

### The Abba Hillel Silver Digital Collection

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4928: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, Series III, 1916-1945, undated.

Box Folder 2 6

United Palestine Appeal, 1944-1945, undated.

HYMAN JUDAH SCHACHTEL, SENIOR RABBI DR. HENRY BARNSTON, RABBI EMERITUS ROBERT I. KAHN, ASSOCIATE RABBI (ON LEAVE AS CHAPLAIN IN U. S. ARMY)

OFFICERS

LEOPOLD L. MEYER, PRESIDENT MAX H. NATHAN, 1ST VICE-PRES. WM. SALMAN, 2ND VICE-PRES. SIDNEY L. MAYER, SECRETARY HENRY GREENFIELD, TREASURER

C. M. WUNDERMAN

## Congregation Beth Israel

ORGANIZED 1856

KEYSTONE 3-6670

KEYSTONE 3-6679

HOLMAN AND LA BRANCH STS.
HOUSTON, TEXAS

Houston, Texas January 11, 1944 TRUSTEES

SYDNEY H. COHEN M. N. DANNENBAUM MELVIN T. DAVIDSON DR. THOS. FREUNDLICH IKE L. FREED I. FRIEDLANDER MRS. CARL J. HERMAN. SR. HERBERT E. LEVY MRS. M. D. LEVY RENE S. LEVY SAM W. LEVY MRS. LASKER M. MEYER ALBERT MEYERSON MRS. W. W. MUNZESHEIMER MELVIN ROUFF TOBIAS SAKOWITZ IRVIN M. SHLENKER

TO THE OFFICER, TRUSTEE AND RABBI OF THE REFORM CONGREGATION ADDRESSED:

The resolutions herewith submitted were adopted by an overwhelming majority of the members of Congregation Beth Israel, Houston, Texas, at a special meeting held Nov. 23rd, 1943. The meeting was the largest ever held by this Congregation, there having been more than 800 men and women present.

We forward these Resolutions to you in the spirit of constructive criticism and with a profound concern for the future of American Reform Judaism. Today there are only 55,000 families affiliated with American Reform Congregations. We are not satisfied with this showing, after seventy-five years, and are not content to see Reform Judaism disappear from the American Jewish scene. Our aim is to build and we hope to see Reform Judaism, as envisaged and planned by Isaac Mayer Wise, grow in strength and influence throughout the land.

Sincerely,

Sidney L. Mayer, Secretary.

P.S. You may also be interested in seeing a copy of the Basic Principles of the Congregation and the article pertaining thereto released by our Rabbi to the Anglo-Jewish press, which we enclose herewith.

Resolution adopted by the members of Hebrew Congregation Beth Israel of Houston, Texas (an American Reform Congregation) at a special meeting of the Congregation held on November 23, 1943.

#### - PREAMBLE -

The members of Hebrew Congregation Beth Israel, Houston, Texas (which Congregation was established May 8, 1856) view with great concern and with much regret the persistent, consistent and growing deviation of organized American Reform Judaism from the ideals and pattern which were established at its founding under the leadership of Isaac M. Wise. We are deeply concerned by the processes which, during the last two decades, have vitiated the broad universalism of this Judaism and have set in motion within it, forces which do not belong to the new world of emancipation and promise, but which are attuned to and are a part of the old world's concept of segregation and despair for Jewish life.

The three great institutions of American Reform Judaism are still those instrumentalities born of the vision of Isaac M. Wise, THE UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS, THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE, and THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS. Whatever strength this Judaism may have must come by way of leadership from these three institutions. Whatever defection there may be from the classical patterns of this Judaism must similarly, in very large measure, be the responsibility of these institutions.

Therefore, as a member of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and, as an American Reform Congregation that has in the past and hopes to continue in the future to look to the Hebrew Union College and to the Central Conference of American Rabbis for its spiritual leadership and guidance, we respectfully submit the following resolution in the devout hope that the action of this Congregation may inspire similar action in other congregations and that, united in action, we may be able to revive, strengthen, and re-inforce the heart and soul of that Judaism so long and honorably associated with the term "American Reform".

WHEREAS, the UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS is the official organization of the laymen of American Reform Judaism, and was called into being by Isaac M. Wise to provide support for the Hebrew Union College and to effectively provide a vehicle for the active participation by Reform Jewish laymen in the development and progress of American Reform Judaism, and,

WHEREAS, because of its position of leadership a large share of the retrogression that has taken place in Reform Judaism must be considered dereliction of leadership upon the part of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that as a member congregation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, we register a severe criticism to that body for the recurring and constant compromise of the principles of Reform Judaism and particularly upon the following specific counts:

- 1. The failure of the delegates of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to the recent American Jewish Conference to forthwith register and publicly announce a dissent from that Conference's Palestine Zionistic resolution, which said resolution far exceeded the Palestine resolution accepted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and presented to its delegates as instructions before the American Jewish Conference convened. Their silence gave the impression of assent and any subsequent action must fail to overcome the dereliction of the responsibilities of delegates representing the laymen's reform movement to publicly disavow a commitment of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to the full, maximal Zionist political program as endorsed by the Conference; further, the failure of the Executive Board to disavow the action of the American Jewish Conference and to withdraw from said Conference but instead to refer the Palestine resolution to the next biennial convention, which is eighteen months hence, has the practical effect to place the prestige and influence of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations during this period, which may be the critical period of decision, fully behind the maximal Zionist political program which is contrary to the historical position of the Reform Congregations and the members thereof upon this question;
- 2. The recent tendency to eliminate the word "Reform" as the descriptive title of American Judaism and the gradual substitution of the word "liberal", as, for example, in the new magazine, "Liberal Judaism", the official organ of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. We submit that "Reform Judaism" has an established and honorable connotation in American life, both Jewish and non-Jewish; that it represented and represents certain definitive characteristics of religion in general and Judaism in particular; that the term, "liberal" is vague, non-definitive as applied to our particular American branch of Judaism and open to misunderstanding; and that in all probability this unexpected switching of term without rhyme or reason, represents still another concession to those who are not "Reform" but who desire to have the advantanges of Reform Judaism's established position in the American scene;
- 3. The employment in its educational department of men in authority who are admittedly nationalistic in viewpoint with the resultant publication or endorsement of educational materials for both adults and children which give a predominantly nationalistic interpretation of Jewish life and history;
- 4. The subordination of "text substance" of text-books issued by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to the "commercialization for sale" of such books to the end that such books being used in our religious schools cannot longer be used for the advancement of Reform Judaism because they are designed so as to be saleable also to conservative and orthodox religious schools as well, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these examples in our judgment call for a thorough investigation of all of the departments of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations with the underlying and avowed purpose of having the policies and personnel of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations vigorous and enthusiastic in the advancement, without apology or compromise, of the historic principles of American Reform Judaism, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in the future conventions of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations consideration be given, through amendment to by-laws or otherwise, to insuring that the accredited delegates be preponderantly laymen in American Reform Judaism; that congregations be notified that their accredited delegates should by preference be laymen; that rabbis attend in advisory capacities; that addresses and committee actions be consciously designed, however, to express the laymen's viewpoint; and that for purposes where joint action is called for, between Reform Rabbinate and Reform laymen, some effective modus operandi be designed which should give equal representation to rabbis and laymen, and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in all important standing commissions of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, particularly those having to do with education, ceremonies, public information about Jews and Judaism, etc., the membership of laymen, in advisory capacities be greatly increased, in order that in these important and controversial areas, the opinion of the Reform Jewish laity may be adequately represented.

Whereas, the Central Conference of American Rabbis is the Rabbinical body obligated with leadership for American Reform Judaism, and

Whereas, its own members, above all others, should recognize and acknowledge that the Judaism over which they have been given the leadership and supervision has certain distinctive qualities which called it into being as an interpretation of Jewish life, and

Whereas, in the past few years the energies of the Central Conference of American Rabbis seem by both impression and record to have been in the direction of apologizing for the differences between Reform Judaism and other branches of Judaism, rather than to have been directed toward planning the strengthening and the extension of Reform Judaism, and

Whereas, the historic pattern of Reform Judaism has been one of opposition to political Zionism and Jewish nationalism, regardless of what may or may not have been the relationship between these forces and other branches of Judaism, now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that this congregation, an American Reform Congregation, served by members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis does hereby protest against that body's departure from the historic pattern of American Reform Judaism, as first enunciated by Reform Rabbis in conference in this country at Philadelphia in 1869 and at Pittsburg in 1885, as re-stated at Rochester in 1920 (after the Balfour declaration) and as further re-defined in the Columbus platform of 1937, which departures are indicated by the following actions of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

- 1. The entertainment and subsequent adoption of a resolution endorsing a "Jewish Army" at its 1942 convention, which action was a definite embroilment of a religious interpretation of Jewish life in a political quarrel and the commitment of that religious interpretation of Jewish life to a partisan, political program;
- 2. The entertainment and adoption of a resolution at its 1943 convention, asserting that there is "no essential incompatability between Reform Judaism and Zionism," when as a matter of historic fact and action, the very essence of Reform Judaism has been opposition to both Jewish nationalism and to such emphasis upon the racial, folkloristic, tribal vestiges of Judaism as stem from it;
- 3. The inclusion in the latest, revised version of the Union Prayerbook Volume I, of service numbered "V", for the Sabbath Evening, which is admittedly nationalistic in character when, again, the whole structure and tradition of Reform Judaism has been one of departure from and emancipation above and beyond a religion of nationalistic limitations and delineations, as evidenced in the historic fact that among the modifications for which early Reform contended was the elimination of prayers which alluded either to the restoration of or the return of Israel to a physical Zion;
- 4. The accession of the delegates officially representing the Central Conference of American Rabbis to the American Jewish Conference to the maximal Zionist program of that Conference, despite the fact that the official platform of the Central Conference of American Rabbis adopted in Columbus in 1937, is violated in spirit and in letter by such maximal, Zionist resolution. The American Jewish Conference's resolution, from which the Central Conference of American Rabbis delegates registered no dissent far exceeds any declaration upon Palestine upon which Central Conference of American Rabbis membership has been permitted a free and democratic vote and does not represent, as a result of any referendum or otherwise, the recorded or ascertained convictions of the membership of the Central Conference of American Rabbis;
- 5. The acceptance through their silence of the Central Conference of American Rabbis delegates to the American Jewish Conference, (and the participation by some), in the undignified, abusive, and unwarranted attacks upon fellow rabbis and laymen who are members of Reform Congregations and whose "crime" consisted in the exercise of the right of free speech to state what has been the traditional position of Reform Judaism in the United States upon the question of political Zionism.

WHEREAS, the Hebrew Union College is the rabbinical seminary founded by Isaac M. Wise for the exclusive and specific purpose of providing American Reform Jews with leadership trained in and harmonious with the traditions of American Reform Judaism, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that this Congregation, an American Reform Congregation, joined by such others as may entertain similar views, which Congregations traditionally look to the Hebrew Union College for spiritual leaders, urgently request of the responsible College authorities a thorough and complete investigation of the curriculum, requirements and personnel, some or all of which must provide some of the basic reasons for the fact that over the recent years, an overwhelming preponderance of graduates have openly expressed little sympathy with and have actively sought little expansion of the historic principles of Reform Judaism, and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in the course of such investigation, particular attention be placed upon the following factors which would seem to have an important bearing upon the attitudes of recent Hebrew Union College graduates;

- 1. Increasing emphasis by College authorities upon a considerable background of Hebrew to pass the entrance examinations. It is our information and belief that such an emphasis has a tendency to make it more difficult for young men with the background of American Reform family upbringing to qualify as students at Hebrew Union College, since a profound knowledge of the Hebrew language has never been a cardinal tenet of Reform Judaism. Thus, while apparently pursuing the pathway of Reform Judaism, we are in effect disqualifying our own Reformeducated boys from future leadership in the movement in which they were raised as Jews. This is but a process of self-defeat. The tendency is to attract to Hebrew Union College greater proportionate students from Orthodox and Conservative backgrounds than from Reform.
- 2. The failure to provide a more thorough course at the Hebrew Union College that is designed to provide an understanding of the history and the ideology of Reform Judaism itself. We do not minimize the need of a knowledge of the totality of Jewish life and thought but the Hebrew Union College is an American Reform institution and its graduates are held forth as Reform Rabbis who have been educated at the expense of American Reform Jews, therefore, we submit that it is not expecting too much that they should be specialists in the promulgation and the defense of that particular interpretation of Judaism.

#### CONCLUSION

Whereas, it is the judgment of this Congregation, that in the final analysis, the life and the destiny of American Reform Judaism depends upon the vitality of the belief in such Judaism among the members in the Congregations, and,

Whereas, in its inception, Reform Judaism was a movement that was born of the vision and desire of laymen who sought a Judaism in consonance with the emancipation of their lives, and,

Whereas, in the less than a century of its active participation in the American scene, Reform Judaism has rendered notable service and made lasting contributions for all Judaism, now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the members of Congregation Beth Israel, that it is our earnest hope that the congregations of American Reform Judaism once again through their lay officers and members will study this frank protest and survey the whole status of American Reform against the pattern of its historic principles and demand of the next convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations that it take immediate steps to formulate a program and to implement it with action of a constructive kind, designed to restore to American Reform Judaism that liberal, universal emphasis which made it historically significant and distinctive as an interpretation of Jewish life and a blessing to Israel and mankind.



## Executive Board of the Union

TO CONGREGATION BETH ISRAEL OF HOUSTON, TEXAS . . .

Cincinnati, Ohio, March 28, 1944

Mr. Leopold L. Meyer, President Congregation Beth Israel Houston, Texas

Dear Mr. Meyer:

The Executive Board of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, considering the resolution on the Union adopted by Congregation Beth Israel of Houston, Texas, a member congregation, comments thereon as follows:

The Executive Board regrets that the Houston congregation found it necessary to make public charges against the Union. Particularly it regrets that the Houston congregation refused the request of our Director, Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, to discuss with it the proposed resolution before it was publicized.

We find the resolution contains reference to:

- A. Retrogression and Dereliction of Leadership.
- B. The Conduct of the Union Delegates at the American Jewish Conference.
- C. The Failure of the Executive Board to Disavow the Action of the Conference and to Withdraw Therefrom.
- D. The Use of the Word "Liberal" instead of "Reform" in the name of the Union Magazine.
- E. Personnel and Literature in the Department of Education.

F. Laymen and Rabbis at Conventions and on Commissions.

#### A

With reference to the charge that

"a large share of the retrogression that has taken place in Reform Judaism must be considered dereliction of leadership upon the part of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations,"

the Union Board feels that there has been no retrogression; on the contrary we have lived up to the highest principles of Reform as taught by Isaac Mayer Wise, Kaufmann Kohler and other great Rabbis in their day and ours.\*

The opposite of the word "retrogression" is "progress." We cannot refrain, at this juncture, from pointing to the progress of the Union in recent years. In addition to the many religious and educational activities in which we are engaged, we have in the last five years—

- 1. Increased the distribution of educational materials by 371/2 per cent.
- 2. Within that period the Union inaugurated the publication of a magazine, LIBERAL JUDAISM, the excellence and high quality of which have been widely acclaimed.
- 3. It has also published within the last year or so a special literature for the Jewish men in the armed forces, of which we have already distributed, on the request of Jewish and Christian Chaplains, over three-quarters of a million copies.
- 4. Since the outbreak of the war, we have been largely instrumental, in cooperation with the Central Conference of American Rabbis and

other religious bodies, in setting up a Chaplains' Committee, which has provided 225 Jewish Chaplains, of which 113 are representatives of Reform Judaism.

- 5. We have set up, for the first time in American Jewish history, a Pension System, to take care of our rabbis in their old age.
- 6. We have created two large federations of our congregations in the metropolitan areas of New York and Chicago, which serve as effective agencies for the promotion of Reform Judaism.

With regard, then, to the assertion that our "retrogression" was due to the "dereliction of its (the Union's) leadership," we leave that to such unassailable facts as well as to the judgment of our congregations.

#### B

With reference to the specific criticism of

"the failure of the delegates of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to the recent American Jewish Conference to forthwith register and publicly announce a dissent from that Conference's Palestine Zionistic resolution, which said resolution far exceeded the Palestine resolution accepted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and presented to its delegates as instructions before the American Jewish Conference convened,"

the resolution of the Union, passed April 1, 1943, authorizing its participation in the American Jewish Conference reads as follows:

Resolved, That we adhere to the American Jewish Assembly with the reservation that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations shall not be bound by the conclusions of the American Jewish Assembly without ratification by the Executive Board of the Union. A special meeting of the Executive Board for such purpose shall be called as soon as possible after the adjournment of the American Jewish Assembly.

<sup>\*</sup>This allegation against the leadership of Reform, as well as the matter of Congregation Beth Israel's newly adopted requirements for membership, has been effectively answered by Dr. Solomon B. Freehof, President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. A copy of this reply will be furnished by the Union on request.

This imposed a distinct limitation upon the rights of the delegates to commit the Union because its Executive Board reserved this right to itself.

The interpretation placed by Congregation Beth Israel upon the Declaration of Principles adopted by the Union is erroneous. These Principles were adopted two months after authorization to enter the Conference was given. They were to serve not as mandatory "instructions," but as a guide and as the basis of the Union's appeal to the Conference for a moderate Palestine resolution. This Declaration was presented to the Palestine Committee of the American Jewish Conference and its acceptance was forcefully urged by our delegates.

It is further charged that "the silence of the Union delegates gave the impression of assent to the Palestine resolution . . ." If there was such an impression, the responsibility cannot be laid at the door of the Union. As a matter of fact, the President of the Union gave a written statement to Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, Chairman of the Palestine Committee, to present to the plenary session of the Conference, indicating that the Executive Board of the Union had restricted the rights of our delegates to commit the Union. Acting on this request, Dr. Silver made a public declaration before the entire Conference, which is part of its official record, in which he said:

There are some organizations represented here through their appointed delegates which have not yet taken official action on some of the issues which have been raised at this Conference and that may be raised at this Conference . . . It should be made clear that all organizations have the right to ratify any action taken here if they so desire. This was the basic agreement underlying the Conference.

Hence it is unwarranted to charge that "the silence of the Union's delegates gave the impres-

sion of assent to the Palestine resolution." The fact is that the Executive Board of the Union did not ratify this resolution. In accordance with its specific mandate, within one month after the adjournment of the American Jewish Conference, the Executive Board of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations met on October 3rd, 1943. All the resolutions passed by the American Jewish Conference were offered for ratification. Five resolutions passed by the American Jewish Conference, viz., on Post-war Problems: Rescue; Gratitude to the United States; Message to the Jews of Europe, and a Call to Faith were ratified by a unanimous vote of our Executive Board. The resolution on Organization of the American Jewish Conference was referred to a special committee for study. The resolution on Palestine was referred to the supreme body of the Union, namely the Council, because the Board found itself almost evenly divided on the Palestine resolution. It was realized, after lengthy debate, that with the Board evenly divided, no decision would be regarded as final and generally accepted by the constituent congregations, because it was clear that many of the congregations were themselves divided on the Palestine issue.

C

With reference to the allegation that

"the failure of the Executive Board to disavow the action of the American Jewish Conference and to withdraw from said Conference . . . has the practical effect to place the prestige and influence of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations . . . fully behind the maximal Zionist political program,"

we maintain that this is an interpretation with which we most emphatically must disagree. On October 3rd, 1943, as indicated above, our Board did not take action for or against the Palestine resolution, and again on January 18, 1944, we voted to "refrain from taking any action on the

Palestine resolution adopted by the American Jewish Conference." We have given wide-spread publicity to both of these decisions of our Board. We have likewise notified the American Jewish Conference of the conditions upon which we remain in the Conference, and have received their reply accepting these conditions. We have made known our attitude with reference to the Palestine resolution both in the public press and by direct communication to our individual congregations. No one can be misled by the action of the Union in remaining in the American Jewish Conference.

The resolution of Congregation Beth Israel criticizes the Union for its failure to "withdraw from the Conference." It raises the question: How can a group, holding a different judgment on an important question, decided on by a majority vote of an organization, prevent misunderstanding as to its position? Beth Israel's answer is "withdrawal." Is this a truly democratic procedure? Is there no other remedy more consonant with the spirit both of America and of Judaism? We believe there is. In our case, by giving adequate publicity to our position of neutrality, we are enabled to remain in the Conference in order to participate in other vital activities as have other organizations faced with the same problem.

We know that organizations and individuals occasionally resort to the method of withdrawal as a means of registering dissent from a majority opinion. But if this procedure were followed every time a majority decided against a minority, it would eventuate in the total dissolution of organized institutional life. It would fragmentize American Jewry and render us impotent in the face of the direst tragedy Israel has ever known. It would belie the vision of our founder, Isaac Mayer Wise, who dreamed and labored for a union of "all Israelites" in America.

