally supported the New Deal. (In the final analysis their work depended on the existing order and their organizations would fare better under the New Deal than under the threatening reactionary forces). Last of the three to support Roosevelt was the Labor Zionist group: its partially middle-class leadership, institutional needs, and more emotional approach for nationalism led this group to deviate from a strictly socialistic approach. Only the Bund, workmen born, bred, and led, followed a consistently socialist ideology.

These are but examples of the evidences that point to the conclusion that the attitudes of each group of Jews flowed from that group's social source.

It has also been shown that the Jewish groups followed the pattern of their non-Jewish counterparts unless social forces dictated otherwise! An example of the latter phenomenon was found in the labor groups that were composed largely of immigrants with Eastern European revolutionary backgrounds. Similarly, more radicalism among Jewish social agencies may be due to immigrant backgrounds and the poorer financial condition of Jewish organizations.

This examination of the Jewish reactions to the economy of the thirties will be concluded by a discussion of the trend towards centralization. Much has been said with misleading oversimplification concerning the "well-known trend" towards centralization in the Jewish community. This generality has been used to justify the establishment of an organic Jewish community and to show the inevitability of large organizations run by a few men. Commitment to a certain social pattern may affect an analysis of the trend; this study will attempt objectivity. The first general misconception is that there is one single trend towards centralization! Actually, there are two trends. The first shall be called centralization along class lines. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations is an organization of a specific class (there are, of course, sub-groups within it). Under certain conditions such a class organization (others are

social welfare federations, unions of Orthodox synagogues) will develop a centralized structure in its effort to better achieve its goals and to perpetuate and increase the welfare of the organization itself. There is such centralization in a society whose pattern is centralized: First there is centralization in the economic sphere of society and then it moves into the social: this is the history of America. There was some such centralization in the twenties: one example was the American Jewish Congress. But, generally speaking, within each class there were many organizations that could be coordinated but were not. There was money enough for a great many executive secretaries.

With the thirties, not only had the centralizing pattern pervaded more of the social sphere but the depression gave the great stimulus to centralization along class lines. For the sake of efficiency, organizations of a particular class had to get together to save as much money as possible, so they could do their job and still pay the necessary salaries. And this is just what happened.

But there is another type of centralization: organic centralization. This phenomenon brings the different classes together in community organization. This is very different from one class or group in the community becoming centralized for its own class group welfare. While its fullest development is the kehilla idea of Reconstructionism, organic centralization is also advocated in varying degrees by other classes under certain conditions.

What conditions encourage this organic centralization?

Today anti-Semitism is a primary factor. Whenever there has been anti-Semitism in the past, the Jews have turned inward. Ghetto walls have been erected at the request of the Jewish community which would rather be bound together in the face of Christian hostility. And it took the tremendous pressure of Hitler to bring the Jewish defence organizations to consider their policies together. In the Eastern European society where integration for the Jew was not possible, the cry for "national rights" was raised. This demand for semi-autonomy, for an organic community, was the cry of the rejected Eastern European Jew.

In Western Europe there was less anti-Semitism, and integration was allowed. And so the Jews waved the flags of their respective countries, and no organic Jewish community would be considered. But recently in the Western world, there has been dramatic rejection of the Jew. Conditions in the thirties then became ripe for the renewed cry of national rights, of semi-autonomy, of the organic community. As the Dreyfus Case turned a handful of German Jews away from their pursuit of integration, so the Hitler debacle could turn a generation of American Jews away from conformity and towards organic centralization.

A further factor that would encourage such centralization is the rise of the Eastern European Jewish community in America--a community which in this century came from a land that was still semi-feudal and that therefore contained organic Jewish communities. The masses of American Jews then would have a nostalgic partiality for an organic community program here.

Why was there not such a program in the twenties?

America was still talking about equal opportunities for all, and there did seem to be complete freedom. There was no anti-Semitism to drive the classes of Jews together and the spirit of American nationalism called for allegiance to Uncle Sam. No organic community could have a chance against the American world of freedom, integration, and nationalism.

But with the thirties, there were great changes. Anti-Semitism arose at home and abroad and sent capitalist and working class Jews to join and study their common interests. Cultural pluralism became the idealistic phrase most used when minorities were stopped in their integration movement. Unity in Israel was the cry and still is. And the Eastern European Jews, rising to prominence in America but with the memory of another culture, were very friendly to organic centralization.

Despite the new factors that made for organic centralization, the same conditions that produced those factors also produced forces that made this centralization difficult. The same depression that produced anti-Semitism brought into the Jewish community multiple tensions between the classes which had to be overcome before organic centralization could become a reality.

With this background it is now appropriate to examine how each group was affected by the centralizing forces in the thirties. What was its plan of class-line centralization and what was its attitude towards organic centralization?

It will be noted that the various plans and attitudes--no matter how idealistically stated--reflect the respective social positions.

The old middle-classes of German origin who still were prominent in the Union of American Hebrew Congregations favored the Stern Plan. Its eighth and key aim:

The synagogue would be restored to its natural and deserved primacy as the centre from which would emanate all worthy communal work, and the sanction of religion would be directly placed in back of such work.¹⁰¹

This is how the Plan would work: Every member of a synagogue should specialize in some Jewish organizational work outside of the synagogue:

Thus I would have a group in each organization devoted to the cause of local charitable work, the hospitals, the relief agencies, the federations, etc. I would have a group devoted to the cause of national charitable organizations...¹⁰²

The purpose of these connections with outside groups becomes clear:

...they would familiarize themselves...with let us say the work of the Jewish Publication Society, or with that of the local federation, or with that of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, or with that of the Jewish Agency, or with that of the American Jewish Committee. They would in turn instruct the public generally on behalf of the causes in which they would thus be interested; they would labor for such causes by arousing public interest therein, by seeking funds if need be, by building up their memberships...¹⁰²

Naturally the old middle-classes, with their non-secularist orientation, would seek to build up the community around the synagogue. And this is not a plan for an organic community. It is a class-line centralization plan that will get the maximum financial support and personal participation first

in the synagogue and then in the organizations affiliated with the synagogue: the UAHC, the AJC, etc. Stern refers "to Reform and Conservative Synagogues of the prevailing American type"--this eliminates organic centralization.

But the American Hebrew had a plan that purported to represent all American Jewry. Isaac Landman's idea was that the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Committee, and the Joint Distribution Committee should unite to represent the community.¹⁰³ One can imagine the reaction of American Jewish Congress representatives.¹⁰⁴ This was simply a centralization plan that would give its planners more control in the community.

There were sporadic attempts to unite the Jewish community against anti-Semitism here and abroad. The most nearly to succeed was the Pittsburg agreement of 1938. After the American Jewish Congress had aroused its opponents by proposing to poll the Jewish community on four questions that would justify Congress policy, the Pittsburg agreement made a compromise: the referendum was dropped; only elections were held; and under the leadership of E. J. Kaufman there was established the General Council for Jewish Rights composed of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, and Jewish Labor Committee. This was hailed by almost all groups, but by 1939 the Congress was saying the body had no power¹⁰⁵ and the Reconstructionist was saying it needed a code of ethics.¹⁰⁶ But this plan was accepted all the way by the small minority of the old middle-class, possibly since they had representa-

tion out of proportion to their numbers and probably since the do-nothing nature of the organization and yet its existence forestalled a democratic movement that would have pushed them out of control.

The new middle-class Eastern European Jews criticized the Stern Plan. Its real purpose is

to use the great need of organization in American Jewish life in order to strengthen the synagogue and temple by making them the nuclei of such organizations.¹⁰⁷

Opinion gives the real centralization plan, and that is the Congress idea: a group with political power as the absolute representative body of American Jewry, supported by all Jews, that would absorb competing smaller organizations--all on a democratic basis.¹⁰⁷

The structure of the Congress has been examined and it was found that its delegates were elected by 8 percent of the Jewish community and that its leadership through the devious paths of large centralized organization is composed of the upper echelon of the new middle-class which is striving for leadership in the American Jewish community. Because this new middle-class is the largest Jewish class in America, the term, "democracy," is employed. Centralization along class-lines is in evidence in the Congress itself. Centralization of the organic community type is in high favor with members of this group--since this would be an aid to their further control. However the completely organic community of Mordecai Kaplan would not find official endorsement by this class, because many of

its rabbis (right wing conservative) would feel threatened by the success of Reconstructionism and because its most influential and integrated members would not cut themselves off from Gentile society to the extent of, say, the kehilla court or the Hebrew language-cultivation.

The neo-Orthodox group of manufacturers and small creditors in New York City, who sit at the top of a large disorganized community, favor quite naturally a plan of centralization along the line of their group interests. These small inefficient groups were very hard hit by the depression, and many yeshivas were going bankrupt. So the president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, Rabbi Goldstein, developed a plan to make Yitzhak Elhanan an American Jabneh (his term.)¹⁰⁸ In this way Yitzhak Elhanan could increase its funds and facilities, and there would be an elimination of duplication in the Orthodox community.

Meanwhile the editor of The Jewish Forum was working out a centralization plan for the whole Orthodox community.

Every organization would be represented on the following committees: Sabbath Observance, Kashrus, Education, and Taharat Hamishpacha. These functional committees together would form a centralizing force for all the Orthodox community.¹⁰⁸ After the Stern Plan was announced, the Forum

was very sympathetic. Rev. Dr. Moses Hyamson agreed with the aim of Stern: the synagogue should be central in Jewish life. Why is it having financial troubles? Because of "lack of organization, want of united and concerted effort."¹⁰⁹

Editor Rosengarten takes his cue from the Stern Plan and

puts forth an amplified version of his plan described above admittedly based on Stern's ideas and to be under the auspices of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.¹¹⁰

These plans quite obviously reflect the needs of the Forum group. It is not a need for an organic community, but for tighter group organization. There is little effort to disguise the purpose and Rabbi Hyamson speaks of financial troubles as the basis of disorganization (or visa-versa). Behind the scenes there may be the conflict with the European-trained Orthodox Rabbis of United States and Canada (Agudath Ha-rabanim). This group would be opposed to kashrus regulation and centralization: kashrus regulation would rob them of their dividends and centralization would put them at a disadvantage before the American-trained Goldstein group. On the other hand, elimination of wasteful duplication and the power necessary for an efficient organization could come to the neo-Orthodox group from the centralization along class-lines.

All of the "Jewish professionals" needed class-line centralization. Welfare federations all over the country were uniting. The National Appeals Information Service was formed and contained 46 federations. Its avowed purpose: for efficiency in time of need.¹¹¹ This type of centralization was urged by all those engaged in social work.

But only the Reconstructionist group (immigrant Eastern Europeans spearheaded by Federation executives) favored the

organic type of centralization. Perhaps there was a basic reason: only in an organic community could these large Jewish federations be able to prosper and only with a "Jewish civilization" philosophy could Jewish social work, secular education, etc. on such a large scale be justified. Taking his departure, as did the others, from the Stern Plan, Kaplan agrees with Stern that the community is disorganized and that the synagogue should be more than a house of prayer, that each synagogue should have committees relating to communal affairs. But, Kaplan goes on, to centralize Jewish life around worship-institutions is absurd, since (whatever one wishes) worship is not central in Jewish life. Jewish life revolves around many institutions other than the synagogue; therefore, the Stern Plan should be enlarged into the idea of the organic community.¹¹²

Just what is this organic community? Much theory has been written about it. Some form of it was put into practice in Los Angeles and Detroit. In the Detroit plan, a modern Bet Din was set up for arbitration and conciliation within the Jewish community. This court, says its advocate William Boxerman, executive director of the Detroit Community Council, will keep bad publicity such as kashrus and shechita cases out of the papers. The court is a quiet place where domestic relations can be discussed. It will also provide emotional outlets for those who feel themselves wronged. This is how it works: one party applies, he must be Jewish and a proper subject for arbitration according to the statutes of Michigan. If the second

party is reluctant, a phone call reminds him of community pressure. Payment obligation is assumed when one submits to arbitration. Labor cases are not allowed.¹¹³

This is simply a step towards an organic Jewish community. Its object is to transcend class barriers by setting up a democratic community with about as many institutions as the environment will bear. In this way, an automatic loyalty to the Jewish community and obligation to its institutions will be in every person born into that community. Of all the centralization plans this is clothed in the most elaborate philosophy...which will later be discussed.

The difficulties of the achievement of such a program are the following: the factors that keep Jews from such a communal organization (their own bitter class rivalries, the trend towards integration even today in America)--these factors can only be counterbalanced by anti-Semitism from the outside. And this is not likely to come for sometime in an America riding on a perpetual preparedness program. And assuming conditions degenerate enough to produce the anti-Semitism sufficient to drive American Jewry together, the general society would be one of such inequality and the tensions within the Jewish community would be so great as to produce a Jewish community on an oligarchical pattern that would correspond to that of the outside world! (This conjecture may be substantiated by reference to the communities in declining Poland of the 18th century). Even today, an organic Jewish community would hardly be the democratic

dream it is imagined. For historical precedents demonstrate that the Jewish community pattern is quite similar in its power-distribution to the non-Jewish (As in Venice of the 16th century). And this study has sufficiently demonstrated the lack of democracy in old middle-class, new middle-class and some labor organizations in the Jewish community of today. An oligarchic society may provide the anti-Semitism sufficient to build an organic Jewish community; but the resulting Jewish community would be so oligarchic that the Reconstructionist's dream would become a nightmare.

The labor group that would hail organic centralization would be the National Jewish Workers Alliance: middle-class enough to join with the middle-class and numerous enough to hope for more say in the community through democracy. The weak Pittsburg agreement represents a decline in the Congress idea, since the Conference is too weak to do anything towards an organic community.¹¹⁴ But the evidence available for an analysis of the attitude of working-class groups is not sufficient to permit further discussion.

The difficulties of an organic centralization that would transcend class lines have been discussed. How does one account for the present talk of an "American Judaism" that would unite all Jewry, especially the Reform and Conservative branches? This seems to be what has been called a "class-line" centralization. For it has arisen among those who have realized the common class composition of the large bulk of American Jewry: with the continued rise of the new middle-class and the lower middle-class and the stoppage

of immigration, a large social base made up of one middle-class is being established in America. This class may, so to speak, recognize its existence by the establishment of common religious and cultural organizations. There would be centralization along its uni-class line. However, the development of such an "American Judaism" into an organic community would depend--as has been noted--upon the amount of hostile outside pressure that would increase the secular functions of this large class of American Jewry.

The generality of centralization has been taken apart. It was seen that class-line centralization is encouraged by centralization within the society itself...beginning with economic organization and going over to the social sphere. In the depression this was especially aided by the need for efficiency. Every class, but especially the neo-Orthodox and social welfare groups, was part of this trend. Today the most prominent manifestation of class-line centralization is the movement for an "American Judaism," based upon the growing homogeneity of the large Jewish middle-class. The general prosperity which provides financial backing for many organizations within a class seems to be retarding the class-line centralization in the Jewish middle-class. Also hindering this movement is the fact that there are still very definite layers within that class: the old middle-class, the successful new middle-class, and the less integrated lower middle-class.

The second type of centralization is organic...transcend-

ing class lines and establishing a semi-autonomous Jewish community with numerous secular functions. The success of this movement depends on hostile outside pressures that would turn the Jewish community into a more fully developed sub-culture. Naturally opposed to this plan would be the old middle-class whose efforts towards conformity have never abated. Favoring this movement would be Jewish professionals who depend on such a loyal secular Jewish community. Between these two were found many layers of opinion. The difficulties of establishing a democratic community in a world of anti-Semitism sufficient to draw the Jews together--these have also been discussed.

VI. TENSIONS WITHIN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY: 1929-1939.

In this chapter the following questions shall be discussed:

1. What is a "tension"?
2. What are the social roots of tensions common to all society?
3. What are the social roots of tensions peculiar to minority groups?
4. Why was there more tension in the thirties than in the twenties?

After stating conclusions concerning these questions, examples of the tensions of the thirties will be given to substantiate those conclusions. Then the different issues over which tensions were aroused will be examined and it will be discovered that any issue---from the most trivial matter to a serious problem--can be a peg on which to hang the tensions within the community.

What is a tension? Any difference of opinion among Jews may take the form of a tension. And there were many issues over which tensions arose during the thirties: how to handle anti-Semitism, what brand of Zionism or non-Zionism is best for the Jews, should there be mass meetings to protest Hitler...But in addition to the emotion placed on these important issues, there was a tremendous amount of bitter feeling expressed over matters that objectively were of little real significance: a statue of Haym Salomon, a letter from Julian Morgenstern to Bernard Richards. Fre-

quently the tension would be concretized in an institutional rather than in a personal controversy: the respective merits of the American Jewish Committee or the World Jewish Congress. And yet the amount of feeling generated over these personal or institutional squabbles often more than equalled the tension felt concerning much more important disagreements. An intra-Jewish tension is any disagreement between Jews, a disagreement clothed in antagonism.

What are the social roots of tensions? The conflict underlying the tensions is the conflict between different groups of Jews in America. Just as in general American society there are tensions between different social groups; so within the Jewish community there are conflicts between its classes. Not only do institutional controversies obviously reflect clashes in the needs and interests of different groups of Jews. But also personal controversies of the most unassuming nature also reflect those basic class antagonisms.

What are the social roots of tensions peculiar to minority groups. Superimposed over the class antagonisms that afflict the general society there is in every minority group an additional factor: antagonism between its more integrated and less integrated members. While there is general familiarity with "class warfare," the tension between the margin versus the core that is quite a problem in every phase of Jewish social structure calls for closer examination.

(For in Jewish society one group is always more (or less) accommodated than another.) Such an examination calls for an informal psychological detour...

A hypothetical John Q. Cohen is a member of the Rotary Club and a well-integrated Jew of the old middle-classes. His great goal in life has been conformity to the Gentile world (except, of course, in religion). He is no different in any other way; he prides himself on being a 100 percent American. And yet somewhere along the line the sweet success of his integration turned sour. Maybe an anti-Semitic remark was made in the Rotary or his son complained when he went away to college and had to join a Jewish fraternity. He is frustrated because his program of security through conformity has been thwarted. He could examine his program, but this would be attacking himself. He could attack the Gentile world but this would be violating his creed of conformity. So he is led to attack those Jews who have defied his god of conformity, those Jews who are more different--the perfect scapegoat. To reinforce this tendency there are the interests of his social groups: Perhaps these other Jews are trying to take over his own temple. And he hears from his national institutions that the national organizations of that other group should be discredited.

To summarize the factors behind the tension of the marginal group: an idolization of conformity, a frustration in the conformity program, and a release of the frustration against those who are less conforming--the only possible scapegoat.

But what about Haym who is in the less integrated core of the community? Why should he feel antagonistic towards Cohen? Haym has found his security in belonging to the core of the Jewish community. He may be a Reconstructionist or an Orthodox Jew. No matter. His place is deep within the Jewish structure. Whatever social reasons lie behind his being there, he is well-adjusted because he has a strong group with customs and mores that are Haym's customs and mores. And yet, "it's hard to be a Jew." Perhaps he wishes for more of the glamor of the majority group... perhaps he would like to leave his little store and see what goes on in a Rotary meeting, (although he would not admit this desire). So Cohen with his successful integration, challenges Haym's way of life. Instead of recognizing his own frustration (this would challenge his own way of life too much), he re-inforces his own position by calling Cohen a snob and by using big and little issues with which to attack John Q. Cohen.

Perhaps this psychological detour has facilitated an understanding of the social root of tension peculiar to the minority group: the more integrated versus the less integrated. But this factor is only superimposed on the basic antagonisms between every social class. On the basis of this psychological background the fourth question posed in this chapter may be answered:

Why was there more tension in the thirties than in the twenties? It has been shown that the amount of frustration

an individual feels determines the degree of antagonism he displays towards another. And it is pretty obvious that in the twenties there was less frustration of all kinds than there was in the thirties. With the general prosperity there was little provocation for Cohen and Haym to quarrel; both were generally happy. And their classes were not provoked, for with the blessings of the twenties all organizations could be strong enough to do their jobs and pay their executive secretaries. Evidence of the relation between sharing in prosperity and lack of tension was the antagonism expressed by a Socialist group, in the Vanguard, that was not sharing so much in the prosperity.

But with the depression there was much more frustration in the society...personal and institutional. Individuals having lost their money were looking for explanations and were finding scapegoats; institutions, on their last legs, were competing with other institutions for survival and so did not spare literary etiquette in attempts to discredit their rival organizations. There was increased anti-Semitism and the tensions that this created may have been channelled into expressions against fellow Jews.

Sufficient reasons have been given for the increase of tensions in the thirties, and theories regarding the social roots of those tensions have been presented. But now for the facts that prove this theorizing. It can be shown through the Anglo-Jewish press that there was a tremendously rapid increase of tensions in the thirties. It also can be shown that the tensions were grounded in the insecurities

of every social class within the Jewish community. (Imposed over the class antagonism there is always the shadow of the marginal-core minority group conflict). The final section of the chapter will demonstrate that the issue over which the tension is expressed can be great or trivial-- but the amount of tension springing from the social roots will still be there.

The American Hebrew took official notice of the emergence of tensions within the community. Early in 1932 it stated: we are emerging from the "shush" decade of unity-at-all costs. Religious groups are more aggressive in promoting causes. Frankfurter has given a frank definition of the nationalism implied in Zionism--"and the voice of debate and controversy may soon again be heard in the land."¹ This announcement was followed by a report of Stephen Wise's speech in Cincinnati on behalf of the Congress program. Wise called Rabbi Philipson an "archaeological specimen," and the American Israelite gave the following account.

In a perfervid peroration, suggestive of a July 4 Tammany harangue, Dr. Wise concluded by arousing the democratic spirit of the Russian proletariat of lower Avondale against the German Fascisti of Rose Hill, inciting them to rise in revolt and join up with the American Jewish Congress.²

And as early as 1930 the American Hebrew stated that the Jewish War Veterans should be opposed because its program amounts to self-segregation.³ Conformity was threatened: the margin versus the core. And tension was often released in a phrase, such as the "smart-aleck-Zionist-intelligentsia

talk" of Maurice Samuel.⁴ And, of course, there were constant attacks on the national organization of the rising Eastern European community--the American Jewish Congress: Its elections are not democratic. Candidates are selected by a board that is more oligarchic than Tammany.⁵ And so institutions had become a sounding board for underlying antagonisms.

Meanwhile in an article entitled, "Mr. Brown's Polish Slumming Party," Opinion accuses the publisher of the Hebrew of minimizing the miseries of the Polish Jews.⁶ And the Congress Bulletin attacks constantly its rival organizations: It scorns the American Jewish Committee's "paternalism and shtadlanut, the two attributes of the against-himself-divided-assimilationist." And in the next breath the Jewish Labor Committee is composed of "orthodox cosmopolitan Marxists who frown at the word Jewishness"--they don't represent the workers.⁷ And these leaders of Eastern European Jewry--the best integrated and wealthiest of that group--even cast barbs at the poorer middle-class Eastern European Jews--many of whom were probably members although not leaders of the Congress. The Bulletin speaks of Jews from the lower middle-class, yiddish speaking, who go to a higher social strata:

That rising immigrant element, which regarded certain outward forms of assimilation as a class distinction, could have brought from the old shuls into the new temples a much richer religious life if it had a deeper sense of spiritual values. But that sense too belonged to the immigrant life which was⁸ to be cast off at the entrance to the new edifice.

The inference seems to be that the rising element should remain spiritual immigrants rather than join the new temples.

Only the previous spring the Bulletin had objected to the "duplicate diplomacy" of the Federation of Polish Jews as they tried to act independently to deal with Polish-Jewish problems.⁹

The Forum took up the cudgels against the Congress. This small group of wealthy New York Jews had no organization for public relations purposes. They were certainly not represented in the "democratic" Congress. "How far from a majority of Jewry are represented in the Congress?" asks the Forum and goes on to say that the purpose of the Congress is to belittle anybody connected with the American Jewish Committee or any other rival organization.¹⁰ And yet the Forum, still hoping for representation, supported the 1938 elections of the Congress as the best attempt at democracy that is now available.¹¹ And finally there was a slap at the European-trained rabbis in an editorial claiming that the dignity of rabbis should not be lowered by suspicions concerning kashrus. The editorial favored unified control of kashrus.¹²

Even The Reconstructionist with its banner of unity may become antagonistic towards Jews who thwart their goal and security. Especially violent were its attacks against Rabbi Goldenson when he opposed the very idea of an all-inclusive-authoritative-representative Jewish agency.¹³ And even the Congress is rejected in its claim that it is representative.¹⁴

The anti-Zionist chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee in the name of the Committee and the Workmen's Circle refused to participate in the Congress elections. Why? There is no

need for the Congress' existence: no possibility of a real democratic election; the Congress has assumed to speak for the whole community without being elected by it; the motives of the Congress are political--to clinch leadership in Jewish life.¹⁵ The Congress is a racket: in its 1933 budget, out of \$17,834 only \$2,000 went to the purposes avowed by the organization.¹⁶ And The Workmen's Call attacks the Congress: do not participate in the 1938 elections, it urges. Why? Because the Congress represents simple Zionism. Also because the all-embracing Jewry idea overlooks the Jewish class structure.¹⁷

These charges are answered by the socialist-nationalistic labor group in the Frontier. After denouncing the statement of Goldenson who represents the "Fifth Avenue Jewish aristocracy," the editorial claims that the class differences (brought up by the Labor Committee) do not preclude a representative body.¹⁸ There is mild criticism of the Congress, because it needs to be democratically organized. Still the Congress is supported.¹⁹

It has been seen that whether the manifestation of the tension took the form of a speech against German Jews or an article against self-segregating Polish Jews or a tirade against a rival institution--the tension was certainly there in the thirties, much more so than in the twenties. It has also been seen that the pattern for the tension was the social structure of the community: it was tension not simply between individuals or even groups that didn't like one another, it was tension between a particular class and another class

that--for whatever reasons--challenged each other's security and welfare and usually the tension involved overtones of the antagonism between the more and the less integrated groups. Finally, every class is challenged at some point and therefore every class exhibits antagonism towards fellow-Jews.

Since class tensions inevitably occur under certain social conditions, the particular issue over which the tensions are expressed matters very little to the people who simply must release that tension. It may be an issue of vital importance to the community; it may be an issue laughable in its objective insignificance. And Baroque Italy was split asunder by the world-shaking problem: was the mikveh of Rovigo constructed according to Jewish law. The riddle of Rovigo was actually a struggle between the Venetian rabbis whose authority in the surrounding cities had been challenged. But the issue was hidden beneath the subtleties of Jewish law and the calm waters of Rovigo.

There is abundant evidence to prove that the tensions of the thirties did not need world-shaking issues for their expression. As soon as the tensions were there, the community seized on objectively insignificant episodes to give vent to its antagonism. When important issues were available, they provided more dramatic backgrounds for class antagonisms: the question of how to deal with Hitler was just as convenient a peg on which to hang class antagonism as was: should a statue be built in honor of Haym Salomon? A few of the most

obvious pretexts for class tensions will be examined.

On January 3, 1930, Rabbi Julian Morgenstern, president of the Hebrew Union College, responded to a letter from Bernard Richards of the American Jewish Congress. Mr. Richards had asked for the Rabbi's opinion concerning the plight of the Jews in Russia and concerning what might be done for them. Rabbi Morgenstern answered that the situation was very tragic and that it was unfortunate that Yevsektzia (the Jewish Communist Party) was striving for spiritual leadership with such reprehensible methods. Furthermore, it was unfortunate that Russian Jewry had no chance to find spiritual satisfaction in a liberal interpretation of Judaism.

This letter was made public and condemned by a large section of the Jewish press, led by the Congress and affiliates. Richards himself in the Index attacked Rabbi Morgenstern for his mention of liberal Judaism and his inference that all the Russian Jews needed was some Reform Judaism.²⁰ The Cleveland World joined in the chorus:

The American Jewish Committee is maintaining a policy of silence (regarding persecutions in Russia). The B'nai B'rith has long yielded its active leadership on public Jewish questions...

And Julian Morgenstern has one remedy: Reform Judaism.²¹ The Forum called Morgenstern "cowardly."²² And the New Palestine attacked him.²³ Morgenstern defended himself: he claimed he had been made a victim of politics--he really did not know what had hit him. And the American Hebrew, representing the class that really was being attacked, commented that the whole affair was "ludicrous." A spiritual professor had ventured

into worldly affairs and because of a remark springing naturally from his religious frame of reference had been used as a political football by the Congress and its friends.²⁴

A statue in the park. Even more ludicrous was the case of the patriotism of Haym Salomon. A committee of Polish Jews in New York decided that it would be very appropriate to have a statue erected in New York City, a statue of Haym Salomon--the great patriot of the American Revolution. (Salomon, incidentally, was the first known Polish Jew in America). They petitioned Rep. Celler, who asked for a report of all the facts. Stephen Wise, Judge Mack, and Max Kohler requested that the committee cease its activities until all the facts were known. About this time Samuel Oppenheim of the American Jewish Historical Society issued a statement that Salomon himself had not lent one cent to the United States government, that he was simply Robert Morris' broker, and that the United States was not an ungrateful country (since he rendered little service, the government had no financial obligation towards him). Perhaps it was this statement that stimulated Charles Edward Russel (probably hired by the committee--the only evidence is the word of the American Hebrew) to write a book called, Haym Salomon and the Revolution, in which derogatory facts--if they were facts--were omitted; that is, a praiseworthy picture of Salomon. This may have antagonized Max Kohler. So he revealed the following facts about Salomon: he was only a fiscal agent; he did not lend large sums of money. Not

even Robert Morris has a monument; why should assistant Salomon? In a letter to Rep. Celler, Kohler contended: "Monuments should not be built on the basis of fabricated evidence and concealment of material facts." The Polish Committee answered that a man who dies in poverty could not have been motivated by selfish interests.²⁵ The matter was eventually dropped.

The old middle-classes were in a dilemma as to what side to take. After all, their cry of Americanism among Jews had for years revolved around men like Salomon and Judah P. Benjamin. And yet, here was an issue involving the challenging group of Eastern European Jews who were rising to more prominence. Some of the old middle-class did take this issue and made the most of it--in the name of historical truth. The American Hebrew which provided much of the above account was fairly ambivalent. It presented the facts of the controversy. Even if the fine scholar Max Kohler, is right, nevertheless "this worthy man (Salomon) holds a place among the patriots of the revolution."²⁵

But The Forum was quick to seize the social implications. Why did Max Kohler wait until now to debunk Salomon?--

Whatever be the motives of Mr. Kohler in waking up in the 11th hour with his outcries against an unheard of honor to a Jew, be he of Polish or any other origin, there are sufficient reasons for making Haym Salomon an object lesson of patriotism...²⁶

Id isn't so--or, the sensuous schism. In 1934 a Don Gordon wrote an article for Opinion called "Jews in Hollywood." In this article he contended that the Jew's fundamental sensuality is inhibited by a set of severe moral

taboos. He is a good family man, not because he is under-sexed, but because the alternatives to good family life frighten him--so strongly do his moral taboos suppress his sensuality. His good family life is a reaction formation that reflects the opposite desires. Well, Sen. Alfred M. Cohen of the B'nai B'rith took this article seriously and wrote an indignant letter to Opinion asserting that Opinion was a horrible magazine for publishing such anti-Semitic and libelous drivel against the Jews.

Opinion answered the Senator by saying that he and his ilk have a "pathological hysteria in the face of criticism." After this social blast, it was necessary to defend the article and Jewish sensuality. This was done in an admirable manner: It is his sensuality which accounts "for the life force and survival impulse of the Jew as well as his creative genius."²⁷

Now that these pegs, on which social conflicts are hung, have been sawed down to absurdity, it is appropriate to turn to more important issues on which the tensions were suspended. Whenever an issue more important than a statue or letter is available, it is eagerly seized on. Such an issue was the World Jewish Congress controversy. This controversy fills the Anglo-Jewish press from 1931 through 1936. The stands taken by the different Jewish groups are evidence of their class needs; the epithets thrown by those same groups are evidence of their class frustrations.

Before examining briefly the reactions of the different groups, one should survey the history of the World Congress

movement in order to see what its success meant to the different groups. The World Jewish Congress, proposed in October, 1931, was a project of the American Jewish Congress.²⁸ The problems confronting Jews all over the world could best be dealt with by an organization representing all the Jews of the world. It was the American Jewish Congress idea on an international scale. The delegates to the World Congress would be elected under American Jewish Congress auspices, so the success of the World Congress would mean an international position of prominence for the American Jewish Congress. For American Jewry--the wealthiest in the world--through its delegates (as it came to pass: American Jewish Congressmen)--would have the dominant voice in the world deliberations.

At a conference in Geneva in August 1932, the World Jewish Congress was scheduled to meet in 1934. The Congress controversy was pushed into the background when Hitler's victory shocked world Jewry in 1933. In 1934 not a Congress, but a World Jewish Conference was held in Geneva. This was another defeat for Stephen Wise, who had just been defeated by Sokolow and the Weizman forces in the World Zionist Congress in 1933. In 1934 he was debating with his Zionist colleagues: Wise, Margoshes and Louis Newman favored the Congress; Lipsky, Rothenberg (president of ZOA), Fishman (editor of the Jewish Morning Journal), and Bernard Richards opposed it. In the debate Lipsky said that for sixteen years the American Jewish Congress had labored under the illusion that it was a Congress. The exist-

ing agencies are sufficient, cried Lipsky! One should not shout democratic platitudes when they are remote from reality. Stephen Wise claimed that Polish and Roumanian delegates wanted an immediate Congress and he protested (too much?) that this Congress would not be a rival to the World Zionist Organization.²⁹

Here is a clear example of intra-class tensions. Different individuals or parties within the American Jewish Congress class had reasons for favoring or disfavoring the World Congress at this time. The reasons below the phrases are difficult to find.

In 1935 the World Congress was again postponed, but Wise was elected president of the American Jewish Congress. Then it seems that some agreement was reached among the factions, since in September, 1935, the World Zionist Congress advocated the World Jewish Congress. By 1936 Lipsky was contradicting his words in the 1934 debate: now there was no other organization in the United States or abroad that could deal with the ramifications of the Jewish problem.³⁰ He made many speeches on this subject...and was a delegate to the World Congress. About this time the Congress brought out its intellectual heavy artillery and Horace Kallen wrote about "Democracy and the World Congress." A convention of 1000 (based proportionately on numbers in groups affiliated with the World Congress) were to select fifty delegates. Twenty more delegates were to come from national organizations as such.³¹ In August of 1936, the World Jewish Congress met.

While the Congress movement was progressing, what were the attitudes of the other classes in the Jewish community?

