

12

U

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Some National Jewish Agencies and Social Action,
1939-1949"

written by Irving B. 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: ()

Robert L. Katz
(signature of referee)

Robert L. Katz
(referee)

4-15-53
(date)

microfilmed 6/8, 66
Mona Steiner

Some National Jewish Agencies
and Social Action
1939 - 1949

This thesis attempts a detailed study of three National Jewish Agencies and their social action programs from 1939 to 1949. The American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee and the Central Conference of American Rabbis are the organizations which have been selected, for they present a cross-section view of the American Jewish Community.

Although social action work has not been the principal objective of any one of these bodies, each has devoted considerable effort in this direction. However, their motivations, goals, techniques and effectiveness reveal wide degrees of variance.

The period from 1939 to 1949 was a crucial decade, not only because of the impact of world conditions upon Jewish life, but also because it witnessed a tremendous growth and development of Jewish social-consciousness. Both the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee evidenced basic policy changes during these years which brought them out of the shadows of petty self-defense into the light of leadership in the struggle for social advancement.

This thesis observes three areas of action; church and state, social legislation and civil rights. It analyses the programs of each organization separately and concludes with a comparative analysis of the directions, methods and effectiveness of all the organizations. It demonstrates clearly that social action in the broad sense, exclusive of purely Jewish defense work, is a surprisingly new concept in the eyes of the American Jewish Community.

SOME NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES

AND SOCIAL ACTION

1939 - 1949

by

Irving B. Cohen

Submitted in partial
fulfillment of the
requirements for
Ordination.

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

Referee:
Professor Robert L. Katz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter I The American Jewish Congress | 12 |
| Chapter II The American Jewish Committee | 66 |
| Chapter III The Central Conference of American Rabbis . . | 106 |
| Chapter IV Comparative Analysis | 144 |
| Notes | 185 |
| Bibliography | 200 |

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to study in detail the social action programs of the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, during the decade 1939 to 1949. The first aim will be to discover what were the activities of a social action nature in which these organizations engaged, in the United States within these ten years. In the process, both the types of activity and the actions taken will be carefully noted. Following this, a comparative analysis will be presented in an attempt to understand more clearly the respective direction of each organization's activities, the various techniques employed in approaching the problems and the degree of each one's effectiveness and accomplishment.

The detailed activities of each organization will be presented separately under three headings:

1. Church and State
2. Social Legislation
3. Civil Rights.

This will be followed by the chapter on Comparative Analysis. The problems of direct anti-Semitism and Immigration legislation will not be considered in this paper, for in the programs of these organizations such activities reflect a purely Jewish interest. In addition, each of these two subjects offers a special area requiring a lengthy study of its own.

It must be understood at the outset, that social action per se was not the prime interest of any one of these three organizations. Their major programs were concerned with a variety of other subjects more closely aligned to the specific purposes for which each was created. Nevertheless, these organizations rank among the most important Jewish bodies which have encompassed any program for social action within their overall scope of activity.

The title of this thesis immediately poses three preliminary questions which must be answered in order to give direction to the detailed investigation. These questions are:

1. What is social action?
2. Which organizations shall be surveyed?
3. Why is this period important?

What is social action? According to the Social Work Year Book, social action is a term that has become applied to such a diverse range of activities that it is unlikely that any single precise definition would be acceptable.¹ It might be described as, "organized group effort to solve mass social problems or to further socially desirable objectives by attempting to influence basic social and economic conditions or practices." It involves public pressure in one form or another, short of physical coercion or violence. This pressure is usually achieved by influencing public opinion through educational publicity aimed at winning the active support of large, and if possible, influential numbers of persons. However, this is not always true. Often a very small number of persons may be involved. Sometimes an historic

accomplishment may hinge upon the verdict of one individual's opinion or action, and the pressure brought to bear may be completely private in nature. Indeed many organizations have shown a preference for the clandestine type of operation and have turned to the more extensive form of concerted public action only as a last resort.

The promotion of legislation is often regarded as the typical form of social action, since social advance is frequently achieved through this method. However, most concepts of social action are broader and more inclusive than the promotion of legislation alone, and in many cases advancement may be achieved without recourse to legislation or to any branch of our legal institutions. Nonetheless, in America the law has proven to be perhaps the strongest tool both for the initiation of social advancement and for the preservation of acquired social gains.

In the writer's mind, the term social action implies an emphasis upon action for society, that is for good. In this sense the most important factor is accomplishment. While it is clearly recognized that, "it is better to have tried and failed than never to have tried at all," when national organizations utilizing public time, energy and funds are scrutinized, it is the measure of their success that needs be accounted for. Frequently, misdirected efforts produce an overwhelming element of waste, both of precious time and money. If at all possible it would be well to eliminate these expenditures. Even if this is impossible, at least an insight

into organizational potential may serve as a guide to those who seek a place to invest of their own energies.

Social action then is action on behalf of society for good. In Judaism these ends have been well defined. They are the very goals of religion, though they are not its exclusive possession. No better platform has been penned than the words of Isaiah. For his day and for ours, social action is:

"To loose the fetters of wickedness,
To undo the bands of the yoke
And to let the oppressed go free.
It is to deal thy bread to the hungry,
And that thou bring the poor that are cast out
to thy house.
When thou seest the naked that thou cover him,
And that thou hide not thyself from thine
own flesh."²

Social action is doing something. Its highest ideal seems to imply a measure of altruism and unselfishness. This, however, does not always hold true. Often self interest is the prime motivation for activity. A part of this study will be devoted to determining which is the more effective basis for activity.

Which organizations shall be surveyed? The organizations which have been selected for this study are, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. It would of course be impossible to study in detail all of the national organizations which have been active in varying degrees in the field of social action. Such a project would prove altogether interminable. It became essential, therefore, to select those organizations

which would at least give a view of a cross section of the Jewish community, both religious and secular. These three are, of course, quite prominent. In addition they represent those organizations with which the Reform rabbi will come in most intimate contact. All three organizations have provided a wealth of source material. The American Jewish Congress published the Congress Weekly which incorporated the details of its activities during the entire decade. The American Jewish Committee published annual reports, summarizing its work and also printed the Committee Reporter, a monthly news bulletin, every year after 1943. The Central Conference of American Rabbis printed annual Yearbooks which included detailed reviews of its Committee proceedings, important discussion material and all of the resolutions adopted and statements publicized during this period. An abundance of information was therefore available for study. It is quite fair to presume that none of these organizations has omitted from its own records any important accomplishment or interest that occupied its attention during this decade. In view of this, a sound basis for analysis and comparison is present.

Why is this period important? It is obvious, certainly, that the years of 1939 to 1949 are primarily important in that they form the background of the scene of present day action. In other words, the events and activities of this period lead up to and largely explain the reason for what is going on in the social action programs of Jewish Community organizations now. The fact is that there is a direct

correlation between this decade and the present time, for these years were to a great degree formulative. The outbreak of the second world war reawoke all of America from the inertia of the thirties. The impact of unprecedented world-wide anti-Semitism stimulated the expansion of National Jewish Agencies in particular. As the slaughter of European Jewry mounted it became more and more obvious that the United States was to be, of necessity, both the center of Zionist efforts and the dominant force in the leadership of Jewish life throughout the world.³ Merely to provide for overseas relief materially and financially emerged as full scale activity programs for the National Jewish Agencies of this country. Furthermore, as the horrors of the Nazi atrocities came to light and the permanency of European Jewish hatred revealed itself fully, the direction of attention focused upon the question of post-war settlement and rehabilitation of Jewish survivors. This assumed the form of activities on behalf of immigration, primarily to this country, and the efforts to establish the State of Israel. The activities on behalf of immigration proved to be only meagerly successful and, therefore, the maximum effort was concentrated upon Israel. A larger portion of American Jewry than ever before in history responded to the program of the official Zionist movement and even those factions which disapproved of the political establishment of a Jewish state gave tremendous financial support to the upbuilding of Palestine as a 'haven of refuge.' Were nothing else to have been accomplished

during the entire decade, this alone would stand among the most outstanding achievements of all of Jewish history.

But there was more. Another full scale program of activity was undertaken on the American home front. Coincident with the spread of European anti-Semitism was also a spreading of American anti-Semitism. This new upsurge was, in addition, closely aligned with fascist and enemy fifth-column activities. Thus, many non-Jewish groups united in the fight for Jewish self-defense in America. This provided the seed for an expansion of goodwill and interfaith activities. The threat of world disaster and the sufferings of war were also accompanied by an intensification of religious enthusiasm. Thus began a growth in church affiliation and activity which has continually broadened down to the present moment. In addition, as is particularly true in all periods of national emergency, there arose a marked sensitivity to the problem of the preservation of civil rights. Thus, National Jewish Agencies, both secular and religious, were occupied not only in matters of foreign affairs, but also in far reaching programs of Jewish self-defense within the borders of the United States.

As the activities of these agencies broadened and expanded, it became apparent that there was a growing need for some sort of overall coordination of authority. Attempted unions of autonomous bodies, however, have always met with tremendous resistance. Nonetheless, some attempt was made and in 1944 the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC)

was formed. The American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee were two of the six principal members of this body. The Central Conference of American Rabbis was not a member. However, its lay counterpart, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations was one of the six. In addition, the Synagogue Council of America, of which the Central Conference is the representative of the Reform group, frequently operated in conjunction with the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC).

The significance of this organization, in so far as our study is concerned, is the fact that this unified group acted as a clearing house of opinion and thought for all National Jewish Agencies. Thus, each became more aware than ever before of the activities and viewpoints and outlook of the other. This sharing of thought became particularly meaningful as the broadening outlook upon social action activities developed. It is quite obvious, for example, that the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee were, in a sense, frequently in competition with each other. They were rivals for public financial support and for public acclaim. There may well have arisen a degree of competition for membership after 1944, when the Committee for the first time began to set up local chapters. There must certainly have been some influence upon each other, as the trend of domestic activity moved toward a widening of scope in the latter half of the decade.

This broadening outlook upon social action activities, which was mentioned above, may best be described as a movement away from self-centered and narrow Jewish defense into the broader arena of concern for the interests of all minority groups and restricted individuals. Many contributing factors may account for this development which is so apparent in the work of the two secular organizations which we are to survey. The world upheaval surely helped to bring these Agencies to the understanding that Jewish security is bound up with both world security in general, and the security of any minority group in particular. From this they may finally have realized that efforts in the defense of Jews to the exclusion of other minorities was meaningless. World events may also have brought home the lesson that anti-Semitism is not necessarily a problem rooted within the Jewish group at all. Its roots lie in the sufferings and unrest of the entire nation. Thereby they may have recognized that their efforts to combat it had been largely misdirected. Another factor was certainly the impact of the personality of outstanding leaders. In the case of the American Jewish Congress, for example, the brilliant philosophy and deep insight of Alexander Pekelis may have almost single handedly accounted for the change in policy. John Slawson of the American Jewish Committee played an important role in shaping the thinking of his agency. In addition it is quite possible that the decline in native anti-Semitism after 1945 demanded new areas of concentration for the huge mechanisms of these organizations. And then

there is at least one other possibility. The activities of these years may have borne witness to the inherent and natural development of social thinking, which begins along the avenues of narrow selfish interest only to grow into the maturity of broadened universal concern. We cannot necessarily conclude which of these is the dominant factor. Our task is mainly to observe that this transition did occur.

On the other hand, in the case of the religious national body, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, no such change is apparent. Predicated upon the universal social ideals of Reform Judaism, its activities and interest possessed a broad outlook and an all-embracing concern during the entire period of our study. However, here, too, external affairs played an active role. One example will help to clarify this statement. Although religious idealism may presume an interest in any form of discrimination, it was the national scene which lay the ground work for emphasis upon social action for Fair Employment Practices Legislation. Because of the expansion of war industries and the necessity for complete mobilization of productive power, the government assumed a preeminent interest in a fair employment program. This supplied the impetus for the social action program more than did the creative initiative of any National Agency.

Thus, it is an extremely difficult task to attempt to determine the real causes underlying the growth and development of organizational philosophy. The record of activity need not necessarily provide an answer. It will be our task then,

not to determine why these organizations followed a course of action, but rather to discover what actions they undertook, what methods and techniques they employed, and, if possible, what degree of effectiveness they achieved.

C H A P T E R I

THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

| | page |
|---|------|
| I. Introduction | 13 |
| II. Church and State | 17 |
| III. Social Legislation | |
| 1. Employment Discrimination and F.E.P.C. . . | 24 |
| 2. Housing | 42 |
| 3. Labor | 45 |
| 4. Price Control | 46 |
| 5. Summary | 46 |
| IV. Civil Rights | |
| 1. Discrimination and Civil Rights - General | 47 |
| 2. Group Libel | 54 |
| 3. Anti-Poll Tax and Anti-Lynching | 58 |
| 4. Loyalty | 60 |
| 5. Press and Radio | 61 |
| 6. Public Accommodations | 63 |
| 7. Summary | 64 |

Introduction

The American Jewish Congress was organized in 1918. Basically it must be considered a Zionist type group. Much of its background material correlates with the development of the Zionist movement in America. Its origins are also flavored with the disgruntled reaction of the east European American Jews to the seemingly autocratic, exclusiveness of the dominant faction of German descent American Jews. Nonetheless, the Congress is much more than a Zionist organization or an escape mechanism for the unwanted. From its Statement of Principles we learn that:

"The American Jewish Congress is an association of American Jews committed to the preservation and extension of the democratic way of life and to the unity and creative survival of the Jewish people throughout the world. It seeks to unite for the attainment of these goals all American Jews similarly committed."⁴

More than twenty years of fruitful experience have preceded the period we are to consider. It would be impossible to include a history of the manifold activities of this epoch. However, a brief outline will help us to envision the principal events which led up to the Congress' interest in Social Action work. This record has been best summarized in the report of the Executive Director to the National Convention:

"Throughout its history, the American Jewish Congress has been a movement concerned with the creative survival of the Jewish people in modern society rather than merely a service organization performing some technical functions for the Jewish community. Thus the American Jewish Congress has always regarded it as one of its major responsibilities to formulate the conditions of Jewish survival in the light of changing circumstances and to indicate the courses

of action which flowed from that formulation. The most significant contribution of the Congress movement to the Jewish people has undoubtedly been the manner in which, at every critical period in the past three decades, it has dynamically articulated the imperatives of Jewish survival.

"Thus, the American Jewish Congress, at its founding during World War I asserted that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth was fundamental to the existence of the Jewish people wherever Jews lived. Congress further declared that the Jewish community of this country could not develop in dignity and creativity unless the monopolistic control of the community by wealth or social influence gave way to the democratic processes of popular participation. In the interval between the wars, Congress projected the concept of the democratic and voluntary partnership of Jewish communities the world over for common counsel and action on common problems and it initiated the movement which led to the formation of the World Jewish Congress. For years, virtually alone among Jewish and non-Jewish groups in this country, the Congress warned of the threat to world peace generally and the Jewish people particularly of an emergent fascism. Later, in a fundamental contribution to democratic thought, Congress formulated the inter-relationship between Jewish status and security and the fight for the full equality of all people in a free society. And it gave that formulation practical application through the dynamic program of law and social action whose influence has already been a pervasive one and which has recorded major achievements."⁵

In reality, the American Jewish Congress has six main goals. These are frequently listed in its publicity brochures. They are as follows:

- "1. To help safeguard American Democracy.
2. To preserve and extend civil rights.
3. To eliminate all forms of discrimination.
4. To aid the establishing and strengthening of the State of Israel.
5. To protect the rights and status of Jews throughout the world.
6. To contribute to the enrichment of Jewish Life in America."⁶

However, it seems not unfair to say, after thorough survey of the facts, that the latter three points concerning the State of Israel, the rights of World Jewry, and the program

for cultural Jewish living have constituted the major portion of the Congress' program. Yet this is not meant, in any way, to minimize the extent of its program in the field of our study. The truth is that the overall program of the American Jewish Congress is extremely broad. It would be a lengthy undertaking just to list the various activities of this ten year period alone. Here are just a few:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Zionism | Civilian Defense |
| Anti-Semitism | World Jewish Rights |
| Immigration | Jewish Culture |
| Refugee Assistance | Leadership training |
| Clothing Relief | Peace Treaties |
| Nazi Atrocities | Inter-American activities |
| German Boycott | Interfaith work |
| Aid to Britain | Jewish Philanthropy and Budgeting |
| Bond Sales | Problems in education |
| Americanization | |

We look upon the American Jewish Congress, then, as a dynamic organization, branching out in numerous directions. Above all, it is forthright and outspoken, completely unwilling to negotiate in the background or beneath the surface. Its technique is direct action through trained personnel and mass organization. It willingly employs all methods, shunning none as undignified or dangerous.

Its efforts in the field of Social Action, in actuality, have only begun. They appear to be a direct outgrowth of the broadening insight of a basic concern for Jewish self-defense, a recognition that Jewish security is inextricably tied up with the security of every other group and with the overall welfare of our country. Much success has already found its way into the record, and we may hopefully look forward to continuing years of Congress accomplishment.

As we enter our study, it is fitting to 'set the stage' by quoting the remarks of the Vice-President of the American Jewish Congress, given at the outset of the period of our study, on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary meeting of the Congress, in 1940:

"The Congress is not an organization in the ordinary sense....But it represents a movement, not a job of work, and as a movement it is of far greater significance....It is intended to bring about not the writing of wrongs, not the end of Jewish misery, but the regeneration of Jewish life itself, through its own effort. It is a movement that seeks to find, through Jewish self-expression and the exercise of self-government, the means through which to give Jewish life a new form. SP

"The American Jewish Congress has sought to overcome the inertia of American Jewish life, the refusal of Jews to deal with their own problems in a manly, democratic way. Men of wealth and secured prestige have never favored democracy....For many years the American Jewish Congress was compelled to go its own way, performing those functions in American Jewish life which no other organization had the daring and the courage to undertake, and it suffered the censure and dislike of those elements whose ideal is timidity and self-effacement as Jews.

"It was the American Jewish Congress that was responsible for all representations made on behalf of Jews abroad, before the Embassies and at the State Department, when no other organization seemed to be willing to assume that responsibility. Not even when Hitler came into power in 1933 was there a desire, among the others, to recognize the fact that the time had come for all American Jews to organize themselves, to protect themselves against the rising anti-Semitism in the United States, as well as...all over Europe.

"It was the American Jewish Congress that resisted all pressure from the Jewish side to soft pedal the protest....It was the American Jewish Congress that was responsible for giving strength and purpose to the boycott of German goods and services. Notwithstanding the events of the last six years, the gentlemen of the other side are still unpersuaded of the old adage that 'united we stand, divided we fall'....

"The American Jewish Congress will be compelled to revert, with all its strength and power, to that task for which a united Jewry is yet to be organized. The American Jewish Congress will pursue its objective of seeking to create an organization of American Jewish Life based upon democratic procedure, seeking to fulfill Jewish life rather than to reduce it to a minimum...."7

Church and State

Matters of Church and State cannot be considered a major area of effort in the work of the American Jewish Congress, even in its domestic field of social action, for both the number of issues and the frequency of action remain small. Nevertheless, it becomes immediately apparent that the Congress had some concern in this direction from the very beginning of this period. In addition, it was unhesitating in the expression of its own viewpoint.

The main issue which the Congress considered was that of religious education in the public schools. However, most of its work revolved around the New York area, at least until the latter half of the decade. Thus the problems reflect those of the local environs, although they may also have had national implications. The Congress was not always equipped for broad coverage.

The question which occupied the foreground of attention was the enactment of programs for Release Time, which permitted religious education on public school time, either on or off the public school property. Such a bill was passed by the legislature in New York early in 1940. Immediately, protest was forthcoming from the American Jewish Congress. However this early protest emerged from the Women's Division, and so must be considered as of only secondary importance in the eyes of the National Body. This conclusion seems justifiable, for the work of the Women's Division is in a sense auxiliary, and although important cannot be equated with

those matters upon which the National Body itself took a stand and assumed responsibility.

The action of the Women's Division was three-fold; to protest the passage of the Bill which permitted absence from the public schools for religious observances and education, to issue a plea for the governor to veto the Bill, and to urge its constituents and the public to write or wire the governor. Their reasoning was clear and in consonance with that which continued to prevail as the official Congress attitude. They said:

"We believe that religious instruction is the province of the church, the synagogue and the home; that academic instruction and character training is the province chiefly of the State or school....The two should not intermeddle....This bill clearly violates the American principle of separation of Church and State."⁸

The National Body of the Congress, however, took no public action or forward stand. This is further borne out by another editorial printed toward the close of the year 1940, which condemned the putting into effect in New York City of the new Release Time program for religious education on public school time. It read in part:

"Over protests of such bodies as the Public Education Association, the Teachers' Union, the Civil Liberties Committee, the New York Board of Ministers, the New York Board of Education voted six to one to grant time for religious instruction to the city's public school system."⁹

The Congress' own name is conspicuously absent.

The following year, 1941, brought forth two somewhat contradictory editorials. The first noted that the release of children an hour a week from the public schools of New York

for religious instruction had begun without any startling results. It intimated that public opposition had been largely eliminated and that the present concern was mainly how best to utilize this time period.¹⁰ The second, however, again cried out for strong opposition to Release Time programs and reiterated the Congress' disdain for this break between the traditional wall of separation between Church and State. It maintained that, "the negligible practical results prove that the law should never have been passed and that the vast majorities did not desire it."¹¹ In fact, later results indicated the contrary, and such programs spread widely throughout the country into more than twenty-two hundred communities. What is more important to note, however, is that by this time the Congress had taken some sort of positive action by suggesting, in its legislative Bulletin, a number of steps to be taken by Congress Councils in various communities where the Release Time proposal was on the legislative calendar, on the theory that "the organization of public opinion may prevent this unnecessary and undesirable measure from becoming part of state and city legislation."

It is not until four years later that the next important item appeared. In April 1945, an extensive article again reiterated the Congress' attitude opposing any breach in the separation of Church and State and recommending neither Release Time nor Dismissal Time programs. It expressed the following opinion:

"The Jewish answer to all this should not be negative....Though taking our place as guardians of

Church and State separation, we must be positive and constructive....We urge not Released Time nor Dismissal Time, but active inter-cultural programs. These, through appropriate activities rather than talks, could foster appreciation of other races and cultural groups."¹²

This now introduced a new element for consideration, namely, the fostering of inter-cultural education. This emphasis is in line with the American Jewish Congress' constant stress upon the importance of Jewish Cultural values in life.

This pattern of thought continued in a series of three articles written by Congress leaders two years later in 1947.¹³ The first outlined clearly, "the dangerous intrusions on the present day scene threatening to break down the wall of separation between Church and State." The second indicated the weakness in secular education "in failing to meet the needs of cultural pluralism, and spiritual and religious values," while the third acknowledged the weakness and pledged the Congress' efforts toward seeking some type of a solution. Meantime, it called for "militant resistance to any attempt to impair so fundamental a principle of American Democracy as the separation of Church and State."

The main Social Action effort, however, centered about the Champaign Case, or more commonly called the McCollum Case which reached the Supreme Court of the United States in 1948. This was the most important national legal testing of the legality of state laws permitting religious education in the public schools. It was a matter of national attention and in fact all leading Social Action agencies were vitally concerned. The Jewish groups united together under the aegis of a joint

effort of the combined Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC).¹⁴ The American Jewish Congress, however, claimed for itself the major part of the credit as having been the agency responsible for drafting the brief.¹⁵ In addition, it made special note of having received a citation of honor from the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee in recognition of this brief filed with the Supreme Court, urging the outlawing of religious instruction on public school time.¹⁶

An editorial appearing about the same time gave a detailed analysis of the McCollum decision in which "the Supreme Court for the first time actually voided a State law because it violated the principle of separation of Church and State."¹⁷ It expressed the hope that this decision indicated that Release Time programs might be outlawed. However, this was over optimism, for the matter obviously was not settled. The McCollum case involved the actual usage of school buildings and facilities, and therefore did not necessarily cover cases involving 'off-school premises' religious instruction programs. The subject then continued in importance through 1949, still requiring more test cases. We note, however, that the only further reference by the Congress to this subject appeared in February, 1949. Here an extensive article once more reiterated the American Jewish Congress' strong position on separation of Church and State and discussed the brief filed by the Congress against the introduction of religious education in Canadian Public Schools.¹⁸ There was also published in the same issue a full page 'Letter To The Editor' entitled "Why I

Oppose Released Time" by Esta Gluck.¹⁹ This letter is significant, for Esta Gluck was one of the parties involved in a 1949 case testing the legality of the New York City Release Time educational program. The American Jewish Committee, however, had emerged by this time into the field of legal Social Action and had taken over the assignment of accumulating information and preparing the brief for this "problem of the first magnitude."²⁰ There are no further references in the American Jewish Congress publication to this matter.

Both in 1947 and 1949 the American Jewish Congress announced its support of federal aid to education. In 1947 the executive director of the Congress appeared at a Senate sub-committee meeting in Washington to "warmly endorse the Taft Bill for federal aid to education," urging enactment of the Bill and praising its provisions which guaranteed that no racial discrimination would be practiced in conferring its benefits.²¹ In 1949, the Congress submitted a statement to the House Committee on Education and Labor announcing its support of a similar Bill, but urging that funds be denied to segregated and parochial schools.²² In line with this opposition to aiding parochial schools, an editorial appeared the same year attacking the Catholic Church's change of policy toward seeking any federal aid to education for its schools, even for transportation, books and lunches, as violations of the principle of separation of Church and State.²³

One other matter remains to be noted. In the midst of the war, in 1943, New York State passed a measure which

provided for Saturday school sessions so that children working during the war emergency might make up the legal attendance requirements.²⁴ The Bill was considered basically discriminatory, despite the exemption against the infringement upon the religious observance of any group. The Vice-President of the American Jewish Congress, among others, protested and the governor of New York returned the Bill for further consideration.

We see then that the work of the American Jewish Congress in the field of Church and State confined itself primarily to the problem of the intrusion of religious education into any sphere of the public school activities, based upon the time honored principle of maintaining a wall of separation between Church and State affairs. This is, of course, one of the fundamental requirements for the protection of minority religious groups, and therefore such emphasis would be expected to reflect itself in the publications of any major Jewish Defense agency. Nonetheless, there was actually relatively little direct action on the part of the Congress, with the exception of its participation in the McCollum Case in 1948. Its attitude and policy, however, were clearly expressed in many editorials and articles analyzing the various aspects of the problem. In addition, the Congress publicly supported Federal Aid to education, so long as the benefits would be legally denied to discriminatory or parochial schools. *style*

Social Legislation

Employment Discrimination and F. E. P. C.

The area of greatest intensity of effort on the domestic scene, on the part of the American Jewish Congress, lay in its activities relevant to the field of employment discrimination. While it is true that these efforts cannot completely be titled 'matters of Social Legislation,' still they are so intimately tied up with the advocacy of Fair Employment Practices and other types of remedial legislation as to warrant thorough consideration in this chapter. This work has been engaged in by the Congress since 1930. It began out of concern for the large Jewish population in New York in the midst of a depression. Thus at the outset of our period of study, this branch of the Congress' activity already has had ten years of fruitful experience. The chairman of the Commission on Economic Problems in reviewing these years indicated the prime motive as being, to devote specific attention to the problem of discrimination against Jews in employment.

The direction of activities has been three-fold:

- "1. The process of educating employers to the recognition of the wisdom and value of a fair-minded American employment policy.
2. The awakening of the American Jewish Community to the existence of the problem.
3. The securing of legislation, which if well framed is an admirable educative force, and can be of great help in diminishing discrimination."²⁵

He summarized these fundamental purposes elsewhere as follows:

"One of the major tasks of the Commissions on Economic Problems has been the establishment of better relations between Christian employers and Jewish applicants for employment."²⁶

"A secondary function is the fighting against complacency concerning discrimination, in our own Jewish communities.

