INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Matthew L. Friedman

TITLE The History and Development of Jewish–Christian Relations Internationally Between 1945 and 1964

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [✓]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

2/6/91
Date

Matthew L. Friedman
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed Date July 1991

Marilyn Kunda
Signature of Library Staff Member

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS INTERNATIONALLY BETWEEN 1945 AND 1964

Matthew L. Friedman

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requiremnts for Ordination
Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute
of Religion
1991
Referee, Dr. Michael A. Meyer

This Thesis is Dedicated to the Memory of:

JEREMY DAVID FRIEDMAN

April 13, 1961 - August 27, 1983

27 Nisan 5721 - 19 Elul 5743

DIGEST

The end of World War II was a period marked by an optimism that the nations would join together to resolve world conflicts through peaceful means. The interfaith movement shared in this hopefulness. Unfortunately, international attempts to establish an organization to improve interfaith relations faltered. The main proponents of these efforts were the leaders of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) in the United States and the Council of Christians and Jews (CCJ) in Britain. Dr. Everett Clinchy spearheaded events in the United States as director of the NCCJ and Reverend William W. Simpson as secretary of the CCJ. The NCCJ was formed in 1928 in response to growing anti-Jewish and anti-Catholic sentiment. Similarly, the CCJ was formed in 1942 to respond to antisemitism.

The CCJ and NCCJ began to work together soon after the CCJ came into existence. The leaders of the organizations envisioned the convening of an international conference of Christians and Jews. The conference, attended by individuals and representative of various national councils of Christians and Jews, was held in Oxford in 1946. The conferees reached two major decisions: to hold an emergency conference on antisemitism and to form an international council of Christians and Jews. The emergency conference met in Seelisberg in August 1947. A major accomplishment of the conference was the writing of the "Ten Points of Seelisberg" which addressed the Christian roots of antisemitism. To the present day that document stands as a landmark work.

A third international conference met in Fribourg in July 1948. The constitution of the International Council of Christians and Jews (ICCJ) was adopted. Unfortunately the Fribourg conference was the first and last meeting of the ICCJ. Everett Clinchy had grander visions. He embarked on a venture called "World Brotherhood," which sought to deal with all sorts of intergroup tensions on a global scale. Internal problems and reluctance of the CCJ to make a major commitment also contributed to the collapse of the ICCJ. The ICCJ formally ceased to exist in 1951.

Despite these problems, representatives of the national councils of Christians and Jews in Europe continued to meet informally during the years that followed. By the end of the 1950s World Brotherhood was fading and interest was renewed in international efforts. Changes in the Catholic Church also began to take place. In 1962 the International Consultative Committee of Organizations for Christian-Jewish Cooperation, which included Catholics, Jews and Protestants held its first meeting, and in 1964 the Catholic Church issued a major statement on the subject of other religions. This marked the end of the postwar period and opened a new chapter in interfaith relations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the assistance and encouragement of many people. First I would like to thank Dr. Michael A. Meyer, who served as advisor to this thesis. Dr. Meyer has a love for learning and teaching. This was evident during the past few months that we worked together. Much of the research for this thesis was done in several archives. Dr. Abraham Peck, Director of the American Jewish Archives was more than a resource person. His guidance, suggestions and encouragement were of great value. The staff of the American Jewish Archives was always helpful. They were willing and able to suggest yet another source.

Important parts of the research for this thesis took place outside of Cincinnati, in fact overseas. Dr. Tony Kushner, Professor of history at Southampton University at Southampton, England not only oriented me to the resource material available there, but opened his home to me. Sr. Hedwig Wahle, a member of the Sisters of Sion in Vienna, has been dedicated to the improvement of Jewish-Christian relations for many years. She provided material on World Brotherhood and the ICCJ from the European perspective. She also assisted by translating several pieces written in German. While overseas, I had the opportunity to participate in the annual colloquium of the ICCJ through the invitation of Dr. Desider Galsky, z"l, who served the Prague Jewish community with much dedication. Dr. Jacobus Schoneveld and Mr. David Schoneveld provided information from the central

files of the ICCJ as well as taking a great interest in this project. David also assisted with translation of German material. While in Prague I had the opportunity to meet and interview several individuals dedicated to Jewish-Christian dialogue in the international arena. They were Lord Bishop Donald Coggan, Ms. Ruth Weyl, and Mr. Paul Mendel.

Stateside, Mr. Dave Klaassen and the staff of the Social Welfare History Archives at the University of Minnesota were of enormous help. The material in Minnesota was very important. I also had the opportunity to speak with Dr. David Hyatt, former president of the NCCJ and the ICCJ. He worked with several many of the people who were important in the development of the NCCJ and ICCJ. Locally, Mr. Chip Herrod of the Cincinnati branch of the NCCJ, provided both material and helpful contacts. Dr. Benny Kraut of the University of Cincinnati, has studied the history of the NCCJ and willingly offered his insights. Ms. Iris Pilling also assisted with translation from German.

Of course every piece of writing comes down to putting words together in a coherent way. Ms. Rita Sherwin and Ms. Heather C. Hay, both of whom have many years of professional editorial experience, were very helpful. Computers too, are a necessity. Ms. Lisa B. Frankel and Mr. Marshall Goodman were always ready with suggestions, and instructions.

Those who write a thesis with Dr. Meyer join a special "chevrah." Mr. Alan Rabishaw and Mr. Steve Moskowitz offered helpful advice and encouragement throughout the process.

Finally, I would like to than, my family, friends, classmates and congregants who have endured thesis stories for the past several months.

INTRODUCTION

The aftermath of World War II raised issues and questions which are deep and far-reaching. Almost immediately after the conclusion of the war, concerned individuals began to meet and discuss the implications of the tragedy that had occurred in Europe. These implications involved both the human consequences of the Holocaust and more theoretical concerns.

A major concern was postwar relationships between Christians and Jews. Prior to the war Jews and Christians had already begun to meet on a large scale in the United States and England. The rise of antisemitism and anti-Catholicism during the 1920s was the impetus to form the National Conference of Jews and Christians (later known as the National Conference of Christians and Jews or NCCJ) in 1928. In England informal meetings were held between Jews and Christians starting in the 1930s, but it was not until 1942 that the Council of Christians and Jews was formed there to combat antisemitism.

Soon after its inception, the CCJ began to have contact with the NCCJ. The NCCJ sent letters regarding its annual Brotherhood Week, planned for February 1943. An NCCJ team traveled to Britain at the time of the Nazi Blitz and programmatic ideas were exchanged. Among them was the idea to hold an international conference of Christians and Jews to seek an understanding of the wartime tragedy that was still unfolding. Even before the war ended plans were underway for an international conference of

Christians and Jews.

During August of 1946, the International Conference of Christians and Jews convened, as planned, at Oxford, England. Participants in this conference were representatives of British and American councils of Christians and Jews, as well as private individuals. The participants, working through commissions, generated suggestions on how to deal with the concerns regarding Jewish-Christian relations. Two very significant decisions were the recommendation to form an International Council of Christians and Jews composed of various national councils of Christians and Jews and to hold an international "Emergency Conference on Antisemitism."

During the following year a continuing committee worked to organize the Emergency Conference which then was held in August, in Seelisberg, Switzerland. The conference commissions developed suggestions on how to deal with the problem of antisemitism. A significant document was developed known as the "Ten Points of Seelisberg," which dealt with the underlying roots of antisemitism. The conference participants also decided to continue pursuing international efforts at improving interfaith relations.

During this time issues which had an impact on interfaith relations included the rise of Zionism and the formation of a Jewish state, and the status of displaced persons. These issues affected the ways Jews and Christians viewed each other and themselves. They also affected the perceived importance of

interfaith activities, as both the Jewish and Christian communities struggled to deal with these and other events and issues.

In the years that followed, much energy was invested in sustaining the international interfaith activities. However, it was not until the early 1960s that the effort began to be successful. Various impediments, including differences of approach by the participating national councils as well as problems within various national organizations, slowed progress.

Though much has been written on the Holocaust itself, little has been produced about the post-1945 development of Christian-Jewish relations before 1964. In 1965, the Second Vatican Council of the Catholic church issued a number of important documents including "Nostra Aetate." This document liberalized relationships between the Catholic church and other religious organizations. Following the liberalization, the level of activities related to interfaith relations increased dramatically. The works that have discussed Jewish-Christian relations prior to 1964 have generally been broader works, either in terms of subject matter or period of study.

This thesis discusses the history of the international interfaith movement between the end of the Second World War and the issuance of "Nostra Aetate" by the Catholic Church at Vatican II. The thesis examines the beginnings of the interfaith movements in the United States and Britain. It also discusses the events and accomplishments of three international conferences

of Christians and Jews held in 1946, 1947 and 1948. However, the main focus is on the attempts to establish and maintain internationally based efforts at improving interfaith relations.

The research for this thesis was done chiefly through primary sources held at several archives. The archives used were the American Jewish Archives (Cincinnati, Ohio), the Southampton University Library Archives and Manuscripts (Southampton, England), the Social Welfare History Archives of the University of Minnesota (Minneapolis, Minnesota), the central files of the Sisters of Sion (Vienna) and the central files of the International Council of Christians and Jews (Heppenheim, Germany). (This ICCJ is an organizational descendant of the ICCJ discussed in the thesis.) A small amount of research, generally pertaining to historical background, was done through secondary sources.

CHAPTER ONE

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE INTERFAITH MOVEMENT

Jews and Christians have encountered each other since the inception of the Christian faith. While historically tension existed between the two groups, the twentieth century has seen the rise of efforts not only to lessen these tensions, but also to establish cooperative efforts among adherents of the two faiths on topics of mutual concern. Since the 1920s efforts to mitigate tensions and increase cooperation took place under the auspices of the "Goodwill" movement.[1] In more recent years this activity has been referred to as the "Interfaith" movement.

This chapter will discuss the formation and activities of two major organizations, the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the United States and the Council of Christians and Jews in Britain. These two organizations played key roles in the attempts to establish interfaith activities on an international level following World War II. While the two groups differ in methods and foci, they have many common concerns. Their leaders shared much in management style and personal attributes.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews

The National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) traces its origins to the 1920s. Several histories have been written about the NCCJ, notably two written under NCCJ auspices by Pitt

---

[1] Sometimes referred to as "Good Will."

and Ashworth.[2] A secondary literature about interfaith relations in general and the NCCJ in particular also exists. Writings from the secondary literature are at times in disagreement with the NCCJ-sponsored histories.

Two major streams united within the interfaith movement. The first is the ecumenical movement, which sought to bring together various Protestant denominations as well as the Catholic church. The second stream was the joining of Jewish groups with these efforts to form interfaith organizations. Similar reasons motivated participants to join these movements, despite lingering suspicions of conversionist intents of each group towards the others.

A variety of factors contributed to the various religious movements joining together. Among these were the resurgence of hate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) and the publication of antisemitic literature. The KKK and organizations like it were anti-Jewish, anti-Catholic, anti-Black and isolationist. Ashworth states that at its peak in 1924 the KKK had a membership of two and a half million. [3]

An example of this type of bigotry occurred during the presidential election of 1928, when the Democrats nominated Alfred E. Smith, who was Catholic. Smith"s detractors feared he

---

[2] James E. Pitt, Adventures in Brotherhood, New York, 1955. Robert A. Ashworth, The Story of The National Conference of Christians and Jews, March 1950. (unpublished draft)Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota (hereafter SWHA), NCCJ Collection.

[3] Ashworth, 2.

would follow the dictates of the Pope. He responded: "I recognize no powers in the institutions of my church to interfere with the operation of the Constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land."[4] Despite such statements, popular perceptions of papal influence on Smith contributed to his defeat. The pervasive atmosphere of bigotry in American society spurred some to work to change people's attitudes. The interfaith movement is an example of an attempt to deal with this problem.

Anti-Catholic sentiment undoubtedly motivated Catholic participation in interfaith activities. Initially, Catholic organizations such as the Knights of Columbus and the Calvert Association participated unofficially. In 1928, Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical forbidding participation in activities lending credence to incorrect beliefs. With the rise of the KKK and other anti-Catholic activities, however, Catholic participation increased.[5]

Another example of bigotry in this era can be found in the publications and activities of Henry Ford, Sr. He funded the publication of the Dearborn Independent. This newspaper printed antisemitic documents such as "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," a pamphlet purported to be a plan for global control by the Jews. It was in reality not written by Jews, but rather by

---

[4] Pitt, 10.

[5] Lance Sussman, "Toward Better Understanding: The Rise of the Interfaith Movement and the role of Rabbi Isaac Landman," American Jewish Archives, 34 (1982): 41.

antisemites wishing to ascribe certain desires to Jews. Ford also funded the publication of The International Jew: The World's Problem.[6]

The first organized interfaith effort to attack bigotry was in 1920. The American Committee for Rights of Religious Minorities was composed primarily of Protestants, with Jewish and Catholic participants. This group issued a statement in December of that year condemning "divisive passions," "racial prejudice" and "religious fanaticism."[7] In the years that followed, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (FCCCA) continued to track the growth of the KKK.

Concerned by the rise of the KKK, Dr. Alfred Anthony, the executive secretary of the Home Missions Council (HMC) of the FCCCA, founded the Committee on Goodwill Between Jews and Christians in 1923.[8] Anthony acted in consultation with Jewish leaders, including Rabbi Samuel Schulman and Rabbi Joseph Blau. Correspondence reveals a spirit of cooperation among these participants.[9] Discussions centered around the scope of the Goodwill Committee's activities and group membership. The format of representation of Protestants, Catholics and Jews within the

---

[6] Sussman, 12.

[7] Pitt, 13.

[8] Ashworth, 5. Pitt places the formation of the Committee in 1924 with John W. Herring at its head. Pitt, 13.

[9] Samuel Schulman, various correspondence, American Jewish Archives, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio (hereafter AJA), Samuel Schulman collection, Box 13 File 8. (hereafter 13\8)

committee, as well as its activities, played a strong role in what would become the composition and program of the NCCJ. In 1927, the Permanent Commission on Better Understanding between Christian and Jew in America was formed by Rabbi Isaac Landman to foster interfaith dialogue.[10]

Landman was a religious liberal and universalist.[11] Like many of his Jewish colleagues in the interfaith movement, he was anti-Zionist and considered Zionism to be a manifestation of particularism. He participated in an interfaith response to a "blood libel" charge that had been leveled in Massena, New York, in September of 1929. This was an early example of joint response by Catholics, Protestants and Jews to an episode of religious bigotry.

The activities of these three groups and others like them for the most part consisted of issuing statements, holding interfaith dinners and producing radio programs. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, who later succeeded Anthony, took an interest in anti-KKK activities. Cadman, an ordained minister, served as president of the FCCCA.[12] He went on a successful speaking tour concerning the KKK throughout the Midwest in 1923. Within two years this activity attracted the interest of Charles Evans

---

[10] Pitt, 15. and Benny Kraut, "A Look From the Outside: Jews, Catholics and the Establishment's Goodwill Movement in the 1920s," University of Cincinnati, ~1987, 3. (photocopy of manuscript)

[11] Sussman, 46.

[12] Albert N. Marquis, ed., Who's Who in America? (Chicago, 1934), 464.

Hughes and Roger W. Straus, who went on to become founding members of the NCCJ.[13] Hughes was a respected jurist who served as Supreme Court Chief Justice.[14] Straus was a director of American Smelting and Refining and was active in the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.[15]

There were problems, however. Some members of the FCCCA leadership believed that the only reason to engage in dialogue with Catholics and Jews was ultimately to convert them to Protestant Christianity. Anthony, of the Home Missions Council, (HMC) was known as an evangelist. The Jews whom he contacted were wary. In one instance, in 1922, when he was meeting with representatives from the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), he said that the purpose of his contact was "to help Jews find their messiah."[16] In retracting his statement he said that his evangelistic activities were not aimed at Jews, but rather at the "unchurched."[17] It was unclear as to whether this term referred to those unaffiliated with a congregation or unaffiliated with a religion.

Kraut maintains that the atmosphere after World War I was

---

[13] Ashworth, 4.

[14] Pitt, 30.

[15] Albert N. Marquis, Who's Who in America?" (Chicago, 1934), 2282.

[16] Kraut, "A Look From the Outside..." 22.

[17] Benny Kraut, "Towards the Establishment of the NCCJ: The Tenuous Road to Goodwill in the 1920s," American Jewish History, 77 (1988): 395.

one of Protestant triumphalism. The American Protestant community believed that the Allied victory was divinely inspired. Thus, not only was it a victory for the United States, but a victory for the "American" religion, Protestantism.[18] In accordance with this philosophy, the Americanization of new immigrants logically included guiding them to a proper American religion.[19] Conversionist activities occurred in a number of locations, notably in settlement houses where large numbers of immigrants received their first introduction to the United States and its culture. This activity became known to the leadership of the Jewish community and was of concern. The CCAR noted that lack of formal synagogue affiliation was not equivalent to rejection of Judaism. Furthermore, Judaism was as American as any other religion.

An example of the conflict between the FCCCA and the CCAR over the missionary efforts of such groups as the FCCCA can be seen in the 1928 report of the CCAR's Commission on Good Will.[20] The CCAR was in favor of the Goodwill movement and established a standing committee on the topic. The Commission became aware in 1926 of two international conferences to be held in Europe, under the sponsorship of the FCCCA, on the subject of proselytizing Jews. The Executive Board of the Conference sent a telegram to

---

[18] Kraut, "Towards..." 391.

[19] Kraut, "Towards..." 393.

[20] Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, New York, 1928, vol. 38, 98.

Anthony stating that these conferences would violate an agreement signed by the FCCCA and the CCAR in December of 1924 that in part stated that "...each faith shall enjoy the fullest opportunity for its development and enrichment, these committees have no proselytizing purpose." Herring and Anthony responded that the FCCCA was not a homogeneous body and had fundamentalist members. They went on to say that a meeting between the president of the International Missionary Council (IMC), John R. Mott, and Jewish representatives could be arranged and that the Jewish community should avoid hindering the Good Will Committee's work.

David Philipson, Abba Hillel Silver and others met with Dr. Mott in February of 1927, but he was noncommittal on the issue of proselytism of Jews. A series of letters was exchanged between Mott and the committee leadership. On April 19, 1927, Anthony, Herring and Sidney L. Gulick sent a cable to Mott in Budapest urging him to recommend that the congress take a stand against antisemitism and high pressure conversionary tactics. The CCAR committee reported that they did not see a hidden agenda within the Good Will Committee itself and recommended a continued, though cautious, involvement.

Moderate members of the FCCCA realized that interfaith cooperation would need to take place in a setting outside of the FCCCA. To this end, the National Council of Jews and Christians was founded in 1927. (The name was changed to the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1938.) Jewish fears of missionary activity also motivated participation. [21] The

[21] Kraut, "Towards the Establishment..." 388.

Jewish community saw the independent NCCJ as a vehicle to discourage the proselytism of Jews.

A letter signed in 1927 by Hughes, Cadman and Straus sought financing for the launching of a National Conference.[22] Sufficient funds were raised and a modest program was started. While there was Jewish support for the effort, at times it was given guardedly, as evidenced in the 1928 report of the CCAR Committee on Good Will. The committee recognized the early success of the National Conference, but the language suggests concern regarding the existing positive relationship with the FCCCA and the role of the new organization.[23]

There were other factors propelling members of the three major faiths in the United States towards cooperative work on topics of mutual interest. While Kraut saw more negative factors, Sussman saw more positive forces.[24] For example, while Kraut understands the post World War I period to be one of Protestant triumphalism, Sussman sees it as one in which the Jew was viewed as more of an equal than ever before. He cites the total equality of the Jew before the law and largely within society. Sussman also cites the scientific and critical study of sacred texts, which brought Jewish and Christian scholars together in a way that was removed from religiously predetermined values regarding the source and authorship of ancient texts.

---

[22] Ashworth, 4.

[23] CCAR, Yearbook, New York, 1928, Vol. 38, 60.

[24] Sussman, 38.

Scholars began to separate personal beliefs from scholarly methods. Furthermore, Sussman sees a confluence of various liberal religious viewpoints, in particular the social gospel movement of the liberal churches and the message of Prophetic Judaism as supported by Reform Judaism. While Sussman sees universalistic ideas at work, Kraut sees them as Protestant ideas applying only to Protestants. Kraut stated that while the churches embraced the idea of the social gospel and selflessness, it was an internal phenomenon. Thus, the Protestant community was sending out mixed religious signals.[25] It is clear that many factors, both positive and negative, were contributing to the growing interfaith movement and giving it continued momentum.

In 1928 the FCCCA appointed Reverend Dr. Everett Ross Clinchy to direct both the Goodwill Committee and the nascent National Conference of Jews and Christians by the FCCCA.[26] Clinchy served the NCCJ as executive director and framed many of its programs and policies until his retirement in 1958.[27] He was a driving force behind the NCCJ and its projects, setting priorities and channelling the organization's energies. Clinchy was an opponent of Protestant triumphalism who wrote that the United States was home to three great streams of thought- Catholic, Protestant and Jewish - each one as important and

---

[25] Kraut, "Towards..." 7.

[26] Pitt, 19.

[27] Institute on Man and Science, "The Brotherhood of Man, Tribute to a Founder, Everett R. Clinchy," Rensselaerville, New York, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, 9\"Everett R. Clinchy, Biography",18.

American as the other.[28] David Hyatt, who joined the NCCJ as public relations director in 1953 and later went on serve as its president, knew Clinchy well. He described him as "very charismatic," and as one "who liked to be compared to Paul."[29] Hyatt added that Clinchy had an eye for the spectacular. He thought in grandiose terms and through the power of his personality attracted many followers. Much of the story of the NCCJ and its programs is the story of Everett Clinchy, including international aspects of interfaith relations.

Clinchy's first program, a seminar at Columbia University, took place in the fall of 1928. Participants included clergy of all three faith groups, academics and members of the business community. During that year, Clinchy undertook other organizational tasks such as the recruitment of three cochairmen. Roger W. Straus served as the Jewish cochair, Newton D. Baker as the Protestant cochair and Carlton J. H. Hayes represented the Catholic community. These three individuals were leaders both within their respective communities as well as within society at large. Baker served two terms as mayor of Cleveland from 1912 to 1916 and was Secretary of War from 1916 to 1921.[30] Hayes held an endowed professorship in history at Columbia University.[31] In

---

[28] Kraut, "A Look..." 9.

[29] David Hyatt, interview with author, September 24, 1990.

[30] Albert N. Marquis, ed., Who's Who in America? (Chicago, 1934), 229.

[31] Pitt, 33.

the words of Ashworth, "they brought the National Conference prestige..."[32]

Despite the formal organization of the National Conference, the Jewish community remained concerned about Christian missionary activities towards Jews. In 1929, the Bureau of Jewish Social Research of the Synagogue Council of America (SCA) completed a major study of Christian proselytism among Jews.[33] The report examined all missions in New York City and their facilities, staffing and program with regard to Jews. At the time the report was issued the secretary of the SCA was Rabbi Israel Goldstein. Although Goldstein was quite concerned with these missionary activities he nonetheless became involved with interfaith activities on both a national and an international level.

The National Conference enjoyed programmatic success. From the beginning, it sought to bring together Jews and Christians, having them speak from the same platform. This was a step beyond the dinners and issuing of statements of previous years that had little long-term impact. For the first time, discussion between the panelists and the audience was encouraged.

One of the National Conference's most innovative ideas was the initiation of "trio teams".[34] Each trio team consisted of a

---

[32] Ashworth, 5.

[33] Bureau of Social Research, Synagogue Council of America, A Study of Missions and Kindred Christian Organizations Engaged in Religious Work Among the Jews. AJA, Schulman papers, Box 13\ File 11.

[34] Ashworth, 11; Pitt, 40.

Catholic, a Protestant and a Jewish member. Generally they were members of the clergy. The first trio team consisted of Father John Elliot Ross, Clinchy and Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron. Ross was an author and lecturer on Catholic doctrine at several colleges in the United States and Lazaron was the rabbi of Baltimore Hebrew Congregation.[35] They toured the country in the fall of 1933, visiting thirty-eight cities from coast to coast. They traveled 9,000 miles, much of it by air. In each session, the three participants would engage in conversation among themselves, with one member asking questions of the others. Following the discussion, questions would be taken. These programs were so successful that by 1936 twenty-five such trio teams had together travelled 38,000 miles throughout the country.

A second hallmark of the National Conference was the establishment of "Roundtables" in each city. These groups, composed of business leaders, clergy and academics, would form the basis of local National Conference chapters. The roundtables were to serve as local clearinghouses for coordinating activities meant to foster mutual respect and understanding. They would organize the gathering together of religious organizations, service clubs and academic institutions for study and, when necessary, action. By 1938 there were roundtables in over 100 cities.[36] By organizing on the grassroots level, individual citizens as well as those in leadership positions could be

[35] Pitt, 42.

[36] Ashworth, 17.

reached and influenced. The establishment of local roundtables was one of the models the NCCJ thought would be adaptable for use overseas after World War II. This will be described in greater detail in Chapter 4.

Other programs of the NCCJ that were developed in the 1930s were Brotherhood Day (which later became Brotherhood Week and Brotherhood Month), seminars and institutes. The seminars and institutes were held in various places around the country and addressed a variety of issues. In general they focused on the importance of religion and religious tolerance as an underpinning of American democracy.

International Interests of the NCCJ

The interest in international affairs by those involved in Jewish-Christian relations dates back to 1926.[37] In August of that year the Goodwill Committee convened a conference on international relations near Detroit that was attended by 100 Christians and several Jewish representatives. The conference, which included a Jewish Friday night service, was covered in the local press and the national wire services.

The interest in international affairs on the part of the leadership of the NCCJ itself dates back to at least 1931. At that time Everett Clinchy was working both for the National Council and the Committee on Goodwill of the FCCCA. In a letter

---

[37] The Committee on Goodwill Between Jews and Christians of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, "Statement of Fundamental Aims and Report for the Year November 1, 1925 and November 1, 1926," New York, 9.

dated June 3, 1931 to Ashworth, Clinchy stated the need for "all churches and Christians to oppose antisemitism in any form and all discrimination against Jews and to express to our Jewish brethren in word and act the spirit of Christ."[38] In support of his call. he cited a large antisemitic parade that had been held in Mexico City and a memo about antisemitism in Germany. The memo detailed the gaining of power of the Nazis and the Nazi policy towards Jews. He listed proposed restrictions on Jews and the threat of the spread of antisemitism to other parts of the world if the German situation was not dealt with. He concluded by saying that American Jews must also participate in this process or else there would be little chance of helping the Jews in Germany, and Jews throughout the world would be endangered.

By 1933 there was high level of cooperation between the NCCJ and major Jewish organizations. On May 5, 1933, L. Shultz, Director of Publicity and Research for the American Jewish Congress, wrote to Clinchy in his capacity as executive director of the NCCJ.[39] Shultz called upon Clinchy to release a statement pertaining to the deteriorating situation in Germany. The letter included a memo that outlined the history of the Nazi regime, its gaining of power (in January of 1933) and its antisemitic activities. A second memo listed in detail all anti-Jewish

---

[38] Clinchy to Ashworth, June 5, 1931, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 1\ "Committee on Goodwill Between Jews and Christians."

[39] L. Shultz to Clinchy, May 5, 1933, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, 1\ Jews in Germany.

decrees promulgated by the Nazi government through April 30, 1933. In May, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick wrote a statement deploring the conditions in Germany.[40] The statement was signed by over 1000 Protestant members of the clergy in the United States and sent to the leaders of many German denominations.

On July 4, 1933 the National Council issued a statement written by renowned social scientists and signed by over 100 college and university presidents.[41] The carefully worded statement called upon the German government to cease persecution of minority groups. It stated that while different cultures may at times be in conflict, there was greater benefit to be derived from working together. Along with a list of signatories, the press release included excerpts of individual comments made by the college and university presidents. The statement urged the Germans to establish mechanisms to deal with problems associated with intolerance. In no place -- in either the general statement or in the individual comments -- is any specific group mentioned by name. In the introductory paragraphs preceding the academics' statement, Clinchy made it clear that the statement was not to be considered as a protest against the German government, but rather "an appeal for common sense."[42] It was also expressed by Newton D. Baker, Catholic co-chair of the

---

[40] Pitt, 139.