The old middle-classes were, of course, indignant. This Congress would serve no purpose but would confuse American Jews, destroy already existing institutions, create anti-Semitism, and even conflict with the authority of the United States Congress--so went the official argument of the American Jewish Committee.³² But it was left to the journalists to stir up the feeling--with such articles as "On Being Wise without Wisdom: a Modern Parable in which St. Stephen Seeks the Grail at Geneva where they Served Servetus with a Hot Stake."³³ The agitators are called "a willful group actuated by the limelight complex." This is the first step in world segregation in the "swastika sense."³⁴ This argument represents the familiar attack on those Jews who are "more different." The Congress is the "gravest blunder in the annals of American Judaism." It can do untold harm by giving proof to those who believe in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. This is the usual rationale for the attacks of the old middle-class: the belief that conformity has resulted in an alleviation of anti-Semitism and that those who stress their secular Jewishness help cause anti-Semitism. And it would certainly seem to a group which considered its salvation to be integration that this Congress movement would threaten its security. This, in addition to the challenge it presented to the American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith which were clinging to their leading positions in the American Jewish community.

The group behind the Jewish Forum has the same attitude towards the World Congress as they have towards the American Jewish Congress: reserved acceptance of the idea. Why? The Forum-class are not in the leadership circle, but they hope that with greater extension of democracy into the Orthodox ranks, they will find themselves in more prominent positions. It is good that the Congress will be the first body with the right to speak for all Jews, but it will be difficult to set up a democratic organization because of strongly entrenched national and international groups. The Geneva Conference of 1932 should have called not for a Congress but a Conference to assure an eventually democratic Congress.³⁵ But when the Congress was called in 1936, the Forum supports it even though it only represented 1/3 of all the Jews.³⁶

The Reconstructionist, having an immediate concern with an organic community here in America, is naturally a little cool to the more grandiose scheme. It makes the point that the American Jewish Congress itself is not representative. Rather than sponsor a larger parliament, it should join with the American Jewish Committee and organize American Jewry.³⁷ And this, indeed, would be much more in line with the needs of the federation leaders who want a well-organized American Jewry.

The Jewish National Workers Alliance was at first opposed to a World Congress, because it would have to be based on democratic organizations in every land--and such organizations did not exist. But once the Congress was called they

supported it by asserting that it has rung the knell on the power of the wealthy unauthorized American Jewish Committee. Still they bemoaned its lack of democracy. Of the Congress leaders the Frontier wrote:

After loudly calling for the overthrow of self-appointed notables who irresponsibly dominate Jewish public life, they quietly discouraged the preparations for popular elections.³⁸

And yet the delegates were generally the type that would have been selected by ballot. Naturally the nationalistic workers with a bourgeois tinged leadership felt that more democracy would mean a larger representation in the Jewish community for the working man and for the masses in Europe. So as right wing socialists in the good evolutionary tradition they joined in the capitalists' organization and cried for more democracy. The workers and lower middle-class were willing to ally with Eastern European upper-class leadership to oppose the American Jewish Committee.

The Jewish Labor Committee and the Workmen's Circle did not participate in the Congress movement. Although English periodicals of these groups during the World Congress controversy are not available, the reason for the strictly socialist stand is clear: the working classes alone are united. The nationalism that tries to unite Jews is an affair of the capitalists. And, especially among the leaders of the movement, there is the cry: Jews will solve their problems by uniting with the workers in the countries where they live...not through separatist and nationalistic activities. These were true Bundists.

It can be concluded from this study of the World Jewish Congress controversy that each group in the community responded in perfect accord with its supposed interests. But more than that. The controversy became a giant receptacle for the tensions felt in every group towards at least one other. And when the pot was stirred the mixture was an explosive controversy that boiled through 1936 and bubbled on until the end of the decade.

Several conclusions have been reached:

1. Due to different social forces there was a tremendous increase in the amount of tension within the American Jewish community, 1929-39.
2. There are social and psychological factors that set the more integrated against the less integrated within every minority group.
3. Every class within society is challenged at some point by another and so every class exhibits tension towards some other.
4. The issue over which the tension is expressed may be absurdly insignificant (a statue) or it may be important for the welfare of a class's institutions (World Congress).

It shall soon be seen how these same class-rooted tensions are expressed in discussions over really serious problems that confront the Jewish community: anti-Semitism in America, what to do about Hitler, Zionism...In this chapter the psychological and economic roots of these tensions have been discussed. There was no concern with the validity of

the World Congress idea or the true picture of Haym Salomon. From now on, there will be more interest in the validity of the different approaches to these more important problems. But this discussion may have demonstrated the psychological similarity between Jewish controversies revolving around issues large or small. Suffice it to say, the antagonisms within the community can be expressed in an argument over a statue, a Congress, or...a Hitler.

VII. NAZI GERMANY--REPERCUSSIONS IN AMERICAN JEWRY

What understanding did the American Jewish community have of capitalism in the most desperate crisis it has thus far experienced? This is more than an academic question of passing interest. The industrial capitalism of Germany which had not solved the problem of overproduction and which found itself without home or world markets had two alternatives: maintenance of capitalism through a totalitarian form of government which shatters labor and enforces the wage cuts necessary to stimulate production or a complete re-shaping of its social structure along non-capitalistic lines. If there had been sufficient wealth (buying power) within the country and the possibility of finding some new markets abroad, then inflationary methods such as were practiced in the New Deal would have stimulated "recovery." But as the world market was becoming saturated through the vast world productive mechanism and through the competition of other powers, and as there was insignificant buying power left at home (the inflationary measures which paid off some of the war debt had ruined the middle and lower middle-classes)--then there was nothing to do (for the German capitalist) but to cut wages. And this could only be done (since standards were already so low) under the protection of a fascist dictatorship. The alternative was a non-capitalistic social structure. So in Germany, capitalism reached its most desperate crisis. (The background of this crisis has been discussed in Chapters I and III.)

Since the problems of world capitalism are not confined by national boundaries, it is important that American Jewry and all America should understand the crisis of Germany. What segments of American Jewry saw Nazism as a result of a most desperate economic and social crisis? What segments did not grasp the causes of Nazism?

Anti-Semitism, was used by the Nazi leaders to take the minds of the Germans off the real cause of their difficulties (viz., their economic system) and to provide a mythical cause for the world war that had to be forthcoming. This channeling of the frustrations of the populace against the Jews has been utilized as government policy in every declining system where the Jews were numerous enough to be a convenient scapegoat. When the feudal world was in decline (14th to 16th century Germany, 18th and 19th century Poland, 20th century Russia), anti-Semitism became the official government policy. And with the downfall of the embryonic capitalisms of Renaissance Italy (when the Jews who had lent money to the impoverished Italian artisans could no longer be paid back, as early Italian capitalism was in a state of chronic depression), the official policy of the city-states became anti-Semitic. To what degree did the different classes in American Jewry understand the role of the scapegoat in a declining economy? Why did some classes misunderstand this role and what were their compensating attitudes?

The first section of this chapter therefore will deal with the degree of understanding that the different classes

in America showed with regard to what was happening in Germany:

1. Was Nazism seen as the answer to the most desperate crisis faced by the economic and social system of Germany?
2. Was anti-Semitism seen as the inevitable policy of a desperate government in a declining economy?
3. What extraneous causes were attached to German anti-Semitism and why?

The data used will be primarily the Anglo-Jewish press before Hitler gained power. Since the value of a particular historical analysis is enhanced by its predictive power, a comparison of analyses of the various classes can be gained by noting how they regarded the possibility of a Nazi regime. However, since some groups are not well represented in the press before March, 1933--reference will be made to articles written later in the decade which are pertinent to this inquiry.

What were the Jewish old middle-classes of German descent saying from 1930 through March 19, 1933, when the Reichstag abdicated? It will be seen that the nature of Nazism was completely misunderstood. Instead of attributing the rise of Hitler to economic forces, these groups stressed the "psychology" of the German people: first hailing this psychology as the bulwark against the clown Hitler and later damning it as the cause of the tragedy. Optimism was the dominant note, and German sensitivity to world opinion would soon change the bad situation. The Jews were needed as scapegoats, but this scapegoat role was only tem-

porary. Anti-Semitism was primarily a matter of the mind.

But let the American Hebrew speak for itself chronologically:

1930: (September, 19) "The successes of anti-Semitic parties in Germany possess no quality of permanence." Why? Germany would not want to lose the respect of the world, as Roumania and Hungary have done.

(October, 24): German Jews should not become panicky because of riots in the Reichstag. "Hitlerism cannot prevail in the Reich." Why not? because

(October, 3): The Germans are "not a people who leave revolutions."

In 1931, the Nazis suffered a minor setback in a Prussian plebiscite. While, said the Hebrew, this did not mean the shattering of the anti-Semitic party, it was a straw in the wind:

(August, 21): "...a saner spirit does prevail throughout the entire Reich."

(November, 20): --after further Hitler victories-- "Comfort is derived from Hitler's conference with Von Hindenburg. He will stop Hitler through a coalition cabinet. Besides, Germany does not want to be looked upon as a medieval state. When Hitler gains representation, he will no longer need the anti-Semitism!"¹

The sane (or insane) spirit is seen as the determinant of the fate of the Reich. The need of the capitalists for a fascist alliance is not seen, so the conference with Von Hindenburg becomes the chance for sane German capitalism to assert itself. The scapegoat role of the Jews is seen: however, it is seen as it was played in a rising capitalistic economy: the Jew was often the target for dissatisfied parties (French Catholics, Socialists, Populists) that were minority groups in the nation. The Hebrew hopes that when the minority Hitler party gains some success the need for

anti-Semitism will cease. However, it is not seen that Germany, in its chronic crisis, now is ready for a government-sponsored scapegoat.

Events moved rapidly in

1932:(January,15): "There are two possibilities: either the Teutonic temperament can be trusted or there will be a Hitler triumph followed by a clash with the communists.

(March,18): --after Von Hindenburg was re-elected -- "Faith in the stability and practicality of the German people was restored after the general elections last Sunday, even among those who, under the emotional influence of Nazi propaganda, doubted these momentarily."

(April,15): --after Hitler gained two million more votes-- "As the economic situation over there clears, so will the cohorts of the Swastika fade from the political picture."

(June, 10): --after Hindenburg dismissed Bruening and his cabinet--"Pessimism is warranted. Hitler may get a majority in the next election.

(November, 18): --after the famous election when the votes of the Nazis declined-- This is "a clear recession of the Nazi flood with indications that it is not likely to rise again to threatening heights... this result was not unexpected...The only combinations that can make for defeat of the government are like oil and water in their principles and cannot coalesce."

The alternatives of revolution to the right or left are not seen, but there is the belief that "Teutonic temperament" will allow things to continue as of yore. Capitalism and fascism in a time of crisis are not like oil and water. Again, the stress on characteristics of a people as determinants of its history.

And the few months just before the tragedy were taken especially calmly by the Hebrew...

1933: (February, 3): --after Von Hindenburg had appointed Hitler on January 31 to his cabinet-- "Von Hindenburg has copied Abraham Lincoln (!) and brought the enemy within the camp in order to control him. The 'ir-responsible agitator is taken off the street.' He will now be chained down to national sanity. Even the German Democratic Party's official bulletin states that Hitler is now 'an ex-corporal amidst a count and four barons...under the supervision of the foxy capitalist, Hugenberg.'"

(March, 10): --the Nazi-Nationalist coalition was now in the majority and there were rumors of the dissolution of the Reichstag-- Should the Reichstag adjourn, anti-Jewish legislation would be less likely with twelve responsible men running the country than with an assembly of 650 in charge! "Von Hindenburg -- sane, civilized, loyal to his constitutional oath will never descend to the status of a rubber stamp for Adolph Hitler."

--And when Hitler made public his condemnation of further anti-Semitic practices... -- This shows he is "attempting to slay the anti-Semitic beast with unequivocal warning to his followers." The beast is no longer of value now that the Nazis are in power. The American Jewish Congress is doing a disservice to German Jewry by demanding mass meetings at this time!

(March, 24) -- the anti-Jewish excesses that could not be denied began on March 20 -- The headline: "Outraged world must protest against Nazi barbarism." "Hitler has failed to subdue the anti-Semitic beast... German psychology doesn't change its spots."

Down to the very end there is the same false hope, the same misunderstanding of the Nazi phenomenon. An interesting twist is the confidence in "twelve responsible men" as opposed to 650--here perhaps is the spirit of the American Jewish Committee...that is, even in Germany democratic policies are to be achieved by a few intelligent and capable men at the top of society. And once the excesses have begun, the same factor that was to prevent them (the German mind) is seen as their cause: "German psychology doesn't change its spots."

So the old middle-classes did not see Nazism as the answer to a desperate chronic crisis. This failure to understand that Germany was on the eve of revolution to the right or left allowed the desperate hopes of the Hebrew to soar to optimistic heights. The failure to grasp the powerful forces at work within Germany allowed false hopes to be aroused as to German sensitivity to public opinion. Yet something had to be the cause so, in good middle-class tradition of the 19th century, the spirit of the people was either good or bad. The same pattern is seen in the attitude towards anti-Semitism. Some economic factors were dimly perceived but--due to the misunderstanding of the whole Hitler phenomenon--not in their full light. So what was causal? Again, the mind. And the Hebrew comments about "Brutal Roumania" in 1930, that "typical also of the Roumanian mind" was desecration of cemeteries.² And the answer to anti-Semitism in Roumania was to be public education.³ Despite a Bulgarian student riot, "there is nothing fundamental in Bulgarian life or tradition that can turn the masses against the Jews of the country."⁴

The fallacy of such a purely idealistic analysis is evident in the light of the data of history. The English "spirit" was of one quality in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when Jews would lend large sums to noblemen, king, and clergy, and could be paid back easily by their debtors in this golden age of feudalism. Then were Jews treated well, and Britain breathed a free spirit. But in the 13th century British peers were hard-pressed financially, for

already the embryonic middle-class was attracting a larger proportion of the wealth in society. Feudalism was on its decline. And the noblemen could not pay back their Jewish creditors. Edward II even forbid nobles to borrow money from Jews. Jews were forced into petty lending. There were ritual murder accusations and finally after severe taxation the expulsions. The spirit of Britannia had changed. The spirit of England changed again when after several centuries, Charles II and William of Orange saw Britain's future in an economy of mercantilism. In this society, all money possible was attracted to one's country--lest a rival country would acquire that money and would then be able more successfully to compete in the race for world gold through colonization. And especially Sephardic Jews had money. So the spirit of England welcomed them. The stresses of contemporary England have given a market to Sir Robert Mosley. So just what is the British spirit? Obviously the degree to which a nation grants freedom is dependent on the social conditions existing in the nation at the particular time--and not on any abstract spirit. Tracing the history of the Jews in Germany there was the same so-called spirit of freedom when Jews were international traders and big money-lenders, but there was the withdrawal of that spirit when the feudal system declined. So, why--in flat contradiction to historical analysis--is the spirit of a nation manufactured and used to explain social phenomenon?

The use of the "spirit" of a nation, in this manner, was especially in vogue in the 19th century. It was part of

the rising industrial nationalism: the rulers of Western Europe had to rally their people around the nation. Why not appeal to the spirit? Furthermore, the romanticism and return to the past (especially of the early 19th century) were results of a reaction of much of Europe to the Napoleonic threat. Feudal rulers in Germany appealed to the German folk soul and tried to retain their power. Also the rising middle-class used the national spirit as their rallying point.

Into the Judaism of the old middle-classes of German descent came this idea in the form of the Mission of Israel. So this class with its intellectual background of the 19th century was very well versed in the ways of "a people's spirit!"--be it the Jewish, American, German, or Bulgarian people. If the true explanation of the Nazi phenomenon could not be perceived by this class, it is not surprising that they would turn to the people's spirit as an explanation.

But why the initial misunderstanding that led to the fallacies of optimism and the German spirit and sensitivity to world opinion? This is a very serious question, since it is important, even more, it is crucial for the middle-class to have an understanding of capitalism in its moment of severest crisis. The German middle-class supported Hitler and Fascism. Will the middle-classes of Europe look to the Rightist parties in their present crises or to parties that look for a more progressive social order? Where will the American middle-class turn in its moments of crisis? The old middle-class, we have seen, did not understand the phe-

nomenon of German capitalism in its most desperate crisis?
Why not?

The Jewish old middle-class would have undermined its own confidence and program had it perceived what was really happening in Germany. This group was composed of successful well-integrated merchants who had ridden the crest of the American capitalistic wave. Their success and integration were based on the continued flourishing of American capitalism. To admit that capitalism had within itself the possibilities of developing into fascism was to hint that even American capitalism might become more oligarchic and produce the prejudice that would rob the Jewish old middle-class of its integration and financial success. These descendants of German Jews were very close in spirit to their old middle-class German brethren. The immediate reaction (conscious or not): could what happened to the well-integrated and successful Herr So-and-So happen to me? This reaction is immediately suppressed by a complete negation of the economic factors involved in the German debacle and by a tenacious seizure on the German spirit as the explanatory key. But first, of course, there was the desperate wish that Hitler is not so, hence the extreme optimism.

Simply being members of America's old middle-class would be enough to turn the minds of this group away from reality. But their Jewish affiliation may have made their flight from reality more desperate and their view more distorted.

It is conceivable that a class which had erred so in its analysis of so crucial a crisis would, after the crisis, re-

examine its analysis to discover wherein its analysis fell short. So it is appropriate to ask: after the reality of Hitlerism, did the Jewish middle-class of German descent gain a clearer comprehension of the phenomenon?

In the Hebrew of December 22, 1933, it is pointed out that Hitler had fertile soil in the German people. Germany never was a civilization in the sense that England and America are:

Can one conceive of an Englishman or an American doing what the Germans are now doing? Can one imagine a Frenchman being so brutal?⁵

Here is clearly seen the fact that the crucible of experience did not refine the understanding of the phenomenon: Again, it must be a matter of the mind of the people; this assures the old middle-class that it cannot happen here.

Occasional bursts of optimism in the later thirties show that the lesson has still not been learned:

(After Von Papen was dismissed as vice-chancellor in Hitler's effort to show his capitalist allies that he was in control, the Hebrew wrote in June, 1934): German fascism may be cracking up. German public opinion is slowly recovering her breath. "The free play of ideas among men cannot be suppressed."⁶

And in August, 1938: Do not despair, writes William Zuckerman.

(Nazi anti-Semitism) is fundamentally not a real product. It does not flow from the depth of the people's interest and feeling.⁷

So deep was the need for a misunderstanding of the phenomenon that the failure of predictions, the dashing of optimistic hopes, and the inadequacy of analysis could not bring about a re-evaluation of that analysis.

To what degree did the new middle-classes of Eastern European background understand the Nazi phenomenon? In the

press of this group, less frequent notice is taken of the Hitler crisis in its early days (1930-1931) than in the press of the old middle-class. But there was enough expression of opinion to warrant a few conclusions.

In the Index of 1930:

If Hitler should succeed in his ambition to establish a Fascist dictatorship in Germany, it would undoubtedly constitute the greatest calamity for German Jewry. (However, this is) not very likely (since Hitler will never join the National Party).⁸

Opinion, in 1932, saw in Germany a "ghastly outlook" that was obvious---said Stephen Wise---to all save the professional optimists. Hitler may not succeed, but the forces of hate will continue.⁹ But by March of that same year (after Von Hindenburg was re-elected), Opinion felt a "lightening of the heart"---while the Hebrew also had its "faith in the stability and practicality of the German people" renewed. But Opinion cautions that Hitler is "more formidable in partial defeat" than in triumph.¹⁰

Thus far it will be noted that the new middle-classes, while not indulging in the excessive optimism of the old middle-classes, did not demonstrate a grasp of the Nazi phenomenon and did echo---albeit faintly---some of the misconceptions of the old middle-class analysis. No inkling is given that Nazism and its concomitant anti-Semitism is based on the effort of a decaying, economic and social system to preserve itself in the face of chronic crisis. The belief that Hitler is more formidable in defeat shows little understanding of government-sponsored anti-Semitism

in a state suffering from chronic depression. The extreme optimism of the old middle-classes is decried, but the new middle-class is swayed to optimism by the Hindenburg election and speaks not in terms of economic forces but of forces of hate...that is, the psychological approach.

But from May 2, 1932, the new middle-class press takes on a different tone. Hitler had gained two million votes in the Spring election. The Hebrew was saying that as soon as the economic situation clears, the Swastika will fade... and after November expressed extreme optimism. But the new middle-class saw by May 2 that: "The dread event has come to pass. Hitler is in power."¹¹ The answer is unashamed self-defence. And from this point on, the new middle-class attacked the old middle-class for its foolish optimism (do not be fooled by the fact that Hitler has joined Hindenburg; Hugenburg is a slight brake¹²). From this point on, the new middle-class prepared for boycott and suggested that this was all the more reason for a World Jewish Congress.

This seems to be an intuitive foreboding. There is no analysis of the factors underlying the anti-Semitism. There is an emotional reaction to the obvious tragedy, the bitter recognition of a new middle-class not too many years away from the Czar.

Only after Hitlerism was well-established and only after (significantly) the American depression had given cause for reflection--in April of 1934, did Opinion see Hitlerism as an economic phenomenon:

Its roots are deeply and inextricably entwined in that capitalistic economic order which is itself the contradiction and the foe of freedom of human brotherhood, of peace.¹³

The fate of the German Jew is the "logical, almost automatic" fate of any minority group when social revolutionary forces are thwarted by reaction. We should beware of the fascism that does exist in America and that advocates "politer forms of dictatorship,"¹³

And so, the new middle-class which (it will be remembered) reacted to the American depression with radical analyses of American society--although their practical program did not flow from their radical theory--, this new middle-class also eventually reacted to the German chronic crisis with the same radical analysis. It is interesting that this class' attitude towards the American and German crises is similar in a number of ways: Before the crisis there was no awareness of the economic factors involved--there was acceptance of American prosperity; there was also the substitution of idealistic fallacies for economic facts in the analysis of Germany up to May, 1932. Then after the crisis occurred, there was radical analysis of both American and German society. (It was seen that the new middle-class which suffered so in the depression did mouth socialist phrases and its technocratic theories called into question the existing social order). But the practical program relating to the American and German crises did not flow from the radical analyses. (It was seen that no practical revolutionary philosophy was seriously suggested during the ^yDepression but the new middle-class

helped Roosevelt doctor up the existing social order). Similarly, as will be shown more clearly, the remedies for Hitlerism suggested by this class did not flow from their analysis of the phenomenon.

How were the attitudes of the new middle-class affected by the interests and needs of that class? The new middle-class would naturally be slow to call into question the very society on which its prosperity has been built. But being extremely sensitive to crisis, it will under certain conditions become very disillusioned and theoretically question its society. But when there is no acute crisis (as it appeared to American Jewry in 1930-1 Germany), it will show extreme reluctance before launching into an economic analysis of its society. Hence, such misunderstandings as: Hitler is more formidable in defeat, optimism after the Hindenburg election. Also, after the crisis has struck, while there is radical analysis, there is not a program consistent with that analysis, because the new middle-classes are ultimately committed to that system which has given them their place in the sun.

But the new middle-class did not share the extreme optimism of the old, did not share the complete stress on the temperament of the German people. For the new middle-class admitted that it could happen here. They admitted this in their Zionist ideology and in their economic analyses of the German and American depressions. They had just fled from a land of oppression, and they did not have behind them the long tradition of integration. So anti-Semitism was an

accepted fact in their existence. Why could it not happen in America? Since the new middle-class could admit the possibility (not the inevitability) of American anti-Semitism and could accept rejection by the Gentile world as part of the facts of Jewish life, there was no necessity for them to swing to the hopeful optimism or the it's-all-in-the-mind attitude of the old middle-class. The old middle-class needed to preserve its belief that integration in American society was the inevitable American way and that anti-Semitism could not happen here. Because the new middle-class did not have these needs, it did not embrace to such an extent the rationalizations of its more integrated co-religionists.

What were the New York manufacturers and small creditors, the supporters of neo-Orthodoxy and the Jewish Forum, saying about Hitlerism?

(July, 1931) There appears to be a tendency to view the Hitler movement as of only temporary nature. It is true that Hitler's seed could bear such abundant fruit only in times of economic despair. But it must be borne in mind that the business depression in Germany, which was so conducive to National Socialist doctrines, is not a temporary occurrence. Germany's economic hardships are not due to a previous period of over-production, but are attributable to the losses incurred by Germany during and after the war.¹⁴

(And in October) Such economic difficulties make for extremist political movements, and the future must be viewed pessimistically.¹⁵

(And in November) A great number of German industrialists and businessmen, too, are not free from responsibility. Without the financial support of these circles, Hitler would have been doomed to failure...One may wonder at the inducements offered to industries to support a political movement which claims to oppose capitalism.¹⁶ (The solution proposed in this article was to abolish all reparations.)

In May, 1932, while calling those who claim Hitlerism is a "passing phase" ostriches with their heads in the sand, the Forum maintains that "political parties are the outgrowth of economic conditions and sociological changes." And these are the conditions in Germany: World War I losses, inflation, reparations, and the spread of cartels eliminating the middleman.¹⁷

As for the role of the Jew as scapegoat:

(Nazism) aims to make the Jew the target of mass hatred, diverting the punishment of those guilty for the misfortune of the masses, to the Jews.¹⁸

So economic factors are definitely seen as the causes behind Nazism. And there is no delusional optimism in a whole series of articles on the situation in Germany. Why? These are manufacturers and small creditors talking. They are more likely to think in terms of economic factors than are the middle-classes with their relatively limited contacts with the relations of production! Furthermore, the recent flight of this group from lands of oppression plus their familiarity with economic relations would not allow the optimism of the old middle-classes. They are very familiar with a government policy that diverts the masses' frustration against the Jews; the scapegoat is understood.

However, the economic factors that underlay Nazism are not those economic factors which are stressed! The desperate need of an economic system that is in severe crisis, the desperate need to survive even at the cost of embracing Fascism is not understood by the Forum. Instead it views Nazism as a movement which opposes capitalism! German

economic hardships were caused by the failure of that European country with the most powerful forces of production to find markets for that production. This failure was certainly hastened by German losses in the first World War. But the losses of the first World War were not the primary cause as the Forum would indicate...though those losses certainly contributed to Germany's crisis. It might be suggested that the World War I theory of the Forum is stressed, because America (which won the War) is, therefore, in no danger of a similar catastrophe.

The manufacturers of consumer-goods industries and small creditors were certainly flourishing in American society. Any analysis that would call into question that society would also cast doubt on their continued prosperity. Therefore, capitalism is opposed to fascism and a World War I defeat is the cause of German crisis.

The understanding of Nazism is further affected by the religious and social attitudes of the neo-Orthodox group. German Jewry, it is claimed, lacks the idealism for the struggle, idealism possessed by Eastern European Jews. This lack derives from eight decades of assimilation, and from a desire to "delegate Jewishness to an inconspicuous corner." They are so pro-German that they will not make the necessary protestations.¹⁹ What is more, this assimilation, this sin of apostasy has actually caused the persecution! The prayer u-mipnay hato-enu ("because of our sins") is cited to show that because of the "renunciation of the glories and duties of the past," Nazism has arisen in Germany.²⁰ These are fairly

obvious distortions springing from those social tensions discussed above.

How did the labor groups view the crisis in Germany? Although there were many divisions within the Jewish laboring class, during the period of Hitler's rise, all of these groups were to some extent expressing a socialistic ideology. And so, the interpretation of events in Germany given by intellectual socialists Charles Ervin and Ludwig Lore, foreign experts of the Advance, was in the early thirties the interpretation of Jewish labor in general. What was the attitude of the Advance towards the rise of Hitler?

(July 31, 1931) (The Dawes and Young Plans are trying to keep life in a condemned man until the date set for his execution. The financial and industrial lords are in a plight:) Not only do the forces of socialism and communism menace their privilege but a middle-class, ruined by the aftermath of the war, is throwing in its lot with the Fascist movement led by Hitler. (German depression needs more than a moratorium on debts.) Unless demands are radically cut, a revolution is sure. And this coming from either Right or Left means another war.²¹

The criminal foolishness of the world war and the essential weakness of the capitalist system have to be liquidated. The near future is big with events that will further change the face of the world.²²

Germany has her pollyannas the same as we have in the United States. They see "trends" towards better times in the same way that our White House and the Chamber of Commerce see them. "Trends" don't put food in people's mouths nor warm clothes on their backs.²³

Fascism was in Italy, and will be in every other country, the last force to which capitalism will take recourse in the face of the oncoming forces of labor. It is likely to be the last, and in all probability, the strongest bulwark of the employing class against the aspiration of the toiling masses for liberation from exploitation and oppression.

It will not be long before the bourgeoisie parties will have to recognize the victory of Fascism by admitting one or several National Socialists into the government. The participation of the Hitlerites in the government will undoubtedly subject the Jews in many ways to indignities and hardships...Fascism is a very real danger to labor, especially to organized labor. Capitalism in Germany feels itself endangered by the growing strength and militancy of the working masses. Prompted by fear, all parties of capitalism, the Liberals, the Conservatives, and the Catholic Center Party will unite in supporting Fascism in the task of destroying the house that labor has built for its own protection and the preservation of the best in civilization.²⁴

All of this in the year 1931!

In 1932, anti-Semitism is called the "trump card of fascism" and Ludwig Lore fears that American progressive labor will be called on to perform a duty of international solidarity to gain admission for Jewish refugees into this country.²⁵ In February, 1933: "There is no fundamental difference between the reactionary non-fascists and the fascist reactionaries." The communists are attempting to wreck the Social Democrat party.²⁶

All of these expressions come from the Advance. ILGWU's Justice--with as large a proportion of Jews in the union as in the ACWA--is virtually silent concerning the Nazi crisis. Owen Darragh writes in 1932 "How Wage-Cutting Has Brought Germany to the Brink of Ruin": wage-cutting means more profit to industry; this means more machinery, which means more unemployment.²⁷ But Jewish considerations do not seem to enter into the policy of ILGWU's Justice as much as in the Hillman publication. Why this should be is an open question.

Returning to the Advance, one is struck by the accuracy

of its predictions. While all other groups in 1931 were completely blind to the possibility of a coalition between the industrialists and the Hitler forces with a resulting fascism, the Advance saw this as not only likely but inevitable as the industrialists would try to save themselves: "all parties of capitalism...will unite in supporting Fascism." The middle class was seen as throwing in its lot with the big capitalists to save the system through fascism. The possibility of revolution to Right or Left is recognized, and either way the end result would be war. The need for a scapegoat under fascism is seen. The possibility of a Jewish refugee problem is envisioned. The destructive role of the communists is understood. Fascism is analyzed as the most desperate resort of a capitalist system in chronic crisis...which leads to the statement: "There is no fundamental difference between the reactionary non-fascists and the fascist reactionaries."

So while the old middle-class was indulging in frantic optimism and in tirades against the German spirit, and while the new middle-class was paying little heed to the problem, the labor groups as early as 1931 were acutely aware of the tragedy that was about to strike and had an accurate understanding of the nature of Nazism! The final test of historical analysis is in its predictive power, and the writers in the Advance were among the very few who passed the test and showed an understanding of the world-wide depression!

The ability to understand current historical forces affecting a given system is possible only when the analyst is

not committed to that system. These socialist spokesmen for labor were not bound to the capitalistic system and so their minds were free from the necessity of giving a partial analysis in order not to challenge the existing order. Furthermore the threat of fascism to the working class is direct and immediate.

How did the American Jewish community react in practical terms to the Hitler regime? The degree to which the different Jewish groups understood the tragedy has been discussed. But does each group's plan of action spring from its understanding of Nazism? It has been seen how the degree of understanding is affected by the group's social status. Is the same influence clear with regard to a plan of action to counter Hitler?

What type of reaction would flow from the understanding of Nazism that historical perspective and scientific analysis have given us? With Nazism understood as the last resort of a capitalist nation in chronic crisis, it becomes clear that the answer to Nazism would be the replacement of the ruling fascist-capitalist class by another social order. That this would be done by a coalition of capitalist powers is highly unlikely, since their own position would be challenged by a non-capitalistic state. (And, indeed, the appeasement policy of the Western Powers stemmed from the fear of the overthrow of the German social order. Furthermore, the action of the United States after the war in blocking the socialization of the Ruhr and in re-instituting the old industrialists in their old positions bears out the conclusion that a coalition of capitalist states would not solve ultimately the problem

of Germany). Encouragement of revolutionary elements within Germany and a weakening of the German state economy would be, it seems, a logical although futile program. For the capitalist nations which have the power to crush Germany would not leave her to the mercies of a new social order. And there was no way to encourage the revolutionary elements within Germany.

There is a short range program that would aim not at a solution of the German problem but at the quickest possible relief for the suffering people of Germany...even at the price of a renewed rule by a few industrialists as is now being established. This program would involve the quickest possible intervention by the other world powers to put an end to the Nazi rule. Since a German war economy would eventually conflict with the economic needs of the other nations--war was inevitable. Until that conflict should come, a weakening of the German state economy through other means would be some insurance for the victory of the non-fascist powers. In this light, an effective boycott could conceivably have weakened Germany.

Germany had made of southeastern Europe a group of economic colonies. The government had taken over foreign trade, and this government monopoly plus the proximity to southeastern Europe were sufficient to control the trade in that area. The great effort of the economy was the achievement of autarchy. Cellulose wool, synthetic oil and rubber were being made. But the German economy was a long way from self-sufficiency. Germany was a debtor nation and to pay for the imports that were necessary for her arms-

economy she had to do a big exporting business..." and there was a great danger that Germany's exports would not prove sufficient to pay for all the imports she needed for her re-armament program."²⁸ It follows that a successful and large-scale boycott of German exports would be of some effect.

History has shown that the mass meetings which were meant to arouse the conscience of the world did not affect the decision of the world powers to take strong action against Germany. For as long as Britain and France did not feel challenged by Nazism, they continued appeasement. And the United States State Department exercised extreme caution in protecting German trade interests until a definite shift was taken in the direction of a firmer foreign policy. It has also been shown²⁹ that the Voice of America, the protests of Roosevelt, were words that the German government did not mind so long as they were not backed by action. The so-called German sensitivity to world opinion was a pipe-dream.

The remainder of this chapter will deal with the problem: what groups within the Jewish community advocated boycott, mass meetings, and Voice of America techniques...and why. To be sure, there were other reactions: Advocacy of the preparedness program (it will be remembered that the Jews reacted virtually along class lines.). The Stalinist United Front (this is important enough to be dealt with in a special chapter on Communism). Zionism or Territorialism (this will be dealt with in a chapter on Zionism).

What were the reactions of the old middle-class of

of German descent? Regarding the boycott, there was a mixed reaction. The official position of the American Jewish Committee and the B'nai B'rith Grand Lodge was in opposition to the boycott, but many rabbis of this group and eventually the American Hebrew favored the boycott.