In the kind of world in which we Jews live,

it is imperative that we nurture the cohesive principle rather than the divisive. Shall we, who stress our religious heritage and who preach the brotherhood of man, repudiate this principle in the field of Jewish action; can we do less than to "seek our brethren" in unity in this hour of doom for so many of our fellow Jews?

The Board of the Union was moved, because of such compelling considerations of conscience and stark necessity, to remain in the American Jewish Conference, and therefore resolved on January 18th:

The Union, continuing as a member of the American Jewish Conference, declares its sense of fellowship with all Israel and will associate itself with all worthy and practical efforts designed to ameliorate the tragic plight of world Jewry and to assist in reconstructing those communities that have suffered from the ravages of Nazi tyranny.

Would any fair-minded person or loyal Jew expect us to do otherwise?

D

Certain strange deductions are drawn from the use of the word

"Liberal" instead of the word "Reform," particularly in the name of our new magazine.

We believe that these deductions are in nowise justified.

On page 262 of "Life and Selected Writings" by Philipson and Grossman, Isaac Mayer Wise says: "Progressive Judaism would be a better designation than Reformed Judaism." Dr. Israel Mattuck, a graduate of the Hebrew Union College, rabbi of a temple in London, a non-Zionist, ministers in the Liberal Jewish Synagogue.

At its organization meeting in London in 1926, in which outstanding leaders of American Reform Judaism participated actively, the World Union for Progressive Judaism, after due deliberation, by unanimous decision, adopted its

name, employing the term "Progressive" rather than "Reform" as being the most descriptive of our movement. Moreover, in the evaluation of various designations, it was the unanimous opinion that the term "Reform" was less precisely descriptive and adequate for our movement than "Progressive" or "Liberal." In the light of this considered judgment on the part of the World Union for Progressive Judaism, why should anyone cavil at the Union's use of the word "Liberal"?

E

Severe criticism is levelled against the Union

"for the recurring and constant compromise of the principles of Reform Judaism," particularly in: "the employment in its educational department of men in authority who are admittedly nationalistic in viewpoint with the resultant publication or endorsement of educational materials for both adults and children which give a predominantly nationalistic interpretation of Jewish life and history."

Congregation Beth Israel, which speaks in the name of religion and Americanism, would wish us to discriminate against our fellow American Jews who happen to be Zionists. The Executive Board of the Union unequivocally rejects the suggestion that it should employ or refuse to employ its professional workers on the ground of either their anti-Zionism or their Zionism. We consider such discrimination to be both un-Jewish and un-American. It violates the very freedoms for which we are at present fighting. It so happens that a majority of the executives in our national office is non-Zionist. But this proportion simply "so happens." Our executives are not chosen with reference to their being Zionists or anti-Zionists, but in accordance with their ability to fulfill the functions which they are expected to perform.

As to the content of our textbooks referred to in the charge that the employment of "men in authority who are admittedly nationalistic" has resulted in the "publication and endorsement of educational materials which are predominantly nationalistic in their interpretation of Jewish life and history," this charge is altogether inaccurate, as may be shown by the examination of the textbook literature. The interpretation which is emphasized throughout our books is essentially religious in character. Of course, we do not exclude from the treatment of Jewish history or modern Iewish problems, any of the vital questions of our day, of which Zionism is surely one. All good teaching involves the presentation of more than one point of view. Each congregation is free, through its rabbi and its teaching staff, to give whatever emphasis it wishes to the material taught in the classroom.

It is contended, likewise, that "text substance in the textbooks of the Union is subordinated to the commercialization for sale of such books in Orthodox and Conservative religious schools." The charge that "text substance is subordinated to commercialization, etc." is preposterous. At no time were any of our principles or points of view subordinated in the slightest degree to such a purpose. It should be pointed out in this connection that the Commission on Jewish Education, since its reorganization in 1923 (and of course before 1923) has had as its principal officers (until 1942) Dr. David Philipson, Chairman, whose leanings are far from nationalistic, and Rabbi George Zepin, Secretary, likewise a non-Zionist. Furthermore, the majority of its members and a majority of its committee chairmen, throughout those years, were either non-Zionists or anti-Zionists. Every manuscript published is read by at least three members of the Commission, and only upon their recommendation is the manuscript in question published. Controversial questions must be decided by the rabbinical readers and not by our professional executives.

If, then, as should be evident to any unprejudiced observer, no principles are abandoned or sacrificed in our textbooks, nor owing to the organization of the Commission could they possibly be so sacrificed, then why should there be any objection to the popularity of our books in non-Reform congregations? Would the Houston congregation say that the use of our books by Orthodox and Conservative Jews disqualifies them for use in Reform Jewish schools? Our books are so extensively used because they are effective in writing and in format. Their popularity is a compliment to the statesmanlike manner and to the tact which our workers have exercised in the preparation of our materials, as well as to the excellent quality of the books from the point of view of their content, method, and their esthetic appearance.

The charges of the Houston congregation against our textbooks and our Commission on Jewish Education are wholly unfounded. The vast popularity of our textbooks in all types of schools is the most telling proof obtainable that we are working constructively in the field of American Jewish education. Our textbooks, perhaps more than any other single Reform activity and achievement, are promoting "the advancement of Reform Judaism."

F

In the resolution of Congregation Beth Israel it is urged that

"delegates to future Biennial Councils be preponderantly laymen."

The truth is that a substantial majority of the delegates to the Councils of the Union have always been laymen. Each congregation is entitled to determine for itself the composition of its own representation to the Biennial Councils. With the exception of some of our professional executive officers, the officers of the Union are laymen; a preponderant majority of the mem-

bership of the Executive Board consists of laymen. Almost all of the members of the Administrative Committee, which acts in the interim between meetings of the Executive Board, are laymen. Even a cursory review of the programs of recent Biennial Councils shows that most of the scheduled speakers and panel leaders were laymen.

No good purpose would be served by requiring Rabbis to attend Biennial Council sessions solely in an advisory capacity. This would in no way facilitate the work of the Union. If a member congregation prefers to have its religious leader as one of its representatives, why should it be deprived of this right?

Where joint action is called for between rabbis and laymen an effective modus operandi has been achieved which gives substantially equal representation to both groups. For example, such Commissions as those on Synagogue Activities, Information about Judaism, Pulpit Placement, and Survey already reflect such equal representation. Other standing Commissions such as those on Education and on Ceremonies now consist chiefly of Rabbis, primarily because of their more obvious qualifications for the task, in view of their specialized training. However, if any member congregation has in mind additional names of any qualified laymen who might serve on such standing Commissions, the officers and Executive Board of the Union would give any such recommendations most serious consideration.

#### CONCLUSION

We have endeavored to set forth herein the position of the Union with regard to the various criticisms made in the resolution of Congregation Beth Israel. We are not averse to constructive criticism. On the contrary, we welcome it.

It must be borne in mind that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations is a Union or Federation of the Reform Congregations of America, organized for the specific purpose of carrying out those activities, indispensable for the persistence, growth, and progress of Reform Judaism on this continent, which no single congregation can perform for or by itself. Without the Union, Reform Judaism in America cannot survive. The Union is as strong only as the sum total of its constituent congregations acting together for the common cause. The Union has no authority other than that which its constituent congregations, meeting in its Biennial Councils, confer upon it. It operates only in conformity with the directives given it by these Councils, and follows strictly the democratic procedure of both American and Jewish thought and action.

Every constituent congregation has full and equal right and freedom to voice its opinion and to exercise its influence within the Biennial Councils of the Union. That alone is the ultimate tribune. Every congregation has the right likewise to express its opinion concerning the principles, policies or actions of either the Council or the Executive Board, whether of assent or dissent, through written communications directed to the Executive Board, which is vested with the authority to act in the interim between Biennial Council meetings.

The officers and Executive Board of the Union are ever vigilant to give responsible consideration to the viewpoints thus presented to them by our member congregations. The Union asks its constituent congregations to give it their full and constant support in order that through the Union, Reform Judaism may go forward with maximum efficiency toward its consecrated goal.

For the Executive Board of the
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
ADOLPH ROSENBERG, President
MAURICE N. EISENDRATH, Director

#### UNITED PALESTINE APPEAL

#### STATEMENT OF INCOME AND DISTRIBUTION

#### AS OF JUNE 5, 1944

Bank Balance as of January 1,	, 1944
-------------------------------	--------

\$ 87,106.54

INCOME:			
United Palestine Appeal	- 1944 (Bequests)	\$ 3,157.68	
Jewish National Fund	- 1944 (thru April)	519,393.75	
United Jewish Appeal	- 1944 (thru 35th Unit)	1,134,000.00	
United Jewish Appeal	- 1943	2,375,000.00*	
United Jewish Appeal	- 1942	93,100.00	
United Jewish Appeal	- 1941	23,017.44	
United Jewish Appeal	- 1940	4,321.94	
United Jewish Appeal	- 1939	1,852.74	
Prior Campaigns		1,036.77	4,154.880.32
Motol Co.	ah Deseimed		AA 247 000 00

#### Total Cash Received

\$4,241,986.86

DISTRIBUTIONS:			
Jewish National Fund	- 1944	\$625,000.00	
	- 1943	1,125,000.00	
	- 1942	40,012.50	
	- 1941	10,000.00	
	- 1940	2,784.17	
	- 1939	1,185.00	\$1,803,981.67
	VVI		
Palestine Foundation Fund	- 1944	\$625,000.00	
	- 1943	1,125,000.00	
	- 1942	40,012.50	
	- 1941	10,000.00	
	- 1940	2,784.17	
	- 1939	1,185.00	\$1,803,981.67

Palestine	Foundation	Fund	-	1943	(Earmarked	Jewish	
					Agency)		

300,000.00 Mizrachi Palestine Fund - 1944 125,000.00 \$4,032,963.34

### SERVICE PAYMENTS:

Zionist Organization of America -	1944 \$27,0	00.00	
Mizrachi Organization of America-	1944 6,0	00.00	
Poale Zion - Zeire Zion -	1944 6,0	000.00	
Hashomer Hatzair	1944	300.00 \$	39,300.00
Tourseline Control Control	7044	0.00 80	

Executive Committee Grants - 1944 \$866.70
Administrative Expenses - 1944 63,622.23 \$ 64,488.93

#### Total Distributions

\$4,136,752.27

Bank Balance as of June 5, 1944

\$ 105,234.59

*Includes \$3	300,000 received
from U.J.A.	1943 fund ear-
	Jewish Agency
Deficit. "	

National City Bank \$80,234.59 Manufacturers Trust 10,000.00 National Safety Bank 10,000.00 Public National Bank \_ 5,000.00 \$105,234.59

#### MINUTE OF A MEETING TO DISCUSS NATIONAL BUDGETING

Held at the Office of United Palestine Appeal, 41 East 42nd Street, New York City, on Thursday, October 5, 1944; 11:05 A.M. to 1:15 P.M.

Present: Dr. James G. Heller, presiding Charles J. Rosenbloom Rudolf G. Sonneborn Dr. Martin Rosenbluth Henry Montor

For the United Palestine Appeal

Sidney Hollander, President of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
Jacob Blaustein, Chairman of its Budget Research Committee
Dr. Maurice Hexter
William Rosenwald
Harry L. Lurie, Executive Director Solomon Kuznets, Research Director

For the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds

Mr. Blaustein started the discussion after pointing out that the meeting with the United Palestine Appeal representatives had been requested by the Council as part of its effort to communicate with all national and overseas agencies having an interest in the subject of national budgeting. He reviewed the situation since 1939, when the Council, at the request of various Welfare Funds, began to explore the possibility of instituting a system of national budgeting. In January 1941 a proposal for national budgeting had been submitted to the General Assembly of the Council at Atlanta, Georgia. Subsequently a referendum was held among the Welfare Funds and the proposal, he said, had been sustained by a small majority, but so small that the Council did not deem it advisable to go forward with the plan. There had followed negotiations with opponents of national budgeting (largely identified with U.P.A.) and, as a result, a three-year agreement had been made. It provided for limited research into the budgets of agencies. At the end of the three-year period the Council would be authorized to re-examine the subject. Now the three-year period was coming to an end and the necessity for reaching a decision existed. He described the operations of the Council Budget Research Committee set up by the three-year plan. Although it had done some good work, he did not think it met the needs of the Welfare Funds. He pointed to the successful experience with planned budgeting by such bodies as the President's War Relief Control Board, the National War Fund, Community Chests and Councils and, insofar as the Jewish field is concerned, by the United Jewish Appeal itself, the Joint Defense Appeal (Anti-Defamation League and American Jewish Committee), the American Fund for Palestinian Institutions, etc.

There is a tendency, Mr. Blaustein continued, for new organizations to come into the Jewish fund-raising field, sometimes overlapping already existing agencies. Óld organizations are going into new fields of activity, sometimes conflicting with other agencies. He referred specifically to Vaad Hatzala, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Emergency Committee to Save the Jews of Europe, Red Mogen Dovid, etc. It was necessary to introduce order into the picture, for the sake of the American Jewish community, which was demanding some intelligent guidance, and for the sake of the established Jewish organizations themselves.

Mr. Hollander supplemented Mr. Blaustein's statement, saying that as a member of the Budget Committee of the National War Fund he was impressed with the progress made with national budgeting in that field, where the sources of friction are just as great as in the Jewish field. The Council, he said, has no sides to play. The sky is the limit on quotas being established by new Jewish agencies coming into the field. Welfare Funds wanted to know how they could distribute their funds with an eye to most effective use.

Mr. Lurie said there has been steady improvement in local budgeting procedures. But there was one obstacle they could not overcome. Local Welfare Funds did not have the machinery to analyze national budgets thoroughly. The effect of the present competitive system, he said, is that small agencies will be frozen, regardless of the expansion in their possibilities of action. This should be avoided. Quotas were established that had no relationship to the facts. Communities wanted guidance when one agency established a goal of \$1,200,000, having previously spent \$1,000,000, as compared with another agency also seeking \$1,200,000 but previously having spent only \$400,000. Quotas alone were no criterion for intelligent action.

Mr. Blaustein pointed out that the Budget Research Committee of the Council had not met and had not adopted any recommendations for action. He was merely exploring the subject.

Dr. Heller said that the U.P.A. has reached no definite conclusions on the subject. It had appointed a committee to study the problem and bring in recommendations. He would be glad to hear the views of the Council representatives.

Mr. Sonneborn commented that there is a great amount of overlapping, especially between small agencies. There is also noticeable high-pressure salesmanship which does not always bear a relationship to the legitimate needs of an agency. As an officer in the New York campaign he was familiar with the problem. He cited the non-discriminating giving in his own oil and chemical industry. A small group had raised \$75,000 for the U.J.A. but some \$23,000 for the Joint Defense Appeal. He saw no proper relationship between such gifts. However, he did not know the problem would be solved by directives from above. It just happened that certain people connected with the J.D.A. were convinced of its supreme importance. They were zealots on its behalf. No amount of reasoning seemed to change them.

Mr. Blaustein observed that the proposals sought by the Council were for purely advisory purposes. There was no attempt to make recommendations for budgeting on a mandatory basis.

<u>Dr. Hexter</u> raised the question of American responsibility for certain programs. He pointed out that various sections of world Jewry contribute to the Jewish Agency budget. How could the problem of fluctuations in percentages of giving be solved? What should American Jewry give in the light of changing conditions abroad?

Mr. Rosenbloom said that if we were living in an ideal world, the proposal for national budgeting might seem an ideal solution to admittedly complex problems. True, it was desirable to approach the ideal. But, considering the alternatives, would not all the organizations and the Council itself be better off if the present more or less chaotic conditions in the field of budgeting were permitted to remain? He did not agree that the Jewish world particularly was beset by problems of competitive campaigns, unjust ratios and unfair quotas. He had a wide experience in his own community of Pittsburgh, in the Community Chest, etc. There was just as much pressure and personal influence and personal predilection exercised in the non-Jewish world as he had ever seen among Jews. It seemed to be inevitable human nature. It was his own belief that actually the Jews were doing a better job of budgeting, even

under present conditions, than non-Jews are. He discussed the Vaad Hatzala and the Joint Defense Appeal. As far as he was concerned, he could well understand the response to Vaad Hatzala. Whether it was getting more or less in relation to other organizations, it was spending its money to save human lives. But he could see no logic in the Joint Defense Appeal campaigns. It was merely a personal reaction on his part. There were some people who believed that it would be desirable to spend \$10,000,000 a year on "civic-defense" activities. If such persons were on a national budgeting committee, their personal convictions would result in extraordinarily disproportionate recommendations. He did not share the belief that by spending money on a large scale Jews could improve their status in the United States. The fact is that expenditures of \$100,000,000 to enhance the prestige of American Jews could be upset by just one single item, for which Jews were in no way responsible. He cited the anti-Semitic use being made in the current Presidential contest of the name of Sidney Hillman. The J.D.A. operated on the basis of a "fear complex". But these things were matters of personal taste and conviction. To freeze these personal convictions on the whole American Jewish community was, to his mind, unwise. It would create more frictions than it would resolve. He believed that actually the Jewish communities of America were doing pretty well with their budgeting, regardless of alleged limitations.

Dr. Heller reminded the Council representatives that he had been violently opposed to the plan presented by the CJFWF at Atlanta in 1941. He understands why the CJFWF is interested in national budgeting. But he did not think that the question was as simple as it seemed. National budgeting was not one problem but a host of problems, of inter-related nature. He was connected with many national organizations and with many local ones in his own community of Cincinnati. All such organizations were confronted with the same problem, of making equitable decisions as between conflicting claims. He wanted to offer these observations on the subject:

- (1) If American Jewry were to set up a total national budget, it would find itself in a bad state. Everything in the community would tend to be frozen.
- (2) There were certain types of advice that communities needed and which could well be provided, without resort to a national budgeting scheme. He had in mind (a) the question of duplication of appeals and of function. He did not think that the Council was exercising the authority with which its Welfare Funds had already vested it. For example, if the Council examination found that the Vaad Hatzala program was completely duplicatory, both in fund-raising and work, there was no reason why it could not directly advise its constituency to that effect. However, he felt it essential for the CJFWF to distinguish between questions of mere duplication and questions having to do with aims and purposes. (b) Typical of latter questions was the relationship between the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal. It was not possible to judge these two agencies simply from an objective viewpoint. Profound differences of ideological approach are involved. There are still deep differences of opinion in the Jewish community as to the methods to be employed in dealing with the long-range Jewish problem. There are some people who do not wish to give to Palestine at all. There are others who feel that any interim assistance is only palliative and does not go to fundamental causes for the existence of the Jewish problem.

He was not as sanguine as Mr. Blaustein on the subject of budgeting as it had been tried in the United Jewish Appeal. Dr. Heller cited his own reactions to the Allocations Committee of the U. J. A. He did not believe that there was any objective approach to the problem there. All the men who had served on the Allocations Committees were fine persons, as fine as any that American Jewry could find for national budgeting purposes. But there seemed no possibility of going to the root of the problem and of making radical decisions. This was demonstrated by the fact

that since 1939 there were only small variations of percentage, if any variation at all, between the amounts distributed among the agencies of the UJA by agreement and the amounts subsequently voted by Allocations Committees. This was not because the agencies have not tried to present facts to the Allocations Committees. But what had happened in the UJA was likely to happen in any national budgeting scheme. There would be an arrival at some artificial arrangement, based on pressures.

(3) In Dr. Heller's view the tendency of national budgeting would be to establish static levels of giving. He was worried that a general goal might be set, or a certain ratio might be fixed, and regardless of changing needs, the precedents would serve to paralyze expansion.

Dr. Heller added that his own experience with the President's War Relief Control Board would not bear out Mr. Hollander's faith in its efficacy. As far as he could see, the Control Board was unable or unwilling to take action to meet difficult situations.

Mr. Montor referred to Dr. Heller's observation that the U.P.A. had reached no conclusions. He thought it desirable to explore the questions involved. It was only fair to the U.P.A. that the Council should know that the U.P.A. was doing its utmost to approach the problem sympathetically. It was doing more than talking. It was acting. It realized that there was confusion in the Palestine fund-raising field. But it was trying to approach the problem with good-will and cooperation. Thus, the U.P.A. was trying to introduce order into the subject of Youth Aliyah fund-raising. It was trying to bring Hadassah, Mizrachi and Pioneer Women into a coordinating committee that would explain to the public the financial responsibilities involved for each. But the U.P.A. was trying to meet the situation without fanfare and without arousing ill-will. The U.P.A. had also undertaken to study the question of Red Mogen Dovid fund-raising in this country. The U.P.A. had initiated the formation of a Consultative Council for Palestine Fund-Raising Organizations in the United States. Mr. Montor also cited recent experiences in the field of fund-raising for Dutch and Rumanian Jewish refugees in Palestine. The necessity for duplicating fund-raising campaigns had been eliminated by prompt U.P.A. action in both instances. The U.P.A. had taken a position on the League for Religious Labor in Palestine. It had publicly announced that there was no warrant for the campaign. No other organization in the United States had been similarly determined to meet its responsibilities.