[41] National Conference of Jews and Christians, Press Release, July 5, 1933, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, 1\ "Correspondence 1930-1933."

[42] Ibid.

National Conference, who wrote that while he felt German persecution was shifting towards the Catholics and away from the Jews, the danger remained for all minority groups. Despite the broad base of support for this statement, it seems particularly reserved, considering the known reality of the situation at the time, especially when compared to the statement of Protestant clergy released two months earlier.

Throughout most of the 1930s, the NCCJ concentrated primarily on domestic issues. There was little or no mention of Zionism or Palestine in the NCCJ records of that time. Though these were important issues in some Jewish circles, they were not stressed in the NCCJ. There are several possible reasons for this, one being the nature of coalition building and another being the ideologies of the participants both in the NCCJ in general, and of the Jewish participants in particular.

The Zionist issue was a difficult one for the NCCJ. The NCCJ was firmly rooted in the United States. It was an American program for the betterment of life in the United States. As such, there was perhaps a desire not to cloud issues by bringing in the possible support for the creation of another nation state. The participants in the NCCJ viewed Judaism as a religious, not a national, identity. Thus, the idea of American Jewish support for a Jewish national homeland also carried questions regarding ultimate loyalty of Jews. Since the NCCJ was thought of as an American institution, the idea of the NCCJ supporting a separate Jewish nation was not in keeping with NCCJ beliefs. Furthermore,

the NCCJ as a coalition had to limit areas of potential controversy and unresolveable disagreement. Involvement in the Zionist issue would threaten the coalition and drag the NCCJ into an issue that on the surface had little to do with the American Jewish situation as it pertained to American Jews.

The second reason that these issues were not mentioned had to do with the leadership of the NCCJ, especially the Jewish participants. Three of the major Jewish participants- Lazaron, Landman and Rabbi Julian Feibelman -were anti-Zionists. Feibelman and Lazaron, among others, had a particularly close relationship with Clinchy as their correspondence files reflect.[43] The exchange of letters took place over many years. The letters prove close personal connections far beyond a working relationship. As a result of this closeness, it is reasonable to assume that these men exerted some influence on Clinchy with regard to Zionism. As Lazaron (an active member of the American Council for Judaism) and Feibelman were anti-Zionists, it is somewhat easier to understand why Clinchy, and subsequently the NCCJ was not involved with this issue. Even if Clinchy did not feel as strongly as his friends, there was a wide variety of other issues to tackle. By setting aside Zionism and related issues, conflicts were avoided.

The international arena remained in the background for the NCCJ until contact was established with the CCJ. Clinchy wanted to broaden the scope of the NCCJ. He believed that what had

[43] Feibelman papers, Lazaron papers, AJA.

suceeded in the United States wouls scceed in other countries. The CCJ was receptive to contact and joint work with the NCCJ.

The Council of Christians and Jews

The CCJ's development to some degree parallels that of the NCCJ. As was the case in the United States, intergroup problems existed in Europe and there was a desire to deal with them. Foremost among these tensions was antisemitism, particularly in Europe, but also in Britain. The rise of Nazism in particular was an impetus for founding the CCJ. The CCJ, like the NCCJ, also had dynamic personalities in its leadership. The CCJ's most important leader was Reverend William Wynne Simpson, a Methodist.

The CCJ as an organization was much more modest in scope than the NCCJ. It had a smaller financial base and as such could not have had as ambitious a program. It also had to contend with problems and situations that it did not share with the NCCJ. In particular, even before the start of World War II, Germany was a much greater threat to England. Once the war began, Britain suffered directly and was imperiled. Thus, national energies and thought were directed towards war related needs and issues.

As was the case in the United States, much of the interest in modern day Jews and Judaism came from missionaries, who sought to do work within the Jewish community. Over time, some of these missionaries became not only more interested in Jews and Judaism, but more sensitive to Jewish rituals and practice. In July 1924 Professor W. A. L. Elmslie of Westminster College, Cambridge

wrote to Herbert Loewe, a reader in Rabbinic Studies in Oxford, explaining the desire of the English Presbyterian Church to examine its "relations towards Judaism."[44] A study commission was formed and proposals for what could have been a council of Christians and Jews was put forward but not acted upon at that time.

Much of the history of the CCJ parallels the life story of Rev. W. W. Simpson. Like his counterpart in the United States, Clinchy, Simpson was an ordained clergyman and highly educated individual. Also like Clinchy, he wanted to draw people together based on their commonalities.

Simpson's first contacts with Jews came during his seminary days and early in his own ministry in a church in North London, a section of the city that by then had a large Jewish population.[45] Simpson was initially involved in youth work. In the course of discussing some of the issues relating to intergroup relations and realizing in part the ignorance of the young people, Simpson organized a youth council on Jewish Christian relations.[46] This council was made up only of Protestants. They discussed antisemitism and its manifestations in Germany.

---

[44] William W, Simpson, "Jewish-Christian Relations Since the Inception of the Council of Christians and Jews," The Jewish Historical Society of England, Transactions, Sessions 1981-1982, 28 (1984): 89.

[45] Reverend William W. Simpson, untitled Memoirs, 1983 (?), ICCJ, central files, Heppenheim, Germany, 15.

[46] Ibid., 22.

In September of 1935, Simpson placed a Rosh Hashanah greeting, in Hebrew, in front of his church.[47] This had never been done before and it attracted the interest of community residents. Simpson went on to arrange a lecture series on a variety of topics of interest to Jews and Christians as well as organizing informal discussion groups that met in people's homes. As time went on, these discussions attracted the interest and support of Cardinal Hinsley, who later became involved with the CCJ and played a role in bringing about Catholic participation.

The outbreak of World War II was a major turning point. It brought ever increasing persecution of the Jews of Germany and eventually the Holocaust. Early during the war, refugee commissions were formed in Britain, under the auspices of the various Christian and Jewish communities.[48] The Jewish community's refugee committee dated back to 1933.[49] The Quakers followed shortly after that. The Christian churches initially formed a committee to deal with the problems of non-Aryan Christians; however, George Bell, the Bishop of Chichester, established a more encompassing Christian Council for Refugees in 1938. [50] As the specter of the deep suffering of the war became evident, the leadership of the religious community in England drew together on the subject of antisemitism. During the time

---

[47] Ibid., 21.

[48] Ibid., 22.

[49] Ibid., 45.

[50] Ibid., 46.

of the Nazi Blitz, in 1941, Father Vincent D. Donovan, Clinchy and Lazaron were invited to tour Britain as guests of the British government.[51] They met with British religious leaders, in particular those who went on to form the leadership of the CCJ.

The CCJ was initially organized only by the Protestant community. The Jewish and Catholic communities also joined, but not without reservations. Some of the same issues regarding Jewish and Catholic participation in the NCCJ were involved in the formation of the CCJ. For the Jews the issue was proselytism; for the Catholics it was the issue of giving the impression that all religions are equal and correct. It was made clear that even though some of the Christian leadership had a background in missionary activity, the CCJ would in no way be involved in such. The Catholics stated that their major motivation for joining was to work against manifestations of antisemitism, especially in Germany. The first meeting of the CCJ took place on March 20, 1942, about 14 years after the NCCJ had been organized in the United States.[52]

On August 28, 1943 the CCJ publications committee released a refutation of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," just as the American Committee for the Rights of Minorities had done several years earlier.[53] Although the CCJ continued to meet throughout the war years, its activity was limited.

---

[51] Pitt, 142: and Ashworth 28.

[52] Simpson, "Jewish-Christian Relations Since..." 89.

[53] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, August 28, 1943.

On March 13, 1944 Israel Goldstein, president of the Synagogue Council of America and Vice President of the NCCJ, met in London with the CCJ executive.[54] They discussed several subjects, including antisemitism and the holding of a postwar Jewish Christian conference. Goldstein said at the time that the NCCJ was not directly involved with the issue, but "with the long range objective of building up a positive appreciation of the value of interfaith goodwill." [55] Even so, all agreed that following the war an international conference on Jewish Christian relations should be convened. Before the war ended, the NCCJ and the CCJ began to make plans for the conference.

---

[54] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, March 13, 1944.

[55] Ibid.

CHAPTER TWO

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE

The first international conference of Christians and Jews convened in Oxford, England from July 30 to August 6, 1946. This conference resulted from a cooperative effort between the CCJ and the NCCJ. It attracted Jewish, Protestant and Catholic delegates from throughout Europe and North America. The conference's work was divided among six topical commissions and one youth delegation.

The conferees reached two major decisions. The first was to conduct an international conference on the subject of antisemitism and the second was to establish an international council of Christians and Jews. However, the mere fact that the conference took place established that Jews and Christians could gather on a large scale and discuss important subjects. While such meetings are no longer regarded as unusual, it was the conference at Oxford that set the precedent.

The initial contacts between the leadership of the CCJ and NCCJ date to the time of the Nazi Blitz when three NCCJ leaders, Morris Lazaron, Everett Clinchy and Father Edward Cardinal, were in London.[1] The British leadership included Robert Waley Cohen and Reverend William W. Simpson. Cohen was a leading figure in overseas British trade and held many positions of leadership in

---

[1] Reverend William Simpson, untitled memoirs,(photocopy of typed manuscript with handwritten notes by author), 1983(?), as found in ICCJ central files, Heppenheim, Germany), 91.

the Anglo-Jewish community.[2] The leaders discussed a number of topics, including the possibility of a trio of CCJ representatives traveling to the United States. Unfortunately the circumstances of the war prevented this.

Contacts between the two organizations continued, however, and on March 13, 1944 the CCJ executive met with Rabbi Israel Goldstein, president of the Synagogue Council of America and an active leader of the NCCJ.[3] His primary goal was to assess the impact of the war on the status of religious life in Britain.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the idea of holding the international conference was first conceived by the leadership of the NCCJ in 1944.[4] The British CCJ, noting that the war "was only a symptom of the deep seated and universal spiritual disorder" and that Christians and Jews could play an important part in the rebuilding of the postwar world, supported the concept and joined in the planning efforts.[5] Planning by correspondence commenced. Over the course of time, British conference planners traveled to the U.S. and vice versa.

---

[2] Frank C. Roberts, Obituaries From the Times, 1951-1960, London, 1979, 156.

[3] Ibid., 93.

[4] CCJ, "Freedom, Justice and Responsibility: Reports and Recommendations of the International Conference of Christians and Jews," Oxford, 1946, 5.
The reports and recommendations of the conference state that planning began in the late summer. Simpson's description of Goldstein's meeting of March 13, with the executive board of the CCJ indicates that in reality decisions had been made and movement was taking place.

[5] Simpson, Memoirs, 93.

Planning for the Oxford Conference

The NCCJ's interest in global affairs began soon before the end of the war in Europe. Arthur H. Compton, the Protestant co-chair of the NCCJ, stated:

"Because we see the first rays of hope of the end of the war the present time is an appropriate one for the National Conference to take stock...In the post war world, our contacts must be world contacts. The principles of the National Conference must be projected on a world scale."[6]

The Americans felt that the political systems of Europe had failed. The United States with its successful brotherhood programs would be well-suited as a model to help show Europe how to effectively improve intergroup relations. European leaders cautioned that cultural and societal differences must be considered.[7] Thus it was natural for the NCCJ to be involved with the planning for the Oxford Conference.

Rabbi Morris Lazaron, Dr. Everett Clinchy and Dr. Frank Aydelotte were among the chief planners from the NCCJ. Dr. Aydelotte, a Quaker, president of Swarthmore College, had served on the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine. The major areas of planning included conference location, membership and program.

At the March 13, 1944 meeting Goldstein noted that he found widespread agreement among Jewish, Catholic and Protestant leadership in that a joint "pronouncement on economic goals for the postwar world" be issued.[8] This proposal provoked much

---

[6] Pitt, Adventures in Brotherhood, 221.

[7] Ibid., 225.

[8] Simpson, Memoirs, 93.

discussion, some of it revolving around the importance of "interfaith goodwill" and its role as a basic defense against antisemitism. This led to the issuing of the following statement by the CCJ:

"...One of the first things to do after the war would be to hold an international conference representative of the various bodies at work in the field of Jewish-Christian relations in order to secure clear cooperation and better understanding of the programme."[9]

Simpson believed that this was a critical moment for the CCJ. At this point the commitment by the CCJ to an international approach to interfaith relations actually began.[10]

The Americans desired to hold the conference in a formerly occupied country. They thought this would be more dramatic. The British preferred that it not. Practical considerations prevailed and it was decided to hold the conference in England.[11] Clinchy said it would be worthwhile to invite Moslems to the conference, but this idea was also dropped for practical reasons.[12] What may have appeared to be a casual suggestion was truly indicative of Clinchy's nature. He had a broad vision for a wide involvement in intergroup relations that went beyond Christians and Jews. This would become evident in the years that followed.

During the summer the NCCJ issued a Suggested Program for

---

[9] Ibid., 93.

[10] Ibid., 94.

[11] Ibid., 94.

[12] Ibid., 95.

the Conference on Religious Freedom Proposed for the Summer of 1946 based on the memorandum of recommendations of the CCJ issued on June 5, 1945.[13] The commissions were further defined in Outline of Program: Definition of Commissions and Summary of Conference Discussions.[14]

The CCJ issued an undated document entitled Interim Procedure of the Conference: September 1945 to January 1946.[15] This memorandum listed eight procedural points including the following: the Americans and the British would decide on the program, delegation size and composition, and commission membership. An important item was the proposed establishment of a provisional International Council of Christians and Jews. This council would be based in London and its members would be from the national groups of the participating countries.

The conference planners also decided to write a handbook for conference participants, giving them background on the Goodwill Movement and details about conference program and proposals. The handbook would also be distributed outside the conference to encourage public interest.

The CCJ document proposed a week-long series of commission

---

[13] NCCJ, Suggested Program for the Conference on Religious Freedom Proposed for Summer of 1946 (mimeograph copy), AJA, Lazaron Papers, Box 18 folder 1.

[14] NCCJ, Outline of Program: Definition of Commissions and Summary of Conference Discussions, AJA, Lazaron Papers, box 18, folder 1.

[15] CCJ, Interim Procedures of the Conference: September 1945 to January 1946, (mimeograph copy), AJA, Lazaron Papers, box 18, folder 1.

work sessions. Copies of all commission documents would be made available to all delegates. The commission sessions would be closed, with the general sessions open to the public. Finally, the London office would coordinate all communication. The official language of the conference would be English.

Clinchy described the planning process to Lazaron in a letter dated September 9, 1945.[16] In July, Dr. Aydelotte had met with the CCJ leaders. They in turn had sent a proposed conference agenda to Dr. Henry Noble MacCracken, president of Vassar College, who reviewed and revised the proposed agenda. Clinchy and Benson Landis developed five points of recommendation including: the focus of the program should be more on education than on philosophy, worship should take place on the Sabbath(s), less time should be to discussing various reports and more time devoted to discussing "present-day problems." Lazaron wrote to Clinchy on September 18 stating he agreed with Landis's comments and enclosed a proposed program outline which became a major part of the program.[17]

Lazaron suggested that the conference attendees be divided into five commissions, each to deal with a different topic. He further suggested an extensive involvement of laypersons, especially veterans, as the common experience of those who had served together could prove to be valuable.

---

[16] Letter from Clinchy to Lazaron, September 9, 1945, AJA, Lazaron Papers, box 2 file 9.

[17] Lazaron to Clinchy,September 18, 1945, AJA, Lazaron Papers, Box 18\ folder 1.

During the early part of 1946, the CCJ and the NCCJ exchanged several documents concerning the conference title and outline. On March 11, the NCCJ issued Document No.2.[18] This document proposed the responsibilities of the six working commissions.

Commission One was called "The Tasks Confronting the Conference." Commission Two, "Fundamental Postulates of Christianity and Judaism in Relation to Human Order," was charged with finding the basis within Catholicism, Judaism and Protestantism from which demands are made for freedom, justice and responsible citizenship. Commission Three was "Religious Freedom and its Implications."

Commission Four, "Justice and its Claims," was to investigate the attitudes of the religious communities regarding "international justice" and various church pronouncements. Commission Five, "Mutual Responsibility in a Free Society," had the task of determining what factors would harmonize a diverse community, and studying situations in which there was an "unequal sharing of the leadership." The last commission was called "Responsible Citizenship." This commission was to focus on education at all levels and to develop means by which religious values could promote constructive gains.

Also on March 11, the NCCJ issued its third document, which was the same as the CCJ's International Conference, Document No.

---

[18] NCCJ, Document No. 2, NCCJ, March 11, 1946, (mimeograph sheet), AJA, Lazaron papers, box 18, file 1.

5.[19] This memorandum had two major headings and a number of subheadings. Under the first major heading, "Conference Arrangements," were included a brief history of the conference planning and proposals concerning the particulars of the program. The dates were to be July 30 through August 6, 1946. An inaugural meeting was planned for London on July 29, with the remainder of the conference to be held at Lady Margaret Hall in Oxford. Expected attendance was 100 to 110, with arrangements made for 130. The conference membership was to be drawn from national councils of Christians and Jews, which included those of the United States, Britain, Switzerland, South Africa and Australia.[20] Various other prominent individuals would also be invited to participate.

The NCCJ was to provide $50,000 in financing, which would cover administration costs of the conference and publication of its proceedings. Travel arrangements were up to the individual participants, though the CCJ would assist in obtaining travel permits in cases where problems existed.

The second major heading was "Programme and Preparatory Studies." The program was to follow the plan as had been devised by the CCJ and NCCJ. A tentative timetable was proposed, which ultimately proved to be close to the final conference schedule. While material for each of the six commissions was

---

[19] NCCJ, "Document No.3, NCCJ, March 11, 1946", (mimeograph sheet), AJA, Lazaron Papers, box 18, file 1.

[20] Simpson, 100.

being prepared in Britain and the United States, conference planners expected that similar preparation were being made in the countries of other participants. According to Simpson, the great majority of the preparatory work was done in Britain.[21]

Subsequently the NCCJ issued World Conference Document No. 4.[22] The undated document was a more refined discussion of the subject matter and questions with which the study commissions would be involved. The conference plan, as reflected in this document, varies little in substance from what actually took place.

The Conference Convenes

The gathering itself began as scheduled on Monday, July 29 with a rally before at the Society of Friends meeting hall in London. The exact number in attendance is not known though Simpson indicates that the hall was filled to capacity.[23] The rally whose theme was "The Rights of Man" was chaired by the Archbishop of Canterbury.[24] In his opening remark, the archbishop spoke about the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on July 22, just days before the rally took place.[25] He said, "Let us be careful not to condemn a whole people, a

---

[21] Simpson, 99.

[22] NCCJ, World Conference Document No. 4, AJA, Lazaron Papers, box 18\ file 1.

[23] Simpson, Memoirs, 106.

[24] Simpson, Memoirs, 106.

[25] Howard M. Sachar, A History of Israel, 267.

whole race, Jews or other, for the evil deeds of some."[26] The archbishop also stated that Jews and Christians share the belief that through divine revelation all people can claim essential human rights as children of God, and thus there was a need to eradicate antisemitism and racism. He concluded that "...tolerance is a civilized expression of man's approach to divine justice."[27]

Several other prominent leaders spoke, including the American theologian Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, the Lord High Commissioner to India, Viscount Reading and Rabbi Leo Baeck.[28] The words of Rabbi Baeck were particularly moving. Simpson recounted that "while others spoke their messages Leo Baeck embodied his."[29] Rabbi Baeck questioned whether or not human civilization did indeed rest upon any kind of a foundation. In the past this was never questioned, yet recent years had proven the foundations were weak and in fact broken. Furthermore, the great religions of the world are interconnected and if one can falter, they are all susceptible. He concluded by saying, "...therefore for thine own sake do not be silent, do not stand by and look on, the common foundations are at stake."[30] Unfortunately no recording or transcripts of these speeches are

---

[26] The Jewish Chronicle (London) August 2, 1946, p. 1.

[27] Ibid., 5.

[28] Simpson, Memoirs, 106.

[29] Simpson, Memoirs, 107.

[30] The Jewish Chronicle, (London) August 2, 1946, 5.

known.[31]

The main conference began the next day. There were 120 full-time participants with an additional thirty part time. Of these sixty-five were Jewish, fifteen were Roman Catholic and the rest were Protestant. [32] According to the list of participants in the conference report, twenty-eight participants came from the United States, sixty from Britain and the rest were from Palestine, Australia, South Africa, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and France.[33] Some of the participants at this conference continued to be involved with interfaith activities on an international level for a long time.

Among the participants were Dr. Hans Ornstein and Dr. Erich Bickel of Switzerland, Mr. Neville Laski, Mr. A.G. Brotman and the Marquess of Reading from England. Bickel was the president of the Swiss Council of Christians and Jews and Ornstein was the secretary.[34] Laski was an important Anglo-Jewish leader who held a variety of positions including the presidency of the London Committee of Deputies of British Jews.[35] Brotman was the secretary of the Board of Deputies.[36] Pastor Heinrich Gruber of

---

[31] Simpson, Memoirs, p. 104.

[32] Simpson, Memoirs, 107.

[33] CCJ, Freedom, Justice and Responsibility: Reports and Recommendations of the International Conference of Christians and Jews, Oxford, 1946, 36.

[34] CCJ, Freedom, Justice and Responsibility..," 37,42.

[35] Who's Who? (London and New York, 1950), 1610.

[36] CCJ, "Freedom, Justice and Responsibilities..," 38.

Berlin had spoken out against the Nazis and was imprisoned by them in 1937.[37] He was released and continued his protests. In 1940, he was reimprisoned until 1943 in Sachsenhausen and Dachau concentration camps. After he was freed he worked secretly. Following the war, he worked tirelessly for the cause of bringing Nazi war criminals to justice and figured prominently in the Eichmann trial of 1961.

The first plenary session took place on Tuesday evening. The tasks of the conference were outlined. From Wednesday, July 31 to Friday, August 2, the conference commissions dealing with the conference theme of Freedom, Justice and Responsibility met. Each day opened and concluded with a plenary session. Friday evening, August 2 through Sunday was set aside for observance of the Sabbath. Monday and Tuesday were devoted to fine-tuning reports and findings, and would culminate with the issuance of various statements.

The conference report summarized the commission findings and recommendations. The first commission, entitled "Group Tensions," issued seven general statements, three multisection statements on antisemitism, and a very brief statement on displaced persons. The general statements responded to the fact that the war had undermined people's sense of security and increased their fears of totalitarian regimes. Jews, Catholics and Protestants had all suffered persecution during the war.

It was crucial, therefore, that members of each of the three

---

[37] Encyclopedia Judaica, Jerusalem, 1971, vol. 7, col. 942.

religious groups stand up for the rights of the others. It was recommended that religious freedoms be incorporated into any basic documents of human rights being developed at the Peace Conference in Paris. Furthermore, a broad-based educational program should be developed for all levels of education. The goal of this program would be to foster an understanding of the basic beliefs of the various religions and an appreciation of those beliefs held in common. The vehicle to help implement these programs would be the various national councils of Christians and Jews. Those communities where councils did not already exist should begin to form them. The final recommendation was the formation of an International Council of Christians and Jews.

The second section of Commission One's report dealt with antisemitism, which was recognized as a unique example of "group tension." It stated in part:

> "Of all the various group tensions, that known as antisemitism concerns the whole world and calls for special treatment. Recent history shows that an attack on Jewry is an attack on the fundamental principles of Judaism and Christianity on which our ordered human society depends. Accordingly it is advisable to deal with antisemitism as a special case requiring special treatment..."[38]

There was recognition of the historic hardship of Jews in many countries, the worst act of antisemitism being the murder of six million Jews by the Nazis. This act of antisemitism was also an attack on democracy. Given these thoughts, the commission passed a resolution calling for the planning and convening of a

---

[38] Ibid., 12.

conference on antisemitism as soon as possible. The third section consisted of one sentence on the status of displaced persons and urged that they be found new homes where they could rebuild their lives. Of all the recommendations of the conference, the two that had the greatest impact were those calling for the establishment of the International Council of Christians and Jews and the convening of a conference on antisemitism.

The second commission, "Fundamental Postulates of Christianity and Judaism in Relation to Human Order," developed a document entitled "Fundamental Postulates of Christianity and Judaism in Relation to Human Order." (appendix A) This document acknowledged the common creator God of all people. Thus, as creations of God, individuals and societies are obligated to respect one another with regard to life, liberty and personal dignity. Other statements called for respect of the family unit and nature.

The third commission was entitled "Religious Freedom." It called for guaranteed religious freedom for all, including the freedom "from compulsion to do what one's conscience forbids," "...to worship according to conscience and to maintain distinctive religious observances," and "...to preach, teach and persuade." The freedom of parents to educate their children must be upheld and, in nations where state funds are used for religious schools, the funds should be distributed proportionately.

The fourth commission, "Justice and its Claims," dealt with basic human rights. These rights encompass the social, economic and political arenas. Each individual and nation should be guaranteed security in these areas. The fifth commission was "Mutual Responsibility in the Community." It stated that just as each individual has rights, the individual has responsibilities to the whole of society. So too, particular groups have a right to exist, but they must not ignore their responsibilities to the whole and retreat into isolation. Mutual responsibilities include preservation of human rights, family values, development of a sense of responsibility for participation in civic affairs, and elimination of economic and social injustices. The means for accomplishing these goals was the establishing of local and national bodies to deal with these issues through education, youth organizations and the observance of an Annual World Brotherhood Week based on the American model.

Members of the sixth commission, "Education and Training for Responsible Citizenship," felt the tragic state of human affairs could partially be remedied through teaching people how to be good citizens. Religious institutions, schools and universities and labor unions have a responsibility to take part in the educational process. The commission recommended that various religious groups learn about one another and each religious group study the "Fundamental Postulates." The religious organizations should work with secular institutions.

The Youth Commission met on the topic of "Group Unity."

They suggested ways of achieving group unity as well as identifying issues needing work, such as the availability of integrated housing, provision of adequate health care and employment placement assistance. They urged educational programs at all levels and legislation outlawing religious and racial persecution.

During the conference a number of individuals commented on aspects of antisemitism. The thoughts of some of the German participants were particularly interesting. Pastor Hermann Maas spoke of German guilt. He stated:

> "Each encounter with a Jew is an occasion for us to confess. Even those of us who fought antisemitism from the start must share the guilt with the German people. We did not fight hard enough. We did not pray faithfully enough. We did not love ardently enough. From this distress we may rise to a new and reverent love. We should fast with the Jews on Tisha b'Av and remember with tears those who did not come back from Belsen or Auschwitz."[39]

The New York Times also reported on Maas' statement, but the wording was different and at times not clear. While the Times version also reflected Maas' thoughts concerning German guilt, it also indicated that the people had been misled into their beliefs. The Times version stated:

> "Each encounter with a Jew is an occasion for us to confess an immense guilt, a guilt which the German people, misled and carried out by delusion, and satanic powers, has incurred and will have to carry for all time."[40]

Pastor Gruber described the horrors he had witnessed.

---

[39] The Jewish Chronicle, August 9, 1946, p. 17.

[40] New York Times, August 2, 1946, p. 5.

Pastor Fricke told of Pastor Schneider in Buchenwald who was beaten daily by the SS for reading psalms to dying Jews. Pastor Schneider eventually died as a result of these beatings.[41]

Reactions to the Oxford Conference

Reaction to the Oxford conference in the Jewish press as reflected in The Jewish Chronicle was mixed. The August 9, 1946 edition carried one article and a letter to the editor. The first-page article, "Christians and Jews New Council: To Promote Good Relations and Fight Racism."[42] It highlighted the recommendations of the conference, in particular the resolution to send a report to the Paris Peace Conference and the decisions to convene a conference on antisemitism and to establish the International Conference of Christians and Jews.