The Committee and B'nai B'rith issued a joint statement:

Governed by the known wishes of the Jews of Germany as well as by our own judgment of the effect of certain activities, notwithstanding our own keen sense of outrage...we counseled against public agitation in the form of boycotts and mass meetings.³⁰

Such agitation, continues the statement, are futile and ineffective channels for the release of emotion. They give pretexts for the prejudice to bigots, and they distract those who should look for more constructive methods. The Hebrew at first agrees with this attitude and cries for justice, not revenge!:

Let not us Jews be seized with the Hitler madness. Let us cease the irresponsible agitation for the boycott of Germany and German goods.³¹

A shift in the attitude of the Hebrew is soon noted. By May 19, 1933, the editor was sympathetic to a boycott by non-Jews. And on September 29, the Hebrew urged the American Federation of Labor to boycott Germany. By March 16, 1934, the Hebrew opposed only the secondary boycott, that is, boycott of stores that sold German goods: this was using Hitler's tactics. And on January 3, 1935, the Hebrew, attacked for its anti-boycott stand, claimed that it had only opposed an all-Jewish boycott. Among the rank-and-file of the old middle-class there was a split regarding the boycott, but the impression given by meager evidence

is that a majority of the group favored the boycott while the leadership opposed it. Rabbis Irving Reichert and Ephraim Frisch of the Classical Reform school favored the boycott.³² Judge Proskauer opposed the boycott and stated that the observance of a boycott that interferes with American business transactions is opposed to one's duty as an American citizen!³³

It has already been noted that the Committee and B'nai B'rith opposed mass meetings. The Hebrew gave consistent support to this stand: German Jews who have displayed their patriotism through solemn protests resent Stephen Wise's passionate talks. These meetings only give Hitler more material.³⁴ The B'nai B'rith urged that discretion is the better part of valor and added that some of the finest German Jews are members of B'nai B'rith. Public protests may harm them. Anti-Semitism has happened before in Germany, and Jews have survived.³⁵

The Voice of America or the Conscience of the World--these expressions of public opinion were widely hailed by the old middle-class as very effective weapons against the Nazis. Before the worst Nazi atrocities, the B'nai B'rith Magazine, in its April-May, 1933 issue, claimed that public opinion had so far restrained Hitler. And after the excesses began, public opinion was deemed the great chance for the Jews. Publisher Brown of the Hebrew wrote an article entitled, "Roosevelt and Hoover Can Influence Hitler." The American leaders are urged to protest for the sake of American interests in German trade and for the sake of Ameri-

can interests in German trade and for the sake of American investments in Germany.³⁶ The value of public opinion was not limited to German anti-Semitism. But after an outbreak of Polish persecution and after protests from various quarters in America, Rabbi Ferdinand Isserman wrote:

Outspoken criticism of Poland in this country... will have the desired effect of inducing the government to restrain the extremist Polish elements.³⁷

The United States government protested the German attack on the B'nai B'rith. This protest would stir the conscience of the civilized world.³⁸ In 1938, the Evian Conference on refugees made it perfectly clear that no nation would open its doors to a sizable number of victims of persecutions. But the Committee's Record hailed Evian as "heartening... for enunciation of principles."³⁹ Related to the stress on public opinion is the faith in facts. The Anti-Defamation League informed the world that 100,000 Jews were in the German Army in World War I.⁴⁰

In the chapter on Tensions the characteristic fear of being obviously too different and the idolization of conformity of the old middle-class was explained. This underlies the objection to showy mass meetings, to an all-Jewish boycott, and to a boycott that would be opposed to American policy and therefore unpatriotic. (Although the boycott would not violate the sense of conformity so much as would the mass meeting.)

The psychological view of anti-Semitism held by the old middle-class has been explained. Unable to grasp the

economic factors, this group turned to the spirit of the people as causal. Just as a nation has a conscience, so the world has a conscience. And the United States, the citadel of freedom for the old middle-class, by its protests can stir the conscience of the world. When Germany sees that the civilized world is against her, the spirit of Goethe and Heine will re-awaken. Therefore, government protests and even publication of facts are helpful. The government protests can best come when handled by a few men who are accustomed to dealing with government officials...mass meetings are unnecessary. And so, the faith in public opinion is based on the inability of the group, because of its social status, to understand the real causes of the crisis and the natural substitution of "spiritual" or psychological factors. The futility of this approach has already been discussed for the conscience of the world, Chamberlain and Daladier, were fearful of social revolution should Hitler be opposed. But it can be said that the program of the old middle-class did flow from its particular understanding of the German crisis.

A boycott, so long as the AF of L joined, would be very appealing to all but the most sensitive of the old middle-classes. However sensitivity to being different could hardly be the primary factor behind the consistent stand of the Committee, the B'nai B'rith and men like Judge Proskauer. A hint is given as Judge Proskauer is fearful of losses that may affect certain investments in Germany and American business transactions. It would be the leader-

ship of the old middle-class that would have considerable investments in Germany--the country of their forbears. And it would be, then, this leadership that should be most cautious regarding any really harmful act against Germany such as a boycott! For the German reprisals against the boycott might easily affect Jewish-American investments in Germany. Furthermore, the wealthiest of the old middle-class were connected with industries and interests that had investments in Germany. There is more evidence than Proskauer's hint: Ludwig Vogelstein (cited below) vigorously opposed boycotts and mass meetings. He was an industrialist, born in Pilsen, and chairman of the American Metal Co., Ltd. He was called by his opponents, a representative of German Jewish bankers.⁴¹ In this light perhaps the division between the old middle-class leaders and its rank-and-file (a division that will also be noticed in the analysis of Zionism) can be better understood.

What was the program of the new middle-class? The B'nai B'rith Messenger of Los Angeles, representing the "rank-and-file" new middle-class membership that was rebelling against the Grand Lodge claimed that the Committee and the Grand Lodge had interfered with a successful boycott. The boycott is certain to bring the German people to their senses.⁴² Jews will gain and not lose the respect of the world through the boycott.⁴³ And in April, 1934, Opinion offers evidence that the boycott is working: Macy's and Woolworth's have stopped buying German goods because of con-

sumer resistance. A few rabbis in the Conservative Rabbinic Assembly opposed the boycott as a "not reliable weapon."⁴⁴ But the dissent to the boycott in the new middle-class was so small as to be insignificant. The Congress and its adherents were behind the boycott.

The leadership of the new middle-class was the spearhead of the mass meetings. The Congress Courier hailed a protest march led by Bernard Deutsch and Stephen Wise on May 10, 1933--book-burning day.⁴⁵ In an April, 1933 editorial, Opinion asks "What Shall be Done?" In addition to financial help for refugees and appeals of the United States government and League of Nations and the boycott, the mass meeting renders a service that is not measurable. However "the will and the words of the men who addressed it constitute a memorable record." An editorial, written in July, 1933 gives some support to the above inference of economic factors' being behind the old middle-class leadership's opposition to boycotts and protest meetings. The statement is further indication of the tremendous antagonisms that were aroused between the Jewish groups over this issue, antagonisms that--it will be recalled--would hang on any intellectual peg, important or not. Ludwig Vogelstein at the Union of American Hebrew Congregations had stated that the protest meetings are of no avail and violate the "amenities of western civilization." Vogelstein is called by Opinion a representative of German Jewish bankers. This is followed by the generalization that criticizes:

...willful and tyrannical Prussians who are Germans first, some sort of Americans second, and no sort of Jews third except as they use the Reform Temple as a shield wherewith to guard themselves against the contamination of brotherhood with all non-German Jews. (May the) contemptible gesture of Stadlanut mark the beginnings of the end of the Bavaro-Prussian-Jewish regime in American life.

And so, in the heart of a controversy that concerns the fate of world Jewry there is clear indication of those intra-Jewish tensions that are grounded in a struggle for power within the Jewish community: the end of the German "regime" is the climactic hope.

What was the attitude of the new middle-class towards the Voice of America and the Conscience of the World? This group has a strong belief in the efficacy of the Voice and the Conscience, but this faith is shaken at times during the thirties. In February, 1936, Opinion ranked the McDonald Report with J'accuse and the Balfour Declaration. James G. McDonald, High Commissioner of the Commission on Jewish and Other Refugees from Germany, resigned and gave forth a statement that attacked German barbarism. He was called another soldier in the war for humanity. This report, it was asserted, will arouse public opinion against Hitler. Roosevelt's address to Congress in January, 1938 was deemed all the more powerful because it did not mention Hitler by name!⁴⁶ And, of course, once America and the world had become aroused to the danger of Hitler, in 1938, the verbal protests of world leaders were hailed with even more enthusiasm:

The very outburst of righteousness sounded like a new lease on life to a people whose existence depends on righteousness.⁴⁷

However, there is not complete idealization of the Voice of America. Cordell Hull's opposition to the boycott was attacked by Opinion in October, 1934. In 1937, the State Department had to apologize to Germany for the aggressive remarks and actions of Mayor LaGuardia. Opinion in April of that year again was displeased with the American government. But the clearest statement of the disillusionment of the new middle-class in its faith that the conscience of the world would rise up in wrath against Nazism is an editorial in the Congress Bulletin of December 3, 1937, an editorial that is tragic in its bitter awakening from a delusion:

We could not visualize a democracy in whose interest it would be to help stabilize Nazism and discuss with it areas of expansion...Today we are the forgotten victims of a barbaric regime which is dictating its own terms to civilization. Our continuous victimization will not in one iota change the treaties to be drawn up between Nazism and Democracy.

Four and one half years ago we arose to the struggle against Nazism in the belief that allied with us were not only groups and elements in this and other democratic countries, but the countries themselves, their peoples and their governments...To the democracies of the world functioning as diplomatic bodies Poland is only part of one or another possible combination of armed European powers.

And Opinion recognized that education is no safeguard against prejudice...witness Germany.⁴⁸

It will be recalled that the new middle-class at one point considered Hitlerism as an inevitable product of a desperate German capitalism. The solution that would spring from such an analysis would be a new social order in Germany which could never be the result of the efforts of the worried capitalistic powers. However, as in the case of the new

middle-class program for the depression, practice did not follow theory. The faith developed that the capitalist nations of the world would crush the Nazi state, once their conscience was aroused. Hence, the stress on the Voice of America and the Mass Meetings. Had the analysis quoted above really been understood, the disillusionment and tragic tone of the Congress Bulletin's editorial would have been averted. Instead much energy was spent on such protests. These protests did serve as a psychological release for a group that had to express itself in some way. It also served as a rallying point for the institutions of the class--the American Jewish Congress and its World Jewish Congress. The institutions were the spokesmen for all who wanted to protest unashamedly the Nazi barbarism. There was no sensitivity at being different on the part of the new middle-class, as it is not affected by that emotional characteristic of more marginal Jews.

There is an ambivalence in all of new middle-class thought and activity. A swing from radical ideas that question the existing order to undying loyalty to that order---and back again. Reasons behind this ambivalence have been discussed.

Regarding the boycott, this pressure on the Nazi regime could have the complete support of an angered new middle-class, unafraid to express itself and with no economic ties that would hinder such expression.

Regarding the Voice of America, this was also the voice of the New Deal. And it has already been shown how

the new middle-class was ardent in support of the Roosevelt administration. It could practically do no wrong. Hence, a high regard for the Voice of America.

What was the program of the neo-Orthodox school of manufacturers and creditors in New York? It will be recalled that the Forum stressed economic factors as being responsible for Nazism. It would then be expected that their program would stress the economic remedy, viz., the boycott. And this expectation is borne out through the articles in the Forum:

The boycott is called the only self-defence the Jews have! The American Jewish Committee is severely criticized for its opposition to the boycott. The Committee cannot admit the cruelties of the Fatherland. Why not? This would be a confession that its members come from no better a place than do their Eastern European brethren "whom they always considered their inferiors as coming from 'inferior' countries."⁴⁹ A boycott by all the people is advocated.⁵⁰ The boycott and the stand of the Committee give rise to frequent expressions of social and religious antagonisms: boycott not only German-made goods but also German-made Judaism!⁵¹

What about the mass meeting? The mass meeting is ineffective--this is the general theme, although there is some support for such meetings. Theodore Nathan claims that the ineffectiveness is caused by too many self-styled leaders, by lack of coordination, and by lack of non-Jewish participation.⁵² Such meetings are seldom calculated to motivate action. More helpful would be strengthening free-

dom-forces in Germany and the systematic education of Americans.⁵³ Rabbi Jung admits that every weapon, such as the impressive mass meeting, will help but will not save. The Jew must return to the Rock of Ages. "Assyria will not help us. We shall not ride the high horse"--- he quoted from Hosea.⁵⁴

What of the Voice of America and the Conscience of the World? From the infrequent references to this remedy it does appear that the neo-Orthodox group has some faith in its efficacy. The Evian Conference did put moral pressure on the democracies to allow refugees to enter.⁵⁵ And after an anti-Nazi address by Cardinal Mundelaine, the Forum writes "Perhaps it is the Catholics who will finally furnish the solution to the Jewish problem." But adds: If the Catholics are ineffective, the problem will not be settled until a world war.⁵⁶

And so there is found in the Forum the expected preference for concrete economic action. Manufacturers and financiers, as has been noted, theorize and act more in terms of economic forces than do the middle-classes with their fewer contacts with the relations of production. Opposition to mass meetings may be due in part to an awareness of their general ineffectiveness. In such opposition there are also overtones of antagonism against those Congress leaders who were running the meetings, antagonism against that Congress leadership which the neo-Orthodox group had little part in and (as has been noted) was frequently in verbal opposition to. The trust in God as the real answer

springs from the religious program of the group which will later be more fully discussed. The evidence regarding the Voice of America is too skimpy to warrant discussion or conclusions.

In a discussion of the reactions of the labor groups to a Hitler well-established in power, it will be necessary to analyze the attitudes of the Frontier (nationalistic socialists), the Jewish Labor Committee, and the Call (anti-Zionist socialists).

In an interesting issue the Frontier in 1935 presents a series of articles by Raymond Swing, Norman Thomas, Sidney Hook and Jakob Lestshinsky on the middle-class in the thirties. No differentiation is made between anti-Semitism in America and in Germany. About the Jewish middle-class, the editor writes: Being a minority the Jewish middle-class is free "from illusions and aspirations which other middle-classes are prone to adopt." Ample evidence to the contrary has already been given. Lestshinsky's analysis maintains:

There is a crisis in world Jewry because all Jews in virtually all countries are undergoing the ravages of a common set of conditions from which they vainly seek relief.

The nineteenth century saw a trend towards a normalization of Jewish economic life; there was even a proletariat. But with a crisis this normalization stops and the Jews are de-classed:

The fascist national integration in the period of capitalistic decay again displaces the Jews from the framework of the majority nation, isolates them economically and politically from the related social classes.⁵⁷

The answer to this problem is the Jewish state, where there can be a normalized Jewish society. Because of the strong nationalism of this group, and because of its grasp of social forces,--little regard is paid to the remedies so stressed by the middle-classes. Indeed, mass meetings are hardly mentioned. And there is extreme skepticism as to the efficacy of the conscience of the world. After the Evian Conference, the Frontier reports that "every country has its alibi."⁵⁸ But there is support for the boycott, the primary economic measure being taken against Germany: The German economy needs desperately exports; therefore, the boycott is effective.⁵⁹

The social influences on the Frontier's attitude become clear: The Jewish socialists, tinged with middle-class ideology and leadership, would be quite willing to see a Jewish middle-class free from the "illusions and aspirations" of the non-Jewish middle-class! Their labor interests and Jewish affiliation give strong backing to the boycott. Their awareness of social forces place the mass meetings and the Voice of America (or world conscience) in their proper light.

The Jewish Labor Committee seems to represent a departure from the reaction that has been observed and will continue to be observed among the working class groups. There is considerable optimism in a 1935 view of Hitler. Chairman Vladeck claims that Hitler cannot last much longer. The middle-class has discovered that it was fooled. The Fourth Reich will be the expected coalition between

labor and the middle-class!⁶⁰ On November 29, 1938, 2200 delegates passed the following resolution that demonstrates the nature of the organization and its faith in the Voice of America:

We consider the countries in which we live as our homes...As workers and Jews we will never submit to the idea that we are strangers in those countries for which we have worked, which we have enriched and for which our fathers have died. We will struggle with all our power against anti-Semitism seeking to impress on the minds of the people that we are aliens in those countries.

The Labor Committee expressed gratitude for the protests of almost the entire American population and especially for Roosevelt's historical denunciation of the Hitler regime.⁶¹ The Committee also published "Father Coughlin, his Facts and Arguments."

It has been noted that the Labor Committee is an eclectic organization with representatives from all labor groups. However, its leadership is primarily non-Zionist. But these are socialist non-Zionists who would have no seeming reason to reject Zionism only to embrace more ardently American nationalism. Indeed it has been noted that the Arbeiter Circle and its publications are quite thorough in their rejection of all vestiges of the capitalistic system. Why should the Labor Committee, led by Bundist Vladeck and backed by the Arbeiter Circle, embrace American nationalism, predict (in the face of its socialist analysis) a labor middle-class coalition in Germany, and hail the same Roosevelt whom the socialist members constantly opposed for advocating fake remedies for America's social system?

On investigating the origins of the Jewish Labor Com-

mittee, it is discovered that the Committee did not spring from the ranks of the labor organizations it represented. In 1934 at a San Francisco AFL convention a Labor Chest was formed. Its purpose, to aid members of the labor movement who had been victimized by fascism. The Jewish Labor Committee was an outgrowth of this Labor Chest. Its funds came from the member organizations, not all of which were exclusively Jewish. The more middle-class orientation of this Committee therefore becomes more explicable. A creation of the non-socialistic AFL, a more conservative tone may have been set from the beginning. Perhaps the Jewish labor leaders who formed the Committee were exercising the function of Shtadlanut to the non-Jewish labor leaders... in a fashion similar to the relation of Jewish capitalist leaders to the American government. At any rate, the Committee was primarily a "defence" organization and, as such, must have felt that the best defence is conformity to society and its attitudes. A labor committee for Jewish rights could accomplish very little if it proclaimed that the American system was inherently unstable. Hence, the development of a platform quite inconsistent with the ideology of the thoroughgoing socialist.

But why did the socialist group take over the leadership of the Committee? A possible explanation of the need felt by non-Zionist socialist leaders for a Jewish defence organization is that Zionism was having tremendous appeal to the masses of Jewish workers. What answers could the non-Zionists give to the pressing problem of anti-Semitism other

than a socialist future that would be very long in coming. Some concrete program through a Labor defence organization-- even though at some variance with strict socialist ideology-- was needed to keep the non-Zionist socialist loyal to his Bundist ideology and his Arbeiter Circle!

What was the reaction of the Committee towards the mass meeting? "Meetings are a result of a movement, not a justification for it."⁶⁰ This coolness towards the mass meeting seems to reflect a certain rivalry with the American Jewish Congress, which was the main organization behind such meetings. For in speaking of the boycott which the Committee supports, Vladeck maintains that this technique was not original with the Congress but originated with Samuel Untermyer and the Jewish veterans.

The boycott is the most effective weapon. By 1938 the Congress and Labor Committee had formed a Joint Boycott Council which exposed German generators disguised as American products.⁶² What underlay the attitudes towards mass meetings and the boycott? The mass meeting would not be too highly favored within a labor defence organization that stressed conformity and also that was well aware of the lack of effectiveness of such meetings. The boycott, on the other hand, was AFL policy and also made some economic sense to the labor leaders.

It is interesting to compare the attitude of the defence organizations of which the Workmen's Circle was a member to that of the official periodicals of the Workmen's Circle. The Voice of America and the Conscience of the World were scorned:

Yes, the democracies are to blame. Sooner than see working class government in Germany, they preferred fascism...Liberation of Germany depends upon the German workers...Dare we believe that a warring capitalist England, capitalist France, semi-fascist Poland, and Quixotic America will set up the foundations for a warless world?⁶³

Further understanding of the lack of a "conscience" among the Western democracies is given:

Why should British wink at Fascist aid to Spain? Clearly because its Tory government fears the consequences of a left government in Spain far more than it does a Fascist dictatorship.⁶⁴

Joseph Baskin's "The Answer" states that the United States is not now protesting against Germany. But even if she should:

"The Beasts of Berlin do not fear protests." However,

...if we can figuratively beat them over the head, we should do so. With a strong economic boycott, we can obtain the support of many non-Jewish elements.⁶⁵

There is cynicism regarding the Evian conference. Writes Benjamin Gebiner:

I do not belong to those optimists who believe that eventually a "country" of extraordinary possibilities can and will be found.⁶⁶

And so, the Workmen's Circle demonstrates an adequate analysis of the German crisis and a long-range understanding of why another war is not the final answer. The Circle naturally is skeptical regarding the Conscience of the World. Its only positive action seems to be consistent support of the boycott...and a prayer for the German workers.⁶⁷ Such a program we might expect from the most consistently socialist group that is not so "public relations-conscious" as the Labor Committee.

It has been demonstrated that the American Jewish community had varying interpretations of the meaning of Nazism and had varying plans with which to combat Hitler. Indeed, each class had a somewhat different approach. These approaches have been described. It has been observed that the nature of a particular class' approach is in large measure affected by its position in society. Commitment to class interests often makes impossible an accurate analysis or a realistic program. It would follow that an awareness of class interests might be an aid to the individual who is in search of reality.⁶⁸

VIII. ANTI-SEMITISM, USA.

The nature of anti-Semitism in America during the thirties has been discussed in Chapter IV. It was concluded that in view of the new historical forces that were felt in the general society, a native American anti-Semitism was to be expected. The frustration generated by the depression provided an ample market for the peddlers of bigotry. Especially frustrated were the lower middle-classes, and so Jews were called Wall Street Bankers and Communists--names feared by the petty bourgeoisie.

Although American anti-Semitism resulted from a capitalism in crisis, it was markedly different from the Nazi government-sponsored bigotry. The American government was not in such desperate straits as to require the regulations of a totalitarian regime and the government-sponsored scapegoat that goes with such regulation. America was giving her people the New Deal. And there was enough reserve and resiliency in the economy to start the wheels of industry turning for a while and there was the impression of prosperity. For a brief moment the anger of the people searched for a scapegoat and found it in the Wall Street banker. And Congressional investigations exonerated the system as a whole by focusing attention on speculative practices of the titans of Wall Street...especially the House of Morgan. But soon the banker was forgotten as the little businessman hailed the Blue Eagle.

The anti-Semitism in America, while based on the frustrations of the Depression, was a tool directed against the Ad-

ministration by forces that opposed the New Deal. In a successfully operating economic and social system, anti-Semitism is always a weapon used by frustrated interests which are opposing the dominant party. Examples are numerous: In nineteenth century France the Catholic and Royalist parties, being pushed out by the rising Republic, instigated the Dreyfus affair. Frustrated socialist groups in France also used anti-Semitism. In America, the Populists--always on the outside looking in--resorted to anti-Semitism. And so, in a more or less expanding stable society the Jew may be the object of anti-Semitism motivated by a frustrated minority interest. But so long as the system is running relatively smoothly, the government will protect the Jewish group. The government is really the object of attack and knows it. Thus, the rallying of the French Republic and all who were interested in its survival behind Dreyfus. Thus, the emphatic tolerance of the Roosevelt administration as it attacked the bigots of America.

There appear to be four divisions of anti-Semitic activities from 1929 through 1939.

1) Spontaneous expressions of frustration during the early depression years (1929-1932). A Passion Play was held in Sacramento, California--despite the protests of Rabbi Norman Goldberg.¹ Mayor LaGuardia charged discrimination in the State Department foreign office.² Rutgers was charged with an anti-Semitic policy by the American Hebrew.³ And much of the material in Heywood Broun and G. Britt's Christians Only is taken from this period. There was no well-

organized anti-Semitic front; primarily there were expressions of a frustrated American populace that saw fewer opportunities.

2) The Pelley Era (1933-1935). But once the New Deal gained power, some large interests in America were bound to suffer. For the government--despite its support by business in general--was taking over a larger sector of the economy. And some groups of private enterprise opposed some government action. There were now powerful interests that would sponsor bigots and take advantage of the large market of frustrations. Perhaps the antagonism of the people could be channeled against the New Deal. The general frustration was not enough enticement for the professional bigots. But with the aid of financial backing by powerful interests, the hate-organizations began. Of course, they received encouragement from their German cohorts...in the form of pamphlets and techniques. But the conditions for their birth and growth were 100 percent American.

William Dudley Pelley's Silver Shirts were the most dramatic of such organizations. But there were others: The Crusaders for Economic Liberty and the National Watchmen in 1934 also attacked the New Deal and used scapegoats, varying from the gold standard to the Jew.⁴ Pelley began his activity in January of 1933. There was a general increase in anti-Semitic activity: anti-Semitic leaflets were placed in New York's Temple Emanu-el on Yom Kippur morning, 1933.⁵ However, the organizations had very little success. Pelley's activities had to cease, due to lack of funds in the Spring of 1934. He

reappeared in August. Father Coughlin's first intimations of anti-Semitism were heard in May, 1934.⁵ However, these groups were small, and bigotry was poor business. Why? In the earliest years of the New Deal, American corporate interests were very solidly behind Roosevelt. The NIRA was drawn up by the National Chamber of Commerce. Only the most bitter opponents of Inflationary Recovery (perhaps those largest industries which could afford to wait longer) would support anti-Semitic activity directed against the Administration. Practically all of the forces of society were behind Roosevelt. There was more support for anti-Semitic organizations than in the earlier "spontaneous" period--for now there was a New Deal to attack and a few people to back that attack. But there were still not enough forces opposed to the Administration to support a financially successful anti-Semitic movement on anything other than a very minor scale.

3) Coughlinism (1935-1938). The causes for increasing dissatisfaction on the part of several large groups, dissatisfaction with the Roosevelt administration--these have been previously discussed. It has been noted that steel, chemicals, and chain store interests were opposed to the New Deal and to its NRA which fixed prices and so restricted competition. Some of the largest industries, now that there was a little more money in society, were back on their feet and ready to return to rugged individualism. And so, through 1935 and especially 1936, the anti-Semitic movement against the Administration found much big money eager to sponsor its

attack. And there were still large segments of the population ready to listen. The New Deal had not solved the unemployment problem, and the lower middle-class was being hurt by continued inflation.

4) The American Spirit (1938-1939). There was virtually an end to anti-Semitic propaganda once the preparedness program was underway. The dissatisfied elements--many of them--had defence contracts. Unemployment declined along with the market for bigotry. So with less patronage from above and with less frustration down below--the peddler of prejudice faded from the picture. And the American Spirit re-asserted herself.

How did the different segments of the Jewish community react to the anti-Semitism of the thirties? While it certainly was not sanctioned by the government, the bigotry was in larger proportions than had ever before been known in America. Concerning each class within American Jewry, these questions will be asked: To what degree did the class understand the phenomenon of native American anti-Semitism? What type of program did the class develop to combat anti-Semitism? How did the class' social position influence its understanding and its program?

What was the reaction of the old middle-class of German background? Was The Nation correct in its 1938 assessment of the attitude of this group?--

As in Germany, Jews of the business world by and large share the attitude of their German counterparts. Why should they not? They similarly oppose

Roosevelt and fear the New Deal and denounce the CIO...They cannot serve what they believe to be their economic interests without encouraging the growth of anti-Semitism at the same time.⁷

The old middle-class viewed anti-Semitism as an intellectual (as opposed to a social) movement. Therefore, the American Hebrew urges appeals to Christian intellectual leaders. The reason:

Social movements originate in the masses and emerge upwards; intellectual movements begin at the top and work downwards.⁸

Therefore, one cannot "solve a hateful problem by...a mass meeting with resolutions."⁸ Jews who spread rumors of anti-Semitism are actually causing more prejudice.⁹ Father Coughlin is ignorant:

Truly this priest knows not what he is doing; and, though we forgive his ignorance, the crucifixion through his insidious attack is nevertheless accomplished.¹⁰

This psychological interpretation of anti-Semitism steers clear of an analysis of the connection between bigotry and society. This psychological interpretation, it will be recalled, is similar to the attitude towards Hitlerism. Anti-Semitism there was an evil idea. But in Germany the idea was encouraged by the German spirit. How did it take root in America?

American anti-Semitism was a product of the German spirit! Certainly not native American, it is of alien origin. The decline in American anti-Semitism in June, 1934 is viewed as the result of troubles in Germany's Fascist movement.¹¹ Actually, as has been explained, the limited funds available in this Pelley Period were running out. The

B'nai B'rith Magazine answers a statement by John Haynes Holmes that anti-Semitism in America will increase if economic conditions become worse with an emphatic No(!) to the question: "Can America Go Anti-Semitic?" The memory of the klan is too recent (Again, the mental approach). Jews will stand courageously together. And, finally, the chief fomenters are German-Americans. Therefore, anti-Semitism in America is an imported product.¹² And still in 1936, when anti-Semitism seemed very native, the Hebrew believed the contrary...as evidenced by an article entitled: "Prejudice--the Alien Enemy: Religious and Racial Bias in the United States is an Undesirable Alien that Should be Deported."¹³

The view of anti-Semitism as an intellectual and an alien movement led to a tendency of it-can't-happen-here optimism and even it-isn't-happening-here delusion. Reports of anti-Semitism among university students (those who have the most learning and intelligence)--these were denied as rumors.¹⁴ The most striking evidence of the inability to admit native anti-Semitism in the face of reality was the attitude towards the elections of 1936, in which the Lemke anti-Semitic ticket received almost one million American votes. "Americans knew counterfeit when they saw it."¹⁵ So said the B'nai B'rith. And the American Jewish Committee stated that the last election shows the decline in anti-Semitism since America did repudiate the demagogues.¹⁶

So the old middle-class viewed anti-Semitism as an intellectual an alien movement--a movement that could not happen here.

What program furnished the answer to the problem of anti-Semitism, according to the old middle-class? Their program was quite consistent with their analysis of the phenomenon. If anti-Semitism was an intellectual movement, the answer lay in the direction of better understanding and of statistics. Two approaches to better understanding can be detected by an examination of the old middle-class's periodicals. From 1929 til 1933 a quiet and conservative approach was stressed. But with the emergence of well organized anti-Semitism in the Pelley Period the tactic was changed to vigorous exposure of all facts. But before 1933, the "bad" facts were minimized and better understanding was carried on in a quiet and friendly way:

The Anti-Defamation League in 1931 concluded that the best answer to anti-Semitism was a "quiet, dignified, and friendly approach to guilty parties." "Professional Jews" should not magnify rumors of anti-Semitism.¹⁷ The American Hebrew proudly took credit for the removal of the slurs on the term, "Jew," in Roget's Thesaurus.¹⁸ The fact that Christians helped raise money for the Cincinnati Jewish Hospital was given great praise.¹⁹ Better understanding seminars were considered the most effective of techniques used to alleviate anti-Semitism: "Better understanding seminars reduce heavy toll exacted by misunderstanding"-- was one subtitle.²⁰ "A Conference of Transcendent Importance" was held by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Dr. Francis J. Haas, director of the Catholic Social Service School, stated:

We come together not to impugn one another's belief, but to indict the forces that prevent us from living and working happily together.²¹

A December issue of the Hebrew has what amounts to a "Who's Who among Good Christians."²² Anti-Semitism in centers of learning is reluctantly recognized, and better vocational guidance of Jews is suggested as a remedy:

...the American Jewish organizations which are constantly echoing the cry of anti-Jewish discrimination in admission to medical colleges should instead study the situation from the point-of-view of vocational guidance, rather than from the aspect of anti-Semitism. (Parents) should be informed that other fields of professional endeavor, as well as commerce and industry, can be pursued with honor.²³

When non-Jews cannot enter a medical school, they go elsewhere. But disappointed Jews cry anti-Semitism.²⁴

While the intellectual program is continued during the 1933, it takes on a much less apologetic tone. By 1935, the Hebrew is opposing those who advocate voluntary vocational restrictions by the Jews through more careful vocational guidance---the very program the Hebrew earlier advocated.²⁵ Immediately upon the appearance of the well-organized Silver Shirts, the "quiet, dignified, and friendly approach" to the guilty parties was dropped. And the Hebrew became one of those groups that spent a great amount of words echoing tales of anti-Semitic discrimination. On September 8, 1933 began a series of sensational exposures of the Pelley organization. Its contacts with Hitler were stressed, and its anti-administration goal was pointed out. But the many evidences of the use of the Jews to discredit the NRA did not imply to the Hebrew a native anti-Semitism that was

American born and bred. Alien influences were still the primary cause.²⁶ And the solution seen by the Hebrew was to expose the sinister forces.²⁶ In the same issue, Mein Kampf was called literary poison, and the Hebrew vigorously opposed its translation into English by Houghton-Mifflin... again the fear of the idea.

The vigorous exposure of facts of anti-Semitism was joined to a statistical denial of the arguments of the anti-Semite. After Coughlin had denounced Bernard Baruch as one of the wicked Jewish bankers, the Hebrew pointed out that Baruch was not a banker.

This, we are confident, Father Coughlin himself will now admit and regret, especially when he reads the statistics displayed on this page.²⁷

There is constant concern with Father Coughlin's arguments:

We demand of Adolf Hitler and Father Coughlin that they give us facts and figures that will stand up in an impartial court of evidence.²⁸

At the time of the Popular Front, the Anti-Defamation League published material to prove that Jews are not Communists.²⁹ There is an account of the American Jewish Federation to Combat Communism and Fascism, founded in October, 1938 and led by lawyer Milton Solomon. The organization claims to be fighting "an American struggle, on American soil, to be waged by Americans for the preservation of American ideals and the American form of government."³⁰ So Conformity is part of the program to answer anti-Semitism.

Flowing from the belief that American anti-Semitism is of alien origin is the Hebrew's proposed legislative program: It should be unlawful to advocate the destruction of

the United States government; all foreign representatives should register; the Secretary of Labor should have the power to shorten the visits of anyone here on a temporary visa; it should be illegal to advise any member of the military to disobey regulations; United States attorneys should be able to proceed against anyone who holds a Congressional Committee in contempt.³¹ The Hebrew opposed Congressman Dickstein's investigations of anti-Semitism as being publicity-seeking and asked instead for legislation. The American Jewish Congress favored the Dickstein investigation.³²

Stemming from the inability to grasp the nature of native American anti-Semitism, the old middle-class was frequently assured by its leaders (as was noted after the 1936 elections) that there was no need to fear anti-Semitism in America. After Father Coughlin was recognized as an anti-Semite, Rabbi Ferdinand Isserman celebrated the Passover by speaking on the same platform with Father Coughlin before the National Union for Social Justice. The rabbi was "in sympathy with much--but not all--of its program."³³

The closest the old middle-class came to a realistic program may have been in statements by the American Jewish Committee: Our "only salvation--democracy." "The welfare of minorities is more than ever dependent upon the maintenance of democratic ideals."³⁴ But such a program would stop with the generality.