The question of national budgeting raises certain anxieties. These would have to be allayed. It cannot be said that there is a uniform state of mind in American Jewry on all fundamental Jewish problems. Mr. Montor felt that differences would be accentuated rather than composed at the end of the war. (1) There were questions of jurisdiction. For example, what was the relationship between the J.D.C. and aid to Jews by the Jewish Council of Russian War Relief? There were sponsors for both approaches. (2) There were larger questions of relationship, as, for example, that between the J. D. C. and the World Jewish Congress or the Jewish Labor Committee. There were certainly overlapping phases of activity, in the public mind. These were technical problems that could not always be solved merely by establishing percentages and ratios. Points of view were also at stake. (3) Aside from these seemingly technical questions, there were broader issues, involving ideological differences as to the Jewish future. For example, (a) there is the point of view that advocates maximum funds for local Jewish community purposes as against overseas purposes. How could any national budgeting program effectively cut through these knots? (b) There was, moreover, the difference between one way of dealing with the overseas situation and another, as between, e.g. concentration on Europe or concentration on Palestine.

It seemed to Mr. Montor that discussion of national budgeting at this time rests on a misconception. It assumes that the CJFWF has come to the end of the road and must now seek new avenues for giving assistance to Welfare Funds. Actually it has not carried out its present authorized program. At the present time, the CJFWF merely passes on to Welfare Funds figures submitted by individual agencies. There is no analysis of income and expenditures by the Council itself. There are many items of information arising out of the functions of an organization on which the Council could properly comment. Communities which suggest that the Council do more in the budgeting field very often do not read even the material that the Council now issues.

Finally, the suggestion for national budgeting is based on a static concept of the community's ability to give. When, for example, the UJA suggested quotas in 1944 many communities protested. Actually, most exceeded these quotas. The saturation point in American Jewish giving has been far from reached. The idea for national budgeting assumes that there is a certain, limited amount available for distribution and that a fair share must be assigned to each cause. In his own view, that was far from true. Imagination was needed to spur American Jewry's giving. All causes would benefit. Generally speaking, with all the faults alleged in the system, Welfare Funds had done pretty well with their own methods of budgeting. An examination of the manner in which money has been distributed during these years indicates that there has been, generally, a sound, even if allegedly only intuitive, method for allocating a community's funds in the proper order of importance of causes in Jewish life.

Would not the introduction of national budgeting accentuate the differences between viewpoints at a time when more rather than less harmony was needed?

Dr. Rosenbluth felt that ideologies do play a role in the American Jewish community. He did not think there are any neutrals in Jewish life. Only those who are indifferent are impartial, he said. And such people have nothing to add to Jewish causes. He believed that the danger of regimentation should be avoided. He could not help remarking, after some years of observing the American Jewish scene, that many American Jews like to do their thinking by proxy — when it comes to Jewish matters. Jewish business men and professionals, who are exceedingly competent in their own affairs and would never permit anyone to do their thinking for them in the fields in which they have achieved success, think it quite proper to base their Jewish thinking on findings given to them by others.

He was glad to hear Mr. Lurie say that local Jewish communities were expanding their budget study process and that more persons were being brought into the picture. He felt that this process, of enlarged interest in budgets of agencies, might be retarded by any plan for national budgeting.

Mr. Rosenwald said he was in broad agreement with most of what had been said at the meeting. He cited the meeting in June by U.J.A. officers with the President's War Relief Control Board as justification for the thought that the Control Board had actually not conquered the problem of budgeting and competitive appeals. He did not share Dr. Heller's view of the U.J.A. Allocations Committee. Whatever might be thought of the decisions of the Committees, there is an allocations committee which reviews the work of the three agencies and which is thus in a position to tell the American Jewish public that sound work is being done under scrutiny. He too felt that a more complete service to the Welfare Funds should be rendered by the Council. He was in agreement that the Council should be able to do more in exploring the factual reports of agencies. Doing more of that would certainly be helpful.

Mr. Lurie declared that 85% of all Welfare Fund money goes to the United Jewish

Appeal, Joint Defense Appeal, Jewish Welfare Board and such combined appeals as for the Vand Leuni, American Fund for Palestinian Institutions, etc. If these agencies could have budgeting internally why could it not be done externally? Perhaps the CJFWF should not be the agency to do it. He was not insistent upon that. Perhaps an entirely autonomous body might be established for the purpose.

Dr. Heller said he would like to observe frankly that some of the anxiety regarding national budgeting arises out of the nature of the CJFWF. He felt it could very well stand democratization. Its leadership did not represent a cross-section of the American Jewish community (Mr. Hollander interrupted to observe that an effort was being made in this direction). It is overweighted with one section of opinion and it is the general concensus that it is a self-perpetuating body.

With respect to budgeting procedures, he thought the Council ought to draw up a definition of limitations on what it can and what it cannot do. He felt that (1) it might set up machinery to determine the veracity and significance of information submitted by agencies; (2) inquire into duplication of activities of organizations; (3) inquire into the representative quality of organizations; (4) such studies should consciously disavow judgment on ideological questions. An announcement that a national budgeting committee would not commit itself on ideologies might obliterate many of the objections being offered.

Mr. Lurie observed that as long as there is a United Jewish Appeal, the consideration of the budgets of its component agencies would not be touched upon.

<u>Dr. Hexter</u> asked whether Dr. Heller would exclude consideration of duplications within a specific field, for example, as between the United Palestine Appeal and other agencies in the Palestine field — or even within the Jewish Agency itself.

Dr. Heller replied that he would have no-objections.

Mr. Hollander, commenting on Mr. Montor's remarks, said the CJFWF would never try to tell communities which part of their funds should be used for local purposes and which for overseas.

Mr. Blaustein asked Dr. Heller whether he would permit the CJFWF to recommend quotas for the United Jewish Appeal to individual communities.

Dr. Heller said No!

Mr. Lurie asked whether the U.J.A. would be willing to discuss its goal for 1945 with community leaders before it was publicly announced.

Dr. Heller answered in the affirmative.

Dr. Hexter felt that the U.P.A. had made a number of very helpful suggestions. He felt that some of the fears that had been expressed were justified. As the Council officers knew, he shared some of them. The discussion as a whole, he believed, should be further explored by the Council.

Mr. Blaustein agreed that the discussion had been helpful. He did not feel, however, that the suggestion that the Council expand its present services really met the need. He felt that there were a great many advantages and perhaps some disadvantages for the national agencies to be examined by a budget research committee. The CJFWF has actually gone quite far, he felt, in telling its constituents about duplications, etc. Merely enlarging what the CJFWF is doing will not meet the problem, in his view. There were certain practical necessities that had to be considered

in introducing budgeting. He felt that the Council would want to go first into the particulars of smaller agencies.

He felt that another meeting with the U.P.A. representatives would be desirable.

Mr. Hollander said that there had been great fear of the Council in the past among some agencies. It was important to emphasize that the Council never had and now hasn't any intention to interfere ideologically in any Jewish program of activities.

Mr. Lurie asked whether the U.P.A. would send the Council the informal suggestions that Dr. Heller had made with respect to proper budgeting procedures.

Dr. Heller said he had no concrete proposals at this time but felt there should be joint action in formulating them. This might then be the basis for unanimous action.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 P.M.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \*



Mr. Wendell L. Willkie 15 Broad Street New York, N.Y.

My dear Mr. Willkie:

May I add my humble word of tribute to those of many others who have undoubtedly communicated their feelings to you and who, though saddened by your withdrawal from the contest for the presidential candidacy of the Republican Party, have nevertheless been profoundly moved by the manliness of the stand which you took, and the consistent and courageous position which you have maintained throughout on all matters involving basic moral principles and the fundamental ideals of our beloved country.

Your right to political leadership in these critical times was never so firmly established as it is today. The American people will continue to look to you for guidance and direction for they know that you are unswervingly loyal to all that is best in their great tradition.

May God bless you and prosper you.

Most cordially yours,

AHS: BK

# The 'uth About the Third Term

Alleged Tradition Has No Historic Basis. Washington Favored Unlimited Tenure for President. Jefferson Not Opposed to Third Term in "Emergency." Republicans Breached "Sacred" Tradition in Favoring Third Term for Grant, Theodore Roosevelt and Coolidge. To Deny People the Right to Select President for Third Term Would Be a Denial of Democracy Itself.

By ALBERT A. WOLDMAN, Author of "Lawyer Lincoln"

NOTE: The following is a condensation of a 15,000-word series of articles, prepared by this writer for a national newspaper syndicate. In refusing to publish these articles, the head of the syndicate advised:

"Albert A. Woldman's series on 'The Third-Term Myth' is really quite a good yarn. But I'm afraid most of the press wouldn't publish it. This is because he proves that Washington not only did not start the 'third-term tradition' but himself was in favor of a man serving as long as the country wanted him, and repeatedly said so. . . The so-called tradition. Mr. Woldman proves, has been maintained for reasons of practical politics, not because of any unwritten law or feeling on the part of the people. In short, there's nothing to prevent F. D. R. from taking a third term if the voters say so and the political circumstances are propitious. It's a good yarn, but most papers are so violently opposed to this conclusion that they'd not only not buy it, but suppress it if sent out by us."

OPPONENTS of President Roosevelt, unable to make a dent in his record of epoch-making achievements—what with Wendell Wilkie agreeing with Roosevelt's basic policies and Senator McNary admitting the "social gains" of the New Deal—are resolved to defeat the President by raising the third-term bogy. Already the cries of "no third term," "dictatorship" and "no indispensable man" fill the land.

What is the truth about this so-called anti-third-term precedent?

It is nothing but a myth. There exists no "sacred" tradition. It has no historic or constitutional basis. It is a figment of feverish minds. It is the invention of politicians, conveniently invoked from time to time to becloud the real issues.

Here are the true facts about the third-term question:

GEORGE WASHINGTON, who for personal reasons had desired to retire after one term and then declined to serve more than two terms because of age, fatigue and illness, did not oppose a third term for other Presidents. On the contrary, he always favored unlimited tenure and eligibility to re-election without limit. He said:

"I can see no propriety in excluding

ourselves from the services of any man, who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally more capable of serving the public."

It is not too much to believe that Washington, who had reluctantly accepted a second term only after being convinced it was for the national welfare, would also have served a third term had there existed a national emergency such as the possibility of a foreign war.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, an original one-term, no re-election advocate, after serving two terms, permitted a third-term

#### Washington for Third Term

George Washington was unalterably opposed to limiting the number of terms of a President of the United States. To Lafayette he wrote on April 28, 1788:

"I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity or expediency of rotation in that department (the Executive). The matter was freely discussed at the Convention, and to my conviction.

"I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who in some emergency shall be deemed universally capable of serving the public."

boom for him to go on for thirteen months, renouncing it only after he ascertained he could not attain another nomination without a contest. But he served by proxy for four more terms through hand-picked successors.

#### Jefferson Would Run Again

Although Jefferson did express his personal views against "prolongation beyond the second term of office," he noted an exception when a third term would be permissible. (Anti-Roosevelt newspapers, in quoting Jefferson's declarations against a third term, conveniently forget this exception.)

Jefferson, wrote in a letter to John Tyler, in January, 1805:

"There is but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election, to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist."

Today's equivalent of the "monarchist" whom Jefferson regarded as sufficient cause to overlook the third-term taboo, is the economic monarchist and advocate of Fascism against whom President Roosevelt has declared war.

Who could question that if Jefferson were President today he would run for a third term to defeat these undemocratic forces?

ANDREW JACKSON, although favoring a tenure of one term of six years, served two terms, and by proxy carried on for a third term through a personally selected successor.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, had he escaped the assassin's bullet, would have sought a third term to finish the job of Reconstruction.

#### Grant and T. Roosevelt

GENERAL U. S. GRANT, seeking a third term, led in the balloting at the Republican convention in 1880 for 33 ballots, coming within 64 convention votes of a third nomination. He lost out, not because of any strong anti-third-term sentiment of the Republicans, but rather because of the untrustworthiness of Roscoe Conkling, his campaign manager, and other practical political considerations. The vast majority of Republican delegates, voting ballot after ballot for his third nomination, shed no tears over the breach of a "sacred" tradition.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, who had refused almost certain re-election in 1908, but retired in favor of William H. Taft, his personal choice, came within an ace of a third-term election in 1912. His and Taft's combined popular vote far exceeded

Wilson's. But for the split in the Republican ranks Teddy would have become a three-term President. Supporting him in his effort were Senator Hiram W. Johnson, Senator George W. Norris, William Allen White, Alf M. Landon, Gifford Pinchot, Amos Pinchot, James R. Garfield, Bainbridge Colby, Col. Frank Knox and many more Republican stalwarts. None shed any tears over the attempt to shatter a "sacred tradition." They favored Roosevelt again in 1916, and it was generally conceded that had he lived he would have had the Republican nomination of 1920 without opposition, the alleged tradition notwithstanding.

WOODROW WILSON, according to notes kept by Senator Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury in the Wilson cabinet, had hopes of running for a third term to vindicate his stand on the League of Nations. Serious illness prevented this new assault upon the "sacred tradition."

#### McNary for Coolidge Third Term

CALVIN COOLIDGE, who, in 1928, said, "I do not choose to run," had not expected to be taken literally. He had hoped to be drafted. He was the most bitterly disappointed man in the world when the Republican convention failed to understand the real significance of his enigmatic statement.

Favoring Coolidge for a third term were Herbert Hoover and Senator Charles L.

## Jefferson Would Accept Third to Defeat Economic Royalists

Although Thomas Jefferson was a strong advocate of rotation in office, he was practical enough not to make this an unalterable rule.

He himself would have run for a third term in order to prevent the Federalists, whom he called "monarchists," from capturing the Presidency.

In 1805, after his second election, he admitted in a letter to John Tyler:

"There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election: to-wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist."

Is it not reasonable to presume that if Jefferson were President today and finishing his second term, he would be willing to run for a third term in order to defeat the "monarchists" or economic royalists of 1940?

McNary, present Vice Presidential candidate.

In view of the foregoing incontrovertible historic facts, it is erroneous to contend that it is the "traditional" policy of the United States that no President shall be nominated and elected to a third term. It is false to say that a "sacred tradition" exists against it.

If the founders of the Republic had thought it wise to limit Presidents to two terms, would they not have written it into the Constitution? On the contrary, the Constitution is eloquently silent on the question. The drafters of our immortal Charter of Liberties had considered the question of the tenure of office of the President in great detail. They finally decided to let the people keep the power of determining how many terms a President shall serve. Alexander Hamilton expressed the views of the majority of the framers when he said:

"An ill effect of exclusion would be depriving the community of the advantage of the experience gained by the Chief Magistrate in the exercise of his office."

#### Denial of Democracy

To deny, on the ground of an alleged tradition, an opportunity to the people to decide for themselves whether they want President Roosevelt for a third term, would be a denial of democracy itself.

To deny that Constitutional right to the people is to reveal a want of faith in democracy—a lack of trust in the people's ability to decide whom they will have for President. Such a position, said Woodrow Wilson, "casts a doubt upon the whole theory of popular government."

Why should the American people, in one of the most critical periods of their entire history, deprive themselves of their best leadership; why should they dispense with experience and talent simply out of regard to a so-called tradition which has no more historic basis than the George Washington cherry tree myth?

#### Dictatorship Bogy

The danger of dictatorship that might arise by reason of electing a President for a third term is but a bogy. American democracy does not rest on so flimsy a foundation. There can be no dictatorship in the United States so long as the people have a free choice in electing their Presidents, and so long as Congress votes the laws.

The Presidency is no despotic office. It is

circumscribed l Constitution. Among other things, side at is subject to by impeachment proceedings. The cuties, in a number of ways, is restricted by an alert Congress and an independent judiciary. He is exposed to the watchful eyes of a free and critical press. He is held in bounds by a people steeped in democracy, to whom he is answerable every four years.

Certainly, if dictatorship were possible, no mere third-term tradition is strong enough to prevent it.

This is no mere brief on the right of the people of the United States to elect Franklin D. Roosevelt to a third term, if they so desire. It is a defense of the people's right to choose whomever they wish as their Chief Executive. It is a defense of the American people to govern themselves.

#### Why Jefferson Refused Third Term

As Thomas Jefferson's second term neared its end, seven of the thirteen States then composing the Union, petitioned him to stand for a third term. But the other six States, including Virginia, failed to join the boom although it continued for thirteen months. Without Virginia victory would remain uncertain. On the other hand, James Madison, if nominated, could expect a solid party behind him. So, after waiting thirteen months, Jefferson, in a letter to the Vermont legislature, quashed his boom.

He did not decline solely because another term would be his third. In all candor he stated:

"Truth also requires me to add that I am sensible of that decline which advancing years bring on, and feeling their physical, I ought not to doubt their mental effect, happy if I am the first to perceive and to obey this admonition of nature, and to solicit the retreat from cares too great for the wearied faculties of age."

Jefferson did not write his famous anti-third term declaration until long after his two proteges, Madison and Monroe, had each served two terms.

We cannot help but wonder whether Jefferson would have squashed his own third term boom if re-election had been certain and he had been a younger man.

# PLEDGES, RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS (Cont'd) United Jewish Appeal Campaigns, 1939-44 (as of December 31, 1944)

The Art War	CAMPAIGNSOF					
	1944	1943	1942	1941	1940	1939
D. Total Distributed						
To JDC	\$13,872,558b \$	9,404,000 \$	7,074,037	\$ 6,115,123	\$ 6,089,754	\$ 7,953,23
UPA	10,127,442b	6,336,000	4,137,313	3,664,074	2,919,877	3,976,61
NRS	1,080,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,875,000	3,500,000	2,600,00
Christian Refugees		and the second second second second		•	• 5	250,000
Jewish Agency (special grant)	-	300,000	•		•	-
Percent of JDC-UPA total		And the second s				
to JDC	57.8b	59.7	63.1	62.5	67.6	66.
to UPA	42.2b	40.3	36.9	37.5	32.4	33.3
		7				
14 March 1914   1914		111 45				
		/ 41.4	HILLY ES			
		-	N. H			
		WITE	odd the			
		3000	00			
		100				

<sup>\* -</sup>Includes \$600,000 granted as offset to JNF traditional collections, and not included in calculation of ratio

a -Incomplete - estimates for year are between 29 and 30 million dollars

b -Partial distribution; - - final distribution to be made in March 1945

December 31 1944)

# 1

### DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER'S RESIGNATION

## A MEMORANDUM

who was despit committed to the rescuntion, enote a periodal letter to the President.

The appalling and long festering situation within the American Zionist Emergency Council which led to the resignation of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver as cochairman of the Council and as chairman of its Executive Committee is known to very few. Those of us who had been in daily contact with the political work of our movement but who could not in conscience continue after Dr. Silver and his program were ruthlessly sacrificed, have resolved that you shall have the facts. You who have done such a magnificent job during the past year, are entitled to the truth.

In a memorandum dated December 12th, you were informed of much that had transpired in Washington in connection with the Palestine resolutions. That memorandum avoided any reference to the shocking conditions which obtained in official Zionist circles during this period. But after all that has taken place, and with wild rumors agitating our people throughout the country, we regard it as a solemn duty to pass on as many of the important facts as can be encompassed within the space of this memorandum.

At a meeting of the American Zionist Emergency Council on October 30th and at a subsequent meeting, it was agreed that the "green light" should be obtained from the State Department and the President before we pressed for action on the resolution. This was done, not out of a desire to avoid offending the State Department or the President, but to protect ourselves against the kind of opposition which we encountered last Spring. No one anticipated any serious difficulty in view of Secretary Stimson's letter lifting the military ban, the President's own statement of October 15th, etc. Accordingly, Dr. Silver, Dr. Wise and Dr. Nahum Goldmann called on Mr. Stettinius on November 9th to get the "green light."

Mr. Stettinius had no opinion of his own, but said that he would consult with the President. It is altogether false to suggest, as has been suggested, that Dr. Silver or the other members of the delegation which called on Mr. Stettinius gave any promise, expressed or implied, that we would give up the resolution if the State Department or the President registered objections. If anyone gave such a promise, it was done before or after the interview with Mr. Stettinius - and not by Dr. Silver.

At a meeting of the Emergency Council on November 21st, Dr. Wise reported that on November 15th Mr. Stettinius had telephoned to him and had said that the President thought we should not proceed with action on the resolution and that the matter should be left with him for a little while longer. In the discussion that followed, it was clear that the Council was not satisfied that Mr. Stettinius' reply definitely closed the matter. On the contrary, it was felt by quite a few that a mistake had been made in going to Mr. Stettinius in the first place, that we should have assumed that the "green light" had, in fact, been given by President Roosevelt in his statement of October 15th. Dr. Silver urged that a strong effort should be made to induce the President to change his mind, but Dr. Wise argued against such action, declaring that the President was leaving the country almost immediately. Dr. Wise emphasized further that Congress would adjourn in a few days and that he had been assured that our resolution could not possibly be acted upon in the closing days of this Congress. Dr. Wise was badly misinformed in both of these matters.