"The Commission further offers its services to advise and assist any community to install the mechanism for fighting job discrimination."²⁷

(non-legislative)

Let us then turn first to those activities which were of a non-legislative character and secondly to those connected with specific legislative proposals and enactments. One of the early activities of the Congress was in attempting to remove the question of 'religion' from the employment application blanks, in order to substitute merit for prejudice. An article appeared early in 1940 discussing such efforts, for example, in the hotel field. It explained the technique of successful campaign. Preliminary interviews with executives were fruitless, but then the Congress followed with an educational campaign and successively forwarded three reports on Jewish non-employment. These had a profound effect and led to the final elimination of the 'religion' question from the employment blanks of this hotel chain.²⁸ In line with this work, the Commission also conducted a study of employment opportunities and the extent of discrimination against Jewish applicants.²⁹

There were several other instances of such activity between 1940 and 1942. Concerted efforts of the Congress were largely responsible also for removing the question of 'religion' from the employment applications of three State Employment Services, namely Colorado and Kansas in 1940³⁰ and Missouri in 1941.³¹ In a similar vein, the Congress Commission on

Economic Problems claimed much of the credit for ridding the newspapers of 'foul anti-Jewish discriminatory advertisements,' for reversing the discriminatory practices of the New York State Employment Service, and for the issuance by the President of the United States of Executive Order #8802 which forbid racial or religious discrimination in war industry.³² This type of activity, however, is not reported on further in the succeeding years.

One of the prime techniques of the Congress was to conduct studies and investigations and surveys. There are many examples of these activities. At the end of 1940, it was reported that, the Congress' Commission on Economic Problems was pursuing further its investigation of alleged anti-Jewish discrimination by the National Manufacturers Association.³³ After it was substantiated that advertisements had been placed specifying non-Jews, conferences were arranged with the two heads of the Association. A similar though unsuccessful effort was publicized in 1941 concerning a laundry company which not only refused to eliminate questions of religion from employees' application blanks but also refused to discuss the entire problem of discrimination with the Commission.³⁴

In 1945 an exhaustive survey was completed covering fifteen years of operations, and presenting material covering one thousand cases of discrimination in more than eight hundred firms engaged in all forms of trade, commerce and industry in New York State.³⁵ Another made in 1946 revealed that "two out of every three white collar employment agencies in Manhattan still discriminate"³⁶ despite the report by the State Commission

Against Discrimination (SCAD) that discrimination in employment had been discouraged by the mere existence of the State agency. Another survey reported at the close of 1946 revealed overwhelming discrimination against Jews and Negroes in clerical, administrative and executive employment by Insurance companies. Only in selling were they widely hired. These facts were gleaned from an exhaustive survey of almost two hundred individual Insurance companies, employing close to twenty-six hundred persons. It concluded that even those who favor a State law against discrimination, practice it in employment.³⁷

This important phase of the Congress' activity did not cease, for its premise was the sound policy that required all the facts first. So again in 1949, we read of another survey which discovered that "one out of every five New Yorkers has personally experienced discrimination in employment."³⁸ A later analysis of this investigation revealed that its purpose was to discover the reaction of minority groups to discrimination, their techniques of escaping it, and their familiarity with existing anti-bias laws. Results showed that only 8% had any understanding of the New York law against discrimination in employment, and that nearly one-half of all groups surveyed, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Negro, approved of 'passing' and 'name-changing' in order to avoid discrimination.³⁹

As one might expect, less emphasis was concentrated upon this problem in the professional fields. One extensive article, however, was written in 1946 which carefully analyzed the ills and hardships of discrimination practiced among the professional groups.⁴⁰ However, the serious action work,

for the benefit of professionals, lay in the ceaseless attacks upon quotas and discriminations in the professional schools.

We referred above, in passing, to the credit claimed by the Congress for ridding newspapers of 'foul anti-Jewish discriminatory advertisements.' This effort deserves a more thorough discussion. It amounted to a full-scale project. The work extended over an eight year period and was concentrated principally in New York City. It included surveys and statistical studies, interviews, conferences, attempted round-table discussions and various other indirect pressures. A full account is given in an important article of 1944.⁴¹ What is particularly interesting to note is that the campaign was rather ineffective until 1942 and 1943. At this time, however, certain State laws, began to play a role in the 'coercion' and also the newspaper "P.M.," which printed no advertising matter itself, took up the battle-cry and waged a public attack on these newspaper policies. Who merits the reward for victory then, may be seriously open to question, but the singular role of the American Jewish Congress in pioneering the campaign is in itself highly commendatory.

Although these efforts were greatest in the New York area where the Congress was a strong and highly organized unit, to some extent they also reached into other metropolitan centers. In 1941, the Chicago Bureau on Jewish Employment was already being maintained jointly by the American Jewish Congress, the B'nai Brith and the American Jewish Committee. It had issued a report covering three years of activity which demonstrated widespread employment discrimination practices against Jews in its area.⁴²

By the end of 1943 the New England Division of the Congress was preparing to enlarge its activities in this field. At its annual convention, it heard an address by the National Chairman of the Commission on Economic Problems on the subject of "Discrimination in Employment," and then went on to adopt a resolution providing for enlargement of the local fight against this type of discrimination.⁴³ Congress studies of job discrimination in Boston had revealed a desultory handling of the problem.⁴⁴ This neglect was excused by the acute, continuous interest in overseas Jewish affairs. However, with this prodding from the National Headquarters, it was felt that the New England Jewish Community would recognize the importance of home-front work and expand its activities.

At this same time, the Philadelphia Branch was busy doing its share in handling the local problem. It had proved quite effective through educational and practical works in clearing up flagrant cases of employment discrimination. It was handling all the Jewish complaints in non-war industries through investigations and direct consultation and was also giving support to the Government and the Fair Employment Practices Commission agency through the means of the 'Metropolitan Council' which it had been instrumental in setting up.⁴⁵

As a result of a Congress survey of employment conditions in northern New Jersey, another branch was established to cope with existent problems in the Jersey City area.⁴⁶

We have seen then that the American Jewish Congress was vitally concerned with the problem of employment discrimination, but primarily, if not exclusively, as a Jewish problem. Its

major arena of combat was the New York area. Its efforts were without limit. It ^{lashed} leashed out against every type of employer. It fought against every kind of employment agency, whether private or government operated. It attacked the newspapers for their part in promoting discriminatory advertisements and it attacked the members of its own Jewish group for their lethargy and apathy to the basic issues involved. In addition, we have seen that these activities spread out through the large metropolitan centers, to Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia and Jersey City. These latter, however, grew out of the war situation i.e., the mass mobilization of labor for war industry plus the Presidential orders for compulsory compliance with Fair Employment Practices, which really provided the structural groundwork for potential success in these activities.

(legislative - state and local)

Let us turn now to those activities of the Congress in the field of employment discrimination which are more directly legislative in character. In order to get a clearer picture, we shall try to separate, those matters which are on a state and municipal level from those on the national scale.

It almost seems as if the American Jewish Congress was summoned into this field of activity by reason of the State of New York's having a Jewish governor, who himself expressed public concern over matters of employment discrimination. The first item of interest appears in an editorial of 1941 supporting the governor's appeal to the legislature that it eliminate the "vicious practice of discrimination in all business."⁴⁷ This editorial also reveals that several years

of fact-finding, by the American Jewish Congress, have furnished vast material on this discrimination which is being supported by the advertising policies of the press. It is clear, however, that this refers primarily, if not exclusively to anti-Jewish discrimination. Two months later, more detailed items appeared reporting the Congress' endorsement of two state bills which supported the governor's plea to outlaw employment discrimination.⁴⁸ Congress members were urged "to write and telegraph" legislators in order to get these bills out of committee. Even the names and addresses of the legislators were printed.⁴⁹ In addition, the Congress arranged for an address to its Youth Division by the author of one of these bills on the topic of "Racial and Religious Discrimination in Industry."⁵⁰

From this point on, the legislative approach was destined to grow into a major phase of Congress activity. The earlier emphasis on the importance of voting and pressuring for supported legislation had been the enthusiastic concern mainly of the Women's Division, but in June of 1941, announcement was made of the formation of the American Jewish Congress National Committee on Law and Legislation (CLL), "having in mind the importance of legislation as a defense of democracy," with its aim, "to educate the Jews of this country...to register their views favoring or opposing legislation."⁵¹

However, no success was reported from these early efforts, and a year later we again meet with a duplication of the same situation. In March, 1942, the Committee on Law and Legislation (CLL) reiterated its whole-hearted support of the new, more extensive bills awaiting action by the New York Legislature,

designed to eliminate discrimination in employment because of race, creed, religion, color, or national origin. The method of action was to urge that these Bills be gotten "out of Committee" to be voted upon.⁵² An editorial to the same effect appeared the following week.⁵³ It is clear then, that at this point the method to be employed, at least by the general membership, was that of writing letters and otherwise bringing pressure upon legislative representatives.

The broader extension of these activities, however, soon began. In May, 1942, a War Emergency Session of the American Jewish Congress was held in Chicago and in the course of the three day meeting adopted the following legislative platform:

"1. To advocate the adoption by all States of the United States and by the Federal Government of laws eliminating discrimination in employment against any person by reason of his race, creed, color or national origin and the enactment of laws setting up a Federal Commission and State Commissions with powers of subpoena to investigate all complaints of discrimination.

"2. Favoring all laws which provide that a person who is duly qualified may practice his profession without regard to whether he is or is not a citizen of the United States, if he has declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States.

"3. Opposing to any rule or regulation of any State which would prevent any qualified physician from being admitted to practice in that State by classifying a foreign medical college from which he is a graduate, as unqualified, although that person received his education in such foreign college during a time when it was deemed by the particular state to be qualified."⁵⁴

In order to implement the program, the Convention urged that the Congress Councils set up in each State, local Committees on Law and Legislation to cooperate with the national body. The Convention also approved a resolution urging legislation to bar discrimination in any professional school or institution.

The first record of any success appeared in September of 1942 with the announcement that the Mayor had signed a New York City Bill barring employment discrimination in public works or any contracts doing work for the city government, a measure which the American Jewish Congress had been supporting.⁵⁵

The activities of the following year, 1943, on the State level, primarily extended the legislative endorsement policy and contributed to the public enlightenment. One lengthy article reviewed the whole history of the educative and legislative struggle to eliminate discrimination in employment primarily in New York, and outlined a plan for future legislative action, calling for widespread support and activity.⁵⁶ In addition, the Congress announced its endorsement of anti-discrimination legislation in five other states.⁵⁷

Thus far there has been a minimum of direct legislative action by the Congress, other than public pronouncements and endorsements and urging its members to write and wire legislators. Nevertheless, the pages of its weekly publication have been a forum for reporting and analyzing all the liberal and positive movements in the fight against employment discrimination. By 1944, however, the Congress was prepared to take more direct steps and we carefully note that "a bill to create a State Fair Employment Practices Board has been introduced into both Houses of the New York State Legislature under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Congress."⁵⁸ This bill recognized for the first time the right to work as "a fundamental civil right," regardless of race, creed or color. It set up a five man administrative board and defined and

listed unfair discriminatory practices punishable by law. Another important feature of this Bill, was the inclusion of an educational program, which recognized that "legislation alone cannot cure or prevent community intolerance. People must be trained to understand."⁵⁹ This bill was actually prepared by the American Jewish Congress itself, after a careful study.

The following year, 1945, the Congress waged an all-out campaign in support of this measure. It first submitted to the New York State Committee Against Discrimination (SCAD) a comprehensive memoranda covering its own fifteen years of statistical findings in the field of employment discrimination practices, together with an analysis of all the legal phases.⁶⁰ Further, it extended its activities to speaking in all parts of the State and circulating printed materials. It sought representation at the public hearings and manifold correspondence from citizens to their representatives. As a climax, official representatives of the Congress Executive spoke in Albany at a public hearing of the bill.⁶¹ The Congress, therefore claimed a major share of the credit for its successful passage, and held a Mass Meeting in March, 1945, to mark its enactment into law, and to "focus attention on similar measures pending in other States."⁶²

In December of 1945, the creation of the Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA) was announced, as a result of the merger of the old Commission on Law and Legislation and the Commission on Economic Problems. This proved to be the high-point in the development of the Congress technique of legal

action for social benefit. This new commission through the brilliance and ceaseless work of its constituents played the leading role in the whole field of legal social-action for the next few years. In addition it appeared likely to have provided the incentive and the challenge, which at long last forced the hand of the American Jewish Committee into similar work some two or three years later.

At any rate, by the close of 1946, the American Jewish Congress Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA) had already achieved a notable victory in its work. The Congress had requested that the New York State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) correct a major deficiency, which previously had permitted only the agrieved person to file complaints of discrimination. A new ruling was issued which entitled organizations, such as the American Jewish Congress, to legally act as agrieved persons, in cases where employment questionnaires or advertisements utilized discriminatory methods. In the words of the Congress, "This new ruling constitutes an important step toward giving organized public bodies a wider opportunity to take aggressive action in the fight against discrimination."⁶³

In further pursuance of its own right to act, the following year in 1947, the Congress again criticized the effectiveness of the State anti-discrimination Bill. The bill provided that action could be taken only upon direct complaint of a victim, and the Congress called for an amendment to allow action against discriminating agencies and enterprises upon the basis of its own researches. It maintained that without such power,

the State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) remained a paper agency, because of the many reasons for individual's reluctance to enter complaints.⁶⁴ Along this same line, a special investigator for the Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA) reported on two years of surveying commercial employment agencies which revealed the ineffectiveness of the law and its widespread disregard. It also disclosed the extensiveness of unemployment discrimination throughout New York, that there was "far more lip-service compliance than actual compliance with the law." Eighty-eight per cent of the agencies were still willing to accept discriminatory job orders.⁶⁵

Also in 1947, the Congress initiated an action against Columbia University which resulted in the denial of the University's employment agency's claim for exemption from the provisions of the State anti-discrimination law. This successfully established the precedent that, "all employment offices run by educational and charitable institutions must obey the anti-discrimination law."⁶⁶

Once more we have seen that the overwhelming portion of the Congress' activity focused itself upon the New York area, but there were a few instances where its legislative activities in the field of economic discrimination also extended into other metropolitan centers. In February, 1943, five proposed bills aimed at various forms of discrimination were filed in Massachusetts with the General Court, in the name of the New England Division of the Congress.⁶⁷ In addition, a widespread campaign was undertaken to enlist cooperation of all community

organizations in pressing for passage of these bills. This campaign had to continue its efforts for some time, for it was not until three years later in 1946 that the Massachusetts legislature passed a Fair Employment Practices Commission Bill. This measure was modelled on the New York Bill, originally prepared by the American Jewish Congress, and moreover it contained several improvements supplying 'teeth' and enforcement powers to its provisions. In addition, the four man draft Committee, appointed by the governor, included a representative of the New England Division of the Congress.⁶⁸

There is, likewise, some mention of activity in Pennsylvania. In November, 1945, the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Jewish Congress drafted the local Fair Employment Practices Commission Ordinance introduced to City Council.⁶⁹ However, as late as the close of 1949, attempts on the State level were failures. In discussing the failure, the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Region blamed the process of "top-level negotiations," rather than following the American Jewish Congress policy of mass activity and widespread public arousing, "which proved so successful in the New York and New Jersey campaigns."⁷⁰ Earlier the same year, it is interesting to observe that the Congress successfully argued a case before the Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Board on behalf of a woman who refused a job involving her services on the Sabbath and who was then denied unemployment compensation. On the appeal, the Board decided that, "the evidence is clear, to have accepted the proffered employment would have seriously offended the claimant's morals and would have offended her ethical

conscience, which springs from her life's training in the Orthodox Jewish faith."⁷¹

(legislative - national)

As to the American Jewish Congress' activities on the scene of National Legislation for the amelioration of employment discrimination, we may observe as an outline of objectives the statement of the Congress' Vice-President issued at a meeting in July, 1942, arranged by the Congress to discuss the Role of Legislation in the Protection of Democracy. He urged specifically:

"1. Legislation to implement and enforce constitutional provisions, to outlaw discrimination because of race, color or creed.

"2. The enactment of legislation in the various municipalities prohibiting the publication of discriminatory employment advertising by any employment agency, unless such advertising carries the name of the employer.

"3. The establishment of a Federal Agency, with local branches in every State, which would receive and investigate complaints of discrimination in industry and make public its findings.

"4. The enactment of a law which would make it unlawful for any government agency to advertise in newspapers that accept discriminatory advertisements."⁷²

Almost every other significant action refers to some phase of the proposals for continuous Federal Fair Employment Practices legislation. The real impetus for these activities was supplied by the growth of war industry and the attendant presidential concern with eliminating discrimination from war plants, in order to insure maximum production and minimum strife. As early as February, 1942, the Congress presented an oral memorandum at hearings of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. The memorandum attested to anti-Jewish discrimination in hiring for defense plants.⁷³ The Congress

representative spoke on behalf of all organized Jewish bodies rather than as a direct representative of the Congress itself. However, it was the Congress that gathered together all the material underlying the report and its recommendations.

The following year brought forth several severe criticisms, whenever the President's F. E. P. C. was neglectful of its functions. In January, 1943, a leading article decried "the recent order of the chairman of the War Manpower Commission, calling off the projected hearing on discrimination in the railroad industry, by the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices."⁷⁴ Again in November, through its editorial column, the Congress expressed strong protest against the Comptroller General's attempts to weaken the effectiveness of the F. E. P. C. regulations prohibiting discrimination in government agencies' contracts, and called upon the President to reassert that, "there is no 'optional' feature in these measures."⁷⁵ Another editorial, the following month, continued this discussion and announced the successful correction of this impropriety.

In 1944, the Chairman of the Commission on Economic Problems called the F. E. P. C., "The Symbol of Liberation"⁷⁶ and urged full support for its continuance throughout the war and its extension into peace-time legislation. In June another of many continuing editorials called for the extension of Federal F. E. P. C. "as one of the safeguards against new fascist penetrations into this country after the war."⁷⁷ In addition, the President of the Congress testified in favor of a permanent F. E. P. C., before the House Labor Committee.⁷⁸

In September, the Chairman of the Commission on Economic Discrimination appeared before the Senate Sub-Committee, as did Catholic and Negro representatives, in support of a permanent F. E. P. C.,⁷⁹ and the following month he made another appearance in Washington at a Mass Meeting.⁸⁰

Through 1945 the fruitless campaign went on. The first meeting of the newly organized Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA) discussed F. E. P. C. as one of the chief topics of study for an extended legislative program.⁸¹ In June the Congress was one of thirty organizations sponsoring a gigantic "Save the F.E.P.C." rally at Town Hall in New York.⁸² The Women's Division also joined in extensive activity to promote the advancement of the F. E. P. C. idea.⁸³ More major articles⁸⁴ and continuous editorials called for the adoption by the United States Congress of a permanent F. E. P. C. But, as we well know, the measure did not pass and furthermore the United States Employment Service was returned to state jurisdiction. As a result of this latter action, the President of the American Jewish Congress wrote a letter of protest to the President of the United States in which he labelled the removal of federal control as, "the elimination of any hope of tackling discriminatory employment practices."⁸⁵ The American Jewish Congress realized that it was the filibuster techniques "of a reactionary minority helped by an appeasing majority" which had defeated F. E. P. C., as well as anti-lynching and anti-poll tax bills in the Senate.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, it concluded, "The fight must go on. The temporary defeat

of the Federal anti-discrimination Bill calls for increased efforts to have such Bills introduced and passed in every State legislature."

The last mention of concern for federal legislation was in a resolution adopted by the Administrative Committee in 1947 which supported the Ives-Norton Bill in Congress. This bill was to prohibit by law the practice of discrimination by employers, and would have established administrative machinery for enforcement.⁸⁷

We see, therefore, that the American Jewish Congress was vitally concerned with every aspect of the problem of employment discrimination. It was aware of the extensiveness of this form of discrimination from statistical information, painstakingly accumulated through its own surveys and investigations. As a result it pursued the elimination of these ills both publicly on every level of government as well as privately through indirect pressure and direct intervention. The social movement toward F. E. P. C. was a result mainly of the vast economic demands of the war industry expansion. Permanent gains were secured on some state levels. Gains on the national scene were only temporary, and dissolved into nothingness in the post-war era. The American Jewish Congress worked largely on its own, because its main impetus was the concern for discrimination as a Jewish problem. This fact does not deny the Congress' growth into a realization of the broader aspects of the problem nor, its willingness to join in common bond with other organizations seeking the same ends. But, nevertheless, the Congress, whose deep interest in

employment discrimination began back in the earliest years of the depression, was definitely motivated by the needs of its own Jewish group for adequate defense. The Congress viewed this phase of its social action program as the prime area of endeavor on the domestic front. Its degree of success was notable throughout the decade.

Housing

The only other area in the field of Social Legislation with which the American Jewish Congress showed any vital concern was in the question of Housing. This interest, however, emerged only after the creation of the Committee on Law and Social Action (CLSA) in 1945, and its activities were primarily legislative and legal in character. This does not decrease the importance of the Congress' activity in this field, once its scope and vision broadened enough to encompass this vital issue. Indeed its work was concrete, practical and extremely significant. In February, 1946, the Committee on Law and Social Action (CLSA) prepared a bill to outlaw discrimination in housing, "as a menace to the institution and foundations of a free democratic state."⁸⁸ This bill was introduced into the New York State legislature. The following month, in a joint message together with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Congress urged the governor of New York to endorse publically this bill.⁸⁹ A year later, in 1947, an extensive article was published which presented a detailed analysis of the problem of 'racial ghettos' caused by discrimination in housing, the main tool being

restrictive covenants.⁹⁰ Further opposition by the Congress was evidenced by its legal actions in filing briefs of amicus curiae in cases involving restrictive covenants in Chicago, New York and Detroit. The Chicago case was lost. The judge ruled that, "I have enjoyed your fine argument (i.e., of the American Jewish Congress) and I agree with it, but I have to follow the law....The law is that while public places cannot discriminate, private persons can." The Congress, pledged itself to continue to correct this critical social evil.

Largely as a result of this action, the Chicago Defender, the oldest Negro weekly publication in the country, selected the American Jewish Congress for a place on its famous Honor Roll of Democracy as being, "among the most outstanding contributors to Democracy in the United States in 1947."⁹¹

Beginning in 1947, the Congress also showed public concern with the discriminatory practices of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's housing project, known as Stuyvesant Town. The project was of a 'semi-public' character, with certain regulatory provisions lying within the City's jurisdiction. In May of that year, the President of the American Jewish Congress wrote a letter to the acting Mayor of New York City urging that, "no modifications of the rentals in Stuyvesant Town should be permitted by New York City, unless a provision forbidding racial discrimination is included in the contract."⁹² Efforts to effect any policy change were unavailing, however, and two years later, the Congress joined with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to bring suit to

restrain the city in granting tax exemption to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and the Project, unless they ceased their discrimination against Negroes.⁹³ An unfavorable verdict was returned and so in October, 1949, these three organizations pursued further and asked the United States Supreme Court to review the case.⁹⁴

In 1949 several other matters warrant consideration. In March, a Fair Housing Practices Bill aimed at eliminating 'racial ghettos' was introduced in the New York State Assembly. This bill, prepared with the cooperation of the Congress, declared it unlawful, "to refuse to rent apartments or sell a residential property to any person on the grounds of race, religion or ancestry."⁹⁵ The same month, the President of the American Jewish Congress was among the signatories to an open letter to the governor of New York urging him to create a commission to investigate discriminatory practices in housing.⁹⁶ Then in November, a Congress representative participated in an all-day conference to acquaint community leaders and the public with the promise and the danger inherent in the Federal Housing Act of 1949.⁹⁷ And finally in December, 1949, the Congress' Vice-President issued a statement praising the action of the New York City Council, in approving a proposed law requiring anti-discrimination clauses in all documents executed by the city in connection with housing construction. This ordinance, too, had been drafted by the Congress.⁹⁸

We see, then, a secondary concentration of effort by the Congress in the field of social legislation for housing. This work centered mostly in the New York area, although again there

was some extension of activity involving other metropolitan cities. Almost all of the interest focused around the question of restrictive covenants. Although this question may appear to be one affecting primarily the Negro group, we understand fully that its implications reach deeply into the Jewish group as well, and that any accomplishments will accrue also to their benefit. This is particularly true in the New York area where the Jewish population is proportionately so high.

Labor

The only reference to concern with Labor, is to be found in a resolution of the Administrative Committee of the Congress at its meeting in 1947 which urged the defeat of the Taft-Hartley labor program because it "gravely jeopardizes the very existence of a free labor movement."⁹⁹ On one other occasion, in November, 1949, in a 'Message of Greeting' to the CIO Convention in Cleveland, the American Jewish Congress expressed, "deep and abiding gratitude for the major contributions the CIO has made in the fight against discrimination, for the extension of American Democracy, for the preservation of Civil Rights and on behalf of the State of Israel."¹⁰⁰ This gives us no grounds for any conclusions as to a labor policy of the American Jewish Congress or as to any interest on its part towards social legislation for the advancement or protection of any element (men, women, or children) of the laboring class, or the Union movement itself.

Price Control

There remains only one more rather unique item of which to take note, regarding Social Legislation. This concerns the matter of Food and Price Controls. In October of 1945, the Women's Division urged "continued rationing and price control, in order that more food and fuel may be sent to Europe to relieve destitution and suffering."101

Summary

In summing up, then, it is quite obvious that the American Jewish Congress' concern with Social Legislation directed itself towards two major problems. The primary one was employment discrimination in which its efforts were indefatigable and ceaseless. The secondary one was restrictive covenants in housing, where its work was much smaller in scale, but crucial and directly to the point. Other aspects of the housing problem and most other matters of social legislation were neglected. These two areas, which incidentally display themselves as prime problems of the Jewish group itself, formed the arena for Congress' social action during this period.

Civil Rights

Discrimination and Civil Rights - General

It is not a simple matter to systematize the work of the Congress in the field of civil rights. It must be remembered again that the early period of the forties saw the entire World Jewish Community primarily concerned with questions of anti-Semitism. Therefore, Jewish self-defense is to be found at the root of almost all organizational activities. It was inevitable, with the later growth of vision and the enlargement of minority problem understanding, that concern for Jewish problems should lead to an equally vital concern for problems of other minority groups and unprotected individuals. This, however, could only come about after the severity of anti-Jewish pressure had been eased. It is therefore logical to expect that the bulk of the social action program, divorced insofar as possible from purely self-interest Jewish defense work, will not appear until the latter years of the period under consideration. This, in fact, proves to be so. For although the protection of Jewish rights per se was a fundamental doctrine of the American Jewish Congress from the moment of its inception, the breaking forth into the general field of activity does not gain real momentum until after 1945. This change was marked by the creation of the Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA), whose constituency included prominent representatives of all factions and classes of American life. Its ideology was that, "at no time were anti-Semitism and bias against Jews regarded as phenomena totally disconnected from

the discrimination and persecution which other minorities suffer."¹⁰²

That this broader outlook had not yet come to the foreground as late as 1941 is equally clear, however. In this year the Youth Division was formed and its application blank unmistakably indicated the narrow confines of basic interest in Jewish self-defense.¹⁰³ It is true that by the end of 1943 articles began to appear concerning the Negro problem, protesting violently against 'Jim Crowism' in the army and against racial discrimination in general, in peace or in war.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, prior to this date, the only items of civil rights interest are of a more limited scope. As early as 1940, a delegation from the Congress called upon the assistant Secretary of War to secure a change in policy that would permit graduates of foreign medical schools to be considered for appointments to the Medical Reserve Corps.¹⁰⁵ In this they were successful, but basically it concerned only refugee doctors, most all of whom were Jewish. Also as early as 1941, the Law Commission had already issued four copies of its Legislative Bulletin, for the purpose of bringing pressure upon action supported by the American Jewish Congress.¹⁰⁶ But most of these measures centered about the issues of fascists and bigots who are anti-Semitic menaces. In 1943 the Congress did go on record opposing such federal bills as one providing for the abolition of foreign language schools, and another to fingerprint every United States citizen and force him to carry an identification card, and a third to provide the right of incarceration or deportation of aliens in time

of national emergency, but even these had obvious Jewish implications.¹⁰⁷ In general, then, we shall expect to find a minimum of social action work on matters of civil rights, exclusive of purely Jewish rights from 1940 to 1943, the beginnings of an organized program from 1943 to 1945, and the emergence of full scale activities from 1946 onward. This full scale program led to the Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA) of the American Jewish Congress being called in 1949:

"the chief proponent of the direct action method in the field of Jewish affairs....the first Civil Rights organization to clearly formulate and extensively publicized the positive approach which offers to all Civil Liberties organizations the most effective program yet suggested for meeting the complex Civil Rights problems of the future."¹⁰⁸

It will be helpful to group a whole number of problems together under the heading of General Discrimination and Civil Rights. In a sense they are all related in that they grow out of race hatred and personal prejudice. In addition they reflect the pattern of development, for it seems that only as a result of its years of coping with direct Jewish persecution and discrimination that the Congress finally reached the point of encompassing all these divergent perplexities within the framework of its own activity.