In resume, the old middle-class program flowed from its analysis of anti-Semitism as an intellectual movement imported

from abroad. Better understanding in a quiet way was replaced by a bolder expose of facts: the outbreak of organized anti-Semitism seemed to call for more vigorous measures. And these measures were still along the lines of statistical refutation and good will meetings. Americanism was the sure remedy, since anti-Semitism was an imported product. Publication of Jewish patriotism and an anti-alien legislative program were thought to be effective.

It remains to discuss in what way the analysis which underlay this program was influenced by the social status of this class. It has already been shown that this same class viewed German anti-Semitism as a result of the German mind and spirit, because a recognition of more basic social factors in Germany would have challenged their position in American society. Why this group, in its flight from reality, seized upon the spirit of a people has also been discussed. A recognition of the social factors underlying American anti-Semitism would have challenged the position of this group in American society.

The old middle-class had found salvation in America. Here was the land of freedom. The American economy had welcomed their forefathers and had welcomed them. Any inference that stresses inherent in that economy would cause a significant amount of anti-Semitism--such an inference would be saying to this group: integration into American society may yet be thwarted. It has been shown that anti-Semitism increased in America as the economy matured, as there were less opportunities because of the severe

depression. If the old middle-class admitted the possibility of a collapse of the economic structure and with it the inevitable elimination of opportunity for minority groups, then their class position (or more likely, the position of their grandchildren) would be challenged. Then all they had worked for and strived for, their adherence to the American ideal and their idolization of conformity--all these things would be for nought. It is no wonder that such a group--unwilling or unable to admit the reality of social factors in their true light--would turn to psychological interpretation. And this psychological interpretation necessitated the bringing of the idea from abroad--since the American spirit was guiltless. This interpretation also led to a program that was bound to be ineffective, since it was based on faulty analysis.

What understanding did the new middle-class have of American anti-Semitism? And what program did it advocate? Its understanding combined the psychological interpretation with what very often seemed to be a total grasp of the economic factors. Anti-Semitism in one editorial is an idea that is imported from Germany and in another article is a native American product of a capitalistic system in crisis. This dual approach that is superficially contradictory is apparent in the published statements of this group. First, the psychological analysis...

Anti-Semitism in the Socialist movement against Morris Hillquitt was bemoaned: This anti-Semitism is based on "primitive passions" the elimination of which is the object

of radical movements.³⁵ James Waterman Wise diagnoses 1933 Pelleyism: "Success breeds imitation." Although America is not Germany, Americans should oppose the foothold Fascism is gaining. That is, anti-Semitism is imported.³⁶ An anti-Semitic article by Theodore Dreiser in the Nation shocked the liberal Jewish world. But Opinion assured its readers that American liberalism would never be the pawn for a fascist state. As evidence Hutchins Hapgood's answer to Dreiser in the Nation was pointed to.³⁷ During the year of bigotry, 1936, Rabbi Philip Bernstein in Opinion assured the Jewish community that seven years of depression have produced no fundamental changes. Landon is no Fascist and Roosevelt is no socialist. There are no realistic fears for the near future. The campaign simply brought already existing prejudices out in the open:

So if today the inexplicable mood of reaction which has made those who have benefited most from the New Deal, turn bitterly against it and especially against the Jews in it, the position of the Jew remains essentially unchanged. This too will pass.³⁸

And, as was believed by the old middle-class, the election results of 1936 showed the American people's "disinclination to be swayed by religious prejudice."³⁹ (With the exception of 700,000 of them.) Louis Lipsky speaks of "alien influences...finding nests in American political life."⁴⁰

However, there is a current of analysis that takes into account economic and social factors at the risk of challenging the nature of the current social order. In a 1934 editorial which asks: "Should Jews be Radicals?" Opinion emphatically answers yes: Only through revolutionary

efforts can an end be made of arraying race against race. The Jews will find inevitable allies in "mine, and mill and farm and slum." They need not worry about being linked with the radical...it is a term of honor:

Even on the lowest level of self-preservation it is obvious that the very safety and survival of the Jew is bound up with the defeat of Fascist and reactionary forces and the emergence of an economic order based not on the price-system and the profit motive, but on a socialized control and direction of the processes of production and distribution.⁴¹

Fascism is not limited to Germany. There is a Fascism in America that advocates "politer forms of dictatorship."⁴¹ California vigilante anti-strike activity is called American Fascism:

The economic conditions which called it forth are latent in every community in the United States.⁴²

This becomes an anti-Semitism that cannot be fought by reliance on the "good sense and good humor of American temperament."⁴² Max Lerner identifies American anti-Semitism with the tendencies towards reaction in this country.⁴³ Stephen Wise attacks the American Jewish Committee for its assurance that there is no American anti-Semitism.⁴⁴

A very interesting analysis which was awarded second prize in Opinion's contest (the best essay on "How to Combat Anti-Semitism in America") was written by Rabbi Joshua Trachtenberg. An acute awareness of the social factors is combined with a program that admittedly does not take those factors into account: Anti-Semitism cannot be eradicated without "demolishing the America we live in and building a new one." Why? It is a "disease indigenous to our economic system, which goads the underprivileged, in their ignorance of

the operation of social forces, to exact payment of the eternal scapegoat, the Jew, for the iniquities of the system itself." What is really needed:

A revolutionary revamping of our social system and the elimination of those economic relationships which are responsible for social inequalities and injustice.

If one fights against anti-Semitism, he robs the ruling class of its scapegoat and hastens the doom of capitalism.

However, this is no practical program:

(Jews) are not, by virtue of their economic interests, prepared to advocate so radical a solution of the Jewish problem.

Therefore, another appeal must be made to Jews:

The fact that our position is bound up with the preservation of American rights and principles is our greatest source of strength.

Apologetics do no good. But make the churches see that they will rise or fall with the Jew. Educate America for cultural pluralism.⁴⁵

There is the feeling after such a radical analysis that the solution proposed are offered as almost a futile gesture.

But the article crystallizes the problem of the dual analysis of the new middle-class. It demonstrates that even following a radical analysis, a radical program is not possible because "Jews are not, by virtue of their economic interests prepared to advocate so radical a solution to the Jewish problem." This, of course, refers to the middle-class Jews. And so, the program of the new middle-class falls in line---not with the current of analysis that takes into account the social forces that underlie native American

anti-Semitism, but--with the current of interpretation that stresses the idealistic nature of bigotry and the German influence. Such a program leads to education and legal action and statistics.

This dichotomy of analysis and program has been found previously in the new middle-class' attitude towards the depression and towards Hitler.⁴⁶ And in those cases as herein, the factor behind the dichotomy is the vulnerability of the new middle-class in times of crisis (plus perhaps its recent experiences of Eastern European persecution) combined with its essential dependence for social status on the continuity of the existing social system. But exactly what was its program? And how did it differ from the program of the old middle-class?

Stephen Wise answered Father Coughlin with rhetoric and reason: "I refuse to believe that you are ready to do a great wrong, in order to achieve what you believe to be a great right." Wise disproved Coughlin's allegations and demanded a retraction by the priest. Coughlin's answer to Wise: Am I anti-Protestant because I criticize a Protestant munitions-maker?⁴⁷ The American Jewish Congress compiled statistics to show that "Jewish economic control in the United States (is) a myth."⁴⁸ The winner of the first prize in the contest on how to combat anti-Semitism was a Christian, H. C. Engelbrecht: There are two types of anti-Semitism. The "malicious" type can be destroyed through Christian legal action. The "ignorant" type can be destroyed through education, of the Christian educators who are at the

root of the trouble.⁴⁹

But there were some marked differences in the approach of the old and new middle-classes. The old middle-class did use statistics and arguments in a greater quantity than did the new middle-class. The approach of the new middle-class was of a more outspoken nature--even before 1933, when the old middle-class was advocating caution, quietude, and dignity:

"Speak out frankly and boldly."⁵⁰

This was the cry of the Congress as early as 1930. In 1931 Stephen Wise warned that good will may be "an attitude or pose." He called grotesque those Jews (the Hebrew) who pick out Christians as "most aggressive or effective of the year's goodwillers."⁵¹ J. X. Cohen, whose study of anti-Semitism provided much of the Congress' data and analysis, criticized the American Jewish Committee and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations for minimizing economic discrimination. All discrimination should be publicized and there is need for maximum open discussion.⁵² This was still 1931. In 1932, Wise criticized Alfred M. Cohen for being satisfied with a few cuts in the movie, "King of Kings." The whole movie should be abolished.⁵³

After 1933, the old middle-class became much more outspoken, but even then their public protests were less dramatic than were those of the new middle-class. Mass meetings to protest Hitler were out of the question. And the Dickstein committee's sensational publicity of anti-Semitic evidences (hailed by the Congress) was opposed by the old middle-class.

The new middle-class was much more concerned than was the old with the rights of other minority groups. Opinion hailed the participation of Samuel Leibowitz in the Scotsboro case. As a member of minority group, the Jew should support other minorities.⁵⁴ No mention of the Scotsboro case was found in the old middle-class periodicals under examination with the exception of a report of anti-Semitism directed against Samuel Leibowitz, lawyer for the victims.⁵⁵ Agitation in alliance with other minorities whose cause Jews share--this was a program proposed by Opinion in October 1934. Cultural pluralism was spoken of by Trachtenberg. And in February, 1939, Opinion hailed the liberation of the labor-martyr, Tom Mooney.

Franklin Roosevelt was in 1936 and 1937 hailed as the answer to American anti-Semitism. Despite a letter written by Warburg to the contrary, the supporters of Landon are pro-German--so stated the Congress Bulletin.⁵⁶ The answer to anti-Semitism is to line up with the forces for social justice, viz., the New Deal.⁵⁷ Of course, the old middle-class, many of which were opposed to Roosevelt at this time, could not hail him and his program as the answer to anti-Semitism.

But the basic difference between the programs of the old and new middle-classes is that the new middle-class pays no heed to the great urge for conformity to the general society felt by the older group. In speaking out frankly and boldly (as in its mass meetings), there is proud non-conformity. And in identification with other minority groups

there is the admission that the Jews are a minority group, kept out of some aspects of American life just as are other minority groups. The new middle-class, being less integrated into American society than the old and also having an Eastern European background of a more secularistic Jewish culture, would quite naturally admit that it is a distinct minority group. Whereas the old middle-class, with its stress on integration and conformity, would be loath to admit or to emphasize its position as a minority group. The old middle-class was raised in the melting pot, but the new middle-class speaks of cultural pluralism. The factors behind the old middle-class' stress on conformity have already been discussed in the chapter on Tensions.

And so, the new middle-class viewed anti-Semitism at times as the result of social forces in a straining economy and at times as an alien idea. The psychological interpretation formed the basis for its main program of education and statistics, of frank exposures and alliances with other minority groups, of adherence to the New Deal. The old middle-class (for reasons discussed) could not go along with the social analysis, stayed behind a little in the dramatic public exposures and in the aid given to other minorities and in the identification of tolerance in America with Franklin Roosevelt. There is emerging a pattern of dichotomy between theory and practice in the new middle-class point-of-view. This was ascribed to its vulnerable position in society and its dependence on that society.

What were the interpretation and program of the neo-Orthodox group of New York manufacturers and small creditors as expressed in the Forum and the Outlook? Three contradictory factors seemed to them responsible for American anti-Semitism: It was an alien idea--imported from abroad and not native; it grew out of American conditions--it was native; it exists because of unfortunate Jewish activity.

The dichotomy that was noted in the new middle-class analysis is found again: anti-Semitism is a purely alien idea at one moment and a native growth at another. But the neo-Orthodox group seems to stress the psychological interpretation more than did the new middle-class.

"Anti-Semitism is not American. The very nature of our system of government is against it."⁵⁸ In America anti-Semitism grew up with competition and with an influx of Gentiles from Central Europe. The Christian is jealous of the Jew's wealth and his ability to adjust.⁵⁸ And an even more idealistic view: Hatred accumulates through the centuries. The Phoenicians had hatred, the Romans had hatred. In this tradition there is the same idea of hatred today.⁵⁹ (An idea through time). And still in 1938:

The McFaddens and Winrods have discovered that their Hitler-like methods will not bring them victory in an American community; that newspaper men and other liberals (!) will always oppose them; that it is against the American spirit to accept campaign documents breathing racial or religious hatreds.⁶⁰

Some of the formative forces affecting the American spirit of freedom are discussed:

Not only have the people of the United States been saved from the pathological aftermath of a crushing military defeat, but they are insensitive to the lure of territorial aggrandizement, militaristic prowess, and the racial ideologies rampant in Europe...(our) yearning for freedom was quickened by the refreshing contacts with the raw environment of the frontier.⁶¹

It will be recalled that in the analysis of Hitler Germany, the affects of World War I were stressed. In this way, America--the victor in the War--would be free from prejudice; therefore, anti-Semitism becomes an imported product, alien to the American spirit. While an economic analysis--albeit not a complete one--was given of the plight of the Jews in Germany, a primarily psychological interpretation was given of American anti-Semitism. The economic interpretation of Hitlerism presented no challenge to American Jewry, since Germany had peculiar social conditions. But an economic interpretation of American anti-Semitism was too risky to attempt in a thorough manner.

Still, beginning in 1936 when a native anti-Semitism was undeniable, there were some attempts to understand what native conditions gave rise to prejudice. It can happen here, admits the Forum.⁶² And while germs of prejudice are spread by agents of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy "as well as by our native fascists, depressed economic conditions make this country a good breeding ground."⁶³ There is a connection between fascism and big business, even in America. Knudsen of General Motors is quoted as intimating that fascism has solved the German economic problem.⁶⁴ Still no analysis of the American social system as thorough as was found in the new middle-class' interpretation is forthcoming. Similarly,

during the depression, the new middle-class offered a more radical analysis than did the neo-Orthodox group. As has been suggested, the new middle-class is in a much more vulnerable position in capitalism than is the consumer-goods manufacturer. This greater vulnerability may have caused the new middle-class to examine more critically the existing social order interests. But nowhere does the neo-Orthodox group seriously--even theoretically as does the new middle-class--challenge the existing social order.

The third interpretation of anti-Semitism is the familiar u-mipnay hato-enu: because of the sins of the Jews. And what were the sins of the Jews? Engaging in activities that challenged the class program of the neo-Orthodox group. What was that program? Strict adherence to the existing social order on which the prosperity of manufacturer and financier, rabbi and Mizrachi leader was based. Acceptance of American cultural standards and the amenities of Western secular civilization. (This could be compared to the respectability of the English Orthodox Sephardic community). Maintenance of Orthodox Judaism and its institutions.

When Jews do not accept this three-fold program, there is persecution. Regarding the social order: Jews are persecuted, because they have gone astray after communism, socialism, or other spurious ideas. The Christian then "instinctively feels the sin of the Jewish people" and uses them as his scapegoat.⁶⁵ Regarding cultural standards: Jewish conduct should be more proper, for "snobbery, condescen-

sion, overbearing haughtiness, preclude the spirit of equality."⁶⁶ The Jew should help "eradicate those mannerisms which tend to create anti-Jewish feeling."⁶⁷

Regarding Orthodox Judaism: "It is in a combination of true traditional Judaism with true usefulness to humanity that a true remedy to Jew-hatred is found."⁶⁸ And the Outlook agrees with its adversary, Cyrus Adler, that the "best answer to false racial theories (is) a strengthening of Jewish religious life in America."⁶⁹ Here is clear evidence of a class program influencing its interpretation of reality.

What program did the Forum group advocate?

The psychological interpretation of anti-Semitism would naturally lead to an educational program. And so the remedy to prejudice is seen in "a complete overhauling of the educational process." The belief in the guilt of the Jews for the death of Jesus should be eradicated from the Christian mind. There is need therefore for the propaganda of truth.⁷⁰ A frank admission and disclosure of all facts of prejudice is advocated.⁷¹

From the superficial interpretation of bad economic conditions being related to American anti-Semitism comes a vague program for working against bad economic conditions. Nothing specific is mentioned. Rabbi Joseph Lookstein maintains that good will meetings are artificial and will not help. But working with Gentiles against political corruption and for social justice--this will alleviate anti-Semitism.⁷²

Jews should "work in concert with all anti-fascists."⁷³

While the new middle-class had a more thorough social analysis of the problem than did the neo-Orthodox group, its vague program of working for social justice was quite similar to the vaguities of the Forum.

A final aspect of the program reflects the acceptance of anti-Semitism as a fact of life and yet the desire for more integration into American public life. A Jewish non-sectarian medical school is advocated against the opposition of James Marshall who fears the Jew would then be a "self-created alien."⁷⁴ Endorsement of discrimination is not involved in alleviating its effects.⁷⁵ Better vocational guidance is advocated: there are simply too many Jewish lawyers.⁷⁶ Despite the inability to recognize anti-Semitism as springing from basic strains in the social order, it is recognized as a fact of life by those Jews who have recently come from Eastern European persecution.

But despite the acceptance of minority status, the group's desire for integration leads to a stress on conformity regarding manners (as has been noted) and a bemoaning of the fact that "social discrimination against Jews has become an important problem...even in these free and liberal United States."⁷⁹ The same author is pleased that there are so many Jews in public life. The Anti-Defamation League and American Jewish Congress are wrong in their intellectual appeal. They should use more of an emotional appeal: fair dealings with non-Jews, participation in civic affairs, love the stranger.⁷⁸

This seeming contradiction between an acceptance of segregation and a passion for conformity to American society is explicable in the light of the peculiar position of the class. The complete idolization of conformity that is found in the old middle-class would not be expected in a group so close in experience to the Russian pogrom and so much embedded (not in the integrated Jewish social structure of Western Europe but) in the semi-autonomous social structure of Eastern European Orthodoxy. But while being a product of such a sub-culture, this group, by virtue of its new economic position was rapidly becoming more marginal in American society! And so, when compared with Orthodox co-religionists who are less integrated into American life, the neo-Orthodox group appear to be patriotic conformists. The Baltimore Orthodox Council protested against Daylight Saving Time. But the Forum solemnly warned that this American custom should be accepted and spoke of a "sense of responsibility towards Jewry."⁷⁹ Hence, the dual attitude towards conformity and integration.

The "Jewish professionals"--that heterogeneous class of welfare workers described in Chapter II--had two main approaches to the problem of anti-Semitism in America. One analysis was provided by the group that has been called the "universalists." This is not an evaluative term but simply a label used to designate those workers who for whatever reasons (perhaps they were well-established in the non-Jewish social service world; perhaps they came from old

middle-class German background) did not adhere to the ideologies of an organic community or of Labor Zionism but were simply social workers for Jews without joining in an elaborate effort to preserve the Jewish culture. Another analysis was provided by the Reconstructionists among the workers---many of them Eastern European immigrants and very often the leaders of the federations that needed the Reconstructionist rationale to assure the prospering of their organizations.

The universalists were stronger in the early thirties. They understood anti-Semitism to be bound to the existing social order:

(The Jewish problem) is an expression, a function of the general economic problem and will be solved only when the problems of the total population are solved.⁸⁰

Harry Lurie in an article entitled, "Critical Social Situations," offers the following analysis:

It is not in the ranks of labor that the most acute form of the problems of inter-group prejudices and conflict is to be found. (But higher in the economic scale,) competition is keener, opportunities more restricted and there is a sharper awareness of the differences rather than of the common qualities of the human beings in the group...It is particularly in a period of economic crisis that these irrational elements become aggravated and may even be seized up by vicious groups as political instruments for diverting economic conflicts to the interests of particular economic groups.

But the New Deal is no salvation:

This program is in part adventurous and in part opportunistic. From the standpoint of exact economic and political principles the program is vague, uncertain, and in some respects confused...

Lurie's solution:

It is clearly the task of educators and religious leaders of all faiths to clarify these critical social problems of existing and potential group conflicts in terms of the economic component. To emphasize historical and psychological aspects, traditional prejudices and other phases of these conflicts is likely to blur the essential elements and to distract from, rather than advance, sound solutions.

The difficulty which is faced by all at this time is the lack of a clear integration of ideas concerning racial, religious, and group relationships with the economic factors which are involved in the creation of these problems. Some of the difficulties arise out of the fact that association with and preference for the status quo leads into an optimism about the existing economic arrangements which is unwarranted. Because of this optimism there is an inclination to dissociate the problems of group relationships, such as between religious groups, from those of economic class conflicts, with an ensuing inability to recognize the relative ineffectiveness of halfway measures and minor expedients.

A real contribution can be made in this field only by emphasizing clearly the economic factors which are fundamental to group relationships. A social system which is striving desperately for equilibrium on the basis of traditional economic principles is a tinder box which may explode smoldering religious and other prejudices. Everything possible must be done clearly to set forth the fact that an equitable economic system can be achieved only through an economic organization of the whole community of workers and producers.⁸¹

A year later a report made before the National Conference--in apparent agreement with Lurie's theory--criticized the defence programs of the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Re-distributionists. (The Reconstructionists-minority wrote an addendum to this report which will later be discussed; therefore, this report represents the work of the universalist group):

The concrete activities of the American Jewish Committee are determined by the social and economic position of its leaders and their conception of the underlying cause of anti-Semitism. As a result the

Committee confines itself to advocating good-will talks and conferences, discussions with government officials, and with appeals to the reason of the American people. It has not a word to say about the rise of reaction against other sections of the population which profoundly affects the status of the Jew. By fostering the belief that anti-Semitism can be eliminated by a mere appeal to Americanism, the American Jewish Committee not only is naive but has no claim to leadership.

As a result of the recrudescence of anti-Semitic activity in Europe and its rise in this country, the (American Jewish) Congress has adopted a policy that is more aggressive than that of the Committee...But to this day its program has not placed the problem of anti-Semitism in its proper perspective by fighting against the whole onslaught of fascisms.

Concerning those who would re-distribute Jews in the economy:

We must remember that this economic planning, if it can be called that, attempts to work out a solution for the Jewish group within the confines of the present economic system. This presents a situation wherein the Jew is advised to go into agriculture at a time when millions of farmers are being forced off the land. The attempt to interest Jews in homestead farming can only mean their reduction to a peasant existence. Even in as large a city as New York where Jews figure prominently as employers of labor, it has been definitely stated that no industrial openings of any numerical significance are available for Jews. (Therefore, this program) of economists and communal workers...is obviously impossible.

After this devastation of other defence programs, what does the committee propose? Fight for civil liberties and against reaction. More specifically, this means for social insurance, child labor legislation, the thirty hour week.⁸²

There is also to be expected among social workers the psychological approach to prejudice: This is not to be confused with the pseudo-psychological explanations of those groups which hold the mentality of a people to be causal.

Prejudice is based on a learned tendency to withdraw from "the other." One's own superiority is shown through a "pre-judging of someone who is different."⁸³ It would follow from the psychological approach that association of groups that are different would help alleviate prejudice. If prejudice is projection against a group that is different and the individual is made to feel through association that the people in that group are not so different after all, then his frustration will be more evenly distributed and not directed specifically at that group. And Lillian Wald maintains that through association one learns the law of brotherhood.⁸⁴

This psychological approach does not contradict a social analysis if it is seen that under certain social conditions the frustrations at large may increase so that the psychologically oriented program becomes impossible. In other words, the degree of association possible is determined by social conditions. The effectiveness of association should be placed in perspective.

The basic difference between the Reconstructionist program and that of the universalists is found in the addendum to the report of the Committee before the 1936 National Conference. This minority report, signed by Harry Baron, Abraham Duker, and others, maintained that fighting for economic emancipation is fine but is not a sufficient program. To carry on this fight the Jews need an adequate group life. They should, therefore, use their "cultural differentia": their history, language, and mores

which are based on "the ideology of a social system which would eliminate the evils of capitalism." For example, the Labor Zionist ideology in Jewish tradition gives group strength and an ideology opposed to the existing order.⁸⁵

But it is true that the Reconstructionist has the same social analysis as has the universalist group. After a discussion of Father Coughlin, an editorial states:

But the problem lies not so much in the men that lead such movements as in the conditions that make people look to such men for leadership.⁸⁶

The way to fight anti-Semitism is not by refuting specific charges but by working

for a social order in which the general economic security will remove the basis for anti-Jewish discrimination and by cooperating...with all those liberal forces that are endeavoring to discover the nature of religious and racial prejudice.⁸⁷

Exactly what these liberal forces are is not made clear.

The very lack of an immediate program springing from a radical analysis--that is, a program that could be carried on by a group bound so intimately as are social workers to the existing social order--this very lack may have led to the Reconstructionist's practical plan to alleviate anti-Semitism: an organic community that could facilitate vocational re-distribution, that could establish a Jewish medical school, and that could provide the spiritual and material stamina for a harried Jewish community. Of course, the form the plan took was obviously influenced by the already existing Reconstructionist program. Vocational redistribution so that Jews would be in all classes of society would fit into the plan for an organic Jewish community. The Jewish

medical school and the cultural defences (whatever their rationales) certainly were part of the plan for a self-sufficient communal organization that would support such institutions as many of the Reconstructionists represented.

In his "Planning for Jewish Economic Welfare," Ben Selekman assumes "the continuance of the capitalistic system but operating under mild social controls" and predicts more restrictions of Jewish opportunity. He then recommends economic redistribution programs of an experimental nature:

First we can and should use whatever energy and influence we may possess to help the forward-looking elements in the country wrest from the government and the times the maximum social gains for all the people, even while we set up simultaneously defences for our own people against specific dangers that threaten them. Second, we can and should so strengthen our own cultural and spiritual life... that they will furnish both the supports against our hardships and the agents for converting them into spurs to the battle for social justice.

The mass of men and women cannot wait for fundamental programs of reconstruction which it may require decades to bring into existence.

And this impatience and pessimism with the status quo leads him to stress the re-distribution program:

Overconcentration in white collar jobs, in the professions, in small business and in cities--(this is the problem.)⁸⁸

The Reconstructionist, in one case, I. Rubinow, believes that such re-distribution can come about only in an organic Jewish community.⁸⁹ Mordecai Kaplan outlines the following program which he maintains can be carried out only in his organic community: Move the urban unemployed into farm-industry cooperative communities; sponsor accurate vocational guidance

in accordance with openings; have efficient Jewish employment agencies; fight for employment rights everywhere.⁹⁰

Taking cognizance of the numerus clausus in medical schools, the Reconstructionist states that the only answer is the organic community with its own schools.⁹¹

Admitting that "suffering and frustration (is) incidental to the social crisis," the Reconstructionist claims that "material and spiritual needs" can be achieved only through a communal organization with a creative ideology.⁹² In commending a vocational guidance program in New Orleans, it warns that this is only part of the survival plan...the Reconstructionist philosophy will supply the rest.⁹³

It has been shown that the program to combat anti-Semitism fit well into the overall program of these federation leaders. The vocational re-adjustment plan assumes what may be the basic fallacy of the Reconstructionist program: that Jews can form a community of any desirable nature if they will it, regardless of the conditions in the outer environment! Such an assumption is seen in the historical analysis which assumes that the Jewish community has been throughout the generations democratic. It is seen in the belief that in an oligarchic anti-Semitic world, a democratic Jewish organic community can exist. It is seen in the belief that in a society in crisis, re-distribution of Jews would be both possible and beneficial. The truth would seem to be that the role the Jews play in the economy is determined by the condition of the economy. And if there is to be any vocational re-distribution, it will be determined

by social conditions and not by a small group of Jews. Furthermore, as a universalist pointed out, a Jewish farmer in time of economic crisis would be in as sore a strait as a shop keeper.

In Chapter VI it was observed that the Jewish professional group--due to its ultimate dependence on the existing order--would not advocate seriously a radical program. However, its position in society enabled it to see clearly defects in the system. Hence, the radical theorizing of both universalist and Reconstructionist group. Hence, the vague program of the universalist. Hence, the program of the Reconstructionist that flowed not from the analysis but from its class needs.

What were the interpretations given by the various labor groups to the American anti-Semitism? They were unanimous in agreement that there was a native anti-Semitism that was based on social conditions in America. The Advance spoke of

a rash upon the social organism, symptomatic of its incipient decay.⁹⁴

Fascism cannot be imported; it must spring from local conditions...and from a failure of the workers to deal with the crisis.⁹⁴

However injurious anti-Semitism is to the Jews, it is even more destructive to the very life of progressivism, labor, and democracy.⁹⁵

Anti-Semitism among farmer and laborer is fed by the antipathy of these groups to the middle-man and by fundamentalistic religion.⁹⁵

Labor groups viewed native American anti-Semitism as socially caused, because they were well aware of America's class conflict and could quickly see the use to which anti-Semitism was being put--both as a weapon for dissatisfied corporate interests and as a salve for the petty bourgeoisie.

But to understand the differences in interpretation and program of the Labor Zionist group and of the Socialist anti-Zionist, it would be well to recall the attitudes of these groups towards Hitler and the American depression. The Zionist group adhered to American and Jewish nationalism--as their more middle-class background seems to have facilitated a reluctant acceptance of the Roosevelt patriotism and preparedness program as well as an enthusiastic acceptance of the Zionist program. The anti-Zionist was more consistent in his opposition to the New Deal and did not accept the preparedness program before World War II had broken out. Zionism--another middle-class ideology--provided no answer for these workers of long standing, many of whom came from the Menshevik Bund.

The Frontier presented a radical and at times deterministic analysis of American anti-Semitism: Anti-Semitism rises with fascism--this idea originated not with the Communists but with Nahman Syrkin.⁹⁶ The use of anti-Semitism by dissatisfied corporate interests is clearly seen:

If the political advisors of the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Fords, and the Mellons decide that anti-Semitism is the best smoke-screen behind which they can ride to power--they will whistle for McFadden...and let the Jews take the rap.⁹⁷

The financial racket of Coughlin is understood, as in his use of the most effective name-calling devices: Coughlin knows the facts but wants money from the Mellons, Fords, or Morgans. Baruch is the scapegoat. "This time it is a banker. Next time it will be a Communist...The trick is to confuse the people, play the savior."⁹⁸ Examples of native fascism are given, from the American National Labor Party to the incident in which Los Angeles police attacked hobos in 1936...to Coughlin's Christian Unions.⁹⁹ There is a note of determinism in an editorial of August, 1936:

The Fascists hate us less as Jews than they love us as mascots of their struggle for power...We shall be treated as the laws of social conflict exact.

What was the program of the Labor Zionist group? They were unalterably opposed to the facts and figures of the American Jewish Committee and Anti-Defamation League. The ADL is criticized for its belief in the "magic efficacy of facts and figures."¹⁰⁰

The gentlemen who fear that the Congress will furnish anti-Semites with further ammunition are not being discreet. They are being madly utopian. They assume that Jew-hatred moves on a rational plane and may therefore be affected by reason or persuasion.¹⁰¹

The Jewish War Veterans anti-Communist slogan is opposed with the following metaphor:

The lady who proclaims her virtue though she be an authentic model of chastity, adds little to her fair name.¹⁰²

As for the group's positive program: Zionism constituted its main feature, since the Jew in the Diaspora could do little about the laws of social conflict. But

Zionism was not enough: Jews should unite with other minority groups:

America's minority groups are both the last promise of American life and the first battleground for its barbarization.¹⁰³

The New Jersey Homestead project in which two hundred Jewish families formed a cooperative was a healthy step towards normalization of Jewish economic life.¹⁰⁴ But the plan for economic re-distribution did not seem to be stressed or taken seriously by the workers or leaders in the Labor Zionist movement. It was stressed primarily by social workers such as I. Rubinow who had joined the movement.¹⁰⁵ The thought that tolerance could be taught in truly democratic schools was expressed.¹⁰⁶ But the general impression received is that these programs are looked upon cynically and that the only significant effort is the work for a Jewish state.

The Arbeiter Circle would naturally share the radical analysis that anti-Semitism is bound up in the crises of the capitalistic system:

If the New Deal fails to keep the capitalist system working here, then the bankers and industrialists like their ilk in Italy and Germany, will not hesitate to subsidize these groups.¹⁰⁷

[The only salvation is] a strong radical movement.

So Zionism another capitalist nationalism cannot be a solution. This group alone was denying that the preparedness program was the answer to Hitler's anti-Semitism: The Jewish praise being given to Roosevelt's condemnation of atrocities is "dangerous applause," for it is sanctioning a capitalist preparedness program and it makes the Jews forget their under-

standing of all anti-Semitism:

We forgot entirely the reasons for anti-Semitism. We applauded when they said it was due to conflicting ideologies. Is it a question of theology? We applauded when they said it was due to teutonic barbarism. Is it a question of anthropology? No one that mattered said that it was an economic problem. Still we applauded. Dorothy Thompson became the heroine of America and the darling of American Jewry. Bishop Manning and Cardinal Dougherty became the guardians of Judaism. Senator Vandenberg and Tom Dewey became the American spokesman for equality of rights and civil liberties. And, of course, F.D.R. was first in the sound of our applause.

In between pogroms we carefully study the phenomenon of anti-Semitism. We compare it to the hatred of the Negro in the South and other cheap labor or scapegoat minorities. We come to the conclusion that its cause is economic. We agree that fascism in whatever form looks for a whipping boy and that wherever convenient the Jew serves that purpose. We also agree that with the decline of American capitalism there will be an attempt at reaction. With this reaction will come the loss of civil rights, persecution of minorities, a search of a scapegoat; and that scapegoat will be the Jews...(and so) we offer socialism.

When there will be a choice between some American Fascism and some form of workers' collectivism, where will our heroes of today stand? Are Vandenberg and Dewey going to stand with true democracy or with big business and its necessary slogan "take America back from the Jews"...Also where will Warburg and Straus and the other rich Jews stand?¹⁰⁸

Here then is an analysis which assumes that America will not find the answer to the problem of overproduction of producer-goods industries and that the result will be a period of reaction and anti-Semitism in which the American capitalist will desperately seek to retain his wealth and his system. Since these American officials who are being applauded represent capitalism which, according to the Arbeiter Circle is the current cause of anti-Semitism, then applause of the pronouncements of these leaders is "dangerous."

And how can socialism be achieved? By working with like-minded workers throughout the world. The Daily Forward--when Vladeck was general manager--wrote:

The Jewish question must be solved in the lands in which Jews live, by cooperating with the laboring and progressive masses of other nationalities.¹⁰⁹

The distinction should be drawn between the expressed attitude of the Call (official organ of the Workmen's Circle) and the attitude of the Jewish Labor Committee. The Call states that "the work of the Jewish Labor Committee is our work...fighting at once against anti-Semitism and fascism."¹¹⁰ And the leader of the JLC was a member of the Circle. However, here the similarity in point of view ends. For, despite the official adherence of the Call to the JLC's policy and analysis, it has already been shown (in Chapter VII) that the Committee engaged very vigorously in the "dangerous applause" of which the Call just warned, had great faith in the Voice of America and the Conscience of the World, answered Father Coughlin with facts and arguments, and proclaimed the phrases of middle-class America. The Call, it has just been shown, rejected such a program and the analysis which it implies. The reasons for the differences in the views of the Call and the JLC have also been discussed.