The Council agreed that a strong effort should be made to reach President Roosevelt. It was clear from Dr. Wise's attitude that if the matter were left to

him, no earnest effort would be made to urge the President to change his mind. As far as he was concerned, the resolution might just as well die.

The President was not in Washington and could not be reached. It was not until December 2nd, 11 days after the meeting of the Council, that Senator Wagner. who was deeply committed to the resolution, wrote a personal letter to the President, in which he explained the situation as he saw it and appealed to the President to withdraw his objections. Meanwhile, important events had already taken place -without any pressure on Dr. Silver's part. For many months your committee, along with the other local Emergency Councils, had been interviewing your Senators and Representatives, Congressmen-elect and other public officials, and obtaining pledges from them to vote for our resolution. All members of Congress received our book, "America and Palestine" which contained the printed opinions of nearly 400 members of the 78th Congress. Senator Wagner informed the Convention of the Zionist Organization of America that the President's statement clears the way for Congressional action on the Palestine resolutions. Secretary Stimson had lifted the military ban. The ZOA Convention called for speedy action on the Palestine resolution. Congressman Bloom had announced that he would summon a meeting of his Committee to consider the Palestine resolution on November 15th. In short, the Congress, which all of us had been cultivating for a full year, was set for action and the sponsors of the resolutions insisted upon discharging their obligations to the Jewish people.

Dr. Silver had wired Dr. Wise on November 22nd, the day after the Council's meeting, to this effect: "Because of strike here (in Cleveland) could not reach you by telephone. Strongly urge you to contact Bloom immediately and urge him to see the Chief and persuade him to give clearance to resolutions... Please inform me by telegram or telephone results of conversation with Bloom."

Dr. Wise never replied to this telegram.

On the very day that Dr. Silver arrived in Washington (Nov. 27) he went to see Congressman Bloom to urge him to get in touch with the President. Congressman Bloom, a staunch supporter of President Roosevelt, declared that he did not need any new "green light." He had already made his own soundings. He stated that he was going forward with the resolution. Congressman Bloom requested that Dr. Silver write him a letter indicating approval of the course he was following. Dr. Silver complied with Mr. Bloom's request in order that the resolution be kept alive pending negotiations with the Administration. As you know, favorable action was taken in the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Wednesday, November 29th.

When Dr. Silver met with Senator Wagner on Tuesday, November 28th, the Senator had no plans to see the President to persuade him to remove his objections, despite the fact that Dr. Wise and Mr. Shulman had seen Senator Wagner in Atlantic City on November 26th. But Senator Wagner was, nevertheless, determined to go into the meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the next morning and have his resolution considered. On that same Tuesday, Mr. Shulman telephoned Senator Wagner's secretary in Washington and gave him many reasons as to why the Senator should use his efforts to postpone consideration of the resolution by the Senate Committee. This was not Mr. Shulman's mission. Three men -- Dr. Silver, Dr. Wise and Mr. Shulman -- had been authorized and directed to try to persuade the Administration to change its mind, not to urge Senators and Congressmen to desist from working for the passage of the resolution.

As on earlier occasions, our leaders were working at cross purposes. Dr. Wise and Mr. Shulman were pressing Senator Wagner to have his resolution shelved, and

Dr. Silver, following the clear line indicated by the Council, was urging the Senator to get in touch with the President. Senator Wagner found himself the victim of two opposing forces pulling in different directions. He was telephoned a score of times from New York by people, all of whom spoke in the name of the Emergency Council or of Zionists. Senator Wagner was baffled and confused -- and understandably so.

On Saturday evening, December 2nd, when Dr. Silver arrived in Pittsburgh to attend the American Jewish Conference, the situation was the following: the resolution in the Senate was hanging fire, pending word from Mr. Stettinius and a reply from President Roosevelt to Senator Wagner's letter. Senator Wagner and Dr. Silver were awaiting an appointment with Mr. Stettinius scheduled for noon on Monday. There was little doubt that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was determined to act -- without being prodded or pressed. The House Foreign Affairs Committee had already acted favorably and its action had been warmly hailed by the Jewish press, by the Jewish public and by most of the leaders of the Zionist parties.

When he arrived in Pittsburgh, Dr. Silver planned to call together the members of the Interim Committee, consisting of the co-chairmen of the Council and the representatives of the Jewish Agency, which, the Council had ruled, was to consult on urgent political affairs between meetings of the Emergency Council. To his amazement he discovered, upon his arrival, that Dr. Israel Goldstein had during the day called a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Z. O. A. to discuss the Palestine Resolutions, despite the fact that neither the Interim Committee nor the Council had as yet discussed the matter, and that Dr. Silver, who was closest to the whole situation, was not present to supply accurate information. The halls of the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh were buzzing with rumors, fragments of information and misinformation. What Zionist purpose Dr. Goldstein intended to serve by calling this meeting, at such a time and place, where hundreds of delegates including non-Zionists were gathered not for a Zionist convention but for the American Jewish Conference, is incomprehensible. Nothing but mischief could result from such hasty and illconsidered opinions expressed on insufficient and largely inadequate data. Here was the start of a campaign to "run down" the resolution passed by the House Committee and to discredit Dr. Silver, whose name had been so closely identified with the resolution. entiring telephoned Genetor Magney and asked Use and the Lionists of New York about withdrawing the

Dr. Wise declined to attend the meeting of the Interim Committee which Dr. Silver had called in Pittsburgh. The other members of this Committee who did attend received all the essential facts from Dr. Silver.

Dr. Wise called an unauthorized meeting of the Emergency Council in Pittsburgh for Sunday evening, December 3 (the Council's Constitution clearly provides that no special meeting of the Council can be called without three days' notice.) This meeting resulted in nothing except a request that Dr. Silver meet with the heads of the four parties represented in the Council to consider what should be done in case the President persisted in his objection. Dr. Silver had to leave for Washington immediately after his report to the American Jewish Conference, and rushed from the platform to the train.

On Monday, December 4, Dr. Silver, together with Senator Wagner, had an interview with Mr. Stettinius. Both were shocked and amazed when they were shown a telegram sent by Dr. Wise from Pittsburgh to Mr. Stettinius, which in so many words stated that while Dr. Wise wished the resolution passed, he was prepared to acquiesce in its deferment if the Administration so desired. This, in effect, told the Administration that the Jews of America would quickly reconcile themselves to the deferment of the resolution, and that Dr. Wise, co-chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, could be counted upon to defend the Administration's stand.

When considered in retrospect, it becomes quite clear that Dr. Wise's unauthorized telegram, sent without the prior knowledge of the Council or of Dr. Silver, sealed the fate of the Palestine resolution.

Mr. Stettinius told Senator Wagner and Dr. Silver that he would immediately transmit to the President the case as presented to him by them. (He characterized the case presented by Dr. Silver as "unanswerable.")

It must be borne in mind that every member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee received telegrams from the President of the ZOA, urging favorable action on the Palestine resolution. Similar telegrams were sent by the heads of the other parties. The telegram sent by Dr. Israel Goldstein on December 5th opened with the statement: "We earnestly urge you to report favorably the Palestine resolution for adoption by the present Congress." As of Tuesday, December 5th then, the presidents of the Zionist parties in the United States -- including Dr. Goldstein -- were officially urging the Senate Committee to act, not to defer action! If there was a decision against taking such steps and if the decision was binding and unalterable, then clearly the sending of such telegrams by the Zionist leaders was either a violation of these decisions or a reversal of earlier decisions. It is as clear as a pikestaff that if the resolution had been approved, all the Zionist leaders would have eagerly shared the credit for that achievement. Now that it has been deferred, the situation is, of course, quite different ...

What happened in the meetings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, you have learned from our earlier memorandum. It was quite clear to the State Department that the Committee was intent upon reporting favorably on the resolution. The State Department then adopted another method to achieve its end, the deferment of action on the resolution. They tried to get the Zionists themselves to withdraw the resolution. The Zionists were to assume the role of lobbyists against their own measure. Someone got in touch with Dr. Wise, presumably on Wednesday, December 6th or early Thursday morning, December 7th, for by Thursday noon Senator Connally was informing Senator Taft that the resolution would not pass the Committee, because Dr. Wise and the Zionists of New York would soon be heard from. On the afternoon of the same day, Mr. Stettinius telephoned Senator Wagner and asked him whether he had already heard from Dr. Wise and the Zionists of New York about withdrawing the resolution.

Dr. Wise lost no time in complying with the request made of him. He called two meetings, again in violation of constitutional principles, and at these meetings it was decided to send a delegation representing the 4 parties in the Council to Washington to arrange for the deferment of the resolutions. The Mizrachi Organization voted against this proposal and refused to participate in the delegation. The delegation, headed by Dr. Israel Goldstein, arrived in Washington on Friday morning, December 8th. It had been instructed to see Dr. Silver before going to the Capitol and that nothing was to be done until they had spoken with Dr. Silver. But by 8:30 A. M., Dr. Wise had already telephoned Senator Wagner, again urging him to ask for deferment.

The delegation was advised by Dr. Silver that it should not make the Zionist movement ridiculous in Washington by requesting the shelving of a resolution which all of us had been urging upon Congress for almost a year. Dr. Silver pointed out that the Senate Committee was pressing for it, that it was not the duty of Zionist leaders to press for deferment, that it was enough to indicate to the State Department that the Zionist leaders were not pressing the resolution but that the matter was in the hands of the Senate Committee, which was bent on action.

The delegation saw Mr. Stettinius, Senator Wagner and Senator Connally, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and discussed various compromise proposals which had been considered in the discussion with Dr. Silver. The delegation made it clear to Mr. Stettinius that the Zionist leaders were not pressing for action. While the Secretary of State thought well of a compromise whereby the resolution would be voted out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with the understanding that it would not come to the floor of the Senate for final action at that session of Congress, this proposal was turned down by Senator Connally. The anti-Zionist elements in Washington who were anxious to see the resolution shelved. felt very confident -- the very presence of the delegation of Zionist leaders outside the doors of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee indicated that the plan to get the Zionists to disown their own measure was succeeding. Members of the Senate Committee saw what was happening. The Jews themselves were divided and did not know what they wanted after they had conducted an intensive campaign in behalf of the Palestine resolutions for almost a year -- and all this was happening only 48 hours after the very same Zionist leaders had sent telegrams to every member of the Senate Committee urging favorable action on the resolution!

The delegation of Zionists was actually invited by Senator Connally to come in and address the meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Fortunately, they refused this invitation.

What took place at the last two meetings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee you have learned from the earlier memorandum. You know that the State Department has assumed full responsibility for the deferment of action. You have seen the statement issued by the State Department. You know, too, the attitude of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as indicated by the statement which twelve of its members -- seven Democrats and five Republicans, constituting two-thirds of the Committee members who considered the resolution -- made: "... we wish to record our own personal approval of the Resolution."

When Dr. Silver presented a complete report of what had transpired in connection with the resolutions to the Emergency Council on December 20th, he made a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the present situation and submitted a program of action which he urged the Council to consider. He also urged that a sub-committee be appointed to make a careful study of the Council's organizational structure with an eye to the greater efficiency and the smoother functioning of the Council and the avoidance of such tragic pulling at cross purposes in the future.

Dr. Silver's statement and an account of what transpired at the last two meetings of the Council cannot be covered adequately in this memorandum. Suffice it to say that the small group which had been quietly opposing Dr. Silver and frustrating some of his most important efforts almost from the very moment he was named to lead American Zionist political work, refused to deal with questions of policy. They were out to "get" Dr. Silver. This clique, composed chiefly of the representatives of the Zionist Organization of America on the Council, created an "issue" -- Dr. Silver had "contravened" the Council's decisions. They could not wait to settle their score with him immediately. A motion to censure Dr. Silver was squarely rejected. However, a motion calling for the resignation of "all officers" of the Council was made, following which another motion to table this last proposal was defeated. Dr. Silver then resigned.

The ludicrousness of the trumped up charges against Dr. Silver becomes obvious after one surveys the account of what really took place in Washington. It should be added that there have been occasions when there was contravention of the Council's decisions, when Zionist leaders had acted independently and broken

discipline, and when such actions had damaging effects on our work -- but the gentlemen of the Z. O. A. in the Council not only refrained from censuring such acts, but condoned them, actually gave them moral support and encouragement. Dr. Silver was not one of the leaders whose actions were under fire. But that is a story requiring a chapter of its own.

Here, then, is an important part of this tragic story. We have dealt with first things first, and have given you an account of some important happenings in connection with the Palestine resolutions. Other important aspects of this critical situation, as well as a discussion of the basic and vital question of policy involved here (which is really the core of the problem) must be dealt with separately. This basic question of policy should be fairly clear to you from this memorandum and from Dr. Silver's statement of resignation: "I shall continue to advocate ... a policy in which timidity, appeasement and backstairs 'diplomacy' will have no place."

Harry L. Shapiro

Formerly Executive Director,
American Zionist Emergency Council

Harold P. Manson

Formerly Director of Information, American Zionist Emergency Council





[1944]

#### THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL - A YEAR OF ACTIVITY

The American Zionist Emergency Council came into being a year ago, during the darkest period of recent Zionist history. At a time when certain official quarters went so far as to attempt a ban on open discussion of the Palestine question, the major Zionist bodies in the United States — the Zionist Organization of America, Hadassah, Mizrachi and Poale Zion — joined in reorganizing the American Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs and establishing the Council as the political and public relations arm of the entire American Zionist movement. Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen S. Wise were named co-chairmen of the Council and immediately set out to mobilize public opinion behind Zionist aspirations through a broad public relations program.

A number of special departments, directed by experts in their respective fields, were established. These included departments dealing with Community Contacts, Information (Press and Radio), Publications, Speakers, Research, Intellectual Mobilization, Christian Opinion, American Jewish Religious Forces, Special Events, Labor Relations, etc. A permanent bureau was set up in Washington and almost immediately official circles began to recognize that a dynamic force was on the scene — a responsible organization voicing the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of American Jewry.

More than 300 local emergency committees were formed throughout the country, and in December, 1943, the first conference of local committee chairmen was held in Cleveland, where detailed plans to enlist American public opinion in support of the Council's work were formulated. The heads of these local groups returned to their cities, inspired to carry out the most effective program of education in American Zionist history. Hundreds of editorials in papers ranging from country journals to metropolitan dailies, scores of resolutions, rallies, radio addresses and articles by Jewish and non-Jewish leaders resulted from the educational activities carried on in the local communities.

Another highly successful conference of local committee chairmen took place on May 23rd and 24th in Washington.

On the political front, the most important step was the introduction of the Palestine resolutions in both Houses of Congress. Of course this involved risks, but the Council was convinced that the risk of inaction was even greater.

During the hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Zionist leaders presented our case in a brilliant manner, and the local committees did magnificent work. From every state in the Union, thousands of letters, post-cards and telegrams were sent to the members of Congress, Seldom had Washington seen such amazing public interest in a piece of legislation.

While action was deferred at the request of the military, it should be made clear that these measures are not dead. When the proper moment arrives, the Council will press for action on the Palestine resolutions.

As a resit of the widespread public agitation and education brought about by the Palestine resolutions, the "conspiracy of silence" on the Palestine question was broken, and on March 9th President Roosevelt authorized Dr. Wise and Dr. Silver to say that "the American Government has never given its approval to the White Paper of 1939...and that when future decisions are reached, full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish National Home."

The Council's educational activity in Washington also helped to bring about the inclusion in the platforms of both major political parties of excellent Palestine planks. On June 27, 1944, the Republican National Convention declared:

"In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the Resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic Commonwealth..."

This pronouncement was followed three weeks later, on July 20th, by the Democratic National Convention's declaration, as follows:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth."

With both major political parties giving their unqualified endorsement to the Jewish people's efforts to rebuild their national life in Palestine, Zionism has become a declared objective in the postwar program of the United States.

While much has been accomplished in the past year, there are many obstacles to be overcome on our road to complete victory. The continued support of an overwhelming majority of American Jewry is required to bring this drive to a successful conclusion. With that support, victory is almost assured, and the day when Palestine shall be established as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth not too far distant.

#### CONFIDENTIAL

Bronxville, N.Y. Jan. 6, 1945 Tel. Bronxville 2:1036

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, Rabbi The Temple Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Doctor Silver -

Your wire of a few days ago I found upon my return here. It will, unfortunately, not be possible for me to accept your kind invitation to address your congregation on the Sunday you mention. I am speaking in the Congregational Church of Stamford that morning on a union service of all the Protestant denominations. There have been a few cases of flagrant anti-Jewish discrimination in that town and the various ministers thought it best to have the thing thrashed out in the open, in God's house, as they said, in the good old American way of the Town Hall meeting. When it was put up to me that way, I dared not refuse. They are nearly all young men, terribly in earnest. To me talking about anti-Semitism is an awful bore, but I overcame my impatience and am now willing to suffer to the extent of wearing gown and bib and buckled shoes for a few hours. I hope you will excuse me.

I had intended to write you a few days earlier. What does Homer say? "I was on the point of knocking when you prevented me by opening the door." In fact I had written you a long letter, but I tore it up again thinking that it might seem presumptuous on my part, a non-Jew and therefore not a Zionist (officially) to mix into affairs which were not my concern. But then I was so ardently pressed these last few weeks by the Doctors Wise and Goldstein to come out with an act or statement in support of their particular attitude in the current diversity of opinion, that I got my myself into such trouble and vexation of spirit that I was almost decided to leave Zionism alone altogether. Now it was "dear Pierre, I want to be guided by you (Israel Goldstein) and we should (nota bene) have our pictures taken together for the N.P." And from Dr. Wise all sorts of flattering remarks, but behind my back they instructed the Christian Council not to have me speak as I am (contemptible argument!) more anti-British than pro-Zionist. If I am antiimperialistically inclined, not anti-British, wasn't it for the sake of Zion and the Jewish people that I took this attitude? Do these gents think that I could not be basking in high favor with their FDR and their Churchill if I, as British subject, had taken an anti-Zionist point of view, which is so easy to take for the Gentile with anti-nationalist notions?

Now I am told "the Jewish masses listen to you," by both Dr. Wise and Goldstein, "and you must help repair the damage inflicted by Dr. Silver."

Well, I am not going to do it. That's all there is to it. Rather cast out, and muzzled and lied about, than betray the cause of Zion. I spoke in Washington last week. We had as large a crowd as in Severance Hall and 25 Protestant ministers on the platform. And there I defended your attitude, as far as I understand it, and your point of view. When I said this: "It is one thing for Dr. Weizmann and the leaders of the Agency to pursue a policy of trust and confidence in Britain and Churchill and to wait patiently for some concession after the war, they probably cannot do otherwise. But for Dr. Wise and Dr. Goldstein to pursue a similar polic of laisser-drift vis-a-vis of FDR is impolitic, un-American, and will lead to complete stagnation. On the other hand an aggressive, militant, American Zionist policy, a policy pursuied by American Zionists, of determined criticism and impatience

will immensely strengthen the hands of Dr. Weizmann. He can in that case point to the greatest Jewish community in the world as no longer satisfied with sacharine assurances of good will for after the war. I said I understood this to be the view of Dr. Silver and the house literally rose to its feet and cheered your name, the goyim, too, by the way! Significant!

The same thing to-night at the Brooklyn Jewish Center, which had the synagogue crowded to the rafters. There we had a question period. And I came out openly against Wise cum suis. In Louis I. Newman's Temple last Friday, too, the same thing.

After the meeting last night, I talked with the Brooklyn Zionist leaders. They asked my advice. They were boiling with indignation. They want to sweep the administration into the ash can. I think they will. The Jews are sick and tired of appeasement and whispers and dark hints. Their kinsmen are dying in Europe. The White Paper is in force. Tomorrow the British will tell us: there are no Jews clamoring to enter Palestine. The Jews are dead. Hitler killed them. Before this argument is advanced they want action. And they feel that you ought to lead them. They are waiting for word from you. They are deeply stirred.

The Mizrachi, who believe I am their particular chaver, called at my house here in Bronxville. I advised them not to quit yet, to wait till we hear from you.

And so it goes. But, the others are not sitting still. There is a furious, base campaign of slander going on. I will tell you more about that in detail when I see you, and of course, I am now to be silenced, too.

The trial of the Irgunist case (my case) is also taking a wrong direction. Bergson won the first round. The American Jewish Committee had a series of articles published in the W. Telegram wherein it was hinted that in addition to being anti-Catholic, I am also anti-Semitic, vide my slander of a reputable Jewish organization. Instead of defending me, Shulman let that go. They, the lawyers, have collected no data, have no material to present to the court. I susp ct double dealing. An attempt to discredit me, kill two birds with one stone, so to speak. I don't put it past them after what I have learned in the last few weeks. But enough! I hope you can read this. I can't use a typewriter, having only one hand. The other one I gave for Mr. Churchill's Empire when I thought that England was the "mother of the free." Foolish Dutchman, wasn't I?