Let us note several examples. In 1949 the Congress filed a brief challenging the constitutionality of an Hawaiian statute which curbed the teaching of foreign languages to children, urging, "that the law curtails religious liberty and leads toward 'cultural genocide.'"¹⁰⁹ The same year it filed another brief questioning the legality of the

Nationality Act of 1940, which provided automatic loss of citizenship for naturalized citizens residing abroad for more than five years, charging, "an unconstitutional discrimination between naturalized and native-born Americans."¹¹⁰ In 1948 the Congress filed briefs in two other cases. One challenged the constitutionality of a California law denying fishing licenses to aliens ineligible for citizenship,¹¹¹ while the other denied the legality of the California Alien Land law, which forbid aliens who were ineligible for American citizenship the right to own, occupy, or transfer agricultural property.¹¹²

Diverse matters such as these would not have commanded the time and effort of the Congress a decade earlier. It was then laboring under the pressure of domestic anti-Semitism and would have been unable to reach out beyond this point. It took time for its vision to broaden. In 1944 the Vice-President of the Congress was appointed by the Mayor of New York to a four-man Committee on Unity, "to promote understanding and mutual respect among all the racial groups."¹¹³ The year before, its representatives had already testified in Washington on a proposed measure to bar false and malicious race hatred literature from the mails.¹¹⁴ But not until 1945, do we find a broader and deeper comprehension of the whole field beginning to reflect itself. Then for the first time, an extensive article appeared analyzing the entire problem of prejudice on the American scene. Here the relief of every minority group was at last recognized as the job of all Americans, "for only when every American is free and equal can you be sure of your

own freedom and equality."¹¹⁵ It was this year also that the Congress was responsible for New York Coney Island's youngsters, Italian, Catholic, Jew, and Negro, giving up their racial bitterness and creating "Youth Town", an interfaith-inter-racial organization to foster friendship and understanding.¹¹⁶

It was also in 1945 that Alexander Pekelis, a truly great liberal, was appointed Director of the Commission on Law and Legislation (CLL) and later of the Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA) into which the former merged. He sounded the call to action, when in advocating Group Sanctions against Racism he declared:

"The answer to hatred and oppression is not mere debate or legislation alone, or half-hearted pressure. Once again the history of labor affords a lesson: debate plus pressure, legislation plus picketing, individual protection plus group action offer the only chance of success....a community has the moral duty to see to it that, like any other crime, racial aggression does not pay."¹¹⁷

In the following years the Congress continued to expand its work in combatting prejudice. In 1946 it initiated a series of radio broadcasts in New York, dramatizing its work in adjusting minority group problems.¹¹⁸ In 1948 it announced the completion of a survey of more than five hundred of the country's leading social scientists regarding the effects of segregation on all segments of American society. The conclusions indicated that the deleterious effects of discrimination and segregation extend not only to the segregated group but also to those groups that enact and enforce the segregation and to the country as a whole. It was declared that:

"the completion of this study...provides all groups in America which are fighting against segregation with a new weapon....giving scientific substance to the

doctrines that segregation scars the minds of those segregated and of those who segregate; it causes an economic, scientific and cultural loss to the entire community, and endangers the national interest and international power of the United States."¹¹⁹

Several other studies were made. An interesting one devoted to the question, what to do when you hear someone making a bigoted anti-minority remark in public, revealed that it is better to speak up calmly with an answer which stresses the American tradition of fair play, for this has a beneficial effect on others who hear the remark.¹²⁰

The Congress also busied itself with the project of Community Self-Surveys, a technique for community participation in discovering the degree of its own prejudice and discriminative activities. This technique is based on the idea that, "people who are told what is wrong with them have a different attitude from people who discover the facts for themselves."¹²¹ Although the Congress did not originate this method, it helped to prepare the manual and most enthusiastically assisted small communities to put it into effect.

In viewing the development of the Congress' change to the broader outlook, we must take note of two feature articles written in 1947. These clearly expressed the Congress' viewpoint that the fight against racism is the task of ending the curtailment of democratic rights and that the security of all groups is inseparably tied up with the strength of the democratic system. The solution lies in completing the unfinished business of American democracy, not by appealing for tolerance or extolling brotherly love. The techniques are specific

objectives, full knowledge of the facts, and mass organization. Together with these must be used:

"all the weapons the people themselves have fashioned in their struggle for liberty--the ballot box, legislation, judicial precedent, administrative regulation and enforcement, the powers of the state and municipal governments and mass pressure on public officials..."¹²²

It is no surprise then to find that the Congress showed only lukewarm sympathies to the leaders of the Brotherhood Week movement. Its sentiments were best expressed in a letter sent to the General Chairman of 1948 Brotherhood Week, a member of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ). It expressed the feeling that Brotherhood Week could be more effective if it were dedicated each year to the conquest of a specific obstacle to brotherhood, such as the passage of Fair Employment Practices or Fair Educational Practices legislation, rather than to the dissemination of vague exhortations to tolerance. The American Jewish Congress maintains that, "the most, if not the only, effective education for brotherhood comes from the common participation in an active campaign for some specific objective."¹²³ The letter also criticized the statement that the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) is not empowered to take action in controversial situations.

Once the expansion of interest had been effected in its policy, the Congress acted in defense of a wide variety of causes. In addition to the several diverse briefs mentioned above (see pages 49-50), we must also list the following:

1946 - Sponsored a mass meeting to protest killing of negroes.¹²⁴

1947 - Sponsored on three separate occasions conferences and forums on Defense of Religious and Civil Liberties.

Urged the indictment of Senator Bilbo for election irregularities at hearing of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.¹²⁵

1948 - Sponsored petition for investigation of prejudice in Massachusetts schools.¹²⁶

Published with N. A. A. C. P. first complete listing of all anti-discrimination laws in effect in the United States.¹²⁷

1949 - Announced plans jointly with N. A. A. C. P. to publish periodic surveys on State of Civil Rights and Group Relations in the United States.¹²⁸

Drafted two Civil Rights bills; one of which was introduced and enacted into law in New Jersey,¹²⁹ and the other introduced into the legislature of New York.¹³⁰

From this the general picture it should be clear, despite the necessity of grouping together certain only partially related materials, that the American Jewish Congress grew slowly into its forefront position as a defender of Civil Rights. Its prime objective has always been Jewish self-defense, but its view of Jewish self-defense developed in the latter part of the decade into a concern for all matters of Civil Rights involving any group or individual in the land, based on the theory that no one is safe and secure unless all enjoy equal privilege and full protection.

Group Libel

Let us turn now to certain specific problems in the field of Civil Rights. Again as in the field of Social Legislation, we find a definite concentration of emphasis around one issue, although neither the volume of activity nor the measurable results in any way compare favorably. In this section, it is the issue of Group Libel legislation, a concept which appears to have taken strong hold as a natural outgrowth and a

later development of the struggle against anti-Semitism. As early as 1941, the Commission on Law and Legislation was enlisting public support for a Bill, which provided that:

"publishers and printers of anonymous, scurrilous literature maligning American Citizens because of their race, religion, descent or nationality shall identify themselves by plainly printing on the material their names and addresses."¹³¹

This obviously was an attempt to seek recourse against those disseminating the Nazi and fascist hate literature of the period, but it also marks the starting point of the Congress' interest in Group Libel legislation per se. The following year, 1942, the Congress arranged a meeting to discuss the role of legislation in the protection of democracy. Among the speakers was the organization's Vice-President who urged that:

"it should be made a criminal offense to send through the mails anything defanatory or false which exposes persons of any race or religion to hatred, contempt, ridicule or obloquy....or to broadcast such statements....or to maliciously libel any group because of race, religion or color."¹³²

By 1943, the Congress was deeply involved in the legislative conflict to secure passage of laws to this effect. During the year it was the sponsor of the State Group Libel Law adopted by Massachusetts.¹³³ The Congress also declared itself a sponsor of the Lynch Bill, a federal measure declaring unlawful the use of the mail for defamatory purposes.¹³⁴ The Vice-President of the American Jewish Congress was the first to be heard at the public hearings on the Lynch Bill. He urged that the, "United States government agencies must be prevented from becoming aids to stirring up racial and religious hatreds."¹³⁵ Appearances at the government hearings were also

made by the Chairman of the Administrative Committee, a member of the Executive Committee, and the Vice-President of the Women's Division. Furthermore, the Congress submitted a brief in favor of the proposed federal law which it claimed:

"would successfully put a stop to the flooding of the mails with matter defaming racial and religious groups...without violating the principle of free speech."¹³⁶

Moreover, it urged all its member and the public, to write letters to legislators and Congressional Committees concerned with this measure. The Congress also wrote a letter to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) refuting the contention that this proposed Group Libel Legislation would foster arbitrary censorship powers, that it was unconstitutional and that it would violate free speech.¹³⁷

Through 1944 the effort was continued. Again testimony was presented at Congressional hearings urging the passage of the bill, and again it was publicly urged that letters be written to Congressmen to help vote the bill out of Committee.¹³⁸ The Congress also sponsored many local meetings in support of this measure and its officers participated in a radio symposium agitating in favor of both federal and state Group Libel Bills.¹³⁹ In addition, the Women's Division held a Legislative Institute in support of both the State and National Group Libel Bills. It again urged the writing of letters to legislators.¹⁴⁰ At the close of the year, the Congress was still trying to prevail upon individuals and organizations to send letters to their Congressmen and in addition was urging that "organizations should adopt resolutions...in order to secure

the necessary Congressional signatures to get the Lynch Bill out of Committee and before Congress."¹⁴¹

At the first meeting of the Commission on Law and Legislation in 1945 again the role of the American Jewish Congress in framing a model State Group Libel Bill introduced in New York and other parts of the country was discussed.¹⁴² But the intensity of activity and the frequency of publicity items sharply diminished from this point on. What is important to note, however, is that a change in thinking took place. In December of 1945, an article by a Congress officer expounded the theory of extending the legal doctrine of Libel to include defamation of all races, peoples or ethnic groups and suggesting the barring of any such defamatory activities from the air and the mail, prohibiting the use of public premises for such purposes, and the removing of Congressional immunity for such utterances.¹⁴³

It was not until 1949, however, that the subject was seriously publicized again. Then it was noted that five Congressmen had introduced a new Group Libel Bill, drafted by the American Jewish Congress, which made it a Federal crime to import false racial or religious incitements, or to distribute them in interstate commerce or through the mails. However, it was clear once again, that the self-defense motive was in the foreground, for the theory was advanced, in conjunction with the drafting of the bill that:

"A law to prevent group defamation will not eradicate anti-Semitism, but can play an important role in the continuing struggle for harmonious group living in America."¹⁴⁴

Nevertheless, the Congress had considerably broadened its

insight into the problem. This was evident from an article, "Good and Bad Libel Bills" which explained that there were now four different bills in the national legislature, and that, therefore, it was not enough to be merely in favor of Group Libel Legislation, but one must be able to select the best law. The approach of the American Jewish Congress is to oppose those bills which protect only Jews and Negroes, and which fail to allow adequate defenses.

"The Bill which the American Jewish Congress supports is all embracing, as to provide more comprehensive protection to all groups, and allows legitimate defenses, so necessary to protect the essential rights of free speech and expression cherished in this country and guaranteed by its laws."¹⁴⁵

Anti-Poll Tax and Anti-Lynching

With regard to the passage of legislation to outlaw Poll Taxes and Lynching, there was a comparatively small amount of material. This is understandable on two grounds, despite the Congress' positive attitude on these measures. First, we must bear in mind the extensiveness of its many other activities and particularly those 'closer to home,' and secondly we must contend with the comparative degree of helplessness of any group to effect much influence in this direction, particularly any northern group. These measures have become political footballs and they have fallen victim to the political chicanery of filibustering and pigeon-holing. This was recognized by the American Jewish Congress in its oft repeated call for "reform of Congress rules which bottle up civil rights bills"¹⁴⁶ and for "changing the rules of Congress to prevent filibustering in the Senate,"¹⁴⁷ of which these are but two examples.

These actions culminated in a letter printed in the New York Times in March, 1949, written by the President of the American Jewish Congress, calling upon the President of the United States to call the Senate into a special session after adjournment, for the purpose of considering rules to prevent filibustering. The letter read, in part:

"It is now clear that no adequate civil rights legislation will pass without drastic revision of the Senate Rules."¹⁴⁸

However as early as 1942, the Women's Division was sponsoring open forums on Anti-Poll Tax Legislation, expressing its viewpoint that:

"It is part of our program to fight for the rights of all minorities and to combat discrimination wherever it is found."¹⁴⁹

Editorials on the subject even antedated this. In an address in 1944, the Chairman of the Commission on Law and Legislation listed "the abolition of the poll-tax" as one of the major interests of his group.¹⁵⁰ Again in 1948, the Congress urged the enactment of a Federal Anti-Lynch Bill "as a necessary measure to protect the republican form of government guaranteed to all states,"¹⁵¹ in a statement filed with the House Judiciary Committee. This was in consonance with other statements made both prior and subsequent to this year.

Although favoring both of these measures, it must also be noted, however, that they were subordinated in emphasis to the efforts for the enactment of Fair Employment Practices Legislation. In a statement of 1949, it is clear that the employment measure was to be considered foremost, "since it concerns by far the greatest number of people."¹⁵²

Loyalty

The American Jewish Congress has clearly opposed the institution of government loyalty programs. As early as April, 1947, the Administrative Committee passed a resolution condemning the President's Executive Order #9835, prescribing procedures for executing a government employee's loyalty program. It viewed this order "as a significant retreat from democratic methods to those of totalitarianism."¹⁵³ The following year, the President of the Congress joined thirty five leading Americans in asking the Chairman of the Federal Employees Loyalty Review Board, "to remedy serious defects in the present procedures for checking the loyalty of federal employees to prevent the danger of injustices."¹⁵⁴ Again in May of 1948, in a rousing editorial, the Congress called for the defeat of the Mundt Bill which:

"in its vague attempt to curb subversion and disloyalty denies the fundamental preservation of individual rights and freedom to our citizenry."¹⁵⁵

More criticism is heaped on a year later. In April, 1949, another editorial concerned with the right of the government to protect itself against subversive activity claims that proper legislation already exists. It deplores:

"the ill considered attempts to supplement that legislation with State and local measures...which lack the basic democratic requirements of due process of law and fair hearing....They represent the first step towards the police state."¹⁵⁶

The only legal action mentioned, however, is in October, 1949, when it is recorded that the New Jersey Division of the Congress had filed a brief challenging the constitutionality of the New Jersey law requiring a loyalty oath of all candidates for

public office.¹⁵⁷ As a result, the law was declared unconstitutional. One last item on the subject, revealed that on October 5, 1949, the Executive Committee adopted the following Statement of Policy:

"The American Jewish Congress is acutely sensitive to the growth of totalitarianism and to any practices which would encourage its growth. It is equally sensitive to any measures which seek to limit the practice of democracy....No form of totalitarianism can be fought by adopting any of the practices and programs of a police state....nor can democracy be preserved or strengthened, by any measures which would limit democracy. The American Jewish Congress therefore strongly opposes any system of loyalty oaths in a democratic society."¹⁵⁸

The Congress felt that such oaths served no positive purpose. They would be taken lightly by those determined to destroy democracy and at the same time would weigh heavily and unfairly upon those who are truly loyal. Such a system requires espionage, informers and spies and is fed by gossip, hearsay and malice. It introduces the mechanism of totalitarianism and inevitably generates fear and hysteria. The many innocent are more frequently penalized than the few guilty, and independent thought and speech become a dangerous adventure.

Press and Radio

Most of the work of the American Jewish Congress, like that of the other National Agencies, in the field of the Press and Radio, falls into the category of interracial education, and therefore deserves special consideration in another paper. There is, however, an area where civil rights action comes into play. Unfortunately, the instances on record deal only with matters of Jewish self-defense and so rightfully belong again to another dissertation on the subject of anti-Semitism.

Examples of this are the Congress' campaign to eliminate from newspapers, advertisements which include such terms as "restricted" or "select clientele", etc.¹⁵⁹ or its petition to the F.C.C. to revoke the license of a Radio station which had deliberately slanted its news to stir up religious and racial hatred against Jews.¹⁶⁰ However, one particular campaign cannot go unnoticed, for three reasons. First, because it involved the Negro group to some extent, as well as the Jewish group. Second, because the activities of this action were carried out despite protests in some sections of the Jewish community that they would only provoke further hostility and lead to retaliation and that the chances of success were extremely remote. And third, because: "the results of this campaign give striking proof of the manner in which private groups can apply technical and legal skills, social vision and a refusal to accept apparent defeat to shape new weapons with which to challenge anti-democratic forces."¹⁶¹

In November, 1946, the American Jewish Congress decided to oppose the New York Daily News in its application for an F.M. Radio license, despite the protestations of certain segments and agencies of the Jewish community. It presented evidence during six days of hearings, charging the paper with bias against Jews and Negroes. Following this, a brief was filed with the F.C.C. summarizing all the evidence.¹⁶² In April, 1947, announcement was made that the license would be granted, but the Congress would not give up. It filed exceptions to the F.C.C. ruling.¹⁶³ A long and complicated

battle ensued, but in April of 1948 after three years of unrelenting effort, the viewpoint of the Congress was victorious and the final verdict denied the license.¹⁶⁴ For the several reasons cited above, this must be considered one of the major accomplishments of the period.

Public Accommodations

We have seen before that the Congress maintained an extensive battle against newspapers which carried discriminatory advertisements. Its concern in this field was two-fold and it directed its strength toward eradicating these discriminatory actions in questions of employment, and public accommodations in hotels and resorts. In the latter, it fought not only against the newspaper advertisements, but also against the literature and correspondence sent out by the hotels and resorts. At first it was thought that this battle had been won as early as 1943, but unfortunately in 1946 (and indeed even to the present day) struggle was still going on. In an extensive article, the effects of the New York State Civil Rights Law with regard to restricted clienteles in resorts and hotels was analyzed. A survey adequately demonstrated that newer phrases "Churches nearby" and "Transportation provided to Catholic and Protestant Churches," etc., continued to violate the law and to withhold the facilities from minority groups, and that hotels in their correspondence and acceptance of reservations as well as in their publicity literature, still maintained their old disreputable policies.¹⁶⁵ Again this is a matter of almost complete

Jewish self-defense, and we are at a loss to find any other activities of a broader scope with reference to civil rights in public accommodations.

Summary

In summing up the activities of the American Jewish Congress in the field of Civil Rights, we find once more the major concentration of effort on those problems which concern Jewish self-defense. But we also find much more. We have witnessed a dynamic picture of organizational growth. Out of the fight for Jewish protection and the struggle against anti-Semitism developed a broadening insight into the indivisibility of minority group problems. This development culminated in the Congress' placing its services at the disposal of a variety of dissimilar legal causes involving individuals and groups of all sorts, predicated on the philosophy that the security of one minority is contingent upon the liberty and equality of all. As in the field of Social Legislation, we have found the bulk of the material focused about one subject, but in this instance, too, a broadening development is apparent. The concern for Group Libel originated as a defense attempt directed against anti-Semitic rabble-rousers. There existed the simple hope of barring these utterances from the mails. Out of this, however, there emerged an all-embracing new idea, that of eliminating from every phase of American living all types of insidious defamation wherever found, this to be subject, however, to our basic legal defenses and the preservation of the fundamental right of free speech.

It is apparent that the efforts of the Congress did not extend into all phases of Civil Rights social action. It may also appear that the Congress did not delve deeply enough into some areas that were actually touched upon. But perhaps some restrictiveness must be anticipated in the functioning of any organization which is limited not only by time and staff and finances, but also to a large extent by the fundamental purposes and goals for which it was originally set up.

CHAPTER II

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

| | page |
|---|------|
| I. Introduction | 67 |
| II. Church and State | 71 |
| III. Social Legislation | |
| 1. Preliminary | 78 |
| 2. Employment Discrimination and F.E.P.C. . . | 82 |
| 3. Housing | 90 |
| 4. Labor and Price Control | 93 |
| 5. Summary | 93 |
| IV. Civil Rights | |
| 1. Discrimination and Civil Rights - General | 95 |
| 2. Group Libel | 99 |
| 3. Anti-Poll Tax and Anti-Lynching | 100 |
| 4. Loyalty | 102 |
| 5. Summary | 104 |

Introduction

The American Jewish Committee was organized in 1906. For thirty years it consisted of only a handful of people, not more than fifty in number.¹⁶⁶ It emerged on the scene of history as a Jewish defense agency, concerned primarily with the persecution of Jews abroad. Its action was largely achieved through diplomatic representation in Washington and elsewhere.¹⁶⁷ Its other primary task was fund raising, for relief abroad.¹⁶⁸ Indeed the Committee was the first large national Jewish fund raising group. This function, however, it eventually turned over to an organization which became the Joint Distribution Committee. For many years the Committee confined its activities to being a kind of department of state for the Jewish community, concerning itself with the safety and security of Jews throughout the world. In the 1920's with increasing evidence of anti-Semitism in America, coupled with efforts to restrict immigration to this country from Eastern Europe, the Committee focused its attention upon an educational program directed to the general American public stressing the incompatibility of prejudice and true Americanism. Education and propaganda developed as its chief working tools.

Through the 1930's the Committee directed itself almost exclusively to the task of detecting, exposing and defeating organized anti-Semitism and rabble-rousers, and immunizing Americans against the Nazi thesis of 'master race' and their campaign against the Jews.¹⁶⁷ Rather than working with Jews, it worked for them. Its program now became investigative as

well as educational and it directed its efforts towards the general American public. From 1936 to 1943, the Committee also enlarged its membership to four hundred, but it did not begin to establish local chapters until 1944.

Again in the 1940's there was a shift in emphasis. The major area of concentrated effort now became the problems of the surviving Jews in Europe. Reconstruction and rehabilitation, the fight for liberalized immigration into this country, the support of the United Nations, particularly with regard to the inclusion of human rights provisions in its charter, and the gigantic struggle attendant to the creation of the state of Israel, these occupied the foreground of the Committee's program.

Not until the late 1940's, as we shall clearly see, did the Committee enlarge the scope of its concern on internal domestic matters. Largely spurred on by the historic President's Report on Civil Rights of 1947 the Committee finally became concretely concerned with injustice to all minority groups and began to turn its attention towards the matters of social action with which we shall deal in this paper. During this period the Committee also began to expand appreciably in numbers. From 1944 to 1949, it established thirty-eight local chapters in the major cities of the country and its membership ranks swelled to over twenty thousand.¹⁶⁶ It seems quite logical to presume that in its drive for large numbers the Committee would find itself somewhat in rivalry and competition with other similar type organizations, such as the American Jewish Congress. One cannot help wondering, therefore,

whether or not this is an additional factor leading to the extension of the Committee's activities into these new fields of social action.

In recent years, the Committee has also directed itself to one additional problem, namely, the achievement of balance between integration into American society and the retention of Jewish identity. In this regard, it has been working with Jews, rather than merely for Jews, to clarify the issues at stake and to help them understand how Americanism and Judaism can mutually strengthen and enrich one another.

Traditionally the Committee has been a Jewish Defense Agency. This is clearly to be observed from the following extract from its charter, which is included in practically every annual report and which is also included in most of its general publications:

Objects of The Committee

"The objects of this corporation shall be, to prevent the infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews, in any part of the world; to render all lawful assistance and to take appropriate remedial action in the event of threatened or actual invasion or restriction of such rights, or of unfavorable discrimination with respect thereto; to secure for Jews equality of economic, social and educational opportunity; to alleviate the consequences of persecution and to afford relief from calamities affecting Jews, wherever they may occur; and to compass these ends to administer any relief fund which shall come into its possession or which may be received by it, in trust or otherwise, for any of the aforesaid objects or for purposes comprehended therein."169

The activities of the Committee have, therefore, been mainly directed against those forces which would deny rights to Jews. For all practical purposes, this has amounted to a continual campaign against anti-Semitism. The techniques

employed have been largely investigative and educational. Every avenue of 'mass media' has been utilized to a high degree. Through the years, the Committee has built up an organization that is both financially powerful and publicly respected. These two factors are of extreme importance, for they hold the key to success. Unfortunately the American Jewish Committee has been extremely late in its entrance into the field of general social action. Because of its wealth and prestige and vast organizational know-how, however, it extends a hope of great accomplishment in the future, resulting from the broadening vision and deepening insight which it developed during the latter years of our period of study from 1939 to 1949.

Church and State

The area of Church and State activities did not form a major segment of the Committee's program, although it clearly recognized these problems to be of prime significance to the American Jewish Community. For the most part, it permitted the practical work to be carried on through the agency of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC). However, it was always prepared to accept its share of the responsibility and detail. One strong exception to this general conclusion was with regard to text books and teaching materials for religious education. Here the Committee was quite concerned on its own part, and undertook extensive work in the supervision of materials.¹⁷⁰ This, however, was primarily, if not exclusively, for the purpose of combatting anti-Semitism and promoting understanding between religious denominations.

The main problem of the period was, of course, the introduction of religious education into the public schools. Although this problem had arisen, even in New York at least as early as 1940,¹⁷¹ there is nothing to evidence any action taken by the Committee until many years later. In 1942, even the Rabbinical Conference complained that "nobody seems willing to oppose" these programs.¹⁷² Not until 1946 do we read in print that the Committee reaffirmed its conviction, "that religious training is properly the concern of the home and the church and of the synagogue, and not of the public school."¹⁷³ It further declared the Dismissed Time Plan less objectionable than the Released Time Plan and recommended the establishment

of an Inter-denominational Commission to supervise the operations of Release Time where operative, to eliminate its abuses.

In 1947, the Executive Committee adopted a stronger resolution that the:

"utilization in any manner of the time, facilities, personnel or funds of the public school system for purposes of religious instruction should not be permitted."¹⁷⁴

It also expressed the belief that Jewish communities were justified in objecting to these programs, although it was considered preferable to register the protest through some non-Jewish body, in preference to direct acts of defiance and non-conformity.

In addition the Committee featured a special article, in its Year Book of 1947, on "Church State and Education,"¹⁷⁵ tracing the development of the tradition of Church-State separation and recent attempts to weaken it in the United States. Similarly it gave space in its news publication to various articles on the subject which dealt with the actions of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), of which the Committee is a member.¹⁷⁶

This material in itself serves to indicate a mounting degree of interest, when one compares even these passive actions to the complete void of the preceding years. However, the focal point of action on the Church-State issue revolved around the court action of the McCollum case of Champaign, Illinois, testing the legality of religious instruction given on public school premises during school hours. This test-case was basically a project of the National Community

Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) and the Synagogue Council of America, but the Committee publicized at length its, "vital interest...having been a signatory to the joint brief submitted to the Supreme Court."¹⁷⁷ Although the case was won, the court's decision was somewhat ambiguous and unclear, so that it in no way solved the fundamental issues involved. Thus throughout 1948 and 1949 much space in its publicity was given to articles explaining the decision and outlining the areas of work which remained, and reaffirming the policy that, "schools which belong to all the people, can not be used by religious groups to recruit adherents."¹⁷⁸ It seems to have been essential to the Committee that the subject be kept up to date and in the foreground of the minds of its members.¹⁷⁹ Recognizing the necessity for more test-cases, to get a clearer ruling on the fundamental issues, the Committee, in 1949, was busy gathering extensive evidence and preparing for trial another very important case, testing the constitutionality of the Released-Time program of New York City.¹⁸⁰ Furthermore, it had prepared "A selected bibliography on Church State and Education" covering all the background material, the current developments and a cross-section of authoratative opinion on the subject.¹⁸¹

It is evident that once the American Jewish Committee assumed an interest in a matter, it possessed the resources and means of being highly effective in a number of directions. What is also evident, however, is the fact that it was so deeply immersed for years in every aspect of the singular problem of anti-Semitism as to be unable to broaden its

vision and to bring itself to cope with these issues of more widespread social concern.

By the end of the decade, the Committee recognized that there were also other problems meriting consideration in this field. There were the problems of, "free bus transportation and textbooks, Bible teaching, sectarian hymns, the employment in public schools of teachers clad in the garb of religious orders and the increasing pressure for Federal and State subsidies to parochial schools."¹⁸² All of these were symptomatic of the trend of religious groups to encroach upon the public school system and to invoke state aid in behalf of sectarian interests. But the Committee simply deplored the fact that there was nothing to enlist the interest of the American public, as for instance there had been in the field of civil rights with the Report of the President's Committee.¹⁸³ Apparently it still could not bring itself to lead an open fight in these directions. Its outlined course of action was to formulate sound policies through the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) and to cooperate closely with the group of outstanding leaders who constitute the Institute of Church and State which was engaged in calling attention to these dangers.