All labor groups saw American anti-Semitism as a native growth due to social conditions. The socialist groups thought these conditions were chronic (The more conservative unions and especially union leadership worked in the New Deal for an elimination of those conditions).

But among the socialists, there were some who felt Zionism to be the only realistic program (while other techniques were mentioned in passing). And the more consistent socialists felt that only socialism would be the answer: They spoke neither of Zionism nor of the work-with-minority or vocational-re-distribution methods that were mouthed (how seriously is not certain) by the socialist Zionists.

This concludes the discussion of the analyses and programs formed by the different Jewish classes when confronted by anti-Semitism in America. Social influences in these analyses and programs have been pointed out. By understanding these influences a more objective view of reality may--it is hoped--be gained.

IX. COMMUNISM AND THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

The reactions of the American Jewish community to its major problems during the thirties have been discussed. Those major problems were three: the crisis in America's economy, the advent of Hitler, and the rise of native American anti-Semitism. These problems may be considered one: they are all related to the world depression that shook every nation during the thirties.

In the analysis of Jewish reactions to these problems, three aspects of those reactions have been purposely omitted thus far. There were three ideologies already established before the thirties that offered solutions to the personal and social stresses among the Jews. Those ideologies were Communism, Zionism, and Judaism. In the following chapters an attempt will be made to discover what underlay the proposed solutions offered by these ideologies and to discover how responsive the different segments of the Jewish community were to these solutions.

It will be recalled that a considerable number of Jews and non-Jews were attracted to the Communist movement during the thirties. Dissatisfied workers, groping intellectuals, and declassed bourgeoisie were among those attracted to the Communist Party. In this chapter, two questions will be posed: What was the solution of the Communist Party? And among which groups of Jews were there individuals who, while not Party members, were sympathetic

to the movement and, misunderstanding its real nature, were enthusiastic members of "front" organizations sponsored by the Party?

The basic policy of the Communist Party throughout the world is to prevent the emergence of successful working class governments in every country. For if such governments were to emerge, then the leaders of the Communist Party in Moscow, that is, the rulers of the Soviet regime, would have a difficult (if not impossible) task of continuing their subjugation of the Russian people. For the big selling point of the Russian government for its oppressed masses is that Russia is the one place in the world where the proletariat rules. All other countries are in a state of capitalistic degeneration. Therefore, the Russian people should unite in support of the Soviet government to maintain and strengthen the Soviet state which is having such difficulty in a world of degenerate capitalist states. If those capitalist states ever worked out a solution to their problems or established democratic socialistic governments, the great diversion that is keeping the Soviet state afloat would be lost to the Russian ruling hierarchy.¹

In the light of this basic principle of Communist Party policy, the following discussion of the Communist attitudes towards the depression and the New Deal, Hitler and American anti-Semitism, and Zionism can be understood as not a series of conflicting and contradictory pronouncements but a very consistent policy which underlies the

curving Party Line. It will be noted that a second (though less important) determinant of the Party Line in different countries is the current policy of Russian foreign diplomacy.

In the period under discussion there were two major shifts in the Party Line. One, after the secure establishment of Hitler and two, after the Stalin-Hitler pact. First the period before the success of Hitler will be discussed.

It will be recalled that in 1929 the American Communist Party favored a policy of militant dual unionism. During the depression and through the early New Deal, Norman Thomas was called a "social fascist." Roosevelt was anathema. The words of Communism were antagonistic to all other parties:

The Republican party wishes to save the capitalist system by helping the rich without any concealment. The Democratic party wishes to save the capitalist system by helping the rich under the demagogic disguise of helping the "forgotten man." The Socialist Party wishes to save the capitalist system by giving it a social-democratic mask.²

The capitalist press treats Norman Thomas as a gentleman and a scholar. He is given a police escort, while William Foster is clubbed. Therefore, the Communists are the only truly revolutionary party. Socialists and social-democrats are fakers.² This policy was sure to have the following result: Left-wing workers, normally sympathetic to a revolutionary philosophy, would be in a dilemma. Many would return to their traditional social-democratic movement and be alienated from any revolutionary activities. Some would join the Party. Surely any revolutionary energy would be under the safe control either of the mild American socialist parties or of the Communist Party which had no intention of starting

a revolution. Finally, the American labor movement was thrown into further turmoil so that any radical democratic workers movement was out of the question.

This Line was continued through the early days of the New Deal. Roosevelt's program was called:

An intensive extension, with its tempo dictated by the deepening crisis at home and internationally, of the basic program of Wall Street imperialism... multiplied exploitation of the working class and quadruple oppression of the masses, Negro and White.³

What was the Line towards Hitler during this period? It is well known that the Communist Party split the working class in Germany and prevented any successful attempt to prevent the rise of Hitler to power. This program paralleled the efforts to prevent a successful American working class movement. In the New Masses there is a studied silence concerning Hitler--as though the American workers should not examine too closely what was happening in Germany. (They might discover the secret of the Communist Party...and many of them did).

What was the Line towards anti-Semitism in America at this period? The New Masses evinced no interest in anti-Semitism at this time--either German or American anti-Semitism.

What was the Line towards Zionism at this period? A strong anti-Zionist and pro-Arab policy was frankly stated. After Palestinian Communists instigated the Arab riots of 1929, an article in the Morgan Freiheit stated:

Guilty! The overwhelming majority of the Jewish population in Palestine, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, in a larger or smaller measure, has been engaged in colonizing and ex-

exploiting a foreign country for the bourgeoisie in Palestine and abroad. They all did their share⁴ to step upon the exploited but undefeatable Arabs.

And a month later:

Jewish immigration to Palestine is possible only⁵ under conditions created by British imperialism.

Therefore, not only Zionism but all Jewish immigration to Palestine should be opposed. This attitude flows from the policy of forestalling any successful working class movement, such as one that might spring from a Jewish socialist state. A further factor was the prevailing anti-British policy of the Soviet foreign office.

But with the success of Hitler a change was called for in the Party Line. The working class at last saw clearly that splits within the labor movement had allowed Hitler to gain power and that the Communists had been instigating those splits. No workers at all would be attracted to a movement that would not cooperate with those "progressive" forces that were combatting Hitlerism. So, in order to remain a movement, in order to survive as an active organization--the Communist Party had to join the fight against fascism. A factor that reinforced this anti-Hitler policy was the Soviet state's growing fear of German military aggression. But this was a very secondary cause, as that fear also existed before the change in the Line. The new Party Line was clearly dictated by the success of Hitler and the refusal of the working class to take seriously any movement that instigated splits and that remained aloof from the struggle against fascism. And, so the United Front was adopted as Party policy.

The United Front meant that Communists would join with those same groups that they had just been calling social fascists and would combat Hitlerism. Since this wooing of "liberal" elements, from New Dealers to Norman Thomas, was so contrary to the existing line and since many members sincerely were sold on that pre-Hitler line,-- the transition to the United Front had to be made gradually so as not to lose loyal members of the Party who had learned to hate Roosevelt and Thomas. It was not until 1935 that the Seventh Congress of the Communist International gave official recognition to the United Front.

The transition to the United Front was made in America in 1934. On February 16, there was an attempted United Front meeting in Madison Square Garden that ended in a riot. The AFL representatives and Mayor LaGuardia were at the meeting. Disgraceful conduct by Communists rioters was protested within the Party by John Dos Passos, Clifton Fadiman, and Elliot Cohen. These gentlemen were answered very courteously by the Party that a United Front policy was being attempted, but it would never be practiced at the sacrifice of having to listen to some of the conservative speakers that were at the last minute pushed into the program.⁶ Perhaps some Party members were not yet ready for the United Front.

But very shortly after the riot, the United Front became the accepted policy. And the heretofore despised social reformers were hailed as saviors. The New Deal was considered a progressive movement of the people.⁷ In 1938, the Communist

Party in New York was supporting the American Labor Party and was advocating:

strengthening of labor's rights, low-rent public housing, and comprehensive social security, abolition of child labor...extension of democratic rights especially to the foreign born and Negro population...

Then as if to allay the fears of members of long-standing:

While aware that only a Socialist system of society can finally do away with the inhuman poverty and degradation forced upon us by the blind forces of capitalism, (the Party) presents legislative measures that can be realized now and which would immediately improve the conditions of the people.⁸

Dramatic evidence of the shift in policy was the Madison Square Garden debate held between Earl Browder and the erstwhile social fascist, Norman Thomas. The polite proceedings took place on November 27, 1935.⁹

As the important idea to be conveyed by the Front was Communism's opposition to Hitler, there was a notable change in the Line: from little concern with Nazism to loud vocal protests and mass meetings. Communist front organizations were established to entice many liberals into Communist groups. Many who were carried along by the wave of indignation against the Nazis drifted into the Communist camp. This both assured the Party of a good membership and gave further assurance that no independent working class movement would come of a coalition of New Dealers, Thomasites, and Communists!

Jewish Life urged a strengthening of the boycott.¹⁰
The People's Movement claimed to represent 500,000 Jews.¹¹
The Jewish People's Voice was put out by the Jewish People's Committee for United Action against Fascism and Anti-Semitism.

Jewish Life hailed Roosevelt's Chicago speech and demanded that America "intercede in behalf of the downtrodden Polish Jews."¹¹ At a mass meeting William Weiner, president of the Jewish People's Committee, stated:

Every American can be proud of the way in which our entire nation has spoken up in horror and anger against the unspeakable Nazi pogrom against an innocent and defenceless people.¹²

Needs of Russian foreign policy seem to be expressed in the opposition to the appeasement policy of England and France.

If at first you don't concede, fly and fly again.¹³ But the dominant note of the United Front was the cooperation of all "progressive" elements to fight fascism.

This program led to an increased awareness of American anti-Semitism. Just as Communist attacks on Hitler enticed many Jews, so the Communist solution to American anti-Semitism attracted Jews. The solution was the same: a United Front against reactionary forces in America.

After long silence on the Jewish problem, the New Masses suddenly writes in April, 1934 about "Jewry at the Crossroads." Opinion is congratulated for its statement that Jewry should join hands with "mine and mill and farm and slum." Special praise is given James Waterman Wise for his cooperation with the United Front.¹⁴ And Jewish Life bases its whole appeal to Jews during 1937 and 1938 on the belief that Communists are the natural allies of the Jews:

In its present form [the Jewish question] grows out of the nature of the capitalist economy in its dying stage.

In America, evidences of reaction and therefore of anti-Semitism are the Liberty League and the AFL.

The working class, farmers, certain elements of the middle class and national groups, including the Jewish people, must of necessity present a common front against this deadly enemy of progressive humanity.¹⁵

The B'nai B'rith is praised for its efforts on behalf of the United Front.¹⁶ The May, 1938 index of Jewish Life reads:

"Anti-Semitism in USA," "Anti-Semitism in Latin America," "Situation of Jews in Austria," "Anti-Semitism Must Be Defeated." And so American anti-Semitism was "used" by the Communist Party in pursuit of its United Front program.

What was the result of the change to the United Front line on the Communists' strong anti-Zionist policy? While never sanctioning Zionism, the Party tones down considerably its attitude of opposition to Jewish nationalism. While in 1929 it was observed that Jewish immigration could only aid British imperialism, by 1937 Jewish immigration is possible through Arab-Jewish cooperation.¹⁷ The Party opposed the 1937 Partition Plan, because this would prevent Arabs and Jews from getting together. If they could only throw off the British yoke, then they could live together in peace.¹⁸ Morris Schappes claims that Palestine can remain free from war if the free people will establish a concerted quarantine against the aggressor nations.¹⁹ There is criticism of the 1939 White Paper: It was written by the same hand that wrote the Munich agreement!²⁰ So now, it is becoming evident what

lies behind this tenderer treatment of Zionism. Russia is smarting under the rejection of British and French co-operation in her proposed containment policy against Hitler. The anti-British Soviet foreign policy may well have influenced the tone of the Party's statements regarding Palestine. This is especially evident in the last cited statement: the hand that wrote the Munich agreement (and put Russia in a desperate plight) also wrote the White Paper.

Another important factor is probably the attempt to attract Jews to the United Front program. This could not well be done with a continuance of the extreme antagonism towards Zionism.

Still the Party was basically opposed to Zionism and actively supported the Arab riots of 1936.²¹ No matter what American Communists were saying, no successful working class movement could be allowed to succeed in Palestine. Furthermore, any riots in British colonies would hinder the Empire.

The reasons for the United Front policy and its effects on the Communist attitudes towards the New Deal, Hitler, American anti-Semitism, and Zionism have been examined. In the latter part of 1939 there was another radical change in the Party Line. The Soviet state signed a pact with Germany. The negotiations with France and England had fallen through, Munich had made appeasement official Western policy, and Russia faced Hitler alone and without allies. This pact was an emergency move and called for a quick change from the United Front program. The Party could not continue boycotting Hitler after Mother Russia had signed a pact with him.

The Jewish People's Voice, organ for the United Front, ceased publication. In an attempt to salvage some support from American workers, the Party did not follow completely Russian foreign policy by endorsing Hitler. Instead it maintained a plague on both your houses:

The international munitions merchants supplied China with armaments; Mr. Hudson discussed with Dr. Wohltat in London British-German rapprochement. Mr. Chamberlain betrayed Czechoslovakia in the interests of the City; the French Fascists have murdered the Spanish Republic with their non-intervention. And in the face of all this one now objects when Soviet Russia does the same? Equal rights for all!²²

Since the results of the change in Party Line occur in 1940, they are beyond the scope of this study.

To complete the discussion of the Communist solution that was offered to the Jewish community of the thirties (more properly, the solutions), an examination of the Biro-bidzhan project is essential. The following is a capsulization of pertinent facts presented in Solomon Schwarz' The Jews in the Soviet Union.

The theme of Schwarz' book is that in such a totalitarian regime as Russia all minority groups will suffer. Witness the Jewish group: the Yiddish press was abolished, Zionist activity was forbidden, emigration to Israel was not allowed.²³ Biro-bidzhan, far from being a sincere effort to give the Jews a land of their own, was at the beginning an attempt "to find a suitable area for the large-scale agricultural settlement of destitute Jewish city-dwellers." President Kalinin, to spark the project, did use slogans about Jewish nationalism. The first settlers arrived in 1928. Over half of them returned. But more settlers were sent because of the infiltration of

Chinese farmers into the area! So urgent was the need for settlement of the area as a buffer state against foreign elements in the East that non-Jewish settlers exceeded the Jewish. The chalutzit spirit was not encouraged by the government; therefore, few Jews desired to go there. So with the establishment of the Jewish Autonomous Province in 1934, Jewish settlers--workers and farmers from Western provinces--were actually recruited. By this time the purpose of the project was officially recognized by the Soviet government:

To every thinking participant in socialist construction the great importance of defending the Far East against foreign intervention is absolutely clear. The settlement of the area with trustworthy and responsible people is a basic requirement in strengthening the defenses of our Far Eastern frontier.

Actually the proclamation of Jewish autonomy was a facade covering over the recruitment process of Jewish and non-Jewish Russians. In this way foreign aid could be enticed by public statements that created sympathy towards the Soviet Union:

For the first time in the history of the Jewish people its burning desire for the creation of a homeland of its own, for the achievement of its own national statehood, has found fulfillment.²⁵

And so, throughout the middle thirties some Jewish groups were attracted to the project. But the purges of 1937 destroyed the leadership of the Jewish Autonomous Province, scotched the whole project, and disillusioned all American Jews who had been sympathetic except the Communists themselves. The leaders who were purged were condemned as "Trotskyite-Bukhari-nite and bourgeois-nationalist bandits who had come from counterrevolutionary Jewish parties (Zionists, Bundists, etc.)"²⁶ The publications of the JAP ceased, and most of the Jews who

remained in the province held down semi-bureaucratic jobs in the governing administration. And American Jewry lost interest in Birobidzhan.

The solution of the Communist Party to the problems facing the Jews during the thirties has been examined. The revolutionary words and disruptive actions in the working class during the early depression, the lack of concern in America with Hitler and anti-Semitism, and the strong anti-Zionism are characteristics of the early line. The United Front with its friendship towards reformers, with its strong anti-Hitler policy and its rallying all progressive groups against anti-Semitism, and with its milder non-Zionist policy--this is characteristic of the line until the Stalin-Hitler pact. The Biro-bidzhan project attracted attention until 1937. This was the solution for those Jews who were avowed Communists...just as it was the view of the Party. For the Jewish and non-Jewish Communist thought alike on all issues. The Jews were simply more interested in how the United Front affected the Jewish community.

It is now in order to examine the reaction of the avowedly non-Communist Jewish community to the Communist Program. To what degree did the different groups understand or else lean towards the Communist solution...especially the attractive United Front? No Jewish class organizations officially sanctioned the United Front. In fact the failure of Jewish organizations (The American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Bund) to sympathize with the Front draws continuous criticism from Jewish Life.

The history of the Bund is an unfolding of the triumph of nationalism over its revolutionary ideas.²⁷

The Jewish Labor Committee prefers to accept the most unfounded slanders of the reactionaries and fascists about the Communists.²⁸

As for the Congress' opposition to the People's Committee:

If they are truly interested in the Jewish masses, they will realize that a united front...is the only possible body that will represent the democratic Jewish masses.²⁹

However, many individuals within the Jewish groups sympathized with the United Front. On examining the Anglo-Jewish press of the thirties, it is found that certain classes furnished the Communist Party with a great many sympathizers including some of the leaders of the class. Other classes were too well aware of the nature of the policy to be led astray. The degree to which the different groups leaned towards the United Front can perhaps be explained by the needs and interests of the particular classes.

Among the old middle-class of German background there is no evidence of sympathy with the United Front. On the contrary, there are efforts made to prove that American Jews are not Communists.³⁰ There is no evidence of members of this class being prominent in local Communist-front activities of the thirties.

The only area in which prominent members of this class were partial to the Communist solution was that of Birobidzhan. The B'nai B'rith Magazine, in October, 1936, viewed the project very favorably. And the Hebrew saw in the proposals of Madagascar, New Caladonia, and Birobidzhan that the world was awakening to its duty.³¹

This class reaction might have been expected from a group whose old middle-class interests had led them to abhor any movement that even hinted that all was not well with the economic system, even in the mild form of the United Front. The interest in Birobidzhan was natural for a group that saw a tremendous world Jewish problem and could not admit immigration to America or a Jewish state in Israel as a solution. Birobidzhan's illusion was cherished, and the project was made the resultant of the all-powerful conscience of the world.

The new middle-class was much friendlier to the Communist Party Line. In his prize essay on anti-Semitism for Opinion, Joshua Trachtenburg advocated alliance with such organizations as the League against War and Fascism, although he admitted the difficulties due to Communist-association.³² The Congress Bulletin had hopes for Birobidzhan but admitted its error when the project fell through in 1937 in an article entitled, "End of an Illusion."³³ James Waterman Wise, editor of Opinion, it has been noted, was hailed by the Communists for participation in United Front activity. Only after the Stalin-Hitler pact did he write that "Russia Betrays Mankind." We should "admit our error and revise our course."³⁴ The Congress Bulletin, however, formally rejected the United Front and stated that one cannot suppress Jewish national life in one country and promote national unity in another.³⁵ Still it is the impression that many prominent individuals within this class were drawn

towards the Party Line.

The vulnerability to the Communist solution might be expected from a group that courted pseudo-radical solutions such as technocracy, from a group that was willing to examine the basis of the social order and that was not afraid of radical terminology. The Communists also were not satisfied with the existing order; perhaps they have something to offer. The phrases of the United Front were very attractive to a group of groping bourgeoisie who had not gone through the experience of the American worker who had for years been fighting Communism within his ranks and could more easily see the movement for what it actually was. As evidenced by the history of revolutions, the new middle-class has long had a dream of uniting with all other classes against the ruling powers in order to establish a new society. But in such cases the new middle-class has either been fooled by the Right (France) or by the Left (Russia).

Information sufficient for conclusions about the New York manufacturers and small creditors of neo-Orthodox persuasion is lacking. The Outlook did jeer--after the Stalin-Hitler pact--at those Jewish radicals who had been "taken in" by the United Front.³⁶ And the Forum shows no evidence of leaning towards the Party. It might be argued through evidence of omission that the Forum group opposed the United Front. This would be a logical surmise, as the manufacturers and financiers connected with consumer-goods industries would not be likely to have sympathy for any

radical social movement...especially such a "godless" one that challenged neo-Orthodoxy, or any religion.

The group most susceptible to the Party Line seems to have been the Jewish professionals. Anti-communism was seen to be a mask for fascism.³⁷ And Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn's letter to the Reconstructionist encouraging the popular front stated:

[Events have proved the] utter and senseless futility of liberals and leftists fighting among themselves the whole reaction prevails... that is the whole justification of the popular front...at this precise moment democracy needs the united support of all who will defend her.³⁸

While Birobidzhan was not so important as Palestine, it was important to set up an "autonomous mass settlement of Jews living as a classless society."³⁹ And even Jakob Lestschinski was persuaded by the publicity-statements of President Kalinin that the purpose of Birobidzhan was to preserve the Jewish nation and culture and "to cure the sick Jewish national body."⁴⁰ And still in April, 1939, Rabbi Harry Essrig was involved in a debate in which he favored joining the American League for Peace and Democracy.⁴¹

It might be expected that the most radical of bourgeois groups would be most likely to be attracted by the Party Line. A group without any practical revolutionary or working class program, a group whose analysis allows the establishment of a democratic Jewish community in a non-democratic society, a group that talks of socialism and Labor Zionism and yet has had no first hand experience with the tactics of the Communist Party--in short, the most radical

of the middle-class, with its faith in the "progressive," would most easily be swayed by the progressive phrases of the Communist Party. The Birobidzhan project at a distance might even seem like a Russian Reconstructionist Movement! Here is Russia, who seems to be sanctioning cultural pluralism--the program that America should adopt, according to the Reconstructionist. So naturally many Reconstructionists would desperately want to believe in the worthiness of the project. And the wish is father to the thought of even some very astute analysis.

Most consistent in rejection of the Party Line was the Labor Zionist group. This might appear surprising when it is recalled that many Reconstructionists were Labor Zionists. However workers who had had experience with Communists made up the majority of the Labor Zionist movement; while middle-class social workers and rabbis formed the core of the Reconstructionist movement.

The groundwork for labor's antagonism to the Communists was laid in the dual union movement of the depression. In 1930 the Vanguard wrote:

While there is no immediate way of staying the ruthless arm of the Communists, ⁴² it is vital for the Jews outside Russia to know.

The Birobidzhan colonization scheme should be exposed.⁴² And so while the liberal middle-class still thought of Russia in terms of the great social experiment, the Labor Zionist group was well aware of the nature of the Soviet system.

Little wonder that with the change in the Party Line in

1935, the Frontier observed a note of insincerity: Perhaps the Communists are concerned with anti-Semitism only in relation to fascism and are really indifferent to the fate of the Jews. The Front is recognized as a new Communist line.⁴³ The reason for the change in line is given as the fear of fascism and choosing the lesser evil.⁴⁴ It has been seen that this is only part of the truth. Birobidzhan is continually spoken of as a deceitful project.⁴⁵ The Soviet does not want an autonomous Jewish community. There can be no chalutzim in chains.⁴⁶ Before the Stalin-Hitler pact and after the failure of Russian-French negotiations there is the accurate prediction that there will be a change in the United Front policy. For that Front was

the ideological superstructure of the Franco-Soviet and the Franco-Czech-Soviet pacts. These pacts have broken down. And the superstructure is bound to disappear with the substructure.

(Russia) must either cling to her old democratic contacts--and that is not a very hopeful policy--or try to come to an understanding with the fascist powers--or at least with one or two of them.⁴⁷

However, reversal of the Front would mean isolation from the masses. So Russia will adopt an experimental policy.

This amazing analysis just before the Stalin-Hitler pact shows a fine, although not complete, grasp of the factors motivating Communist Party policy. The Front was actually the ideological superstructure of the needs of the Party to continue its existence in an America that would ignore any group which remained aloof from the fight against facism. However, the change that was astutely predicted in Russian foreign policy (a breach with the West and an alliance with

fascism)--this change would (it was seen) necessitate a change in the United Front Line. And it did.

The above analysis⁴⁷ was written by Franz Borkenau, author of World Communism, a book containing Rosa Luxembourgs thesis that Lenin's one-party system by its nature will destroy the workers.⁴⁸ Also exposing the Soviet system for the Frontier was Solomon Schwarz who wrote of labor conditions in Russia.⁴⁹

And so, the Labor Zionists, having had first-hand experience throughout the depression with the Communist Party, became acutely aware of the changing line and of the destructive nature of the Party in America. This led to an examination of the Russian policy that controlled the Party and this further unmasked the Soviet Union with analyses of varying accuracies.

There was a Left Poale Zion that was very sympathetic to Russia. Only one of its publications was available, and this, a pamphlet entitled Youth at the Crossroads, claimed that an

active organized anti-Semitic movement is out of the question (in Russia) because all such activity is strictly forbidden by law and severe punishment is meted out to the offenders.⁵⁰

Birobidzhan was formed so that Jews could be on par with other nationalities and failed because of the lack of Jewish national consciousness in Russia. However, the class composition of this small movement was not ascertainable from the data available. So no conclusions will be drawn.

The Bund-background Arbeiter Circle opposed the United Front and the Communist Party. However, they were very sympathetic to Birobidzhan.

The Call of Youth warns its members against front organizations such as the Fraternal Federation for Social Insurance which could only undermine the Circle.⁵¹ A satirical picture is painted of conditions in Russia.⁵² An article by Rebecca Pitts, published in Opinion and presenting the United Front's view of anti-Semitism, was commented on by representatives of many Jewish classes in subsequent articles in Opinion. E. Charney Vladeck of the Circle was the only reviewer of the article to see in it the Communist Party Line.⁵³

Despite this attitude towards the Party and the United Front, the Circle reacted favorably to Birobidzhan. There was "no reason not to believe in the sincerity of Kalinin... to enable Jews to establish themselves both in industry and agriculture and to produce a healthy Soviet Jewish nationality."⁵⁴ And Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky, writing in the Congress Bulletin even after Wise's "The End of an Illusion," stated that Birobidzhan was essential to prevent anti-Semitism in Russia.⁵⁵

It is understandable that the Arbeiter Circle after conflicts with the Communist Party in the American labor movement would be alienated (along with the Labor Zionists) from the United Front. But a movement that offered no solution to the Jewish problem other than a revolution that would be long in coming, such a movement that would not admit

Zionism to be a solution was naturally attracted by the myth of a territorialism that was not bound with a capitalistic brand of nationalism. Hence, the sympathy towards Birobidzhan and the belief in the propaganda of President Kalinin.

This analysis of the Communist solution has attempted to explain just what the Jewish Communists (and, of course, non-Jewish Communists) believed or said they believed. The Party Line has been followed through its changes and its basic pattern aimed at destroying any independent democratic working class movement has been shown as underlying the changes in Line.

While it should be stressed that no Jewish class organization officially accepted the Party Line, many Jews were taken in by the United Front and the Birobidzhan myth. It has been seen that Jewish professionals and members of the new middle-class were most prominent among those who leaned to the Line. Labor Zionists and New York manufacturers were adamant in their resistance to the Party. The old middle-class and the Bundists opposed the Party but were partial to Birobidzhan. The varying reasons underlying these class tendencies have been discussed.

X. ZIONISM AND THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

Many American Jews found in Zionism a solution to the pressing problems of the thirties. But the precise nature of that solution within the Zionist framework varied with each class in the community. Some Jews found in Zionism an opportunity for investment abroad while they feared the consequences of a Jewish nation. Other Jews abhorred the capitalistic nature of the struggle for Palestine and looked forward to a socialist state where investment and profit would not be called for.

The ideologies of the different groups of Zionists or non-Zionists or anti-Zionists are well known. It is the purpose of this analysis after stating very briefly the ideology of Zionism or non-Zionism of each class, to examine how that ideology was influenced by the needs and interests of its social substructure.

Since the source material is primarily the Anglo-Jewish press of the thirties, the ideologies of the different classes will be presented in terms of Zionist events during this period. Those events were briefly as follows:

In 1930 there was a revival in the spirit of American Zionism. The Brandeis-Mack group returned to the movement. Non-Zionists were active in the Jewish Agency. And the first American halutzim went to Palestine. The Simpson Report and Passfield White Paper restricted Jewish immigration, forbidding any more Jewish labor to enter the country while Arabs were yet unemployed and any further acquisition of land

by Jews so long as Arabs were landless. In 1931 the World Zionist Congress adopted the Brandeis economic program, and American Zionism--after a period of relative insignificance--seemed to be returning to the spotlight on the world scene.

Labor Zionism by 1933 was rapidly becoming the dominant element in the movement. Sokolow, representing the Weizman forces, defeated Wise for presidency of the World Zionist Organization. Histadrut was recognized by the World Congress as the only legitimate labor organization in Palestine.

In 1936, the year of the Arab riots, the Zionist movement was split by the Ha-avarah controversy. Should Jewish capital in Germany be transferred to Palestine in the form of German goods--thus giving the Germans a market, aiding the Palestinian economy, and saving some of the money of German-Jewish refugees?

In 1937 and 1938 Great Britain advocated and then forgot the tripartite partition plan. Judah Magnes suggested a bi-national state. There was a recession in Palestinian economic activity--especially in the citrus industry.

In 1939, the British government, preparing for war against Germany and fearful of Arab aid to the Nazis, issued the White Paper which relegated the Jews to a permanent minority in Palestine. This brought storms of protests from nearly all Jewish groups.

Throughout the period there was some interest expressed in territorialism outside of Palestine--in Lower California, Alaska, and--as has been discussed--Birobidzhan.

What was the attitude of the old middle-class towards Zionism? While committed to non-Zionism, there was considerable interest in investments in Palestine and in making Palestine a homeland (although not a Jewish state) for Jewish refugees.

In 1929 seven non-Zionists, including Felix Warburg, Cyrus Adler, Julian Morgenstern, and Louis Marshall, were placed on the Jewish Agency. The Agency was one of the largest stockholders in the Palestine Electric Corporation which sold 2,344,000 kwhr in 1926 and 65,496,000 ten years later.¹ At this time Zionist labor groups protested the large dividends of this corporation.² In 1929, Brandeis gained the support of the old middle-class leadership, and he and Warburg favored an "American business corporation with a view to furthering the economic development of Palestine."³ When Brandeis, with his plans for the Palestine Economic Corporation, came back into the movement, the Hebrew exclaimed, "At last there is hope for the Z.O.A."⁴ And a year later the Hebrew favored the Brandeis-Mack plan which stressed private funds and individual initiative in the movement.⁵

It may be that the particularly friendly attitude of the non-Zionists towards the movement at this time might reflect a need of American business for investment into any expanding foreign economic area, since the world-wide depression had shut off to American business much opportunity for expansion.

Palestine was spoken of as a haven of refuge. And the Passfield White Paper which suspended immigration temporarily was not (as some were saying) a "dastardly violation" but it

was "unsound and regrettable."⁶ The Ha-avarah Program was favored, since actual sterling did not go to Germany.⁷ The B'nai B'rith in 1936 contributed \$100,000 to the JNF for a new farm colony. The 1937 plan for partition was opposed. The White Paper was condemned as setting up "a ghetto in Palestine."⁸

Palestine was looked upon by the old middle-class as a place of refuge. The need of an asylum for the German Jews was increasing. It is doubtful that the old middle-class would have favored a new immigration of middle-class Jews into America: there were already enough for the more limited opportunities. Palestine would be a fine homeland...so long as it did not become a Jewish state:

The Balfour Declaration does not imply a Jewish nation, claimed the Hebrew.⁹ Nahum Goldman's statement that the Jews will be an irritant alien until they solve their problems is attacked bitterly: Jews are not aliens.¹⁰ In 1937 the non-Zionist ideals of Morris Lazaron are expressed.¹¹ A bi-national state is favored in Palestine.¹² And there is interest in territorialism...in Australia, British Africa, and South Rhodesia.¹³

So objection to any philosophy of Jewish nationalism is combined with very friendly interest in a Jewish settlement in Palestine! Perhaps this interest was based on investment opportunities or on the desire to find a homeland for refugees outside of the United States--this is a possibility but evidence is not sufficient to warrant definite conclusions. An unexamined factor that might aid in explaining the program of

the old middle-class is the attitude of the United States government towards British imperialism during the thirties. An article by Felix Warburg entitled, "Palestine--an Investment" is of interest.¹⁴ It is an investment in the social stability of the world. This makes one curious as to the position of American state department policy towards the Near East in general, and the degree to which such financiers (closely tied to government policy) went along with the nation's "interest."¹⁵

Further subject for thought is that the enthusiasm for settlement in Palestine came from the upper eschelon of the old middle-classes. The rank and file of that class, reared on an anti-Zionist ideology, gave no evidence of enthusiasm for the semi-Zionist activities of their leaders! One rabbi, unaware of the social forces in operation and a long-time anti-Zionist, demanded of Marshall: are you a Zionist or are you not? This seems to be similar to the division in the old middle-class on the boycott question: the upper eschelon again had interests that forbade the boycott; while many members of their class carried out the boycott.

Despite their flirtation with the Zionist cause, the old middle-class leaders remained firm in their opposition to the philosophy of Jewish nationalism. They came from that part of middle-class Western European Jewry that had found their opportunity in the expanding capitalistic economy. They had adopted nationalism, the banner of capitalism in Western Europe. It was the nationalism of the countries in which they lived. Through economic and

political loyalty to their nation they had found their place in the sun. Their prosperity had produced integration. Since they felt that their integration had produced prosperity, they would not consider any ideology that seemed to challenge conformity to American patriotism. But Zionism claimed that the Jews were a nationality. The melting pot had stopped bubbling and there were hard chunks of minority groups that never would blend into Western society in crisis. This challenged the integration and American nationalism of the old middle-class--their whole way of life. So, while making investments and encouraging a place of refuge, that class could never accept the basic ideology of Zionism.

The new middle-class, so vulnerable to depression and lacking the long period of prosperity that brings with it integration and the craving for conformity, found in Zionism the primary answer to the Jewish problems: Not only was a Jewish state the answer but working for its establishment would rid the Jew of anxiety:

There is release for all doubts and depression through loyalty, discipline, and systematic work.¹⁶

After an outbreak of anti-Semitism in Mexico City, New Palestine comments:

After centuries of effort to secure an improvement of the Jewish position in the Diaspora, the need for a Jewish National Home in Palestine proves to be greater than ever.¹⁷

Whereas, the old middle-class, by virtue of its social situation, could not admit this greater need.