With regards and assurances of solidarity and my respects, please to the Rabina.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Pierre van Paassen 5 a.m.

P.S. I am told the meetings in Dayton, Columbus, Indianapolis and Cincinnati which I am scheduled to address are to cancelled in view of my "anti-Zionist attitude in Washington." Quel toupet!

1944-1945]

# An Appeal to the Conscience of America

A T THIS decisive moment in history, we direct this urgent plea to the conscience of America as well as to the world statesmen gathered at San Francisco — a plea on behalf of the Jewish survivors of Nazi bestiality.

We speak for millions of Americans, Jews and non-Jews alike — for our congregants troubled by the plight of their European brethren and for our Christian friends who share their concern for justice, mercy and the preservation of the human values paramount in our common religious heritage.

We speak as Jewish spiritual leaders versed in the traditions of our faith and as Americans cherishing the ideals of our land. We find, in both, the imperatives which make it impossible for us to close our eyes to suffering or to ignore injustice.

Five million human beings — men, women and children, innocent of any wrong — have been slain because they were Jews. It is true that the Jews were not the only people who suffered at the hands of the Nazis. But the Jews, first in suffering, are last in the hope of rehabilitation.

When peace comes, the Poles, the Czechs, and the Dutch will be free and go home. They will rightfully sit in the councils of nations. But for hundreds of thousands of Jews who have survived the Hitler slaughter the future holds little promise. They are naked, hungry, sick. The poison of anti-Semitism which the Nazis left behind, has made them literally homeless.

Their eyes are turned to the ancient homeland of their people — Palestine. This is the land which the nations of the world pledged to the Jews at the close of the last war. This is the land which Jews have rebuilt and reclaimed from the desolation and barrenness in which they found it. This is the land which has given freedom to 600,000 Jews and which promises the opportunity for normal, creative living to the hundreds of thousands in Europe who look to it longingly.

Palestine has room and room to spare for the Jews who seek entry into it. No single non-Jew will be dispossessed or deprived of his rights in the Holy Land. Our world will be the richer for having made of Palestine a bridge-head to the future for the entire Middle East.

BUT — and this is a situation so intolerable that it cries out to the heart of humanity — these Jews whose only hope lies in Palestine cannot enter Palestine. The land which has been designated as their home is now closed to men and women who desperately need and are justly entitled to it.

The United Nations stand on the threshold of victory. They dare not ignore the plea of these victims of one of the most heinous crimes in history. The gates of Palestine must be opened — and opened now — not tomorrow when it may be too late.

We call upon all citizens who are lovers of humanity to join their voices with ours in demanding human rights and human dignity for these bitterly persecuted people. The undertaking of the nations of the world, our own America among them, that Palestine shall be reestablished as the Jewish national home and that, in the words of President Wilson, "There shall be laid there the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth" must be fulfilled in letter and in spirit.

Now that the nations assemble once again to plan a peace which we pray shall this time be just and enduring, we call upon you to turn to the leaders of the nations and demand

that there be full justice for the Jews of Europe; that they be aided to emigrate to Palestine quickly — in accordance with their desire and their need;

that the pledges of the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations Mandate be fulfilled;

that those conditions be created which will insure the realization of a Jewish aspiration which has been shared by numberless Christians of great vision — Franklin Delano Roosevelt — Wilson — Smuts — Balfour — Lloyd George — Churchill — and a myriad others — the aspiration that Palestine shall be a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.

This appeal is circulated by the Committee on Unity for Palestine of the Zionist Organization of America and is sponsored by the following rabbis: Philip S. Bernstein, Barnett R. Brickner, Israel Goldstein, Robert Gordis, Julius Gordon, Simon Greenberg, James G. Heller, Mordecai M. Kaplan, Jacob Kohn, Arthur J. Lelyveld, B. L. Levinthal, Israel H. Levinthal, Louis M. Levitsky, Felix A. Levy, Joshua Loth Liebman, Joseph H. Lookstein, Jacob R. Marcus, Irving Miller, Abraham A. Neuman, Louis I. Newman, David de Sola Pool, Abba Hillel Silver, Milton Steinberg, Samuel Thurman, Stephen S. Wise.

PRESS RELEASE from

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA 607 West 161 Street New York, N. Y. WAdsworth 3-0275

FOR RELEASE FRIDAY, JANUARY 26

ALL JEWISH BODIES UNITE IN PRAYER FOR ROOSEVELT

ORTHODOX, CONSERVATIVE, REFORM GROUPS PRAY FOR SUCCESS OF PRESIDENT'S MISSION

New York, January 26 -- On the eve of President Roosevelt's forthcoming conference with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, the Synagogue Council of America, representing almost 2,000 Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform synagogues and temples and their rabbis throughout the country, has issued a call designating tomorrow and Sunday as days of special prayers for the success of his mission.

The Synagogue Council has called upon all its constituent groups to pray for the health of the President and ask God Almighty to "guard him from danger and protect him in hardships in his going forth and in his coming back," The prayer expresses the hope that the forthcoming conference of the three leaders of the United Nations will ensure the liberation of all enslaved peoples, the rescue of the persecuted remnants of Israel in war-ravaged Europe, and bring about justice for the Jew in the land of Palestine.

"O Heavenly Father," reads the prayer, "we pray Thee to grant vision and courage to the President of our great republic that he may espouse the cause of the oppressed of all nations and remember the oft-forgotten people of Israel.

Awaken Thou the hearts of the spokesmen of freedom to the plight of the most grievously stricken victims of the foe of humanity.... May they realize that the world will know no peace until all who are enslaved are set free, until all who are homeless are given refuge and until all who are downtrodden are restored to human dignity, and iniquity has vanished from the face of the earth."

"In the name of the multitudes whose graves are not marked and whose ashes not gathered," the prayer continues, "O Lord God, strengthen the sense of justice in the hearts of those who are charged with the fashioning of a new world, that they may reaffirm the pledge of the restoration of Zion made to the people of Israel by the nations of the world, that they may see and espouse our right to establish a Jewish Commonwealth in a free and undivided land of Israel, whither our uprooted and homeless brethren may go unhindered and unafraid, to rebuild their lives and to restore their ancient heritage of faith, freedom and righteousness."

Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein of New York, president of the Synagogue Council, in commenting on the call for the special prayer, stated that it was the opinion in informed circles that the plight of European Jewry and the status of Palestine would come up for consideration at this meeting of the Big Three. "More than a half-million Jews still remaining in Axis-occupied Europe are threatened with destruction at the hands of the Nazis," said Dr. Goldstein. "Hundreds of thousands of Jewish survivors in liberated territory who have emerged from hiding are as yet without hope or prospects for the future."

Rabbi Ahron Opher of New York, Director of the Council's Committee on Emergency Intercession, asserted that the "sole sustaining hope and the only feasible and tangible prospect for these people is to rebuild their lives in Palestine — a land which has the resources and the ability to absorb all those Jews who wish to or must go there."

The heads of the three national Rabbinical bodies issued instructions to their respective memberships to join in the prayer for the President. Rabbi William Drazin, head of the Rabbinical Council of America, composed of Orthodox Rabbis, has written his colleagues: "I summon all members to respond to the call of the Synagogue Council. The religious and historic link between Israel and the land of Israel must be asserted and established clearly. The fulfillment of Israel's millennial hope is the sole solution in the hour of Israel's deepest sorrow."

Dr. Robert Gordis, president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, Conservative rabbinical group, has asked his associates to "dedicate the service and the sermon on January 27th to the task of stimulating nation-wide interest in the imperative need of opening the doors of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration looking ultimately to the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth." Continuing, Dr. Gordis urged that "we record our heartfelt plea to President Roosevelt that the United Nations honor their moral and legal commitment to the Jewish people with regard to Palestine."

Dr. Solomon B. Freehof of Pittsburgh, president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Reform rabbinical group, has also endorsed the call of the Synagogue Council of America.

WRHS ARCHIVES ARCHIVES

#142 - 1/25/45

#### SUGGESTED PRAYER FOR THE SABBATH OF JANUARY 26-27

O God, Thou great governor of all the world and guardian of nations, we invoke Thy blessing upon the President of the United States and pray Thee that his re-inauguration into office may be the harbinger of a wise and fruitful administration and mark the beginning of an era of enduring peace. Be Thou with him as he embarks upon his sacred mission to confer with the other leaders of the great liberating nations, to aid in the achievement of speedy victory and in the planning and establishment of a world order of justice and righteousness. Grant him fortitude and vigor, sustain him in health, guard him from danger and protect him in hardship in his going forth and in his coming back, and glorify his endeavors with noble accomplishments.

O Champion of the oppressed, bestow Thy spirit upon the councils of the great leaders of the United Nations. Strengthen within them the resolves to vanquish tyranny and eradicate oppression, to heal the wounds of mankind, to right the wrongs wrought on the enslaved peoples and to rebuild human society on the four-fold cornerstones of freedom everywhere on earth.

O Heavenly Father, we pray Thee to grant vision and courage to the President of our great republic that he may espouse the cause of the oppressed of all nations and remember the oft-forgotten people of Israel. Awaken Thou the hearts of the spokesmen of freedom to the plight of the most grievously stricken victims of the foe of humanity. Behold, they are banished from their homes, driven without food, shelter or hope to the hiding places of the earth, tortured and massacred. May the blood of the dead, the lament of the bereaved and the wail of the doomed stir the souls of the great leaders to open every avenue of rescue to the captive children of Israel. May they realize that the world will know no peace until all who are enslaved are set free, until all who are homeless are given refuge and until all who are downtrodden are restored to human dignity, and iniquity has vanished from the face of the earth.

O Lord God, strengthen the sense of justice in the hearts of those who are charged with the fashioning of a new world, that they may reaffirm the pledge of the restoration of Zion made to the people of Israel by the nations of the world, that they may see and espouse our right to establish a Jewish Commonwealth in a free and undivided land of Israel, whither our uprooted and homeless brethren may go unhindered and unafraid, to rebuild their lives and to restore their ancient heritage of faith, freedom and righteousness.

In the name of the multitudes who have died for the sanctification of Thy Name, whose graves are not marked and whose ashes not gathered, we implore Thy grace upon the great spokesmen of freedom. Gird them with fortitude and steadfastness to achieve the deliverance of humanity and Israel and to enhance the establishment of Thy kingdom on earth. Praised art Thou, O God, Who hearest our prayers. Amen.

# COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS EAST CENTRAL STATES REGION

NATIONAL OFFICERS Sidney Hollander, Baltimore President

William Shroder, Cincinnati Chairman of the Board

REGIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Julian Krolik, Detroit President

Bernard Pepinsky, Cincinnati Walton Strauss, Erie Vice-Presidents

Herman Handmaker, Louisville Treasurer

William Avrunin
Secretary and Regional Director

M. W. Ades, Louisville Maurice Bernon, Cleveland Lawrence Brile, Tri-State Jewish Welfare Council Morris Berman, Butler Jerome Curtis, Cleveland Ben Dreyer, Canton Eugene Farber, Toledo Robert Goldman, Cincinnati S. D. Granek, St. Catharines Max Hirsch, Cincinnati Stanley Kann, Pittsburgh Sydney Kleeman, Charleston A. H. Kollenberg, Grand Rapids Simon Lazarus, Columbus John Merdler, Saginaw Henry Meyers, Detroit Charles Morris, Louisville Sam Mueller, Indianapolis J. I. Oelbaum, Toronto Sam Pollock, Hamilton David Rubin, Terre Haute H. Rosenthal, Windsor A. B. Saeks, Dayton Dr. N. Salon, Fort Wayne D. C. Schonthal, Huntington A. Srere, Detroit E. Teitelbaum, Johnstown M. Tucker, South Bend

Room 328 Chester-Twelfth Building CLEVELAND 14, OHIO MAin 5414

To the Members of the Board of Trustees of the Jewish Welfare Federation of Cleveland:

Dear Sirs:

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds is distributing to the Board Members of its constituent Federations and Welfare Funds, the enclosed statement describing the proposal for a National Advisory Budgeting service which is to be considered and acted upon at the National Assembly of the Council to be held in Detroit, Michigan early in February 1946.

The statement is sent to you for your study and consideration and will be followed by a further statement giving the advantages and objections as submitted at the Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Council when the proposal was adopted for submission to the Constitution.

It is hoped that the recipients of this statement will give it careful study in anticipation of its consideration by your Federation.

Very truly yours,

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

December 20, 1945

# Important Letters in a VITAL AMERICAN JEWISH ISSUE

Interchange of Correspondence on

### NATIONAL BUDGETING

between

EZRA SHAPIRO

Chairman, Committee to Oppose National Budgeting

and

SIDNEY HOLLANDER

President, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds

#### COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE NATIONAL BUDGETING

44 East 43rd Street New York 17, N. Y.

The Committee to Oppose National Budgeting was formed by leaders of Federations and Welfare Funds throughout the country to organize the overwhelming opposition of American Jewry to a program which would give centralized authority to a single group to determine the future of all causes, national and international, appealing for American Jewish support.

#### COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE NATIONAL BUDGETING

44 East 43rd Street, New York 17, N. Y.

September 21, 1945

Mr. Sidney Hollander Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds 165 West 46th Street New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HOLLANDER:

A group of community leaders, associated with the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds, and deeply interested in the causes which appeal for the support of American Jewry, have formed a Committee to Oppose National Budgeting. This Committee was organized in response to the action taken by the Board of Directors of the Council at its June meeting which called for a referendum on the establishment of a national budgeting service. This Committee feels that this problem projected the most serious issue that has confronted member agencies of the Council since that body was formed. We believe that it is essential that there be a thorough discussion of the implications of this proposal. Only with a clear understanding of the basic reasons for and against national budgeting can the exchange of views among the member agencies be educational in character and be representative of community thinking.

Since the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Council in Detroit in June, the Executive Committee of the Council decided to abandon the referendum and to leave the issue to the General Assembly of the Council. We strongly urge you, as President of the Council, and your fellow workers to modify the decision of the Executive Committee so that the intention of the Board of Directors may be realized. We feel that vast social changes and an extraordinary transformation of American Jewry are implicit in the proposal for national budgeting. We are sure that neither the proponents nor opponents of national budgeting wish to see a decision of such momentous character made by default or by a casual vote of a delegate. This can be avoided if the member agencies of the Council are called upon, between now and the General Assembly, to engage in the widest possible discussion and to allow for a decision which should reflect the views of the community. Only in this manner can the community decide on the merits of an issue so vital to all Jewish interests. The Council, whatever the decision may be, will be able to rest its program on a more solid foundation, having the assurance that the community has spoken.

The methods by which delegates to the General Assembly are frequently chosen, the vagueness of the voting rules that apply at the General Assembly and the limited time available for thoroughgoing discussion all point to the value of a community decision and an instructed delegation.

The Council of Federations and Welfare Funds has not, up to this time, attempted to set itself up as a super-body, but only as an instrument of the member agencies which compose it. Under these circumstances, it would seem of prime importance that the officers of the Council insure the widest possible discussion and the broadest possible referendum, so that they can be secure in the knowledge that the decision reflects the will of the communities.

The Committee to Oppose National Budgeting would be happy to cooperate with the Council in setting up of procedures with respect to the manner in which the referendum might be expeditiously conducted in a representative manner. No issue that has confronted the fund-raising instrumentalities of American Jewry is so vital for the future of American and world Israel as the attempt to introduce national budgeting. We are sure, therefore, that you and the other officers of the Council will want to guarantee that the determination of this issue will rest on the democratic and representative processes in the American Jewish community.

I would appreciate hearing from you in this matter at your very earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA SHAPIRO, Chairman.

#### COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS, INC.

165 West 46th Street, New York, N. Y.

October 5, 1945

Mr. Ezra Shapiro '
Committee to Oppose National Budgeting
44 East 43rd Street
New York 17, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SHAPIRO:

Your letter of September 21st was presented to the Council's Executive Committee, as requested.

I cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, see how you can characterize anything as simple as the proposal for advisory budgeting into something involving "vast social changes and extraordinary transformation of American Jewry." As I see it, it's merely a helpful device through which national and overseas agencies appealing for funds and the communities supplying those funds review together programs and requirements, and reach a figure which they can jointly sponsor. Such a procedure, it seems to me, should prove helpful both to the agencies and the communities. Why you're trying to make it something sinister or Machiavellian I can't figure out.

After the 1942 referendum it was agreed by the Council's Committee on the Referendum and the "Opposition" group that if, after a three-year testing period, the matter should again be brought up, the Board of the Council would ask for approval from its General Assembly before putting the complete service into effect. With that in mind, the subject was discussed at the Assembly last year, and the Council's Board instructed to bring back a recommendation to the 1946 Assembly. At our Board meeting last June, the matter was discussed at length, as a result of which a national advisory service was again recommended. In view of the 1942 agreement, the Board desired to bring this recommendation before the next Assembly, but in view of travel restrictions there was some doubt as to whether such an Assembly could be held. As a substitute expedient, it was decided to have a mail referendum to give every member agency an opportunity to express its views. Later, when the lifting of restrictions made the Assembly possible, there was no reason to deviate from the original agreement.

To help the member agencies know the arguments—pro and con—the Council will be sending material presenting both the affirmative and negative arguments well in advance of the Assembly. This will give the members time to consider the problem in all its aspects before reaching decisions. You suggest that your Committee would like to cooperate with the Council. I wish you had adopted that attitude earlier. Perhaps if you had taken the time and effort to review the proposal more thoroughly in advance, you might not now be committed to opposition. Since, however, you are so committed, and are restricting yourselves to the presentation of only one side, I frankly don't see how cooperation between us would be helpful.

The voting rules of the Assembly are clear and explicit. They were so formulated as to give due weight to every community, large and small, with preponderance to none. As to the selection of delegates, that is up to the member agencies themselves. I think it can reasonably be assumed that those whom they select will properly represent them.

The Council sees national budgeting as a partnership between national and overseas agencies and the communities; your group opposes such a partnership, taking the position that agencies can permit no preview of their budgets, and must continue their present *ex parte* procedure. This, I believe, communities are no longer willing to accept.

That most of the agencies serving the Jewish community are entitled to support there is no question. The partnership the Council proposes will, in our opinion, do more than anything else to insure that support. There is nothing in it to threaten the integrity, the autonomy, or the program of any agency; and I am confident that, within a few years, you of the opposition will be among the first to admit that your doubts and fears were groundless.

Cordially yours,

Sidney Hollander,
President.

#### COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE NATIONAL BUDGETING

44 East 43rd Street, New York 17, N.Y.

October 10, 1945

Mr. Sidney Hollander Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds 165 West 46th Street New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HOLLANDER:

It is a source of regret to learn, from your letter of October 5th, that the Council has declined to permit a referendum among its member agencies on the vital subject of national budgeting, but prefers to leave the decision to the haphazard voting processes of the General Assembly. The only conclusion that can be derived is that the Council is fearful of an expression, in advance of the Assembly, of opinion by the Jewish communities of America in whose hands should rest the decision whether so grave a change in the direction and control of American and world Jewish life should be undertaken.

It is a source of further regret that the Council, which has consistently declared that it is merely an instrument doing the will of its member agencies, now stands revealed as determined to impose its preconceived notions on the American Jewish community. It had previously been stated that the Council of Federations would be neutral in presenting the issue of national budgeting. It is now clear that the top officers of the Council have no such intention, but will use all the powers which come with their position to force their conception of national budgeting on member agencies. It is perfectly proper for every Welfare Fund leader to express his views. In fact, our opposition to national budgeting is based on the conviction that such a plan will paralyze and not further the expression of such views. But in the case of the Council it is well that its member agencies should see now that it has abandoned the cloak of objectivity and impartiality. The distribution of a single statement interpreting the reasons for opposition to "national budgeting," as the Council plans to do, is no indication of neutrality. In view of your own outspoken statements, as President of the Council, it seems merely a technique for maintaining the mirage of neutrality. Obviously, the Council officers believe in national budgeting. They are going to press those views. They thus confirm the anxieties of those opposed to national budgeting, who fear that the views and programs of one group of people may be forced on the whole of American Jewry.

That the Committee to Oppose National Budgeting does not misread the real intentions of officers of the Council in pressing for the establishment of a National Budgeting Advisory Committee is clearly indicated in the revealing report issued in September, 1940 by Mr. Jacob Blaustein, Chairman of the Council's Budget Research Committee. He then said: "It might be advisable to agree at the outset that the national budgeting process is to be wholly of an advisory character and that there will be no immediate transfer of responsibility to the national budget committee of the prerogatives of national and overseas agencies or the authority of local welfare funds." Any fair reading of this disclosure of the ultimate intentions of the sponsors of national budgeting can only deepen apprehension of the consequences.

The fact that you do not even admit the possibility of sincere opposition to national budgeting is another token of the arbitrariness that may be expected from such sponsorship of a national budgeting procedure.