The article also detailed some of the participants' thoughts during and after the conference. Mr. John Fogarty, a Roman Catholic from Cardiff, reminded the Jewish participants to speak out on behalf of persecuted Christians just as Christians had spoken out on behalf of Jews. Rabbi Israel Abrams of Capetown stated that "freedom is the leitmotif of Jewish life," and asserted that the antisemites must be allowed to express themselves for the suppression of antisemitism would be a form of "inverted Fascism."[43] He did favor the enacting of group libel laws. Others spoke optimistically about the conquering of

---

[41] The Jewish Chronicle, August 9, 1946, p. 17.

[42] The Jewish Chronicle, August 9, 1946, p. 1.

[43] Ibid., 1.

antisemitism.

It was also noted that no explicit reference was made to the Palestine question. Apparently there was lengthy debate on a proposal, made by an unnamed individual, that there be an explicit reference. Despite the fact that a majority of those present seemed to favor such a reference, a vote never took place. There was fear that the vote would cause divisiveness among the Christian delegates.[44]

The New York Times and JTA Daily News Bulletin also carried a few brief articles about the conference. The first New York Times article discussed the general activities of the conference and outlined the work of the commissions, and the second contained a statement by Clinchy noting that the laity were "fed up" with religious leaders.[45] The final article was about Pastor Maas' statement regarding German guilt.[46]

The JTA articles focused on the attempts by those at the conference to deal with the subject of antisemitism.[47] One article noted that the conference was the first international gathering of Christians and Jews and listed the countries of the participants. Other articles described Clinchy's desire that a World Council of Christians and Jews be set up and that the

---

[44] Ibid., 17.

[45] New York Times, July 31, 1946, p. 8. : August 1, 1946, p. 10.

[46] New York Times, August 2, 1946, p. 5.

[47] JTA Daily News Bulletin, July 16, 1946, p. 5. : August 4, 1946, p. 5.: August 6, 1946, p. 6.

NCCJ's "Brotherhood Week" be replicated in other parts if the world. MacCracken suggested that churches and synagogues join together to establish education centers and lecture series for young people to combat antisemitism. The JTA also noted the approval of the recommendation to hold an international conference on antisemitism and the favorable feelings of the conference towards the returning of war orphans to their communities of origin.[48]

Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, an American minister with many years of involvement in interfaith efforts, relates that controversial subjects such as the Palestine question or the plight of displaced persons and reparations were either dealt with summarily or completely avoided.[49] Voss recounted that according to Geoffrey Wigoder, then a D. Phil student at Oxford, Israel Goldstein explained that the delegates wanted to avoid controversy with their British hosts.

Wigoder, who wrote some of the reports in The Jewish Chronicle, was also in correspondence with Simpson. He noted that the issues of the Holocaust and of Palestine were both ignored.[50] Despite the impassioned speeches by Gruber, Maas and Baeck, there was little interest in these topics. Those who attended the conference were interested more in abstract ideas

---

[48] JTA Daily Bulletin, August 6, 1946, p. 6. : August 7, 1946, p. 7.

[49] Carl Hermann Voss, interview with the author 19 July 1990.

[50] Letter, Geoffrey Wigoder to the author, August 1, 1990.

than in the reality of the Holocaust, and Holocaust, he stated that there was a fear than any involvement with the Palestine issue would cause a split in the conference. The Jews as well as the Christians expressed concern about this. It appears that Simpson avoided Palestine as politically too sensitive, just as Clinchy avoided the issue because of his associations with anti-Zionists.

Criticism of the conference was also evidenced in the Jewish press at that time. Mr. Jacob Sarna, in a letter to the editor of The Jewish Chronicle, was distressed that the archbishop in his opening address referred to the bombing at the King David Hotel but made no mention of the murder of forty-six Jews in Poland a few weeks earlier.[51] It appears that the Jewish community of Britain was not necessarily either impressed or interested in the conference.

Overall, there were three major achievements of the conference. The first was simply the unprecedented convening of an international conference of Christians and Jews. The cooperation of the NCCJ and CCJ in the planning of the conference proved that international Jewish-Christian cooperation was possible. The second was the decision taken there to hold an international conference, on the subject of antisemitism. Although the Holocaust itself was not discussed at the Oxford conference the strong desire to discuss antisemitism showed that there was a commitment to confront that issue. The third

[51] The Jewish Chronicle (London), August 9, 1945, p. 15.

accomplishment was the decision to form the International Conference of Christians and Jews (ICCJ). The focus of the conference was international efforts to improve Jewish-Christian relations. The steps taken toward the establishment of the ICCJ represented a desire to continue an international effort that went beyond the gathering of various national groups to the formation of a specific international body.

While it is true that other issues such as the Palestine problem and the DPs may have overshadowed this conference in the minds of the Jewish community, it was nonetheless significant. It established the possibility of large scale Jewish-Christian dialogue and laid the foundation for future work. The conference was flawed in its avoidance of certain critical issues, yet the forum had been opened for future discussions such as the planned conference on antisemitism. On an individual level, many of those who actively participated in the Oxford conference continued to be involved in interfaith activities for many years. In some cases individuals devoted entire careers to that endeavor. Its clear that in this respect the conference was a success.

CHAPTER THREE

THE OPTIMISM OF SEELISBERG

Following the close of the first international conference of Christians and Jews in Oxford. excited preparation ensued for the planning for another international conference and for the formation of the International Council of Christians and Jews. The second conference focused on antisemitism and was held in Seelisberg, Switzerland. As much of Europe was still rebuilding after the war, adequate conference accommodations were difficult to find. However, sufficient facilities available in Seelisberg.

The formation of the ICCJ was a priority of the NCCJ, with Dr. Everett Clinchy leading the way. The efforts of the CCJ, in this arena, were headed by Reverend William W. Simpson. The months between the Oxford conference and the Seelisberg conference were ones of high optimism and expectation. Indeed, the conference at Seelisberg broke new ground, and significant progress was made in understanding the phenomenon of antisemitism, its roots and manifestations. Those who attended the conference left with high spirits and a strong drive to move forward in this area.

Preparation

The planning efforts for Seelisberg began almost immediately after the close of the meeting in Oxford. As was the case with Oxford, work was done on both sides of the Atlantic. Although the NCCJ and the CCJ were major forces, there was participation from people in continental Europe as well. Indeed, councils of

Christians and Jews were in various stages of formation in France, Switzerland, and Germany as well as in Canada.

The committee of the Oxford conference first met on August 16, 1946.[1] The committee considered plans for establishing the International Council of Christians and Jews as well as possible program ideas for the emergency conference on antisemitism. It was relayed that Clinchy that felt invitations to this conference should be issued to the various national councils of Christians and Jews by the New York office of the NCCJ. Clinchy pledged $2,500 in funding support from the NCCJ.

Several individuals were nominated to represent CCJ on the committee to plan for the emergency conference. They were Lord Reading, Percy Bartlett, Erich Bickel, A. G. Brotman, Reverend Henry Carter, Reverend James W. Parkes and a Catholic not named in the record. All of these people were involved with the CCJ and knowledgeable in the area of Jewish-Christian relations-except for Bickel, who was president of the Swiss Council of Christians and Jews.

In October the Executive Committee of the CCJ met and discussed in broad terms the content of the conference and several issues to be discussed with the NCCJ.[2] Preliminary plans called for the conference to be held in Switzerland with

---

[1] CCJ, Executive minutes, September 23, 1946, Southampton University Library Archives and Manuscripts, Southampton, United Kingdom (hereafter SUA), Council of Christians and Jews Collection (hereafter CCJ Collection), File 2\2.

[2] CCJ, Executive minutes, October 10, 1946, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

about forty people in attendance. The cost would be about $10,000 and there would be two levels of exploration. The first level would explore antisemitism as a political phenomenon. The second level would look at antisemitism as it manifested itself with regard to everyday relations between Christians and Jews. Conference planners realized that investigations needed to be completed prior to the conference to assess the political, economic, and social causes of the growth of antisemitism in Europe. These investigations would also assess existing efforts to combat antisemitism and strategies for making these efforts more effective.

In November, Clinchy proposed a broadly based research team which team would include historians, anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists.[3] These scientists would be charged with finding the root causes of antisemitism. Clinchy was convinced that once these causes were determined, they could be treated like a disease and eliminated.

In January 1947 Pierre Visseur of Switzerland was appointed secretary of the emergency conference.[4] A young man of twenty-seven, Visseur was educated at several Swiss universities and had published a book on international labor legislation.[5] Over the next few months Simpson met regularly with Visseur to develop

---

[3] CCJ, Executive minutes, November 11, 1946, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[4] CCJ, Executive minutes, January 7, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[5] International Who's Who (London, 1990), 1644.

more concrete plans. In April the decision was made to hold the conference from July 30 to August 5, 1945 in Seelisberg.[6] The chair of the conference was to be held jointly by Clinchy, Professor Jacques Maritain, who was the French Ambassador to the Vatican, and Mr. Neville Laski of the CCJ, who was a prominent Jewish leader.[7] During this time details of the proposed International Council of Christians and Jews (ICCJ) were considered.

Clinchy arrived in Britain in early July and met with the continuation committee. They reviewed the final program for the emergency conference as well and anticipated the establishment of the ICCJ. Although the specific organizational details of the ICCJ were incomplete, the official proceedings of the conference were presented as the work of the ICCJ.

In June the NCCJ held a national staff meeting in Lake Forest, Illinois.[8] Willard Johnson, who later became executive director of the NCCJ, wrote about the future directions of the NCCJ. While most of the program described focused on the NCCJ's domestic program, there was a clear indication of a desire to spread the ideals of brotherhood throughout the world. Johnson stated that the NCCJ would also be a driving force in unifying

---

[6] CCJ, Executive minutes, April 15, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[7] CCJ, "The Widening Circle," Common Ground, May- June (1947): 3.

[8] NCCJ, Report, N. C. C. J. Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 9\ Staff Conference, Lake Forest, Ill.

the world. It appears that the postwar period was one of optimism, of hope that the last great war had been fought. In Britain, Simpson, writing in The Jewish Chronicle, described high hopes for the meeting. He cited the proposed hard look at the root causes of antisemitism, and the increasing interfaith cooperation at both the national and international levels, as reasons for optimism.[9]

One of the most important areas designated for further research by both the Oxford and Seelisberg conferences was education. In preparation for the Seelisberg conference a number of documents were prepared including one by the education commission of the NCCJ.[10] This document described efforts throughout the United States to deal with problems of group relations. The NCCJ realized the need for a cooperative effort that would bring together experts in sociology, psychology and education to develop a method to deal logically with these problems. The program of the NCCJ was directed at schools as the primary sites of community education. The program recognized the need to involve administrators and classroom teachers on the school level the program was tailored to the individual school. The report also stated that as a program developed it would be evaluated and improved over time. This well-developed local school-based program was one of the parts of the NCCJ's program

[9] The Jewish Chronicle (London), July 25, 1957, 11.

[10] NCCJ, International Emergency Conference to Combat Anti-Semitism, 1947, ICCJ Central Files, Heppenheim, Germany, untitled file.

that was envisioned as replicable elsewhere.

Other preparatory documents were developed in advance of the Seelisberg conference in response to questionnaires sent out by the planning committees. An example of a response is a report by the Swiss counterpart to the NCCJ.[11] The Swiss document described the organization's membership and details of its program. The Swiss recognized the importance of eradicating antisemitism or any bigotry that caused friction and discrimination among groups. They also were aware of the fact that only a small number of people were truly interested in this issue. They believed that it would not become a mass movement and that efforts should be directed at developing a quality program. With regard to the specific problem of antisemitism, the Swiss document presented ideas similar to those of Clinchy. It viewed antisemitism as a historical problem, but one that should be treated as a psychological one. The resolution of the problem of antisemitism required determining its roots and treating the problem at its source. The Swiss believed the international community could provide a forum for exchanging ideas, theories and programs. It was with the desire to confront the problem of antisemitism as demonstrated by the Swiss document that the conference was convened in Seelisberg.

Antisemitism is Discussed at Seelisberg

The conference was convened under the joint chair of Dr.

---

[11] Christlich-judische Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Bekampfung des Antisemitismus in der Schweiz, Development up to the Present Day, undated, ICCJ Central Files, Heppenheim, Germany.

William E. Goslin, Superintendent of Public Schools, Minneapolis, Neville Laski, and Reverend Father Calliste Lopinot, from Rome.[12] This was different than originally planned. The conference proceedings list fifty-nine registered participants and five observers. Participants came from the United States, Great Britain and the European continent, which included France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Germany, Austria, Denmark, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The participants, as listed in the proceedings, represented a cross-section of cultures, religions and professions. Participants represented Judaism, Catholicism, Quakerism, and various Protestant denominations. Although the conference proceedings did not list the religious identities of the participants, information regarding employment gives an indication of the religious identification of some individuals. Professionally the participants were members of the clergy, government officials, scholars, physicians, community leaders and staff members from the various national councils of Christians and Jews. The representatives from Eastern Europe represented religious leaders and at least one government official. It is not clear if these individuals were there in a personal or official capacity. Although there were no councils of Christians and Jews in Eastern Europe, several of these people were affiliated with religious communities. The official language of the conference was

---

[12] International Council of Christians and Jews, Reports and Recommendations of the Emergency Conference on AntiSemitism (Geneva, 1947), 26.

English with informal translation available.

The conference was charged with two main tasks.[13] The first task was to study the causes of antisemitism in postwar Europe and the reasons for its continued existence. The second task was to seek remedies for the causes of antisemitism. These measures were to be both for an intermediate and long-range time frame. They were to be implemented by educational, political, religious and social institutions, on both the national and international levels.

As was the case with the Oxford conference, the main work at Seelisberg was done by five commissions. Each commission had a chair, vice chair, secretary and from six to twelve members. The five commissions were: The Principal Objectives of Jewish-Christian Cooperation in Relation to the Combating of Antisemitism, Educational Opportunity in Schools and Universities, The Task of the Churches, Work in the Field of Civic and Social Service, and Relations With Governments.[14] In addition to the issuing of recommendations and resolutions by the individual commissions, the conference as a whole passed two resolutions.[15]

The first plenary resolution called for the continuation of work begun in Oxford to formally establish the ICCJ. It also urged the ICCJ to work to implement the recommendations of the

---

[13] ICCJ, Reports and Recommendations..., 3.

[14] ICCJ, Reports and Recommendations..., 26-27.

[15] ICCJ, Reports and Recommendations..., 22.

conference at Seelisberg. The second resolution urged the transmission of the findings and recommendations of the Seelisberg conference to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, and recommended that a representative of the conference maintain contact with that commission. The work done by Commission Three had the greatest impact, and will be discussed in detail further on. The recommendations and findings of the other three commissions are presented first.

Commission One's area of concern was Jewish-Christian cooperation in combatting antisemitism. In an eight-point statement, the commission recognized the worldwide problem of antisemitism, and its solution as being a challenge for all people.[16] Antisemitism is a sin against God and humankind, it stated, and even though there are other problems caused by bigotry and prejudice, antisemitism is unique with regard to its use as a political tool. There was also a recognition of the role of anti-Jewish attitudes on the part of Christians for many centuries. The commission identified two major issues for resolution. The first was to ensure equality for all Jews throughout the world. This would include social, economic, political and legal equalities. These included the enactment of laws to provide restitution for property losses suffered by Jews, economic and social rehabilitation of Jews, measures to counteract antisemitism in Europe, and the enactment of laws banning hate crimes and libel on both the national and

[16] ICCJ, Reports and Recommmendations..., 7.

international levels. The second issue dealt with the right of Jews, especially those from Europe, to find homes elsewhere, including in Palestine. The commission encouraged plans to continue work towards formally establishing the ICCJ as well as councils of Christians and Jews throughout the world.

Commission Two concentrated on educational issues. Rabbi Julian Feibelman, from New Orleans, served on this commission. The commission proposed a twelve point program to be carried out on all levels of the educational system from young children through university students. It would involve developing new curricula to study the problem both of racism in general and of antisemitism in particular. Old curricula would be reviewed and revised to eliminate inaccurate references and portrayals. UNESCO would be asked to serve both as a resource to the educational community and as a distribution agent for new teaching materials that would be developed.

Commission Four sought mechanisms through which civic and social institutions could be drawn together for the purpose of fighting antisemitism.[17] Its ten point program called on religious leaders of all faiths to join together to take on the problem of antisemitism. As individuals Jews and Christians in leadership positions needed to put aside their own feelings of exclusiveness and set an example for other members of their communities. This was especially important where there existed a wide social separation between the Jewish and Christian

[17] ICCJ, Reports and Recommmendations, 16-18.

communities. The commission also urged the formation of councils of Christians and Jews and the continued development of the ICCJ.

Commission Five developed four resolutions with regard to governments. The first urged the repeal of discriminatory legislation and the passing of new laws that would ban discrimination and violence. The second resolution urged restitution for the property of Jews that was destroyed or stolen by the Nazis. The third resolution dealt with antisemitism in occupied Germany and the fourth addressed the issue of displaced persons (DPs). Given the difficult circumstances under which DPs, especially Jewish DPs, lived, it was felt that their permanent settlement to a location of the individual's choice, Palestine included, should be expedited. Furthermore, efforts should be made to greatly improve their living conditions. The committee recognized the tensions due to the existence of the DP camps, and the possibility of renewed antisemitic activity.

The Ten Points of Seelisberg

Commission Three, The Task of the Churches, wrote the single most important document produced at the conference. This document has come to be known as the "Ten Points of Seelisberg."[18] To this day, a placard with the "Ten Points" hangs in the office of the General Secretary of the ICCJ in Heppenheim, Germany. The commission's goal was to define the role of the churches in combating antisemitism. Its findings

[18] ICCJ, Reports and Recommendations..., 13.

were the most detailed and concrete of any commission. Chaired by Reverend Father Calliste Lopinot, the commission included Professor Jules Isaac, a key person in the development of the "Ten Points" document.[19] Isaac was born in 1877.[20] His family had a tradition of meritorious service to the French army. He too was decorated for service during World War I. By training he was a historian and an educator.[21] In 1936 he was appointed Inspector General of Education in France, the highest educational post in the country. He wrote a seven volume history work, Cours d'Histoire, that was widely used in secondary schools and universities.

Isaac's first awareness of the problem of antisemitism began during the Dreyfus Affair.[22] He championed the cause of Dreyfus during the early years of this century, helping to clear Dreyfus' name. He became even more involved with the issue of antisemitism during World War II. As a Jew, he lost his position under the Vichy government and joined the resistance movement. When the Nazis arrived at his home to take the family for deportation, he was away. Only he and one son survived the war. As the war progressed, he delved into the historical roots of

---

[19] ICCJ, Reports and Recommendations..., 27.

[20] Claire Huchet Bishop, "Biography of Jules Isaac", in Jules Isaac, Has Antisemitism Roots in Christianity (New York 1962), 27-31.

[21] Joseph L. Lichten, "Jules Isaac: The Teaching of Contempt," in Katharine T. Hargrove, R. S. C. J., ed., The Star and the Cross: Essays on Jewish-Christian Relations, 133-134.

[22] Bishop, "Biography of Jules Isaac," 29.

antisemitism and its relationship to Christianity. His first book on the subject, Jesus et Israel, was published in 1947.[23] Isaac presented an eighteen point document that became the focal point of the commission's discussion and was the major source for the Ten Points as well as the introductory material to the commission's reports in the proceedings. The Eighteen Points of Jules Isaac and the Ten Points of Seelisberg are listed in appendix B.

The members of the commission, through the work of Isaac, realized that a major source of antisemitism could be traced to misunderstanding, misquoting and improper use of the Gospels. The commission also stated that antisemitism was counter to true Christian teaching and belief. It felt that Christianity had grown out of Judaism and as a result there were close ties between the two religions. Thus, Christian teaching itself had to serve as a vehicle for combating antisemitism. Isaac's program was directed toward Christian education.[24] It was his belief that it was in the teaching of the Passion narrative and its circumstancess with regard to the Jews that time that gave rise to much of the antisemitism that has been present over the past centuries.

In the beginning of his remarks, Isaac set out two assumptions.[25] The first was that antisemitism is also anti-

[23] Lichten, "Jules Isaac: The Teaching of Contempt," 133.

[24] Jules Isaac, "Christian Anti-Semitism and the Means of Curing it by Redressing Christian Teaching," ICCJ Central Files, Heppenheim, Germany.

[25] Jules Isaac, "Christian Anti-Semitism..."

Christian, and the second that Christian antisemitism is the basis for all other forms of antisemitism. He then went on to state that, though Christianity grew out of Jewish roots (also listed under point four), the separation of the two faiths nad been a painful one. He discussed several myths that were used as justification for Christian antisemitism. One such myth was that the Jewish dispersion resulted because of Jewish rejection of Jesus as the messiah. He countered that the dispersion of the Jews took place several centuries before Jesus lived (also listed under point five). In response to the problem of Christian antisemitism, Isaac proposed his eighteen points. The Ten Points of Seelisberg were very similar.

The first point of Seelisberg was drawn from Isaac's first four points. It stated that one God speaks to all people through both the Christian and Hebrew Bible. Isaac mentioned that the Hebrew Bible was holy to the Jews long before the inception of Christianity; that much of Christian liturgy, literature and art incorporated themes from the Hebrew Bible; and that God had revealed himself to the Jews, who in turn transmitted the Bible to the Christians.

The second and third points of Seelisberg stressing the Jewish origins of Jesus and his disciples and that Jesus himself lived his entire life as a Jew. These corresponded to Isaac's seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth points. The fourth point of Seelisberg reminds people that Jesus' commandment to love one's neighbor is drawn from the Hebrew Bible. Isaac did not make a

similar point.

The fifth point of Seelisberg discouraged the glorification of Christianity at the expense of Judaism. This was not an explicit statement by Isaac, but one with which it seems he would have concurred. Point six rejected the use of the word "Jew" to mean enemy of Jesus or the phrase "enemies of Jesus" to mean all Jews. Not all Jews were enemies of Jesus and the enemies of Jesus were generally those in the hierarchy, such as High Priests, Scribes and Pharisees. This corresponded to Isaac's sixth point.

The seventh point of Seelisberg closely corresponded to Isaac's points eleven through seventeen. These points all dealt with the Passion narrative. The Seelisberg document described the need to take great care in teaching this material. Isaac dealt more with the specific details. For example, Isaac's eleventh point was that the idea of Jesus as messiah was not outrightly rejected by the entire Jewish people as most people never knew Jesus. Point sixteen made it clear that the Jews did not have control over any part of the trial of Jesus, even the Jewish trial of Jesus, as the Roman authorities were in control of the situation at all times. The seventh Seelisberg point spelled out clearly the consequences of an improper presentation of the Passion narrative. The major consequence is that the students watching an innacurate portrayal of the Passion narrative would perceive an inaccurate portrait of what happened and an incorrect view of the role of the Jews in these events.

Isaac specified what the inaccuracies could be.

The eighth point of Seelisberg and Isaac's eighteenth point both quote the statement, "His blood be upon us and on our children," as having no force against the statement, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." This means that the second statement, uttered by Jesus, had much greater weight than the statement shouted by some Jews.

The ninth point of Seelisberg rejected the notion of the Jews as an a people acursed for their rejection of Jesus. While this was not explicitly stated by Isaac, it is clear that he would have concured. His point five, for example, stated that the dispersion of the Jews could not be linked to their rejection of Jesus, as some wished to do, because the dispersion occurred centuries before Jesus lived. The final point of Seelisberg was a reminder that the early members of the Church were themselves Jews. Isaac did not discuss this point.

It is clear that the contribution of Isaac formed the basis of the ten points. These ten points are the single most important creation of the Seelisberg meeting. In the years following, from Seelisberg to the present, these points have remained a starting place for Jewish-Christian dialogue. Aspects of these findings and recommendations are reflected to some degree in the other commission reports as well. This major step forward contributed greatly to the feelings of optimism which followed Seelisberg and which contributed to the subsequent burst of interfaith activities in the United States and Europe.

Reactions to the Seelisberg Conference

The reaction to the Seelisberg conference was very encouraging. The most important response was the increase in interfaith activities that followed the conference. This will be discussed in detail in the next chapter. Individual and press reactions to the conference were also positive. The Jewish Chronicle gave the report of the conference front page exposure.[26] Describing the conference as a "sequel" to the Oxford meeting of the previous year, the article listed the major participants and highlighted the importance of the role of education in combating antisemitism. It concluded with a note about a resolution calling for an equitable solution to the Palestine problem. The weekly editorial also spoke favorably about the conference and made reference to existing problems of anti-Jewish riots that had recently occurred in Britain.[27] A week later, The Jewish Chronicle again ran a front-page article, detailing reports on antisemitism that were presented at the meeting, and calling for education as a means of eradicating antisemitism.[28] The article concentrated on the contributions of the British and Americans in attendance. The work of Jules Isaac was not mentioned, nor was the commission with which he worked.

The response in the United States was also enthusiastic. Typical were the thoughts of Rabbi Julian Feibelman, who had been

---

[26] The Jewish Chronicle (London), August 8, 1947, 1.

[27] The Jewish Chronicle, August 8, 1947, 10.

[28] The Jewish Chronicle, August 15, 1947, 1.

in attendance. In a piece written about twelve years after Seelisberg, he described the conference as "the idea whose time had come."[29] Feibelman chronicled his own involvement with the NCCJ and discussed the vision and adept leadership of Everett Clinchy. He went on to describe the work at Seelisberg and underscored the work of Isaac and his contributions that had proven to be very significant over time. Seelisberg provided a significant starting point for serious Jewish-Christian dialogue as well as a major impetus to the organizational work that followed the conference. The New York Times and the Jewish Telegraphic Agency carried brief articles about the conference that highlighted elements of the "Ten Points."[30]

The ground-breaking work at Seelisberg set the direction for progress in interfaith dialogue. For the first time, core elements of antisemitism were identified. The conference at Oxford had shown that Jews and Christians could meet together on a large scale, but it was the meeting at Seelisberg where difficult and often painful issues were discussed. The interfaith movement now had both built the trust between Christians and Jews necessary to speak openly and provided a base of knowledge concerning the root problems. The work of the years that followed built on the work of Seelisberg.

---

[29] Julian B. Feibelman, "Seelisberg 1947: The Idea Whose Time Had Come," AJA, Feibelman Collection, 3\1. This piece comes from a group of sermons from around 1960.

[30] New York Times, August 6, 1947, p. 5. and JTA Daily News, August 6, 1947, p. 7. and August 7, 1947, p. 6.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ADVANCE AND RETREAT OF INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS TO ENGAGE IN INTERFAITH ACTIVITIES, 1947-1950

The adjournment of the Emergency Conference on Antisemitism in Seelisberg continued an era of optimism and intense activity in interfaith relations. This era was marked by participation of the NCCJ, the CCJ and the various national councils of Christians and Jews in a flurry of activity. The success of Seelisberg and the progress made there gave its participants and many others a sense that a new age had begun. There was a belief that the root causes of all prejudice and disharmony, including antisemitism, could be determined and thus eradicated. Efforts to formally establish the ICCJ continued. In addition, national councils of Christians and Jews continued to grow and to extend their programs. The NCCJ played an important role in this, particularly in Germany.

Despite this enthusiasm, the reality of the Cold War was becoming apparent. Other problems that either had been set aside or had not been crucial in previous years began to emerge. In addition, the NCCJ, through Everett Clinchy, began to move towards other ventures. Though these ventures were guided by the same optimism evident in the development of the ICCJ, they were also subject to the harsh realities of the postwar world and to certain elements of human nature, such as mistrust of the unknown, that undergirded prejudice. The words and thoughts of Seelisberg were not easily translated into a real world that was

still not yet free of hatred and prejudice. However, these problems did not totally dampen the spirits of those committed to the improvement of interfaith relations.

These years were also a time when the power of various personalities, most noticeably those of Everett Clinchy and William Simpson, came to full force. Just as these two men had been the impetus to the organization of the international conferences, they were also the impetus to the ICCJ. Yet the fervor of Clinchy and Simpson also produced opposition and personality clashes.