A revolution in General Zionist leadership in the early

thirties more sharply defined this group's policy and satisfied its rank-and-file by displacement of a leadership that--judging from all reports--did not represent the masses of the movement. The return of Brandeis to the movement "will add a tower of strength to the Jewish purpose in Palestine," stated the Portland Scribe.¹⁸ Meanwhile the group in control of the ZOA was trying to maintain its power:

Minority parties clamor for re-organization, new program, and new alignment of administration.¹⁹

But this is not the time for an exposure of differences. Rabbi Brickner called the Brandeis plan a dictatorship, since it involved a two year hand-picked administration.²⁰ But the Brandeis' group captured the leadership and was hailed by virtually every Zionist and non-Zionist group. What was the particular ZOA program?

General Zionism is all-embracing Zionism. Neither anti-labor nor anti-religious, it is interested in labor and free enterprise. Members can be either Socialist or Orthodox. General Zionism is "unhyphenated Zionism." It is "Universalistic,"--not shackled by extraneous ideology.²¹ However the actual program of General Zionism was hardly universalistic, as it involved practices and principles of interest primarily to the wealthier among the middle-classes: American capital should be mobilized through private corporations formed by big investors; smaller investors should form the Palestinian corporations, and "capitalist" immigration should be urged.²² And the American Hebrew favored such a

a program and commented: "Conservatives are now in control of Zionist affairs in America."²³

In addition to having humanitarian motives for the establishment of a Jewish state, the leaders of the middle-class American Zionist group would naturally think of building up Palestine just as so many other Western capitalistic states were built: through investment of foreign capital into large corporations. This program would naturally be resented by the socialist settlers of Palestine and by the Labor Zionists of Europe. Since such foreign investment hindered at first the growth of a native middle-class in Palestine, the final establishment of the state of Israel found the General Zionists in the minority there, despite the tremendous amounts of capital that middle-class Jews abroad had furnished.

Further evidence of the decidedly "hyphenated" character of the General Zionist movement will be given through discussion of the brand of Zionism of the other American Jewish classes and their opposition to the General Zionist ideology and social structure. Little wonder that the bourgeois Zionism of the new middle-class, losing steadily to labor groups on the world scene, would welcome strength from the pockets and prestige of the Warburg-Marshall non-Zionist group! The return of Brandeis to the scene signified an attempt to mobilize all sympathetic powers of the American Jewish middle-class to take over leadership in the movement. It may be recalled that Brandeis became a power in Zionism

during the first World War, when European Zionism had to relinquish its world leadership role. When the European group regained that role after the War, Brandeis dropped out of the movement. In 1930, the year of world-wide depression, when America was the least shaken of the major nations, perhaps Brandeis saw the possibility of leadership again going to the American Zionist Organization. And he became that leadership, simply by offering his services.

The New York manufacturers and small creditors found in Zionism an answer to the Jewish problem. But it was not the brand of Zionism proposed by the older new middle-classes. It was primarily Mizrachi Zionism--that combination of Orthodoxy and Nationalism that appealed not only to the leadership of this neo-Orthodox class but also to the rank-and-file of their employees and to all those petty bourgeois elements not economically successful enough to crash the new middle-class and who were still tied to the institutions of Orthodox Judaism. Orthodoxy alone was not sufficient to maintain the loyalty of this layer that was barely middle-class. But given a strong nationalist ideology which meant to Eastern Europeans self-realization, given a Zionism that was tied to Orthodoxy, this group would remain loyal to its Orthodoxy and its class leadership. It appears that through Mizrachi Zionism, most of the petty bourgeois elements did remain bound to their class. However, it was necessary to give the workers not only nationalism but also the radical-

sounding phrases of Hapoel Hamizrachi. In this way the sporadic socialistic movements among Orthodox workers could take place under the aegis of an Orthodox-producer-financier leadership and no harm could come from the movements to Orthodoxy or to the capitalistic system. It is not suggested that the leadership invented such an ideology and imposed it on the rank-and-file. There was within the rank-and-file a basic conflict between adherence to old-world traditions, new world socialism, and a nationalism that was a bridge between the old and the new. While the compromise ideology sprang from the needs of the rank-and-file, the class leadership formalized the compromises into the Zionism of Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi and so retained the loyalty of the class.

Evidence for the analysis is found in the Jewish Forum and other Mizrachi publications. The Forum, as has been shown, is sponsored by the wealthy New York manufacturers and creditors and consistently advocates the Mizrachi program. And that Mizrachi program speaks up in behalf of the workers and the lower middle-class. Rabbi Meyer Berlin, presenting the Mizrachi view in New Palestine, demands that poor members of the middle-class should not be kept out of Palestine through discrimination in distribution of certificates. He complains about similar discrimination against members of Hapoel Hamizrachi.²⁴

Rabbi Manuel Laderman welcomes Hapoel Hamizrachi as a movement for Orthodox youth:

Whereas it is fashionable and respectable to be a Zionist or belong to Hadassah, it is queer and quaint to belong to Mizrachi. (Youth) will not join Mizrachi when the movement is associated in his mind with old people, and old interests and old methods. He will join a Mizrachi that is idealistic vigorous, youthful, and in his use of the word, respectable.

The tendency to reaction and standing pat that arises easily in the movement because of its religious philosophy is balanced by the surge to advanced economic thinking, to progressive interests. Through it Mizrachi ceases being "old stuff." It's very new, very exciting stuff. Mizrachi is not just an interest in Kosher meat. It is not an emphasis on the number of days when not to work. It's an intense interest in hard labor.

Hapoel Hamizrachi makes the movement "more positive, more creative...It builds Palestine, builds soundly, effectively, in a modern manner."²⁵

This Zionist ideology is used not only to attract members within the class but also to attack Jews without the class. The return of Brandeis is a good sign, but this does not mean a revived democratic Zionist movement.²⁶ The leadership of the ZOA is labelled "moneybags."²⁷ The old middle-class allies of the General Zionist administration should be removed from the Jewish Agency.²⁸ Warburg in 1937 was opposed to partition for the wrong reason: he feared for his status.²⁹ The Keren Hayesod provides funds for the establishment of irreligious labor cooperatives. So Mizrachi established its own fund in 1934.³⁰

So while Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi are ideologies meeting the needs of the New York manufacturers and creditors and the workers and lower middle-class and some of the youth of these groups, these ideologies also become weapons

with which to attack other social groups in the American Jewish scene. The neo-Orthodox leaders, who complained about the hierarchy in the new middle-class' American Jewish Congress, are also complaining about the hierarchy in the new middle class' ZOA. There is natural dissatisfaction when the new middle-class opens the door of leadership not to life-long Zionists but to non-Zionists who are suddenly given powerful positions on the Jewish Agency. So the old middle-class is attacked. And, of course, the Labor Zionists, currently taking over world leadership and representing an ideology that would undermine neo-Orthodoxy's religious and social order are opposed.

Perhaps the failure to attain a leadership position led to the Selah project. In 1938 the Forum proposed that in addition to Palestine another territory was immediately needed to meet the needs of Jewish refugees:

The territory we propose is that of Lower California--- well segregated so that the country that owns it, Mexico, will not fear an overflow of Jews into Mexico proper.³¹

Selah, Inc. was formed as an "Organization for Planned Settlement of Refugees in Lower California."³² This plan was met with ridicule in all other Zionist circles. The Frontier wrote an article called, "Jews on the Moon."³³ The Congress Bulletin called it a "publicity stunt."³⁴ But the Forum criticized:

Zionists (who) in their unreasonable desire to make capital of the present catastrophe by directing every ounce of Jewish energy and every penny of Jewish capital to the Palestinian project.³²

An attempt has been made to go beneath the Mizrachi ideology. It is true that

Mizrachi is a Zionist Organization of religious Jews which aims at the realization of the two objectives, namely, the upbuilding of Palestine as a Jewish state in the spirit of our Written and Oral Torah and the strengthening of traditional Judaism and its influence in the Diaspora."³⁵

It was founded by Rabbi Meyer Berlin and its three pillars are "The Land of Israel, for the People of Israel, according to the Torah of Israel."³⁵ It has been shown that this particular brand of Zionism met the needs of that class within the American Jewish community which advocated it. It has also been shown that the Zionist ideology of the class became a weapon for the achievement of the broader goals of the class itself. This is not peculiar to the class under discussion. For example, the new middle-class through the ideology of General Zionism attained its dominant position on the American scene. And this is a phenomenon common throughout the history of man--when a set of ideas arise to meet the needs of a class and to furnish them with an ideological weapon in their struggle against other groups.

These Jewish professionals who supported the Reconstructionist movement adopted either General or Labor Zionism and placed their Zionism in the framework of Reconstructionist ideology. There should be a united front in Zionism--a reflection of the cry for a united organic Jewish community.³⁶ But Zionism is not enough: there should be more stress on its cultural aspects. Herzl's and Bialik's

birthdays should become national Jewish holidays.³⁷ The Christian Century is attacked for its stand against cultural pluralism or hyphenism.³⁶ There should be more democracy in the ZOA.³⁶

It has been seen that a particular group of Jewish professionals would tend to favor an organic community. It would then be only natural for their brand of Zionism to be embellished with certain characteristics of that organic community: unity of parties, democracy, and an intense culture. It would also be expected that these professionals--the radicals of the bourgeoisie--who stand on many issues between the new middle-class and the labor nationalists, would adhere either to the brands called Labor or General Zionism. Histadrut's Arab weekly is a fine idea,³⁹ and the Hadassah is praised for its "feminine intuition."⁴⁰ Again...a brand of Zionism influenced by the class needs.

Labor Zionism was the rising Zionist movement of the thirties. Jewish workers who were suffering through the depression did not feel particularly at home in America. In Eastern Europe when socialism furnished a real hope of quick realization, many Jewish workers joined the Bund and felt no need for nationalism. However in America, socialism was not a practical program that looked for immediate fulfillment. Socialism could not give full expression to the desire for security and self-realization of American Jewish workers. But nationalism--that ideology which meant freedom to the

oppressed of Europe during the early twentieth-century--nationalism could give expression to those desires for security and self-realization. So when socialism became just a theory, many Jewish workers embraced nationalism. Nationalism had saturated the world: for the Jews there was either the strong American nationalism of those striving for integration or the strong Jewish nationalism of those accepting minority status and wanting (in the Eastern European sense) "national rights."

But what was the ideology of Labor Zionism? In a series of articles in Labor Palestine which began publication in June, 1933 and which later became the Jewish Frontier, Ben Gurion explains Labor Zionism.

The Histadrut...is the idea of the working class and its historic mission; the political struggle for national and social rights.⁴¹

All Zionism is "mixed." Revisionists combine Zionism with the hatred of workers and unbridled chauvinism; bourgeois Zionists combine Zionism with love of gain and striving for class rule by the rich few over the poor and enslaved masses; Labor Zionism combines Zionism and the

aspirations of toiling humanity for a social order marked by free labor, equality among the nations, and universal peace.

Zionism and Socialism are separate; they neither conflict nor coincide. But "no true socialist may keep aloof from his people." People stand in many circles: the nation, the people, the generation, the working class. Both Socialism and Zionism were created to save us.⁴²

The Histadrut stressed cooperation between Jewish and

Arab worker, because of their workingclass interests. But autonomous unions are needed because of different customs and standards.⁴³ The basis for this ideology is the work of Ber Borochoy. The Frontier speaks of his concept of the national struggle: a conflict between conditions of production and forces of production. The stychic process is the elemental will to be free. This can only be achieved in a socialistic Jewish state.⁴⁴ And this squaring of the two ideologies of freedom during the early twentieth century--nationalism and socialism--gave Labor Zionism a very strong hold on the workers. A detailed analysis of Borochoy's thought is given in the Appendix.

As has been observed, the Labor Zionist group had a large percentage of middle-class leadership. There was a general drift towards radicalism at this time; furthermore, members of the middle-class who found no berths in the ideological movements of their group could be quite prominent as the influential powers in a Labor Zionist organization. To gain national and international power the Labor Zionists on their part had to temper the original program of Borochoy and had to cooperate with bourgeois Zionism.

It is only natural that the constant struggle of the socialist labor groups against representatives of the capitalist order would be reflected in the socialist brand of Zionism. So again Zionism becomes a weapon for a broader class effort. Complaints against the high dividends of the Palestine Electric Corporations have already been noted.

The Zionist leadership is, according to the Vanguard, too weak and too corrupt.⁴⁵ Ben Gurion's view of the General Zionists as striving for oligarchic class rule has been mentioned.

Thus did Labor Zionism meet the broad class needs of Jewish workers and of some members of the radical-talking lower middle-class.

Information concerning Left Poale Zion was too scanty to warrant definite conclusions. The Left Poale Zion constantly is reminding:

The state will not be the full solution--and under capitalism there cannot be a full solution--of the Jewish problem; its creation is nevertheless, a great landmark in Jewish history.

Middle-class Zionists are ridiculed:

(They consider) Palestine as a new era of exploitation, a new market for its capital, a new opportunity to increase its wealth.⁴⁶

ANTIFA, the Palestinian organization of left Poale Zion established in 1935, favors more social contact between Jew and Arab for the sake of the class struggle.⁴⁷ He-halutz, the young radical blood in Poale Zion, criticized the organization's leadership for not making a firm commitment to the socialist ticket in 1936.⁴⁸ From this scant evidence, it would seem that Left Poale Zion represented the rank-and-file of the movement that was more consistently socialistic than was the leadership which was made up of many members of the middle-class who, for various reasons, had drifted into the labor camp and who, quite naturally,

would not be inclined to follow a completely socialistic philosophy...especially in 1936 when the New Deal was crying for help.

This lag between the rank-and-file of labor and its leadership is reminiscent of the structure of the Hillman and Dubinsky unions...

Information concerning Hashomer Hatzair and the Revisionists--the Marxist and Fascist groups respectively--is too scanty to provide the basis for an intelligent discussion.

The group most consistently opposed to Zionism during the thirties was the Workmen's Circle. Some of the reasons given for the anti-Zionist position are: Zionism is not practical, since a maximum of 1,750,000 Jews can be taken in the country; the Histadrut discriminates against Arab workers and this discrimination delays the real solution of working class liberation; Zionism is anti-Yiddishist. What is the answer?

Only by cooperation in the common struggle with the working class of the countries where Jews live, can a homeland be erected out of exile... Zionism in any form forgets the class struggle, substitutes chauvinism for Socialism, and associates itself with groups and classes which are inimical to the interests of the Jewish workers.⁴⁹

Since a state cannot be built on a volcano and since partition will not leave a large enough area, Arab and Jewish workers should unite in one state.⁵⁰

Vladeck joins those few Zionists with Revisionist or Communist tendencies in his criticism of the Ha-avarah

agreement. Palestine will become a scab agent of the boycott if German goods are allowed to find a market there. Because of profits absorbed by the German government and the Jewish National Fund and various Palestinian banks and unions, the individual only received \$111 out of the \$1,000 he owned in Germany.⁵¹ The Call takes the 1939 White Paper very calmly and comments objectively that the White Paper is simply Britain's effort to win over the Arab feudal lords before the coming war breaks out.⁵²

It has already been observed that the members of the Workmen's Circle have found in socialism expression of Borochof's elemental will to be free. Why did they not find the need of nationalism? The core of the Circle was composed of Bundists who developed their ideology in the day when socialism was a very realizable goal. Nationalism was unnecessary.⁵³ The Circle was composed of long-time workers and was free of the middle-class tinge of the Poale Zion. That middle-class tinge was given Labor Zionism by a leadership that was partially bourgeois and also perhaps by workers who were declassed bourgeoisie and not members of the working class of long standing. Within the Labor Zionist ranks there were also members of the lower middle-class who thought very much in terms of nationalism and who felt little place in the upper middle-class ZOA. While social factors that underly the nationalism in Poale Zion are clearly evident, those same factors are absent in the Circle. Consequently, the Circle lacks Zionist ideology.

This lack of Zionist ideology permits the Circle to be

more objective in viewing, for example, the White Paper. Instead of condemning Britain, it sets forth clearly the reasons for British action. But this same lack of Zionist ideology may have lost some members to the Workers Alliance. This may be one reason underlying the establishment of a Jewish Labor Committee, largely under anti-Zionist leadership. In this way the socialist anti-Zionist was given some sort of practical program to answer the Jewish problem--even though that program was, as has been seen, not always consistent with socialist ideology.

It has been shown that for all but the old middle-class and the Bundists Zionism furnished a solution (partial or otherwise) to the Jewish problems of the thirties. But the nature of that solution varied greatly with each class. The Zionist idea was common and available to all. But each class molded it to meet its own interests and needs and sometimes to use it as a weapon in its broader struggle against other classes. The limited Zionism of the old middle-class and the anti-Zionism of the Bundists have also been explained in the light of the social needs of those classes.

XI. JUDAISM AND THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

Religion may at times give moral sanction to the needs of a class. Through ritual and ideology the aspirations of a group are institutionalized. Religion does not provide a solution so much as it sanctifies each class as well as the solution which it has found. The attitudes towards society in general, towards Zionism, towards anti-Semitism, towards the "correct" role that the Jews should play in society--these attitudes are often embodied by the religion of each class. An old middle class congregation is given security when it hears that the earth is the Lord's and true Judaism is universalism...and so, their anti-Zionist ideology (socially formed) is given divine backing. A neo-Orthodox Jew hears from his pulpit that traditionalism is true Judaism but the American culture should be absorbed: his religion tells him that the way of life his social situation has bequeathed upon him is also true Judaism. The new middle-class hears that Classical Reform has drifted away from Judaism and that their own loyalty to tradition makes them the true enlightened Jews; and so, their current cultural position that calls for some ritualism and that aspires to leadership in American Jewry is given the support of God and Israel. Religion may at times spiritualize its class, justify the mores and ideas that spring from the class position, and give divine authority to those solutions which the class is most easily able to accept.

This analysis does not refer to what religion could do

or should do...or to what individual religionists might do. It does refer to the history of organized religion which consistently gives moral sanction to the needs of its class.

Therefore, it is appropriate that this analysis of the reactions of the American Jewish community to its major problems during the thirties conclude with a discussion of how Judaism embodied and spiritualized those reactions. Each class had its own brand of Judaism. And that particular brand of Judaism gave sanction to the class--its way of life, its habits and mores, which were all the while being molded by social forces.

The old middle-class were adherents of Classical Reform Judaism. It has been observed that social forces motivated this group to integrate into the larger society of Western Europe and America. To integrate into a strongly nationalistic culture, it was necessary to conform to that culture--economically, politically, and culturally. Thus Classical Reform Judaism took over the nationalism of its environment and rejected Zionism. In its passion for conformity, ritual was held down to a minimum. The rationale was that reason and the spirit should triumph over automatic ritual...and this indeed was the rationale of all nineteenth century liberalism. But there was much more behind this rejection of ritualism. For soon the non-Jewish social counterparts of the Reform movement--the upper middle-class Episcopaleans and even some Unitarians--were stressing the beauty of ritual in religious services. But not Classical Reform Judaism...

for its members were committed to conformity. And a re-introduction of observances, no matter how beautiful, would be a return to the ghetto. Thus did the anti-ritualism meet the social needs of the conforming class.

However, if religion was to be the only difference between Jew and Christian, the Jew--still subject to the barbs of bigotry-- had to formulate for himself a religion of unquestionable superiority. He could not satisfy his sense of belonging by simply saying that he was a member of the Jewish cultural group or people. So his insecurity, based on his marginal position in society, was met by the stress on the Mission of Israel. Israel had a particular genius for the religious...witness her great heritage. As heir to this superior heritage the Classical Reform Jew bolstered his group ego. And the Mission of Israel became the crutch on which leaned the marginal Jew.

The new middle-class--at least its more integrated section--was entering the Reform movement. This entry was facilitated by the fact that the institution of Reform Judaism was rapidly losing its prominence in the American Jewish community, as tremendous numbers of Eastern European Jews were becoming well integrated in the middle-class and their religious and secular movements threatened to become soon the primary representatives of American Jewry. So to strengthen a movement that no longer could depend on the comparatively small number of old middle-class Jews for its strength, Reform opened the doors to the new middle-class. Thus

began the neo-Reform movement.

The conflict between these two social classes was continually masqueraded beneath religious terminology: the issue may have been Zionism or ritual. In 1931 the Central Conference of American Rabbis revised the Union Hymnal and included Ha-tikveh and the melody of the Kol Nidre. 177 hymns written by non-Jews were eliminated.¹ The 1937 Columbus Platform represented the compromise between the two groups:

Judaism as a way of life requires...the retention and development of such customs, symbols and ceremonies as possess inspirational value, the cultivation of distinctive forms of religious art and music and the use of Hebrew, together with the vernacular, in our worship and instruction.

In the rehabilitation of Palestine, the land hallowed by memories and hopes, we behold the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a haven of refuge for the oppressed but also a center of Jewish culture and spiritual life.

It is interesting to note that in the same year when the new middle-class had made its voice heard in the Central Conference, one of their representatives, Henry Monsky, became president of the B'nai B'rith.

Class antagonisms were clothed by a tallis or concealed beneath a yamelke as throughout the country congregations were split asunder--each group claiming quite sincerely that it represented the true liberal Judaism. The yamekle often became the symbol for the middle-class, for its cherished cultural standards; similarly it frequently became a threat to the old middle-class which was finding itself a minority in its own congregations.

The less integrated of the new middle-class remained in the Conservative movement. This movement developed a "left" wing that would keep within the fold those whose integration might lead them into the Reform camp. It seems that Solomon Goldman's "liberal conservatism" could answer the needs of integrated Conservative Jews...even though he was "officially" rebuked by the leaders of the movement, his Chicago temple served as a buffer against Reform and the movement has not rejected her heretic.

Among the New York manufacturers and creditors, their children, and those lower middle-class and workingclass adherents of neo-Orthodoxy--religion in a very interesting way gave sanction to class structure. The leaders of neo-Orthodoxy were those wealthy producers and bankers who could afford--because of the nature of their business--to observe the Sabbath and other Jewish traditions. The rank-and-file of the movement was composed of those middle-class immigrants reared in Orthodoxy and living in the New York East Side and Brooklyn. Many of them were not sufficiently integrated into American culture to join the Conservative Synagogue. But these members still of the lower middle-class (and perhaps some workers who had been in the middle-class in Eastern Europe) did not want to remain completely bound up in the Old World Orthodoxy. (And this European Orthodoxy was represented by the Agudas Ha-rabanim). And so they became followers of the neo-Orthodoxy, that religion which continued Orthodox practice but invited the immigrant to partake of the

American culture. It seems that within this group there were two divisions: neo-Orthodoxy and modern Orthodoxy:

Neo-Orthodoxy, as has been stated, "combined loyalty" to Jewish tradition with love for the general culture. There must also be "a valid belief (that is, a rationale) for every practice." The reason may not be known, but it exists.² But the more radical school of this class calls itself Modern Orthodoxy: In interpretation of Jewish doctrines, the modern Orthodox Jew is not necessarily bound by traditions; a miracle is a natural event that cannot be accounted for and is therefore ascribed to a spiritual cause; Higher Criticism of the Bible is guesswork; one may reject "a belief in the supernatural." This school is said to spring from "a portion of the cultured Orthodox laity" and some rabbis who have regard for the needs of the hour.³

And so, a flexible program that varies from Orthodox ideology to its rejection has been institutionalized into an appeal to those who stand culturally between the semi-integrated Conservative Jew and the un-Americanized immigrant. It especially meets the needs of the leaders of the class, since it allows respectability, rationality, and religious leadership over a large community. This is achieved without joining the "liberal" Jewish movements. There was no reason to become Reform or Conservative. The old middle-class in its effort for economic and social emancipation adopted Reform Judaism. The new middle-class was using Conservative change to integrate into American society and to combat Reform. But the neo-Orthodox leadership had

no need for further integration: they had no great struggle to make. So they were free to develop an Orthodoxy to suit their minds and hearts and social position, an Orthodoxy that would appeal to many of the lower middle-class at a time when Orthodox religion was a helpful check against the radicalism of the thirties. And--above all--this program that sanctioned the needs of the class was "not a wing in Jewry at all. It is just Judaism."⁴

Reconstructionism was the only philosophy of Judaism that was primarily a product of the post-World War I period. As has been observed, this brand of Judaism was supported by many Jewish professionals whose welfare depended on the strengthening of the Jewish community and whose prosperity could be insured by an "organic community." But the movement attracted many others besides those federation heads and the Eastern European rank-and-file in the social welfare field. It attracted many who keenly felt the rejection of the world as Hitler and Coughlin drove them back into their Jewishness. A product of twentieth century thought, its philosophy was naturalistic. This attracted many young people and rabbis, dissatisfied with the traditional theology of Judaism and even with the 19th century modifications made by Reform and Conservative theologians. And so Reconstructionism satisfied the need of a harried Jewish community for intense belonging (the surest protection against attack) and for a theology that appealed to the growing number of Jews who could no longer accept belief in supernaturalism.

Its basic principle was that Judaism is a civilization. And a civilization consists of social interaction (the desire to live together), language (Hebrew), social habits, and values.⁵ A folk religion should not try to embrace peoples of different cultures but should "limit itself to those who have a common past and common environment."⁶ Traditional concepts were re-interpreted. Redemption meant the emergence of Jewish personality.⁷ Functional Torah was the attitude of seriousness applied to one's civilization. "Fulfillment of the Torah means creative and maximum participation in the Jewish civilization."⁸ Israel is an internationalism with Palestine as its national homeland.⁹ "Nationhood is the principal spiritual opportunity by which man is enabled to fulfil himself to the utmost."¹⁰

It becomes evident how again a religious ideology gives sanction to the needs of its class. In this case, the "class" is quite heterogeneous. But its backbone is the group of social welfare workers dependent on an organic Jewish community. As it voiced an appeal to all Jews, there may have been the recognition that the movement appealed to a need common to all Jews of whatever class during the thirties, a need to turn inward after the rejection by so much of society.

Among the Labor Zionists there is little evidence of an ideology of Judaism. These Jewish workers channeled their aspirations and moral sense into both socialism and nationalism. They did not need the sanction of religion. And yet, in the Vanguard of 1930 there is an answer to the question, "What's Judaism?"

...it is that child bent over the holy scroll, on a Sabbath morning, reading in his turn the weekly parsha and taking upon himself in the courage of his young soul, the redoubtable yoke of God's covenant. It is the small link lengthening the long chain of the Jewish tradition. There you have in a living and poetic form, an exact definition of Judaism.¹¹

So while formal religion is rejected as a system of thought, the Jewish culture of which religion is so much a part is prized. And Judaism becomes a beautiful part of that culture.

The more consistent socialists of the Workmen's Circle rejected religion. Consequently, they had no philosophy of Judaism. But a group cannot live without a religion, even though its hopes and aspirations are not couched in religious terminology, even though its concept of reality is completely secular. And so the Call of Youth speaks of Jewish education without religion, and then presents the "religion" of the Workmen's Circle:

History, especially modern history, demonstrates that the economic and political life of the Jews is safer and more secure under a democracy, under a labor and socialist government than under autocracy...Jewish education should therefore have for its goal the idea of making the Jewish people realize the importance of identifying their economic and political security with the hopes and aspirations of the organized labor and socialistic movement and with all progressive and democratic forces in society.¹²

Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky maintained that religiousness is not a criterion of Jewishness but is a personal matter. For him Jewishness meant adherence to socialism and the Yiddish culture.¹³ And so, even in the non-religious Circle there is a faith that springs from the needs of the Jewish prole-

tariat.

Through the examples given it is hoped that the evidence is sufficient to show that some aspects of the varying ideologies of Judaism spring from the needs of the different classes within the Jewish community. As they solve their problems, as they justify their existence, as they bolster their group ego, as they struggle for security in a world of insecure classes--their total way of life is sanctioned by their religion. The religious controversies of any age can best be understood in the light of the social forces of that age. Even during the thirties, the religious movements and controversies have been seen as part and parcel of the aspirations and conflicts of the different classes of American Jews.

XII. CONCLUSIONS

This study of the American Jewish community and its reactions to major problems has led to certain broad conclusions. The evidence has been given. In this chapter some of that evidence will be selected to underline the conclusions.

1. The major characteristics of the Jewish community are molded by the general environment of that community.

It has been demonstrated that from the fertile soil of the twenties grew a Jewish community of prosperity, of latent anti-Semitism covered by words of tolerance; a community that had little concern with anti-Semitism abroad, that was de-centralized in structure especially along organic lines, that was notable for a high degree of harmony among the Jews themselves. It has further been shown that with the tremendous changes in the general social order that took place in the early thirties, the Jewish community experienced corresponding changes and a series of problems brought about by the new conditions. Prosperity gave way to poverty and partial recovery. The latent anti-Semitism became very overt in America and abroad--as world-wide depression released frustrations and opened a market for bigotry. Centralization along organic and class-lines took place rapidly, as poverty brought the need for the efficiency of class-line centralization and anti-Semitism encouraged the organic pattern. And tensions within the Jewish community increased manifold.

2. Intra-Jewish tensions are based on social divisions

within the Jewish community. Any issue, whether of ob-
jective insignificance or of paramount importance, may be
clothed in these antagonisms. That there is basis for
 antagonism between every class in society in general and
 in the Jewish community in particular has been shown. An
 additional factor characteristic of minority groups is the
 conflict between the more and less integrated members of
 the group. The issues over which tensions are expressed
 may vary from a statue to be dedicated to Haym Salomon or
 an article on Jewish sensuality to the proper method of
 answering the Hitler menace or the true ideology of Zionism.

3. The American Jewish community is divided into
definite socio-economic classes. These classes have a
definite "class point-of-view" towards the major problems
and ideologies that exist in the Jewish community. The
 composition of these classes has been examined in Chapter
 II. The existence of a class point-of-view has been
 demonstrated by the evidence of duplication in attitude of
 the periodicals of the same class and by the connection
 shown between the class reactions and the class needs.

4. Within each class there is some difference be-
tween the interests and attitudes of the leadership and
the interests and attitudes of the rank-and-file of the
class. The old middle-class leadership differed with the
 rank-and-file on the boycott issue and on the interest in
 Zionism. Factors behind those differences have been sug-
 gested. The new middle-class leadership was at times the
 object of attack by the class membership which claimed oli-

garchic organization. The neo-Orthodox manufacturers and creditors did not have the same interests as their followers in the lower middle and working class; followers for whom a new ideology of Jewish nationalism was formed. The Jewish Labor Committee had a much more "patriotic" attitude than did rank-and-file socialist anti-Zionists in the Workmen's Circle. The semi-middle-class leadership of the Labor Zionists was very sympathetic to the New Deal in the shaky years of Supreme Court controversy, but the rank-and-file criticized the leadership for not supporting the 1936 Socialist ticket. And the leadership of the large Jewish unions spoke of overproduction and underconsumption in the same breath as they led the workers from socialist ideology into the New Deal camp.

5. The attitudes of each class towards the social problems and ideologies within the Jewish community are tremendously influenced by the needs and interests of that class within the community. The degree to which such influences are determining factors will be decided by the individual on the basis of evidence given. In order to concretize this theory and to capsulize this thesis, the attitudes of each class will be summarized and some of the factors underlying those attitudes will be recalled.

The old middle-class felt that the cause of the depression was the psychology of fear. The solution lay in faith in America and in the natural recuperative powers of the economic system. The old middle-class would admit no flaw in a system that had brought them so much prosperity--

as American businessmen and as integrated Jews. But with their non-Jewish counterparts in the Chamber of Commerce, they supported the early New Deal and the NRA. However, after the upper layer of the middle-class saw that business was stimulated, they objected to the high taxes and the inflation and the "governmental interference." They opposed a preparedness program until the Chamber of Commerce stated that a self-contained economy was super-nationalism--as it was clear such preparedness was an answer to the recession.

The rise of Hitler was the result of the German spirit. For this class could not admit that American businessmen might conceivably align themselves with fascism. Such an admission would throw doubt on the security of the old middle-class Jew. And so, the idea of a nation's spirit was taken from the nineteenth century heritage--and the old middle-class used the same type of racist ideology that Hitler was using in his attacks against the Jews. There were good spirits and bad, and the Voice of America was thought to be a great spirit that would speak and the waves of history would flow backwards. The leadership's opposition to the boycott was probably based on business interests in Germany. Opposition to mass meetings can be understood in the light of this group's tremendous stress on conformity as a guarantee of integration and prosperity.

Native American anti-Semitism was thought to be an idea that was imported from abroad. An admission that this bigotry grew out of American social conditions would be an immediate challenge to a happy future in America. The idea was stressed--

anti-Semitism was an intellectual movement. And this idea had to come from Germany--since it was foreign to the free American spirit. From this psychological approach, a program of good-will meetings and statistics was urged. Anti-alien legislation was suggested to keep out the foreign influences.

A class that feared any challenge to the American economy would have nothing to do with the Communist's United Front. However, this class did need a solution for the world Jewish problem outside of a Jewish state and immigration to America. And so, the Birobidzhan project (among other territorial schemes) appealed to some of them. The leaders of the class, perhaps looking for investments in a saturated world and for a place where Jews could go outside of the United States, participated in the efforts to build a place of refuge (although not a national state) for Jews in Palestine. The stress on conformity and the degree of integration of this class led to a minimizing of ritual in worship. A group that strongly denied Jewish nationalism needed a religious rationale for existence and so stressed the mission of Israel.

The new middle-class before a crisis never understood society sufficiently to fear or predict the events to come. However after the crisis occurred (whether it be the depression in America or the rise of Hitler), this class came forth with a radical sounding analysis of society in which was stated that the nature of the present social system is

responsible for depressions and for fascism. This radical analysis was invariably followed by a program that did not stem from the analysis. After stating that the cause of the depression was inherent in present society and after fleeting identification with such "radical" movements as technocracy, the new middle-class embraced a program of social reform within the existing system and idolized the New Deal. And after evincing considerable understanding of the social forces behind Hitlerism, this class developed a program based on the effect of the Voice of America and mass meetings and the boycott. While the boycott is compatible with the analysis and would be expected from this section of the middle-class that had no interests in Germany, the faith in the Voice of America and mass meetings show that the class did not fully understand the implications of its analysis. This dualistic attitude of the new middle-class can be explained by its marginal economic position. When a crisis occurs the new middle-class is hit very hard. It will search for a radical solution and will give radical analyses--but only after the crisis has occurred. However, the member of this group is ultimately committed to a society which keeps him above the proletariat, to that society which has awarded him his new-found gains. And so the program of action will never seriously endanger the existing social order and will frequently seem inconsistent with the original analysis.