It is the view of the Committee to Oppose National Budgeting that it is the Jewish communities which should decide the issue. You have undertaken to preempt their decision. We still believe that democratic procedure and the very nature of the structure of the Council—if it is to be a useful instrument of service to the American Jewish community—require that every member agency, by discussion and decision locally, should register its views formally whether it wants to entrust extraordinary powers over the Jewish future to a handful of men.

Sincerely yours,

Ezra Shapiro, Chairman. News

# AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE 386 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 16 • MU 5-0181

JOSEPH M. PROSKAUER, President
JACOB BLAUSTEIN, Chairman, Executive Committee

DAVID SHER, Chairman, Administrative Committee JOHN SLAWSON, Executive Vice President

Washington Office --Marcus Cohn
1420 New York Avenue, N.W.
DIstrict 6229

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Washington, November 23 .--

The establishment of the Joint Anglo-American Commission to inquire into the question of Palestine and the situation of the Jews in Europe should in no way preclude or delay the granting of President Truman's request for the admission of 100,000 displaced European Jews into Palestine, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes was told by Jacob Blaustein, chairman of the executive committee of the American Jewish Committee, and John Slawson, its executive vice-president, who conferred with him today on behalf of that organization of which former Supreme Court Justice Joseph M. Proskauer is president.

Pointing out that the President's request has the full support of all Jewish groups, and of American's of all faiths, the Committee representatives declared, in a memorandum submitted to the Secretary of State, that the proposal of the British Government to admit 1,500 Jews per month is "wholly inadequate" and urged the United States Government to continue to press for the adoption of President Truman's recommendation which they termed "a compelling necessity for the saving of human lives."

The American Jewish Committee further urged recognition of the Balfour Declaration and the terms of the Mandate for Palestine entrusted to Great Britain by fifty nations and approved by the United States.

"Hundreds of thousands of Jews immigrated into Palestine, and substantial investments were made, because of faith in the pledges of the Mandate," the memorandum stated.

Declaring that there is no irreconcilable conflict between the interests of the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine and that the entire Near East will benefit from the existence in that country of a thriving economy and democratic self-government, the Committee stated that "with good will on both sides and a firm attitude on the part of the United Nations, harmony can prevail."

The American Jewish Committee further expressed its approval of that section of the terms of reference of the Joint Commission providing for examination of the situation of the Jews in those European countries, where they have been the victims of Nazi and fascist persecution, and of the measures taken to eliminate discrimination and oppression in those countries. "This is in the spirit of the United Nations Charter, which seeks to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language or religion," the Committee said, and urged "that the Joint Commission devise effective procedures to eliminate discrimination against Jews."

In commenting on the active participation of the United States in attempts to alleviate Jewish needs, the American Jewish Committee stressed that "the United States should share fully in the responsibility of providing immigration opportunities for European Jews."

(The full text of the American Jewish Committee's memorandum to Secretary of State Byrnes is attached to this release.)

The establishment by the United States and Great Britain of a Joint Commission to consider the Palestine question and the situation of the Jews in Europe should in no way preclude or delay the granting of President Truman's request for the admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine.

The President has the full support of all Jewish groups, whatever their views on Zionism, and of Americans of all faiths, in his conviction that "no other single matter is so important for those who have known the horrors of concentration camps for over a decade as is the future of immigration possibilities into Palestine." A harsh winter is upon the displaced Jews of Europe, scattered throughout Austria, Germany, Italy and other countries. Immediate admission to Palestine is a compelling necessity if their lives are to be saved, and as such it transcends all other considerations. The proposed rate of Jewish immigration into Palestine, 1,500 a month, is wholly inadequate. The American Jewish Committee notes with satisfaction the President's statement that he continues to adhere to the views expressed in his letter of August 31 to Prime Minister Attlee, asking for 100,000 certificates for the immigration of Jews into Palestine.

The American Jewish Committee also urges the recognition of the Balfour Declaration and the terms of the Mandate for Palestine, entrusted to Great Britain by more than fifty nations and approved by the United States. Hundreds of thousands of Jews immigrated into Palestine, and substantial investments were made, because of faith in the pledges of the Mandate. The devotion and labor of the Jewish settlers have produced in a remarkably short time a flourishing industry and agriculture, and impressive gains have been achieved for the entire population of Palestine in living standards, health and possibilities for future growth.

There is no irreconcilable conflict between the interests of the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine, since the true interest of both lies in a prosperous democracy. The entire Near East cannot fail to benefit from the existence in Palestine of a thriving economy, and harmony between Arabs and Jews. With good will on both sides and a firm attitude on the part of the United Nations; harmony can prevail.

We commend the directive to the Commission to examine the situation of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution, and the practical measures taken or contemplated to be taken in those countries to enable them to live free from discrimination and oppression. This is in the spirit of the United Nations Charter, which seeks to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language or religion. If European democracy is to be maintained and advanced, if Nazism and all its evils are to be swept away, and if we are to have true peace and amity among all the peoples of the world, there can be no place for anti-Semitism. We urge that the Joint Commission devise effective procedures to eliminate discrimination against Jews.

We endorse the instructions of the United States and British Governments to the Joint Commission to consider the possibilities of immigration to and settlement in countries outside Europe. The United States should share fully in the responsibility of providing immigration opportunities for European Jews.

It is satisfying to learn that the United States proposes to participate actively in the settlement of this urgent humanitarian problem. It is right that our country, with its strength and with its dedication to democracy and justice, should share in rebuilding what the enemies of mankind have sought to destroy, in healing the wounds of their victims and in laying a firm foundation for a future of peace and justice.



FROM: Jacob Blaustein, Chairman

TO: Members of the Budget Research Committee

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the work of our Committee on the question of national budgeting which has been done in the last several months. Developments to the end of October 1944 were described in the report submitted to the Board of Directors of the Council on October 28th, a copy of which was sent you.

Our major activities have been as follows:

- 1. An all-day meeting of the members of the Budget Research

  Committee who could be present with official representatives of large city

  welfare funds and a few nearby cities of intermediate size was held

  December 9, 1944, in New York. Fourteen cities were represented. (A summary of the discussions at the meeting is attached.)
- 2. In order to determine the views and attitudes of a sample of the national and overseas agencies, informal conversations have been held with representatives of the ORT, HIAS, American Friends of Hebrew University and American Fund for Palestinian Institutions; discussions have also been had with the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal.
- 3. A meeting of representatives of our Committee with representatives of the United Palestine Appeal on October 5, 1944, was followed by explorations and discussions of the question between Rabbi James G.

  Heller, National Chairman of the UPA, and myself. As a result of these conversations, we agreed personally, without binding our respective groups on certain recommendations which each of us was prepared to submit to his respective organization. However, these recommendations have been rejected by formal action taken on the subject by the UPA Adminis-

trative Committee on December 28, 1944. (See attached copies of letter from Jacob Blaustein to Rabbi Heller, December 28; letter from Rabbi Heller with attached UPA resolution, December 29; and letter from Rabbi Heller, January 2, 1945).

#### Summary of Findings

The gist of our conversations with the national and overseas agencies and with the representative welfare fund leaders may be summarized as follows:

- 1. There is general agreement both among the agencies and the welfare funds that the Council's budget research studies are objective and valuable and essential tools for local budgeting responsibilities.

  They should be extended and can be further improved.
- 2. There is also general agreement that definite recommendations from the Council are urgently needed on the new appeals whether by established agencies or new organizations which appear to duplicate or overlap in part programs already in operation. Upon further consideration, however, it appears that a policy limited to these new appeals is not feasible. It would introduce invidious distinctions among agencies by setting up a "preferred" category. Moreover, it is technically impossible to judge the merits of new appeals without at the same time exploring and passing judgment on the efficiency, adequacy and costs of related programs already in operation.
- 3. The main difference of opinion is on the proposal for budget review (after the budget has been prepared in the first instance by the particular national or overseas agency) which, after consultation with the agency, would recommend advisory only minimum budgets for the established agencies as well as for the new or duplicating appeals.

- A. The welfare fund leaders with whom the subject has been discussed are overwhelmingly in favor of such a national budgetary review covering both the old and new appeals.

  Welfare funds apparently recognize the inadequacy of the present method of unilateral action by the national and overseas agencies in establishing annual budgets. They would prefer an orderly method of review on a national basis by a committee representing the welfare funds, and the final determination of campaign goals and budgets, in cooperation with the agencies, through this process; and they at least want advice to be given to communities with respect to whatever budgets are established. It was indicated that they would continue to urge national budgeting even if some of the national or overseas agencies are in opposition.
- B. A number of the national and overseas agencies also favor, though with less conviction, national budgetary review, but the UPA is officially opposed to such a development. Several of the agencies consulted view the project favorably only if it is applied generally to large and small organizations alike; and it appears that some would not openly express support of the project if it is opposed by the UPA.

#### Possible Action by Budget Research Committee

In view of the above developments, the following appear to be alternatives which might be followed by the Budget Research Committee in the presentation to the Assembly:

- 1. To recommend that the Council's budgetary service be extended to include budget review and advice, thus reflecting the expressed views of the Council's member agencies.
- 2. To present a summary of the results of our investigation and study but without offering specific recommendations on national budgeting.

June 14, 1945

Mr. Jacob Blaustein American Building Baltimore, Maryland

Dear Mr. Blaustein:

This will acknowledge your letter dated June 8th.

Since you seem to be compiling a record may I disabuse you of your misapprehension, which you insist on repeating. that the United Palesdine Appeal did, at any time, vote in favor of national budgeting in the way in which you seem to understand it. The United Palestine Appeal took an affirmative constructive position with regard to the expansion of the services of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfere Funds do that the Jaws of America might be more intelligently informed on the causes to which they contribute funds. The United Palestine Appeal drew up a detailed statement of procedures that could be followed out whereby the Council of Federations, in cooperation with the national agencies, could enormously expand its usefulness to its member agencies. No effort has been made to discuss these proposals with a view to reconciliation of viewpoints. Your own definition of national budgeting has varied from time to time. On December 29th, 1944, Dr. James Heller wrote to you to advise of the action taken on December 28th by the Administrative Committee of the UPA expressing its dissent against the type of national budgeting which you wish to introduce and affirming its positive interest in an extension of budgetary services which, in its opinion, satisfied all the requirements of the member agencies of the Council.

On January 2nd, Dr. Heller wrote to you again suggesting that the Board of Directors of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds discuss the memorandum submitted by the UPA.

On January 16th. 1945. Dr. Heller wrote to you again saying that "the members of the UPA would be very happy to meet with your associates and yourself" in order to discuss the questions that have been raised. It is a source of regret that you have not found it possible because of many other obligations that face you to arrange for such a meeting. It

Mr. Jacob Blaustein

100 THE

June 14, 1945

would seem that discussions at meetings of the Board of Directors of the Council of Federations do not have the benefit of prior consultation on specific programs with the national agencies whose support you wish and which are most anxious to cooperate with the Council of Federations in an attempt to provide the type of service that can be of constructive value to the communities.

I should like to refresh your recollection of the meeting which you and your associates of the Council were kind enough to attend on October 5, 1944, at the UPA office in New York City.

At that meeting Dr. Heller said "that the UPA has reached no definite conclusions on the subject. It has appointed a committee to study the problem and bring in recommendations. He would be glad to hear the views of the Council representatives."

Mr. Rosenbloom expressed hisself comprehensively on the subject of national budgeting at that time. He spoke of the wide experience he had had in his own community of Pittsburgh, in the Community Chest and in Jewish bodies.

Dr. Heller stated at that time that he did not think that the "question of national budgeting" was as simple as it seemed. "National budgeting was not one problem but a host of problems, of inter-related nature." He was of the opinion that there were certain types of advice which communities needed and which could well be provided, without resort to a national budgeting scheme. He had in mind the question of duplication of function. He did not think that the Council was exercising the authority with which Welfare Funds had already vested it. He felt it essential for the Council to distinguish between questions of mere duplication and questions having to do with aims and purposes. There are still deep differences of opinion in the Jewish community as to the methods to be employed in dealing with the long-range Jewish problem, he said.

Dr. Bosenbluth felt that idealogies do play a role in the American Jewish community. He did not think there are any neutrals in Jewish life. Only those who are indifferent are impartial and such people have nothing to add to Jewish causes. He could not help remarking, he said, after some years of observing the American Jewish scene, that many American Jews like to do their thinking by proxy — when it comes to Jewish matters. Jewish business men and professionals, who are exceedingly competent in their own affairs and would never permit anyone to do their thinking for them in the fields in which they have achieved success, think it quite proper to base their Jewish thinking on findings given to them by others.

Dr. Heller, again discussing the subject, said that he would like to observe frankly that some of the anxiety regarding national budgeting arises out of the nature of the Council. He felt it could very well stand democratization. Its leadership did not represent a cross-section of the American Jewish community. It was, he said, overweighted with one section of opinion and it is the general concensus that it is a self-perpetuating body.

Mr. Jacob Blaustein

-23-

June 14, 1945

At the same meeting Dr. Hexter "felt that the UPA had made a number of very helpful suggestions." He felt that some of the fears that had been expressed were justified. As the "Council officers knew" he shared some of them. The discussion as a whole, he believed, should be further explored by the Council.

Mr. Lurie asked whether the UPA would send the Council the informal suggestions that Dr. Heller had made with respect to proper budgeting procedures.

Subsequently such proposals were sent. They were never discussed by you or by other Council officers with the United Palestine Appeal.

I have gone very thoroughly into the records of the UPA in order to determine why you state in your letter of June 8th, 1945 that "On October 5, 1944, some of my Budget Research Committee associates and I met at the UPA offices with Rabbi Heller, you and others of your group. In the course of the discussion, it was divulged that UPA had appointed a subcommittee to study the question of national budgeting and had reported in favor of it. Some of the contents of the report were also given us, — and you made the point that the UPA Administrative Committee had not passed on the subcommittee report."

At the meeting on October 5th to which you refer it was Dr. Heller who, in response to one of your earlier observations said that "the UPA has reached no definite conclusions on the subject. It had appointed a committee to study the problem and bring in recommendations."

The subcommittee appointed by the UPA consisted of Harold J. Goldenberg. Louis Lipsky and Rudolf G. Sonneborn. It was the recommendations of these men which finally resulted in the statement adopted by the UPA. It is apparently your contention that the UPA, by favoring a maximum of accurate and comprehensive information on agencies obtaining funds from the Jewish communities of America, is in favor of national budgeting. I reaffirm that the UPA has an affirmative approach to the question of more comprehensive fact gathering. It continues to be opposed to what you describe as national budgeting. Possibly we have the same thing in mind. It is regrettable that it has not been possible for you to accept the several invitations extended by Br. Heller to meet with representatives of the UPA in order to review our points of view.

Cordially yours,

Henry Montor Executive Vice-Chairman

HM: HH

## INDEPENDENT JEWISH PRESS SERVICE, Inc.

Woutherg-207 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

IA

Release: Friday, February 23, 1945

#### UNITED JEWISH APPEAL DISSOLVED

The United Jewish Appeal has been dissolved. The Joint Distribution Committee and United Palestine Appeal will conduct separate campaigns. That does not mean that each will go to the communities with separate fund-raising efforts, but they will make separate applications to the Welfare Funds which exist in the communities. The Welfare Funds will, as in the past, conduct campaigns on behalf of the various causes appealing to American Jewish generosity. But instead of the money being divided through one central source at national headquarters, each community will be given an opportunity to examine the respective merits of the causes and make allocations on the basis of local judgments. It should be an interesting and even helpful process in education as to the broad purposes for which American Jewry is contributing tens of millions of dollars.

Basically the United Jewish Appeal was dissolved because the Joint Distribution Committee failed to concede the equality of importance of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. The Joint Distribution Committee for a period of three months of negotiations insisted that the only basis for relationship to the United Palestine Appeal was that of 60-40. Considering the fact that Palestine, during twelve years of Hitlerism, gave refuge to over 300,000 Jews and saved as many Jewish lives as virtually the rest of the world combined, it is difficult to understand that there could be in this country a leadership which, out of reasons of prestige or sincere belief, cannot understand the primacy of Palestine even in the lowest relief terms of pure life-saving, not to speak of the broader aspects of the Zionist program.

American Jews should, in 1945, make it possible for the United Palestine Appeal and Joint Distribution Committee to do more effective work than ever before. Whatever standards of generosity have been established before, they should be impressively surpassed in this crucial year, when Jews in Europe must be assisted and when, for these very same Jews of Europe, a permanent, free future must be assured to them by strengthening and enlarging Palestine's capacity to receive them. The fact that the two organizations are not conducted ing a common fund-raising effort should not in the slightest deter any community from doing its maximum on behalf of both.

It is necessary to add, however, that the Joint Distribution Committee did not act in complete good faith with the American Jewish community in its first announcement that it was conducting a separate campaign. Its statement said that it had accepted a proposal submitted by a "mediation committee" appointed at Cincinnati by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare (Continued on Page 2)

Funds while the United Palestine Appeal had not. The statement issued by Rabbi James G. Heller, National Chairman of the United Palestine Appeal, which followed that of the J.D.C., was couched on the highest possible level. It stressed the needs of both the U.P.A. and J.D.C. But it declared that "no useful purpose could be served by discussing the reasons for the dissolution." One can understand the desire of a spiritual leader to go out of his way to avoid an acrimonious interchange.

But fairness to the United Palestine Appeal requires that the record be kept straight. The U.P.A. took the position that Palestine's great role in Jewish life requires the recognition of its equality in importance with the relief needs. Both serve the same Jewish people. But when the differences between the U.P.A. and J.D.C. proved irreconcilable by direct negotiation, the U.P.A. offered to submit its case to the three neutral members of the 1944 Allotment Committee of the United Jewish Appeal. All three had been selected by common agreement of the U.P.A. and J.D.C. All three are. in fact, members of one or another of the official bodies of the Joint Distribution Committee. But Mr. Levy informed the U.P.A .: "You propose that our differences be submitted to the community representatives of the Allotment Committee. There are various reasons why we are unable to accept this proposal. We cannot delegate to others the responsibility that we owe to the work entrusted to us. No one who has not had to do with the day to day emergencies that have confronted the J.D.C. can possibly be put in a position to evaluate our needs and our obligations. In the negotiation of the agreement we must assume full responsibility."

Very clearly then the J.D.C. was the agency which consistently refused to submit its case to mutually selected outsiders.

We understand, furthermore, that the U.P.A. urged that all the funds of a 1945 U.J.A. be entrusted to an Allotment Committee, giving that body full power to determine on the distribution. This, in effect, was the most decisive form of arbitration that any agency could submit to. But this the J.D.C. rejected forthwith, even though, it is reported, a committee of the Council of Federations thought the idea an excellent one.

At Cincinnati, when the Board of Directors of the Council of Federations met, the U.P.A. again submitted this proposal. It was rejected. There was no "mediation committee" appointed at Cincinnati. Three men were named by the President, on his own initiative in the effort to avoid a break. These men were Irvin Bettman, St. Louis; William Shroder, Cincinnati, and Daniel Shiman, Newark. The first two are members of the Board of Directors of the Joint Distribution Committee. Several proposals were made by this committee which were rejected by the J.D.C. Finally one suggestion was made which the J.D.C. found eminently satisfactory: because it reiterated the 60-40 position to which the J.D.C. had rigidly adhered from the beginning. Inevitably the U.P.A. rejected this. Therefore, for the J.D.C. now to put itself in the role of an injured innocent is putting too much strain on the gullibility of Jews familiar with all the facts.

The Joint Distribution Committee is supposed to be a body which is non-political and non-partisan in character. Its tendency to assume the role of an agency (Continued on Page 3A)

disputing the extraordinary place which Palestine has had and will have in the solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness will not contribute to constructive determinations of Jewish needs.

The United Palestine Appeal and Joint Distribution Committee will campaign independently. Good luck to both of them. They carry within them the instruments for ameliorating and solving the plight of the Jews. But one of them ought not to becloud the issue with irrelevant inferences which have no basis in fact.



1945

# BUDGETING BULLETIN

For Member Agencies

No. B-1

March 2, 1945

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL. 1939-44 AND SUMMARY OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR 1945

#### Historical

The UJA as it was known in 1939-44 was the joint fund raising instrument in the United States of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the major Jewish overseas relief and rescue organization: the United Palestine Appeal. established in 1936 as the joint fund raising arm in the U.S. of the two major Palestinian funds -- the Jewish National Fund concerned with the purchase of and the preparation for cultivation of land, and the Palestine Foundation Fund, the fiscal instrument of the Jewish Agency for Palestine; and the National Refugee Service, established in 1939 as a central agency for the reception and resettlement of refugees in the U.S. In the period 1936-38 the JDC and the UPA were campaigning independently. However, in 1937 and again in 1938, an agreement was reached between the two agencies whereby they recommended to welfare funds affiliated with the CJFWF that the total sum raised by the welfare fund for both agencies be allocated on the basis of 60 percent for JDC and 40 percent for UPA. Prior to 1936 the JDC and the two constituents of the UPA conducted independent campaigns, except in 1930 and again in 1934 and 1935 when the JDC and the Palestine Foundation Fund (Keren Hayesod) were campaigning jointly.