The NCCJ Takes "Brotherhood" on the Road

In August of 1945 the Japanese, the last of the Axis powers, had surrendered. The United States moved in to bring American style democracy to Europe and Asia. Japan was being guided by General Douglas MacArthur. In Europe efforts to democratize Germany were led primarily by the Americans, with the help of the British and French within their respective zones of occupation. The NCCJ was a part of this process in Europe. Initially the NCCJ's involvement was through the international conferences described. Now the NCCJ was poised to take a more active role. The NCCJ's leadership believed that its successful model of dealing with prejudice could be transplanted to Europe and the goals of the international conferences could be implemented. The NCCJ reflected the optimistic belief of the people of the United States that the ending of the war would bring a new beginning for world peace. In a sense it was an

American "triumphalism." It was triumphalism in a paternalistic sense. The "American Way" could be replicated and all nations could prosper as the United States had.

The NCCJ eagerly leaped into its role of postwar guidance counselor to Germany. General Lucius D. Clay served as the American Viceroy in Germany and headed the Office of Military Government United States (OMGUS).[1] He was responsible for changes being made in postwar German society. Clinchy, Sterling Brown and other members of the NCCJ and ICCJ staff worked with Clay in program planning. In August of 1947 Dr. Sterling Brown met with General Clay on the subject of the ICCJ and NCCJ working in the American zone. Brown, an ordained minister of the Disciples of Christ, had a career of university teaching before joining the NCCJ. From 1947 to 1949 he served full-time on the OMGUS staff.[2] Brown wrote to Clinchy on August 20 describing a letter he had drafted for General Clay's signature, which would invite the NCCJ and ICCJ to begin organizational activities in major German cities.[3] Brown urged Clinchy to give wide publicity both to the invitation extended to the NCCJ to work in Europe and to Clay's words of praise for the NCCJ's work with regard to intergroup relations.

---

[1] Bea Joseph et al., Biographical Index: Cumulative Index to Biographical Material in Books and Magazines, November 1946- July 1949, (New York, 1949), 183.

[2] Who's Who in America? (Chicago, 1963), 400.

[3] Sterling Brown to Clinchy, August 20, 1947, AJA, Julian Feibelman papers, 18\1.

In September Clinchy was busy building support for the NCCJ's growing program in Europe. On September 4 he wrote to Mr. Leonard B. Levy of New Orleans with regard to Rabbi Feibelman.[4] Clinchy was seeking Levy's support for obtaining leave time for Rabbi Feibelman to travel throughout the United States. He wanted Feibelman to speak about interfaith events overseas in general, with particular emphasis on his experiences at Seelisberg and at the World Youth Christian Conference that had been held in Oslo. According to Clinchy, Feibelman had made significant contributions to both conferences. Levy's response is not clear from the files. There is a reference in Clinchy's journal to Feibelman's having met in Berlin with youth of the three religious groups during the month of August.[5] Evident from Feibelman's papers is that he remained active in interfaith activities throughout his rabbinical career.

Clinchy's European Tour

In October 1947 Clinchy traveled to England and Continental Europe to work on the establishment of the NCCJ and ICCJ programs.[6] He kept a detailed journal that discussed plans, meetings and his personal reflections on people, places and

---

[4] Clinchy to Levy, September 4, 1947, AJA, Feibelman papers, Box 2\16.

[5] Everett R. Clinchy, journal, SWHA, October 31, 1947.

[6] Technically, the ICCJ did not exist as it had not formally adopted a constitution. However, it appears Clinchy had an idea in his mind of what the ICCJ program should be. The NCCJ had established an office in Geneva which was staffed by Visseur. It was this office that functioned as the ICCJ headquarters. Thus Clinchy acted as the director of the ICCJ as well as the NCCJ.

events.[7] The journal covers the time period beginning October 15 through Clinchy's departure from England for the United States on December 9.

The first entry is quite illuminating as to Clinchy's attitudes towards his coworkers and the ICCJ. He indicated displeasure with the leadership of the CCJ for not making better use of members of the NCCJ staff. Clinchy's stay in London did allow him to establish contacts with the leaders of the CCJ, as well as the opportunity to meet Sir General Brian Robertson, the Viceroy for the British Zone of Occupation, in Berlin. [8] A letter of introduction from the Ford Motor Company was instrumental in enabling Clinchy to arrange this meeting. Throughout Clinchy's journal there are numerous such examples of assistance through corporate connections. The Ford Motor Company was particularly helpful. Clinchy saw the meeting with Robertson as a chance to try to establish the National Conference's program

---

[7] Everett R. Clinchy, journal, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, 9\ Everett Ross Clinchy, Writings 1947. The end of the journal bore his name and an indication that the original had been signed. The available copy of the journal was typewritten, the original was probably handwritten.

There are four main sources dealing with Clinchy's tour: his journal, a memorandum of summary by Clinchy written after his return to the United States, a letter from Abraham Levinthal to Meier Grossman and the Executive minutes of the CCJ. By far the journal is the most complete and descriptive of the four sources. Clinchy's summary memorandum draws some conclusions about the trip which are consistent with the tenor of the journal. Levinthal's letter discussed several items, of which Clinchy's visit was just one. The same is true of the CCJ minutes, which also reflect other matters.

[8] Frank C. Roberts, Obituaries From the Times, 1971-1975, (London, 1978).

in the British zone as well.

Clinchy also met with the Provisional Committee of the ICCJ.[9] This committee had been in existence since the Oxford conference and was charged with developing a constitution and program for the ICCJ. Although it was not explicitly stated, the membership of this committee was probably the same as the continuation committee from the Oxford conference that had planned the Seelisberg conference and had started work on the program of the ICCJ. The CCJ minutes are not clear as to who served on this committee although it appears Neville Laski and Lord Reading were members. The committee and Clinchy discussed the proposed ICCJ constitution and organizational details as developed by the committee. Clinchy found numerous problems and felt that the constitution should be rewritten, and that all of the specific organizational matters could be set aside until after the completion of his European travels.

The next day Clinchy went to Berlin. The leaders of OMGUS were receptive to having the International Council post a field worker in Germany. They offered office space, housing, access to intercity transportation, and purchasing privileges at the post exchange. They urged that the field worker be fluent in German, as much of the work would be done at the local level with people who spoke little or no English. Over the course of the next few

[9] The continuation committee members from the Oxford conference were Lord Reading, Percy Bartlett, Erich Bickel, A.G. Brotman, Reverend James W. Parkes, and Reverend Henry Carter. It is likely that Neville Laski, Professor J.A. Lauwerys and Russell Bradley also participated.

days, Clinchy met with various officials from the British and American occupation authorities. These meetings proved to be successful. Before leaving London, Clinchy had made plans to meet with General Robertson. Robertson was interested in the NCCJ plan and promised to have his Education and Religious section administrator meet with Clinchy.

On the 19 Clinchy presented his ideas for a German council of Christians and Jews to the religious staff of the occupation administration, to several important figures from the Berlin church, and to Judge Louis Levinthal, Clay's advisor on Jewish affairs. Levinthal was active in Zionist circles and had served as president of the Zionist Organization of America. His proposal was received with interest. After Clinchy spoke, four important church leaders, including Pastor Gruber, responded positively, according to Clinchy. Clinchy then asked them what they believed the next step should be. They said that German Christians had to accept responsibility for what happened to the Jews during the war. They viewed this as an opportunity to begin to build relations with other nations of the world. The Christian leaders also indicated an agreement with the scope of the proposed activities. They were relieved that there would be no need for doctrinal changes nor for relinquishing the Christian hope of "conversion of the world."

After the Christians had spoken, Levinthal responded that the Jews of Germany needed to hear the thoughts that had been expressed. Clinchy reported that Levinthal was deeply moved.

Levinthal reported to Meier Grossman of the American Jewish Conference on the state of affairs, including the meeting with Clinchy and the church officials.[10] Levinthal apparently was not as inspired as Clinchy believed. Levinthal felt that the German clergy were "cold and guarded in discussing the Jewish question." He noted that Pastor Gruber, who had been active since the time of the Oxford conference, spoke movingly about the need for Germans and Christians to confront their guilt and to make "collective atonement."

While it appears that the Germans' willingness to accept responsibility was indeed an important gesture, there still remained the question of conversionary activities. Since the only available record of the discussion on this point is Clinchy's report, it is not clear if the point of the Christian desire for world conversion was discussed at length. If it was brought up in more than a casual way, it would be interesting to know what Levinthal's response was to this particular issue. The fear on the part of Jews that this proposed organization could have been a conversionary front organization was always in the background. Clinchy was certainly aware of this. Perhaps Christian acceptance of responsibility for wartime atrocities against the Jews by the Christian clergy was sufficiently convincing to Judge Levinthal that he felt their intentions were honorable.

---

[10] Levinthal to Meier Grossman, November 19, 1947, AJA, Jacob Billikopf Papers, Box 16\ folder 8.

The following day Clinchy met with Mr. Devereaux, General Clay's policy advisor on commercial affairs. Before going to Germany, Devereaux had served as vice president for AT&T. They had a thorough discussion about the purpose and reasoning behind the fervent American activities to reconstruct Germany. Devereaux pointed out three major reasons for American reconstruction of Germany: the decency of the American people, the need to build a barrier in Germany against Communism, and the realization of the interdependency of world economies. It is clear from the depth of Clinchy's discussions and the people with whom he spoke that he sought out the cooperation of officials at the very highest levels. This was consistent with Clinchy's methods. He had thought in big terms in the United States when initially building up the NCCJ, and now he was doing the same in Europe.

Clinchy was a man of optimism. As he met with church and educational leaders, he became convinced that a German council of Christians and Jews would be established within the year. While he saw negative traits that had persisted for generations in the German people, he also saw tendencies that if properly channeled could be used productively. He believed that a German council could be developed to reflect the Germans' own needs and concerns.

By October 23 Clinchy had traveled to Frankfort. He met with Pastor Otto Friche in Wiesbaden. Pastor Friche described his own deep feelings of guilt for not opposing the Nazi terror

against the Jews. He also stated that his church was planning to release a statement vowing to prevent such violence from happening again in the future. That evening Clinchy described his meeting with Friche to Sterling Brown, Judge Levinthal and Levinthal's assistant, Major Abraham Hyman. Levinthal was particularly interested in the statement, as he had discovered no evidence for a rejection of antisemitism on the part of the Germans, nor had he heard any promises that anti-Jewish violence would not take place again in the future.

The following day Clinchy met with Fabian von Schlabrendorf, a lawyer in Wiesbaden, who was interested in establishing a council in that city. Von Schlabrendorf agreed to generate a list of ten citizens who could serve on the council. This type of meeting -between Clinchy and a leading local citizen who would provide the names of other community leaders- was typical of Clinchy's method. Clinchy sought influential people who would form the core of each local council. He also met at length with the mayor of Wiesbaden, who was very eager to cooperate and who was interested in strengthening democracy in Germany. In particular, he was anxious about the extreme forces of Communism and younger ex-Nazis. Before leaving Wiesbaden, Clinchy met with Prelate Wolfe. Wolfe at first was somewhat resistant, but then warmed to Clinchy's proposals. In the course of their discussion, Wolfe described existing programs of cooperation between the Catholic and Protestant communities, especially with regard to rebuilding of church facilities that had been destroyed

during the war.

Clinchy used this process of meeting leading citizens and local leaders throughout his travels to various communities in Germany and other parts of Europe. It is the same method he used in the United States when developing local roundtables in each city. The roundtables became the core of the local chapter. Although it is stressed throughout Clinchy's journal that the organization of local councils in Germany was to be German in nature, based on German custom and cultural norms, it is clear that he saw the American model as the pattern upon which the Germans should build.

In addition to meeting with German community leaders, he visited members of the DP community. On October 24 he visited Wetzler DP camp and met with three representatives of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) as well. The DPs were insistent on moving to Palestine. At the time Clinchy met with these representatives there were, according to figures Clinchy read in Stars and Stripes, 113,000 Jews in DP camps and some already integrated into the German economy. The Jews were not particularly interested in interfaith discussions. Their major interest was emigration to Palestine. Clinchy and the IRO officials were frustrated by the seeming narrowmindedness of the DP leadership. An unnamed staff member of the Religious Affairs branch of the occupation government advocated a plan for the closing of the DP camps.

The plan for closing the DP camps had a number of aspects.

It was not clear from Clinchy's writing whether this plan encompassed all DPs or just Jews. The plan advocated repatriation to native lands where possible. It also called for the admission of some Jews to the United States and Palestine. In any event, all the DP camps would be closed on a specific date. Those individuals who remained in Germany would be "forced into the German economy." Another unnamed individual said that for "the sake of the Jews as well as the Germans" the Jews should be dispersed. Both in this instance and throughout Clinchy's journal there is a stream of thought suggesting that the greatest amount of antisemitism is present in locations where there are higher concentrations of Jews, and less antisemitism where the Jewish population is small. For example, he closes the entry about this meeting with the DP leaders with harsh words for what he considered to be the narrowmindedness of the DP leaders. This was particularly so on the subject of Palestine, the place ultimately preferred for settlement by the DPs. This attitude, in Clinchy's mind, contributed to "the increasingly acute bitterness concerning these conspicuous islands of Jews."

It is clear from Clinchy's writings that he had little more than token interest in a Palestine option, yet at the same time much was happening on the Palestine issue. As mentioned earlier, Clinchy was undoubtedly influenced by his association with strong anti-Zionists since the early days of his work in interfaith relations. The strong Zionist orientation of the Jewish population of Europe set them in opposition to Clinchy and

his idea of improving relations between Jews and Christians wherever they happened to live.

After his meetings in the Wiesbaden area, Clinchy went on to Heidelberg and Tuebingen. He met with two Catholic university professors. After some discussion, they too became interested in his ideas. Though they hesitated, they also accepted the inclusion of Jews in the process and agreed to having a trio team visit the area as long as its constituent members were able to speak German. Local leaders in Stuttgart favored the same ideas and agreed to put together a list of prominent Catholics, Protestants and Jews to serve on a local council. Clinchy continued this process throughout Germany.

The Jews Clinchy met were not as responsive to his ideas. In general, they were unwilling to trust the Germans. Discussions with various Jewish leaders revealed their belief that antisemitism still persisted. They cited a number of examples including shortcomings in deNazification, clandestine Nazi radio broadcasts, the lack of visible action on the part of the Christians churches to root out antisemitism, and accusations against Jews for being involved in the black market. There was also much emotion concerning the lack of support and aid for Jewish emigration to Palestine. Despite these apprehensions, they did indicate willingness to support the ICCJ and a tour of a traveling trio team.

Early in November Clinchy began travels to Italy, France and Switzerland. By November 5 he had arrived in Rome. One of

his first meetings was with Father Lapinot, who had attended the Seelisberg conference. Clinchy was encouraged by the activity that had taken place since the conference. A few days later, with the assistance of Vatican officials, he met Pope Pius XII at his residence, Castel Gandolfo. The Pope was interested in the program and activities as Clinchy had explained them, and in the conference on anti-Catholicism to be held in 1948. He cautioned that the preparations must be carefully done. The Pope added that he would have to study the possibility of permitting Church assistance in preparation. Clinchy participated in additional at the Vatican later that day. He was urged to delay planning the conference until a positive word was received from the Vatican.

Before leaving Rome, Clinchy met with a group of notables who agreed to form a chapter. The meeting was not a smooth one and Clinchy hinted that the discord was due to the head of the Rome Jewish Congress pressing Zionist-oriented issues. Clinchy seems to have viewed such Zionism as a hindrance.

Clinchy's next stop was Florence. The Florence community had already organized a committee and they had a productive meeting with Clinchy. A similar meeting took place in Torino. From there Clinchy and his party went back to Milan and on to Berne.

On November 12 Clinchy met with the Foreign Minister of the Swiss Confederation, H. E. Max Fehlpierre. Fehlpierre was interested in the ICCJ. He was particularly keen to point out that the ICCJ should seek to include all "men of goodwill,"

including Communists, as he felt disappointed by the separation taking place between the Soviet Union and the non-Communist world. Clinchy was impressed by the man and saw him as a potential asset to the ICCJ.

Clinchy's group then met with Monsignor Charrare, Bishop of Fribourg. Charrare volunteered to work with the ICCJ, supported the idea of a conference on anti-Catholicism and provided some suggestions for its preparation. Afterwards they toured the university and decided that it would be a good site for the summer meeting being planned. The following day, meetings were held with Professor Erich Bickel and Dr. Hans Ornstein, leaders in the Swiss Jewish community. Clinchy wrote that though both of them had been at Oxford and Seelisberg, they seemed focused only on the topic of antisemitism and not the broader concerns of brotherhood. Prior to leaving Switzerland, a group of community leaders met in Geneva.

On November 15 meetings began in Paris with community leaders. Clinchy recognized the potential challenge to organizing in France, where there was no history of official cooperation between the three religious groups. Over the course of several days there were meetings with leaders of all three faith groups, who represented both the Paris communities and France in general. There was a fair amount of interest in the ICCJ. The Jewish community had already discussed the proposals and offered its recommendations. They also offered to help recruit Catholic and Protestant participants. Before leaving for

Brussels, Clinchy and Visseur met with Dr. Kazimierz Wotkowicki, first secretary at the Polish embassy, and the cultural attache, Mr. Gagoulrski. The Polish men defended their government's record with regard to both its treatment of the Catholic church and its attitude towards antisemitism. Clinchy felt that they were careful not to speak against the Communist Party. However, the two men saw no reason why the ICCJ could not actively pursue its program in Poland.

On November 20 meetings took place in Brussels. Clinchy described Belgium as being one percent Protestant, one half of one percent Jewish, with the remainder being Catholic. Catholic leaders said that due to the small size of the non-Catholic population there were few intergroup problems. An organizational committee was in place to establish a local affiliate of the ICCJ, consisting of Catholics, Protestants and Jews. The Cardinal of Brussels, though he thought it was unnecessary to have an organization such as the ICCJ in Belgium, recognized that it was needed in other parts of the world and had no objection to the recruitment of supporters for the ICCJ. In other meetings, support was voiced by scholars, but there was concern that most Belgians knew little of intergroup problems and educating them would take a considerable amount of time. On November 22nd, the group went on to Holland and met with Catholic and Protestant academics. On November 23 they met with Rabbi J. Tal of Amsterdam and the president of his congregation.

The rabbi and the president were not particularly interested

in the ICCJ. They recounted the decimation of the Jewish population of Holland and the fact that a sizeable number of the Jews in Holland were refugees, some of them with no desire to stay in Holland, but to go to Palestine. The president, who had lost his entire family in the war, said that he could see no use for a Dutch council of Christians and Jews. After discussion on the possibility of educating future generations about the problems of religious prejudice, the rabbi and the president agreed to receive and review additional information on possible programs. Clinchy and his staff realized that they would have to seek out additional leaders from the Jewish community. Visseur and Brackett stayed in Holland for a couple of days while Clinchy and his wife returned to London.

On November 25 Clinchy met with leaders of the CCJ, including Leonard Montefiore, Lord Reading and Edmund de Rothschild. They discussed the financial contribution of the CCJ to the ICCJ. Clinchy's journal says nothing about the outcome of the meeting. The following day Simpson of the CCJ and Clinchy met with Cardinal Griffin. The cardinal had been critical of the CCJ's seeming preoccupation with the subject of antisemitism. Clinchy reported on his trip to the Continent, including his audience with the Pope and the receptivity of seventeen communities to forming local councils. At this point, Griffin became more interested and responded to several points including the report of the Polish embassy officials in Paris. He said that there was indeed repression of the Catholic Church by the

Polish government. The following day an organizational meeting like those held on the Continent took place in Manchester, with encouraging results. The meeting concluded with a resolution to form a local council. Several days of meetings began in Scotland on December 1, beginning with a visit to Edinburgh.

The Scots already had an existing committee to deal with Christian-Jewish relations. It is apparent from Clinchy's description that people at the meeting came with a variety of personal agenda. Some were openly missionary, but viewed as precedent the elimination of antisemitism, as "fair play must precede the gospel." Others saw the need for more Catholic participation. An unidentified Quaker spoke in favor of the ICCJ. After discussion, it was agreed that steps should be taken to form a Scottish council. Meetings with Protestant leaders took place on December 2. They related that there were some tensions with Catholics and attributed them to the proximity to Northern Ireland, where tensions were especially high. Leaders of the Jewish community were not available to meet.

William Simpson joined Clinchy on December 3 for a meeting with Bishop Fisher, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Clinchy described his work and ongoing activities on the continent. The Archbishop was at first concerned that moral and spiritual issues were interests of the Church. Clinchy and Simpson assured him that the proposed work was designed to combat bigotry, eliminate prejudice and cooperate on civic projects of mutual interest. The Archbishop responded that he saw no problems within the

greater Christian community and the CCJ should concentrate its efforts on problems related to the Jews. He saw no need to enlarge the project in either scope of activities or finance.

The men then moved on to the question of Palestine. They brought up a statement by the Archbishop of York who said that the government of a Jewish state would be inadequate to protect the Arabs or Christians. Bishop Fisher responded that many of the atheistic Jews now in Palestine had become terrorists. Clinchy did not record any response to this statement. He did, however, append a copy of newspaper article that quoted the Archbishop of York. In addition to the statement about terrorism and the safety of non-Jews, the archbishop called for the internationalization of Jerusalem.

Following the meeting with the Archbishop, Clinchy and Simpson met with representatives of Jewish organizations and later in the day with the Executive of the CCJ. The day concluded with a gathering of members of Parliament who were interested in forming a committee to further the goals of the CCJ.

The next day, December 5, Clinchy and his staff went to Cardiff, Wales. Clinchy explained the purpose and program of the ICCJ. He mentioned the importance of establishing local councils in major population centers. He tied the need for a successful program to foster brotherhood to the preservation and strengthening of democracy. A large section of this segment of Clinchy's journal seems to be an outline of his presentation

more than a chronology of events and his impressions. Clinchy did not write about the response of those in attendance. A similar meeting was held in Reading on December 6. Leaders in Reading, after some hesitation, indicated an interest in participation in the ICCJ.

Clinchy spent December 7 and 8 with last-minute meetings, brief speaking engagements and preparations to depart. Clinchy and his wife left for the United States on December 9.

In less than two months Clinchy had completed a whirlwind tour of major European and British cities. He carried the banner of the NCCJ and ICCJ throughout. It is interesting to note that in the early part of the tour he made more frequent references to the NCCJ. In the latter part he even more strongly emphasized the ICCJ. While all this was going on, the ICCJ only existed on paper. At the beginning of the trip when he met with the CCJ leadership, he put aside any attempt to deal with the formalities of the organization. While a draft constitution had been prepared by the Provisional Committee of the ICCJ, he and other NCCJ staff members found numerous problems with it. There is no evidence in Clinchy's journal that anything except finances were discussed when the NCCJ and CCJ leaders met in London just prior to Clinchy's departure in December.

Clinchy was obviously a dynamic and charismatic individual. Numerous times he had been successful in winning the support and participation of those who were initially skeptical. Just as he had been the core of the nascent NCCJ, so too was he now

seemingly the core of the ICCJ. Thus the future of the ICCJ was closely linked to Clinchy.

In January of 1948 Clinchy wrote a confidential memorandum to "the Friends of the National Conference of Christians and Jews."[11] The memorandum summarized his trip to Europe and stated some of his conclusions in retrospect. He was optimistic and presented three major generalizations. The first was his belief that antisemitism "as a popular movement" in Europe was inconceivable. The second was that "the main current is away from Kremlin communism, which means that the anti-Christian tide is turning." The third was that "Western Civilization" could gain a "new lease on life" to the extent that diverse groups could learn to work together towards the elimination of bigotries and enhancement of liberty. Most of the report dealt with specifics of the trip, details of the proposals he presented to each community with regard to establishing a local council of the ICCJ, and an example of how they were positively received.

Meanwhile Back in England...

Everett Clinchy and the NCCJ were not the only parties interested in the ICCJ. The CCJ, with strong leadership from William Simpson, was also interested. Simpson, though a very different man from Clinchy, was his counterpart in England in many ways. Just as he had pioneered the gathering together of

---

[11] Everett R. Clinchy, "The International Conference of Christians and Jews: A Report of a European Mission,"January 1948, (Mimeograph copy), SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 8, "Everett Ross Clinchy, Writings 1948."

Jews and Christians, so too he had a grander vision. Simpson had been very involved in planning the two international conferences, perhaps more so than Clinchy. The ICCJ, then, was an important project and one to which he devoted much effort. The minutes of the CCJ Executive show that Simpson was the main staff member concerned with issues and work connected with the ICCJ, and was its greatest proponent. It was he who was committed to the notion of international cooperation.

On September 10, 1947 the Executive of the CCJ met.[12] Simpson reported on the events of Seelisberg and the proposed ICCJ with Clinchy as its president. Neville Laski would serve as chair of the Executive committee and Simpson and Visseur as joint secretaries. The CCJ indicated an interest in Clinchy's proposed tour to the continent for several months. After some correspondence with the NCCJ, it was determined that Clinchy would work on the European Continent and Simpson would work in Britain. Laski indicated that he was unwilling for Simpson to go to the Continent unless adequate plans were made. The Executive met again on October 1 and decided that the continuation committee composed of Laski, Lord Reading and Captain Bulkeley-Johnson would meet with Clinchy to discuss his plans for work in Europe and the constitution and program of the ICCJ.[13] As reported in Clinchy's journal, the planned meeting did indeed

---

[12] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, September 10, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[13] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, October 1, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

take place. Clinchy's journal and the minutes of the CCJ Executive committee seems to disagree as to what was accomplished at the October 10 meeting.

The CCJ Executive met once more on October 28, about three weeks after the meeting with Clinchy.[14] Simpson reported that a constitution had been drawn up for the ICCJ by the Provisional Committee and that it was suggested that the NCCJ and CCJ recognize the existence of the ICCJ. While it is evident from Clinchy's writings that he was operating under the assumption that the ICCJ was in existence, it is also clear that Clinchy had a different view of the status of the organization's constitution. It seems that, in view of the attitudes represented in the CCJ minutes and Clinchy's journal, there was a discernible difference in understanding.

The British seemed to prefer a careful, measured approach. The Americans, as typified by Clinchy, were much more interested in getting immediately involved with organizing local chapters and getting on with the work. The British wanted to pay closer attention to details and specifics, while Clinchy wanted to put off the specifics until later, after he had completed the tour to the Continent.

The Jewish Chronicle reported on November 14 concerning the CCJ annual meeting held in November and the reports given regarding the Seelisberg conference and the ICCJ.[15] The assembly

---

[14] CCJ, Executive Committee Minutes, October 28, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[15] The Jewish Chronicle (London), November 14, 1947, p. 1.

passed a resolution condemning hatred as "inherently evil" and a "threat to the well-being of the community." Simpson spoke of the urgent need for the establishment of the ICCJ. The report concluded with the statement that both the NCCJ and the CCJ regarded the ICCJ as existing. On November 28 The Jewish Chronicle described a press conference held by Clinchy in London to discuss efforts in Europe to form the ICCJ.[16] Clinchy called upon Christians and Jews to unite on topics of mutual concern and join in educational activities directed at eliminating bigotry and prejudice. The article noted some of the details of Clinchy's travels and plans for the ICCJ. It also noted the reluctance of the Amsterdam and Munich Jewish Communities to participate.

The details of Clinchy's trip to the Continent and visits to several of the local British councils were discussed by the CCJ Executive on December 3.[17] Reaction to Clinchy's tour was, in general, positive. Members of the Amsterdam community were, as Clinchy reported, more skeptical than the rest. Little was said about the ICCJ itself other than that the constitution was still being revised. At this point there were signs that interest in the ICCJ and concern with its program were changing. Previously international affairs had been a high priority for the CCJ, as reflected in the Executive Committee meeting and the efforts put

---

[16] The Jewish Chronicle (London), November 28, 1947, p. 1.