This same ambivalence is seen in the dual analysis of the cause of American anti-Semitism...at one time it is an

alien idea and at another time it is inherent in the economy. But, of course, the program for opposition to this anti-Semitism follows the less radical analysis. Statistics, publicity, and exposure are employed. Unhindered by the old middle-class' need for conformity (since the new middle-class sprang from the Eastern European Jewish sub-culture), this group could afford to be more vociferous and non-conforming than the Jews of German background and could join with other minority groups and the New Deal in a "progressive" struggle.

The new middle-class has always had a dream of uniting with all social classes in an effort to form a better social order. This dream plus the susceptibility to radical phrases and the lack of experience with the class struggle allowed some new middle-class members to become easy prey for the Communist's United Front line. The Zionism of this class was naturally influenced by capitalist's method of colonization through large investments. This led to an alliance with the non-Zionists, especially since Labor Zionism was rising throughout the world and American Zionism after the worldwide depression found itself with a greater chance for world leadership. The neo-Reform and Conservative Judaism of the well-established members of the new middle-class reflected their adaptation to the American environment in religious terms: they no longer wanted the complete traditionalism. But the traditions that they retained became ideological weapons to be used against the old middle-class.

The leadership of neo-Orthodoxy--the manufacturers and creditors--had to develop attitudes that would meet their needs and the needs of their working class and lower middle-class followers. So, the depression was caused by the bad bankers and the government. Also invoked was the common religious ideology: social inequalities are eternal; the solution is to lead a good life and follow the Torah. In this way, neither workers nor manufacturers were blamed and the existing system was in no way challenged.

This unwillingness to challenge the existing order springs naturally from the high position of the class leadership in that order. And so, while economic factors are given as underlying Hitlerism (manufacturers could easily see these factors), they were factors (eg, the World War I defeat) that were not present in the American economy and so the American social structure was safe. German Jewish apostasy was seen as a factor in German anti-Semitism; so even social prejudices played a part in the analysis. Mass meetings were opposed in editorials directed really against new middle-class leadership. The boycott and God were the two answers to Nazism.

The need not to challenge the existing order (not even to the extent of the radical theories of the new middle-class) was seen in this class' psychological interpretation of American anti-Semitism. It was an alien idea, alien to the American spirit. It was also caused by actions that were deviations from the class program: by going astray after false economic ideologies, by bad manners, and by falling

away from Orthodoxy. American anti-Semitism could be combatted by having more Americanized manners (conformity) and by setting up Jewish medical schools (acceptance of minority status). Hence, the peculiar position of this class as product of a sub-culture that is now in an economic position which makes for marginality is reflected in its program against American anti-Semitism.

The need not to challenge the existing order is seen clearly in the complete lack of sympathy with the United Front. The religious factor of Orthodoxy versus "godless communism" also plays a role. The Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi ideologies answer the needs of a class dangling between traditionalism, nationalism, and economic radicalism. The neo-Orthodox religion allows the class leadership to preserve its religious institutions, [to have] flexible ideology one wing of which would reject supernaturalism, and to integrate into American culture.

(To simplify this summary the universalist groups among the Jewish professionals will be omitted.) The federation leaders and Eastern European welfare workers, educators, etc. who spearheaded the Reconstructionist movement were severely hit during the crisis, since their financial backing was dependent on the welfare of the middle-class. Being in close touch with the needy of society, they were very much aware of the reality of conditions. And so, they opposed the New Deal which they saw to be a temporary remedy. Their analysis of society was extremely radical. However, when the New

Deal was under attack in its later days, this group rallied to its support. For they feared the extremely conservative elements which were attacking Roosevelt. Furthermore, the welfare worker is ultimately committed to the society in which he is doing his work. Perhaps the rising native anti-Semitism that was directed against the administration brought this group to the support of that administration. This group was slower in support of preparedness than was the new middle-class (it was in a position to see more clearly the function that preparedness was playing in the economy); but it more rapidly accepted preparedness than did the Labor Zionist group. Its program was a little more radical than the Gentile welfare workers; perhaps because the latter group was not in such dire financial stress since it could rely on big industrialists for support and perhaps because it lacked the background of Eastern European radicalism.

This class had a radical analysis of American anti-Semitism. Its conditions were basic to the American economic system. But again the program did not flow from the analysis... for reasons given above. And so, the program developed fit into the Reconstructionist ideology: a strong Jewish culture to give security in a hostile world; vocational redistribution that would make the Jewish community more organic; Jewish schools and vocational guidance agencies.

This group was most sympathetic to the United Front. It was the most radical of the bourgeoisie classes and yet had had no first-hand experiences with the Communists in the working class. Birobidzhan was looked on with favor; per-

haps it appeared to be an organic community in a non-capitalistic society that favored cultural pluralism. This group which stands on the class spectroscopy between the new middle-class and the Labor Zionists had sympathies with both the General Zionists and Poale Zion. But the Reconstructionists naturally spoke of unity among all the Zionist parties, for their whole ideology cried for unity. More democracy in the Zionist groups and more Jewish culture in Zionism--these demands also came from the Reconstructionist ideology. And this very ideology came from the needs of a group dependent for its welfare on a strong loyal organic Jewish community.

The Jewish workingclass in the early years of the depression had a clear understanding of society. For at this time their leadership was not committed to the New Deal program. This was before 1933. The analysis of the American depression pointed out the defects in the capitalistic system very frankly...until the leadership gradually changed the cause of the depression from overproduction to underconsumption. The understanding of Hitler's rise was remarkably clear; and not only his rise was predicted two years in advance but the future alliance of Hitler and capitalism was understood and the inevitability of government sponsored anti-Semitism and a second World War was seen. Furthermore, native American anti-Semitism was seen as a result of local social conditions. This clear analysis was facilitated by the fact that under certain conditions the

labor movement was not committed to the existing social order. And so, its spokesmen at times were free to present an objective picture of that order.

The Labor Zionist groups had some middle-class leadership and were not from the old Bund organization. They at first opposed the New Deal as being a relief program. but when the New Deal was under severe attack, the Labor Zionist leadership ceased its attacks. And Labor Zionism supported with some reluctance the preparedness program. This middle-class leadership, while expressing a socialist ideology, was perhaps not whole-heartedly committed to a radical program that would replace the present society in which these leaders had such a prominent position. At any rate, the definite middle-class tinge in the Labor Zionist group underlay its support of the New Deal when the social reform movement was under attack from the Right. However, because of the primarily workingclass composition of this group, its actions were "to the left" of the most radical of the bourgeoisie classes. Its commitment to the American social order was minimal.

And so, a radical analysis of Nazism was followed by a program that put no faith in mass meetings and the Voice of America. The boycott was advocated (a good labor move), but Palestine was viewed as the only solution. Similarly, a Jewish state would prove the eventual answer to American anti-Semitism, although cooperation with other progressive groups was urged. So, America's social order is expendable... but there is no urgency in its destruction--this seems to be

the attitude of Labor Zionist leadership.

Having had much experience with disruptive Communist activity, this group was consistently opposed to Communism. While committed to socialism, they did not find in this radical economic ideology the promise of immediate fulfillment. And so, when socialism became more of a theory and not an immediate program, many workers in America adopted nationalism as an ideology that would grant emancipation. The combination in the case of the Jews was Labor Zionism. Socialism and nationalism satisfied "religious" needs. So Judaism was looked upon with nostalgia, as part of a prized culture.

The Workmen's Circle was labor led, born, and bred. Its core was Bundist. These were men who adopted a socialist ideology when socialism was a movement of fulfillment and not just of hope. Nationalism and religion were not needed. So Zionism and Judaism had no place in their program. This group was consistently opposed to the New Deal, even when it was under attack. It refused to join the capitalist crusade against Hitler before the War was declared. It favored boycott of Germany (a unanimous labor policy) but ridiculed the Voice of America.

American anti-Semitism was seen as the result of local social conditions. Bundist ideology forecast a tremendous increase of this anti-Semitism. But their class point of view would not permit a Jewish state to be the answer. Perhaps for this reason the Jewish Labor Committee was established a Committee that opposed mass-meetings. (They were aware of

their ineffectiveness and saw them as an expression of a rival class). But the Committee hailed the Voice of America in direct contradiction to the Bundist ideology. But then the leaders of this group needed some immediate answer to pressing Jewish problems, for Labor Zionism must have been very attractive to its members. Also flowing from this need for some solution was the Workmen's Circle's partiality for the Birobidzhan project: Despite its constant opposition to the United Front and its great experience with the Communist Party, the need for a solution to the world Jewish problem outside of Palestine was so pressing that Birobidzhan was considered favorably.

The attitudes of the Communist Party were seen as reflecting the primary need of that movement: to destroy any successful working class movement outside of Russia. Hence, the dual unionism of depression days and the disruptive activity in the German Social-Democratic movement. But with the rise of Hitler the Line changed so that Communism could remain a movement: the Party had to line up against fascism. So the Party was more favorable to the New Deal, protested loudly against Hitler, and was more polite in its opposition to Zionism. It suddenly became concerned with anti-Semitism, a product of reaction.

Through this summary of some of the evidences advanced in this study, it should be clear that the attitudes of each class towards the problems and ideologies within the Jewish community are tremendously influenced by the needs and interests of that class within the community.

6. The influence of the needs and interests of a particular class may distort that class' view of reality and may hinder that class' ability to deal with the social problems it is facing. Distortion of reality due to commitment to the existing social order can be found to some extent in every class. An obvious example is the old middle-class' analysis of American anti-Semitism as an alien idea. The Reconstructionist program for a democratic organic Jewish community and its vocational re-distribution plans disregard the effects of general social forces on the Jewish community. Depressions cannot be due to both overproduction and underconsumption as labor leadership did maintain. The manners of Jews does not underly anti-Semitism and the depression was not caused by the government and bankers--as the neo-Orthodox group maintains. And if the new middle-class' radical analyses are correct, its conservative program is wrong--or visa-versa.

7. When members of a class become aware of those class needs and interests which are so important in shaping the class point-of-view, they are better able to view reality. Just as understanding of the self gives one more control over his actions and a more mature view of life, so understanding of those social forces that shape opinions and attitudes towards society can emancipate the individual from his "social unconscious" and give his intellect more control over his view of society.

Understanding--of self or society--brings freedom.

NOTES

IN THE CASE OF PERIODICALS AND NEWSPAPERS: WHEN PAGE NUMBERS ARE NOT GIVEN, THE REFERENCE CAN BE FOUND ON THE EDITORIAL PAGE.

Abbreviations:

<u>AH</u>	<u>American Hebrew</u>
<u>AJCC</u>	<u>American Jewish Congress Courier</u>
<u>AJCI</u>	<u>American Jewish Congress Index</u>
<u>AJYB</u>	<u>American Jewish Year Book</u>
<u>BBM</u>	<u>B'nai B'rith Messenger</u>
<u>BBMG</u>	<u>B'nai B'rith Magazine</u>
<u>CB</u>	<u>Congress Bulletin</u>
<u>CJR</u>	<u>Contemporary Jewish Record</u>
<u>CY</u>	<u>Call of Youth</u>
<u>JF</u>	<u>Jewish Forum</u>
<u>JFR</u>	<u>Jewish Frontier</u>
<u>JL</u>	<u>Jewish Life</u>
<u>JO</u>	<u>Jewish Outlook</u>
<u>JPV</u>	<u>Jewish People's Voice</u>
<u>JS</u>	<u>Jewish Spectator</u>
<u>LP</u>	<u>Labor Palestine</u>
<u>LZN</u>	<u>Labor Zionist Newsletter</u>
<u>NCJSS</u>	<u>National Conference of Jewish Social Service:</u> <u>Annual Report.</u>
<u>NP</u>	<u>New Palestine</u>
<u>SAJR</u>	<u>SAJ Review</u>
<u>SSQ</u>	<u>Jewish Social Service Quarterly</u>

Notes to Chapter I

1. Charles Beard, America in Midpassage (New York: Macmillan Co., 1946), p. 10.
2. John Strachey, Nature of the Capitalist Crisis (New York: Covici-Frieda, 1935).
3. Ibid., p. 299.
4. Four million were unemployed in 1929 before the depression. The textile and mining industries experienced the greatest unemployment.

Notes to Chapter II

(In the case of periodicals and newspapers: when pages numbers are not given, the reference can be found on the editorial page.)

1. AJYB, 1927-8.
2. JF, January, May, June, July, October, November, 1929.
Here are found continued references to the calendar issue.
3. AJYB, 1933-4, p. 158-9.
4. BBMG, June, 1929.
5. Ibid., July, September, 1929.
6. Idem.
7. AH, August 30, 1929.
8. NP, February 8, 1929.
9. Ibid., March 8, 1929. This interesting conflict between the leadership of the old middle-class, represented here by Warburg, and the anti-Zionist rank-and-file is later explained.

10. Ibid., July 19, 1929, p. 17.
11. Ibid., July 19, 1929, editorial.
12. SAJR, March 22, 1929.
13. JF, November, 1928. Also JF, May, 1929.
14. Vanguard, January, 1929.
15. AH, June 5, 1931.
16. Ibid., January 4, 1929, p. 308.
17. BBMG, January, 1929, p. 125.
18. Alvin Roth, "Backgrounds of the American Jewish Congress." (Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1953)
19. Louis Lipsky, Thirty Years of American Zionism ("Selected Works of Louis Lipsky," Vol. I (New York: Neshar, 1927), p. 51.
20. AJCI, June, 1922, p. 4.
21. Ibid., June-July, 1929.
22. Ibid., March-April, 1929, p. 14. See also Who's Who in American Jewry, 1928 (New York: Jewish Biographical Bureau).
23. See Chapter V.
24. JF, January, 1931, p. 7.
25. AH, June 17, 1932, p. 117.
26. In addition to such snipings at the leadership of the new middle-class there will be noted evidences of retaliatory fire by the leaders.
27. AJCB, June 24, 1938. Also, July 22, 1938.
28. NP, January 18, 1929.
29. JF, March, 1936, pp. 50-1.
30. Ibid., September, 1927, p. 169.

31. Benjamin Stolberg, Tailor's Progress (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1944). Jean Gould, Sidney Hillman (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925). The percentage of Jewish workers in these unions was already declining; still the great majority of them were Jewish.

32. The United Hebrew Trades shared a building with the Workmen's Circle, the Forward Association, and the Socialist Verband.

33. Maximilian Hurwitz, History of the Workmen's Circle (New York, The Workmen's Circle, 1936).

34. Ibid., pp. 26-34.

35. LP., June 10, 1934.

36. Justice, June 21, 1929.

37. Ibid., February 8, 1929.

38. Stolberg, op. cit., pp. 145ff.

39. Reconstructionist, May 28, 1937, p. 7. For Samuel Dinin's review of the two books cited.

40. CY, April, 1934, pp. 2, 7.

41. Call, September, 1939, p. 8.

42. New Masses, January, 1929, p. 20.

Notes to Chapter III

1. Fritz Sternberg, Capitalism and Socialism on Trial (New York: John Day, 1950), p. 282. The economic material in this chapter is taken from this work.

2. Ibid., p. 403. From a statement by Thierry Maulnier.

3. See Chapter I.

4. Beard, op. cit., p. 69.

5. Strachey, op. cit., pp. 51ff.
6. Ibid., pp. 43ff.
7. Fritz Sternberg and John Strachey among others.
8. Opinion, February, 1933.
9. Sternberg, op. cit., p. 341.
10. Beard, op. cit., p. 330.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. A few Jews (eg., Rosenwald, Warburg, Kuhn-Loeb) were in this profiting strata.
2. AH, March 21, 1930.
3. JF, October, 1930, pp. 354-5.
4. SSQ, June, 1932, pp. 183-6.
5. Survey, March, 1935, pp. 69-70.
6. Liberation, March 31, 1934. As cited in Louis Frischman, "Changing Techniques of anti-Semitic Propaganda in the U.S., 1933 to 1939," (Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1951), p. 59.
7. Social Justice, October 19, 1936. As cited ibid.
8. Social Justice, September 6, 1937, As cited ibid.
9. Frischman, op. cit., p. 68.
10. Heywood Broun and G. Britt, Christians Only (New York: Vanguard Press, 1931).

Notes to Chapter V

1. AH, February 7, 1930, p. 484.
2. Ibid., January 31, 1930.

3. Ibid., March 21, 1930, p. 692.
4. Ibid., January 2, 1931.
5. Ibid., November 20, 1931.
6. Ibid., March 17, 1933, p. 307.
7. Ibid., April 1, 1932, p. 506.
8. Ibid., January 3, 1930, p. 350.
9. Ibid., March 7, 1930, p. 622.
10. Nation's Business, January, 1932, p. 15.
11. Mills, White Collar (New York: Oxford, 1951), p. 351.
12. Stephen Wise, "As I See It," Opinion, August 1, 1932.
13. Opinion, June 27, 1932.
14. Nation, July 20, 1932, pp. 53-4.
15. JF, August, 1932.
16. SSQ, June, 1932, pp. 163ff.
17. Ibid., March, 1931.
18. NCJSS, 1931, p. 8.
19. Survey, June 15, 1931, p. 316.
20. "The End of an Epoch," Survey, July 1, 1931.
21. Survey, August 1, September 15, 1931.
22. Justice, January 31, 1930.
23. Advance, January 17, 1930.
24. Ibid., June 6, 1930.
25. P. 63 ff, above.
26. Advance, January 17, 1930.
27. Ibid., June 17, 1930.
28. Ibid., September 5, 1930.
29. Ibid., July, 1932, p. 23.
30. Ibid., November, 1932.

31. Ibid., November 28, 1930, p. 2.
32. Ibid., May, 1932, p. 7.
33. American Federationist, November, 1932. Also John Clark, "The Riddle of the Business Cycle," AF, October, 1932.
34. Labor Age, December-January, 1933; May, 1931.
35. AH, August 25, 1933.
36. Ibid., September 1, 1933, p. 231.
37. Ibid., February 2, 1934, p. 243.
38. Ibid., January 26, 1934.
39. "Three Years of Dr. Roosevelt," American Mercury, March, 1936, p. 257.
40. P. 66-7, above.
41. Mills, op. cit., p. 324.
42. AH, October 2, 1936.
43. Norman Thomas, After the New Deal, What?
44. AH, April 1, 1938, p. 4.
45. Ibid., January 22, 1938.
46. Nation's Business, June, 1938, p. 53.
47. AH, August 19, 1938.
48. Opinion, April, August, October, 1933.
49. Ibid., February, 1934.
50. Nation, January 25, 1933. Also Hazlitt, "Scrambled Eggs," Nation, February 1, 1933.
51. JS, November, 1936, pp. 3, 4.
52. Nation, March 18, 1937.
53. Ibid., November 19, 1938, p. 536.
54. JF, January, 1936, pp. 13ff.
55. JF, September, 1933.

56. Ibid., September, 1933.
57. Ibid., June, 1935.
58. Ibid., p. 120.
59. Ibid., August, 1935, pp. 183ff.
60. Ibid., October, 1937.
61. SSQ, January, 1934.
62. Ibid., June, 1934, p. 276.
63. Ibid., September, 1934, p. 11.
64. Ibid., March, 1936, p. 288.
65. Reconstructionist, January 11, 1935.
66. Ibid., March 5, 1937.
67. Ibid., May 28, 1937, p. 14.
68. Ibid., June 25, 1937.
69. Ibid., October 8, 1937.
70. Ibid., December 17, 1937.
71. Survey, July, 1933, p. 243.
72. Ibid., June, 1934, p. 179.
73. Advance, January, 1933.
74. Ibid., May, 1933, p. 74.
75. Ibid., June, 1933, p. 13.
76. Ibid., p. 14.
77. Ibid., p. 18.
78. Ibid., October, 1933, p. 28.
79. Ibid., February, 1934, p. 12.
80. Ibid., January 16, 1934.
81. Ibid., April, 1935, p. 4.
82. Ibid., October, 1936, p. 8.

83. Ibid., October, 1937.
84. Ibid., December, 1938, p. 1.
85. JFR, January, 1935.
86. Ibid., July, 1936.
87. LZN, June 4, 1937. The author is S. Grodzinski.
88. JFR, February, 1939.
89. Youth at the Crossroads, 1938, p. 7. An obscure anonymous pamphlet (Hebrew Union College Library).
90. CY, March, 1934, p. 5.
91. Ibid., September, 1934, p. 5.
92. Ibid., January, 1935, p. 2.
93. Ibid., August, 1935, p. 4.
94. Ibid., July, 1936, p. 6.
95. Call, February, 1938, p. 9.
96. Ibid., January, 1939, p. 9.
97. Ibid., October, 1939.
98. Ibid., November, 1939, p. 12.
99. American Federationist, October, 1933, p. 1076.
100. Labor Age, December-January, 1933.
101. AJYB, 1933-4, p. 168.
102. Ibid., pp. 165-6.
103. AH, August 1, 1930.
104. AJCI, October, 1930, p. 4.
105. CB, May 26, 1939.
106. Reconstructionist, May 5, 1939.
107. Opinion, March 7, 1932, p. 5.
108. JF, September, 1930.
109. Ibid., September, 1933, p. 67.

- 110. Ibid., March, 1933, p. 8.
- 111. AH, February 14, 1930.
- 112. Opinion, January, 1933, pp. 17ff.
- 113. Reconstructionist, January 13, 1939, pp.
- 114. JFR, July, 1938.

Notes to Chapter VI

- 1. AH, February 5, 1932.
- 2. Ibid., April 8, 1932, p. 522.
- 3. Ibid., July 11, 1930.
- 4. Ibid., January 17, 1930.
- 5. Ibid., October 12, 1934.
- 6. Opinion, November, 1932.
- 7. CB, January 11, 1935.
- 8. Ibid., June 20, 1939.
- 9. Ibid., April 21, 1939.
- 10. JF, March, 1937.
- 11. Ibid., April, 1938.
- 12. Ibid., May, 1934.
- 13. Reconstructionist, June 17, 1938.
- 14. Ibid., January 25, 1935.
- 15. AH, December 21, 1934.
- 16. Ibid., January 18, 1935.
- 17. Call, July, 1938, p. 8.
- 18. JFR, June, 1938.
- 19. Ibid., September-October, 1936. The author is

H. Fineman.

20. AJCI, March-April, 1930.

21. Ibid., p. 6.

22. JF, February, 1930.

23. NP, February 21, 1930.

24. AH, March 21, 1930.

25. Ibid., March 27, 1931.

26. JF, April, 1931.

27. Opinion, August, 1934, p. 33.

28. The Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization called for a World Jewish Congress in 1922. The Index in that year wrote: Such a Congress "has been a slogan ever since the American Jewish Congress has demonstrated the practicability and usefulness of such a Jewish body." AJCI, September, 1922, p. 1. The World Congress issue arose in 1922 over the question of who would constitute the Jewish Agency. In 1931, the rise of Hitler and of anti-Semitism throughout the world motivated the movement again.

29. NP, February 14, 1934, pp. 2ff.

30. CE, February 14, 1936, pp. 1ff.

31. Ibid., May 29, 1936, p. 4.

32. AJYB, 1935-6, pp. 436ff.

33. AH, June 17, 1932, p. 129.

34. AH, January 11, 1935.

35. Ibid., August 24, 1934.

36. JF, August, 1932.

37. Ibid., September, 1936.

38. Reconstructionist, January 25, 1935.

39. AH, June 17, 1932.

40. JFR, September, October, 1936, p. 18.

Notes to Chapter VII

1. This parallels the view of Otto Brodnitz, president of the Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Faith: The more powerful the movement, the more adherents through economic necessity and the less important the Jewish question for its leaders. Therefore, "the Jews in Germany are not in any serious danger of life or limb." (Opinion, December 7, 1931, p. 7.)

2. AH, May 30, 1930.
3. Ibid., September 5, 1930.
4. Ibid., August 28, 1931.
5. Ibid., December 22, 1933, p. 118.
6. Ibid., June 22, 1934, p. 107. June 27, 1934.
7. Ibid., August 19, 1938, p. 10.
8. AJCI, October, 1930, p. 7.
9. Opinion, January, 1932, p. 11.
10. Ibid., March 21, 1932.
11. Ibid., May 2, 1932.
12. Ibid., March, 1933.
13. Ibid., April, 1934, p. 7.
14. JF, July, 1931, p. 243.
15. Ibid., October, 1931, pp. 361-2.
16. Ibid., November, 1931, p. 415.
17. Ibid., May, 1932, pp. 148ff.
18. Ibid., June, 1931, p. 403.
19. Ibid., May, 1932, pp. 148ff.

20. Ibid., September, 1933, p. 48.
21. Advance, July 31, 1931, p. 11. The author is Ervin.
22. Ibid., September 18, 1931, p. 8.
23. Ibid., November 13, 1931, p. 18. Again, Ervin.
24. Ibid., December 25, 1931, p. 6. The author is Lore.

25. Ibid., January, 1932, p. 18. Again, Lore.
26. Ibid., February, 1933.
27. Justice, March, 1932, p. 15.
28. Sternberg, op. cit., p. 360.
29. The intercession of the American government on behalf of Jews has been shown to stem from other than humanitarian motives. In 1902 anti-Semitism in Roumania was deplored, since such persecution would bring paupered immigrants to American shores. Kishineff resulted in a "respectful" petition in the name of "a large number of citizens"--definitely not official intercession. There was not intercession in Poland after World War I. Between 1933 and 1938 there were no official representations to Hitler. The only official intercessions to the German government were apologies for the actions of such rambunctious Americans as Magistrate Louis Brodsky and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia. The most pronounced statement made by the government was the following:

The German government is no doubt aware that its policies have created opposition in many parts of the world, which has expressed itself in various trade conflicts and the probable reduction of Germany's capacity to transfer. (Intercession on behalf of Jews in the Diplomatic Correspondence of the U. S., 1840-1938, New York, 1943, pp. 396-7)

Compare this with the State Department's apology after LaGuardia's outburst:

I very earnestly deprecate the utterances which have thus given offense to the German government. They do not represent the attitude of this government toward the German government.

By 1939, when Harold Ickes (the first national official to speak out) opposed German fascism, the official policy of the United States government had changed and anti-fascism was proper and motivated by national interests.

See Leo Honor, review of Cyrus Adler and Aaron Margalith's With Firmness in the Right: American Diplomatic Action affecting the Jews, 1840-1945, in Journal of Modern History, XXII (March, 1950).

30. AH, April 28, 1933, p. 432. Also see "B'nai B'rith and the Boycott," BBMG, November, 1933, p. 56: Patience and submission have saved the Jews throughout the years. Being a minority, the Jews can really have little influence.

31. AH, March 31, 1933.

32. Opinion, August, 1933. Also, AJCC, April 21, 1933.

33. Opinion, March, 1935, p. 5.

34. AH, April 21, 1933, p. 403.

35. BBMG, May, 1933.

36. AH, April 14, 1933, p. 385.

37. AH, July 30, 1937, p. 17.

38. Ibid., April 30, 1937.

39. CJR, July-September, 1938.

40. ADL Review, October, 1939, p. 2.

41. Opinion, July, 1933.

42. BBM, May 26, 1933.

43. Opinion, August, 1933.
44. Ibid., August, 1934.
45. AJCC, April 21, 1933.
46. GB, January 10, 1936.
47. Ibid., November 25, 1938.
48. Opinion, August, 1933.
49. JF, September, 1933, p. 71.
50. Ibid., pp. 44ff.
51. Ibid., June, 1935, p. 124.
52. Ibid., November, 1934, p. 307.
53. Ibid., August, 1935.
54. Ibid., October, 1933, pp. 102ff.
55. JO, September, 1938.
56. JF, June, 1937, p. 98.
57. JFR, October, 1935, pp. 18ff.
58. Ibid., August, 1938.
59. Ibid., November, 1938, p. 26.
60. AH, April 1, 1938, p. 10.
61. Call, January, 1939, p. 10.
62. AH, April 1, 1938, p. 10.
63. Call, May, 1939, p. 6.
64. CY, January, 1934, p. 4. "Why should British
wink at Fascist aid to Spain? Clearly because its Tory
government fears the consequences of a left government
in Spain far more than it does a Fascist dictatorship."
65. Ibid., September, 1935, p. 5.
66. Call, September, 1938, p. 11.
67. Ibid., February, 1938, p. 13.

68. Jewish "professionals" were not included in this chapter because of lack of data.

Notes to Chapter VIII

1. AH, February 7, 1930.
2. Ibid., June 6, 1930.
3. Ibid., November 14, 1930.
4. Advance, January 16, 1934, p. 18.
5. AH, September 22, 1933.
6. Ibid., May 11, 1934.
7. Nation, August 20, 1938.
8. AH, March 18, 1932.
9. Ibid., April 3, 1931.
10. Ibid., August 7, 1936.
11. AH, June 22, 1934, p. 107.
12. BBMG, January, 1934.
13. AH, February 21, 1936, p. 400.
14. Ibid., September 4, 1931.
15. BBMG, December, 1936.
16. JF, February, 1937.
17. AH, October 16, 1931.
18. Ibid., June 20, 1930.
19. Ibid., March 14, 1930.
20. Ibid., June 26, 1931, p. 105.
21. Ibid., March 11, 1932.
22. Ibid., December 4, 1931.
23. Ibid., December 18, 1931.
24. Ibid., August 26, 1932.
25. Ibid., January 18, 1935.

26. Ibid., September 8, 1933, p. 239.
27. Ibid., March 22, 1935.
28. Ibid., February 3, 1939.
29. Ibid., June 3, 1938, p. 9.
30. Ibid., January 27, 1939, p. 9.
31. Ibid., March 26, 1937.
32. Ibid., May 14, 1937, p. 1218.
33. Ibid., April 26, 1935.
34. Ibid., February 25, 1938.
35. Opinion, May 30, 1932.
36. Ibid., August, 1933, p. 6.
37. Ibid., May, 1935.
38. Ibid., November, 1936, p. 10.
39. Ibid., December, 1936, p. 12.
40. CB, October 16, 1936, p. 4.
41. Opinion, April, 1934, p. 7.
42. Ibid., October, 1934.
43. Ibid., January, 1938, p. 8.
44. Ibid., September, 1937, p. 12.
45. Ibid., April, 1937, pp. 18ff.
46. See Chapter VI and VII.
47. CB, March 29, 1935.
48. Ibid., January 31, 1936, p. 3.
49. Opinion, April, 1937, pp. 12ff.
50. AJCI, November, 1930, p. 8.
51. Opinion, December 7, 1931, p. 13.
52. Ibid., December 14, 1931, p. 6.
53. Stephen Wise, "As I See It," Opinion, June 13, 1932.

54. Opinion, May, 1933.

55. AJYB, 1933-4, p. 63. "The solicitor of Morgan County, Wade Wright, addressed the jury with the following words: 'Let it be demonstrated by you that Alabama justice cannot be bought and sold by Jew-money in New York.'"

56. GB, October 23, 1936, p. 1.

57. Ibid., December 11, 1936.

58. JF, January, 1931, pp. 20ff.

59. Ibid., April, 1931, pp. 146ff.

60. JO, November, 1938.

61. JF, April, 1939, p. 42.

62. Ibid., January, 1936, p. 4.

63. Ibid., September, 1938, p. 141.

64. Ibid., March, 1939, p. 23.

65. Ibid., January, 1936, pp. 13ff.

66. Ibid., April, 1932.

67. Ibid., April, 1937, p. 60.

68. Ibid., June, 1939, p. 70.

69. JO, February, 1939.

70. JF, April, 1932.

71. Ibid., January, 1932, pp. 4ff.

72. Ibid., September, 1934, p. 236.

73. Ibid., September, 1938, p. 141.

74. Ibid., August, 1930, January, 1931.

75. Ibid., January, 1932, pp. 4ff.

76. Ibid., March, 1934, p. 84.

77. Ibid., October, 1930, p. 355.

78. Ibid., February, 1937.

79. Ibid., March, 1930.
80. SSQ, June, 1932, pp. 183-6.
81. Ibid., December, 1935, pp. 222ff.
82. Ibid., March, 1936, pp. 305-7. For a similar analysis, see SSQ, September, 1935, p. 25.
83. Ibid., March, 1930, pp. 85-103.
84. Opinion, August, 1936, p. 16.
85. SSQ, March, 1936, p. 307. Also see "The Jewish Social Worker and Labor Zionism, a Statement by the Social Workers Chapter of the League for Labor Palestine," New York, 1936 (mimeog.)
86. Reconstructionist, March 22, 1935.
87. Ibid., December 13, 1935.
88. SSQ, September, 1935, p. 29.
89. Reconstructionist, May 3, 1935.
90. AH, January 18, 1935, p. 214. Also see Reconstructionist, April 22, 1938: an editorial, "The Time to Act."
91. Reconstructionist, March 8, 1935.
92. Ibid., January 11, 1935.
93. Ibid., February 25, 1938.
94. Advance, January 16, 1934, p. 18.
95. Ibid., June, 1939, p. 3.
96. JFR, January, 1935, p. 7.
97. Ibid., February, 1935.
98. Ibid., April, 1935.
99. Ibid., March, 1936, p. 8. Also, July, 1937.
100. Ibid., June, 1935.
101. Ibid., July, 1936. Also, February, 1937. "How

anti-Semitism is overrated." An editorial.

102. Ibid., February, 1939, p. 3.
103. Ibid., April, 1936, p. 12.
104. Ibid., September, 1935.
105. Ibid., February, 1935, p. 19. Also, April, 1935, p. 10.
106. Ibid., February, 1939, p. 17.
107. CY, March, 1934, p. 7.
108. Call, January, 1939, pp. 9ff.
109. AH, January 18, 1935, p. 220.
110. Call, April, 1938.

Notes to Chapter IX

1. This analysis of Communist policy is made by Fritz Sternberg and others.
2. New Masses, November, 1932.
3. Ibid., June, 1933, p. 15.
4. LZN, May 21, 1936, p. 16. The Newsletter quotes the Morgen Freiheit of September 6, 1929.
5. Ibid., Morgen Freiheit, October 17, 1929.
6. New Masses, February 27, 1934, p. 8. March 6, 1934, p. 8.
7. JL, August, 1937, p. 16. "In every reactionary attack on a progressive movement, reaction picks anti-Semitism as one of its weapons. We have seen the reactionary Liberty League in its struggle against the Roosevelt administration as well as against every progressive movement of the people..."