One other technique which the Committee devised in 1947, 1948, and 1949 was that of the Workshop. These Workshops were conducted on various important topics at the Annual Meetings, and were participated in by the various chapter members. They served the purpose of sifting information and sharing opinions. They were not policy-making, although they might indicate to

to the executive the frame of thinking of the membership. In all three years, Workshops discussed issues of Church and State. Their conclusions concurred with the actions taken by the Committee leadership, mainly with regard to opposing Released Time Programs.¹⁸⁴ However, they recognized these to be delicate problems requiring more study, and urged that there be increased educational and more extensive public relations work done in this field.

There is just one other point which the Committee seems to have attempted to consider, namely that of joint celebrations of religious holidays in the public schools. On this question, a basic shortcoming of the Committee's ideology becomes apparent. It is quite clear that as a group it was unwilling to risk becoming 'offensive' or 'irritative' to its 'neighbors,' even when logic and consistency and principle required it. Despite the unequivocal assertion of the rightfulness of the principle of complete separation of Church and State, in 1947 the Committee suggested that where Christmas and Easter were celebrated, there be respectively joint Christmas-Chanukah celebrations and joint Passover-Easter celebrations. Its own Workshop group immediately recognized the inconsistency of this stand and urged, "the elimination of these recommendations."¹⁸⁵ This appears to have been a problem which the Committee wished it could have avoided altogether. However, once more in 1949 publicity space was given to consideration of this subject, "which is engaging the attention of Jewish communities on an ever increasing scale."¹⁸⁶ Yet again it was unable to take a positive stand or offer any

type of a solution. The discussion merely reviewed the many facets of the issue and the alternative suggestions which had been suggested; namely, to approve of joint celebrations or to disapprove of them. Although the Committee was convinced that these, "school observances of religious holidays constitute a violation of the traditional principle of separation of church and state," nevertheless, it felt that this must be recognized as but one phase of the total problem. It also recognized the "vexing problem" of the right of an individual child not to participate in these celebrations and the need to protect the child. But it concluded that, as in all phases of this subject, the solution depends upon, "statesmanship of the highest caliber" and suggested that no Jewish communities or individuals take any steps likely "to affect the status quo" without first consulting the National Jewish Agencies.

We may conclude then, that the American Jewish Committee did not record any major accomplishment in the field of Church-State matters during this period, with the exception of its entrance into the work of legal court action in the last years. Even here, it but offered a helping-hand in joint endeavor in the name of other National Agencies. On the other hand, it is evident that the Committee has both an understanding and an awareness of the depth and pervasiveness of the issues currently involved. It also possesses in the strength of its organization and structure the means to more effective action, but it is impeded by a reluctance to take stands in opposition to the majority groups in the country. In addition, its

emphasis on educational and mass medium techniques of activity has fostered a reluctance to engage in more forceful and direct approaches, particularly in the 'delicate' field of religious matters.

Social Legislation

Preliminary

One cardinal principle must be remembered at the outset. The American Jewish Committee's prime function has been historically to fight a relentless war against anti-Semitism. The Committee did not consider itself a 'mass organization.' Although founded in 1906, it did not establish its first local chapter until 1944. Subsequently it grew rapidly until in 1949 it had thirty eight local chapters. By this time there had obviously been a great change in organizational character, but at the beginning of the period of our consideration, the Committee was still a small, closely knit organization with a limited scope of activity. It is true that as early as 1913, the Committee had helped to secure legislation in New York which prohibited racial and religious discrimination in hotels and public places.¹⁸⁷ As early as 1918, the Committee had fought against "subversive and un-American forces,"¹⁸⁸ in helping to bring the Ku Klux Klan to the dust and in exposing the fraudulency of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. But these actions were clearly outgrowths of the 'war against anti-Semitism' and cannot be said to reflect a broad program of Social Action.

Certainly from 1940 until 1944, we can find nothing which indicated concern for matters of social legislation directly. The four major Standing Committees¹⁸⁹ were all engaged, on the domestic front, in matters strictly connected with the problems of anti-Semitism.¹⁹⁰ In 1943, the following "Statement of Views on the Present Situation in Jewish Life" was

adopted. Points I, II, III, and VII concern domestic activities:

I

"At this time when our country is engaged in an epoch-making war, we, who are united with our brethren of all faiths in the common bond of American citizenship, pledge every effort and every sacrifice to the winning of the war, the achievement for the whole world of the Four Freedoms and the blessings of the Atlantic Charter and the establishment of a just and enduring peace.

II

"We reaffirm our devotion to our religion and pledge ourselves to maintain and perpetuate the vitality of the Jewish religious community, confident that its teachings have constituted and will continue to constitute a basic contribution to the development of civilization and of democracy.

III

"We join with our brethren of all creeds in the continued fight against those who through bigotry and prejudice endeavor in any way to imperil the rights of any group of American citizens and thus to divide our country and undermine the foundations of American liberty.

VII

"Thus, while associating ourselves fully with all the purposes of human freedom and betterment proclaimed by the President of the United States, we have special concern with the two objectives, salvation of these suffering people (Jews abroad) and the preservation of the Jewish community as a spiritual force."¹⁹¹

This important policy making statement which was unanimously adopted may appear to stress a universal concern. Such a conclusion, however, would be ill founded, for the continuing reports of activities do not reflect any change from the past exclusiveness of almost complete attention to matters of anti-Semitism.

The first glimmerings of a change in ideology are not to be discovered until 1945. By this time, it was presumed that anti-Semitism had become stabilized. For this reason, it now

appeared possible to let up on the area of simply combatting anti-Semitism and to turn to a:

"concern with background situations out of which frustrations grow, and which in turn result in anti-Semitic feelings and other anti-minority and illiberal attitudes."¹⁹²

This led, for example, to a willingness at last, on the part of the Committee to take a direct stand on the problem of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and to say that a denial of fair employment practices for any group in our American society results inevitably in a loss for every group. This, however, was merely an outgrowth of a recognition that unemployment is the most important single cause of anti-Semitism and that perhaps the only way in which the Committee could deal with this would be to lend its aid toward securing legislation which attempted to cope with unemployment. It is apparent that anti-Semitism was still the foremost consideration.

Indeed, not until 1946 does the first really important discussion of the Committee's scope of domestic activity appear. At the annual meeting, it was unofficially considered that "the concept of the Four Freedoms" might be the criterion for the work of the American Jewish Committee.¹⁹³ This outlook would entail positive action to effect new social and economic values. But there were two opposing viewpoints. One maintained that regardless of political or economic implications, the Committee should oppose all forms of discrimination against Jews. However, the organization's limited resources should be applied only to matters which affected Jews directly, and that only such actions were justified by the Committee's

Charter. Though individuals, and even chapters within the borders of their states, might participate in the struggles for Anti-Poll Tax and Fair Employment Practices legislation, etc., the Committee as such should not become involved on a national basis.

The opposing view held that since economic conditions are the main factor in the growth of anti-Semitism, good social, economic and political conditions for the whole of the American people would alone safeguard Jews. It was argued that the status of any minority could not be improved independently of the status of all minorities and that Jews would find few supporters in the general community if they carried on a self-centered struggle, purely for their own defense. Therefore they urged an expanded scope of endeavor based on the injunction of prophetic Judaism, "to build a just community."

What is evident from these important though unofficial remarks is that even in 1946, the Committee was unready to assume an active role in the broad field of social action, except insofar as the rights of Jews were affected. It is clear also that the membership was divided in outlook, but that even the more liberal group still employed as their motivating factor the concern for anti-Semitism. The change, however, was in the making.

The historic point of change took place in October, 1947, when the Executive Committee formally recognized that:

"there is the closest relation between the protection of the civil rights of all citizens and the protection of the civil rights of the members of particular groups"

and that it is therefore

"proper for the American Jewish Committee to join with other groups in the protection of the civil rights of the members of all groups irrespective of race, religion, color or national origin."194

From this point on, there was an expansion of domestic activities and a new shift in emphasis to more attention to legal, legislative and social action.¹⁹⁵ As a result, to conform with these new directions the name of the committee which had in the past dealt only with the legal and investigative work involving anti-Semitism was changed to the Legal and Civic Affairs Committee.

A concentration of effort in behalf of social legislation by the American Jewish Committee therefore is not to be found prior to 1947. From the reading of the Committee's records, it appears that the issuance of the President's Report of the Commission on Civil Rights in 1947, in which it played a role, had the greatest influence in bringing about the shift in emphasis. However, one may wonder to what extent the Committee was also influenced by the rise to prominence of the American Jewish Congress in these broader social action spheres.

Employment Discrimination and F.E.P.C.

We shall see that the prime areas of concern for social legislation on the part of the Committee lay in efforts directed towards remedying employment discrimination and restrictive covenants in housing. However, it will appear that almost all of the work which the Committee itself initiated was confined to legal action in the courts and

efforts to aid the passage of legislation, plus the publication of certain information material. The auxiliary activities of extensive surveys and personal intervention on behalf of individuals or groups is not evident.

Prior to 1944, there appears in the records nothing at all of concern with the question of employment discrimination. We may understand this, of course, as a reflection of the Committee's prior interest in matters of combatting direct anti-Semitism on a national and international scale. In this year, however, some small degree of awareness began to reveal itself. In July, 1944, a full page article appeared in the Committee Reporter on Economic Discrimination and the Movement to establish a Permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.¹⁹⁶ In this article mention was made of the activities of the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League, in following up complaints of job discrimination against Jews. But no direct participation of the Committee was to be noted. In October another article recorded that the delegates to the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), of which the Committee is a member, went on record as favoring the enactment of both Federal and State F.E.P.C. Laws and urged their constituents to send representatives to Congressional hearings.¹⁹⁷ However, the Committee itself followed up this recommendation only on a state level. Obviously in 1945 it was not yet prepared to take any action whatsoever on a national scale.

Nonetheless, it is quite significant to note that some direct action was taken at least on the State level. In

January, 1945, it was reported that the "AJC Supports F.E.P.C. Bill at Hearings in New York"¹⁹⁸ and that its President went to the State Capital to declare that his organization was in full accord with the purposes and principles of the proposed bill. One further detail merits comment. The state bill contained an exemption from its provisions for employers of only a few employees. This exemption was one of the focal points of serious debate. The American Jewish Congress had opposed this special category of privilege as an unwarranted loophole, but the American Jewish Committee in its testimony supported this exception, on the grounds that small employers could always find plausible excuses for rejecting applicants and, therefore, the statute would be difficult of enforcement in their case. The main point, however, is that this incident marks the first public action by the Committee on behalf of social legislation.

Relevant to this measure, several other editorials and articles in the Committee Reporter during 1945 called for support by the liberal forces of this country for the "fight to abolish discrimination in American life,"¹⁹⁹ and lauding the subsequent passage of the New York State Anti-Bias Law.²⁰⁰ In addition, attention was called publicly to the passage of an Anti-Employment Discrimination Bill in New Jersey, the second state to do so,²⁰¹ as well as to various other similar measures being considered in twenty-one other states.²⁰² However, all of these articles appeared only in an impersonal, reportorial manner, with no further mention of any direct action on the part of the Committee.

Some significance was attached to the fact that the only Jewish representative appointed to the group of five Commissioners of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) happened to be a woman who was a Chapter Officer in the American Jewish Committee. This Commission was set up to administer the Anti-Bias law which was mentioned above as having been of interest to the Committee. However, it seems to have been an unwarranted conclusion to have attempted to connect these two facts together and thus to have concluded that public recognition had been given to the Committee's efforts in securing passage of the measure. In reality, this woman had been engaged in such capacities as member of the Workmen's Compensation Board and the State War Council long prior to this event.²⁰³ However, the Committee's publicity does not fail to capitalize on the appointment.

Throughout 1946 there were only occasional references in the Committee Reporter to matters of employment discrimination. Some space was given to publicizing the F.E.P.C. law of New York²⁰⁴ and to report on a National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) survey showing the continuing growth of discriminatory practices.²⁰⁵ Nevertheless, the developing change in attitude became more obvious during this year. In the first place, the Committee issued a pamphlet called "Progress in Democracy," analyzing the New York State law against employment discrimination.²⁰⁶ In addition to this, the Executive Committee at an important meeting in New York voiced its "approval of the participation of the American Jewish Committee in the newly formed

Legislative Committee of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC)."²⁰⁷ This newly formed Committee was to consider legislation which might either directly or indirectly affect the interests of the Jewish community, and was to issue a regular Bulletin on related subjects. This action of approval, indicating that the American Jewish Committee was to openly participate for the first time in campaigns for diverse types of social legislation, even if they did not directly affect the Jewish community proved to be of tremendous significance. It touched off an intensive discussion to determine the Committee's legitimate area of legislative concern, which question was not to be fully settled until the historic resolution of October, 1947, mentioned earlier in this chapter (see page 81), which provided for the unrestricted right of the Committee to act on behalf of the rights of all groups, regardless of race, religion, color or national origin.

As a result in 1947 there was an expansion of activity. The Committee entered the campaigns for Fair Employment Practices legislation in the States of Ohio and Michigan.²⁰⁸ It also voted its support for the first time to the national legislation introduced in Congress, and the President of the Committee became a member of the "Board of the National Council for a Permanent F.E.P.C., which is backing the bill..."²⁰⁹ In addition, the head of the newly formed Committee on Legal and Civic Affairs testified in Washington before a Senate Sub-Committee on behalf of the anti-employment discrimination Bill.²¹⁰ Moreover, the American Jewish

Committee assisted in the deliberations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights and presented it with specific recommendations calling for enactment of Federal legislation to bar employment discrimination.²¹¹

It is also interesting to note that in 1947 for the first time, an open concern for the problem of Negro employment discrimination was manifested in an article entitled "Rapid Negro Job Drop Outside N.Y.C. Reported"²¹² which was printed in the Committee Reporter. This article outlined the mounting difficulties on the employment field despite legislation passed.

The Committee's major accomplishment, however, appears to have been in the publicizing of the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights issued in 1947, which had embodied all of the American Jewish Committee's recommendations relative to Fair Employment legislation, anti-Poll Tax and Lynching laws and the outlawing of restrictive covenants in real estate contracts. A summary for popular consumption was written and two hundred thousand copies were distributed. Copies of the full Report were sent to key groups and individuals all over the country. Fact sheets were sent out to editors, commentators and publicists generally, and hundreds of articles, speeches, plays, cartoons, resolutions, posters, comics, radio scripts, etc. were prepared and given tremendous distribution.²¹³

In 1948, only one article appeared relevant to the issues of employment discrimination. This announced the issuance of a booklet describing in words and pictures the

process by which the New York State Commission Against Discrimination acts to make job opportunities equal to all.²¹⁴ This booklet was produced with the cooperation of the Committee, which also aided in its widespread distribution. Nevertheless, although no other articles appeared, the Committee's Legal Department considered the problem of discrimination in employment to be its key issue, and the one in which legal action and legislation were most feasible. And in the 1948 Annual Report it claimed to have vigorously supported legislative campaigns in four large states and remained on the alert to watch for proper enforcement in those states where such legislation had already come into being.²¹⁵

Similarly in 1949, there were only fleeting references in the Committee Reporter to matters concerning employment discrimination.²¹⁶ However, in the annual summary of activities, the following inclusive report was given:

"Our Civil Rights Division has aided in organizing campaigns for state F.E.P.C. laws, preparing memoranda for use in a number of states on organizing state campaigns and drafting model bills, making recommendations on bills submitted for analysis, and advising community organizations in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, California, Oregon and Minnesota.

"In the interests of a national F.E.P.C. law, the Committee's efforts were likewise helpful. Chapters have been active in making representations to legislatures and community organizations. I testified in the name of our agency before a Congressional subcommittee on May 25, 1949. The AJC was among the organizations participating in the National Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization, in Washington on January 15-17, 1950, to urge enactment of the President's civil rights program at the current session of Congress."²¹⁷

It should also be mentioned that both in 1947 and 1948, Workshops at the Annual Meetings considered thoroughly the problems of employment discrimination. They urged increased

activity by the national body and the local chapters, to stimulate drives and educational activities on behalf of F.E.P.C. legislation on municipal, state and national levels. Where such legislation had already been adopted, they urged a continuance of effort to educate the community as to the rights and obligations created by the legislation.²¹⁸

We have seen then, that the activities of the American Jewish Committee relevant to employment discrimination were closely confined to matters of F.E.P.C. legislation. These activities, however, were not evidenced prior to 1945. From 1945 to 1947 they were limited to minor state level agitations primarily centered about New York. An expansion of interest is discernible from 1947 on and efforts to secure legislation were then pursued on a national level and were also extended, through the activities of the chapters, into many other states. The major impetus for the heightened activity was due to a change in policy in 1946-1947, which appears to have resulted from the lessening of the pressure of native anti-Semitism, and also to have been encouraged by the issuance of the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. The only unique technique employed by the Committee was that of the extensive use of publicity through mass media. This was primarily demonstrated in the dissemination of publicity relative to the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. This, of course, has been one of the main devices employed by the Committee during the many long years of its history of effort in other fields of concern.

Housing

Although the second category of major emphasis in the field of social legislation is to be found in matters concerning housing, there is absolutely no evidence of activity to be uncovered prior to the year 1947. Once again the pattern of development of the American Jewish Committee reveals itself. Not until the reorganization of the Legal and Civic Affairs Committee and the historic statement of October, 1947, do we view the entrance of the Committee into any active work in this direction. Moreover, all the ensuing actions pertain to but one phase of the housing problem, namely that of restrictive covenants in real estate agreements.

However, the rapidity with which this question assumed a dominant position in the Committee's program is almost startling. The very first mention of this topic is in the outline of the recommendations presented to the President's Committee on Civil Rights in May, 1947. Here among the list of many suggestions was one urging "State legislation outlawing restrictive covenants."²¹⁹ Then in November of the same year, the Chairman of the newly formed Legal and Civic Affairs Committee listed restrictive covenants in real estate as one of the four major efforts in which his committee was presently engaged.²²⁰ By December the American Jewish Committee together with the Anti-Defamation League and other Jewish Organizations (but not including the American Jewish Congress), was preparing to file a brief with the United States Supreme Court relative to a hearing on four cases of restrictive real estate agreements, involving attempts to

prevent Negro purchasers from occupying property.²²¹ The Committee was also busily engaged in another court case testing the same principle within the limits of New York State.²²² Although the State case was lost, the subsequent favorable ruling by the United States Supreme Court in May, 1948, marked a notable victory. In hailing the success, the Committee said:

"The unanimous decision...forbidding enforcement... of racially restrictive real estate agreements is a milestone in the democratic effort to eliminate discrimination in the enjoyment of basic civil and political rights by all groups regardless of race, color, religion or national origin.

"Restrictive covenants have been a major weapon in the segregation of racial and religious minorities. Such segregation inevitably is a threat to democracy. For this reason...the argument was made that judicial enforcement of racial restrictive covenants is a violation of the Due Process clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, as well as the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment..."²²³

Although the Committee felt that this victorious ruling had brought the campaign against restrictive covenants to a successful conclusion,²²⁴ this was an unduly optimistic reaction. Fortunately, it soon recognized this fact and did not bring its activities to a halt. Throughout 1949, the Committee remained busily engaged in the support of campaigns to secure local non-discriminatory ordinances. Its services played a vital role in obtaining a municipal ordinance barring race discrimination in the redevelopment of San Francisco slum areas. In this campaign, the testimony of a noted housing authority provided by the Committee, "was credited with decisively influencing adoption of the non-discrimination ordinance."²²⁵ In New York, the Committee was active in the

creation of a State Committee on Discrimination in Housing.²²⁶ It also lobbied in the State Capital to urge other remedial legislation²²⁷ and negotiated with the Federal Housing Authority. In addition, it continued its legal battle by filing a joint brief with the Anti-Defamation League in a case involving discrimination in a New Jersey public housing project.²²⁸

The Workshops of 1947, 1948, and 1949 also discussed thoroughly this question of housing discrimination, and fully endorsed the program of the national body. They further urged continuous efforts by chapters to secure State Investigating Commissions and additional legislation. They also emphasized the need for research and educational materials, "to help promote sound attitudes toward non-segregated housing by eliminating misconceptions concerning the social and economic implications of non-discriminatory housing."²²⁹ Incidentally, in the 1949 Workshop we note the only reference to any other phase of the entire problem; namely, that of working to secure an expansion of the housing program.

We may conclude then, that in the field of social legislation relevant to housing, the American Jewish Committee became vitally active in 1947, 1948, and 1949. It dealt almost exclusively, however, with the problem of restrictive covenants in real estate agreements and similar racial discrimination in public housing projects. The Committee considered this as one of its major assignments and proved highly effective primarily in the pursuit of legal cases through the courts.

Labor and Price Control

Although there was considerable interest by the Committee in the activities of Labor, these were confined to combatting race hatred and bigotry within labor's own ranks. While a concern for Negroes and other minorities is clearly discernible, this entire field of endeavor is only a direct outgrowth of the Committee's primary concern with the problem of anti-Semitism. There is virtually no expression of opinion on the rights of labor, nor any activity in pursuit of legislation to strengthen the laboring group.

Likewise questions relative to price control or any other economic legislative matters are nowhere in evidence in the scope of the Committee's activities.

Summary

We may conclude then, that the activities of the American Jewish Committee in the field of social legislation were focused almost exclusively around the two problems of Fair Employment Practices legislation and Housing discrimination. Interest in these fields was only a recent development and reflected the historical change of the Committee's scope of activity in 1946 and 1947. Expansion into these areas was primarily an outgrowth of earlier direct attempts to combat anti-Semitism, in a sense a logical or enlightened extension of these very same activities. Thus its endeavors appear to have been motivated by a desire to eliminate the causes of latent anti-Semitism rather than the result of a vital

concern for the welfare of the aggrieved minorities. Thus, we do not find intensive surveys of specific violations, personal interventions on behalf of individuals, or negotiations with private industry. Similarly we note a somewhat exclusivistic type of approach to these problems. Top level negotiations are stressed. Mass meetings and extensive mass pressures are not utilized. The only approach to the population as a whole is through the dissemination of educational materials. This technique, however, was extensively employed. The effectiveness of the Committee's efforts was nonetheless worthy of commendation. Its accomplishments have been as notable as any other in the field.

Civil Rights

Discrimination and Civil Rights - General

The same pattern of organizational history which was responsible for the Committee's belated entrance into the field of social action for social legislation was also responsible for its equally late entrance into the rest of the field of social action for civil rights. The prior restriction of concern exclusively with matters of direct anti-Semitism, eliminated everything else from the domestic scene of activity. Therefore, it is not until after the historic meetings of 1946 and 1947 that the Committee's records revealed anything of interest regarding civil rights.

The following example may help to illustrate the point. In May, 1947, an article in the Committee Reporter revealed that:

"The President of the American Jewish Committee is serving on the national campaign committee of the Urban League Service Fund."²³⁰

Although not of vital significance, this certainly indicated that the problem of race relations was now in the foreground, for prior to this date, not a single item of this nature was to be found. We certainly cannot conclude from this that members of the American Jewish Committee had never before been concerned with interracial problems, for indeed an interfaith department for goodwill had long been functioning. However, we may presume, that any similar activities in an earlier period were considered as of only minor importance.

Again it was the President's Committee on Civil Rights which acted as the starting point of the expanded program.

Upon the request of this group, in May, 1947, the Committee submitted to it "a national program for civil liberties, including intensive and far reaching measures to affirm and safeguard civil rights and to combat group dissension, racial and religious discrimination, and bigotry."²³¹ Later the Committee was proud to report that virtually all of its recommendations had been incorporated in the final Report. When the Report was issued, the Committee lauded it in special articles in its magazine Commentary²³² as well as in the pages of the Committee Reporter.²³³ The Committee immediately pledged its support and urged implementation of its recommendations. In a letter of commendation to the President of the United States, the Committee's President declared the Report would "serve as a charter for action for years to come by all who are concerned with the realization of American ideals." We have already noted before the extensive assistance which the Committee rendered in the nationwide publicizing of the details of this important document. In addition the Committee joined in with other groups to form "A National Citizens Council on Civil Rights"²³⁴ which served to keep the issues of civil rights before the electorate as a non-partisan, non-political issue. Also the Committee supplied the materials for a booklet which this Council produced, listing the progress which had been made in the entire civil rights field. This booklet was circulated among all the members of Congress and all state legislatures.²³⁵

In the field of mass media the Committee did more during 1948 and 1949. It arranged for a very successful "American

Exhibition on Superstition Prejudice and Fear," to be shown in a number of cities in the country through the facilities of its local chapters.²³⁶ It issued its own "Handbook on Civil Rights," analyzing federal and state laws and court decisions on fundamental freedoms.²³⁷ It prepared six feature advertisements referring to such topics as brotherhood, human rights and civil liberties, which were distributed to newspapers and magazines throughout the country and reprinted in more than two hundred publications in a six month period.²³⁸ And in addition it opened up all of its publicity facilities to promote the advancement of civil rights programs by means of continuous distribution of large quantities of general materials for mass circulation. It also cooperated with the Anti-Defamation League and several labor unions in the preparation of a comic book on civil rights and various radio programs.²³⁹

However, the important legislative actions were directed toward matters of Church and State, Employment Discrimination, Housing and Fair Education Practices. A full scale program on behalf of individual and personal civil rights has not yet emerged, although it appears to be in the making at the close of our period of observation. Also, internal reorganization is being continued, in order to develop a blueprint for future social action which will call for a greater intensification of effort in all directions.²⁴⁰

There were a few other instances, however, in which the Committee had already proved its effectiveness. In 1947:

"A member of the American Jewish Committee legal and civic affairs committee...took an active part in the successful campaign to include anti-discrimination clauses in the State charter for New Jersey..."²⁴¹

The provisions of this charter forbid denial of any persons' privileges because of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin and prohibited segregation in the schools and militia, and abolished the provision prohibiting paupers to vote.

Again in 1949, the Committee, including New Jersey chapters and the national office, helped substantially in securing the passage of another Civil Rights statute in New Jersey.²⁴²

We may also note that the Committee attended a special meeting called in Washington by the secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in September, 1948. Representatives of nineteen leading organizations met to plan the strategy of civil rights legislation in relation to a special session of Congress.²⁴³ Also in connection with the federal program of legislation, the Committee submitted a statement to Senate and House sub-committees endorsing the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1949. The terms of this endorsement indicated clearly the broadened outlook with which the Committee had emerged at the close of the decade, and which gave promise of notable future activity:

"The AJC memorandum particularly endorsed provisions for the creation of a permanent Civil Rights Commission and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights....

"The AJC also recommended strengthening and modernizing existing civil rights statutes....

"In addition it stressed the need for statutes to safeguard the political participation in federal primaries and elections."

The statement added:

"The American Jewish Committee has repeatedly opposed discrimination and segregation based on race, religion, color or national origin.

"We believe that segregation is an archaic remnant of a period of unenlightenment and ignorance and is always discriminatory.

"We believe that segregation imposes a badge of inferiority just as clearly as did the Nuremberg laws of the Nazi regime.

"We believe that segregation in all forms and at all levels is a denial of the high ideals and principles on which our Republic was founded.

"We believe that segregation, as practiced in many areas of American life, is a substantial handicap to our country in its foreign relations, and we urge Congress to eliminate this practice in all areas where it has the power to do so."²⁴⁴

In 1949 the Committee also testified against segregation in the Armed Services before a Presidential Committee, and collaborated with other organizations in bringing pressure upon the American Bowling Congress to discontinue its practice of excluding Negroes from tournaments.²⁴⁵ One other case which occupied the Committee's attention in this general category dealt with the right to expatriate a naturalized citizen because of his absence from the United States for more than five years. We have seen that this case was also of concern to the American Jewish Congress.

Group Libel

The question of Group Libel legislation has never been an important issue to the American Jewish Committee. Although the matter was considered slightly in an unofficial discussion at the 1946 Annual Meeting, there was divided opinion even as to the right to curb the free speech of bigots or subversives.²⁴⁶ Indeed, the fundamental policy of the Committee is simply to apply the 'hush-hush' or 'Quarantine'

treatment to those who would abuse the rights of free speech, believing that the most effective treatment is to supply the minimum of publicity. The Committee also appears to believe that sufficient legislation already exists for the legal prosecution of those guilty of defamation or subversive utterances, and in much of its work in the field of anti-Semitism it has successfully cooperated in bringing legal forces to bear against its enemies.