[17] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, December 3, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

forth by Simpson. In January and February 1948 there was little action or discussion with regard to the ICCJ.[18] While there was not an abandonment of the ICCJ and international activities, there was a perceptible change in attitude, apparent when the totality of the CCJ's activities are viewed in retrospect. The enthusiasm and level of activity as indicated by the Executive minutes diminished considerably from this time forward. In January it was also noted that the NCCJ was on record as supporting the statement defining genocide as a crime under international law.

In March, the ICCJ returned to the discussion table of the CCJ. The Executive Committee received a report stating that members of the CCJ and NCCJ staff were cooperating in working on details of the program and policy of the ICCJ.[19] By April, activities had picked up considerably as plans for the summer conference of the ICCJ reached completion.[20] This was the conference that Clinchy had discussed while touring Fribourg. Although Clinchy had discussed the possibility of a conference on anti-Catholicism during his tour to Europe, it appeared that the ICCJ itself would be a major point of discussion. The two main topics proposed were the role and program of the ICCJ and the

---

[18] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes January 6 and February 10, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[19] CCJ, Executive Committee meeting, March 9, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[20] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, April 13, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

possibility of establishing an educational program based on the CCJ's work in England. This did not mean that Jewish-Christian relations was not to be a topic of discussion, rather that the ICCJ leadership, as represented by the Provisional Committee, had to make some decisions regarding the direction of the organization.

The May meeting of the CCJ Executive Committee revealed a growing difference between the American and British approaches.[21] Visseur spoke to the Executive Committee. He said that there was indeed European interest in the ICCJ, but there was a lack of leadership development and the differences between the Americans and the British were becoming more apparent. Visseur did not elaborate on the differences. He also mentioned the reluctance of the Dutch Jewish community to get involved, reiterating the frustration Clinchy had experienced just a few months earlier during his visit. He urged that both the Executive Committee and the provisional Executive Committee of the ICCJ should meet again before the summer conference to be held at Fribourg from July 21 through 28. The minutes record that, despite difficulties, Clinchy was still interested in securing the participation in the conference of representatives from Eastern Europe.

Despite the strains between the NCCJ and the CCJ, plans were moving ahead for the Fribourg conference. There was still much enthusiasm for the postwar prospects of a world where all people

---

[21] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, May 11, 1947, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

would live free of bigotry and prejudice. Unfortunately the grand ideas of Clinchy and the restrained approach of Simpson were already beginning to undermine an organization that had not yet really gotten off the ground. Clinchy was seeking to broaden his horizons while Simpson was trying to contain his. The months that followed were difficult ones for the ICCJ and a time of rapid changes.

In June, the CCJ Executive met again and discussed the ICCJ and the upcoming Fribourg conference.[22] Simpson reported that the provisional Executive Committee of the ICCJ was to meet late in the month to work out continuing problems. He said that the CCJ had problems "with the whole nature, constitution and work" of the ICCJ. The Executive discussed the problems at length and in the end reaffirmed their commitment to the ICCJ. The minutes of July 13 state that questions about the constitution were resolved.[23] Despite the questions raised at the June meeting, the Executive at that time indicated that they saw the primary function of the ICCJ was to assist in the formation of new national councils of Christians and Jews. It is clear that Clinchy had broader aims. He saw the ICCJ as being more of an initiating body which, in addition to starting new councils, would be actively working on a program of its own. These differences can to a large extent be traced to differences in the

[22] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, June 6, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[23] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, July 13, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

CCJ and the NCCJ.

By the time that the CCJ was formed, the NCCJ had already been active for over ten years. Although the NCCJ did not have an inexhaustible budget, it was certainly better funded than the CCJ, as evidenced by the activities of the respective organizations. The NCCJ was well respected in the United States and had a number of successful ongoing programs throughout the country.

The CCJ, on the other hand, was still in the organizational stage in some cities and had focused much of its attention on problems in London and the planning of the international conferences. The coalition that held together the CCJ had seemed tenuous from the outset, while the NCCJ was relatively strong and stable. For example, the participation of the Jewish community in the CCJ was dependent on the Chief Rabbi. His concerns and wishes had to be considered. In the case of the United States there was no chief rabbi and Jewish communal leadership was decentralized.

The NCCJ made its contacts initially and most strongly through the Reform Jewish community, which was more amenable to interfaith contacts. The CCJ, on the other hand, was dealing with a much more conservative leader whom they could not in any way offend. Thus, the CCJ had to take a more cautious and conservative approach. They did not share the same degree of drive for programmatic expansion and experimentation as did the NCCJ as exemplified through Clinchy's activities.

The Fribourg Conference

The Fribourg conference of the ICCJ convened from July 21 through 28, 1948.[24] In addition to working on specifics of the ICCJ, the conferees discussed the theme of intergroup education. Among the accomplishments of the Fribourg conference was the furtherance of interfaith dialogue and the acceptance of the new ICCJ constitution.[25] (see appendix C) The 120 conference participants came from the United States, Austria, Britain, Germany, Switzerland and Holland, with only one representative from Eastern Europe, a representative of the Polish government.[26] Apparently Clinchy was not able to fulfill his desire to have Eastern European participants. This was a marked contrast over the meeting the previous year in Seelisberg. It is not clear as to exactly how many participants were Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, although the various descriptions indicate that all three communities were well represented

---

[24] William W. Simpson, "The International Council of Christians and Jews: A Brief History," (mimeograph booklet, Heppenheim, Germany, 1982), 9. The proceedings of the conference itself were not available. However, there were some references to it in secondary literature and minutes of the CCJ.

[25] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, September 14, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[26] Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, "Christians and Jews Get Together," The Catholic World, October 1948, 6, as found in SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 7\ File "International Council of Christians and Jews."

"Die Internationale christlich-juedische Konferenz von Fribourg/ Schweiz, 1948," Rundbrief zur Forderung der Freundschaft zwischen dem alten und dem neuen Gottesvolk - im Geiste der beiden Testamente, 1 (1948): 12-14, as found in central files of Sister of Sion, Vienna. This publication later became known as the Freiburger Rundbrief.

During the conference the ICCJ appointed Professor Joseph A. Lauwerys to serve as a part-time educational advisor for Europe and named Geneva as the site for the ICCJ headquarters. On September 14, Simpson reported to the CCJ Executive that the ICCJ constitution was ratified by at least the CCJ and the Swiss council. Thus there was sufficient support to consider the ICCJ as formally established and its Executive functioning in an active rather than a provisional state. The ICCJ Executive did in fact chair at least part of the conference.[27]

A plenary meeting accepted the report given by the commission on religious questions. The commission offered a number of suggestions. These were to establish a permanent religious commission for the ICCJ, to give greater publicity to the "Ten Points of Seelisberg," to establish a theologically-oriented information service, and to promote common understanding between different churches, stressing common traditions of Judaism and Christianity.[28]

The conference continued some of the discussion topics that had been presented at Seelisberg. One of these topics was the religious and psychological roots of antisemitism, including the suggestion that much of antisemitism was based on the teaching

---

[27] William W. Simpson, and Ruth Weyl, The International Council of Christians and Jews, (Heppenheim, West Germany, 1988), 27-28.

[28] "Die Internationale christlich-juedische Konferenz von Fribourg/ Schweiz, 1948," Rundbrief zur Forderung der Freundschaft zwischen dem alten und dem neuen Gottesvolk - im Geiste der beiden Testamente, 12.

that Jews were Christ killers. The correction of this teaching would alleviate much of the problem. Participants in the plenary were concerned that antisemistism could once again become a threat. The plenary recognized the deep shame and guilt of the churches with regard to past antisemitic activity and the need for the churches to join together to fight antisemitism and as mentioned, to communicate these feelings to the WCC. It further urged the leadership of the ICCJ to continue to set up national councils of Christians and Jews as a means to accomplish this task. The commission on civil rights echoed these concerns and suggested utilizing the media as a means of educating people on the issue of antisemitism and intolerance in general. It further recommended the encouragement of the international exchange of ideas and an emphasis on youth work.[29]

The conference also had moments of controversy. At one point a representative from a European country suggested that the scope of the ICCJ be broadened to include atheists and agnostics. She was verbally attacked by a number of people including Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, a contributor to the Catholic World, who said she had "no business at the conference."[30]

There were no common prayers said or public blessings.[31] From the earliest days of the NCCJ it had been customary to

---

[29] "Die Internationale christlich-juedische Konferenz von Fribourg/ Schweiz, 1948,"Rundbrief ...," 12.

[30] von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, 6.

[31] von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, 8.

include prayer, in the form of an invocation or benediction as a part of a program. The invocations and benedictions, at NCCJ functions were a symbol of the success of the NCCJ program. It is notworthy that even at the third international conference, where trusting relationships may have been established on the basis of the previous two conferences, there was still no common prayer. This is interesting in light of the fact that all the respected participants were assumed to believe in God. The incident involving the agnostic woman is a very graphic illustration of this assumption.

Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn wrote about his reactions to the conference.[32] He was impressed with the ease and openness with which Protestants, Catholics and Jews from all of these nations conversed with one another. He was especially struck by the "optimism" of the Americans and their ability to keep the discussion on line and not get stuck on minor European oriented particulars. He also noted that these same attributes that he admired were criticized by other Europeans, perhaps because the American optimism may have appeared naive in the face of the reality of recent European history.

Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn. He felt that the woman had "no business at all at the congress." He concluded his article by noting that there had been no discussions on theological or ecumenical subjects.

Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn felt a tension when the theological

---

[32] von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, 6.

status of the Jews was discussed, particularly with regard to the subject of Israel. An Italian participant, whose religion was not identified, spoke against a resolution supporting the state of Israel, finding it abhorrent that Israel be reduced to the level of an ordinary nation with routine national concerns. By the time the conference was convened it had already been some time since the State of Israel had declared its independence. The War of Independence had begun and it was an item that filled the newspapers of the time.

Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn said relatively little about Israel and at least one delegate saw the secular state as anomalous. The theological tension on which he concentrated indicates obliviousness to the events then transpiring. Neither Israel nor the "Palestine issue" had received much discussion at any of the previous international conferences or the one at Fribourg. Some Christian participants did pass a resolution calling on Christians not to be indifferent about Israel.[33] From von Kuehnelt-Leddihn's comments it seems that the participants preferred to focus on more abstract aspects of Jewish-Christian relations rather than on some of the brutal realities of the war in Israel. According to a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report there was generally a favorable attitude towards Israel.[34] Participants saw no "theological reason" to oppose Israel and they hoped for a peace that would be "taking into account the

[33] The Jewish Chronicle (London), August 6, 1948, 10.

[34] Jewish Telegraphic Agency, July 27, 1947, p. 4.

legitimate interests of all religions and ethnic communities in the country." They believed that Israel, as the land of the Bible, should stand as an example of "spiritual strength."

According to von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, the NCCJ screened films shown to U.S. troops during the war to combat prejudice. By and large the films were not warmly received. The audience perceived that the films were "circumlocutions" about the more difficult topics such as anti-"Negro" or anti-Jewish prejudices. The audience was particularly incensed by the ending of each film, where the viewers were encouraged to remember "we're all Americans," and that now the "wretched refuse" of Europe had the opportunity to aspire to the same lofty heights achieved by the Americans. The showing of the films was further evidence of American attitudes, as exemplified through the NCCJ, towards the European nations. Once again the Americans continued to believe that the American way was best, just as was evident from the writings of Clinchy in his journal.

Clinchy, in a statement to the press covering the conference, emphasized the educational aspects of the ICCJ.[35] He stated that the ICCJ represented "the first international effort by professional educators to train teachers, children and parents in cooperation across the lines of separate religious cultures." He called upon people of religion to work together towards common goals in the same way scientists strive towards shared ends.

---

[35] New York Times, July 31, 1948, "Christians, Jews Adopt Charter for World Body," as found in ICCJ central files, Heppenheim, Germany.

Clinchy said that once funding became available, the ICCJ was going to assemble a multidisciplinary body of experts to carry out the program of the organization. The ICCJ was also seeking to work with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Early in August an editorial in The Jewish Chronicle of London praised the work of the conference.[36] It cited the adoption of a constitution for the ICCJ as an important step "towards removing misunderstanding and prejudice between racial and religious groups." It also noted the favorable resolution passed by some Christian participants regarding the new state of Israel. The editorial closed with a call for the World Council of Churches (WCC), which was to meet at the end of August in Amsterdam to look at the relationship between the teaching of the Gospel and antisemitism. This was in keeping with the spirit of all of the previous international conferences of Christians and Jews.

According to The Jewish Chronicle, the WCC met as planned late in August.[37] Simpson attended as a representative of the ICCJ and of the United Methodist Church of Great Britain. He presented the resolutions of the ICCJ. In particular he urged that the WCC form a subcommittee to deal with Christian responsibility for the "Jewish problem." He also called for

---

[36] The Jewish Chronicle (London), August 6, 1948,p. 10.

[37] The Jewish Chronicle (London), August 27, 1948, "World Council of Churches: Christian Responsibility for the Jewish Problem."

church action on antisemitism, particularly through the process of Christian education.

Although initially, at the WCC conference, there were only private conversations on Palestine and Jewish-Christian relations, resolutions were passed by the end of the conference.[38] The discussion about Palestine revealed deep divisions between those who were pro-Arab and those who were pro-Jewish. The WCC did, however, pass a strong statement condemning antisemitism.[39] It had particularly harsh words for the Church for failing to fight antisemitism and for describing the Jews only as the enemies of Jesus. A resolution was unanimously passed and sent to the central committee calling for the study of three aspects of Jewish-Christian relations. These three aspects were the history and present condition of Jewish-Christian relations, the need for Jewish-Christian cooperation in civic and the social endeavors, and challenges caused by the creation of the State of Israel. The WCC also passed a resolution supporting an international bill of rights and a declaration on religious liberty. There was no mention of the ICCJ or kindred organizations.

Despite the success of the Fribourg conference, the fledgling ICCJ was already in trouble. The differences evidenced by the growing gap between the American viewpoint and that of the British was destined to grow wider. Even as the various

---

[38] The Jewish Chronicle (London), September 3, 1948,p. 1.

[39] The Jewish Chronicle (London), September 10, 1948, p. 1.

constituent national members of the ICCJ were approving its program and accepting its constitution, unresolved difficulties were beginning to tear at the frail coalition that held it together, and in some cases at the constituent national councils themselves. Many of these forces were already in motion, but it was during the months that followed the Fribourg conference that they began to have an effect. The ICCJ never truly functioned again following the Fribourg conference even though it continued to exist on paper for some time.[40]

The Differences Cause a Parting

In many ways the 1948 Fribourg conference was a high point for the ICCJ. The coming months and years, while being a time of some advancement for Jewish-Christian relations, would be turbulent ones for the ICCJ, CCJ and the NCCJ. Events began to move quickly. The factors that held together the coalition of the various organizations began to stretch beyond their limit, causing some bonds to break. The two biggest factors affecting the ICCJ were the attitudes of the NCCJ and the CCJ. While the NCCJ was still committed to the idea of maintaining an international level of activity and Simpson as an individual was similarly committed, the focus of both the CCJ and NCCJ changed.

The changes on the part of the CCJ can be traced over time through its Executive minutes. After the period of involvement

---

[40] There were successor organizations to the ICCJ. Some of them will be discussed in Chapter Five. One of them took on the name "International Council of Christians and Jews," but it is not the same organization discussed in this thesis.

on the continent, the CCJ began to look inward. The questions and problems the CCJ had concerning the ICCJ were serious enough that policy changes took place. The minutes for this period reflect a greater concern with domestic British issues. The Executive was focusing both on problems within Britain and on the establishment of new local councils. The CCJ would never completely lose its interest in international activities, but that interest was definitely on the wane.

The change for the NCCJ is attributable to Clinchy. As was noted earlier, Clinchy had a penchant for the grandiose as well as an idea of improving intergroup relations in a realm that went beyond the program of the ICCJ and even the NCCJ as it was constituted. Though not yet evident to the CCJ and others, Clinchy had other plans, and the ICCJ did not fit within his overall design.

Another important factor was the interest level of the general Jewish populace in the programs of the CCJ and ICCJ. For example, The Jewish Chronicle of London carried little news of the CCJ or ICCJ except at the time of the Fribourg conference, even though the CCJ was functioning and conducting programs around the country. From the close of the Seelisberg conference until well after the Fribourg conference, little was written about the CCJ and almost nothing about the ICCJ. Most of the coverage of issues outside of the British Jewish community itself focused on Israel, the DP situation, and antisemitism in general. This is not to say that the programs of the CCJ were not regarded

as important, but clearly the dominant community concerns as reflected by the newspaper were elsewhere.

By October of 1948 more signs of the differences between Clinchy and the CCJ were visible.[41] Clinchy suggested that the work of the ICCJ be done in four permanent commissions with an overall governing body composed of distinguished individuals. The CCJ believed that the governing body itself should oversee the day-to-day work and direct the commissions. Distinguished individuals would serve in the capacity of consultants. The following month Lauwerys suggested to the CCJ that the ICCJ be involved with helping local councils organize, as well as sponsoring regional seminars and publishing educational information.[42] At the same meeting Simpson reported receiving a letter from Clinchy about some problems that were appearing on the Continent.

Clinchy relayed two complaints to Simpson from Dr. Erich Bickel and Dr. Hans Ornstein, president and secretary of the Swiss Council of Christians and Jews. The first was Bickel's objection to not having a desk at the ICCJ office in Geneva. The second was from Ornstein who said that he would not appoint a Swiss representative to the governing body of the ICCJ if he could not act in Germany on behalf of the Swiss organization. Clinchy said that he responded to the Swiss by saying that the

---

[41] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, October 12, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[42] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, November 9, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

NCCJ did not have an official representative and neither would they.

Simpson also reported on other events on the Continent. An unspecified number of new groups was formed in Hungary, France, Belgium, Italy and Luxembourg. The Danes were encountering problems in organizing. After much discussion, the CCJ unanimously passed a five-point resolution directed at Clinchy, Visseur and Bickel, regarding ICCJ activities. The five points discussed the CCJ's belief that the work of the ICCJ could be best accomplished with the CCJ, NCCJ and other national councils of Christians and Jews working together. The NCCJ, due to its size and financial resources, was best suited for helping establish new councils. The CCJ also felt that matters having to do with the permanent establishment of an office in Geneva and Dr. Bickel's complaints should be dealt with at the general meeting of the ICCJ. Such a meeting never was scheduled.

By December, CCJ concerns about the ICCJ had grown to the point that the Executive called an emergency meeting solely to discuss the ICCJ.[43] The CCJ again engaged in lengthy discussions about the ICCJ. Among the decisions reached was to formally request that the NCCJ refrain from endorsing the ICCJ and appointing members to the governing body until it was clear how responsibilities for program planning and financing would be settled. Simpson reviewed the history of the CCJ and. though a

---

[43] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, December 9, 1948, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

supporter of the ICCJ, was concerned that unresolved problems of the ICCJ might hinder the development of national councils of Christians and Jews. The Executive voted to recommend that the CCJ as an organization vote at its annual general meeting to ratify the ICCJ constitution and begin to resolve some of the problems. By the January 1949 meeting of the Executive this was accomplished.[44] The membership at the annual general meeting and the Executive Committee also decided that it was time for the NCCJ to get their act together. By virtue of the action taken at Fribourg and the ratification of the ICCJ constitution by the British, German and Swiss councils, the ICCJ existed. The question remained as to what degree the NCCJ was committed to the ICCJ, particularly with regard to finances. If the NCCJ pulled out it would be impossible to maintain a full-time office in Geneva. The Geneva office, staffed mainly by Visseur, was funded by the NCCJ. The reality was that the ICCJ was an organization on paper and that the activities of the Geneva office were under the direction of Clinchy and the NCCJ.

Frustrations with the ICCJ on the part of the CCJ continued to increase. When the CCJ Executive met again in February, it heard a report of the meeting between Sterling Brown and CCJ representatives.[45] Brown was a longtime NCCJ staff member who was finishing a tour of service with OMGUS. Brown said that the

[44] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 11, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[45] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, February 8, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

differences between the ICCJ and the Swiss were unresolvable. These differences centered in the issue of the Swiss organization having a desk at the ICCJ office and the role of the Swiss organization in the everyday operations of the ICCJ. Bickel in particular wanted the Swiss organization to be active within Germany. However, despite this difficult situation, the Swiss stated that, as they had ratified the ICCJ constitution and appointed representatives, they considered the ICCJ as a functioning organization. Brown countered that since the NCCJ paid for the Geneva office, neither the Swiss nor the CCJ had a voice in the administrative activities of the ICCJ. Lord Reading, angry at this report, stated that if the problems were not resolved he would resign from his position with the ICCJ.

Reading sent a message to Clinchy explaining his concern over the situation with the Swiss and the overall future of the ICCJ.[46] Clinchy responded that the NCCJ was hesitating in general with regard to work on developing the ICCJ. He was unsure of both the scope and title of the ICCJ. Clinchy suggested that the pace of work be slowed for a few years but that it be carried on through informal contacts and discussion and he wanted to "let the incipient ICCJ, or whatever it would eventually be called, grow a little before we constitute ourselves legally." Brown suggested that a temporary committee make decisions regarding the Geneva headquarters. If the CCJ

---

[46] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, March 8, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

agreed, Brown would work with Simpson and Visseur to work out a new program. After discussion, the CCJ Executive voted to build up the ICCJ slowly and that a change in the ICCJ constitution could be made if necessary. The CCJ still believed in maintaining the ICCJ as an organization. The Executive called for cooperation between the NCCJ and the CCJ to resolve this question. Little happened for the next few months. Clinchy expressed a desire to come to England, but kept putting it off until September.[47]

These changes mark a radical shift in the desires and intention of the NCCJ, and to a lesser extent the CCJ, with regard to the ICCJ. Clinchy had been headstrong in his desire to set up the ICCJ. As he had traveled through Europe, he had presented the program of the organization and established chapters throughout Europe. Now he was seemingly backing away. The British, on the other hand, were had been cautious all along. The truth of the matter was that Clinchy had other plans. All along it had been clear that Clinchy had a grand vision. While the ICCJ became bogged down with organizational problems, Clinchy was ready to move ahead with a new program of his own. He wanted to go beyond matters of interfaith relations. This new program of Clinchy would become known as "World Brotherhood" and will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Five. Even though Clinchy was at work on his plans, the evidence suggests that he did not

---

[47] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, May 10 and July 15, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

reveal this to the CCJ Executive. While Clinchy wanted to expand his activities, the CCJ was looking to curtail its involvement outside of Britain.

Soon the tenuous connections that held the ICCJ together began to unravel. The CCJ Executive met again in September 1949.[48] At that meeting the Executive set a meeting with Clinchy and Thomas E. Braniff for October 4th. Braniff, the Catholic cochair of the NCCJ, and Clinchy were due in London to address business and labor leaders. The Executive also decided to send Simpson to a meeting in Europe of the French and Swiss councils of Christians and Jews as a representative of the CCJ prior to Clinchy's arrival. The Executive also voted to refrain from further international involvement until more national groups made commitments.

The meeting planned between the NCCJ and CCJ leaders took place in London on October 4.[49] Clinchy discussed his version of the history of the ICCJ, its problems and new plans. He said that the initial purpose of the ICCJ was to combat antisemitism, but now he thought the ICCJ was "impractical." He found its program too limiting. He viewed Jewish-Christian relations as just one part of the challenge to improve intergroup relations. He also had a problem with the title of the organization since it had the names "Christian" and "Jew" in it. He believed the word

---

[48] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, September 6, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[49] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, October 4, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

"Christian" had too many political connotations and the word "Jew" would link the organization to issues with the problem of antisemitism. Thus he proposed a new program. This as yet untitled program would be pan-European and less nationally based. It would deal with broader cultural issues. Its work would be done in five commissions: Education, Religious Organizations, Community Organizations, Mass Media, and Labor and Management Organizations. The program was based on the same framework of the NCCJ and ICCJ, but would be much much farther reaching. The new organization would hold its first conference in the summer of 1950. The CCJ was still not ready to totally let go of the ICCJ, but they would consider Clinchy's proposal.

It appears that Clinchy wanted a freer hand to control the operations of whatever organization was involved with improving intergroup relations. David Hyatt described Clinchy's management style as "top-down."[50] Hyatt said that Clinchy liked to be the absolute authority and in total control of the organization. This was not the case with the ICCJ. It seems that Clinchy had two major frustrations with the ICCJ. The first was its limited agenda as described above and the second would be his inability to totally dominate the ICCJ. This is illustrated by disputes between the Swiss organization and the ICCJ leadership and the friction between Clinchy and the CCJ leadership. By starting a new organization Clinchy would be free to develop its program the way he wanted and to establish from the start the leadership

[50] David Hyatt, interview with author, September 24, 1990.

structure.

Later in the month the CCJ Executive met again.[51] The members reviewed Clinchy's proposal. They recognized the problems with the ICCJ and at the same time agreed that interfaith activities should continue in some way. After discussion, they voted unanimously to send Clinchy a three-point letter regarding his new proposal. They insisted that the independence and autonomy of the CCJ be maintained, that detailed plans for the new organization would be made clear before the CCJ would participate, and that the Executive Committee would assist in making those plans. The Executive Committee also expressed its regrets over the failure of the ICCJ and attributed part of the problem to the lack of consultation. From the outset of joint activities, the CCJ had always sought careful preplanning. It seems that this request was unheeded and often Clinchy operated at his own discretion according to his own plans. It also seems that in reviewing the entirety of the few years before this incident the CCJ was not consistently consulted on policy and planning decisions. At the October meeting of the Executive there was yet another call for consultation.[52]

By January of 1950 there was serious discussion about the

---

[51] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, October 19, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[52] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, November 3, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

future role of the CCJ in international activities.[53] The NCCJ announced it was going ahead with plans for a new organization, the "World Council on Brotherhood," later referred to as World Brotherhood. The CCJ was concerned that some of the same issues regarding coordination of activities and communication were still not being adequately addressed. After discussion, the committee decided to be involved, but on an unofficial basis. The Executive also debated the topic of the ICCJ. It was still in existence and there were some parties that wanted to keep it going. There were those who believed the withdrawal of the NCCJ and its financing made any efforts to support the ICCJ extremely difficult.

The Collapse of the ICCJ

The months following the January 1950 meeting of the CCJ Executive saw the creation of a new organization, World Organization for Brotherhood (World Brotherhood), and the collapse of the ICCJ. World Brotherhood was a creation of Clinchy. It was his desire to expand his program and the ICCJ had proven insufficient for that purpose. World Brotherhood, its program, and interaction with the CCJ will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Five. Meanwhile, the ICCJ had been created and there were parties interested in its continuation.

Little activity was recorded on the part of the CCJ

---

[53] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 3, 1950, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

Executive with regard to the ICCJ until January 1951.[54] Simpson reported that the ICCJ constitution had been passed at the Fribourg conference. Furthermore it had never been implemented and those who ratified it were unable to take steps to make the ICCJ functional. Neither the CCJ nor the French or Swiss organizations had the resources to do so. The committee decided that "no useful purpose could be served by the maintenance of the fiction of an International Council of Christians and Jews." Therefore a proposal was accepted to rescind the ratification of the ICCJ constitution. A recommendation to act similarly was sent to the French, Swiss and German councils. Simpson pointed out that informal contacts should certainly be maintained. Simpson reported in February that the Swiss had agreed and the three organizations stated that they favored maintaining informal contacts.[55] On September 11, 1951 the CCJ officially rescinded its ratification of the ICCJ constitution stating that "the continued existence of the International Council was no longer in the interests of the movement."[56]

Sterling Brown issued a statement to all NCCJ offices about the relationship of the NCCJ towards the ICCJ on January 19,

---

[54] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 9, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[55] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, February 13 and December 11, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[56] CCJ, "The Council of Christians and Jews and the So-Called International Council of Christians and Jews," SUA, Simpson Collection, File 8\12.

1951.[57] This memorandum is quite illuminating with regard to the attitude of the NCCJ. Before and at the time of the Fribourg conference the NCCJ had already expressed concern that some of the groups participating at Fribourg "were not of the type and did not have the kind of leadership which would adhere to the objectives which the National Conference held." Brown did not elaborate as to the nature of these objectives. The NCCJ withheld ratification of the ICCJ constitution and subsequently withdrew the Geneva office from "cooperating" with the ICCJ. While the Geneva office had previously been identified as the ICCJ office, it was in fact the field office for NCCJ activities in Europe.