8. Ibid., February, 1938.
9. New Masses, November 19, 1935.
10. JL, August, 1937.
11. Ibid., January, 1938, p. 19.
12. JPV, January, 1939, p. 2.
13. Ibid., February, 1939.
14. New Masses, April 24, 1934, p. 6.
15. JL, August, 1937, p. 16.
16. Ibid., October, 1937.
17. LZN, loc. cit.
18. JL, August, 1937, p. 6.
19. Ibid., April, 1938, p. 9.
20. JPV, June, 1939.
21. LZN, Op. cit., p. 18.
22. JFR, September, 1939, p. 5.
23. Solomon Schwarz, The Jews in the Soviet Union
(Syracuse University Press, 1951), vii.
24. Ibid., p. 179.
25. Ibid., p. 181.
26. Ibid., p. 192.
27. JL, September, 1938, p. 28.
28. Ibid., April, 1938, p. 23.
29. Ibid., January, 1938, p. 14.
30. Morris Lazaron and Abba H. Silver, "Are American
Jews Communistic," AH, July 2, 1937.
31. Ibid., January 29, 1937.
32. Opinion, April, 1937, p. 18.
33. CE, October 29, 1937. April 30, 1937.

34. Opinion, September, 1939, p. 21.
35. CB, March 4, 1938.
36. JO, September, 1939.
37. Reconstructionist, March 25, 1938.
38. Ibid., April 22, 1938.
39. Ibid., January, 1935.
40. Ibid., February, 1936.
41. Ibid., April 20, 1939.
42. Vanguard, February, 1930.
43. JFR, January, 1935, p. 7.
44. Ibid., May, 1936, p. 29.
45. Ibid., January, 1935.
46. Ibid., March, 1938, p. 9.
47. Ibid., January, 1939, p. 13.
48. Ibid., June, 1939, p. 57.
49. Ibid., May, 1939, p. 15.
50. Youth at the Crossroads, op. cit., p. 9.
51. CY, April, 1934, p. 2.
52. Ibid., January, 1934, p. 5.
53. Opinion, August, 1934.
54. CY, March, 1936, p. 7.
55. CB, December 24, 1937.

Notes to Chapter X

1. J. C. Hurewitz, The Struggle for Palestine (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1950), pp. 30-1.
2. JFR, November, 1935.
3. AJYB, 1930-1, p. 71.

4. AH, May 30, 1930.
5. Ibid., July 17, 1931.
6. Ibid., May 30, 1930.
7. Ibid., January 3, 1936.
8. Ibid., May 19, 1939.
9. Ibid., January 31, 1930.
10. Ibid., May, 1931.
11. Ibid., January 29, 1937.
12. Ibid., August 27, 1937.
13. Ibid., February 25, 1938.
14. NP, January 20, 1933, p. 4.
15. Thirty-three million dollars of American capital were in Palestine in 1936, according to General Wadsworth, American Consul-General. LZN, November 1, 1936.
16. NP, January 24, 1930.
17. Ibid., May 8, 1931.
18. Scribe, June 6, 1930.
19. NP, February 14, 1930.
20. Ibid., June 27, 1930.
21. Ibid., October 14, 1932.
22. Ibid., November 6, 1931, p. 45.
23. AH, July 4, 1930.
24. NP, August 17, 1933, p. 3.
25. Leon Gellman and P. Churgin (ed.), Mizrachi Jubilee Publication (New York: Posy-Shoulson Press, 1936), pp. 2, 6.
26. JF, October, 1930, p. 353.
27. JS, June, 1937.
28. NP, August 17, 1833, p. 3.

29. JS, September, 1937.
30. JF, January, 1934.
31. Ibid., May, 1938, p. 88.
32. Ibid., July, 1938.
33. JFR, November, 1938.
34. GB, February 25, 1938.
35. Gellman and Churgin, loc. cit.
36. Reconstructionist, November 1, 1935.
37. Ibid., March 11, 1938, p. 10.
38. Ibid., July, 1936, p. 18.
39. Ibid., May 28, 1937.
40. Ibid., November 19, 1937.
41. LP, June, 1933, p. 3.
42. Ibid., September-October, p. 4.
43. JFR, July, 1937, p. 11.
44. Ibid., February, 1938, p. 25.
45. Vanguard, February, 1930.
46. Youth at the Crossroads, op. cit., p. 13.
47. Reconstructionist, March 5, 1937.
48. LZN, October 18, 1936, pp. 10-11.
49. CY, June, 1935, p. 4.
50. Call, September, 1938, p. 5.
51. CY, January, 1936, p. 3.
52. Call, July, 1939.
53. The Jews in Bundist territory had not felt the rejection of the Ukrainianian pogroms. See Appendix.

Notes to Chapter XI

1. AJYB, 1931-2, p. 45.
2. JF, January, 1937, p. 6.
3. Ibid., February, 1937, p. 27, August, 1937,
p. 141.
4. Ibid., June, 1930.
5. SAJR, March 29, 1929.
6. Ibid., April 12, 1929.
7. Ibid., April 24, 1929.
8. Ibid., May 3, 1929, p. 18.
9. Ibid., May 10, 1929, p. 20.
10. Ibid., May 24, 1929, p. 17.
11. Vanguard, February, 1930, p. 18.
12. CY, August, 1934, p. 7.
13. Call, April, 1939.

Bibliography

Periodicals

The following Jewish periodicals were primary sources. Every issue available in the period 1929-1939 was investigated. This included:

Advance (New York: 1929-1939), usually weekly.

American Hebrew (Chicago: 1929-1939), weekly.

American Jewish Congress Courier (New York: 1933-4), irregular.

American Jewish Congress Index (New York: 1929-30), irregular.

American Jewish Year Book (New York: 1929-1939), annual.

B'nai B'rith Magazine (Chicago: 1929-1939), monthly.

B'nai B'rith Messenger (Los Angeles: 1929-1939), weekly.

Call of Youth (New York: 1934-1937), monthly.

Congress Bulletin (New York: 1935-1939), weekly.

Contemporary Jewish Record (New York: 1938-9), bi-monthly.

Jewish Forum (New York: 1929-1939), monthly.

Jewish Frontier (New York: 1934-1939), monthly.

Jewish Life (New York: 1937-8), monthly.

Jewish Outlook (New York: 1938-9), monthly.

Jewish People's Voice (New York: 1938-9),

Jewish Social Service Quarterly (New York: 1929-1939).

Justice (New York: 1929-1939), usually weekly.

Labor Palestine (New York: 1933), monthly.

Labor Zionist Newsletter (New York: 1936-9), fortnightly.

Menorah Journal (New York: 1929-1939), monthly.

National Conference of Jewish Social Service: Proceedings

(New York: 1929-1936), Annual.

National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare: Proceedings

(New York: 1937-9), annual.

New Palestine (New York: 1929-1938), monthly.

Opinion (New York: 1931-1939), monthly.

Reconstructionist (New York: 1935-1939), bi-weekly.

SAJ Review (New York: 1928-9), weekly.

Scribe (Portland: 1929-1939), weekly.

Vanguard (New York: 1929-30), monthly.

The following non-Jewish periodicals were investigated:

American Federationist.

American Mercury.

Fortune.

Labor Age.

Nation.

Nation's Business.

New Masses.

Survey.

The following secondary sources were used:

BEARD, CHARLES A. AND MARY R. America in Midpassage.

New York: Macmillan, 1946.

CHURGIN, P. AND LEON GELLMAN (ed.). Mizrachi Jubilee

Publication. New York: Posy-Shoulson Press, 1936.

ELBOGEN, ISMAR. A Century of Jewish Life. Philadelphia:

Jewish Publication Society, 1944.

GLASSMAN, LEO. (ed.). Biographical Encyclopedia of American

Jews. New York: Maurice Jacobs and Leo Glassman, 1935.

GOULD, JEAN. Sidney Hillman. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin,

1952.

HUREWITZ, J. C. The Struggle for Palestine. New York:

W. W. Norton & Co., 1950.

HURWITZ, MAXMILLIAN. History of the Workmen's Circle.

New York: The Workmen's Circle, 1936.

KARPF, MAURICE, Jewish Community Organization in the United States. New York: Bloch, 1938.

LIPSKY, LOUIS. Thirty Years of American Zionism. New York: Nesher, 1927.

MILLS, CHARLES. White Collar. New York: Oxford, 1951.

SCWARZ, SOLOMON. The Jews in the Soviet Union. Syracuse University Press, 1951.

SIMONS, JOHN (ed.). Who's Who in American Jewry, 1938-9.

New York: National News Assn., 1939.

STERNBERG, FRITZ. Capitalism and Socialism on Trial. New York: John Day Co., 1950.

STRACHEY, JOHN. The Nature of the Capitalist Crisis. New York: Covici, Friede, 1935.

Who's Who in American Jewry, 1928. New York: Jewish Biographical Bureau, 1928.

APPENDIX

Aspects of the Socialist Nationalist and Socialist anti-Nationalist Movements in Eastern European Jewry

An understanding of the Bundist and Labor Zionist groups in America is dependent upon an understanding of the rise of those groups in Eastern Europe. Why did some Russian Jews become socialist anti-Zionists and others, socialist Zionists? Why did the Poale Zion modify the class-conscious ideology of its founder and become more "middle-class" in leadership and in program? When we can answer these questions, we will have a clearer picture of the social composition of the American Bundist and Labor Zionist groups whose membership came in large part from the "mother" movements in Eastern Europe. Therefore, a study of the rise of the different brands of Jewish socialism in Russia should be of value. This analysis, while dealing with all groups, will stress the Labor Zionist group formed by Ber Borochoy.

Social forces in Russia from 1861 through 1881 made for the development of socialist ideology but those forces did not encourage any Jewish nationalistic development. For this was the period of Alexander II's "revolution from above." The "liberal" Czar freed the peasants and encouraged industrialization. From 1865 to 1890 coal production was multiplied by seventeen. A large railroad system was built. On the basis of these producer-goods industries, consumer goods were produced beginning in the 1870's. Jews worked in textile industries in Moscow, Lodz,

and Bialystok; in leather industries in Smorgon and Shavli (Lithuania); and in tobacco, in the Ukraine. Thus the Jewish artisans and craftsmen--formerly employed in pre-capitalistic modes of production--gradually found their way into Russian consumer-goods industry. This industry was on a very small scale (in Bialystock an average of 26 workers in a factory) and was similar to the early "putting out" system of embryonic British capitalism. Meanwhile members of the first guild--the Jews who could afford to pay a large tax for membership in that guild--were given preferred treatment by the Czar. They participated in banking and railway contracting. They were centered in the large cities... especially up north. Baron Ginsburg formed the OPE, the Society for spreading education among Jews in Russia, and was a supporter of Zederman's Hamelitz--which appeared to be sort of a Russian Ha-maasef.

The freeing of the peasants and their difficult plight face to face with the world market led to agitation by the Narodnik party, led by Tchernishevsky. This group developed a socialist ideology based on the peasantry. However, it was a small group of intelligentsia and did not spring from the peasants themselves and it glowed with the romanticism of Tolstoy. The peasants paid little heed to these leaders. There were some Jews in this movement, but they did not play a dominant role--there were virtually no Jewish peasants.

From this picture of society, it can be seen that the seeds of socialism were sown among the Jews: there was the industrial development (and there were some spontaneous

strikes by Jewish workers); and there was a Russian peasant socialism in its early stages (this attracted a few Jews). But such a socialism would take on no distinctly Jewish form, since in this early period of industrial development the problems of the Jewish workers were practically identical with those of the non-Jewish and since Czar Alexander gave promise (even to the poor Jew) of potentially better treatment.

These are the social roots of the Vilna Circle. In a rabbinic seminary in Vilna in 1875, Aaron Sundelewitsch led the first Jewish socialist group: a circle of cosmopolitanists, mostly Narodniks, who felt that the Jews were only a religious group and that religion was dead. They expected assimilation and would admit no particularly Jewish nature of their group. Also in the 70's, Aaron Liberman and a group of refugees in London started a circle based on the Narodnik-cosmopolite pattern. But Liberman himself stressed cultural nationalism more than did his followers. The group made no impression on the London workers and Liberman left for Vienna.

There then were thrown into motion a series of social forces that encouraged Marxism (as opposed to Narodnikism) and Jewish "particularism." Alexander II felt that further concessions to the embryonic Russian middle-class and peasantry would threaten Czarist rule. So he re-invoked old restrictions. He was assassinated in 1881 by a group of

Narodniks. He was succeeded by Alexander III and Nicholas II (1894) who continued the repressive policy. This led to a tremendous intensification of the problems of the new Russian proletariat and made them fertile ground for the already developed Marxian ideology. And so, between 1883 and 1898, Plekhanov, Axelrod, Deutsch, and Zasulich were forming in Geneva a Marxism adopted to Russian needs. This led (under Lenin's guidance) to the establishment in Russia in 1898 of the Russian Social-Democratic Party (RSDP) composed of Mensheviks and Bolsheviks.

This development of Russian Marxism was very appealing to the Jewish proletariat and intelligentsia. For, the Narodnik peasantism was very theoretical to the Jews who had no social base for such a movement. And with the worsening conditions of Russian labor in general, the Jews began to suffer to an even greater degree. Borochof speaks of the fact that now the Jews were limited to a few industries mostly run by Jews and that even Jewish employers often refused to hire Jews. The first major strike occurred among the Jewish weavers of Bialystock in 1887. And so, the social groundwork was laid for the development of a Jewish socialism based on the needs of the proletariat and grounded in the theories of Karl Marx...as interpreted by Plekhanov and others.

The Jewish socialist movement became more particularistic because of a series of rejections by all phases of Russian society. In 1881 there began a series of pogroms in South Russia--in the towns of Podol, Demlovka, Smyela, Odessa, and

Kiev. Those pogroms were instigated by the government to divert the minds of the masses away from the real source of the new repressive measures. Particularly discouraging to Jewish socialists was the attitude of the Narodnaya-Volia (People's Will)--their own Narodnik organization--which maintained that the pogroms were a sign of revolutionary awakening. (Patkin, p. 89). The members of the first guild were, of course, crushed and disillusioned by the turn of events. On into the 1890's continued the persecution and its center continued to be in the Ukraine:

No place in the empire could vie as regards hostility to the Jews with the city of Kiev (Dubnow, V. III, p. 19).

Many Jews emigrated to America: these were primarily Jews who were not completely impoverished but who had enough money to send themselves to the new land. America attracted Jews primarily from northern Russia, Poland, and Lithuania--where conditions were not so bad.

Given the new social forces of persecution, it was inevitable that the old cosmopolitan Jewish socialism would have to give way to a more particularistic ideology. For the Jews--all of them--had become conscious of a particular Jewish problem that was not faced by the non-Jewish population. But there was no one ideology that met the needs of Jewish socialists. On the contrary, there were Bundists, Seimists, Socialist Zionists, Minsker Poale Zion, "Regular" Poale Zion, and Autonomists. It will be shown that the degree of Jewish particularism in these groups varied directly with the degree of rejection from the Russian society. While

all groups had turned from the cosmopolite ideology, the groups in the North (where immigration to America was more easily done and where there were better conditions generally and where there were no serious pogroms until the turn of the century)--the Northern groups stressed living in the Galut and negated Palestinism; while the Ukraine became the center for Zionist activity among the proletariat (for there occurred the first series of pogroms and from there immigration to America was more difficult).

It will be recalled that the increased impoverishment of the Russian proletariat led to an application of Marxism to the Russian working class. And the repressive treatment of the 1880's and 1890's led to varying degrees of particularization within the Jewish socialist groups. These groups will now be briefly discussed in the light of these social forces.

The Bund can be traced back to a small circle of socialists in Wilna in 1892--some of them Narodniks turned Marxian and all with the tradition of cosmopolitanism. Juli Zederbaum was the grandson of the editor of Hamelitz. Adolf Kremer, the leader, in a series of pamphlets vigorously opposed Palestinism. There was at first no effort at Yiddish cultural development. Here was simply a group of intelligentsia applying Marxian principles to their cosmopolitan socialism. The organization was formed officially in 1897 and was centered in Northern Russia, Lithuania, and Poland. Borochoy testifies to this description of "Bund territory":

From Vitebsk, Poale-Zion penetrated into Bund territory in 1903-5 and spread over Lithuania and Poland. (Borochoy, p. 181).

To hold the working class which was a part of Yiddish culture, the Bund leaders had to incorporate this culture as a part of their program. In 1897 the Bund considered itself to be simply an organizational unity within the RSDP--then in formation. But by 1900, Bund resolutions opposed national oppression and admitted that the Jews could be classed as a nation. However, Zionism was deemed a bourgeois movement and national emotions were deplored. A culturist wing grew up in the Bund and opposed the old cosmopolites. This was possibly an effort of the workers themselves to wrest control of the organization from the early intelligentsia leadership. The RSDP, led by Lenin and its publication Iskra, attacked the culturist group and supported the old cosmopolite leadership. In 1903 at the London conference of the RSDP, the Party refused to grant the Bund a federated status, so the Bund--now led by the culturists--became independent. Vladimir Medem was now the leader, and he stressed salvation through Marxian socialism in the Galut.

And so, the Bund was a product not only of the developing Russian Marxism. But having as its social base the workers least affected by the pogroms, it was the least particularistic of the Jewish socialist groups. Still the Jewish problems of the period did result in a particular Jewish cultural character and in its exodus from the RSDP.

The embryonic Poale Zion groups were founded around 1900 in various sections of Russia. However only the group led by Borochoy in South Russia was definitely Palestinian-

centered. There were three other groups that broke with Borochoy's Poale-Zion because of its Palestinism:

The name, "Poale Zion," was originated with the Minsker Poale Zion, organized in 1900. This Minsk group favored the Uganda proposal at the 1903 World Zionist Congress. Four years after the defeat of Uganda, the group joined the Socialist-Zionists (S.S.)--another territorial group.

This S.S. group was led by Jakob Lestschinsky and was formed after the rejection of the Uganda proposal. It developed the theory of non-proletarianization: the Jews cannot become proletarianized in the galut; the solution is a territory. Territorialism is a historical necessity, but Palestinism is romantic nationalism. This movement was active in one hundred large cities. It joined the ITO. It broke with Poale Zion in January, 1905.

The Seimists (or SERP) were even more galut-centered than were the S.S. Socialism is to be achieved in the galut through national minorities. A Jewish seim (parliament) would be established and controlled by the proletariat and progressive bourgeoisie. This (as can be imagined by the ideology) was not a workers' group but was a small circle of intellectual leaders who hailed the Yiddishist-Internationalist Zhitlowsky as their intellectual forbear. It was non-Marxist. It dropped out of Poale Zion in December, 1905, but many of its members eventually rejoined the party. While territorialism was a distant goal, salvation could be gained in large measure through the Jewish national organism in the galut.

Another group never associated with Poale Zion was Dubnow's People's Party, organized in Petersburg in 1906. Dubnow looked upon the galut as the constant factor in Jewish history, favored autonomism, and opposed the Zionist's negation of the galut. But this, too, was no mass movement.

It is now clear that the groups which opposed Borochof's Palestinism were primarily the Bund with its center in Northern Russia, Poland, and Lithuania; the Poale-Zion of Minsk (north Russia); the People's Party of Petersburg. The S.S. group with its base in a hundred cities throughout Russia looked to a territorial solution and stood in its galut-stress about midway between the Bund and Borochof. The geographical location of the Seimist is in doubt, but it was a small group that soon passed out of existence. The geographical divisions are significant.

It has been demonstrated that the Palestinism of the Jewish labor movement arose to meet the needs of the persecuted proletariat of South Russia. Here were the people who bore the brunt of the pogroms of the 80's and 90's and who could not easily move to America. They were, therefore, ready to hear that America was not the answer. While this movement flourished in South Russia, it was eventually able to make inroads into (as Borochof put it) Bund territory. But this ideological invasion could not and did not take place until the pogroms of 1904-5 in Minsk, Lodz, Brest-Litovsk, and Homel had disillusioned many of the Bundist workers. Again social forces (the anti-Semitic pogroms used to break

up the abortive revolution) paved the way for the advance of Labor Zionist ideology.

Finally the Poale Zion movement led by Borochoy in South Russia can be analyzed in the light of the social forces which made it possible: the development of Russian Marxism to meet the needs of the Russian proletariat and the particularly tragic plight of the Jews in Southern Russia who were now ripe for a Palestinian solution: salvation could not be found in the galut, immigration to America was very difficult for them,--the Jewish proletariat discovered a national problem that could only be solved in Palestine.

Ber Borochoy was born in 1881 in the Ukraine. His family moved to Poltava and was of high enough social position to place Ber in the gymnasium. His father was a teacher. Ber graduated in 1900 and did not receive a scholarship award because of anti-Semitism in the school. In 1900, he joined the Bund but was expelled in 1901 because of his nationalistic leanings. In 1903 he wrote his first essay entitled, "The Nature of the Jewish Intellect." In 1905, he joined Poale Zion. He immediately wrote his most significant works, "The National Question and the Class Struggle" and "Our Platform"--the creed of Poale Zion. Among the revolutionary refugees after 1906, he fled to the Hague. He spent time in America before the World War and opposed America's entry into the war. He returned to Russia at the time of the Revolution, but he died at the age of 36--on December 17, 1917.

So, as the Russian socialist movement, the main leadership of Poale Zion came from the intelligentsia of the crushed middle-class.

Borochov's ideology can be divided into four aspects:

1. The Jewish worker, not being in basic industries, is ineffective in the class struggle.
2. Only in Palestine can he be in basic industries.
3. The progressive nationalism necessary for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine is compatible with Marxism.
4. The following program is needed: the proletariat should direct the emigration of the petty-bourgeoisie; should demand national autonomy in the galut--although this will produce no radical change in his position. A belief in the inevitable development of Zionism is changed to more stress on self-help and a more active role by the proletariat.

This is his program in plain words. But his writings are couched in Marxian terms and are filled with acute observations of the Jewish world of his day.

1. The Jewish worker, not being in basic industries, is ineffective in the class struggle.

The necessity for a territory in the case of the Jews results from the unsatisfactory economic strategic base of the Jewish proletariat. ("Our Platform," p. 196)

But the class struggle can take place only where the worker toils, ie., where he has already occupied a certain workplace. The weaker his status at this position, the less ground he has for a systematic struggle. ("Nationalism and the Class Struggle," p. 159)

That the Jewish worker cannot be in basic industries in the

galut is in evidence through Borochoy's Russia. Furthermore, Borochoy constantly points out the displacement of Jewish workers by the peasants and the discrimination against Jews by Jewish employers. ("Jewish anti-Semitism"). In his "Economic Development of the Jewish People" he advances various reasons for the fact that Jews stress human and mental labor over natural and physical. The landless history of the Jews has removed them from nature and "from the occupations which are at the hub of history." (p. 69). Jews are pushed out of industries as soon as the native population can work in those industries. Marxian terminology is used: since constant capital increases at the expense of variable capital and since Jews are not in heavy industry, the development of technology throws Jews out of work more rapidly than non-Jews.

2. Only in Palestine can the Jew be in basic industries. For the Jew to be in basic industry he must go to undeveloped countries. In highly industrialized countries he is not able to get into the basic industries. In fact, those countries will soon exclude him altogether:

In order that the Jewish immigration may be diverted to colonization of undeveloped countries, it is not sufficient that the colonization merely should be useful to Jews. It is also necessary that the immigration to the previous centers become more difficult. This, as a matter of fact, is taking place. Because of national competition, immigration into the well-developed capitalistic countries is being limited ("Our Platform," p. 191)

In Palestine, the Jewish worker can paralyze the whole industry by a single strike.

The social forces of oppression are quite clear in

Borochoy's appeal to the workers:

The terrible national oppression; the exploitation on the part of petty Jewish capitalists; and the comparatively high cultural level and restlessness of the city-bred Jewish proletarian, the son of the people of the book--these generate an overwhelming revolutionary energy and an exalted spirit of self-sacrifice. This revolutionary zeal, hampered by the limitations of the strategic base, very frequently assumes grotesque forms...A chained Prometheus who in helpless rage tears the feathers of the vulture that preys on him--that is the symbol of the Jewish proletariat. (OP, p. 195)

The answer is Palestine...and a progressive nationalism.

Palestine is chosen above other agricultural undeveloped territories, because of the national character of Jewish immigration. Palestine, practically speaking, is the only undeveloped country where the Jews would not have to compete with a native class and where petty and middle capital would be spontaneously invested. This "Palestinism" is neither theoretical nor practical but "predicative." (OP, p. 203). Thus Borochoy answers the territorialists.

3. But he still must answer the Marxists who consider nationalism to be incompatible with true socialism. And this is the burden of "Nationalism and the Class Struggle"--a fascinating essay in which the Jews are never mentioned specifically, which begins with Marxian dialectics and makes Jewish nationalism compatible with socialism:

The Marxian analysis of forces of production and relations of production fails to explain national groupings. Marx ignores the geographical, historical, and anthropological conditions which are different in different areas. Marx does admit in the third volume of Capital that differences in natural environment and race lead to different developments of the economic base. But this is as far as he goes. Marx

speaks only of the class struggle which takes place when the forces of production are so far advanced that the relations of production become archaic. However, Marx does not analyze the national struggle which takes place when conditions of production (those historical, geographical, etc. factors mentioned above) call for expansion:

A national struggle takes place whenever the development of the conditions of production belonging to a social group be better, more advantageous, or in general that they be expanded.
(p. 140)

This national struggle is for purely material gain:

Every social phenomenon is primarily related to the material elements of society. A struggle is waged not for 'spiritual' things but for certain economic advantages in social life (P. 140)

Just as Marx uses the term "class" to refer to both class-consciousness and the objective existence of people lacking class-awareness but playing the same role in the relations of production, so the term "nation" should be applied to a people's awareness of self and the term "people" to the objective existence of the people who lack self-awareness.

Within every nation there are different kinds of nationalisms. The great bourgeoisie needs a home base to capture the world market.

International competition is not a result of some despotic, egotistic trait of the ruling classes. Rather it is a result of the unconditional need of the capitalistic economies to expand while they are developing.

This competition develops in predisposed individuals, who are concerned thereby, certain sentiments and emotions. And although the sentiments and emotions are deeply enrooted in economic life, it seems to those people who are imbued with them that they are in no way related to the material life. They fail to see the deep economic basis of these feelings,

and they therefore lose every possibility of understanding their own motives, which to them appear holy and far removed from the materialistic. (p. 163)

Middle-class nationalism is concerned with the consumer's market:

In reality they fear every social upheaval, for it might signify their death warrant. They sanctify orderliness, and mortally fear revolution. They cling fast to whatever property is still in their possession, and tremble lest that too be wrested from them. They are therefore the bulwark of "law and order," and are ready to defend with fire and sword the existing order of things. In general, they are vexatious, as might be expected from an element which is on the downgrade to pauperization, and which cannot fight for its future or face it squarely. Everything that is in whatever degree unusual or strange, appears to them as rebellious, traitorous, and subversive. Their poor dull wit will not permit them to rise above their drab possessiveness. (p. 155)

All this has provided excellent soil for various nationalistic prejudices and superstitions. The poor head of the petty bourgeoisie is filled only with "we" and "they," "native" and "alien." Incidentally, the members of this class are always at one another's throat because of mutual competition, and there is no common meeting ground whereon their class interests may converge. (p. 155)

Proletarian nationalism is based on need for the land "as a place in which to work." This nationalism may develop into competition among workers and to immigration policies on behalf of the native proletariat. This type of nationalism hinders class-consciousness and has slowed down the American labor movement. However the class struggle can take place only in a place where the worker toils, so some national feeling is needed simply to preserve the base for that struggle.

Normal conditions of production will give free play to the class struggle and will tend to de-nationalize the

worker. But abnormal conditions of production (and Borochof implies but does not state: as the Jews live under) tend to decrease temporarily class antagonism and to nationalize the worker. But this is a healthy nationalism felt by the proletariat in search of a base for the class struggle. There is a distinction between nationalistic movements (which obscure class consciousness) and national movements (which recognize common characteristics in the environment but do not minimize the class struggle). The nationalistic movements are middle-class in character:

One can usually identify the middle and petty bourgeoisie, and above all the clerical elements and land owners, as those groups of an oppressed nation which are vitally concerned with traditions. The dabblers in national education, in national literature (teachers, writers, etc.), usually garb their traditionalism in national hues. The chief protagonists of national emancipation, however, are always the progressive elements of the masses and the intelligentsia (!). Where these latter elements are sufficiently developed and have already freed themselves from the bonds of traditionalism, their nationalism assumes a purer character. Fundamentally the emancipation process is not nationalistic but national; and among such progressive elements of oppressed nations there develops a genuine nationalism which does not aspire to the preservation of traditions, which will not exaggerate them, which has no illusions about the ostensible oneness of the nation, which comprehends clearly the class structure of society, and which does not seek to confuse anyone's real class interests...Genuine nationalism in no way obscures class-consciousness. It manifests itself only among the progressive elements of oppressed nations. (p. 165-6)

This concept of nationalism is expressed in Borochof's other writings:

Ours is a realistic nationalism, free from any "spiritual" admixture. (OP, p. 195)

The national instinct of self-preservation latent in the Socialist working class is a healthy nationalism. (Nationalism and the World War, p. 113)

(Proletarian nationalism) fades away as soon as the need for normalizing the strategic base is gone. (OP, p. 194)

Thus does Borochoy justify the nationalism of the Jewish socialist!

4. The fourth aspect of his ideology might be called his program for action. This program changed in the period from 1906 when he wrote "Our Platform" to 1917 when he delivered his last speech on "Eretz Yisroel in our Program." In the Platform, the task of the proletariat was simply to organize the petty-bourgeoisie immigrations, to direct them to Palestine, and to secure from the government the right to emigrate. It is this lower middle-class that is the de-classed group ripe for emigration. (OP, p. 191). Bourgeois Zionism has a creative role: to accumulate capital in Palestine. Labor Zionism has a liberative role: to remain in the galut and make sure of freedom of emigration. The program for the galut is the demand for national political autonomy "in all galut lands." This will bring the proletariat face to face with the bourgeoisie but it will not bring a radical change in their condition because of the conditions peculiar to galut. This program will inevitably be carried out by a "stychic" process--that is, independent of anyone's will. Just as the concentration of capital will achieve socialism, so social forces already described (eg, the limiting of immigration elsewhere) will achieve Zionism.

Abraham Duker in his introduction to Nationalism and the Class Struggle stresses the great drift from strict materialism in Borochoy's thought. A. L. Patkin, historian of the

Jewish labor movement, disputes Duker's interpretation (Origins...p. 230) and credits Borochoy with always having had an idealistic element. Duker maintains that the purely materialistic determinism of the stychic process gives way to a more idealistic interpretation with need for strenuous human intervention.

In 1915 in an essay called "National Self-Help":
progress does not create man but man creates progress
(p. 86)

In his last speech, Borochoy favors for the first time a cooperative movement in Palestine which he had previously considered utopian. He uses more emotional terms. Instead of the term "Jewish nation":

Now we can and must employ an emotional terminology.
Now we can and must proclaim: "Eretz Yisrael--a
Jewish home!" (Eretz Yisrel, p. 126)

In 1917, Borochoy praised the Maskilim, the Bund, and the S.S. who helped in the struggle for emancipation. ("Facing Reality," p. 89).

The Patkin-Duker dispute over whether or not Borochoy drifts from materialism to a more idealistic position is reminiscent of the fruitless discussions about Karl Marx who predicted the fall of capitalism but also worked very hard for its destruction. Materialism does not preclude the individual's role in the process which is inevitable.

Of much more significance is the obvious shift to the phrases of bourgeois nationalism with all its emotionalism, the praise given the middle-class movements, and the support given capitalistic cooperatives. This tendency towards cooperation with that middle-class which was so scathingly

described in the early essays comes very close to obscuring the class struggle which no honest nationalism of the proletariat can afford to do. This tendency of the socialists was very common in World War I atmosphere. This tendency towards unity with the bourgeoisie continued after Borochoy's death. The Poale Zion in America--never as class-conscious as the Russian group--became more and more friendly to the middle-class. The nationalism of the socialist leaders of Israel today is concerned with accumulation of capital and new markets for Israeli business.

An exception in this development would naturally be the Borochoyists in Russia: they joined the Bolsheviks and remained as Left Poale Zion a separate party in Russia until 1928. The rank-and-file elements of Poale Zion in America and Israel often expressed opposition to the compromises with the bourgeoisie made by their leadership. (See thesis. Also, Youth at the Crossroads).

The obscuring of class-consciousness in a Labor Nationalism was bound to come--even in the works of the founder of the movement! As the Labor Zionist movement developed into a powerful organization on the world scene, its leaders wanted to bid for control of the World Zionist movement. But the settlement of Palestine was practically in the hands of the possessors of capital, the Jewish bourgeoisie. Unless the sword of the class struggle was sheathed, the Labor Zionists could gain no significant voice in world Zionism. Socialist phrases were excused as all but the Russian Poale Zion joined the JNF. And once

leadership was gained, interest in finding capitalist investments and courting such economic organizers as Louis Brandeis pushed class-consciousness far into the background.

A second factor is that of the universal lag between the leadership of an organization and its rank-and-file members. The movement to begin with was led by intellectuals, by disillusioned members of the middle-class. Borochoy was one of them. Later in its development, the movement attracted members of the middle-class who could not find places of leadership among the general Zionists but who were hailed to high heaven by the laboring group: they added respect and influence to Labor Zionism. And finally, as is the case with all labor leadership, when the organization becomes strong enough, even leaders who came from the rank-and-file are raised--through the success of the movement--to a higher social status and so take on ideals alien to the proletariat.

The middle-class orientation of the American Poale Zion can now be explained. The pogroms in the Ukraine in 1880 gave Poale Zion its original nationalistic character. As emigration to America became impossible more Jewish workers favored Zionism. Many Bundists came to America from Northern Russia, Poland, and Lithuania and formed the core of the Workmen's Circle. But those Jews who came to America from South Russia and from Poale Zion centers in other sections were Zionistically oriented. From the very beginning this American Labor Zionism favored more cooperation with the middle-class than did the Russian Poale Zion.

This would be expected in the non-revolutionary American working class. And soon, as the American Poale Zion became a growing group--more reputable in the eyes of American Jewry--its leadership became more middle-class. (These factors have been described). The Bundist group, not committed to nationalism, did not experience the same tendency towards bourgeoisisation. It did not need to cooperate with bourgeois groups and so remained labor led and so retained a more consistent socialist ideology. Meanwhile, by the 1930's, the Poale Zion leadership was middle-class and composed of various influential Reform rabbis and was even supporting the New Deal in its latter days.

The resultant of the current middle-class leadership was, however, inherent in the movement. Ber Borochov, himself, after brilliantly setting forth a class-conscious proletarian nationalism, became living evidence of the contradiction that was bound to destroy his movement.

Bibliography

- BOROCHOV, BER. (Selected Writings) Nationalism and the Class Struggle. Introduction by Abraham Duker, New York: Poale Zion, 1937.
- DUBNOW, S. M. History of the Jews in Russia and Poland. 3 volumes. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1946.
- PATKIN, A. L. The Origins of the Russian-Jewish Labor Movement. London: Cheshire, 1947.