However, only one official pronouncement has been made on the subject. Since this pronouncement was to be published in pamphlet form and distributed to the membership, it may clearly be taken as the organization's policy. In 1947, the Executive Vice-President declared that:

"The American Jewish Committee...opposes enactment of group libel laws and legislation banning or restricting mailing privileges for publications containing bigoted material."²⁴⁷

He characterized sanctions against the free expression of ideas, even hostile ideas, as psychologically as well as legally unsound. Apparently the Committee did not consider the matter of grave or pressing importance, for nothing else on the subject was printed in its records.

Anti-Poll Tax and Anti-Lynching

We have already seen that matters which did not affect the Jewish community directly or exclusively were not considered by the Committee until around 1947. This also proves to be the case with regard to anti-Poll Tax and anti-Lynching legislation. Once again the Committee's recommendations to the President's Committee on Civil Rights proved to be the

starting point. Included in these recommendations were specific urgings for the passage of anti-Poll Tax and anti-Lynching measures.²⁴⁸ It is clear, however, that even at this time, May, 1947, the American Jewish Committee as a national organization had not yet taken any official stand on these questions, for not until October of this same year did the Executive Committee call for a session to consider "determination of the AJC policy on participation in civic action campaigns for the passage of anti-lynching and anti-poll tax legislation."²⁴⁹ For some reason which is not apparent in the records, when the Executive Committee did hold this meeting, it passed a resolution favoring only the anti-lynching measure.²⁵⁰ There is no mention of any official action with regard to the anti-poll tax law until 1949, when the Committee's counsel testified in favor of this measure before a Congressional House Committee.²⁵¹ The Committee advanced the argument that the tax hits hardest at those groups least able to pay for the right to vote: tenant farmers, sharecroppers and day laborers who live on marginal earnings. It is possible that this line of argument tends to indicate that the Committee considered the poll tax as an economic measure, and that for this reason it did not include it at an earlier date in its own resolutions on civil rights measures.

There are no other references to any further actions on the part of the Committee for the advancement of either of these two measures. This is to be explained by the fact that the Committee's concentration of effort lay elsewhere.

The principle measures upon which its attention was focused were, fair employment practices, restrictive covenants in real estate, church and state and education discrimination.²⁵² In addition, the Committee clearly recognized the inability to be effective in these measures without some change in rules of the Senate to prevent filibustering.

Loyalty

It cannot be said that the Committee played an active role with regard to government loyalty programs. In an unofficial discussion at the 1946 annual meeting, the Committee President made the following summation:

"The American Jewish Committee is not and cannot be a mass organization. The real measure of its effectiveness is its influence in the American Jewish community....

"It is engaged in essential work with international organizations and in Europe, where the attitude towards communism is very different from our own. It cannot, therefore, make any blanket denunciations...

"What is important is achievement, not resolutions. The Committee has no right to enter into purely political or economic questions, on which its members are divided. At the same time, it must go beyond what affects Jews alone, into such areas... on which there is agreement...."²⁵³

This statement is significant in that it reflects the inherent timidity and reserve of the American Jewish Committee's general policy throughout the years. The Committee has been dedicated to the defense of Jewish Rights all over the world. This has been its prime objective throughout the more than forty years of its existence. Its methods have been cautious and careful, guarding against antagonism and offensiveness. In the foregoing pages, the reluctance to extend the scope of operations has been clearly demonstrated. It would,

therefore, be unrealistic to anticipate any marked activity on this issue, so controversial in nature, and which would demand almost outright antagonism and direct opposition to the determined course of action of the government.

Thus we find only two comparatively minor references to the entire issue. One small paragraph in an extensive article of 1947 concerning the implementation of the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, mentions in passing that:

"the chairman of the legal and civic affairs committee led a discussion on the loyalty examinations of government employees. He dealt with the possibility of damaging effects on civil liberties in the application of loyalty tests."²⁵⁴

However, the vice-chairman of the executive committee quickly pointed out that the Report had contained recommendations that the government scrupulously maintain the civil rights of public workers in classifying the loyalty of federal employees.

The only action taken by the Committee was to concur in 1948 with the following statement adopted by the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) as a guide to national agencies and local communities:

"Where there are indications as a result of a preliminary inquiry, that a disloyalty charge has been brought because the accused is a member of a racial, religious or ethnic group, or because of his bona fide defense of civil rights issues, the responsible local Jewish organization should interest itself in the proceedings, should arrange to have the hearings observed, and thereafter should take every action deemed appropriate in the particular circumstances."²⁵⁵

In conjunction with this resolution, the Workshop of 1948 urged all Committee members and chapters, "to be on the

alert to the danger of local disloyalty charges, motivated by membership in a racial, religious or ethnic group or because of bona fide defense of civil rights issues." It also urged the national body "to collaborate with other organizations to effect improvements in the Federal Employee's Loyalty Program which will safeguard the traditional and fundamental rights of Americans." We have already noted that the recommendations of Workshops had no official status and were considered only as suggestions to the national body. Therefore, since no other activity is recorded, we cannot attach much importance to these Workshop utterances.

Summary

We may conclude then that the activities of the American Jewish Committee in the field of civil rights have been extremely limited. The emergence of the beginnings of a program in this field coincided with the issuance of the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, in 1947. Even then the Committee was undecided as to how far its charter would permit it to go into matters which did not affect Jews exclusively. However, this same year a major change in policy was effected and the Committee broadened its scope of activity. Its major work was devoted to the publicizing of the Report of the President's Committee and to campaign for all inclusive Civil Rights Bills both on the Federal and State levels, and to attack through 'mass media' discriminatory and prejudiced attitudes of all groups throughout the country. On specific issues, immediately

following the historic change in policy the Committee supported anti-lynching legislation but delayed in its consideration of the anti-poll tax measure. It was opposed to Group Libel laws but did not attach much significance to the subject in general. The Committee also recognized the dangers in government loyalty programs, but did not engage in any activity to oppose them. Its efforts were concentrated more strongly with those matters discussed in the earlier sections of this chapter. It appears that these have been primarily formulative years for the Committee's program in the field of civil rights, and that its internal reorganization and enlarged plan for future operations holds promise of greater activity and effectiveness in the years that lie ahead.

CHAPTER III

THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

| | page |
|---|------|
| I. Introduction | 107 |
| II. Church and State | 113 |
| III. Social Legislation | |
| 1. Employment Discrimination and F.E.P.C. . . | 120 |
| 2. Housing | 123 |
| 3. Labor | 124 |
| 4. Price Control | 129 |
| 5. Agriculture | 130 |
| 6. Summary | 131 |
| IV. Civil Rights | |
| 1. Discrimination and Civil Rights - General | 132 |
| 2. Group Libel | 138 |
| 3. Anti-Poll Tax and Anti-Lynching | 138 |
| 4. Loyalty | 139 |
| 5. Compulsory Military Training | 141 |
| 6. Summary | 142 |

Introduction

The Central Conference of American Rabbis is, "the oldest rabbinical association in the United States, the largest rabbinical association in the world, the first rabbinical association in America, which has met continuously and for a longer period of time than any rabbinical association in the world."²⁵⁶ It was founded in July, 1889 in the city of Detroit and has grown through the years from twenty-nine charter members to more than four hundred thirty, by the year 1940.²⁵⁷ The activities of the Conference cover every phase of Reform Jewish religious life which affects either the rabbinate or the congregations which its members serve. It functions largely as a policy making and advisory group for the Reform Jewish movement. The decisions and findings of the group have generally been accepted by Reform institutions and adherents, but only on a voluntary and democratic basis. The Conference operates largely through Standing Committees and Special Committees. We shall consider for the most part, the work of two of these Standing Committees, namely that of Church and State, and the Commission on Justice and Peace. However, it is to be understood that the Conference as a whole supported the measures reported in this chapter.

The social action program of the Conference was clearly predicated upon the religious philosophy of the Reform movement. This is indicated by the following statement of principle issued by the Commission on Justice and Peace in 1942.

It will also be borne out by the rest of the material covered in this chapter.

"We are clearly aware of the fact that in studying the needs of peace and justice and in applying the prophetic principles to the problems of modern society, we are not merely carrying out the wishes of this Conference, and the will of its members, but the demands of Judaism. When we speak on these vital problems, we speak not for ourselves, but in the name of God. The message of Judaism was intended not merely for Jews, but for all mankind."²⁵⁸

The work of the Conference was toward the end that man might recognize and respect that dignity of the individual which is inherent in the Jewish spiritual concept of God's Fatherhood and man's brotherhood. This truth above all else motivated the Conference in its efforts.²⁵⁹

Despite the loftiness of its idealism, however, the Conference was seriously limited in its ability to function effectively. It was shackled by financial limitation and administrative complications. It was recognized in 1939 that a full time social justice secretary was necessary if anything effective was to be accomplished.²⁶⁰ It was suggested that a cooperative effort be created between the Rabbinical Assembly and the Conference. This proved unworkable, so the Conference thought to carry out the suggestion on its own. However, in 1941 this idea had to be abandoned, "due to the large expenditures by our Conference in the field of refugee relief work."²⁶¹ In 1942, 1944, and 1945 it was continually recommended that the services of a full time secretary were imperative, because, "the tremendous work of this Commission can not be carried out on a part time basis or in the spare moments of busy men." Without such an office, it was clear that the work of the

Conference was insignificant.²⁶² But the Executive Board "deemed it unwise" to attempt to raise funds for this purpose.²⁶³ Nevertheless, the Commission on Justice and Peace continued its efforts to advance this idea throughout 1946 and 1947. It was finally suggested that it might be feasible to set up a joint Commission together with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC).²⁶⁴ Such a program was adopted in principle in 1947 by the Conference and steps to implement it were begun in 1948.²⁶⁵ Plans called for a joint Commission, a permanent secretary and financial underwriting by the two organizations. By the close of our period, 1949, this new organ had not yet begun to function on any large scale, so that its force and effectiveness remain in the realm of conjecture. It can only be hoped that such a venture will prove fruitful enough to translate the dynamic force of reform religious idealism into demonstrable practice.

It is quite apparent that the social action commissions of the Conference recognized their own inabilities for constructive action or extended work. They had very little money placed at their disposal and their members were engaged as full time Rabbis in congregations spread throughout the country. Their principal efforts, therefore, had to be confined to studies of the various problems, followed by the issuance of reports, publications, public statements and official pronouncements. Thus, annual statements were issued on Race Relations Day, on Labor Day and on Armistice Day,²⁶⁶ and bulletins on Justice and Peace were published from time to time.²⁶⁷ Many of these received extended

publicity in the press and radio. It was always hoped that they would find their way into congregational bulletins and Sunday school classrooms and, of course, into the pulpits. In addition many articles were incorporated into the pages of the Conference' Yearbooks, in the hope, thereby, of directly or indirectly receiving a large reading public.²⁶⁸

Unfortunately, however, in its sincere attempts to overcome these obvious limitations, the Commission on Justice and Peace committed a tragic error which frequently rendered its reports virtually meaningless. With tremendous zeal and enthusiasm it attempted to cover every conceivable aspect of social justice problems, an obviously impossible undertaking. This fault was clearly recognized by Conference members, who were often outspoken in their criticism. In 1943, Dr. Morgens-
stern remarked:

"It seems to me that the Commission on Justice and Peace was animated by the very finest of intentions, but showed poor judgment. There are two procedures open to a committee in preparing a report such as this: It may try to conceive of every possible issue upon which it may express an opinion and I believe this the program which the committee followed....It seems to me that bringing in (so) many recommendations...defeats its own purpose. It makes the whole work of the committee and the action of this Conference trivial....The Commission should have...chosen those principles which have a definite and positive relationship to the work of this Conference...so that the word of this Conference would have some real effect in shaping public opinion and in securing desired social action...."²⁶⁹

Just one other similar comment will be cited to indicate that this criticism was not confined to any single occasion. In 1945, Dr. Silver stated:

"...My second reaction is the same as the one I made at the last convention. It is unwise for the Commission to try to cover every event which

transpires during the year and to ask the Conference to express itself officially and go on record about everything that occurs in that vast field every year. It would be more helpful...if the Conference were to express itself on two or three important matters. It could then be forcibly registered and publicized, which is not the case when the Conference expresses itself on thirty or forty items."²⁷⁰

In the face of these sharp criticisms, the Commission attempted to condense its reports and to make them brief and incisive. But it was never very successful in the attempt and as a result, it will be particularly difficult to approach the task of evaluating the Conference's effective work in the field of social action. The extremes to which it carried this short-coming, as we shall see, sometimes even border on the humorous. Likewise, its own evaluation of significant activity is upon occasion extremely puzzling. One glaring example of this was incorporated in the report for 1941. Mention was made of an important meeting held in Philadelphia. It consisted of "national leaders of industry, business, labor, agriculture, consumer's cooperatives, etc.," and the Social Justice Commission of the Conference was the Jewish representative. The meeting was called by an inter-faith group for the purpose of having, "the leaders of the economic life of the country confer together, in order that they might better understand each other and better plan for the present and the future." However, this meeting was very small, consisting only of the responsible heads of the various organizations. No publicity was given to the undertaking, nor was it possible to reveal the details in this report. It was noted to this extent, however, because:

"We merely want the members of the C.C.A.R. to know that your Social Justice Commission has been an integral part of one of the most significant gatherings held in recent years with regard to the economic and social future of America under a democratic system."²⁷¹

We cannot anticipate, as we turn to view the work of the Conference in specific areas of social action, any extensive variety of activity. We shall primarily seek to observe the matters to which it devoted its attention, and the stands it took on the vital questions of the period 1939 to 1949.

Church and State

One might easily presume that any rabbinical conference would automatically have an intense interest in matters affecting church-state relations. Of course, this holds true for the Central Conference. Although all other matters of social action were relegated to the Commission on Justice and Peace, the questions of church and state were considered by a special standing committee. The membership of this committee represented almost every state in the Union and its various chairmen worked diligently to accumulate information from every part of the country relevant to the problems considered. However, like all branches of the Central Conference, the activities of this committee were plainly limited. Although frequently its members regretted it, the fact was that this was not an action committee and the real problems had to be met by the local communities. It was clearly restated in 1940 that, "this committee can only recommend general principles for guidance."²⁷²

In general, the Central Conference opposed all attempts to break the traditional wall of separation between church and state. This problem was considered two-fold. Its positive aspect was to keep the state indifferent to the way individuals worship and its negative aspect was to prevent any religion from using the facilities of the state to strengthen itself.²⁷³ The most serious specific issue was that of religious education in the public schools. In 1940, the Conference reaffirmed for the third time its disfavor of

Release Time programs. It had already so recorded its will in 1926 and 1936.²⁷⁴ However, it approved of the Dismissal plan as a more constructive step manifesting its vital interest in the religious education of all groups. Programs of Release Time religious education had begun in 1913 and by 1940 they were being utilized in about eight hundred communities in the country. During the decade of our study, however, this number was to almost triple itself. Such programs thus became an ever growing problem in the face of the Jewish community. The Conference Committee on Church and State reacted by printing complete reviews of the whole field of religious instruction in public schools in many of its reports during this period. In 1941 it again adopted recommendations reaffirming in principle the complete separation of church and state, declaring its faith in the high moral teachings of our public schools operated on a secular basis, and calling for an official statement of the Conference's position to be published for the guidance of all concerned.²⁷⁵ For the next two years, members worked on a brochure entitled "Religious Education in Public Schools." This was completed in 1943 and included pronouncements and statements by individuals and organizations and a bibliography on the entire subject.²⁷⁶

Although the Conference had been advocating the Dismissal Time plan, it reluctantly announced in 1942 that it had been unable to supply any data on it.²⁷⁷ This was indicative of the general confusion and apathy which surrounded the consideration of the whole problem. Although it was obvious that

this matter was of ever growing concern, nobody seemed willing to oppose this marked increase of religion in the public schools but the rabbis. Moreover, it was noted that, "some Conservative and Orthodox Rabbis have joined forces in favoring this legislation...and not even all the Conference members are in agreement."²⁷⁸ In an attempt to increase the enthusiasm for action, the committee suggested that the Conference present some papers on the general subject of Religion and State.²⁷⁹ It also issued a plea to the Synagogue Council of America asking that it:

"...call a meeting of representatives of its constituent bodies, of the Civic Protective group and others concerned, to explore this problem looking forward to achieving some common point of view and a program of action, or decide on no action at all."²⁸⁰

This plea was declined by the Synagogue Council in 1943, but the following year it was at last prevailed upon to call such a meeting. This was attended by all the constituent agencies and included representatives of the Jewish Educational Associations and Civic Protective Agencies. It marked, "the first time that such an all-inclusive conference of American Jewry has ever been held to consider this vital problem."²⁸¹ However, this meeting was exploratory and not legislative and it emerged only with a few 'conclusions.' These expressed agreement that opposition should continue and that Dismissal Time programs should be stressed as the positive approach to the problem, and that the Synagogue Council should continue to call similar meetings. There was a difference of opinion, however, regarding attitudes where Release Time has been adopted. The Jewish educators

said to cooperate without renouncing your position, while the Rabbinical groups urged continued resistance. *style*

In 1945, the committee chairman delivered a paper on "Religious Education and the Public School" at the conference of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) in which he urged the public relations organizations to collaborate and work on this problem.²⁸² The same year the Conference issued a call, "to inform the Jewish laity, lest they repudiate and contradict the Rabbis stand."²⁸³

From 1946 to 1949, the reports continued to review current developments. Additional resolutions were also adopted reaffirming the Conference's traditional point of view. It was agreed in 1946 that a digest be prepared relevant to the Conference position on matters of church and state, "which would embody all of these resolutions in a systematic way."²⁸⁴ This was completed in 1948 for distribution to school superintendents and boards of education and the general public.²⁸⁵

The important event of 1948, relative to this discussion, was, of course, the decision in the McCollum case. Immediately after the Supreme Court's ruling, at least twenty members of the Church and State Committee met and endorsed a statement of opinion for the Conference, hailing the decision, reiterating its stand and calling upon churches to unite for intensive religious training within their own institutions.²⁸⁶ This statement, in great length, was presented to the Conference as a whole for adoption and distribution.

A second issue which received attention in the Conference was that of the celebration of religious holy days in public schools. The Conference stood clearly on record as opposed to such celebrations. But, in 1942 it felt that the time had come for more specific answers. The Committee raised some questions. "Shall we also protest?....Are there other approaches?....Or shall we accept the status quo?"²⁸⁷ Unfortunately no attempt was made to answer these questions at that time. The next discussion of this matter is to be found in the report of 1945. Here it is made evident that there is considerable variance of opinion among Conference members. The fact appears to be that most schools have religious celebrations and in the interest of public relations few Jewish leaders have protested. Some rabbis do not even feel that a protest would be well grounded. As a form of solution, some rabbis have encouraged the introduction of joint celebrations, as for example Christmas and Hanukah combined programs. The Conference itself has condemned all such celebrations on the basis that, "two wrongs do not make a right."²⁸⁸ In reality, however, the Conference has only adopted a position. Few members have made it articulate with the result that there has been confusion and disagreement and no program of procedure. Although it was recommended that a special committee study this problem, among others, no further discussion of the matter appears.

The Conference clearly opposed Bible reading in the public schools. The basis of its opposition has been that,

"the Bible required interpretation and interpretation takes the instruction into the field of sectarianism."²⁸⁹ However, greater emphasis was laid on this particular problem during earlier years.

A few other matters should be mentioned at least in passing. These cannot be considered unimportant even though consideration of them was to some extent obscured by the emphasis on the dominant issue of the Release Time problem. In 1943, the Conference concurred in the statement of the Synagogue Council opposing Saturday public school classes in New York.²⁹⁰ In 1945, it expressed increasing concern over religious census taking of pupils, Bible instruction, evangelistic programs in assemblies, and the direct introduction of religious instruction into curriculums.²⁹¹ The same year, as well as in 1947, and again in 1949, the Conference announced opposition to any legislation permitting the use of tax funds for any purposes whatsoever in non-public schools.²⁹² In other words, it opposed public assistance, even for books or transportation, to parochial schools.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, then, was vitally concerned with problems affecting the relationship of church and state. In general it opposed, mainly through its pronouncements, any efforts to breach the wall of separation between the two. Nevertheless, its position was not always clear cut. It recognized that in the interest of public relations, neither its own individual rabbis nor

their congregational adherents were prone to inject themselves into ardent public opposition. The Conference had to content itself, therefore, with issuing guiding statements and attempting to arouse the interest of other organizations to action.

Social Legislation

Employment Discrimination and F.E.P.C.

The viewpoints of the Central Conference of American Rabbis on matters of social legislation are quite clear and unequivocal. However, they are manifest, for the most part, in the form of pronouncements without an organized plan for implementation or direct action. The task of this chapter, therefore, will be primarily to ascertain what were the issues that the Conference considered and what stand did they take upon them. The financial limitations of the Conference, its structure as an advisory body and the manifold responsibilities of its members as full-time congregational spiritual leaders precluded any organized direct social action program on a large scale. On the agendas of the Conference and in their deliberations, these matters, nonetheless, were considered as of extreme importance.

At the outset of the decade, the Central Conference was concerned with the general problem of unemployment. It participated with the other important church groups in an Interfaith Conference on Unemployment at the nation's capital in 1940. Congressmen and lay leaders also participated in the sessions. Papers were read and discussions held resulting in the issuance of a report. The substance of the report condemned unemployment as "a dreadful scourge and a social sin," and called upon the religious bodies to "supply the moral dynamic" for changing its demoralizing effects. It urged a continuing commission of representatives of all

phases of American life to deal with the problem and called upon the national organizations to form such a commission.²⁹³ The Central Conference adopted the report and in addition sent out copies to all its members together with a letter suggesting appropriate use of the material.²⁹⁴

As the war economy rapidly expanded, the general question of unemployment subsided and the emphasis shifted to employment discrimination. In 1941 the President of the United States referred publicly to the flagrant race discrimination in defense industries and the Central Conference quickly adopted a sympathetic resolution reiterating its opposition to 'Jim Crow' tactics in economic life and urging a speedy rectification of discriminatory injustice against Negroes.²⁹⁵ In addition almost every Conference member signed the "Interfaith Statement on Democracy in Defense Industries" for public release. The Central Conference also urged the passage of pending federal legislation which embodied the ideas of this statement.²⁹⁶ A summation of the Central Conference's viewpoint on this issue was best expressed in the following section of the report adopted in 1942:

"We have noted with great regret that discrimination against various groups of Americans continues in many industries...Negroes, Jews and foreigners have been the chief objects of such discrimination. In the name of social justice, we voice our protest against this un-American and unpatriotic practice. To discriminate in employment...is a betrayal of Americanism. We know the national administration is doing its best to do away with such discrimination. We appeal to the moral and patriotic sense of American industrialists to give every individual, regardless of race, creed or color, a fair chance when he seeks employment for which he is qualified."²⁹⁷

From 1943 to 1949, the Conference directed its pronouncements toward Fair Employment Practices legislation. In 1943 it announced "its gratification" when the President recreated a Fair Employment Practices Committee and commended the New York State Committee on Discrimination in War Industry for its positive program. In addition, the Commission on Justice and Peace asked for authorization to approach members of the Conference in the various states, in order to stimulate the organization of similar committees everywhere.²⁹⁸ In 1944 the Conference announced:

"We believe in the principle of equality of sacrifice in times of war. There exists too large a discrepancy between the sacrifices of men in the armed services and those of the civilian population.

"We strongly urge that the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee be made a permanent function of our government. Any discrimination in employment, because of race, nationality or religion is morally repugnant and in violation of the spirit of our Constitution."²⁹⁹

The ideology behind the Conference's support of these measures was based upon the principle of simple justice. As stated in 1946, it was not because it believed that the passage of such bills would immediately usher in an era of economic well-being, but that it points the way to the creation of just relations between man and woman.³⁰⁰ The Conference, therefore, deplored not only the government's failure to pass such a measure permanently, but also the unfair and undemocratic tactics resorted to by the Senate to prevent even a vote being taken. During this year the Conference had also been represented at a Fair Employment Conference held in Washington.³⁰¹

In 1947 the Central Conference adopted another resolution praising the value of Fair Employment Practices legislation in those states which had adopted it and urging others to follow suit. It also authorized one of its members as an official representative in the efforts towards similar legislation in the state of Illinois.³⁰² Only one other reference to this subject was made. In 1949 the Conference once more urged the enactment of legislation on both the national and state levels.³⁰³

Housing

Although the Central Conference made several pronouncements relative to the housing problem of the country, only one of them dealt with the question of restrictive covenants. In 1948, it applauded the Supreme Court decision which declared these restrictive agreements unconstitutional.³⁰⁴ Apparently the Conference did not view this problem as a paramount social justice question of the period.

Its emphasis was on housing conditions in general, which it considered, "the most persistent domestic problem in America."³⁰⁵ As early as 1941, the Conference endorsed a series of institutes held by the National Public Housing Conference,³⁰⁶ but it did not even mention the topic again until 1946. Then it went on record as favoring all methods facilitating the building of modest priced housing for veterans and civilians.³⁰⁷ Another resolution recommended legislation to provide this housing.³⁰⁸

In 1947 the Conference Commission on Justice and Peace set up a separate sub-committee on housing, which appears

mainly to have been responsible for studying the problem. It recommended an over-all public housing program. As the first step it urged the passage of the pending federal bill to set up a permanent National Housing Authority for research and planning. However, this bill was to be considered only a beginning. The Conference recognized that "much more is required to clear slums and rehabilitate blighted areas."³⁰⁹

Again in 1948 it called attention to the grievous need for low-cost housing and expressed regret that Congress had failed to remedy this "national disgrace."³¹⁰

Two important measures were before Congress in 1949 aiming to establish a national housing objective and federal aid to assist slum clearance and low rent public housing. These the Conference endorsed in a lengthy resolution calling for the maximum housing objectives and the elimination of any misinterpretation of the relationship between public housing and slum clearance. It urged that ways and means be found so that state and local authorities could not ignore, "the moral mandate to put the housing act of 1949 into practice at the earliest possible moment."³¹¹ No other action beyond these resolutions was reported.

Labor

Although the Central Conference may not have been in a position, nor possessed the means, to do very much about the labor conditions in the country, it was at least outspoken, prolific, and all embracing in its utterances. Its

policy was clearly 'liberal' and sympathetic towards the interests of the laboring class. On only two occasions was the Conference at all critical of labor. In 1940, disturbed by the disruptive fighting between the A.F.L. and the C.I.O., the Conference joined with religious organizations of other denominations in statements to the Presidents of these two labor groups, asking for peace and unity. In reporting the activities of the year, the Social Justice Commission chairman noted:

"The communications were officially answered in great detail....The religious groups are intimately in the picture at the present time, and may be able to effect service at any moment that a rapprochement seems possible....The goodwill of both labor groups toward us is clear."³¹²

The other instance of criticism regarded the question of absenteeism during 1943. At this time, the Conference adopted a resolution admitting that it was "disturbed by the problem of absenteeism in essential war industry." However, it added, "we cannot believe that this has been brought about willfully by organized labor,"³¹³ and called upon the government to investigate the deeper causes of health, transportation and housing conditions.

It would be an extremely laborious task to review in any great detail the large number of variagated resolutions which the Conference considered or adopted, for they embraced in detail every phase of the labor field. It is feasible only to briefly summarize the main categories.