Brown stated several reasons for wishing to disassociate from the ICCJ. First, the membership rules allowed participation of organizations whose objectives varied from that of the NCCJ. Second, the leadership of two of the participating organizations had "ideologies" that were incompatible with that of the NCCJ. The identity of these organizations and their ideologies were unspecified by Brown. However, a memorandum written by Simpson somewhat clarifies the statement.[58] Simpson stated that the NCCJ was not satisfied with the leaders of the French and Swiss groups. They did not "sufficiently represent

---

[57] Brown to all NCCJ offices, January 19, 1951, SUA, William W. Simpson Collection, File 2\4, Folder 3.

[58] William W. Simpson, "Memorandum on Certain Matters Relating to the International Council of Christians and Jews," SUA, Simpson Collection, File 8\12.

their membership." More importantly, they lacked ties to "big business." Despite this memorandum, it is not absolutely clear what the conflicting ideologies were. The mention of the lack of ties to big business could indicate an anti-business or even socialist ideology. Clinchy was an individual who sought out association with, and assistance, from big business. He would outrightly reject anything that conflicted with this approach.

Brown's third reason for wishing to disassociate from the ICCJ was that the president of the NCCJ (Clinchy) and other officers had decided to form a new organization with leaders in the U.S., Canada and Western Europe. Brown's memorandum went on to describe organizing activities on behalf of the new organization undertaken in 1949 in Western Europe. The groups in Germany, for example, that Clinchy had helped organize affiliated with the new organization (World Brotherhood).

Simpson reported in July that the NCCJ had appointed a new field representative in Europe, Dr. Willard Johnson.[59] Johnson also issued a directive with regard to the NCCJ's disassociation from the ICCJ.[60] The NCCJ indicated it would continue to fund the Geneva office, but it would be serving as World Brotherhood's European headquarters.

It is interesting to note that there is no evidence of American displeasure during the planning and convening of the

[59] CCJ, "Executive committee minutes, July 10, 1951," SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[60] Willard Johnson, "Memorandum (untitled), January 25, 1951," SUA, Simpson Collection, File 8\12.

Fribourg conference. Nowhere in the available written records of the CCJ or NCCJ are there references to problems of constituency in the ICCJ. During his Autumn 1947 trip Clinchy made note of his concerns about the proposed ICCJ constitution, but never at any time about the leadership of participating organizations.

It is also interesting to note that there is no evidence that Clinchy informed his British counterparts of plans for a new organization. Clinchy was making plans for what became World Brotherhood while the CCJ believed that the NCCJ was truly interested in firmly establishing the NCCJ. It should be noted that Brown's memorandum was not found in the NCCJ archival collection, but rather in the Simpson papers. There is a noticeable lack of documentation of why and how Clinchy made his shift away from the ICCJ to establish a new organization within the NCCJ archival collection.

The time from the Seelisberg conference until the collapse of the ICCJ was a whirlwind of change. It was a time that saw Everett Clinchy touring Europe under the banner of the ICCJ only to be developing plans for another organization within months of his return to the United States. Clinchy's counterpart in the CCJ, Simpson, also sought to further the international program, but at a more measured pace. Clinchy, never letting go of his dream of a world wide organization to combat prejudice sought to bring his dream to yet a bigger stage. While Clinchy used the infrastructure he had built in Europe for his new organization,

the other participants in interfaith dialogue, notably the French, Swiss, German and British councils, held onto their dreams as well. During the months and years that followed, the desire for international efforts at interfaith relations remained alive for the religious community in Europe. The next chapter will explore both the development of World Brotherhood and the continued attempts to maintain international efforts to improve interfaith relations.

CHAPTER FIVE

INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS AT INTERFAITH RELATIONS DIM AND REIGNITE

In the years that followed, the collapse of the ICCJ made the prospect for internationally based efforts for improving Jewish-Christian relations seem bleak. The World Brotherhood organization, started by Everett Clinchy, was gaining strength and seemed to have broad interests beyond just Jewish-Christian relations, and beyond the Western world. The participants who had been involved in the first three international conferences were going their own ways and their initiatives seemed to be fading. The optimism and hope that had guided the international conferences was being beaten down by the realities of world political differences and the fact that bigotry and prejudice would not easily fade.

All was not bleak, however. The World Brotherhood organization shared many of the same ideals as the former ICCJ. Though its life span would be short, the organization fostered and worked towards many of the goals of the ICCJ. World Brotherhood, however, went beyond the realm of the religious community, which had been the basis of the ICCJ. The religious community itself, on the other hand, maintained an interest in interfaith activities. The councils of Christians and Jews continued to function and grow. They continued to meet together, though not on the scale nor with the formality of years past.

The CCJ, the Swiss and the French organizations remained in

close contact with each other. Though at times each organization struggled for various reasons, the commitment to improving Jewish-Christian relations remained. The British were cautious about getting involved in the international arena, but participated in meetings on the Continent. Simpson steadfastly stuck to his desire to maintain a connection between the various councils of Christians and Jews. By the early 1960s this connection would once again be formalized.

World Brotherhood

In November 1949 Clinchy put forth a proposal for a worldwide organization which would focus on intergroup relations.[1] He stated that while political and economic restructuring of Europe and Asia were underway, spiritual and intellectual needs remained unmet. He envisioned a program to "promote justice, amity, understanding and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics and Jews, and among individuals of all the nations of Europe." Clinchy cited the need to protect the world from atheism and Communism and suggested that the future battles for "liberty" would not necessarily take place on the battlefield, but elsewhere. Clinchy then gave a detailed listing of the history and program of the NCCJ and the successes of the American model. He asserted that activities to improve intergroup relations needed to go beyond Christians and Jews, Europe and North America, and branch out to all nations. He

---

[1] Everett R. Clinchy, "A Proposed Plan for a Group Relations Organization Worldwide," SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 8\"Everett Ross Clinchy, Writings 1949."

concluded with a recommendation to form "a single, autonomous, unified European council," to work in this area. He suggested a structure based on five permanent commissions and a structure of local, regional and international organizations.

World Brotherhood was officially formed in June 1950 in Paris to "promote understanding, justice, amity, and cooperation among people differing in religion, race, nation, social status or culture."[2] This organizational statement is almost identical to that of Clinchy's original proposal. World Brotherhood's statement of purpose, policy and program was issued in advance of the June meeting.[3] The core goal of the organization was to serve as an educational organization seeking to unite all peoples of the world. At the same time it respected individual religious groups and would not seek "any common denominator" among religions nor engage in common worship. Furthermore, the autonomy of individual nations with regard to governmental processes would be respected. The organization in general was designed to be silent on political issues.

The program called for forming chapters throughout Europe and elsewhere in the world. Each local chapter would work through commissions working in five areas. These areas would function as the fivefold basis for the programming of the

---

[2] World Brotherhood, untitled document (photocopy), SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 7\ "World Brotherhood," 1.

[3] World Organization for Brotherhood, "Outline of Purpose, Policy and Program," SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 7, "World Brotherhood," 3.

organization. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these areas were educational organizations, religious organizations, community organizations, labor and management organizations and the media. Each local chapter, while functioning independently, was supposed to follow the same guidelines as the organization as a whole. The remainder of the document contained a sample charter for a chapter and a draft constitution. (see appendix D)

The World Brotherhood program plan cited the NCCJ as its organizational antecedent and model. The main NCCJ offices were also the offices of World Brotherhood and apparently NCCJ staff would be the core of World Brotherhood's staff. Even more conspicuous is the wording of the prospectus which stated the organization would strive to create a world that was "indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." This is a word for word repetition of a segment of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

Not only was the NCCJ the model, but everything about the United States was to be emulated. The American triumphalism that emerged at the end of the war was still present. The citing of the Pledge of Allegiance was part of the triumphalist mindset that is traceable all the way through NCCJ and American involvement on the international scene. Other examples include the attitudes of superiority of the NCCJ leadership towards the CCJ leadership at the beginning of Clinchy's 1947 tour and the jingoistic films shown at the Fribourg conference. The Voice of America readily gave Clinchy air time to promote the World

Brotherhood organization.[4] This broadcast presented World Brotherhood's program for bringing harmony to Europe and the world based on the NCCJ's successful brotherhood program.

The establishment of World Brotherhood's headquarters in the United States also indicated the belief of the NCCJ that the Americans were still at the center. This seemed to be the case despite the fact that most of the international participants in the organization were in Europe and that field offices had been established there. World Brotherhood viewed its affiliated organizations as field offices. Any one of these offices could have served important directive functions. For example, Pierre Visseur worked out of the Geneva office. He had worked with Clinchy since the days of planning the Seelisberg conference and setting up the ICCJ. The evidence presented through Clinchy's writings, the CCJ executive minutes and other documents indicates Visseur's ability. Despite this, the Americans still insisted on being the center of worldwide activities. This America-centric attitude was also reflected in the American domination of the upper leadership of World Brotherhood which developed its program and policies as discussed above. From the outset the NCCJ leadership planned for Arthur H. Compton, chancellor of Washington University, to serve as World Brotherhood's chair, Clinchy as president, and the three NCCJ national cochairs to

---

[4] Everett R. Clinchy, "World Brotherhood," (radio broadcast transcript), February 1951, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 8\ "Everett R. Clinchy, Writings 1951."

serve on the board.[5]

An NCCJ publication gave substantial coverage to the first World Brotherhood meeting held June 8 through 11, 1950 at the UNESCO House in Paris.[6] The article described the convening of the meeting with representatives from fifteen countries, and the program and policy of the organization. It cited the address by Arthur Compton, Nobel Prize winner and chairman. Compton stated that efforts towards improving international relations were crucial due to the threats to the Judeo-Christian way of life from "the dictatorial forces of Communism" which were "out to gain control of the world by whatever means." The article went on to state that World Brotherhood was designed to "contribute to the creation and maintenance of a free, economically righteous, politically honest and ethically just society; worthy and able to win in competition with atheistic and materialistic systems of thought." The NCCJ was mentioned as the model and the article closed with a description of details of the fivefold program.

The Paris meeting followed Clinchy's penchant for the spectacular. In addition to Compton's participation, several world luminaries attended the Paris meeting. They included Henry Luce, founder and editor of Time magazine, Thomas Braniff, founder of Braniff International Airlines, Paul Renaud, former Prime Minister of France and Albert Plesman, President of KLM.

---

[5] NCCJ, NCCJ News, May 10, 1950, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10, "NCCJ News 1950-," 1.

[6] NCCJ, Conference, Fall 1950, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\ "Conference, 1944-50," "World Brotherhood Formed."

These people and others represented leaders of government, industry, labor, religion and academia. A number of world leaders not in attendance at the Paris meeting issued statements of support for World Brotherhood. They included Chaim Weizmann, Nelson Rockefeller and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

After the conference, Clinchy wrote a report summarizing the conference, activities since the conference, and his proposed program for the coming year.[7] In particular, he noted the favorable and extensive coverage by both the American and international press. He reported on various committees in formation and plans for conferences to be held in 1951. The committees were working in each of the five program areas. One of the planned conferences, for the religious organization commission, was being developed by representatives of the three religious groups. Clinchy was very enthusiastic in his description of new chapters in formation and his belief that within a year fifteen to twenty more cities would have organized chapters. It is interesting to note that Clinchy stated that the CCJ would "be served" by World Brotherhood. Perhaps Clinchy saw the CCJ as an organization in need of what he considered the superior organizational skill of World Brotherhood. The relationship of the CCJ to World Brotherhood and international activities will be discussed below.

---

[7] Everett R. Clinchy, "Memorandum from Everett R. Clinchy, Subject: A Program for World Brotherhood, September 1950- August 1951," SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 8\ "E. R. Clinchy, Writings 1950."

The executive board of World Brotherhood met in Washington from the November 9 to 11.[8] They reviewed the activities of the Paris meeting and further defined aspects of the organization. They viewed World Brotherhood not as a federation of various autonomous national organizations or individual chapters, but as a single integrated organization. Each national group would function as a unit with representation on the overall governing board. Clinchy described the core leadership as being the three American cochairs of the NCCJ, Compton, a representative of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews (CCCJ), and a yet-to-be-named European. In time the leadership would be expanded to include representation from all member national groups.

The program of World Brotherhood would include a World Brotherhood Week patterned after the Brotherhood Week held in the United States. This week of activities would be used as the time to launch new chapters. Each of the local chapters would be expected to work through five commissions as the organization did on a central level. The meeting participants spent a significant amount of time discussing planning and implementation of the fivefold program.

In the winter of 1951, the NCCJ began to publish Brotherhood, which was devoted to activities of World

---

[8] Everett R. Clinchy, "A Memorandum on the Nov. 9-11, 1950 Meetings, Washington, D.C.," SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 8, "E.R. Clinchy: Writings, 1950," 1.

Brotherhood.[9] Its layout and contents were similar to Conference, the general distribution newsletter of the NCCJ's domestic program. It appears that the last issue of Conference was during the fall of 1950.[10] Brotherhood focused on NCCJ activities and American guidance of World Brotherhood. It represented Clinchy's view of an integrated brotherhood organization, but was dominated by the NCCJ and its view of the world program. For example, the first issue of Brotherhood outlined aspects of the World Brotherhood program. Arthur Compton contributed an article describing the program and activities of World Brotherhood. Another section described brotherhood activities throughout the world. Of the sixteen locations cited in capsule descriptions, fourteen were in the United States. There was also a clear antiCommunist message as represented both in the text and political cartoons.

The summer of 1952 was a busy time for World Brotherhood. Several conferences, which were held in Europe, focused on educators, and labor and management.[11] One conference was designed for the aviation industry and brought together

---

[9] NCCJ, Brotherhood, Winter 1951, 2. as found in SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\"Brotherhood: the Magazine of Intergroup Relations, 1951-52."

[10] NCCJ, Conference, Fall 1950, as found in SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\ "Conference 1944-50." It appears from the title and contents of the file folder that Conference began publication in 1944 and ceased in 1950 when Brotherhood began to be published.

[11] NCCJ, NCCJ News, September 24, 1952, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\ "NCCJ News, 1950-."

presidents of airlines from throughout the world. Clinchy, Compton and Braniff made an extensive tour of Europe in the fall.[12] They succeeded in attracting both interest and financing for their program. The use of education and methods from the social sciences as a means of dealing with intergroup problems was a new idea that was the fundamental selling point for Clinchy and the others. They looked to the intellectual needs of the community and the academic leaders in Europe. The team of Compton, Clinchy and Braniff provided an opportunity for most anyone they encountered to find a basis of commonality upon which to build a relationship. Various conferences and meetings continued through early 1953, covering the full range of World Brotherhood's program.[13]

The national headquarters staff met on May 5, 1953.[14] Clinchy discussed an article dealing with the political situation within the State of Israel. He advised the NCCJ staff to "steer clear of the political picture in Israel in any of their speeches and writings." Apparently, the NCCJ, and by extension World Brotherhood, were still avoiding the issue of Israel. They had avoided the Palestine issue before 1948 and had still not dealt with the reality of Israel and its impact on Jewish-Christian

---

[12] NCCJ, "News," (1952) mimeograph, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\ "News: NCCJ, 1952-1953."

[13] NCCJ, NCCJ News, March 24, 1953, as found in SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\"NCCJ News 1950-."

[14] NCCJ, National headquarters staff meeting, minutes, May 5, 1953, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 3\"National Staff Meetings, 1952-1953."

relations. The correspondence of Feibelman and Lazaron with Clinchy reflects an ongoing friendship beyond the time of their participation in international activities. No doubt their previous anti-Zionist feelings continued to affect Clinchy. Clinchy excercised caution, being careful not to offend the mainstream and to affirm "accepted" values.

NCCJ staff continued to help plan conferences and meetings in Europe in the months that followed. In December 1954 the staff began planning a major conference to be held in Brussels for July 11 through 15, 1955.[15] The meeting would target educators and members of the clergy, as had been the longstanding style of the organization. World Brotherhood continued to sponsor conferences and meetings through 1956.[16] An article in Brotherhood indicates that World Brotherhood had become independent from the NCCJ and had expanded its activities to India and other parts of Asia. By 1957, World Brotherhood's program broadened greatly from interfaith relations to include general issues such as the threat of nuclear war and human rights.[17] Education continued to be a focus of the program,

---

[15] NCCJ, "National headquarters staff meeting, minutes, December 21, 1954, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 3\"National Staff Meetings 1954-1959."

[16] World Brotherhood, Brotherhood, 3rd Quarter 1956, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10\"Brotherhood: Journal of World Brotherhood."

[17] World Brotherhood, Brotherhood, 1st Quarter 1957, SWHA, NCCJ Collection. Box 10\"Brotherhood: Journal of World Brotherhood 1954\55-60."

with activities taking place in Asia, North America and Europe. World Brotherhood's activities in Asia escalated rapidly in 1958 with the opening of a new regional headquarters in Singapore.[18] Clinchy also announced his departure from the NCCJ and his full time commitment to World Brotherhood. Lewis Webster Jones then assumed the presidency of the NCCJ.

On October 23, 1958, Sterling Brown announced a formal and complete separation of World Brotherhood from the NCCJ.[19] World Brotherhood agreed to move its office from the NCCJ building. The NCCJ granted them sufficient time to find adequate office space elsewhere. World Brotherhood also agreed to shift all of its primary operations outside of the United States. The NCCJ would work primarily in the domestic arena. Although nothing is available in the archival records of the NCCJ, it is known that the separation of World Brotherhood from the NCCJ and the departure of Clinchy from the NCCJ were not pleasant events. Elliott Wright, currently with the NCCJ and formerly with the Religious News Service, said that the leadership of the NCCJ felt that Clinchy had taken the organization far from its intended purpose.[20] The leadership felt that the primary role of the NCCJ was to deal with intergroup problems in the United States.

---

[18] World Brotherhood, Brotherhood, 2nd Quarter, 1958, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 10, "Brotherhood, Journal of World Brotherhood, 1954\55-60."

[19] NCCJ, "Brown to all NCCJ offices," memorandum, October 23, 1958, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 7\ "World Brotherhood."

[20] Elliott Wright, interview with the author, December 20, 1990.

Clinchy had a grander vision than this, but he was ultimately pushed out of an organization he had largely built. The information about World Brotherhood available from the NCCJ archives dates no later than Brown's memorandum. Within a short time, at the suggestion of Adlai Stevenson, Clinchy changed the name of World Brotherhood to the Council on World Tensions.[21] Early in the 1960s Clinchy founded the Institute on Man and Science. By this point interfaith activities were but a small part of the organization's activities.

Meanwhile Back in Britain...

While the NCCJ was busy with organizing World Brotherhood, the CCJ continued to function and certainly had thoughts concerning international developments. The CCJ, however, was cautious about any involvement with international activities and had its own history of relation with World Brotherhood. The collapse of the ICCJ proved a frustrating for the CCJ. Its commitment to international cooperation had been clear, given its leadership and participation in the three international conferences. However, the events surrounding the collapse of the ICCJ dampened the CCJ's interest, and the organization looked inward. Furthermore, the CCJ was not favorably inclined towards World Brotherhood.

As early as October 1949, the CCJ began to show reluctance to participate in a new organization, voicing their concerns

---

[21] David Hyatt, interview with author, December 22, 1990.

regarding finances, program and their own autonomy.[22] This continued, as mentioned in the previous chapter, throughout the period of the organizing of World Brotherhood and the failure of the ICCJ. The CCJ was not enthusiastic about World Brotherhood. In March of 1950 Simpson reported that Clinchy found little support within the CCJ when he sought participants for the religious organizations commission of World Brotherhood. The personal dynamics between Simpson, the CCJ, and Clinchy are not known, but it seems that relations between them were severely strained. The tensions which had been building for several years had now evolved to the point that, while the two organizations and member individuals were still on speaking terms, their working relationship had been greatly weakened.

In April, 1950 the CCJ executive heard of plans for the Paris meeting of World Brotherhood to take place in June.[23] At the June meeting of the CCJ executive Simpson reported briefly on the World Brotherhood gathering.[24] According to Simpson the meeting sponsored by the NCCJ had adopted a constitution for World Brotherhood and two smaller conferences for the religious organizations and education commissions had been held. After discussion, the CCJ decided not to commit to World Brotherhood

---

[22] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, October 19, 1949, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[23] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, April 4, 1950, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

[24] CCJ. Executive Committee minutes, June 12, 1950, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\2.

and affirmed its desire that World Brotherhood stay out of Britain. There was no further mention of World Brotherhood in the CCJ executive minutes until January 1951.

The tension between the CCJ and World Brotherhood was evident by then. Simpson reported concerning a letter from Spyros Skouras, president of 20th Century Fox, inviting people to become involved with Brotherhood Week, planned to take place in the United States and overseas during the month of February.[25] World Brotherhood was attempting to replicate Brotherhood Week, which had been started by the NCCJ in the United States, and elsewhere. Seven people in Great Britain received the letter. This was a breach of the agreement made between World Brotherhood and the CCJ. Simpson wrote to Clinchy on the subject and the invitations were withdrawn. In March, the CCJ received a letter from Visseur asking the CCJ to consider participation in a future Brotherhood Week, most likely the following year.[26] The CCJ was not interested and responded to World Brotherhood by saying that it was satisfied with programs as they existed. The CCJ had its own series of weekend programs throughout the country, with similar goals and activities.

In July, 1951 Simpson reported on a meeting of the religious

---

[25] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 9, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[26] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, March 13, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

organizations commission of World Brotherhood.[27] Simpson attended as an individual and not as on official representative of the CCJ. The meeting, which took place in Hattenheim, Germany, included representatives of the German Council of Christians and Jews attended along with representatives from Holland, France and Switzerland. Simpson felt that World Brotherhood was in a "fluid state" and that the CCJ was better off not being involved. In the months that followed, the CCJ had little to do with World Brotherhood, though individuals, including Simpson, attended meetings in a personal capacity. The executive, in March 1952, reaffirmed its decision not to be involved with World Brotherhood in an official capacity.[28] This decision was relayed to Clinchy, Visseur and Willard Johnson.

Over time, the CCJ continued to send representatives to the few World Brotherhood events that took place. In January of 1953 the CCJ decided to reevaluate its relationship with World Brotherhood and invited Willard Johnson to meet with Simpson.[29] Simpson reported on his meeting with Johnson at the February meeting of the executive.[30] The relationship between the CCJ and World Brotherhood was still not clear especially with regard

---

[27] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, July, 10, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[28] CCJ, Executive Committee Minutes, April 22, 1952, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[29] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 7, 1953, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[30] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, February 11, 1953, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

to limits of activities. World Brotherhood's constitution called for an integrated organization. The CCJ desired full autonomy for itself and complete control over activities within Britain. Letters were exchanged between the CCJ executive and World Brotherhood leadership seeking to clarify these points. The status of the relationship on the leadership level remained unchanged for some time.

In January of 1954, World Brotherhood approached the CCJ executive about holding a dinner in London with Clinchy and Compton as principal speakers.[31] They hoped that about 100 people would attend. The CCJ was not particularly interested in giving any public signs of sponsorship of World Brotherhood. The executive was also concerned with being held financially responsible for the event. Simpson remained in contact with Clinchy. In February a date in May was set for the dinner.[32]

The London dinner took place with about 70 people in attendance.[33] The CCJ leadership met with World Brotherhood's leadership. Progress was made to a small degree. Sir Richard Mayer of the CCJ felt that the "Americans were more realistic." Apparently the CCJ perceived that in fact World Brotherhood was merely an extension of the NCCJ. There was some movement with

---

[31] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 6, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[32] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, February 17, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[33] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, May 12, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

regard to program, but the CCJ still found the information about program planning insufficient. Again they declined to make a commitment to World Brotherhood.

Like the CCJ the German Council of Christians and Jews or Deutsche Koordinierungsrat (DKR) had problems with World Brotherhood.[34] The DKR leadership met Clinchy, Johnson and McKibben in May 1954. While they were favorable to aspects of the World Brotherhood program, they, like the British, wanted autonomy. Johnson spoke in detail about World Brotherhood and its program within Germany. The DKR leadership was firm in its desire for independence and to be the lead organization within Germany. The local councils also viewed themselves as legally independent, though linked to the DKR.[35]

At about the same time the DKR was meeting with Clinchy and his staff, Simpson reported that he had received a letter from the DKR asking about CCJ-World Brotherhood relations.[36] Some of the German chapters which had been considered a part of World Brotherhood, by World Brotherhood, wanted to be independent. Simpson wrote back to the DKR explaining the current state of CCJ-World Brotherhood relations. By June, the DKR had become

---

[34] DKR, Protokoll, May 11, 1954, Sisters of Sion (Vienna), central files.

[35] Helen Hosp Seamans, untitled report (photocopy), Sisters of Sion (Vienna), central files, 17.

[36] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, May 12, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

completely separate from World Brotherhood.[37] World Brotherhood, however, still planned on pursuing its own agenda and opening a center in Germany. The DKR also appealed to the CCJ to cooperate, and the CCJ was receptive. It should also be noted that not all participants in the DKR wanted to separate from World Brotherhood.[38] A consultant to the DKR believed that the German groups could benefit from association with outside groups. Even though locally based programs were the core of activities, the consultant beleived it was important for the DKR to use the knowledge gained by orgamizations elsewhere.

Again, it seems evident that the Americans wanted to dominate all efforts at intergroup relations. Although World Brotherhood was supposed to be an international venture, the leadership and direction lay in American hands. As mentioned, the headquarters were in New York even though most work on the international level was taking place in Europe. The notion of American triumphalism had not faded and this attitude was beginning to wear on the European participants.

For the CCJ 1954 was not an easy year. In addition to the continued strain in relations with Clinchy and World Brotherhood, there was the added dimension of problems within the organization itself. The single greatest problem was the resignation of His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster from the joint

---

[37] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, June 23, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[38] Helen Hosp Seamans, untitled report (photocopy), Sisters of Sion, central files, 18.

presidency of the CCJ in November.[39] The resignation was prompted by orders from the Vatican. All other Catholic officials involved with the CCJ were instructed to resign also. The reason cited was the fear of the teaching of "indifferentism," the belief that one religion was as good as another.

The Catholic Church stated that the primary reason it had joined the CCJ was to respond to the problems of antisemitism, particularly during the war. Since the war had ended and several major international conferences had been held, the CCJ had drifted more into the realm of education. The Cardinal added that this did not indicate a change in the Church's rejection of antisemitism. The entire CCJ executive expressed its regret over the the departure of the Catholics from the CCJ and despite this loss, the Archbishop of Canterbury urged that the CCJ continue its work. In the ensuing months lengthy negotiations and meetings took place, but the Church was unmoved. The Church's withdrawal received much attention in the secular press.[40]

At the same time, the CCJ had little contact with World Brotherhood. In April 1955, World Brotherhood invited the CCJ to participate in a conference to be held July 11 through 15 in

---

[39] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, November 17, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[40] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 11, 1955, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

Brussels.[41] Interest was low, but Simpson attended as an observer and reported on his discussions. Once again there was little contact between World Brotherhood and the CCJ for some time. In September of 1956, Clinchy and Visseur met with the CCJ.[42] Clinchy said that the NCCJ had formally disassociated itself from World Brotherhood. Though there would still be some American funding, World Brotherhood would be headquartered in Geneva with an all European staff. Visseur said that Jewish-Christian work would continue, but through the various councils of Christians and Jews. Clinchy added that because of this shift in emphasis there was no basis for organized cooperation between World Brotherhood and the CCJ, but that he hoped informal contacts would continue as they had.

The years that followed were much of the same. World Brotherhood would make periodic overtures to the CCJ and the CCJ would respond that it did not want to be formally involved. These overtures would generally took the form of a visit by a World Brotherhood official like Visseur or McKibben. The meetings were cordial, but effected little change. Clinchy maintained contact with the CCJ even after his forced retirement from the NCCJ in 1958.