The UJA was not constituted as a permanent agency. It was brought into existence by annual agreements applying to the campaign for a single calendar year, negotiated for 1939-42 between the JDC and the UPA and in 1943-44 by the three parties including the NRS. Despite this fact the UJA maintained a continuous existence as a device for joint campaigning and for the allocation of the net proceeds among its constituents, except for a few months early in 1941 when failure to reach an agreement resulted in the initiation of independent campaigns. The 1941 agreement was finally signed in May, although independent drives were discontinued two months earlier; the agreement was made retroactive to the beginning of the year, so that the proceeds and expenses of the independent efforts were merged in the UJA pool.

COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS NATIONAL OFFICE: 165 WEST 46th STREET . NEW YORK 19, N. Y. In the period 1939-44 the UJA collected a total of approximately \$93,184,000. This figure, as of December 31, 1944, is incomplete by perhaps as much as \$8,500,000 because large receipts are still expected on account of the 1944 campaign and smaller amounts for campaigns of 1943 and previous years. The expenses of the UJA for the six-year period totaled about \$3,044,000. This figure does not include the campaign expenses of the welfare funds and the local joint appeal, or the expenses of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York; these supplied, of course, the great bulk of the UJA collections. The net proceeds of the UJA campaigns amounting to some \$90,140,000 were distributed among the UJA beneficiaries and furnished virtually the entire operating resources of the JDC and the NRS. The UPA received in addition appreciable amounts from the "traditional collections" of the Jewish National Fund.

#### The UJA Agreement

While the annual UJA agreements varied from year to year on important points particularly as to the distribution of the "initial amount" received in the campaign, a general pattern was maintained over the period, the agreements provided that the beneficiaries were not to engage in independent fund raising in the U.S. However, legacies and bequests made to the constituents were retained by them. Furthermore, the Jewish National Fund was permitted to continue its "traditional collections" provided that no grants were received from welfare funds and that campaigning was conducted in such a manner as not to interfere with the UJA. In the 1944 agreement additional clauses were inserted to limit the JNF to a gross total of \$1,100,000, the excess reverting to the UJA, with the JDC receiving a countervailing sum of \$600,000. A mediation committee was provided to deal with complaints as to conflicts between JNF and UJA fund raising.

The agreements further provided for a specific distribution among the beneficiaries of the initial funds realized from the campaign. The definite formula incorporated in the agreement, arrived at by a process of negotiation and compromise, permitted the beneficiaries to undertake commitments for a major portion of the year with the assurance that the necessary funds would be available. While the total so distributed was in every year set at something less than half of the UJA goal, it did in fact amount to appreciably more than half of the proceeds actually realized. As may be seen from the attached table, the initial amount distributed by negotiation of the agencies accounted for about two-thirds of the net proceeds in 1939, 1941 and 1942, for almost 90 percent in 1940 (due in part to the fact that the NRS was allotted \$1,000,000 from the UJA of Greater New York, in addition to \$2,500,000 from the national UJA), and for a little over one-half in 1943. While the results for the 1944 campaign are still incomplete, it is probable that the initial \$15,000,000 distributed under the agreement will account for about the same proportion of the total net proceeds as the figure shown in the table for 1943.

The distribution of net proceeds, in excess of the initial amount, among the three beneficiaries was left under the agreements to the sole discretion of a distribution or allotment committee. However, in 1939 and 1940 the authority of the committee with respect to NRS grants was limited and for 1942 the committee had no authority to make any grants to the NRS. The allotment committee structure for each year was specified in the agreement. It consisted of representatives of the JDC and the UPA (in 1943 and 1944 also one non-voting designee of the NRS) and three representatives (one in 1939) of local Jewish communities acceptable to the JDC and the UPA. Since the constituent agencies were represented on the allotment committees on the basis of numerical parity, the power of and responsibility for decision was actually vested in the "neutrals". In exercising their authority the allotment committees had access to all records reflecting past experience and current needs, but only in three of the six years was a separate budget provided to finance the relevant studies by the committee. The agreements did not call for any continuity in the neutral membership of the allotment committees from year to year. Such continuity existed only from 1942 through 1943.

#### Division of the UJA Funds, 1939-43

The results of the UJA campaigns for the first five of the six year period are now substantially complete, and have been presented in summary form in the attached table. Although the income of the UJA in 1940-42 was below the receipts for 1939, there seems to be little doubt that financially the UJA was a great success. In 1945, and much more so in 1944, receipts far exceeded the 1939 collections. For 1939 the JDC and UPA received from the UJA about \$11,930,000, which was almost 75 percent more than the amount realized for 1938, the best year of the three which followed the dissolution of the 1935 UJA. Undoubtedly, greater Jewish needs abroad, war prosperity in the U.S., tax legislation favorable to philanthropic giving, and similar factors had much to do with this success. But there is also little question that, quite apart from improved campaign techniques, the joining in a single appeal and agreement as to division of funds by the three most important Jewish programs which between them could count on a response in every element of the American Jewry, contributed greatly to communal unity and generous giving.

The division of the UJA proceeds among the constituents is of interest primarily as to the JDC and the UPA. The needs of these programs were practically unlimited, whereas for the NRS, funds had to be supplied for a clearly defined set of services in a program which was destined to undergo more or less rapid contraction.

As may be seen from the table the division of the funds was in the proportion of approximately two-thrids for the JDC and one-third for the UPA in 1939 and 1940, and about 63 percent for the JDC and 37 percent for the UPA in 1941 and 1942. This was the division of the initial amount specified in the agreements, which was also followed in the decisions of the allotment committees. Thus in 1939 the division of the initial amount between the JDC and the UPA was in the proportion of two-thirds and one-third and this was also the division of the additional amount by the distribution committee. In 1940 the JDC received 67.7 percent of the initial JDC-UPA total, and the distribution committee established the two to one ratio in the division of the additional sums. In 1941 the procedure was somewhat more involved. Of the initial amount the JDC share accounted for 62.9 percent. The allotment committee voted additional grants of \$1,275,000 to the JDC and \$800,000 to the UPA, and later ordered the distribution of all funds above \$11,750,000 in the proportion of 62.5 percent to JDC and 37.5 percent to UPA. In 1942 the JDC received 63.7 percent of the initial JDC-UPA total, and the allotment committee distributed all funds in excess of the initial \$9,100,000 in the ratio of 62 percent to JDC and 38 percent to UPA.

1943 was the first year in which the allotment committee action modified substantially the division established for the initial amount. By agreement the JDC received 63.7 percent of the initial JDC-UPA total; this proportion was exactly the same as provided for in the 1942 agreement. The allotment committee for 1943 first divided the sum of \$6,400,000 in the proportion of 55-45 between JDC and UPA and ordered that the next \$300,000 be paid to the Jewish Agency for Palestine through the UPA to cover part of its deficit. It was agreed, however, that this \$300,000 was to be considered as a special grant, not directly related to current expenditures. In a subsequent decision the allotment committee divided all funds above \$15,800,000 in the proportion of 60-40 between the JDC and UPA. The effect of the two actions was to allot to the JDC little more than 56 percent of the income realized in excess of the initial amount; such additional income was for the first time in 1943 quite large -- approximately 93 percent of the initial sum distributed by agreement. The net result of the 1943 division was about 59.7 percent for the JDC and 40.3 percent for the UPA.

Preliminary Memorandum of Agreement among the American Jewish Joint
Distribution Committee, United Palestine Appeal and National
Refugee Service

- 1. The National United Jewish Appeal campaign for 1945 is a continuance of the campaigns conducted since 1939 through the United Jewish Appeal, Inc., by which the United Palestine Appeal, Joint Distribution Committee and National Refugee Service raise funds for their needs.
- 2. The 1945 campaign of the UJA shall be deemed to have begun on January 1, 1945, and all income voted to, or income received by the three beneficiary agencies from allotments or contributions made by all Jewish communities in the United States since January 1, 1945 are to be considered income of the 1945 UJA. The parties to this agreement undertake to cooperate one with the other to accomplish this result.
- 3. The quota for the 1945 UJA shall be fixed by the Administrative Committee of the UJA constituted as hereinafter described.
- 4. After expenses of the National UJA have been deducted, the net funds received by the UJA and any of the organizations abovementioned as a result of the 1945 campaign are to be distributed, with exceptions as hereinafter indicated, as follows:

All funds, after expenses have been deducted, and except for the amount to be paid to the NRS, shall be divided on the basis of 57% to the JDC and 43% to the UPA. Toward its budget for 1945, the NRS shall receive on account the sum of \$875,000. In the event of need, the NRS shall have the right to apply for an additional amount to a committee of four, two of whom shall be named by the JDC and two by the UPA. In the event that this committee

reaches a conclusion not accepted by the NRS, this committee shall agree upon three additional impartial persons to make an adjudication not later than November 1, 1945.

- 5. (a) The Jewish National Fund traditional collections shall not be included in, or be considered a part of the UJA, except as hereinafter provided.

  Any income received by the JNF through allotments from welfare funds, or from the proceeds of joint campaigns conducted in communities where no welfare fund exists, is to be considered income for the UJA. "Traditional Collections" in excess of \$1,500,000 shall be disposed of as all other income of the UJA.
- (b) The earmarked contributions received by the JDC from landsmannschaften organizations for projects mutually agreed upon between the JDC and the landsmannschaften, shall not be considered part of the proceeds of the UJA. In the event, however, that the gross amount so received by the JDC as earmarked contributions from landsmannschaften for the calendar year 1945 should exceed \$800,000, then the amount of such excess shall be disposed of as is all other income of the UJA. The term landsmannschaft shall apply to bodies established for that purpose prior to 1945.
- (c) No fund-raising activities shall be conducted for "traditional collections" by the JNF or for solicitation of earmarked funds from lands-mannschaften by the JDC in a manner to prejudice the UJA fund-raising or collections or at times which would interfere with or prejudice UJA campaigns or campaigns conducted on behalf of UJA. Problems that might arise in this connection should be submitted for determination to a committee consisting of two members designated by the JDC and two members by the UPA.
- 6. The UJA shall constitute the unified fund-raising instrument of the JDC, UPA and NRS and none of the three organizations shall undertake separate campaigns in the United States during the year 1945, with the exceptions

noted in this agreement. In the event of an emergency arising/one or more of the three agencies, which cannot be financed out of its share of the proceeds of the UJA, that agency may with the consent of the other beneficiaries, undertake a supplementary appeal.

- 7. The two technical managing heads of the UJA, representing the JDC and the UPA respectively, shall have equal status in the direction of the activities of the UJA. It is understood that the two technical/heads will confer and agree on fundamental policies, conforming with the established policies of the three constituent organizations in the management of the UJA, subject only to the general direction of the Administrative Committee hereinafter named.
- 8. It is understood that the UJA, Inc. will take immediate steps for such amendment of its By-Laws and Resolutions as may be necessary for the purposes of this agreement, it being understood that no changes in the manner in which the membership of the Board of Directors of the UJA, Inc. or the Executive Committee or any other body of the UJA is selected shall be made. It is understood that nothing in this agreement involves any change in the present By-Laws and the corporate structure of the UJA, Inc.
- 9. This agreement among the JDC, the UPA and the NRS and the joint campaign which is the subject thereof, shall be deemed to have commenced on January 1, 1945. This agreement between the JDC and the UPA shall continue in all respects for the calendar year 1946, unless within sixty days of December 31, 1945, either party gives notice to the other of its inability to renew. The National Refugee Service shall also be included in such a 1946 UJA on the same terms as in 1945, save as to the initial amount which it is to receive

from the proceeds of the 1945 UJA. Such initial amount shall be fixed by agreement between the JDC, UPA and NRS. In the event of failure to agree, the services of three impartial outsiders, mutually agreeable to the JDC and UPA, shall be invited, as in the case of the 1945 agreement, to make adjudication. The determination of the amount to be received by the NRS for 1946 shall be made not later than November 30, 1945.

- 10. There shall be three national chairmen of the UJA, one to be designated by each party to the agreement.
- 11. All details for implementing and carrying out the foregoing agreement are to be in charge of an Administrative Committee, composed of eight to ten members or their alternates, selected equally by the JDC and UPA.
- 12. All other details pertinent to this agreement will be incorporated in the final text of the agreement, generally along the lines of the 1944 agreement except as inconsistent with the above.

For the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee

Joseph C. Hyman Executive Vice-Chairman

(1946 arrangements, subject to approval of Executive Committee of JDC)

For the United Palestine Appeal

Henry Montor

Executive Vice-Chairman

THE AMERICAN JEWISH JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE, INC. 270 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N.Y.

June 4th, 1945

United Palestine Appeal, Inc. 41 East 42nd Street New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen:

In connection with the preliminary memorandum of agreement constituting the 1945 UJA, it is understood and agreed by the UPA and JDC that two undetermined items of the agreement will be settled by mutually agreeable arbitrators if necessary. These two items are as follows:

- l. It is agreed in principle that expenses incurred by the JDC, UPA and NRS as a result of their separate campaigns shall be paid by the UJA. In the event of disagreement, however, as to specific items, these shall be submitted to arbitration.
- 2. With reference to the 1944 UJA Agreement which specified a ceiling of \$1,100,000 for the traditional collections of the JNF, above which all income was to accrue to the UJA, the question as to the sum due to the UJA in terms of the excess above such ceiling shall be submitted to arbitration. There is involved the question whether the campaign costs of JNF are to be included within the ceiling of \$1,100,000 in accordance with the terms of the 1944 Agreement. The decision of arbitration with respect to the 1944 Agreement, as applied to the meaning of the ceiling, shall also apply to the 1945 Agreement.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) J.C. Hyman

J.C. Hyman Executive Vice-Chairman

JCH:JO

#### Minutes of a meeting held March 26, 1945, 8:15 p.m., at Park School

President's Message Mr Shapiro presented a comprehensive analysis of the Council's significance and work, and devoted special emphasis to the two major developments in the past year which pointed the way to increased service for the entire Jewish community — the establishment of the Public Relations Department, and the Jewish Arts Festival as a forerunner of other cultural activities. (a copy of Mr Shapiro's message is enclosed.)

Membership Applications The Secretary reported that the Executive Committee had considered the applications of the Eddy Road Center Sisterhood and Jewish National Fund Council-Women's Division, and recommended their admission to the council. The recommendation was unanimously approved.

Cancer Campaign

Mrs S S Kates reported that the American Cancer Foundation

was conducting an educational and membership campaign in

Cleveland during the month of April and had turned to the Council for cooperation.

The Executive Committee had considered the matter and recommended that all member organizations of the Council be urged to participate in the drive by encouraging their members to take out individual memberships in the Cancer Foundation. Organizations were asked to secure kits and encourage membership affiliation.

United National Clothing Collection It was reported by Mr Barron that the Executive Committee had recommended that the Council, in association with the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, coordinate the effort of the Jewish community in support of the United National Clothing Collection which in Cleveland would be held during the period of April 22-30. This nationwide campaign under the chairmanship of Henry J Kaiser, was seeking 500 million pounds of usable clothing for the millions of war victims in liberated countries. The recommendation of the Executive Committee was unanimously approved, and it was suggested that appropriate announcements be made at synagogue services on the closing days of Passover.

Public Relations Committee Mr Irving Kane, second vice-chairman of the Public Relations Committee, briefly reported on the work of that Committee. He stated that progress during the early stages was understandably slow, and that much of the immediate work was devoted to the setting up of proper organization and administration. Of greatest importance was the engagement of professional staff, and several candidates already had been interviewed. It was planned that there would be two professional assistants to Mr Barron. Larger quarters were also being sought to accommodate the expanded staff and functions. Despite the preoccupation with the organizational aspect of setting up the new Department, the Public Relations Committee had given consideration to a number of matters. One special sub-committee had been examining several legislative matters, and the PRC was assisting in the efforts to secure passage of a State Fair Employment Practice Act. Another committee was looking into the matter of OPA violations in the meat and poultry fields. The Committee was watching carefully the developments regarding the Municipal Community Relations Board which it considers of great importance. It was hoped that the Mayor in appointing members of the Board would consult with the Public Relations Committee regarding Jewish representation. Mr Kane urged that anyone having complaints regarding discrimination or anti-Jewish activities should communicate with the office of the Jewish Community council.

Cultural Activities

Mrs Moses Halperin, reported as chairman of a sub-committee of the Intercultural Committee to consider the possibility of Jewish Cultural service to the member organizations of the Council. The report of this sub-committee had been presented to the Executive Committee where it was thoroughly discussed. As a result, the Executive Committee made the following recommendations to the delegate body of the Council.

It was the responsibility of the Council to help raise the level of Jewish cultural activities in the community. The fulfillment of this responsibility should become an integral part of the council program and should be under the direction of a standing committee appointed by the president on which should be represented persons and groups intimately interested in Jewish cultural activities. The Jewish Arts Festival should become an annual function sponsored by the Council.

One function which the Council should perform on the cultural field would be that of Program Service. This might include professional advice to program chairmen to aid them in planning cultural programming for their organizations; building up extensive files of program materials, speakers, talent, various topics of Jewish interest; in general to function as a central planning bureau where program chairmen could turn for help in planning and carrying out their cultural programs.

Another type of service would help remedy the present situation whereby the organizations have no advance information regarding each others' plans and as a result there is frequent overlapping and concentrations of subject matters, speakers, etc., while whole areas of Jewish interest are left untouched. To deal with this situation it might be helpful to establish central pooling of plans by the various organizations for lectures, concerts, institutes, and other cultural programs. Such advance planning, in addition to meeting some of the above problems might also provide for a more balanced total program for the Jewish community and reduce some of the undue competition.

The Council might also render a worthwhile service by aiding groups of organizations to pool their resources to bring out of town talent for a series of appearances and thus provide a better opportunity for making a fuller contribution to the local community. This would enable the participating organizations to share expenses, and it would also help make Cleveland an important Jewish cultural center.

Mrs Halperin stated that some consideration was also given by the sub-committee and the Executive Committee to the possibility of the Council itself sponsoring certain large mass cultural events. It was felt that this should be explored further by the proposed Cultural Committee.

Following Mrs Halperin's report, Mr Joseph Feder suggested that the matter be tabled until a conference of Yiddish cultural organizations would be held and would submit a memorandum for the consideration of the Council. He asserted that Mrs Halperin's report was not sufficiently comprehensive and that the committee submitting it had not been adequately representative. Mr Aaron Resnick commented that the purpose of a cultural service by the Council should not be to aid the organizations, but to provide a rounded Jewish cultural program for the entire community under the sponsorship of the Council. Dr Eisenberg urged that there be no delay in securing personnel to conduct this work so that some progress could be made before organizations plan their programs for the next year.

In reply to Mr Feder's suggestion, it was pointed out that it was unnecessary for the proposed plan to be deferred until a group of Yiddish cultural organizations would be convened since it was planned that the Cultural Committee when appointed would make a thorough study of the field and would consult with all interested groups before submitting a proposed program.

A motion was made, seconded and carried without dissent, to approve the recommendations of the Executive Committee as presented by Mrs Halperin.

JEWISH ARTS FESTIVAL Mr Shapiro warmly complimented Mr P L Steinberg for his outstanding leadership in serving as chairman of the Jewish Arts Festival Committee. As a new venture in the community, the Festival involved many problems calling for unusual devotion, skill, patience and ingenuity. Mr Steinberg was equal to all of the requirements, and guided the undertaking to a highly successful conclusion. Mr Shapiro then called upon Mr Steinberg for his report. Severance Hall had been completely sold out for the Festival, Mr Steinberg said, and only because of insistent demand was additional standing room sold. Of the 2,014 tickets sold, fully 2,000 were actually used on the night of the Festival. The Festival received excellent reviews in the daily press and there was much favorable comment about it in the community. A meeting of the Festival committee was held about two weeks afterward for the purpose of considering thoroughly all and all the facets of the venture. This meeting was well attended and there was full discussion of every phase of the entire operation. It was felt that this meeting had been most helpful and would be of considerable value in planning future events of this kind. Mr Steinberg paid particular tribute to the assistance of Cantor Saul Meisels, not merely in helping to plan and execute the Festival, but in the careful analysis which he gave at this meeting. He also expressed appreciation to the

other artists, the members of the Committee, the press, and the many persons in the community who helped make the Festival a success. In reporting on the financial side of the Festival, Mr Steinberg stated that there had been a net income of \$2,322, with an expenditure of a little less than \$1,500, leaving a balance of approximately \$850. The Festival Committee, following its detailed discussion of the entire event, recommended that the Council set up a permanent committee with the responsibility of planning and conducting such events in the future; that this committee function on a year-around basis: and that it be composed of the widest possible representation of persons interested in cultural activities.