Here, for example, are a few of its legislative considerations. The Conference viewed sympathetically the National Labor Relations Act in principle,³¹⁴ commended the establishment

of the War Labor Board, called for supplementation of unemployment insurance and the extension of W.P.A., N.Y.A., and C.C.C.³¹⁵ It opposed the creation of another generation of war millionaires and so favored a hundred per cent excess profits tax, rationing, and price controls, but opposed a sales tax. The Conference feared the Conally-Smith 'anti-strike bill' and urged the enactment of a more sober measure which would not sacrifice any of the gains of labor.³¹⁶ It favored the principle of a dismissal wage and urged further expansion of social security.³¹⁷ Though recognizing the wisdom of the Little Steel Formula as a defense against inflation, the Conference urged increased powers for the O.P.A. and wage relief for white collar workers, civil service employees, and teachers. It approved the Murray Full Employment Act and the reestablishment of the National Resources Planning Board and Senate Bill 1050 to extend health facilities for the nation. It called for fair interpretation of the Selective Service Act which guarded the seniority rights of returning service men, and approved the President's appointment of David Lilienthal as director of the T.V.A., - which in turn led to an endorsement of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority.³¹⁸

The obvious confusion with which one is confronted in reading through this interminable list is not unintentional. On the contrary, it conveys the identical impression of the original source material. In many of the annual reports these recommendations were likewise strung together in so incohesive a manner as to leave the reader, and doubtless

the original listeners, stunned and sadly dismayed. Furthermore, the above list covers only a portion of the material from the years of 1940 to 1945. In the ensuing years there was more. The Conference also commended the President of the United States for vetoing the Case Bill and hoped that no other unjust labor legislation would be passed.³¹⁹ It appointed a representative to join the Workers' Defense League to help influence the President to veto the Omnibus labor legislation of 1947 and commended the President for vetoing the Taft-Hartley Bill.³²⁰ When Congress passed the latter law anyway, the Conference strongly criticized the injustices of the measure and urged that amendments be adopted.³²¹

It must be said, however, that in the latter five year period the reports were more clear and incisive in their approach, for Conference members had finally demanded that the Commission chairman adopt at least some degree of brevity and limitation. Certainly it also may be admitted that the Conference did not avoid these issues.

On two occasions, the Conference made reference to the problem of child labor. In 1943, it passed a resolution urging every safeguard to meet the rising tide of child labor. It said, "No necessity of war should be permitted to break through the established standards."³²² Again in 1945, it noted "with disquiet" the rise of child labor. Its report revealed that over one and one quarter million children were being employed at full-time jobs and urged the passage of child labor laws in the thirty-five states

having either none or only inadequate protection.³²³

Unfortunately there is a minimum of evidence of attempts to connect organized religious activity together with the laboring class. In 1946 it was reported that the Commission on Justice and Peace had sent an official representative to a conference called by the Religion and Labor Foundation,³²⁴ but nothing additional is mentioned on the subject. Also at one point in 1942, the Conference expressed some concern that so few Jewish workers ever found their way into membership in Reform congregations. The chairman of the Social Justice Commission said:

"It is ironical that a group of men who have been as social-justice minded as this Conference, has failed to attract working men and women to its congregational membership, as well as other individuals in humble circumstances. This ought to be a challenge to our consciences."³²⁵

The Commission was determined to bring in some concrete recommendations the following year and was giving some thought to establishing a Jewish Labor Temple. Nevertheless, the matter does not appear again in the records.

The only project undertaken by the Conference in this field was the holding of an "Institute on Judaism, Management and Labor" in Chicago in 1947. It consisted of special religious services, addressed by representatives of each of these three groups, round-table discussions and plenary meetings. Resolutions were passed condemning pending restrictive labor legislation and declaring that labor-management difficulties could be peaceably and privately resolved. Proceedings of the Institute were also published.³²⁶

This was considered the major accomplishment of the year, if not of the entire decade.

Price Control

As early as 1943, the Conference called upon the government to provide for a fair sharing of all available food and commodities and to preserve the present price structure and prevent inflation.³²⁷ Again in 1945, it urged that the protective devices against inflation, such as rationing and ceiling prices, be strictly maintained after the war, "as long as necessary."³²⁸ Through 1946 and 1947 the Conference continued to air the issues of threatening inflation and to urge the government to preserve vigilant controls, to ease the suffering and hardships in millions of American homes.³²⁹ It also urged the extension of rent controls until, "such a time as the present crisis is over."³³⁰ In 1947 there was also a special sub-committee on the problem of inflation which submitted an eight page report included in the Yearbook. This report covered a lengthy analysis of the entire economic problem of inflation and the opposition of reactionary forces to government controls. It also indicated the dangerous results adversely affecting the economy, particularly upon minority groups. It concluded with eleven recommendations to control the inflationary problem at hand.³³¹ However, subsequent to 1947 nothing additional appeared in any way connected to this topic.

Agriculture

From 1940 to 1944 the Conference included in its social justice reports a section on Agriculture. The basis seems to have been that:

"In acknowledging the fact that agriculture remains a basic economic pursuit, its problems are of the highest religious concern."³³²

Nevertheless, it would appear to be an almost meaningless gesture to attach any significance to these particular utterances. In general the statements were so broad sweeping and so all inclusive as to exhibit a completely unrealistic approach to the problems. The confusion wrought by the verbose labor pronouncements (see page 126) was even exceeded in these agricultural reports. They seem to have attempted to cover every conceivable problem known to the farmer with smooth sounding generalizations, completely devoid of action or implementation. The reports ran the gamut from land speculation as a violation of the prophet's injunction, to the extension of birth control clinics in rural areas, and in between nothing imaginable was left out.³³³ Perhaps the most unbiased attestation to the truth of this summation is to be observed from the comment of the one Conference member who was daring enough to record his negative vote against such resolutions. He exclaimed:

"I voted 'no,' not because I disapprove of the spirit of the recommendation, but because it is an 'omnibus' recommendation. There are so many things in this one recommendation, so many different ideas that I cannot grasp them all at once..."³³⁴

It cannot be said that the Conference made any appreciable contribution to the welfare of our agricultural population

or economy other than to record its sentiments favoring beneficial ideas and legislation.

Summary

The efforts of the Central Conference of American Rabbis on matters of Social Legislation have manifested themselves mainly in the form of pronouncements and resolutions. These almost uniformly express a liberal ideology based upon the universal religious outlook, rather than any narrow sectarian interest. They have displayed insights into all aspects of the various questions considered, without any overwhelming concentration of attention on particular issues. The Conference recognizes that many of its members, as individuals, have labored arduously on behalf of social legislation, but that as a national organization it could serve only as the spokesman of Reform Jewish religious thought. Its effectiveness is difficult to measure, as is true with all educative and advisory institutions. One weakness, however, is clear. In its attempt to create a complete platform of opinion, the Conference ventured into so many avenues of inquiry that frequently the resultant formulation of opinion exceeded its logical purview of concern and area of even potential effectiveness.

Discrimination and Civil Rights - General

The activities of the Central Conference on matters of Civil Rights did not vary appreciably from its efforts in the other fields of social action. The Conference was not equipped to do much more as a national body than to issue statements and resolutions. Its financial position was made evident by a remark in the report of 1940. This indicated that in some prior years a Social Justice Bulletin had been issued periodically, but that subsequent limitations of finances terminated this publication. A somewhat ³³⁵humorous conclusion follows:

"We have therefore found it necessary in recent years to give far more protracted annual reports." ³³⁵

What is perhaps more important, is the fact that the general pattern of activity reflects a widespread realm of interest, motivated by a religious philosophy. The concern of the Commission on Justice and Peace was not Jewish self-defense. There existed a separate committee for this purpose. ³³⁶ Its end was to effectuate a socially conscious Jewish religious community through the building up of an enlightened and progressively active congregational life. This is clearly indicated from the remarks of the Commission chairman in the 1940 report:

"For some time there have been recommendations that individual congregations have committees on Social Justice. In some few instances these do exist. In still fewer, they occasionally function.

"If there is any validity to our assertion that the congregation should be the dominant voice in the moral life of the community, there must be an effort within individual congregations to build up these social justice committees which will take a

courageous stand for Jewish social ideals, particularly when those ideals are being violated in a flagrant manner by a member of the congregation itself.

"We make this not as a recommendation, because we realize that such a recommendation cannot be implemented. We record it, however, as a vigorous suggestion. It is only by such means that we can keep the synagogue before our community as a vital factor on moral issues."³³⁷

It is most unfortunate that this basic recommendation could not be implemented and that we are forced to observe an almost complete inability of the Conference, as an organization, to function effectively in the fulfillment of its high aims and ideals.

In the field of general discrimination the Conference was outspoken, nonetheless, in its criticisms of discriminatory practices. It was vitally aware of the Negro problem in the United States as a "violation of every canon of social justice voiced by our prophets."³³⁸ In its reports it appealed to every segment of our population for enlightened understanding and fair treatment of the Negro race; i.e., the trade unions, the federal government, the army, the state governments, the big business men and the consuming public. These pleas were repeated year after year, with particular emphasis upon segregation in the armed forces and the unions. Special criticism was also levied against the American Red Cross which in conjunction with the army was accused of having segregated the donated blood supplies during the war.³³⁹ In addition strong condemnations were issued of the bloody race riots which occurred in Detroit, Michigan in 1943³⁴⁰ and in Columbia, Tennessee in 1946.³⁴¹

In both instances, the Conference called upon the federal government to intervene and to ferret out and punish those groups or individuals responsible for the atrocities.

Three attempts were made to deal positively with the general Negro problem. In 1945, the suggestion was made that Negroes be invited to occupy the pulpits of Temple congregations for race relations Sabbath. Thirteen members of the Conference acted in accord, most of them for the first time.³⁴² In 1947, this was reported as becoming a growing practice.³⁴³ The second effort was the holding of an Institute on Judaism and Race Relations in New York City, in 1946. One hundred men and women participated in this institute which discussed the general problems and issued a statement to serve as a guide for congregations, laymen, and rabbis. This statement was inserted in the Congressional Record and fifteen thousand copies were printed for wide distribution. It was also published in the Conference Yearbook, that it might become a part of the permanent records. This was considered the "singular achievement of the Justice and Peace Commission this year."³⁴⁴ The third project was the preparation of a statement on race relations in 1947. This statement entitled, "Race Hatred is Blasphemy" was approved by the Conference as a whole and more than twenty thousand copies were distributed throughout the country to Christians as well as Jewish organizations and individuals. It received favorable comment in the press and was read over many radio stations.³⁴⁵

Although the Conference dealt extensively with the Negro problem, it also lent its voice to the support of other minority groups. Particularly during the war period, it condemned frequently the ill treatment directed against loyal alien minorities and protested against legislative restrictions levied against them. In 1940 it recorded its faith in the loyalty of those who had come to this country as refugees either recently or in the past. The Conference urged that they become "full fledged citizens" and that no legislation be passed imperiling the liberties of aliens as a group.³⁴⁶ In 1942, the Conference again stated its belief that, "the vast majority of Germans, Italians and Japanese in this country seem to be in hearty sympathy with the American cause."³⁴⁷ It was pleased that there had been no popular outcry for mistreatment or persecution of these groups. However, it accepted blandly the fact that, "Military authorities deem it necessary to remove some aliens from important military zones" and calmly expressed confidence that these removals would be carried out with all possible humanity. Not a word of protest against this 'concentration camp treatment' was uttered. However, in 1943 another resolution praised the work of the Japanese-Americans serving in our armed forces and deplored the discriminatory legislation that existed against them in some states.³⁴⁸ These sentiments were once more repeated in 1944 when the Conference's opposition was voiced against the resistance of certain western states to permit the return of these Japanese-Americans to their homes.³⁴⁹ This

same resolution included a condemnation of the discriminations being practiced against the three and a half million "Americans of Mexican stock." Once more in 1945 another resolution was adopted deploring these ill treatments of both the Japanese and Mexican-Americans. The Conference stated:

"The imperatives of our faith and the imperiled future of our society demand eternal vigilance for the cause of human brotherhood."³⁵⁰

The Conference also issued several resolutions regarding Conscientious Objectors. It applauded the government's understanding and treatment of such persons during the war,³⁵¹ by permitting them to enter non-combattant service. Many, however, had refused even this and were, therefore, imprisoned and stripped of their citizenship priveleges. After the war, in 1946 and 1947, the Conference issued pleas that amnesty be granted to all conscientious objectors who were still incarcerated and that their full priveleges of civil rights be restored.³⁵² In 1948, the following very interesting resolution was adopted on this subject:

"Basic to Jewish religious belief is the doctrine that all men are free and equal having been so created by God.

"It is therefore against our religious principles to be required to serve in the armed forces of any nation which violates this fundamental tenet of our faith by segregating any group on the basis of color or race.

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the C.C.A.R. regards as a valid conscientious objector anyone who refuses to serve on this basis."³⁵³

In addition to the foregoing, the Conference passed from time to time other broad and sweeping civil rights resolutions, none of which was it capable of implementing

in any noteworthy manner. For example in 1942, the report condemned, "incompetency, corruption and collusion with criminal elements" in many parts of our country and stressed the need for civic reform in municipal, state and federal governments.³⁵⁴ But what could the Conference actually do other than to recommend that the religious leaders of America interest themselves actively in civic affairs and civic organizations? In 1946 it urged that the armed forces be democratized, that social distinctions between officers and enlisted men be abolished, that facilities be made equal for all ranks and that the entire system of military justice be reviewed and revolutionized.³⁵⁵ But of what effect is the mere adoption of such a resolution? Similarly in 1947, the Conference lauded the President's Committee on Civil Rights and expressed the hope that this would strengthen the federal government in its protection of the individual citizen, but no implementation appears to follow.³⁵⁶

The only other project undertaken by the Conference was an Institute on Judaism and Civil Rights held in St. Louis in 1948. Relative to this, it was reported that the attendance was good, the round-table sessions excellent and the statement that grew out of its deliberations well received.³⁵⁷ This is the Central Conference of American Rabbis in action.

Group Libel

Nowhere in the proceedings of the Central Conference is the concept of group libel or group libel legislation considered as a singular civil rights issue. Only once, in 1939, does anything which approximates this problem appear. Then in a resolution dealing with a specific Supreme Court decision the Conference stated:

"We will support legislation designed to curb that freedom of speech which libels or slanders religious or racial groups."³⁵⁸

Nothing additional appears to give any indication of the Conference's stand on this matter. It would appear proper to conclude that the Conference took none.

Anti-Poll Tax and Anti-Lynching

The Central Conference strongly favored the enactment of both anti-poll tax and anti-lynching measures. However, once again its activities were confined exclusively to the adoption of resolutions and the issuance of one or two other pronouncements. In 1940, without taking any official stand of its own, the Conference nevertheless stated:

"We find ourselves in delighted accord with the splendid achievement of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare....We particularly endorse that resolution...which asks that legislation be enacted doing away with the poll tax."³⁵⁹

Again in 1946, the Conference directed the attention of its members to the splendid work being accomplished by this southern organization. The Conference particularly praised the efforts of this organization on behalf of the abolition of the poll tax in the face of its being, "denounced as

'radical' and 'communist' by the reactionary forces in the South."³⁶⁰

In 1942, the Conference passed the first resolution announcing its own stand on the question. It read:

"We appeal to the citizens of the states which impose the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, frequently intended to disfranchise the Negro, to abolish this iniquitous undemocratic practice."³⁶¹

These sentiments were reiterated in a statement of 1943, as "a denial of the American spirit."³⁶² In 1944, the Conference lauded the decision of the Supreme Court which gave Negroes equality in the primary elections in southern states and again urged the abolition of the poll tax.³⁶³ In both 1948³⁶⁴ and 1949³⁶⁵ the Conference endorsed federal action and legislation to remove this discrimination from a segment of the American population.

With regard to anti-lynching measures, however, the Conference had announced its endorsement of federal legislation to this end as early as 1920. It did nothing more than repeat this endorsement over again in 1943, 1947, and 1949.³⁶⁶ It is evident that the Conference viewed these two injustices as crimes against the Negro group which were completely incompatible with a religious or democratic outlook.

Loyalty

The Central Conference viewed with apprehension the actions of the federal government in setting up a loyalty program for its employees in 1947. In principle, however, *style* it approved when stating:

"Our government, like that of every other nation, has the right to demand the loyalty of those who serve it. President Truman was justified in issuing his executive order for an investigation into the loyalty of federal employees. We recognize this step as a contribution to national security..."³⁶⁷

Nonetheless, the Conference was sharply critical of the methodology to be employed and recognized that as formulated these investigations would also prove a great, "threat to the well-being of hundreds of thousands of patriotic men and women." The balance of its statement, though somewhat weak and cautious, substantiates the fears of Conference members that civil rights would be encroached upon by the implementation of the presidential program.

"The atmosphere of surveillance and suspicion will create a demoralizing sense of insecurity in the hearts of liberal minded employees who fear that the price of New Deal opinions may be dismissal. Furthermore if the administration of the President's orders is left to fanatical and stupid officials, they will begin a witch hunt against those whose beliefs differ from their own.

"We propose the following modifications in order to preserve the full civil rights of the employees:

"1. Organizations and individuals charged with disloyalty should be given a fair opportunity to present their side of the case, rather than being made victims of Star Chamber proceedings.

"2. The names of blacklisted organizations should be published so that employees should not affiliate without knowledge of their true significance.

"3. The task of assuring the loyalty of government service should be delegated only to men who are outstanding for character, fairness and decency."

In 1948, the Conference expressed its strong dissent from any legislation which, although intended to suppress subversive groups, threatened the liberties of all men.

It disapproved therefore of the Mundt-Nixon bill then

before Congress.³⁶⁸ In another resolution the Conference also recorded its alarm with the emergence of post war hysteria indiscriminately directed against political non-conformists and which intimidated the exercise of the freedoms of speech, thought and press. It also condemned the deportation of law abiding non-citizens because of their political convictions.³⁶⁹ In the same year the Conference adopted still another resolution condemning the practice of imputing guilt merely by association, and criticizing the tendency by high government officials of branding individuals and organizations subversive without specifying the basis of the disloyalty or clearly defining its terms.³⁷⁰ Again in 1949, the Conference reiterated its condemnation of the process of imputing 'guilt by association' and noted that this practice by the federal government had encouraged similar actions by a number of states which, "has led to a mass hysteria which frequently makes a travesty of justice in our democracy."³⁷¹ No action was taken to implement these resolutions.

Compulsory Universal Military Training

The Central Conference often made public its consistent position of opposition to compulsory military training. This position was first adopted in 1926 and was frequently reiterated by supportive resolutions during the years prior to our period of study. In 1945, the Commission on Justice and Peace again issued a statement opposing compulsory military training in time of peace. To further ascertain

the will of its members, a poll was subsequently taken of the membership. The results were that one hundred forty voted against the training program while seventy nine approved of it.³⁷² It is obvious, however, that the majority did not respond. A similar resolution was adopted again in 1946 and another poll brought substantially the same results.³⁷³ In both 1947 and 1948, this position was reaffirmed by additional resolutions, although no other action was taken.³⁷⁴ By the time of the 1948 resolution, however, a draft law had already been passed. In view of this, the Conference included in its resolution an additional statement urging the reform of the court martial procedure and the abolition of caste privileges and racial segregation.

Summary

It is evident that the Central Conference had a compelling concern in matters of civil rights. It spoke out forthrightly in resolutions and statements on a widely extensive number of issues. There has been exhibited little or no evidence of self interest or a motivation based upon Jewish defense. The basis of the Conference's utterances has been consistently the religious belief in the equality of all men and the ideology of the brotherhood of all humanity. The pronouncements reflect the highest social ideals developed in Judaism throughout the ages. Unfortunately the limitations of the finances of the organization and the available time of

its individual members restricted the activities to little more than the pronouncements it issued. However, these have served as a sounding board for the unification of rabbinic thinking, as a clearing house for social concepts and ideas and as a stimulating incentive for supplemental activity by the rabbi as an individual and by the various congregations he serves.

CHAPTER IV

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

| | page |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| I. Introduction | 145 |
| II. Church and State | 146 |
| III. Social Legislation | 154 |
| IV. Civil Rights | 163 |
| V. Conclusion | 175 |

Introduction

The initial aim of this survey has been completed. We have studied in detail all aspects of the social action programs of these three organizations. It has become evident that even though social action per se was not the prime interest of any of these national bodies, each has devoted a great deal of effort to problems that fall in this category. Each organization has been viewed separately, noting the areas of concentration of effort, techniques and methods of operations and obvious results and accomplishments. It becomes necessary now to give some consideration to a comparison of the three programs.

In the chapter that follows, we shall not only summarize the activities of each organization in the three principal areas of Church and State, Social Legislation and Civil Rights, but we shall particularly note the points of similarity and the issues of conflict. We shall also attempt to interpret the reasons for these agreements and disagreements, in terms of the structure and backgrounds of the organizations themselves.

And then finally, we shall endeavor to draw a picture of the interrelationship between the activities of these agencies and the overall Jewish community in order to ascertain whether or not any clear-cut image presents itself of the American Jewish Community in the field of Social Action.

Church and State

In the over-all picture of organizational activity, the C.C.A.R. alone considered matters of Church and State an area of prime interest. It alone expressed continuous concern through the whole decade. It was the only one of the three national bodies which had a special committee devoted entirely to this problem. However, this was not an action committee, but merely an advisory committee. Therefore, from this fact alone, we cannot conclude that the C.C.A.R. was any more effective than the other agencies.

One question received the overwhelming amount of attention by all groups, namely that of religious education in the public schools. There was complete agreement in certain phases of ideology. All predicated their opposition to intrusions by religion upon the public school system upon the belief in the traditional American concept of 'the wall of separation between church and state.' All were strongly opposed to Release Time programs. However, the time schedules varied. The C.C.A.R. expressed itself on these matters during the entire period. This was not a new activity in its agenda. The Committee, on the other hand, was quite late in entering this field. Not until 1946 do we find the beginnings of any sustained interest. The Congress presented a pattern more difficult to analyze. Its auxiliary Women's Division showed some interest in 1941. Subsequent to this, however, only sporadic articles and editorials appeared, with years of apparent complete disregard intervening. A heightened enthusiasm was evidenced in 1947 and 1948 when the Congress

played a leading role in the national court battle, the McCollum case. Subsequently, however, its interest again waned, despite the fact that this case did not settle the issues at all, but only served to clarify the direction of much needed future activity. Coincident to the Congress' apparent withdrawal, came a deepening awareness of the problem on the part of the Committee, which at the close of the decade was immersed in plans for sustained future activity. Whether or not the Congress has yielded in this field to the Committee is a matter which can be determined only by a study of the succeeding years.

Despite the determined opposition to Release Time programs, it would not be altogether correct to say that there was unanimity of thinking on this subject. Actually there was a great deal of confusion. In general, it seems as if all the organizations recognized that here was an extremely important and delicate problem that required attention, but that no one was quite sure just what to do about it. Religious protection is an essential for minority groups. Thus all were concerned for reasons of Jewish self-defense. But there were other ramifications of the question. The advocates of religious training in schools, denied that separation of church and state meant that schools should be godless. Thus Jewish organizations were somewhat reticent towards public actions which would render them 'offensive' to their neighbors. So the C.C.A.R. approved the Dismissal Time plan in order to manifest its interest in the religious education of all groups, while the Congress opposed this

alternative, but urged inter-cultural programs. On the other hand, the Committee declared the Dismissal Time less objectionable, but was opposed to all such programs. However, it considered it preferable for Jewish communities to register their protests through some non-Jewish body.

The C.C.A.R. was largely instrumental in paving the way for the degree of unanimity that was finally achieved and for the fruitful legal action that was jointly undertaken. As early as 1942 it issued a plea to the Synagogue Council to call a meeting of all national bodies to explore the problems and to arrive at a common viewpoint and program of action. In 1944 such a meeting was finally held, and although it did not record any notable accomplishment, a movement was at last underway. Again in 1945, it addressed the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), urging its constituents which included the Congress and the Committee to collaborate and work on this vital problem. These activities of the C.C.A.R. may have gone far in stimulating the interest of the other groups. As an advisory body, the only other activity in which it could engage was the issuance of pronouncements and public statements of its policies.

The most significant concrete accomplishment of the period was the victory achieved in the McCollum case. This legal testing of certain aspects of the Release Time Program was ruled upon by the United States Supreme Court in 1948. The defense brief was filed jointly by the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) and the Synagogue Council of America. In this sense, all three organizations

were at least indirectly represented, although it is clear that the Congress claimed most of the credit for the work. This marked the first instance wherein practically all American Jewish Organizations united together for legal action. It appears that the primary reason they were able to unite for this action was because this was not an area of competition. Certainly neither the Congress nor the Committee had been previously engaged in any extensive campaigns on this issue. Prior cases in the lower courts had not commanded their attention. In addition, no single organization, even including the C.C.A.R., had managed to emerge with a particularly strong and unified viewpoint. Thus combined action presented a picture of greater solidarity than would have been attainable elsewhere. It was not a decisive victory, however, and many of the issues are still unresolved.

It is doubtful whether the record of the C.C.A.R. indicates any promise for increased future action. Its last effort on this issue was to produce a statement of opinion, hailing the court decision and calling upon churches to unite for intensive religious training within their own institutions. Plans for any detailed implementation were not evidenced. Furthermore, the advisory nature of its church and state committee precludes the likelihood of any new or decisive activity being initiated on its own. Perhaps its greatest contribution has already been made in the attempt to rouse the community in general and the other

national agencies in particular to an awareness of the importance of the issues.

It is more likely that the Committee and the Congress will carry the larger part of the difficult job ahead. The Committee has declared these matters to be of prime importance in its developing program and the Congress, despite its apparent decline of concern at the close of our period of observation, will most probably reawaken itself whenever crucial legal opportunities present themselves.

On the question of the celebration of religious holidays in public schools, no clear picture of the views of the Jewish community emerges. The C.C.A.R. stood on record as opposed to such celebrations, in order that it might be consistent with its belief in the complete separation of church and state. But it was unable to do more than take a position. The fact was recognized that most schools had such celebrations and that many rabbis did not feel that objections were well grounded. Indeed many of them preferred to suggest joint celebrations as a solution. The Committee would not even take a positive stand, even though its members, meeting in Workshops, pointed out the inconsistency of demanding the separation of church and state on the one hand, and then advocating joint holiday celebrations on the other. In reality, the Committee adopted a hands-off policy, suggesting merely that there were many facets to this complicated problem, and that, therefore, individuals or groups should act with the greatest of caution when likely to affect the status quo. The Congress virtually overlooked

this problem, other than to suggest that inter-cultural celebrations devoid of religious content might hold the key to a solution. It is clear, however, that nothing was done other than to discuss the matter and to publish the opinions and findings of the groups.

There were a number of other matters which were symptomatic of the trend of religious groups to encroach upon the public school system and to invoke state and federal aid in behalf of sectarian interests. Among these we might list such matters as Bible reading, sectarian hymns, employment of teachers clad in the garb of religious orders, evangelistic assembly programs and the direct introduction of religious instruction, all of these in the public schools. The C.C.A.R. was outspoken in its condemnation of any practices of this type, during the entire period of our study. It frequently went on record stating its views. By the end of the decade, the Committee also began to recognize that these problems merited consideration, but it did little more than deplore the fact that there was no apparent technique for enlisting the interest of the American public. The Committee, whose main desire was to combat anti-Semitism, could hardly be expected to raise a strong cry alone on such volatile issues. After all, such action would more than likely tend to increase hostile feelings rather than alleviate them. The Congress, however, avoided all of these questions. Perhaps they were not as evident in New York, or else other problems loomed as more important. No other reason is apparent. It showed a degree of regard in only

one other matter. On two occasions, Congress representatives testified before House and Senate committees in Washington, on behalf of bills for federal aid to education. In both instances, while supporting the measures, it indicated its determined objections to the granting of any such aid to parochial schools, for any purposes whatsoever. These sentiments were shared by the C.C.A.R. in its pronouncements issued at the same times. The Committee, perhaps because of its hope for closer working relations with Catholic groups, refrained from comment on this matter.

We see, therefore, that in the whole area of church and state relations, only one question has commanded the consistent attention of the organized Jewish Community, namely, the introduction of Release Time religious education programs into the public schools. Many resolutions and pronouncements have been uttered by the national agencies, expressing opposition based on the belief in the complete separation of church and state in America. The C.C.A.R. offered the most sustained program of activity. Acting in an advisory capacity, it was the pioneer Jewish agency sounding the alarm and attempting to arouse the direct-action groups. The Congress expressed concern early in the decade, but maintained only sporadic interest through the years. The Committee became only vitally interested toward the end of the period, but it has made the questions of church and state a focal point of its future plans. Except for the single victory of the McCollum case, the problems in this area remain the same at the close of the period as at the

beginning. Actually they have become even more aggravated, as the violations increased enormously during the ten years. Opportunities for extensive activity lie ahead, but the complete lack of agreement in attitude and outlook, both on the part of the Jewish community in general and the national agencies in particular, presents a picture of limited optimism at least for the immediate future. It seems that the process of Jewish assimilation into American life has had the effect of minimizing the concern about these problems. So long as the 'status quo' does not appear overly threatening, Jews are likely to accept the notion of this being a Christian country whose holidays, customs and even teachings they can absorb as a part of a pseudo inter-faith program. Judaism will maintain itself through its own institutions, without the necessity for waging public war on behalf of 'secondary' rights, which run the risk of offending the indulgent majority.