The CCJ did maintain an active and growing program in Britain. Among its accomplishments were the printing of the Ten

---

[41] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, April 20, 1955, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\5.

[42] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, September 25, 1956, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\5.

Points of Seelisberg and a translation of Jules Isaac's essay on the Christian roots of antisemitism.[43] Progress was also made with relations between the CCJ and the Catholic Church. However, the Church did allow Catholics to again participate in the CCJ until November 1962.[44] By 1964 Archbishop John C. Heenan had accepted an invitation to serve as a joint president.

...and on the Continent

Despite the failure of the ICCJ, interest in interfaith activities continued on the European Continent. The French and Swiss councils of Christians and DKR still pursued their goal of continuing interfaith dialogue. The first move in that direction came in March 1951, when the Swiss proposed a conference of the European countries to take place in Basle in May or June.[45] The CCJ executive felt that it would be worthwhile to participate in the meeting on an informal basis. The CCJ was approaching this venture with the same caution as they approached World Brotherhood. They seemed, however, less reluctant to become involved with initiatives that were based in Europe itself.

A representative of the CCJ attended the Basle meeting.[46]

---

[43] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, July 13, 1960, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\6.

[44] Religious News Service, "Archbishop Heenan to be a President of Interreligious Council in Britain," June 17, 1964, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 34.

[45] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, March 31, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[46] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, June 21, 1951, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

Those present discussed Jewish-Christian relations, antisemitism, and the establishment of a center for the dissemination of information. The CCJ did little to contact other interfaith organizations, aside from its dealings with World Brotherhood and the DKR, until September 1954.[47] Simpson reported on plans for a meeting of the European councils of Christians and Jews to take place in Saarbruecken. The European councils met in Saarbruecken and in Frankfurt during the month of November.[48] Simpson attended the meeting of November 29 and 30 along with representatives of the DKR, Swiss and French councils. A number of points were raised, including concern about the rise of antisemitism and nationalism in Germany, a desire to increase coordination among the various councils, and plans to hold a larger European conference. Owing to frustration of the attempt to form the ICCJ and to the unresolved problems that regarding Catholic participation in the CCJ, the CCJ was still reluctant to become deeply involved in any new venture.

In May 1955, the European councils of Christians and Jews met.[49] Representatives from France, Switzerland, Saarland, Italy, Holland, Germany, and the CCJ participated. When the Saarland council offered to set up a Centre de Liaision et

---

[47] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, September 23, 1954, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[48] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, January 11, 1955, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

[49] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, May 10, 1955, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\4.

Documentation, the offer was accepted.[50] A Swiss representative would serve as president and a Saarbruecken representative as secretary. Every two years the seat of the center and the officerships would rotate. Dr. Ernst Von Schenck, the general secretary of christlich-juedischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft, was selected to serve as the president and Dr. Hans Treinen as the secretary. It was decided to proceed with care so as not to give the erroneous impression that another "ICCJ" was being set up or that there was any relationship with World Brotherhood.

The Liaison Committee met periodically over the next few years. Simpson commented that at times some of the councils were "a little overanxious" to get activities started under a joint name.[51] He reiterated that he believed the body should act as a source of information and not as an initiating body. In September of 1957, a member of the CCJ executive suggested that the CCJ and the European councils consider forming a nongovernmental consultative committee for UNESCO.[52] In the months that followed, Simpson informally discussed this and other topics of common concern with the leaders of the other councils. In January of 1958, Simpson attended a meeting of the European councils in Paris with representatives from France, Germany and

---

[50] Freiburger Rundbrief, October 1955, p. 54.

[51] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, July 19, 1956, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\5.

[52] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, September 19, 1956, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\5.

Switzerland .[53]

The secretaries of the European councils of Christians and Jews met in Frankfurt on July 26 and 27, 1958.[54] Representatives of France, Germany, England, Switzerland and Austria reviewed interfaith activities in their respective countries. It was noted in Germany that there was a rise in nationalism and 5,000 young people marched to Bergen-Belsen in memory of Anne Frank. The Swiss discussed a report establishing that their government had refused to admit Jewish refugees during the war. Among the overall decisions made by the secretaries was to extend wishes for success to a newly formed council of Christians and Jews in Argentina and to discuss in detail the question of Austrian reparations at the next meeting

The secretaries met next on June 3 and 4, 1959, in Paris.[55] The same countries which had been represented at the 1958 meeting were present. In addition to reports of the activities within each country, several general matters were discussed. One of the ideas put forth was to convene an international conference to review the progress made since the 1946 Oxford conference. It was agreed that the conference should be held in Fribourg for about four or five days, with about 50 people in attendance.

---

[53] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, February 25, 1958, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\5.

[54] Secretaries of the European councils of Christians and Jews, meeting notes, June 26-27, 1958, ICCJ, central files.

[55] Secretaries of European councils of Christians and Jews, meeting notes, June 3-4, 1959, ICCJ, central files.

Simpson noted in his report to the CCJ executive that Catholics had been involved in this meeting.[56]

The secretaries met twice in 1960. The first meeting took place in Vienna on February 18 through 20.[57] Unlike the earlier meetings, this one had session open to the public that attracted about 250 people. The film "Nacht und Nebel" (Night and Fog) a moving history of the Holocaust, was shown. In addition to hearing reports from each of the countries, a sizeable amount of time was devoted to the recent rash of swastika daubings throughout Europe. It was agreed that these incidents were indicative of a larger problem of antisemitism in general. Among the suggestions made was that history textbooks be evaluated for presentation of history since 1914, with particular attention to the history of the Nazis and the Jews. For the first time a representative from a Dutch committee was present. He said that it had not been possible to establish a formal council but that there was interest among Catholic lay people and liberal Jews in addition to Protestants. Finally, a recommendation was made to hold an educators conference in 1961. The conference would be for teachers, clergy and youth workers. The issue of seeking consultative status was raised briefly, but not discussed.

---

[56] CCJ, Executive Committee minutes, June 18, 1959, SUA, CCJ Collection, File 2\6.

[57] Secretaries of the European councils of Christians and Jews, meeting notes, February 18-20, 1960, ICCJ, central files.

Formal Efforts at Conducting International Interfaith Activities Begin Anew

The second meeting of the secretaries took place in London on December 9, 1960.[58] This was a very exciting time. For the first time since the collapse of the ICCJ, there was a true desire to get international efforts regarding interfaith relations moving again. The caution of the several previous years was giving way to a renewed enthusiasm. A number of factors contributed to this new enthusiasm, chief among them being activities on the part of the Catholic Church. Pope John XXIII was in the midst of calling for a major review of church policies on a wide range of topics, from the Church's relations to other religions to internal Church policies. Though the totality of these changes would not be known until 1964, it was clear that major changes were going to take place. Another factor was increased interest in interfaith relations as evidenced by greater participation in the Liaison Committee. Finally, time had softened some of the reluctance to get involved in the international arena on the part of some individuals councils after the collapse of the ICCJ.

The same committees and councils were represented in December as had been at the previous meetings. The participants did more than share information about local activities and make general comments about problems at large. Most of the meeting

---

[58] Liaison Committee of the European Councils of Christians and Jews, minutes, December 9, 1960, ICCJ, central files.

revolved around plans for the international conference for educators that had been discussed earlier in the year, and the serious possibility of establishing an international secretariat. At this time there was no international body dealing with interfaith relations. The program of World Brotherhood had drifted to endeavors other than interfaith relations. It too faded from existence.[59]

The secretaries also discussed a constitution for an International Consultative Committee for Jewish-Christian Cooperation (ICC) as written by Wallace Bell of the CCJ.(see appendix E) After making some revisions the secretaries voted to recommend its adoption by the various councils participating in the secretaries meeting. The proposed constitution stated that if three bodies ratified it, the Consultative Committee would be considered to be in existence. Those present hoped this would happen by early 1961, well in advance of the summer conference.

The first official meeting of the ICC was held January 4 and 5, 1962 in Frankfurt.[60] The constitution had received the necessary ratification from the Austrian, Swiss and British councils, thus enabling the organization to operate. The DKR

---

[59] The available records within the NCCJ collection do not indicate precisely when World Brotherhood ceased to function. Elliot Wright indicated that as Clinchy moved on from World Brotherhood, its funding languished and the organization faded. After a move to upstate New York in 1962, Clinchy founded the Institute for Man and Science in 1963. As an organization it had little to do with interfaith relations. (Institute for Man and Science, "Tribute to a Founder," undated, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 9\ "Everett R. Clinchy Biography.")

[60] ICC, minutes, January 4-5, 1962, ICCJ, central files.

indicated that it too was prepared to ratify the constitution after some questions regarding a few minor points were answered. Three officers were formally elected: Leopold Goldschmidt (DKR), chair, Simpson (CCJ), secretary, and Wallace Bell (CCJ), treasurer. Simpson reported that plans for the educators conference had fallen through. The meeting concluded with reports on interfaith activities in other countries as well as member countries. Simpson reported on developments and contacts with other councils, including Australia, New Zealand, South America, France, Holland, Spain and for the first time Israel. The Consultative Committee voted to accept an offer by the DKR to host an educators conference. Invitations to join the ICC were sent out to several national councils of Christians and Jews.

While some organizations responded positively, the NCCJ did not. In an internal memorandum attached to the proposed ICC constitution, Sterling Brown wrote a brief but revealing comment to Lewis W. Jones.[61] He stated: "We need to shun any organ.(sic) involvements at this time!" Clearly, the NCCJ was not ready to become involved in the international arena. Jones reiterated this position in a letter to Simpson.[62] While he personally was pleased to see the ICC functioning, he felt constrained by the trouble encountered with World Brotherhood a few years earlier. He added that a significant segment of the

---

[61] NCCJ, routing slip-NCCJ and ICC constitution, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 34.

[62] Jones to Simpson, December 27, 1961, SWHA, NCCJ Collection, Box 34.

NCCJ constituency was against any use of NCCJ funds outside of the United States.

The ICC met again in October.[63] Representatives from the Swiss, German, French, Italian, British and Austrian councils attended. As with the previous meeting, reports from the member countries were heard. Highlights of the reports included a well-attended public meeting in Florence, a new headquarters for the CCJ, and a tour of German teachers to Israel. It appears that the dominant leadership continued to rest with Simpson of the CCJ and Goldschmidt of the DKR. Although there tended to be ample representation of two or more representatives from each member country, it is not clear as to the power structure of the organization. It seems reasonable to assume that, given Simpson's years of background and experience, he was a dominant personality. About eight to twelve people, many of whom had been presentat the secretaries meeting several years earlier, attended each of the ICC meetings. The secretaries, though not necessarily the highest ranking persons in their respective organization, seem to have been the key persons with regard to any real activity that took place. The next meeting of the ICC was on March 21 and 22, 1963 in Zurich.[64] Reports were heard from the member countries along with discussion of a youth conference that had been held the previous summer in Holland.

---

[63] ICC, minutes, October 31, 1962, ICCJ, central files.

[64] ICC, minutes, SUA, Simpson papers, File 2\11 (folder 1).

The ICC met twice in 1964, in May and December.[65] At this point it became evident the ICC was beginning to take on a role that went beyond the mere exchange of information. Proposals and plans were set for future conferences, including a youth conference and an international conference at Oxford to mark the twentyieth anniversary of the 1946 Oxford conference. Another positive sign was the decision to encourage the national councils to consider participating in the planting of a 5,000 tree forest in Israel in recognition of efforts being made to improve Jewish-Christian relations.

The ICC was also aware of the vast changes beginning to unfold within the Catholic Church. There was an air of excitement as doctrinal changes were anticipated, both within the church and its relations with non-Catholic religious groups. The issuing of the documents produced at the Second Vatican Council gave a great boost to interfaith relations. It also signaled the end of the first phase of efforts to establish interfaith relations on the international scale.

The years that followed the collapse of the ICCJ were tumultuous. Clinchy, wishing to expand his program to encompass more than just interfaith relations, created a new organization, World Brotherhood. Members of the European religious community were reluctant to give up on interfaith activities, yet they were reticent to get overly involved in the international arena.

---

[65] ICC, minutes, May 1 and December 11-12, 1964, ICCJ, central files.

During the 1950s World Brotherhood grew and successfully convened several international conferences on a variety of topics. All the while this was going on the religious community-based organizations continued to grow and develop their respective programs, though not without occasional setbacks.

As the 1950s drew to a close, World Brotherhood was beginning to fade and the religious based-organizations were beginning to gain momentum. The impending changes within the Catholic church and the growth of interfaith organizations elsewhere in the world spurred further activity. Although informal meetings between the councils of Christians and Jews had never ceased, they became more formalized. During the early 1960s an international organization devoted to interfaith activities, the International Consultative Committee of Organizations for Jewish-Christian Cooperation, began to function.

CONCLUSIONS

The years following World War II were initially ones of great optimism. The United States and its allies felt that not only had they triumphed, but by virtue of that victory they had the knowledge to unite the world and bring an end to hostilities among people. Religious leaders believed they too had a role in helping to bring about this world unity. Unfortunately, the world was not as easily shaped and influenced as these leaders would have liked to believe and the very organizations they joined were fraught with problems. While the successes of these attempts to unify people and break down the barriers of intolerance did not equal the hopes of those who storve for them, they nonetheless meaningful progress was made.

The NCCJ in the United States and the CCJ in Britain were organized on very different lines. While they both sought to deal with religious intolerance, they viewed the entire scope of their missions differently and they arose from very different societies. The NCCJ was formed against the backdrop of growing intolerance towards minorities, especially Jews and Catholics. In Britain, however, it was World War II and the rise of virulent antisemitism that gave rise to the CCJ. In both cases it was liberal Christians who initially ventured to form a coalition to respond to these problems of intolerance. In the United States the Protestant churches made contact with the liberal Jewish community fairly easily. The Catholic Church was also interested in becoming involved due to increasing anti-Catholic sentiments

at the time of the 1928 presidential elections.

In Britain, it was necessary for the founders of the CCJ to gain the support of a more traditional Jewish community whose main authority was the Chief Rabbi. Gaining the participation of the Catholic Vhurch in Britain was not as easy, since the Church there was not feeling as much immediate pressure as it was in the United States. The British, however, were much closer to Germany and directly suffered the effects of the war from an early date. The founders of the CCJ felt the effects of antisemitism in a far more direct and powerful sense than their American counterparts. Thus the need to deal with antisemitism was of high priority to the CCJ.

From the outset and throughout the time of international efforts to improve interfaith relations, these differences played a major role in affecting the outcome of those efforts. In both cases several individuals played a major role and their viewpoints were central in the development of organizational programs. Just as the different assumptions underlying the NCCJ and CCJ caused problems, so too did the differences between the major leaders of the respective organizations, Everett R. Clinchy and William W. Simpson.

Clinchy without a doubt was a person who could generate grand ideas. He more than anyone else was responsible for the growth of the NCCJ. He was also responsible in large part for the successes, and the failures, of the various international programs. Clinchy surrounded himself with capable people. He

sought the support of the powerful and, while taking chances, always kept a balance. He led the NCCJ in innovative programming, and used his advisors to plan and create these programs. Clinchy had fifteen years of experience when he entered the international arena. His counterpart, Simpson, also had an ability to draw people together.

Clinchy's style was much more flashy than Simpson's. Clinchy was more willing to try things, while Simpson was more cautious. The grand thinking of Clinchy and careful planning of Simpson, for a while, were an excellent combination. The first two international conferences proved to be the highlight of international efforts at establishing and maintaining interfaith relations.

The meetings at Oxford and at Seelisberg produced results that in some ways have not been equaled since. The single most important outcome of the Oxford conference was that it took place at all. Never before had an international gathering of Christians and Jews taken place. The response to that conference was overwhelmingly positive. The two decisions, to form the ICCJ and to plan the international conference on antisemitism, continued the momentum that had been created.

The conference on antisemitism convened under the auspices of the provisional ICCJ at Seelisberg produced one of the most important documents concerning Jewish-Christian relations, "The Ten Points of Seelisberg." That document laid the foundation upon which future discussions of Jewish-Christian relations would

take place. It identified some of the root causes of Jewish-Christian conflict and the means towards working through some of those difficulties. To this day the "Ten Points" remains a milestone. The fact that this document looms as such a monumental work also points to the failures of attempts at improving interfaith relations, and fact that the document is still so highly regarded indicates that in many ways the effort peaked in 1948. The period from 1948 to 1964 produced little of lasting significance within the interfaith community. The staying power of the "Ten Points" to some degree shows that nothing was produced to supersede or improve upon it.

It is unrealistic to place the entire blame for this effort's failure to continue to grow on members of the religious communities. Many of the problems are traceable to differences in style and personality. Throughout the early days of the provisional ICCJ in 1946 until its formal demise, these differences became ever more pronounced and ultimately destructive. The cautious measured style of Simpson and the CCJ clashed with the aggressive style of Clinchy and the NCCJ. The CCJ, French, Swiss and German national councils remained committed to a faith-based attempt to improve interfaith relations. Even during the most troubled days following the collapse of the ICCJ, these groups held on to their desire for a religious-based approach.

Clinchy was not satisfied. He believed that not only had the NCCJ successfully dealt with interfaith problems in the

United States, but intergroup problems in general. He believed that just as the United States had triumphed in the war, so too it could bring its version of harmony to the world. Clinchy wanted to stay on the move and did not want to restrict his activities to just one arena. Unfortunately, this proved to be a mistake. He did not achieve the solid successes he sought. While much progress was made in resolving faith based conflict, there was much left incomplete. In his headstrong rush to the global he found himself out in front, but alone. The world was still entangled in strife and not yet ready to unite under the banner of brotherhood.

The NCCJ, urged by Clinchy, provided much of the funding that made the international conferences and ongoing programs possible. Had Clinchy been realistic about the success of "brotherhood" and allowed it to develop at a more reasonable pace he might have enjoyed greater long term results. If the NCCJ had been able to work better with the CCJ, it might have been possible to assist it in addressing the question of "indifferentism" when it was raised by the Catholic church. It appears that Clinchy's rush to grandeur laid the foundation for an unmaintainable edifice.

Part of the disappointing results of these efforts to improve interfaith relations lay with the lack of realism on the part of its proponents. Clinchy on the one hand believed that he had a workable formula that could be replicated again and again on yet grander scales. In Simpson's case, the problem revolved

around the fact that he was working with a weak coalition built on a thin line of consensus. That consensus was the need to address the problem of antisemitism. Once he veered from that problem he encountered problems from both the Jewish and the Catholic participants. Of the two problems, the greater one had to do with Clinchy.

The international interfaith community also failed to deal with some of the pressing issues of concern to the religious communities, particularly the Jewish community. The years following the war left the Jewish community in a state of shock. Even the subject of antisemitism as discussed in Seelisberg seemed to be at a cerebral level far removed from the brutal reality of the war years. Despite Leo Baeck's moving speech in London preceding the Oxford conference, the events of the war were dealt with in a passing manner. Even Clinchy's meetings in Germany during the late 1940s were with the select.

The Jewish community was also focused on questions regarding Zionism and the "Palestine question." None of the three major international conferences dealt with the issue of Palestine at length. It was hardly raised at Oxford, no doubt due in large part to the tension surrounding the topic in England at that time. At Seelisberg, Palestine was mentioned only with reference to its being an appropriate place to allows DPs to settle. Finally, at Fribourg, at a time when the State of Israel had declared its independence, little of substance was said. The minds of the Jewish community were concerned with regrouping

after the Holocaust and with the issues surrounding the creation of the State of Israel. The failure of those involved in interfaith activities to place these two items on the agenda in a serious way bore some responsibility for the lack of interest on the part of the Jewish community. The interfaith forum failed to attend to the issues that were most pressing to it.

The question that ultimately arises is: Did anything of value result from these efforts? Despite the failures, the answer is yes! The international community began to discuss the issues surrounding Jewish-Christian relations. Although these discussions have gone through periods of high activity as well as inactivity, they have continued to the present. The conferences at Oxford and Seelisberg proved that the world community could come together and, most importantly, wrestle with difficult and painful issues. The failures showed that the efforts would not be easy and at times progress would be slow. Even though these discussions never occupied the center of the world stage, they undoubtedly influenced those who participated. Often these individuals were leaders within their communities. Their experiences were then integrated into their own approach to Jewish-Christian relations and ultimately passed on to the communities they served.

APPENDIX A

FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Adopted at the International Conference of Christians and Jews
Oxford, 1946
(As taken from Freedom, Justice and Responsibility: Reports and Recommendations of the International Conference of Christians and Jews)

Commission No. 2

FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES OF CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM IN RELATION TO HUMAN ORDER

1. As Christians and Jews, while recognising the important religious differences between us, we affirm on the basis of divine revelation that the dignity, rights and duties of man derive from his creation by God and his relation to God.

We acknowledge God as the Creator and Lord of the universe, and as the Father of all human beings: we see in their relation to God the bond which unites them, even amid division and conflict, and in Him the authority to which all are subject. Moreover, we find the basic motive for ethical conduct in man's response to God as He makes Himself known in His wisdom and goodness.

By the will of God in creation man is both an individual and a member of society, so that both individuals and communities owe obedience to His rule. Moreover, there is true community only where there is full personal life, and *vice versa*.

2. Therefore:

(*a*) *We acknowledge the authority of the moral principles which are implicit in the nature of man in virtue of his relation to God and of his qualities as a rational, moral and social being.* From these it follows that it is the duty of men to respect in others the right to:—

(i) Life. Since each human being is the child of God and has special value in His sight as an individual, his life must be respected and preserved. At the same time, he must similarly respect the life of his fellow-man and is under obligation to promote his good.

(ii) Liberty. The responsibility which falls upon man as a child and servant of God involves the necessity for freedom. He must therefore be given opportunity for the free exercise of the spiritual and moral powers entrusted to him. Life in organised society makes demands and entails restrictions upon the individual, but the fundamental principles of liberty alike for the individual and communities may never be sacrificed.

(iii) Personal Dignity. Each individual possesses worth as a person and must treat others as such, while other persons and the community must accord similar treatment to him. This principle involves recognition of his status as a member of society with a contribution to make to the whole, and is opposed to discrimination on grounds of colour, race or creed.

(*b*) *We repudiate both the individualism which would make a man a law unto himself and the totalitarianism which would subordinate and sacrifice all other values to race, nation, state, class or party.* Against the first, we claim that only as a man accepts himself from God and all his life as under God can he truly live. Against the second we affirm that all human institutions stand under God's rule and judgment and that none may usurp the loyalty which is due to Him alone.

3. *Rights are exercised and duties discharged in a world which includes things as well as persons. Here we would maintain the following principles:*

(*a*) Things must be subordinated to persons, and property-rights should always be secondary to considerations of human welfare and social justice.

(*b*) Nature is to be respected and not merely exploited. It is a revelation of God and a sphere of His purpose: man may not squander its bounty and must show due regard for its beauty.

4. *The right attitude of a community to its members, of persons to persons, and of persons to things, cannot be fully achieved without the recognition, alike by the individual and by the community, of God and of the relation of man and nature to Him.*

Corporate recognition of God will include, in addition to the moral obligations of society, all that comes within the compass of worship.

Divided as we are in the forms of public worship, we are united in affirming the value of it and the need to participate in it if a right human order is to be achieved. Religious communities have therefore the right to exist and also the right to their own freedom of activity. Without the recognition of this right the political community is impoverished.

5. *The moral law which is rooted in God and implanted in man's nature is binding, not only upon individuals, but also upon society in all its groupings.*

(*a*) Within the state there should be respect for the family, freedom for a rich and varied group-life; above the state is the will of God as manifest in the universal moral law.

(*b*) Society is pre-eminently the sphere of justice, by which the relationships between individuals are so ordered that each may perform his duties and be assured of his rights. This can be achieved only under some form of government which recognises the social, political and religious rights and responsibilities of individuals and groups.

(*c*) Society is equally under an obligation to use all its resources for the welfare of all its members. That implies education, adequate provision against want, opportunity of service and conditions which will enable every individual to be at home in the community and every community to be at home in the larger human society.

6. *Man's recognition of himself and of his neighbour as children of God should issue in a charity and righteousness which, while but imperfectly embodied in the forms and laws of organised society, work constantly to transform them into an ever more adequate expression. We therefore, Christians and Jews alike, call upon all who share the religious convictions and the ethical standards here set out to co-operate for the realisation of this ideal.*

APPENDIX B

THE EIGHTEEN POINTS OF JULES ISAAC AND THE TEN POINTS OF SEELISBERG

Adopted at the Emergency Conference on Antisemitism
Seelisberg, 1947
(As taken from Jules Isaac, The Christian Roots of Antisemitism
pp. 17-24)

I. THE EIGHTEEN POINTS OF JULES ISAAC

These are taken from paragraph IV of a memorandum submitted by Jules Isaac to the Seelisberg Conference, and entitled *Christian antisemitism and the means of remedying it by the reform of Christian education.*

* * *

This reform should bear principally upon the following:

1. It should give to all Christians, and especially to Roman Catholics, at least an elementary knowledge of the Old Testament, so that they should know that the Old Testament, essentially semitic, was the Holy Scripture of the Jews before becoming the Holy Scripture of the Christians.
2. It should remind Christians that a large part of the Christian liturgy is borrowed from it; that the Old Testament, the work of Jewish genius – inspired, enlightened by God – is a permanent source of inspiration to Christian thought, literature and art.
3. It should recall that it was to the Jewish people, chosen by God, that God revealed himself first of all in his Omnipotence; that it is by the Jewish people that the fundamental belief in God has been safeguarded and transmitted to Christians.
4. It should teach, by means of the most reliable historical research, that Christianity is born of a living, not a degenerate, Judaism, as is proved by the richness of Jewish literature, the indomitable resistance of Judaism to paganism, the spiritual nature of synagogal worship, the widespread missionary activity, the broadening of belief, and the multiplicity of sects. It should avoid giving an absolute caricature of Pharisaism.
5. It should take into account the fact that history gives the lie to the theological myth of the Dispersion as Divine punishment (for the Crucifixion), because the Dispersion of the Jewish people had already taken place by the time of Jesus Christ, and all the evidence points to the fact that, at that period, the majority of the Jewish people were no longer living in Palestine.
6. It should warn the faithful against certain editorial tendencies to be found in the Gospels, especially in the Fourth Gospel, where the frequent use of the collective term "the Jews" in a partial and abusive sense (= the enemies of Jesus = high priests, scribes and Pharisees) results not only in falsifying the historic perspective, but in inspiring hate and mistrust of the whole Jewish people, whereas in reality this people does not come into the picture.
7. It should state very explicitly, so that no Christian can be ignorant of it, that Jesus was a Jew, born of an old Jewish family, that he was circumcised (according to Jewish Law) on the eighth day after his birth; that his name is a Jewish name – Jeshua – grecised, and that Christ is the Greek equivalent of the Jewish term Messiah; that Jesus spoke a semitic language, Aramaic; and that even to read

the Gospels in their original text, which is Greek, one only knows the Word by translations from a translation.

8. It should teach, in accordance with Scripture, that Jesus "born under Jewish Law" lived "under the Law", that he did not cease from practising to his last day the essentials of Judaism, and that, up to his last day, he did not cease from preaching his Gospel in the synagogues and in the Temple.
9. It should not omit the fact that Jesus, during his human life, desired only to be the "servant to the circumcision" (Rom. 15:8) and that he chose his disciples only from among the Jews. All the apostles were Jews, like their Master.
10. It should show, from Gospel texts, that except on rare occasions, and until his last day, Jesus did not cease to obtain the enthusiastic sympathy of the Jewish masses, in Jerusalem as well as in Galilee.
11. It should refrain from affirming that Jesus was personally rejected by the Jewish people, that they refused to recognise him as Messiah and Son of God. Jesus was never presented to them as such – the Messianic character of the entry into Jerusalem, on the eve of the Passion, could only have been perceived by a very small number. Moreover, it should take into account the fact that the majority of the Jewish people, at this period, no longer lived in Palestine and, according to all our evidence, did not even know Jesus.
12. It should refrain from teaching that Jesus was rejected by the qualified leaders of the Jewish nation. The high priests who caused his arrest and condemnation were the representatives of an oligarchic caste, bound to Rome and detested by the people. As for the scribes and Pharisees, it is evident from the Gospel texts that they were not unanimously against Jesus. There is nothing to prove that the spiritual *élite* of Judaism was involved in the charge brought against him.
13. It should refrain from artificial interpretations of texts to try to show the total rejection of Israel, or the existence of a curse explicitly pronounced in the Gospels. It should keep in mind the fact that Jesus never ceased to make a distinction between the people and their evil shepherds and to show compassion and love for ordinary people.
14. Above all it should refrain from the current and traditional affirmation that the Jewish people had committed the inexpiable crime of deicide, and taken upon itself, in its totality, the whole responsibility. It should refrain from such an affirmation not only because it is murderous, in its generation of hatred and crime, but also because it is radically false.
15. It should throw light upon the fact – emphasised by the four Gospels – that the high priests and their accomplices who acted against Jesus did so without the support of the people, despite them, and even in fear of them.