Social Legislation

Only in the case of the C.C.A.R. is it possible to find the traces of an extensive and inclusive program for the general advancement of social legislation. Both the Congress and the Committee displayed more limited interests, with emphasis placed on one or two issues. However, the apparently broad program of the C.C.A.R. must be largely discounted when making an evaluation. It attempted, as the spokesman for Reform Jewish religious thought, to create a complete platform of opinion on matters of social legislation. In fact, it seemed more significant to this advisory group that it should have something to say on every important issue than that it should be able to do anything, as a body, about any one of the issues. The result was a confusing mass of resolutions and pronouncements. It is possible to extract and reword the multitudinous utterances of the Conference during this ten year period and to emerge with a succinct and perhaps impressive statement of its liberal social idealism, but this would be missing the point. The point is that this would be merely an extract, merely a polished statement. It would not present the true picture of the endless verbage and repetitious monotony of its year after year deliberations. Lacking funds, devoid of skilled personnel and trained specialists, the C.C.A.R. could provide little more than a 'plaintif cry to the human conscience' and a linguistic application of the injunctions of the ancient prophets to the problems of the modern day.

In this respect, however, it commands our attention. The C.C.A.R. did not approach these problems with the narrow self-interest of the Congress and the Committee. It did not blind itself to the broader issues. It was the whole area of unemployment that the Conference labeled as "a dreadful scourge and a social sin." It was the employment discrimination against any group which the Conference called un-American and the violation of "simple justice." It was the failure to clear away the slums and to provide adequate low-cost housing and rentals that it branded as the "national disgrace." Its interest in labor was not that of the Congress and the Committee. These two were concerned primarily with combatting anti-Semitism and bigotry in the ranks of the unions. Only the C.C.A.R. expressed continuous and vital concern with the manifold other problems, such as, wage controls, sales tax, anti-strike measures, forms of relief (W.P.A., N.Y.A., C.C.C., social security, public health, etc.), restrictive legislation and child labor. The broad religious motivation of the Conference would not allow it to ignore any of the basic problems. Thus price and rent controls and the whole area of inflation, as well as the numerous matters affecting the welfare of our agricultural population found their way into expressions of Conference opinion, while being completely ignored by the Congress and the Committee.

We are left then with a paradox, for what was the Conference's strength was also its weakness. Its strength was its ability to perceive the broad extensiveness of the

issues it considered, the necessity to arouse public opinion in so many directions. But this was also its weakness, for it completely lacked the means to cope realistically with such an enormous task.

The Congress and the Committee avoided these pitfalls. Their activities were confined to a few specific issues which they were better equipped to handle, and in which they had a more intensive, and perhaps a more selfish interest. The main difference between these two bodies was that the Committee entered this sphere of operations at a much later date and limited itself to work involving mass media publicity and direct legal actions.

We have seen that activity relevant to employment discrimination formed the area of the Congress' greatest intensity of effort on the domestic scene. This interest was an outgrowth of the concern for Jewish unemployment during the depression era of the thirties. The Committee's preoccupation during those early years had been exclusively in combatting the mounting tide of overt anti-Semitism. Thus we find no parallel of action during the first half of the decade we have been considering. The Congress engaged in an endless task of surveys and studies relevant to employment discrimination against Jews in all types of occupation. It not only made statistical studies but sought through personal intercession and discussions and pressures and educational programs to alleviate these restrictive conditions. It concentrated not only on employers but also on the means of employment. That is, it waged numerous campaigns against

the discriminatory activities of both government and private employment agencies and against the newspapers which carried anti-Jewish advertisements. Some of these activities continued during the entire decade, and through the abilities of trained and skilled technicians met with considerable success. These activities were largely undertaken in the New York area, where the Congress was strongest, but they extended to some degree to other major metropolitan centers. No similar actions were undertaken by the Committee, or for that matter, by the C.C.A.R.

The Congress' intensity of interest in matters of employment discrimination led to its early concern with the legislative approach to the solution of these problems. From the early forties it endeavored to bring pressures upon legislators to aid the passage of F.E.P.C. and other anti-employment discrimination laws. The Congress pursued a variety of techniques on local, state and national levels. It held frequent meetings to discuss pending legislation, announced public sponsorship of bills it approved and urged its members and the public to "write and wire" their legislative representatives. Numerous articles and editorials contributed to its educative process, and brought to public attention any improper actions of elected officials. As early as 1942, Congress spokesmen were appearing before government hearings concerning anti-discrimination proposals, and within the next few years it was preparing actual bills to be introduced into various legislatures. Although again the largest portion of activity centered about the New York

area, action also extended into several other cities and states, as well as into the nation's capital. In addition to these continuous efforts to secure the initial passage of legislation, the Congress pursued a vigilant campaign of supervising their enforcement. On more than one occasion it sought the legal right to act on behalf of agrieved persons and also to act as if it were itself an agrieved party, whenever the results of its investigative work might indicate violations of law. This too developed into a very important phase of activity. It is evident that the Congress was vitally concerned with every aspect of this issue during almost the whole of the decade and that it pursued every avenue of advantage. Although motivated by its concern for Jewish defense, its notable accomplishments accrued to the welfare of all who suffered from employment discrimination.

The Committee, on the other hand, presents an entirely different picture. Certainly during the first half of the decade, it avoided completely all matters affecting social legislation. Prior to 1944, its records did not even indicate that such problems existed. At this time, it began only to report that some Jewish organizations (chiefly the Congress and the A.D.L.) were concerned with economic discrimination and F.E.P.C. It was only as a result of the formulation of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), of which the Committee was a member, that the Committee seems to have been forced to consider these issues. When the NCRAC went on record as favoring the enactment of federal and state F.E.P.C., the Committee was

awakened. Its interest was still extremely limited, however. It began to report in its publications a few articles of interest, but it took only one step in 1945. Then the president of the Committee testified at the New York state capital on behalf of the F.E.P.C. bill and editorials and articles were printed supporting this measure, and lauding its eventual passage. A change was beginning to take place within the Committee, but it was slow in the making. Not until October, 1947, did the historic resolution appear providing for the unrestricted right of the Committee to act on behalf of all groups, regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin. What is most important to understand about this change in policy is the reasoning behind it. It was not that the Committee suddenly became humanitarian, nor even that it was at last concerned with Jewish needs in the employment field. The prime concern of the Committee was to combat anti-Semitism and this ideology did not change. The reason for the shift in emphasis and the broadening of the base of operations was due to the growing realization, that the root of anti-Semitism was economic unrest and that the only way to cope with this would be to engage in efforts to ameliorate economic injustice and inequality. In addition, the Committee decided that it could not long hope for cooperation from non-Jewish organizations, if it would not in turn offer its services and facilities to them. Thus the Committee's advocacy of F.E.P.C. legislation reflected only a newer approach to the war against anti-Semitism.

The focus of its attention then never extended beyond activities directly connected with legislative proposals. From 1947 on, however, there was exhibited considerable expansion of this type of work and the Committee entered into active campaigns both on state and national levels in a manner somewhat similar to the Congress. Nevertheless, the pages of its periodical carried only fleeting references to these matters. Only the annual reports stressed the importance of what the Committee was doing. The only other technique employed by the Committee was the use of mass media. In all phases of its work, the Committee has always emphasized the importance of this educative process. In the field of social legislation, this came into play in the Committee's attempts to publicize the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947. As we mentioned before, over two hundred thousand copies of a summary were distributed plus hundreds of articles, plays, posters, comics, radio scripts, and the like. This was considered one of the great accomplishments of the period. Indeed, a tremendous stress was laid on this Civil Rights Report. Committee records indicate that this report was the factor most responsible for its entrance into an expanded area of operations. It seems more likely that Congress' success provided a stronger impetus.

The remaining area of activity in social legislation centered around the question of restrictive covenants in housing. While the C.C.A.R. alone considered other aspects of the housing situation in this country, it made no

pronouncements specifically relevant to this issue. On the other hand, restrictive covenants was the only phase ^{style} of the housing question which either the Congress or the Committee considered at all. It is likely that the latter two showed a preeminent concern with this single matter because it so closely affects the rights and interests of Jews.

Once more the Congress was the first to enter upon this area of effort, although it was not until 1946 that any significant activity became apparent. However, the Committee this time was not far behind and by the end of the following year, it was also engaged in full scale legal actions, attempting to secure the outlawing of restrictive covenants by the Courts. Such a victory was achieved by the Supreme Court decision of 1948 which ^{made} forbid the legal enforcement of racially restrictive real estate agreements. Unfortunately this decision has not brought to an end the problem of housing discrimination, and so both organizations are now continuing their efforts to secure municipal and state non-discriminatory legislation. There has been little evidence, however, of joint action between the two.

It is clear then that both the Congress and the Committee confined their activities in the field of social legislation to two problems, employment discrimination and restrictive housing agreements. The reason appears to be that these were of prime interest to the Jewish group. Despite any pronouncements they might have issued relevant to humanitarian concern or public welfare interest, other

questions were completely avoided. The Congress' aim was to secure Jewish rights and the Committee's aim was to combat anti-Semitism. Their programs were geared to these ends, even though indirect benefits may have inured to other minority groups. The Congress was certainly the pioneer in this area, paving the way and testing the effectiveness of its diversified techniques. The Committee entered later and restricted its efforts mainly to legislative action, with little approach to mass action and pressure, other than through the dissemination of educational and publicity materials. The C.C.A.R. alone encompassed in its program a complete coverage of all the issues. Its liberal religious ideology demanded utterances on every issue of social justice for mankind, but its dearth of funds and time and personnel removed these benevolent resolutions from the realm of concrete or effective endeavor.

Civil Rights

There seems to be little doubt that the American Jewish Congress occupies the foremost position as the leading Jewish agency engaged in the fight for civil rights protection. Its emergence into this position, however, was the result of a gradual growth and development. The theoretical aspect of this development was inevitable and natural. It resulted from the logical extension of the Congress' basic ideology, predicated on the working principle of the defense of Jewish rights. It was only a question of time until a deeper understanding of the basic issues led to a realization that the defense of Jewish rights was inextricably bound up with the defense of the civil rights of all other individuals and minority groups. This aspect was natural and thus we have seen also that the American Jewish Committee followed a similar pattern of development, although it emerged more slowly as a result of the Committee's inherent cautiousness and timidity.

The unique aspect of the development which accounts for the Congress' undisputed leadership lay in the practical side of implementation and direct action. The diverse activities in which it engaged prior to 1945 on behalf of purely Jewish self-defense assured its ability to function effectively with the same techniques after 1945, when the new broader policy came into being. If the Congress could organize mass meetings, conduct statistical surveys, send delegations to government groups and sponsor legislation

in the early forties on behalf of Jewish welfare, surely it was prepared to apply the same methods on behalf of the general welfare once it took an interest in these issues. There was one more contributing factor. The complete acceptance of the idea that Jewish freedom and equality depends upon the freedom and security of every American manifested itself in 1945 with the creation of the Commission on Law and Social Action (CLSA). This arm of the Congress was composed not merely of Jews, but of representatives of all classes and segments of American life. As a result, it would have been almost impossible for the Congress to revert back to a narrow or limited preoccupation with matters which affected only Jews. Furthermore this Commission was designed to emphasize the technique of legal court action which has since grown to be one of the most effective devices in the defense of civil rights.

These are the reasons why the Congress which was concerned in the early years only with exposing anti-Jewish libel and anti-Semitic organizations, and anti-Jewish discrimination grew in 1946 to 1949 to be so deeply concerned with all problems of segregation and discrimination against any group. This is why the Congress helped to create a friendly "Youth Town" out of New York Coney Island's warring racial factions in 1945, and sponsored mass-meetings to protest Negro killings in 1946, and conferences on religious and civil liberties in 1947, and went to court to protest alien legislation in 1948 and questioned the constitutionality of an Hawaiian statute in 1949. There was indeed a marked

distinction between the two halves of the decade. It is only in the latter half that a number of articles appear displaying such a vital interest in combatting racism, studying the roots of group hatred and showing communities the way to rid themselves of prejudice. We have witnessed during this period the dynamic growth of an organization.

With the American Jewish Committee, the pattern is different. Of course, it also followed the natural aspect of development toward expanded enlightenment, but more slowly. It, too, gradually realized that to be effective in its basic aim of preserving Jewish rights, or more specifically, of combatting anti-Semitism it was equally necessary to cooperate with other minority groups and to adopt some concern for their welfare and interests. But several factors hampered the rapid acceptance and recognition of this idea. The Committee's charter, supported by at least a tacit agreement among its members, seemed to indicate that the organization had only the right to deal with problems affecting the Jewish group exclusively. It overtly resisted any attempts to change this basic concept. It was traditionally opposed to taking stands upon controversial issues or matters upon which its members disagreed. Thus it continued to avoid the broader issues, even when it began to realize that this was inconsistent with its goals and that sooner or later it would have to yield. The historic discussions and meetings of 1946 and 1947 finally brought about the change and resulted in a resolution declaring that the Committee at

last deemed it proper to join with other groups in the protection of the civil rights of the members of all groups.

But the Committee was still not prepared to engage in any extensive campaign, nor was it equipped to employ a variety of techniques. Its earlier activities controlled its methods. In its years of exclusive concern for anti-Semitism, it had relied primarily upon the educative process. It shunned demonstrative public activity. The Committee acted for Jews rather than with Jews. It had long advocated the 'hush-hush' or 'quarantine' treatment for public enemies. It was not a mass organization. Prior to 1944, it had no branches and its membership was only about four hundred. It had assumed its position of prominence only because it was composed of persons wealthy enough to support its costly 'mass media' activities and influential enough to consort with the non-Jewish leadership, not because it represented any sizable portion of Jewry. This governed its unfolding program in the field of civil rights, to a large extent.

Thus its most important project was connected with the President's Report on Civil Rights. The Committee submitted "a national program for civil liberties" to aid in the preparation of this report. Practically all of its suggestions were incorporated in the final document. The Committee considered this alone an accomplishment. However, this might equally indicate, that the Committee's recommendations had encompassed only the irreducible minimum upon which all the

parties involved could agree, and that therefore, in effect, the Committee itself had made no startling contribution, for many other groups and persons had been consulted.

Following the issuance of this report, the Committee utilized all of its skills in disseminating the information through every avenue of 'mass media,' for this was its strongest weapon of action. It also followed this approach in other matters of civil rights interest. It produced booklets concerning the whole history of civil rights legislation for distribution to state legislators and national congressmen. It issued a "Handbook on Civil Rights," analyzing laws and court decisions on fundamental human freedoms, for popular consumption. It prepared advertisements for newspapers and magazines on brotherhood and human rights and civil liberties. It prepared comic books and radio scripts and occupied itself with the continuous distribution of general materials for mass circulation. It also arranged to have an exhibition on prejudice and fear shown in a number of cities throughout the country.

The legislative activities of the Committee in this direction have been limited. In reality, it is just now making a beginning. In 1947 it took an active part in the campaign to include anti-discrimination clauses in the state charter for New Jersey and again in 1949 it acted on behalf of another Civil Rights statute in that state. In 1948, it met with nineteen other organizations in Washington, to plan the strategy for civil rights legislation in relation

to a special session of Congress. And in 1949, it submitted statements to congressional subcommittees endorsing the proposed Civil Rights Act.

These few activities sum up most all of the Committee's efforts on behalf of civil rights during the entire decade. It is obvious that these have been only limited efforts, but it is equally clear that this has been a formulative period in the Committee's history. In 1944, it began to establish chapters. By 1949, thirty eight were in existence and the membership ranks had swelled to over twenty thousand. This decade witnessed a significant change in policy. But this change occurred too late for thorough implementation to have been manifested by the end of our period. With its new enlightened view and the expansion of its numbers, however, there is great promise for an increased program of activity on behalf of civil rights in the future years.

The C.C.A.R. presents the same picture in the area of civil rights that it did in the other fields of social action. It spoke out forthrightly on a great number of issues, many of which were never considered by the Congress or the Committee. Its utterances were based on the religious belief in the equality of all men and the brotherhood of all humanity, with nothing to indicate any preemptive concern for self-interest or Jewish defense. It hoped only to build up a socially conscious Jewish religious community, by inspiring active congregational life. It sought for the creation of social justice committees within the congregational framework, but it recognized that it could do nothing more than

make this as a "vigorous suggestion." Although, as a national body, it could not implement its ideals, it encompassed in its resolutions the condemnation of almost all discriminatory practices. It considered every phase of the Negro problem, in government, in business, in labor and in the army. It decried the terrible race-riots in Detroit in 1943 and in Columbia, Tennessee in 1946, but the only positive steps it could take were to urge that Rabbis invite Negroes to occupy their pulpits once a year, and to issue statements on Race Relations Day and to convoke an institute on Judaism and Race Relations. These three activities comprised the entirety of its direct action program.

However, the C.C.A.R. did voice itself on many other matters. It alone condemned the corruption in all levels of government, and called for civic reform. It was the only organization to consider extensively the treatment of loyal aliens during the war, and the welfare of conscientious objectors. Nor did any of the other Jewish organizations share the concern of the Conference for the well being of the three and a half million "Americans of Mexican Stock," or for the need of democratization in the armed services. All of these issues fell within the perview of the C.C.A.R.'s deliberations. But the Conference lacked the means of creating a meaningful program of activity. Its social justice committee tried over and over again to enlist the support of its colleagues to extend its advisory function. It insisted on the necessity of a permanent secretary and an enlarged budget. But the Conference as a whole refused to

provide this assistance. It is difficult to understand why. The reason advanced, was that overseas Jewish needs required all of the financial resources it could muster. Whatever the answer, one salient insight emerged. So long as the Conference was unwilling to provide the monetary requirements or in some other way to meaningfully implement its avowed program of social action, we are forced to heavily discount the significance of its utterances. The lofty words would appear then to be little more than rationalizations for the failure to act. This may not have been altogether conscious in the minds of the rabbis. Doubtless many of them actually believe that the religious function, and that of the advisory national body, is merely to set the tone of thinking and to provide the spiritual stimulus through which others may be moved to effective activity. It seems sound, nonetheless, to draw this conclusion, particularly after reviewing the vast areas of concern in which the Conference so lengthily deliberated.

In the specific problems of civil rights, we have seen that only the Congress was deeply concerned with the question of Group Libel legislation. Although the C.C.A.R. announced its support in 1939 of any legislation designed to curb that freedom of speech which libels or slanders religious or racial groups, no other mention of this matter appears during the rest of the decade. The Committee also made only one mention of this question, but it took the contrary viewpoint. In 1947 it announced that it opposed the enactment of any group libel laws, as sanctions against the free expression

of ideas. Apparently the Committee did not consider the matter of grave or pressing importance, for it was not mentioned again. Furthermore, such a proposal which would require widespread public arousal and support could not have come within its sphere of operation during this period. The Congress, on the other hand, directed the largest part of its civil rights interest in this direction, engaging in a full-scale program of writing and sponsoring bills, testifying on their behalf, inciting public enthusiasm and in many other ways giving all possible support to these measures. This was in consonance with its open policy of combatting first anti-Semitism and later all racial bigotry through overt legislative action.

At the close of our period of study, all three organizations had taken clear positions favoring anti-poll tax and anti-lynching laws. Only the Committee was late in announcing its stand, but this as we have seen was due to its narrow, exclusivistic policy of the earlier years. However, there was a minimum of activity in this direction for two reasons. Primarily this was the result of a general agreement, which most social action organizations seem to have adopted, that these issues should be subordinated to that of seeking F.E.P.C. legislation, which was deemed more important. Secondly, it was clearly recognized that these issues had become 'political footballs' and that nothing could be accomplished without a change in Senate rules to prevent filibustering and pigeon-holing.

The problem of loyalty programs did not arise until 1947 when the federal government began its investigations. The American Jewish Congress immediately reacted, however, with strong statements of opposition. It continued to express these sentiments throughout the rest of the decade, criticizing attempts to preserve democracy by the use of measures which limit the practice of democracy and which employ the methods of a police state. It foresaw that such a system generates fear and hysteria and makes independent speech and thought a dangerous adventure. The only legal action it undertook, however, was to file a brief questioning the legality of a New Jersey law requiring a loyalty oath of candidates for public office. As a result the law was declared unconstitutional. The C.C.A.R. was likewise strong in its condemnation of the methodology employed in the government programs, and on several occasions expressed its emphatic dissent from any legislation which, although intended to suppress subversive groups, actually threatened the liberties of all men. It criticized in some detail the government's methods and made several sensible proposals for modification, which might have been heeded to great advantage. Only the Committee was reluctant to express itself on this controversial issue. It maintained its traditional timidity, remaining cautious and careful, guarding itself against becoming publically 'offensive.' Conscious of its dignity and prestige, the Committee could not be expected to pursue a course in direct opposition to the determined action of the government, so long as it could avoid it. In time, the

Committee will doubtless follow suit, but it is reluctant to place itself in the vanguard. The only action it took was to concur in the 1948 statement of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) which suggested that local Jewish organizations should take "action deemed appropriate" where disloyalty charges have been brought because of a person's racial or religious membership or because of his "bona fide" defense of civil rights issues.

We have seen once more that the C.C.A.R. in its pronouncements on civil rights issues covered nearly the entire range of potential concern, but that it lacked the ability to amplify its words with actions. Though it sought at least to inspire its rabbis and congregations, it met with little response. The Conference refused to supply the appropriations necessary for a full-time secretary or an expanded program of activity and few congregations could be stimulated to set up social justice committees of their own. Both the Congress and the Committee grew during the decade into positions of leadership in civil rights programs. Both broadened their basis of interest from early exclusiveness of Jewish self-concern. However, the Congress' development clearly antedated that of the Committee, it expressed itself on a larger number of issues and it employed more diverse techniques. For these reasons, the Congress must be considered the undisputed leader in the field, as has been recognized by other independent groups. However, the Committee seems to be about ready to wage battle for

this title. It has been spurred onward, obviously by the Congress' success. Now that it too has established chapters, increased its membership, copied certain techniques and broadened its arena of action, it is also in a favorable position to effect greater accomplishment. Because of its traditional conservatism and reluctance to act in controversial matters, the Committee's progress may continue to be impeded for a while. But its prestige and wealth will heighten the attractiveness of its appeal for membership, and it is therefore destined to become the more powerful of the two organizations if it so wishes.

Conclusion

To have lived through the 1940's is to have seen not only tremendous changes come over the face of the earth, but also to have witnessed a remarkable alteration taking place within the Jewish community. The force of German Nazism virtually destroyed European Jewry and thrust upon the shoulders of the American Jewish community the role of world leadership. Anti-Semitism, of course, had mounted in America prior to World War II, abetted by the tragedies of the depression plus the propaganda of foreign inspired fascist groups within the country. It resulted in a growing strength being manifested by American Jews rising to their own defense in the thirties. This new strength, however, did not signify unity; it merely indicated an enlargement of activity within organizations which were frequently competitive and even hostile to each other. The Zionist groups grew in numbers and fervor. The American Jewish Committee sought to enlarge its membership for the first time and to engage on a large scale in the combat of anti-Semitism. And the American Jewish Congress likewise carved out for itself increased spheres of activity. But the internal Jewish community was anything but a homogeneous unity. The rich and the poor Jew were still alien to each other. The Jews of west European descent still looked down upon those of east European derivation and ostracized them from their ranks. The anti-Zionists were still strong and harsh in their condemnation of Zionists.

solidarity

It was the period of the forties which witnessed the highest degree of solidity yet achieved within the Jewish community of America. It was the war and its impress that brought about the change. In the first place, the conditions of world destruction clarified to the thinking mind the real plight of the Jews. Actual survival was dependent upon victory. Europe could no longer be realistically viewed as a living place. The United States and Palestine offered the only salvation. It became increasingly evident that the United States was not going to open its doors to all of the victims of war who sought entry. Palestine then became virtually the sole hope of suffering Jews. Thus all American Jews, Zionist and non-Zionist and anti-Zionist alike joined hands in the upbuilding of the Holy Land, at least as a haven of refuge. In the second place, the ending of the depression and the expansion of war industry brought about a new leveling process in the economic circumstances of 'eastern' and 'western' American Jews. Wealth found its way into new hands. Families which had been penniless in the sweat shop era, emerged as people of circumstance, and with this new financial success came an almost immediate sharing of community leadership and social acceptance. The tremendous growth of organizational activities, with the attendant rise in monetary requirements plus the enormous jump in relief costs assured this process.

The impress of the war had two other effects, which were of particular significance to the Jewish community. It brought about a noticeable religious revival, which bore

within itself the seeds for enlightened social thinking and broadened concern. And it also crystallized the atmosphere of social thinking, arousing the National Jewish Agencies to the realization, perhaps for the first time to any marked degree, that what was happening in Europe could happen in America or anywhere else and that the roots of Jewish problems were, therefore, intimately bound up with the problems of every other group within the nation. Anti-Semitism could not be isolated as an exclusive issue. Its causes lay in the disturbances of any faction of national life. Jewish security and total American security were one and the same.

All of these factors brought about, by the time of the war's end, a certain degree of unity in the American Jewish community. But this was only a unity of general sociological structure and general ideology. The overall programs of activity of the national agencies were still in wide variance. The specific goals and techniques and approaches remained quite different. The competitive spirit, if anything, increased. This is particularly true with the Congress and the Committee. Their records reflect a bitterness of rivalry, and a constancy of criticism which have persisted to the present day.

Many attempts have been made to create a semblance of unity among the national Jewish organizations themselves. Thus far all have failed, mainly because of the unwillingness of the components to yield their respective autonomies. This is always the major difficulty. History reveals the same

problem in the creation of federal and world governments. But there is a difference within the Jewish framework. Organizational unity may not be a fundamental requirement. Jewry is not in search of a governing body. It need not be expected to have a single viewpoint on issues which it now understands to be tied up with the concern of all groups. Furthermore, it would be unrealistic to presume that such a unified organ actually represented American Jewry. The fact is that even the individual organizations themselves do not represent the large majority of American Jews. Their memberships are limited in the light of the figure of five million or so American Jews. In addition, we have seen that effective work is accomplished primarily through the actions of trained professional workers. The National Social Agencies are in reality a handful of professionals supported by the contributions of a membership that aggregates a mere fraction of the American Jewish population. The overwhelming proportion of Jews are apathetic, except in regard to benevolences and self-defense. This is also true of the successful national agencies, for we have seen that both the Committee and the Congress were motivated by the concept of Jewish self-defense, and that their actions were closely confined to these areas, at least until 1945. Only the Central Conference of American Rabbis espoused a consistent program for broad social action. But it too was apathetic, unwilling to provide the means for implementing its suggestions and unable to create the working structures within its

congregations. It resigned itself to evolving a 'climate of opinion.' But without attempts to augment its pronouncements, the climate remained cold.

It was the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) which was set up during our period of observation, in the attempt to establish an overall organizational unity. Subsequent to 1949, two of its six major members withdrew (the Committee and the A.D.L.), so that the unity has again disappeared. It functioned as an advisory group and as a clearing-house for thought. We have seen that in the questions of church and state, it provided an object for the Conference's attempts to arouse some interest and support for the fight against Release Time. It appears also that through its facilities the Congress and the Committee came into closer inter-play, which may have spurred on the Committee's development to a broader outlook on social action issues. We noted at least that it brought about a significant action by the Committee in 1946, whereby the Committee adopted a special resolution enabling it to participate in the N.C.R.A.C.'s Legal Affairs Committee. It certainly played a role worthy of more extensive consideration than can be given in this paper. On the other hand, we have seen instances where this overall agency has had the effect of aiding the individual organizations to avoid important matters. In regard to the whole problem of loyalty programs, it enabled the Committee to escape any meaningful action of its own, by simply announcing that it concurred in a weak resolution which the N.C.R.A.C. had adopted. Meanwhile the

Conference and the Committee were crying for strong action to be taken, to oppose these measures on all levels. We cannot look for an overall agency to establish apparent unity, where no real unity exists. Nor is it likely to overcome the apathy which already exists in the groups that come together to form it.

We see, therefore, that although organizational unity has not been achieved, a marked unity in general ideology has emerged. Particularly is this true in the field of social action. The Conference is motivated by its religious belief in human brotherhood and social justice. The Committee is motivated by the desire to combat anti-Semitism. The Congress is motivated by the will to preserve Jewish rights and to prevent Jewish discrimination and suffering. But the events of the world and the development of insight have brought these three groups to a common realization, that their specific ends can be accomplished only through a process of social action which engages in the struggle for the rights and liberty and security of all groups and individuals. This understanding reached fruition only in the closing years of the decade. In this sense real social action programs are only just beginning.