16. In regard to the Jewish proceedings against Jesus, it should recognise that – according to the account of the synoptists – the Jewish people had nothing to do with them, played no part in them, and probably knew nothing of them; that the outrage and brutality was inflicted by jailors and, probably, by some of the oligarchy, and not by the Jewish people. There is no mention of Jewish proceedings, or even of a meeting of the *sanhedrin*, in the Fourth Gospel.
17. As for the Roman proceedings, it should not place to the account of the Jewish people the crown of thorns which the canonical Gospels charge to the Roman soldiers; it should refrain from identifying the crowd, swayed by the high priests, with the whole Jewish people, or even with the Jewish people of Palestine, whose anti-Roman feelings are beyond doubt; and should note that the Fourth Gospel lays the blame exclusively on the high priests and their agents.
18. And lastly, it should not forget that the monstrous cry: "His blood be upon us and upon our children" could never prevail against the Word:

"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

THE TEN POINTS OF SEELISBERG

1. Remember that One God speaks to us all through the Old and the New Testaments.
2. Remember that Jesus was born of a Jewish mother of the seed of David and the people of Israel, and that His everlasting love and forgiveness embrace His own people and the whole world.
3. Remember that the first disciples, the apostles, and the first martyrs were Jews.
4. Remember that the fundamental commandment of Christianity, to love God and one's neighbour, proclaimed already in the Old Testament and confirmed by Jesus, is binding upon both Christians and Jews in all human relationships, without any exception.
5. Avoid disparaging biblical or post-biblical Judaism with the object of extolling Christianity.
6. Avoid using the word *Jews* in the exclusive sense of the enemies of Jesus, and the words *the enemies of Jesus* to designate the whole Jewish people.
7. Avoid presenting the Passion in such a way as to bring the odium of the killing of Jesus upon Jews alone. In fact, it was not all the Jews who demanded the death of Jesus. It is not the Jews alone who are responsible, for the Cross which saves us all reveals that it is for the sins of us all that Christ died.

   Remind all Christian parents and teachers of the grave responsibility which they assume, particularly when they present the Passion story in a crude manner. By so doing they run the risk of implanting an aversion in the conscious or sub-conscious minds of their children or hearers, intentionally or unintentionally. Psychologically speaking, in the case of simple minds, moved by a passionate love and compassion for the crucified Saviour, the horror which they feel quite naturally towards the persecutors of Jesus will easily be turned into an undiscriminating hatred of the Jews of all times, including those of our own day.
8. Avoid referring to the scriptural curses, or the cry of a raging mob: *His blood be upon us and upon our children*, without remembering that this cry should not count against the infinitely more weighty words of our Lord: *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*
9. Avoid promoting the superstitious notion that the Jewish people is reprobate, accursed, reserved for a destiny of suffering.
10. Avoid speaking of the Jews as if the first members of the Church had not been Jews.

APPENDIX C

CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

Adopted by the International Council of Christians and Jews
Fribourg, 1948
(As found in the central files of the International Council
of Christians and Jews [Heppenheim, Germany])

CONSTITUTION

of the

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

PREAMBLE :

The International Council of Christians and Jews has its origin in a deep sense of the need for better human relations shared by Christians and Jews in many countries, who are resolved to replace intolerance and persecution by a spirit of mutual understanding and goodwill and of co-operation in matters of mutual concern.

While acknowledging the existence of important differences between them in matters of religious faith and practice, those responsible for bringing the International Council of Christians and Jews into being hold in common a conviction that under the sovereignty of God as Creator and Father of all mankind they can work effectively together for justice and brotherhood.

o O o

THE CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I

AIMS :

The national Councils or organisations of Christians and Jews, hereinafter described as Members, have established the International Council of Christians and Jews to facilitate co-operation between such bodies in the furtherance of the following aims :

Footnote :

In pursuance of resolutions unanimously adopted at two International Conferences of Christians and Jews held at Oxford in August 1946 and at Seelisberg in August 1947, the Board of Directors of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the U.S.A. by resolution passed on October 28th 1947 ; and the Annual General Meeting of the Council of Christians and Jews in the United Kingdom by resolution passed on November 6th 1947, agreed to take initial steps towards the foundation of an International Council of Christians and Jews, and appointed six representatives each to a provisional Executive Committee of an International Council deemed for the time being to be in process of formation. This provisional Executive Committee was authorised by the two initiating bodies to prepare a draft Constitution which, when duly ratified by two or more national Councils of Christians and Jews, should come into effect.

(1) To promote educational activities directed towards intergroup understanding and the development of a sense of common responsibility in civic and community affairs.

(2) To foster co-operation in civic life between all groups of Christians and Jews on the basis of their common convictions and with mutual respect for differences of faith and practice.

(3) To rally all men of goodwill to support through appropriate channels efforts to remove the causes and to remedy the effects of intolerance, and generally to work for the betterment of human relations.

(4) To co-operate with appropriate international agencies, and with other bodies concerned with human rights and fundamental freedoms.

o O o

M E M B E R S H I P

Article II

1. FULL MEMBERSHIP

National Councils or organisations of Christians and Jews which endorse the Preamble of this Constitution and are dedicated to the aims set out in Article I and are approved by the Governing Body of the International Council of Christians and Jews shall constitute the membership of the

---

Footnote :

It should be noted that the International Council of Christians and Jews is not concerned with matters involving common worship, the amalgamation of religion or theological disputation.

Ultimately the International Council of Christians and Jews will serve as a co-ordinating and correlating body, facilitating the exchange of information and experience among its members, providing an international forum on topics of world interest in the field of human relations, and offering aid and counsel to its members upon their request.

During the formative and developmental stages of its existence, however, the International Council of Christians and Jews will also serve as an agency to promote the growth of regional and national Councils, to confer with educational authorities in the field of human relations, and in general to take such steps as will strengthen and extend the movement, always with full respect for, and co-operation with the existing regional and national Councils concerned.

International Council of Christians and Jews and shall be known as Members.

Each national Council or organisation of Christians and Jews thus associated with the International Council of Christians and Jews shall retain its own integrity and autonomy.

2. AUXILIARY MEMBERSHIP

In addition to the Members, the following classes of auxiliary membership are established :

A. Corresponding Members (Class A)

Regional Societies, dedicated to the purposes of the International Council of Christians and Jews set out above, in countries where no National Council exists, may, subject to the approval of the Governing Body of the International Council of Christians and Jews, become Corresponding Members. Class A.

B. Corresponding Members (Class B)

Regional Societies dedicated to the purposes of the International Council of Christians and Jews, in countries where a National Council or organisation of Christians and Jews exists, may, subject to the approval both of the National Council and of the Governing Body of the International Council of Christians and Jews become Corresponding Members (Class B).

C. Affiliates

Societies composed of religious groups possibly including more than or other than Christians and/or Jews,which are in general sympathy with the purposes of the International Council of Christians and Jews, may upon due application and subject to the approval of the Governing Body of the International Council of Christians and Jews, become Affiliates.

D. Honorary Members

Persons of distinction who are devoted to the purposes of the International Council of Christians and Jews may upon the invitation of the Governing Body of the International Council of Christians and Jews become Honorary Members.

o O o

THE GOVERNING BODY

Article III

Each full Member organisation of the International Council of Christians and Jews shall be entitled to elect a minimum of three representatives to the Governing Body of the Council, with an additional member for each fifty million

or fraction thereof in excess of the first twenty-five million of the population of the country concerned, with a maximum of six representatives from any one country. Member organisations shall as far as is practicable ensure that their delegations include at least one member each of the Jewish, Roman Catholic and Protestant communities. Each Member organisation shall determine the tenure of office of its representatives on the Governing Body and in the event of the absence or incapacity of any of them may appoint alternates.

The Governing Body shall determine all questions relating to the work of the International Council of Christians and Jews.

o O o

M E E T I N G S O F T H E G O V E R N I N G B O D Y

Article IV

The Governing Body shall meet at least once in each year, at such time and place as may be determined by the Executive Committee. Notice of ordinary meetings of the Governing Body shall be sent by the Director to all representatives of Member organisations not less than ninety days before the date of the meeting.

The Director shall call a special meeting of the Governing Body if requested to do so by any three Member organisations.

The notice convening a special meeting of the Governing Body shall specify the business for which the meeting is called and shall be sent out as long in advance of the meeting as possible.

o O o

O F F I C E R S

Article V

The Governing Body shall elect three Co-Chairmen of the International Council of Christians and Jews, a Jew, a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, who shall serve as ex-officio members of the Governing Body and who shall preside over the meetings of the Governing Body in rotation. The Co-Chairmen shall serve for three years, retiring in rotation as provided for in By-Law ....., and shall be eligible for re-election.

The Governing Body shall also elect a Treasurer or Treasurers, who shall serve for three years and shall be eligible for re-election. The Governing Body shall also appoint on the recommendation of the Executive Committee a Director, Auditors and Legal Advisors, and shall fix their respective tenure of office and remuneration if any. The Treasurers and the Director shall be members of the Governing Body.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Article VI

The International Co-Chairmen, together with four additional persons chosen by the Governing Body from among its members, shall serve as an Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall be responsible to the Governing Body for the carrying out of the work of the International Council of Christians and Jews in accordance with the policy determined by the Governing Body.

The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the Co-Chairmen upon at least one month's notice. But action, if taken by two-thirds vote, may be taken by correspondence if the Co-Chairmen so request.

o O o

GENERAL CONFERENCE

Article VII

A General Conference shall meet at least once in each two years, upon six months' notice.

The General Conference shall give full consideration to the policy and programme of the International Council of Christians and Jews against be background of current events, and give advice and counsel as it deems expedient to the Governing Body of the International Council of Christians and Jews.

While the General Conference has no executive or legislative functions, and is limited to consultative and advisory procedure, its resolutions as set out shall be received by the International Council's Governing Body as deserving of most serious consideration in determining the future policies of the International Council of Christians and Jews.

o O o

HEADQUARTERS

Article VIII

The Headquarters of the International Council of Christians and Jews shall be established in Geneva and may be changed at any time by a majority vote of the Governing Body.

AMENDMENTS

Article IX

This Constitution may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of the Governing Body provided that six months' notice is given and the amendment so approved is ratified within one year's time thereafter by two-thirds of the Member Organisations.

An amendment may be proposed by any Member Organisation subject to six months' notice of its intention being given to the Governing Body.

o O o

BY-LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Article X

To this Constitution may be subjoined By-Laws made by the Governing Body and Regulations made by the Executive Committee for regulating the business of the Governing Body and the Executive Committee respectively, being By-Laws and Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution. Such By-Laws and Regulations may be amended or suspended by a two-thirds vote of the members attending a meeting of the Governing Body or the Executive Committee as the case may be.

o O o

RATIFICATION

Article XI

The International Council of Christians and Jews shall come into being on the ratification of this Constitution by duly accredited delegates of two or more national Councils of Christians and Jews.

******

APPENDIX D

CONSTITUTION AND PROGRAM OF THE WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR BROTHERHOOD

Adopted by the World Organization for Brotherhood
Paris, 1950
(As found in the NCCJ Collection of the Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota)

RAFT OF CONSTITUTION OR BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I

Name

The name of this organization is

The World Organization for Brotherhood

ARTICLE II

Purpose

1. The purpose of The World Organization for Brotherhood is to promote justice, amity, understanding and civic cooperation among persons of all national, racial and religious affiliations.

2. Its members, believing in the moral law of the universe and deriving their inspiration from religion, constitute this organization as a voluntary association of individuals, not of official representatives of other organizations. This organization does not aim at any sort of amalgamation of bodies or at modifying any of the distinctive beliefs of its members.

ARTICLE III

Program

1. The World Organization for Brotherhood shall rely upon educational procedures in its work. The methods it employs shall involve study, analysis, communications, negociations, arbitration and cooperation. Its activities shall be conducted primarily in cooperation with educational organizations, religious organizations, community and civic organizations, industrial organizations and media of communications.

ARTICLE IV

Board of Directors

Section 1. The affairs and property of the World Organization for Brotherhood shall be managed by a Board of Directors (and members) consisting of not more than 100 persons.

Section 2. The Directors shall be divided into three classes of approximately the same number. When The World Organization is initiated, the term of office of the first class shall terminate at the annual meeting next after the meeting at which they are elected; the term of office of the second class shall terminate at the annual meeting two years after the meeting at which they are elected; the term of office of the third class shall terminate at the annual meeting three years after the meeting at which they are elected. The term of office of Directors thereafter shall be three years. The Directors shall remain in office until their successors are elected.

Section 3. At each annual meeting the successors to the class of Directors whose terms expire in that year shall be elected.

ARTICLE V

Meetings

Section 1. The annual meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held at such time and place as shall be specified by the Board. Notice of the time, place and purpose of the annual meeting shall be served by mail preferably 3 months ahead but not less than thirty days before the meeting.

Section 2. Special meetings may be called by any one of the Co-chairmen of the Board, or by the President, by notice specifying the purpose of the meeting. Notice of special meetings shall be given in the same manner as notice of the annual meeting.

Section 3. Every Director may vote by proxy at any meeting of the Board.

ARTICLE VI

Executive Committee

To conduct the necessary business between regular meetings of the Board, an Executive Committee of not more than 12 members plus the officers will be elected by the Board.

ARTICLE VII

Commissions

Each Commission in the operating program will be represented on the Board, and will conduct its program subject to the Board's policies and review. Other Committees may be designated at the will of the Board.

ARTICLE VIII

Nominating Committee

A nominating Committee will be designated by the officers, subject to approval at each annual meeting, and will be responsible for the nomination of Board members and officers.

ARTICLE IX

Officers

The officers shall consist of three Co-chairmen who shall be of different religious groups, a President, one or more Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and a Treasurer; and such additional officers (with such powers and subject to such restrictions as shall be set forth in the resolutions appointing them) as may from time to time be appointed by the Board. The officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Board, and may be removed by the Board at any time with or without stated cause.

Article X

Chapters

The Co-chairmen and President of this organization shall have the power to authorize the formation of chapters, and to issue charters thereto, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors at its next meeting. Such charters shall be issued only to groups professing acceptance of the purpose as stated in Article II and Program, as stated in Article III of this constitution. Any charter may be withdrawn on the unanimous decision of the Co-chairmen subject to concurrence of the Board of Directors.

Article XI

Amendments

These By-laws (this Constitution) may be added to or amended by a majority vote of the members of the Board at any annual meeting or at any special meeting of the Board, provided in the case of a special meeting that the proposed amendment shall be set forth in the notice of meeting.

PROGRAM

Brotherhood means giving to individuals of all other nations, races, and religions the same dignity and rights you wish to keep yourself.

That is the foundation for liberty, and the only sure way by which anybody can have freedom.

This kind of brotherhood *must be learned.* It is an art, a skill, as much as it is a spirit. Therefore, the program of the World Organization for Brotherhood is essentially educational.

Underlying the economic, political, and educational work in the realm of the spirit, religious organizations must take responsibility in developing a spiritual foundation for human brotherhood that will stand in the face of evil and tragedy.

It seeks to work with all organizations that can be enlisted to instruct their members in brotherhood. The task naturally falls into 5 departments or "Commissions".

Commission on Educational Organizations

1. A Commission on Educational Organizations sponsors projects designed to provide additional professional training for teachers, school administrators, social workers, civic and welfare leaders, parents and *clergymen*, in the field of human relations; to work with them on sound methods for influencing and preparing children in democratic living, and to develop adequate textbooks and other necessary teaching materials. These projects include *(a)* workshops and training courses for teachers, *(b)* human relations centers in universities, *(c)* study conferences on intergroup relations, *(d)* intergroup relations programs in elementary and secondary schools, *(e)* courses in teachers' colleges, *(f)* preparation of manuals for educators, and *(g)* professional intergroup training.

Commission on Religious Organizations

2. A Commission on Religious Organizations undertakes a world-wide program that links ministers, priests, and rabbis and their congregations in promoting good will, cooperation, and justice among all groups. The program includes *(a)* providing churches and synagogues with materials and ideas for Sunday School activities and youth study, *(b)* working with religious educators on intergroup problems, and *(c)* providing teachers for summer youth conferences. The program will not enter into doctrinal debate nor any form of proselytization nor will it engage in acts of worship together.

Commission On Community Organizations

3. A Commission on Community Organizations works with fraternal, civic, welfare, women's, youth, veterans, and other community organizations to help make democratic good will a pattern of world living.

Commission On Industrial Teamwork

4. A Commission on Industrial Teamwork is setting up human relations courses in factories and department stores with a view to lessening intergroup hostilities and frictions that cause economic and psychological losses. Abundant economic production to raise the standard of living for every worker can be developed in a free world to the degree that the spirit of brotherhood is learned and practised.

Commission On Media of Public Information

5. A Commission on Media of Public Information carries the Brotherhood campaign against bigotry to the citizens of all nations through the world's vast and varied forms of communication—newspapers, radio, television, cinema, advertising, magazines, books, pamphlets, speakers, recordings—using truth to combat lies, promoting good will to offset hate.

With the interest and help of those friends attending the patrons' meeting in Paris June 8-11, the educators who will be meeting at the same time in UNESCO House, the religious leaders who will be meeting in Strasbourg, June 13-15, Pan-European Commissions will be formed and begin operations during the twelve months ahead.

Brotherhood Week

An Annual festival in February of each year will be observed as Brotherhood Week. The President or Prime Minister of each nation will be invited to serve as Honorary Chairman.

ADMINISTRATION

The World Organization For Brotherhood Headquarters may temporarily be in New York City near United Nations Headquarters.

The European Division may continue at 37, Quai Wilson, Geneva.

The European Staff properly should have directors for the French-and-Italien speaking peoples. It now has a director and a German Staff for the German speaking peoples. At the Headquarters in Geneva, Staff will be needed for the five European Commissions.

The European Staff will be supervised by an Executive Committee of patrons, composed of Europeans.

APPENDIX E

CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR CHRISTIAN-JEWISH COOPERATION

Adopted by the International Consultative Committee of Organizations for Christian-Jewish Cooperation
January 1962
(As found in the central files of the International Council of Christians and Jews [Heppenheim, Germany])

DRAFT CONSTITUTION

1. NAME: "The International Consultative Committee of Organisations for Christian-Jewish Co-operation", which shall be known as "International Christian-Jewish Co-operation" and is hereinafter referred to as "The Committee".

2. MEMBERSHIP: The Committee shall consist of national organisations of Christians and Jews established to promote Christian-Jewish co-operation. The founding members shall be the organisations named in the appendix to this Constitution. Other organisations may be admitted to membership on a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Committee in accordance with paragraph 7 below. Any member organisation may withdraw from membership by notice in writing given on behalf of such organisation to the Secretary for the time being of the Committee.

3. PURPOSE: The Committee shall be established to provide a channel for the exchange of information between the member organisations, and to provide for consultation between them on matters of common concern in the field of Christian-Jewish relations. It may also recommend action either by separate member organisations individually, or jointly by several or all member organisations, but it shall have no power of direction over any member organisation.

4. ACTIVITIES: The Committee shall function through a Secretariat established at the office of the Secretary appointed in accordance with paragraph 8 below. The activities of the Committee shall consist of the arrangement of meetings of the Committee, and the dissemination of information among the member organisations. The Committee may also through the Secretariat make contact with other international organisations, but such contact shall be made only by resolution of the Committee. The Committee may initiate conferences or other activities in its own name, but shall do so only after such activities have been approved by the member organisations that would be involved in them.

5. REPRESENTATION: Each member organisation may appoint one representative to the Committee. At meetings of the Committee, the appointed representatives may be replaced by deputies provided prior notice in writing is given to the Secretary. Other organisations may be invited by special resolution of the Committee to appoint representatives to attend its meetings, and the Committee may also invite additional representatives of member organisations.

6. MEETINGS: The Committee shall meet at least once in each calendar year. The date and place of meetings shall be arranged by the Secretary in consultation with the member organisations, meetings being held from time to time in the various countries represented by the member organisations. At least four weeks' notice in writing shall be given of each meeting.

7. VOTING: At meetings of the Committee, resolutions shall be adopted by a simple majority of the appointed representatives present and voting, except that for the admission of new members resolutions shall need a majority of two-thirds of the total member organisations, each member organisation having one vote. In the case of an equal vote on a resolution requiring a simple majority of those present and voting, the Chairman shall have an additional casting vote.

8. OFFICERS: The Committee shall at the commencement of each meeting appoint from the representatives of member organisations, a Chairman, a Secretary and a Treasurer. The Chairman shall normally hold office for two years and shall not be immediately eligible for re-election. The Secretary and Treasurer shall be eligible for re-election for further consecutive periods. Pending the first meeting of the Committee held under this Constitution, the Acting Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer respectively shall be Herr Leopold Goldschmidt, the Rev. William Wynn Simpson and Mr. David Wallace Bell.

9. FINANCE: Each member organisation shall be invited to make such financial contribution as shall be agreed by the Committee from time to time towards the expenses of the Secretariat.

10. RATIFICATION: The Committee shall be established when this Constitution has been ratified by not less than three of the organisations named in the appendix, notice of such ratifications to be lodged with the Acting Secretary appointed under paragraph 8 above.

... Appendix

APPENDIX

Aktion gegen den Antisemitismus in Österreich	(Austria)
Amitié Judéo-Chrétienne	(France)
Deutscher Koordinierungsrat der Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit	(Germany)
Christlich-Judische Arbeitsgemeinschaft in der Schweiz	(Switzerland)
The Council of Christians and Jews	(United Kingdom)

APPENDIX F

TIME LINE

TIME LINE

1920's: Rise of antisemitism and anti-Catholicism in the United States.

1923: "Committee on Goodwill Between Christians and Jews, founded by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (FCCCA).

1928: National Conference of Jews and Christians is founded, later becomes National Conference of Christians and Jews. (NCCJ)

1928: Everett R. Clinchy appointed director of NCCJ.

1933: First "Trio Team" tours the United States.

March 20, 1943: The Council of Christians and Jews (CCJ) of Great Britain holds its first meeting.

March 1944: NCCJ team visits England, meets with CCJ leaders, proposes major international Jewish-Christian Conference for after the war.

July 30- August 6, 1946: First International Conference of Christians and Jews meets in Oxford, England.

July 30- August 5, 1947: Emergency Conference on Antisemitism is held under sponsorship of ICCJ at Seelisberg, Switzerland.

Fall 1947: Everett Clinchy makes tour of European Continent promoting ICCJ.

1947-1948: Differences in approach between NCCJ and CCJ emerge.

May 1948: State of Israel declares independence.

July 1948: ICCJ convenes conference in Fribourg, Switzerland.

July 1948-September 1950: ICCJ ceases to function in reality, exists on paper until September 1951. NCCJ orders a complete break from ICCJ.

November 1949: Clinchy proposes the World Organization for Brotherhood.

1949-1956: CCJ experiences tensions with World Brotherhood.

June 1950: World Brotherhood meets in Paris

1951-1958: Informal meetings continue between CCJ and other European interfaith organizations.

1952: World Brotherhood holds several small conferences.

November 1954: Catholics leave CCJ over issue of "indifferentism."

1955: World Brotherhood holds conference in Brussels.

1955: "Centre de Liaison et Documentation" is set up by European councils of Christians and Jews as resource center.

1956: World Brotherhood independent of NCCJ.

1958: World Brotherhood separates from NCCJ completely. Clinchy retires from NCCJ.

1958: Secretaries of European councils of Christians and Jews begin to meet.

1962: Secretaries form International Consultative Committee of Organizations for Jewish-Christian Cooperation. NCCJ remains uninvolved.

1964: Catholics rejoin CCJ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

ARCHIVES

American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio

Jacob Billikopf Papers
Julian Feibelman Papers
Morris Lazaron Papers
Samuel Schulman Papers

International Council of Christians and Jews, Heppenheim, Germany

Central Files

Sisters of Sion, Vienna, Austria

Central files

Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesaota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

National Conference of Christians and Jews Collection

Southampton University Library Archives and Manuscripts, Southampton, England

Council of Christians and Jews Papers
William W. Simpson Papers

INTERVIEWS

Lord Donald Coggan
David Hyatt
Carl Hermann Voss
Ruth Weyl
Elliott Wright

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS

Common Ground, 1946-1950.

Freiburger Rundbrief, October 1955, p. 54.

Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily Bulletin, 1946-1948.

The Jewish Chroncile, 1946-1948.

New York Times, 1946-1948.

OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

The Committee on Goodwill Between Jews and Christians of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Statement of Fundamental Aims and Report for the Year November 1, 1925 and November 1, 1926, New York, 1926.

Council of Christians and Jews, Freedom, Justice and Responsibility: Reports and Recommendations of the International Conference of Christians and Jews, London, 1946.

Wigoder, Geoffrey, letter to the author, August 1, 1990.

International Council of Christians and Jews, Reports and Recommendations of the Emergency Conference on Antisemitism, Geneva, 1947.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, New York, 1928, vol. 38

Joesph, Bea and Squires, Charlotte Warren, eds., Biographical Index: Cumulative Index to Biographical Material in Books and Magazines, November 1946- July 1949, New York, 1949.

Isaac, Jules, The Christian Roots of Antisemitism, London, 1965.

Pitt, James E., Adventures in Brotherhood, New York, 1955.

Roberts, Frank C., Obituraries From the Times, 1971-1975, London, 1978.

Roberts, Frank C., Obituraries From the Times, 1951-1960, London, 1979.

Sachar, Howard M., History of Israel, From the Rise of Zionism to our Own Time, London, 1976.

Simpson, William W., "The International Council of Christians and Jews: A Brief History," (mimeograph booklet), Heppenheim, Germany, 1982.

Simpson, William W.and Weyl,Ruth, The International Council of Christians and Jews, Heppenheim, Germany, 1988.

Articles

Bishop, Claire Huchet, "Biography of Jules Isaac", in Jules Isaac, Has Antisemitism Roots in Christianity?, (New York, 1962): 27-31.

Kraut, Benny, "A Look From the Outside: Jews, Catholics and the Establishment's Goodwill Movement in the 1920s," University of Cincinnati, (Cincinnati, ~1987): 1-49.
also published as:
"A Wary Collaboration: Jews, Catholics, and the Protestant Goodwill Movement," in Hutchison, William R., ed, Between the Times (Cambridge, 1989): 193-230.

Kraut, Benny, "Towards the Establishment of the NCCJ: The Tenuous Road to Goodwill in the 1920s," American Jewish History, (1988): 388-411.

Lichten, Joseph L., "Jules Isaac: The Teaching of Contempt," in Katharine T. Hargrove, R. S. C. J., ed., The Star and the Cross: Essays on Jewish-Christian Relations, (Milwaukee, 1964): 133-134.

Simpson, William W., "Jewish-Christian Relations Since the Inception of the Council of Christians and Jews," The Jewish Historical Society of England, Transactions, Sessions 1981-1982, (London, 1984): 89-101.

Sussman, Lance, "Toward Better Understanding: The Rise of the Interfaith Movement and the role of Rabbi Isaac Landman," American Jewish Archives, (Cincinnati, 1982): 35-49.