From the past record, it is clear that the activities of the Conference, based on altruism and idealism have failed of implementation, while the actions of the Committee and the Congress based on self-interest and personal concern have proven highly effective, at least in limited directions. The Conference at the close of the decade was engaged in an

attempt to overcome its shortcoming. In combination with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (U.A.H.C.), its lay corrolary, it was busy setting up a semi-professional social action group. The years ahead will indicate what success may be accomplished in this direction. Perhaps it will help to prove whether innate apathy can be overcome by religion and idealism or whether social action is actually dependent upon a close felt self-interest. The Conference pronouncements of the past have pointed out the manifold directions where action is needed. They have indicated many areas which the other organizations completely avoided. Its future work, therefore, should be closely observed to see how extensive a program any single organization can undertake.

It seems fair to say that the Congress was the leader in the social action work of the decade. However, this term can be applied only in a restricted sense. It did not have the broadest outlook, nor was it concerned with the widest variety of issues. In reality it worked principally on behalf of those questions which were of prime importance to the Jewish group; Release Time, because of its deleterious effects upon Jewish children; Employment Discrimination, F.E.P.C. and Restricted Housing Agreements, because the homes and livelihoods of Jews were at stake; Group Libel Legislation, because it was a weapon against anti-Semitism. The Congress' preeminent position was due to the techniques it employed in pursuing its goals, rather than the goals themselves. Fearlessly and courageously, in the face of

any opposition it waged its public campaigns. Unafraid of censure, even from other Jewish groups, it availed itself of all potential weapons. With skilled, trained personnel, it conducted endless surveys and studies, amassed statistical information and case histories, and presented its facts whenever and wherever possible. It consulted with individuals, conferred with companies and organizations and testified before all branches of government. It held forums and conferences and hearings and mass meetings and pursued extensively legislative activity and legal court actions. It not only sent out letters and bulletins, but filed briefs and wrote laws. No enemy frightened the Congress, and no intimidation halted its efforts. This is the approach which entitled the Congress to praise during the years of its efforts in Jewish-defense work, and which indicates the greatest amount of promise for future success, now that a policy of all-inclusive social action interest has been accepted as its goal.

But the future will not be controlled by the Congress' own will. The Congress' cardinal principles relate to Zionism and Jewish cultural living. The attitudes of the American Jewish community to these subjects will play a more significant role in charting the future growth and power of this organization in the years ahead. It is quite possible, moreover, that other agencies, particularly the Committee, will play an indirect, but extremely important part in shaping the Congress' future.

The fact is that the American Jewish Committee has far more prestige and acceptability and dignity than the Congress. To the newly emerged sociologically unified Jewish community this is an important feature. As its members swing to the more acceptable country-clubs and synagogues and fraternities, so will they be easily drawn to the ranks of the Committee. A growth from four hundred to twenty thousand in five years is a clear enough indication. It is true that the Committee is still cautious and timid, that it prefers to emphasize the educative process through the extensive use of 'mass media' publicity and propaganda, and that it shuns away from controversial issues and 'offensive' campaigns. But it has learned a good deal from the experimentations of the Congress and it is rapidly adopting the valuable techniques, without succumbing to the inevitable errors which accompany their development. Now that the Committee too has adopted a fairly broad program for social action, it offers reasonable prospects for success. In addition, together with its ally, the A.D.L., a gigantic financial partnership has been created. The Committee will make social action fashionable, and this will insure it an outstanding position.

We have reason then, to leave our period of study with a little more hope than we were entitled to at its beginning. At the outset of the decade, social action meant little more in the Jewish community than the repeated, unfulfilled outcries of the rabbis for social justice and reform, coupled with the defense activities of the other national

agencies. By the end of the decade there has developed an acceptance by all of the idea that American Jewry must work for the rights and protection and assistance of all other individuals and groups, that in reality mankind is one and indivisible. There is a marked indifference to matters of church and state. American Jews do not seem to sense impending danger from this direction. There yet remain areas of social legislation which require concentrated effort, but the record of intensive efforts on behalf of F.E.P.C. and Housing legislation hold promise of more gains in the future. And we may be sure that the whole area of civil rights, accentuated by the pressures of persistent national emergency conditions, will continue as the focal point of social action activity for quite some time.

In the final analysis, however, it must be remembered that social action involves more than ideals and ideas. Behind the thoughts lie the ceaseless works and efforts of men. Without the contributions of countless individuals, there would be no record of victory. The prime task, therefore, of the American Jewish community, possessed as it is of a lofty idealism, is to provide the manpower that will translate its dreams into reality and fruitful accomplishment.

NOTES

Notes

1. John G. Hill, "Social Action," Social Work Year Book 1951. New York, 1951, pp. 455-460.
2. Holy Scriptures. "Isaiah," 58: 6-7. Philadelphia, 1949, p. 549.
3. American Jewish Year Book 1940-1941. Philadelphia, 1940, p. 270.
4. American Jewish Congress, "To Attain These Goals." New York, 1951.
5. D. Petegorsky, "Achievement and Challenge," New York, November, 1949, p. 3.
6. D. Petegorsky, "From Day to Day." New York, October, 1949.
7. Congress Weekly. January 19, 1940, p. 5.
8. Ibid., April 5, 1940, p. 4.
9. Ibid., November 22, 1940, p. 4.
10. Ibid., February 21, 1941, p. 4.
11. Ibid., May 16, 1941, p. 4.
12. Ibid., "Religion in Public Schools." April 27, 1945, pp. 9-11.
13. Ibid., "Religion and Education." March 21, 1947, pp. 5-11.
14. Ibid., January 9, 1948, pp. 10-11.
15. Ibid., March 12, 1948, p. 2.
16. Ibid., May 28, 1948, p. 2.
17. Ibid., March 19, 1948, p. 3-4.
18. Ibid., "Dilema of Religion in the School." February 7, 1949, pp. 9-11.
19. Ibid., February 7, 1949, p. 16.
20. Committee Reporter. April, 1949, p. 5.
21. Congress Weekly. May 2, 1947, p. 2.
22. Ibid., June 2, 1949, p. 2.
23. Ibid., August 22, 1949, p. 3.

24. Ibid., March 12, 1943, p. 16.
25. Ibid., March 21, 1941, pp. 9-11.
26. Ibid., February 23, 1940, p. 3.
27. Ibid., October 23, 1942, pp. 6-8.
28. Ibid., February 23, 1940, p. 3.
29. Ibid., May 10, 1940, p. 1.
30. Ibid., December 27, 1940, p. 4. "Both Colorado and Kansas State Employment Services eliminated the questions of 'religion' in order blanks for employment opportunities through the concerted efforts of the American Jewish Congress. However these make only eight States that have taken such action."
31. Ibid., December 26, 1941, p. 16. "Following action and negotiations by the St. Louis Council of the American Jewish Congress, the Missouri State Employment Service has discontinued the reference to the religious affiliation of workers seeking employment through its service."
32. Ibid., October 23, 1942, pp. 6-8.
33. Ibid., December 6, 1940, p. 16.
34. Ibid., April 25, 1941, p. 16.
35. Ibid., "Who Discriminates and How," February 2, 1941, pp. 6-9.
36. Ibid., January 11, 1946, p. 2.
37. Ibid., "Are Insurance Companies Biased." December 27, 1946, pp. 10-11.
38. Ibid., January 3, 1949, p. 2.
39. Ibid., "About Bias." February 7, 1949, p. 5.
40. Ibid., November 22, 1946, pp. 12-13.
41. Ibid., "Cleansing Ads of Discrimination." February 11, 1944, pp. 5-8.
42. Ibid., June 27, 1941, p. 4.
43. Ibid., December 24, 1943, p. 20.
44. Ibid., January 21, 1944, p. 2.
45. Ibid., "Philadelphia Story of Discrimination." January 28, 1944, pp. 5-8.

46. Ibid., April 28, 1944, p. 20.
47. Ibid., January 24, 1941, p. 4.
48. Ibid., March 28, 1941, p. 2. The first, - in public works contracts, and the second, - in public utilities, banks, insurance companies, and businesses affected with the public interest.
49. Ibid., March 21, 1941, p. 2.
50. Ibid., March 21, 1941, p. 2.
51. Ibid., June 27, 1941, p. 15.
52. Ibid., March 20, 1942, p. 16.
53. Ibid., March 27, 1942, p. 3.
54. Ibid., May 29, 1942, p. 20.
55. Ibid., September 11, 1942, p. 23.
56. Ibid., "Anti-Discrimination Legislation." February 12, 1943, pp. 7-10.
57. Ibid., March 19, 1943, p. 2
March 26, 1943, p. 13.
58. Ibid., February 11, 1944, p. 2.
59. Ibid., February 11, 1944, pp. 6-8.
60. Ibid., February 2, 1945, pp. 6-9.
61. Ibid., February 23, 1945, p. 2.
62. Ibid., March 16, 1945, p. 2
February 16, 1946, p. 2.
63. Ibid., November 8, 1946, pp. 3-4.
64. Ibid., February 14, 1947, p. 4.
65. Ibid., February 14, 1947, p. 8.
66. Ibid., February 28, 1947, p. 2.
67. Ibid., February 12, 1943, p. 16.
68. Ibid., May 24, 1946, p. 2.
69. Ibid., November 23, 1945, p. 2.
70. Ibid., "Death by Negotiation." July 25, 1949, p. 11.

71. Ibid., April 4, 1949, p. 3.
72. Ibid., July 10, 1942, p. 15.
73. Ibid., February 20, 1942, p. 2.
74. Ibid., "A Denial of the President's Orders." January 22, 1943, pp. 5-7.
75. Ibid., November 5, 1943, p. 3.
76. Ibid., April 28, 1944, pp. 6-8.
77. Ibid., June 23, 1944, p. 5.
78. Ibid., June 23, 1944, p. 2.
79. Ibid., September 15, 1944, p. 2.
80. Ibid., October 27, 1944, p. 2.
81. Ibid., January 12, 1945, p. 16.
82. Ibid., June 15, 1945, p. 16.
83. Ibid., June 15, 1945, p. 15.
84. Ibid., June 29, 1945, pp. 10-11.
85. Ibid., December 21, 1945, p. 2.
86. Ibid., February 22, 1946, p. 4.
87. Ibid., May 9, 1947, p. 4.
88. Ibid., February 22, 1946, p. 2.
89. Ibid., March 22, 1946, p. 2.
90. Ibid., "Restrictive Covenants." February 28, 1947, pp. 7-9.
91. Ibid., March 5, 1948, p. 2.
92. Ibid., May 9, 1947, p. 2.
93. Ibid., July 25, 1949, p. 2.
94. Ibid., October 24, 1949, p. 2.
95. Ibid., March 7, 1949, p. 2.
96. Ibid., March 21, 1949, p. 2.
97. Ibid., November 28, 1949, p. 2.
98. Ibid., December 26, 1949, p. 2.

99. Ibid., May 9, 1947, p. 2.
100. Ibid., November 7, 1949, p. 2.
101. Ibid., October 12, 1945, p. 14.
102. Ibid., October 4, 1946, p. 3.
103. Ibid., January 17, 1941, p. 13. The concerns of the young people, in consonance with those of the other Divisions, were to be:
 - "1. Safeguard...rights of Jewish people.
 2. Assist...to reestablish the rights of Jewish people to the Jewish National Homeland.
 3. Expose anti-Semitic organizations,...to refute anti-Semitic libel....
 4. To grant the Allies every possible aid short of war."
104. Ibid., "Is This a White Man's War." December 17, 1943, pp. 8-10, 14.
105. Ibid., February 14, 1941, p. 13.
106. Ibid., February 7, 1941, p. 16.
107. Ibid., April 30, 1943, p. 20.
108. Ibid., July 25, 1949, pp. 12-15.
109. Ibid., January 17, 1949, p. 2.
110. Ibid., April 4, 1949, p. 2.
111. Ibid., June 11, 1948, p. 2.
112. Ibid., January 30, 1948, pp. 3-4.
113. Ibid., March 3, 1944, p. 2.
114. Ibid., January 12, 1945, p. 16.
115. Ibid., "These Our Prejudices." November 30, 1945, pp. 9-10.
116. Ibid., November 16, 1945, p. 13.
117. Ibid., November 16, 1945, p. 13.
118. Ibid., January 4, 1946, p. 2.
119. Ibid., March 26, 1948, pp. 14-15.
120. Ibid., November 8, 1948, pp. 13-14.
121. Ibid., May 9, 1949, pp. 12-13.

122. Ibid., "On Combatting Racism." April 25, 1947, pp. 7-9.
May 9, 1947, pp. 13-15.
123. Ibid., February 13, 1948, pp. 4-5.
124. Ibid., April 12, 1946, p. 2.
125. Ibid., January 24, 1947, p. 2
April 25, 1947, p. 2
May 9, 1947, p. 2.
126. Ibid., February 20, 1948, p. 2.
127. Ibid., December 27, 1948, p. 2.
128. Ibid., May 23, 1949, p. 2.
129. Ibid., March 21, 1949, p. 2.
130. Ibid., February 7, 1949, p. 2.
131. Ibid., May 9, 1941, p. 2.
132. Ibid., July 10, 1942, p. 15.
133. Ibid., April 30, 1943, p. 21.
134. Ibid., April 30, 1943, p. 20.
135. Ibid., November 19, 1943, p. 2.
136. Ibid., November 26, 1943, p. 24.
137. Ibid., December 10, 1943, p. 20.
138. Ibid., January 21, 1944, p. 18.
139. Ibid., January 28, 1944, p. 16.
140. Ibid., March 3, 1944, p. 18.
141. Ibid., November 17, 1944, p. 16.
142. Ibid., January 12, 1945, p. 16.
143. Ibid., "How Free Should Speech Be." December 7, 1945,
pp. 6-8.
144. Ibid., February 21, 1949, p. 3.
145. Ibid., September 19, 1949, pp. 9-12.
146. Ibid., January 10, 1947, pp. 4-5.
147. Ibid., January 10, 1949, pp. 5-7.

148. Ibid., March 28, 1949, p. 16.
149. Ibid., November 27, 1942, p. 15.
150. Ibid., November 10, 1944, p. 14.
151. Ibid., February 13, 1948, p. 2.
152. Ibid., January 10, 1949, pp. 5-7.
153. Ibid., May 9, 1947, p. 5.
154. Ibid., February 6, 1948, p. 2.
155. Ibid., May 14, 1948, p. 3.
156. Ibid., April 11, 1949, p. 3.
157. Ibid., October 10, 1949, p. 2.
158. Ibid., October 24, 1949, p. 5.
159. Ibid., April 2, 1943, p. 16.
160. Ibid., March 26, 1948, p. 2.
161. Ibid., April 23, 1948, p. 7.
162. Ibid., November 22, 1946, p. 2.
163. Ibid., April 25, 1947, p. 2.
164. Ibid., April 23, 1948, pp. 5-7.
165. Ibid., "Near Christian Churches." November 1, 1946,
pp. 7-9.
166. American Jewish Committee, "Facts about the American
Jewish Committee." New York, 1951, p. 4.
167. Ibid., p. 7.
168. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, p. 59.
169. Ibid., #35, p. 5.
170. Ibid., #36, pp. 58-60.
#41, pp. 41, 43.
171. See this paper, American Jewish Congress on Church and
State, p. 17.
172. C.G.A.R. Yearbook, 1943, p. 75.
173. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #40, pp. 84-85.

174. Ibid., #41, p. 40.
175. American Jewish Committee Year Book. 5708 - 1947.
176. Committee Reporter. April, 1947, p. 6
June, 1947, p. 5.
177. Ibid. December, 1947, p. 1, and April, 1948, p. 5.
178. Ibid. May, 1949, p. 7.
179. Ibid. July, August, 1949, p. 4.
180. Ibid. April, 1949, p. 5.
181. Ibid. December, 1949, p. 8.
182. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #42, p. 110.
183. Ibid., #43, p. 84.
184. Ibid., #41, pp. 93-95
#42, p. 32
#43, p. 16.
185. Ibid., #41, p. 94.
186. Committee Reporter. December, 1949, p. 5.
187. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #40, pp. 16-17.
188. Ibid., #40, pp. 18-20.
189.
 1. Committee on Public Relations
 2. Committee on Library of Jewish Information
 3. Legal and Information Committee
 4. Community Service Committee
190. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #35, pp. 59-86.
191. Ibid., #38, pp. 7-10.
192. Ibid., #39, p. 27.
193. Ibid., #40, pp. 100-112.
194. Ibid., #41, p. 37.
195. Ibid., #41, p. 34.
196. Committee Reporter. July, 1944, p. 5.
197. Ibid. October, 1944, p. 1.
198. Ibid. January, 1945, p. 6.

199. Ibid. March, 1945, pp. 1, 5.
200. Ibid. April, 1945, p. 3.
201. Ibid. May, 1945, p. 7.
202. Ibid. June, 1945, p. 3.
203. Ibid. July, 1945, p. 8.
204. Ibid. January, 1946, p. 5.
205. Ibid. June, 1946, p. 1.
206. Ibid. February, 1946, p. 2.
207. Ibid. June, 1946, p. 3.
208. Ibid. May, 1947, p. 2.
209. Ibid. May, 1947, p. 1.
210. Ibid. July, 1947, p. 1.
211. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #41, p. 38.
212. Committee Reporter. July, 1947, p. 4.
213. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #42, p. 107.
214. Committee Reporter. June, 1948, p. 8.
215. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #42, p. 109.
216. Committee Reporter. April, 1949, p. 5.
Cleveland Acts on FEPC
"Proposed fair employment practices legislation was discussed at a recent Cleveland meeting of employers arranged by Herbert Rosenthal, chapter chairman. Theodore Leskes, of the AJC civil rights division, addressed the meeting."
June, 1949, p. 7.
"Federal legislature to ensure fair employment practices is urgently needed to protect the employment opportunities of more than 50,000,000 Americans who at one time or another face job discrimination due to racial and religious prejudice, ... chairman of the A.J.C. executive committee declared last month at a hearing of the House labor sub-committee considering F.E.P.C. legislation in Washington."
217. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, p. 82.
218. Ibid., #41, pp. 100-102
#42, p. 31.

219. Committee Reporter. June, 1947, pp. 1, 2.
220. Ibid. November, 1947, pp. 1, 2.
221. Ibid. December, 1947, p. 1.
222. Ibid. January, 1948, p. 2.
223. Ibid. May, 1948, pp. 1, 4.
224. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #42, p. 111.
225. Committee Reporter. June, 1949, p. 8.
226. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, p. 83.
227. Committee Reporter. April, 1949, p. 5.
228. Ibid. June, 1949, p. 8.
229. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, p. 17
#42, p. 37
#41, p. 102.
230. Committee Reporter. May, 1947, p. 3.
231. Ibid. June, 1947, pp. 1, 2.
232. Ibid. October, 1948, p. 5.
233. Ibid. October, 1948, pp. 1, 6.
234. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #42, p. 108.
235. Committee Reporter. June, 1949, p. 3.
236. Ibid. September, 1948, p. 5.
237. Ibid. April, 1949, p. 8.
238. Ibid. July, August, 1949, p. 2.
239. Ibid. September, 1948, p. 7.
240. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, pp. 81-82.
241. Committee Reporter. October, 1947, p. 2.
242. Ibid. May, 1949, p. 5.
243. Ibid. September, 1948, p. 8.
244. Ibid. July, August, 1949, p. 1.
245. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, p. 83.

- 246. Ibid., #40, pp. 107, 110
- 247. Committee Reporter. June, 1947, p. 2.
- 248. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #41, p. 38.
- 249. Committee Reporter. October, 1947, p. 1.
- 250. Ibid. November, 1947, pp. 1, 2
November, 1947, p. 4.
- 251. Ibid. June, 1949, p. 7.
American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #43, p. 83.
- 252. Committee Reporter. November, 1947, p. 2.
- 253. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #40, p. 110.
- 254. Committee Reporter. December, 1947, pp. 1, 6.
- 255. American Jewish Committee Annual Report, #42, p. 34.
- 256. Universal Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. 3, p. 88.
- 257. Ibid. Vol. 3, p. 92.
- 258. C.C.A.R. Year Book. 1942, p. 85.
- 259. Ibid. 1940, p. 107.
- 260. Ibid. 1940, p. 107.
- 261. Ibid. 1941, p. 134.
- 262. Ibid. 1945, p. 108.
- 263. Ibid. 1945, p. 25.
- 264. Ibid. 1947, p. 66.
- 265. Ibid. 1947, p. 107
1948, p. 41.
- 266. Ibid. 1942, p. 88.
- 267. Ibid. 1945, p. 108.
- 268. Ibid. 1946, p. 100.
- 269. Ibid. 1943, pp. 130, 131.
- 270. Ibid. 1945, pp. 128, 129.
- 271. Ibid. 1941, pp. 141, 142.
- 272. Ibid. 1940, p. 93.

273. Ibid. 1947, p. 123.
274. Ibid. 1940, p. 88.
275. Ibid. 1941, pp. 95, 96.
276. Ibid. 1943, p. 77.
277. Ibid. 1942, p. 82.
278. Ibid. 1943, p. 75.
279. Ibid. 1942, p. 83
1943, p. 74.
280. Ibid. 1943, p. 75.
281. Ibid. 1944, p. 103.
282. Ibid. 1945, p. 88.
283. Ibid. 1945, p. 89.
284. Ibid. 1946, p. 155.
285. Ibid. 1948, p. 108.
286. Ibid. 1948, p. 105.
287. Ibid. 1942, p. 82.
288. Ibid. 1945, p. 91.
289. Ibid. 1940, p. 84.
290. Ibid. 1943, p. 77.
291. Ibid. 1945, pp. 87, 88.
292. Ibid. 1947, p. 120
1949, p. 81.
293. Ibid. 1940, pp. 101-103.
294. Ibid. 1941, p. 133.
295. Ibid. 1941, pp. 136, 137.
296. Ibid. 1941, p. 138.
297. Ibid. 1942, p. 99.
298. Ibid. 1943, p. 124.
299. Ibid. 1944, p. 93.
300. Ibid. 1946, pp. 111-112.

301. Ibid. 1946, p. 107.
302. Ibid. 1947, p. 69.
303. Ibid. 1949, p. 130.
304. Ibid. 1948, p. 127.
305. Ibid. 1947, p. 79.
306. Ibid. 1941, p. 133.
307. Ibid. 1946, p. 103.
308. Ibid. 1946, p. 114.
309. Ibid. 1947, p. 81.
310. Ibid. 1948, pp. 128-129.
311. Ibid. 1949, p. 131.
312. Ibid. 1940, p. 101.
313. Ibid. 1943, pp. 125, 126.
314. Ibid. 1940, p. 104.
315. Ibid. 1942, pp. 97-99.
316. Ibid. 1943, pp. 126-127.
317. Ibid. 1944, p. 94.
318. Ibid. 1945, pp. 122, 123.
319. Ibid. 1946, p. 104.
320. Ibid. 1948, p. 128.
321. Ibid. 1949, p. 130.
322. Ibid. 1943, p. 126.
323. Ibid. 1945, p. 122.
324. Ibid. 1946, p. 107.
325. Ibid. 1942, pp. 91-92.
326. Ibid. 1947, pp. 67-68.
327. Ibid. 1943, p. 125.
328. Ibid. 1945, p. 120.

329. Ibid. 1946, p. 114.
330. Ibid. 1947, p. 70
1947, p. 70.
331. Ibid. 1947, pp. 82-90.
332. Ibid. 1942, p. 93.
333. Ibid. 1942, pp. 93, 94, 95
1943, pp. 127, 128
1944, pp. 94, 95, 96.
334. Ibid. 1942, p. 114.
335. Ibid. 1940, p. 97.
336. Ibid. 1942, Discussion, p. 117.
337. Ibid. 1940, p. 99.
338. Ibid. 1942, p. 101.
339. Ibid. 1944, p. 97.
340. Ibid. 1943, p. 149.
341. Ibid. 1946, p. 112.
342. Ibid. 1945, p. 108.
343. Ibid. 1947, p. 67.
344. Ibid. 1946, pp. 106, 107.
345. Ibid. 1947, p. 67.
346. Ibid. 1940, p. 106.
347. Ibid. 1942, p. 105.
348. Ibid. 1943, p. 124.
349. Ibid. 1944, p. 96.
350. Ibid. 1945, p. 126.
351. Ibid. 1942, p. 103.
352. Ibid. 1946, p. 102.
1947, pp. 69, 73.
353. Ibid. 1948, p. 163.
354. Ibid. 1942, pp. 101, 102.
355. Ibid. 1946, p. 103.

356. Ibid. 1947, pp. 218, 219.
357. Ibid. 1948, pp. 117, 118.
358. Ibid. 1939, p. 159.
359. Ibid. 1940, p. 104.
360. Ibid. 1942, p. 113.
361. Ibid. 1942, p. 100.
362. Ibid. 1943, p. 123.
363. Ibid. 1944, p. 96.
364. Ibid. 1948, p. 120.
365. Ibid. 1949, p. 130.
366. Ibid. 1943, p. 123
1947, p. 70
1949, p. 130.
367. Ibid. 1947, pp. 72, 73.
368. Ibid. 1948, p. 128.
369. Ibid. 1948, p. 129.
370. Ibid. 1948, pp. 163, 164.
371. Ibid. 1949, p. 129.
372. Ibid. 1945, p. 110.
373. Ibid. 1946, pp. 102, 108.
374. Ibid. 1947, p. 69
1948, p. 127.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Bibliography

Abrams, Charles. "The Segregation Threat in Housing," Commentary. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1949.

Abrams, Charles. "Stuyvesant Town's Threat to Our Liberties," Commentary. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1949.

American Jewish Committee Annual Report #33 to #43. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1940 to 1950.

American Jewish Committee, "Civil Rights Committee Interim Report #1 on Program and Structure." New York, 1949.

American Jewish Committee, "Civil Rights Committee Interim Report #3 on Program and Structure." New York, 1949.

American Jewish Committee. Committee Reporter, Vol. 1, No. 1 to Vol. 6, No. 11. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1944 to 1949.

American Jewish Committee, "Equality of Opportunity in Housing." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1952.

American Jewish Committee, "Facts About the American Jewish Committee." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1951.

American Jewish Committee, "A National Program for Civil Liberties." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1947.

American Jewish Committee, Our Objectives. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1945.

American Jewish Committee, "The People Take the Lead." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1952.

American Jewish Committee, "Programs and Policy." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1948.

American Jewish Committee, "Straight Talk." New York: American Jewish Committee, n.d.

American Jewish Committee, "To Secure These Rights." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1948.

American Jewish Congress. Congress Weekly. Vol. 6 to Vol. 16, 1940 to 1949.

American Jewish Congress, "To Attain These Goals." New York: American Jewish Congress, 1951.

American Jewish Year Book. Vol. 40 to Vol. 50. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1940 to 1950.

Beard, C. and M. America in Midpassage. New York: MacMillan Company, 1945.

Central Conference of American Rabbis, Commission on Justice and Peace, "Report to the Conference." Nashville, Tennessee, 1948.

Central Conference of American Rabbis, Committee on Church and State, "Why the Bible Should Not Be Read in the Public Schools." Cincinnati, 1922.

Central Conference of American Rabbis, "Program of World Reconstruction." Cincinnati, 1942.

Central Conference of American Rabbis. Yearbook. Vol. XLIX to Vol. LIX. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1939 to 1949.

Fink, J. L. "Summary of Central Conference of American Rabbis Opinion on Church and State." Philadelphia, 1948.

Hill, John G. "Social Action," Social Work Year Book 1951. New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1951.

Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1949.

Justice and Peace. Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1952.

Pekelis, Alexander. Law and Social Action. New York: Cornell University Press, 1950.

Petegorsky, D. "Achievement and Challenge." New York: American Jewish Congress, 1949.

Petegorsky, D. "Progress and Prospect." New York: American Jewish Congress, 1951.

Petegorsky, D. "From Day to Day." New York: American Jewish Congress, 1949.

"Private Attorneys - General: Group Action in the Fight for Civil Liberties," The Yale Law Journal. New York: Reprinted by the American Jewish Congress, 1949.

Schachner, Nathan, "Church State and Education." New York: American Jewish Committee, 1947.

Schachner, Nathan. The Price of Liberty. New York: American Book - Stratford Press Inc., 1948.

Universal Jewish Encyclopedia. New York, 1942.