Nations Security Conference in San Francisco

Jewish Representation at United Mr Barron reported that the American Jewish Conference had requested all its delegates to help develop public sentiment in their local communities in favor of official Jewish repre-

sentation at the San Francisco meeting of the United Nations so that the important issues confronting the Jewish people might be adequately presented. The Executive Committee of the Council recommended that the Council cooperate with the American Jewish Conference in such manner as appeared feasible in Cleveland. Upon motion made, and duly seconded, this recommendation was approved without dissent.

Nominating Committee Mr Phillip L Steinberg reported for the Nominating Committee which consisted of Mard Blaugrund, Edward Braverman, Mrs Moses Halperin, Leonard Labowitch, William Landy, and A E Persky. The slate proposed by the Committee had been sent out to the representatives of the council in accordance with the provisions of the constitution. Since no written nominations had been received in accordance with the constitutional procedure, the Secretary was asked to cast one ballot for the nominations. Following are the officers and members of the Executive Committee elected by the Council: Ezra Z Shapiro, President; Jerome N Curtis, First Vice-President; James H Miller, Second Vice-President; Mrs S S Kates, Third Vice-President; Julius Schweid, Treasurer; Harry I Barron, Secretary and Executive Director; Executive Committee: Moses Benjamin, Maurice Bernon, Louis S Bing Jr., Edward Braverman, Rabbi B R Brickner, Rabbi Armond E Cohen, Saul Danaceau, Paul Einstein, Robert Felixson, Mrs Abe Gitson, Benjamin Goldish, Mrs Albert J Goodman, Myron Guren, Philmore J Haber, Mrs Moses Halperin, David R Hertz, Irving Kane, Mrs Louis Kaufman, Rabbi Hugo Klein, Max I Kohrman, Ben I Levine, George Mayer, Gertrude Mazur, Alexander Mintz, A E Persky, George Pillersdorf, Rabbi Israel Porath, Aaron Resnick, Rabbi Rudolph Rosenthal, Mrs Lewis Sharp, Joseph H Silbert, Rabbi A H Silver, Max Simon, Phillip Steinberg, Abraham Stern, Henry Toll and Albert A Woldman.

#### Jewish Welfare Federation Allocations to UPA and JDC

Rabbi Jack Cohen stated that as a result of the recent dissolution of the United Jewish Appeal, the decision for the al-

location of funds to the United Palestine Appeal and the Joint Distribution Committee would have to be made by each community. Since this was a matter of vital concern to the Jewish community he felt that the Jouncil had an obligation to consider this matter and to inform the Jewish Welfare Federation of the sentiment in the community. He then read the following resolution: Whereas, the United Jewish Appeal has been dissolved, and whereas, it has become the duty of each community to determine the allocation of the funds previously given to the United Jewish Appeal, and whereas, this is an issue affecting the future destiny of the Jewish people, we do hereby resolve that the Jewish Community Council be called into special session to consider this problem, and we do also request the Jewish Welfare Federation to defer its action in the matter of the allocations between the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal until after this special meeting shall have been held and the community will have had an opportunity to express itself.

Rabbi Cohen moved the adoption of the resolution and after his motion was seconded the matter was opened for discussion.

Mr Louis S Bing Jr agreed that budgeting was of interest to members of the Jewish community and that on this particular issue it was understandable that many would like to express their views and influence the Federation's decision. He pointed out, however, that it was not practical to request the Federation to stop its machinery on this matter; that a number of meetings were scheduled to be held on the next two days to arrive at a decision on the entire budget in order that a

goal could be set for the Welfare Fund campaign beginning the first week of May. He admitted that the Federation should reflect the wishes of the community, and that the present situation in that regard was not good. He urged, however, that the Council not act in haste; that it not take such action that would lead to rebuff by the Federation. He counselled the need for reshaping the Federation machinery in a planful, constructive manner instead of proceeding on the basis of emotion in a manner which would lead merely to ill-will and strife.

Mr Aaron Resnick questioned whether in view of the immediacy of the situation the Council could take action at this meeting and express itself on the UPA-JDC allocation. The chairman pointed out that inasmuch as there had been no special advance notice to the delegates that this matter would be on the agenda, no action could be taken at this meeting.

Rabbi Armond Cohen asserted that no damage would be done if the Federation action on the allocation were deferred. The Federation should be grateful, he said, to get an expression of opinion from the Jewish community from whom it gets its funds and the Federation should be guided by the judgment of the community. Rabbi Cohen read a statement written by Rabbi Silver in which he declared that the Jewish Community Council should express itself on this matter and that the Council had the right to give the Jewish Welfare Federation's Budget Committee its advice and judgment.

It was the opinion of Rabbi Rosenthal that passage of the proposed resolution would antagonize some persons on the Federation Board and might jeopardize the possibility of perfecting more favorable allocation arrangements. The Council, he maintained, could adequately fulfill its function without asking the Federation to defer its action, since the matter could come before the Council for discussion in any event.

Mr Max Kohrman stated that these arguments were always presented whenever a vital issue arose on which there was disagreement. The Council should not be put in a position, he said, whereby it is always estopped from action on the basis that the particular time was not propitious. For those who oppose vigorous action by the council on controversial issues, the time never would be propitious. The council must speak out, he contended, whenever it was confronted with an issue of general concern to the Jewish community. The present issue, Mr Kohrman stated, involved not merely funds but ideology and point of view. As such it was imperative that the council determine the majority viewpoint and so inform the Federation for its guidance.

The viewpoint was expressed by Mr Alexander Mintz that the most democratic method for dealing with this matter would be to secure the views of the Welfare Fund contributors. He questioned whether the Gouncil could properly advise the Federation on this matter. Mrs Albert Goodman reminded the delegates that as head of the Hadassah in Cleveland she was eager to obtain the most favorable allocation for the United Palestine Appeal. At the same time, however, she was responsible for the work of a large number of women on the forthcoming Welfare Fund drive and she greatly feared the effect of the proposed resolution on the campaign.

Mr Suggs Garber stated that he personally advocated an allocation of parity for the JDC and UPA. He felt, however, that in view of the local developments it would be unwise for the council to ask the Federation to defer action pending a special meeting of the Council. He pointed out that if after the Federation has made its decision the special meeting of the Council reaches a different conclusion, the Council should then inform the Federation as to how the community reacts.

Rabbi Jack Cohen was asked whether he would consent to separating his original motion into two parts: one calling for a special meeting of the Council to consider the local allocation, and two to request that the Federation defer action on the allocation until the community would express itself through the Council meeting. Rabbi Cohen refused this request.

A substitute motion was then submitted and seconded calling for a special meeting of the Council to discuss the matter of allocation. This motion was carried by a vote of approximately 42 to 12. Rabbi Jack Cohen suggested that the special

meeting of the Council should be open to contributors to the Jewish Welfare Fund and to the general community since this was an issue which could not be decided by a few people. The chairman indicated that all meetings of the Council are open to the community, but that only official representatives to the Council may vote.

The original motion on Rabbi Cohen's resolution was then voted upon and carried by a vote of 44 to 30.

Inter-City Allotment Committee Mr Kohrman stated that it was his understanding that an effort was being made to set up a modified form of national budgeting whereby 15 of the largest Jewish communities in the country would attempt to set up standard allotment arrangements. He moved that the Jewish Welfare Federation be asked to defer participation on such a budgeting set-up until the matter could be discussed by the Council. Mr Shapiro, however, pointed out that the Jewish Welfare Federation had already appointed two representatives to this Inter-City Allotment Committee with the understanding that the Federation would not be bound by any decisions reached by that body. He suggested that in view of this action Mr Kohrman's motion be deferred. So carried.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry I Barron Secretary



# Summary of a Special Meeting held April 9, 1945, 8:15 P.M. at the Community Temple

Attendance 135 delegates were present, as well as a number of alternates and visitors.

Purpose

Mr Ezra Z Shapiro, chairman, explained that the meeting had been called in response to the action taken by the Council at its meeting on March 26, for the purpose of considering the needs of the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal so that the representatives of the Council's constitutent organizations could express themselves with respect to the allocations to be made by the Cleveland Jewish Welfare Federation to these two agencies. The chairman read the resolutions adopted at the March 26th meeting calling for this special meeting and requesting the Federation to defer action on its allocation to the JDC and the UPA until this meeting had been held.

The chairman also read the council's communications to Mr Joseph Berne. President of the Jewish Welfare Federation and to Mr Sidney Weitz, chairman of the Jewish Welfare Fund campaign, inviting them to be present at this special meeting and to participate in the discussion. Mr Shapiro then read a letter from the President of the Jewish Welfare Federation in which he stated that following a series of meetings of the Welfare Fund Sub-Budget Committee, the Welfare Fund Committee, the Central Budget Committee and the Board of the Jewish Welfare Federation, a formula had been adopted whereby 90% of the total funds raised for JDC and UPA would be divided on the basis of 60% to JDC and 40% to UPA, the remaining 10% of the funds to be divided on September 1, 1945, by a special committee on the basis of the then respective needs. Mr Berne declared further that while it had been made plain at each of these meetings by the Zionist leaders that this division was not satisfactory to them, it had also been contended by the JDC representatives that they felt a much higher percentage should go to the JDC this year. He explained that the formula arrived at was a compomise, and he expressed the hope that the members of the Council would understand that the judgment of the Federation Board was based only upon the desire to save as many Jewish lives as possible this year. He explained that the JDC secures almost all of its funds from the Welfare Funds of the country, whereas much money is collected from other sources for Palestine purposes. He expressed the hope that the Council would not take any action which would hurt the Welfare Fund campaign.

Mr Shapiro stated that the Council had invited the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal to send representatives to this special meeting to speak on the needs of their agencies. Mr Henry Montor, National Director of UPA, had been designated for this purpose. The JDC, however, informed the Council that it had been unable to secure a speaker and only after the chairman of the Council repeatedly urged it to have someone speak for it, did it call upon Judge Bernon a few hours before the meeting. The chairman then called upon Mr Montor.

Remarks by Mr Montor

There is no antithesis between Palestine and Europe, Mr

Montor said, nor is there any question of organizational
loyalties between the JDC and the UPA. Both agencies are instruments of American
Jewry and both serve vital needs. He stated that the Jews of liberated countries
in Europe lacked confidence in their future in Europe; many of them do not want to
return to their former homes and would prefer to go to Palestine. Not only must
we supply remedies for the physical survival of European Jewry, but we must also
supply solutions which have permanence. It is erroneous, he said, to think that
the funds raised for UPA are for the purpose of aiding the Jews of Palestine.
Palestinian Jewry not only is making its own way, but is contributing significant
sums itself to assist European Jewry. UPA funds help to bring Jews from Europe
into Palestine.

Mr Montor pointed out that hundreds of millions of dollars will be required to help the Jews of Europe, sums far beyond the capacity of the Jewish people to raise. These funds must be provided by governmental agencies and we must exert every influence to get these governmental agencies to meet their responsibility. It would be dangerous to leave the implication that the Jews will meet the needs of their people. It is impossible for us to meet these needs and, moreover, European

Jewry must not live on the philanthropy of other Jews. They must be helped by the governments as a matter of right. The governments of the world must be compelled to spend whatever is required to meet the basic needs. The Jews should provide secondary relief, for the reestablishment of Jewish communal life, immigration assistance, etc.

The needs of Palestine, Mr Montor declared, are actually the needs of the Jews of Europe who have come to Palestine. Thirty-five million dollars is needed for immigration, housing, colonization, and land purposes. He pointed out that 13,500 children have been brought to Palestine by Youth Aliyah. In Palestine all efforts are directed toward making the new immigrants self-sustaining. Mr Montor pointed out that there must be large scale Jewish emigration from Europe; that the whole world is closed to Jews; and that Jewish decimation in the past decade now makes it possible for Palestine to absorb virtually all remaining European Jewry.

With the dissolution of the United Jewish Appeal, the decision for distributing the funds to the constituent agencies now rests with each community. The UPA has suggested that the funds be divided evenly between the JDC and the UPA because: 1) this would recognize the equality of importance of each of the agencies; 2) it is impossible to arrive at scientific budgeting on these allocations since no amount that could be given would be enough and it requires, therefore, a rule of thumb approach — the variables and imponderables being too great to lend themselves to any refined or exact appraisal; and 3) parity would make for equilibrium and unity in the community, and would make clear that both causes have our regard.

Remarks by Judge Bernon At the outset, Judge Bernon stated that no one questions the value and importance of Palestine as a refuge and a homeland. He took exception, however, to the implication in Mr Montor's remarks that the work of the JDC was merely palliative. He agreed that the governments should eid in assuming responsibility for aiding European Jewry, but he pointed out that they are not yet meeting their responsibility and we must not let Jews die for the sake of establishing this principle. The UNRRA can help only displaced nationals and we must take care of our own if no one else does. While many Jews may want to go to Palestine, large numbers will still want to remain in their own countries or return to their original home. The JDC must take care of these. Moreover, it will be impossible to move any appreciable number of Jews to Palestine immediately. There is no indication that the White Paper will be lifted soon, and Judge Bernon questioned whether this year more than 15,000 could be moved to Palestine. He reminded the Representatives that the JDC pays for the transportation of Jews to Palestine. Unless the Jews of Europe are keptalive, there will be none to be taken to Palestine, he said. When the time comes to get Jews into Palestine, American Jewry will respond generously. But that time was not yet at hand and meanwhile the Jews in Europe had to be helped.

Judge Bernon emphasized that it was impossible to budget on the basis of "equal importance". Budgeting could be done only on the basis of need. Allocations, he contended, could not be made by flipping a coin, and the prestige of an organization or a movement must not enter into it. Human lives should not be sacrificed for this purpose. He deplored the suggestion of equality and parity regardless of merit, and declared that it would be folly to sacrifice the principle of merit for the purpose of "unity".

Judge Bernon analyzed the 1944 national allocations to JDC and UPA, pointing out that the original \$14,000,000 was divided by giving JDC 60% and the UPA 40%. In the latter part of 1944 another \$10,000,000 was divided on the basis of the deficits of the two agencies. As a result UPA received a more generous distribution and the total allocation for the year was on the basis of 58-1/3% for JDC, and 41-2/3% to the UPA. He emphasized the fact that this distribution was made while most of the European countries were still under Nazi domination, and pointed out that since that time the picture had changed markedly as a result of the liberation of many areas, which in turn created the opportunity and need for clothing, feeding, etc. The pressing problem at this time, said Judge Bernon, is to help as much as possible in Europe, whereas the situation in Palestine had not changed. He observed that with larger goals and more funds raised by American Jewish communities, UPA this year would receive considerably more than it did last year.

Communication from 39 Welfare The chairman read a communication from 39 contri-Fund contributors butors to the Jewish Welfare Fund. The letter stated that the group included proponents of

both JDC and UPA, but all agreed that it was more important to "unite within the area of our agreement rather than that either side prevail over the other." It was suggested, therefore, that every effort be made to find a basis of agreement which would assure maximum support in the campaign and thus unite the community to provide increased funds for European Jewry as Well as for Palestine.

Communication from Rabbi Silver Mr Shapiro read a letter from Rabbi Silver in which he expressed regret at being unable to attend the meeting due to an important speaking engagement in Canada. Rabbi Silver stated that the present issue threatened the harmony of the community and the success of the Welfare Fund campaign, and he expressed his disappointment that the Federation had not respected the request of the Council to defer its action on the allocation until the council could have had an opportunity to express itself. The 60-40 formula adopted by the Federation, he said, had no logical basis. It was both unfair and unjust, and from a community point of view, exceedingly unwise. He pointed to the fact that nationally the neutral allotment committee appointed by the UPA and JDC in 1944 which made a careful study of the income and expenditures of the two agencies, in its last allocations in November, distributed \$10,000,000 on the basis of 47.7% to UPA and 52.3% to JDC. It would have been logical for the Cleveland Jewish Welfare Federation to have accepted this last ratio in determining its allocations, instead of the arbitrary formula which not only was below that of 1944 but even less than was alloted to UPA in 1943. He deplored the Federation allocation as a "complete capitulation to the intransigent position taken by the JDC which was unfortunately responsible for the disruption of the United Jewish Appeal." The action, he declared, would cause UPA serious damage throughout the country and was already being used by the JDC in other communities as justification for a universal adoption of the 60-40 formula. He felt sure that the majority of the Jews of Cleveland had no intention to inflict such damage to the UPA. While he would like to see a revision of the allocations in line with the 52-48 ratio made by the impartial national allocation committee in November, 1944, he felt that the absolute minimum should be the national allocations of last year. "With a measure of good will," he concluded, "the situation can be rectified to the hurt of none and the blessing of all."

Remarks by Max gimon Mr Simon stated that it was important to avoid impugning each other's motives. He pointed out that there is room for honest disagreement without rancor. The concern for the welfare of the community should be much stronger than the occasional issues that divide. He deplored the dissolution of the UJA and the controversy which it produced. It was inaccurate to describe the present issue as one of relief vs. non-relief, and it was unfair to accuse Zionists of being indifferent to the fate of European Jewry. The conflict on allocations was essentially a conflict of opposing concepts of Jewish life. Those who were insisting on this disparity also had contended for disparity in the UJA from 1939 through 1944 and would continue to maintain this position without regard to need, but essentially because Palestine to them can never merit parity. He agreed that prestige was an element in the present issue, but he asserted that prestige in this instance was not merely a matter of protecting the honor but also the status of a cause which was completely bound up with the destiny of the Jewish people. To let that cause suffer by permitting it to be kept out of its rightful place in the focus of Jewish thinking would imply a lack of understanding on the part of Zionists and a wilful disregard of what was involved.

On the local scene the Jewish community Council recognized that the Federation & Welfare Fund have the task of fund raising and fund distribution. The council did not claim for itself the right to dictate to the Federation or to the Fund on the discharge of their functions. However, the Council not only had the right but the duty to determine the sentiment of the community on a problem of vital interest and disturbing to good community relations, and then to transmit a report on this sentiment. This was constructive service clearly within its purview, to provide a forum for the crystallization of community thinking and an orderly and disciplined channeling of that thinking in the direction of sound community action.

Mr Simon then reviewed the steps leading to the dissolution of the UJA. He pointed out that in the negotiations for a 1945 formula the UPA demanded parity. The JDC at first demanded a flat 60%, but later in the discussion was willing to agree on 60% for the first \$25,000,000 with the balance to be distributed as in previous years by an allotment committee. In the final stages of negotiation the JDC indicated a willingness to compromise or to consider arbitration of the 60-40 formula on the first \$17,500,00, the balance to be handled by an allotment committee. The negotiations broke down on the refusal of the JDC to deviate from the 60-40 principle.

As a result of the failure of the national leaders to agree on a formula, the burden had fallen to each community. In view of the sharp division locally, Mr Simon stated that the only logical course to follow was not to favor either side. Since it was impossible for both sides to reach an agreement he suggested that it would be only fair to continue the arrangement agreed upon last year. He cited the willingness of the JDC nationally to work on a basis which would have been similar if not identical to the 1944 allocation and pointed out that New York City, whose campaign goal is one-third of that of the country, adopted a formula of 57-43 based upon the record of 1944.

Mr Simon observed that there had been some criticism of the Zionists in the community because they were refusing to abide by a decision arrived at by the Federation. He reminded the representatives that it was in the best of democratic tradition to ask for a rehearing when a decision was found to run counter to solid blocks of community sentiment, and if the temper and climate of community opinion warranted a rehearing. Democracy, he said, was in essence a fluid and not a rigid process. Legislative bodies throughout the land constantly resort to this procedure, and the right of appeal was a thoroughly grounded principle of progressive democratic practice.

Recognizing the hurt that would result to the community if the people were to break on the rock of intransigence, Mr Simon presented the following resolution whose purpose he described as expressing the prevailing sentiment of a large portion of the Jewish community:

The Cleveland Jewish Community Council, meeting in special assembly on Monday evening, April 9, 1945, to consider the situation resulting from the dissolution of the United Jewish Appeal, believes that the allocations voted by the Jewish Welfare Fund and Jewish Welfare Federation of Cleveland to the United Palestine Appeal and Joint Distribution Committee were inequitable and contrary to the thinking and wishes of the majority of the Jewish community.

While the sentiments of this Council would favor parity as a fair basis in the distribution of funds between the JDC and UPA, the Jewish Community Council is desirous of unifying the community and restoring harmony in our ranks. It recognizes that any prolonged dispute would be harmful at this time when the needs of both Palestine and European Jewry are greater than we can meet.

The Jewish Community Council, composed of elected representatives of the entire community, therefore urges upon the Cleveland Jewish Federation, that in the interest of achieving unity and cooperation for the forthcoming Welfare Fund campaign, there be a reconsideration of the allocations with a view to a constructive reconciliation of the two points of view so that there will be a decision more expressive of the views of the whole community.

While recognizing that the allotment of funds has been the function of the Jewish Welfare Fund and Federation, the Jewish Community Council believes it to be its duty and responsibility to inform these community agencies of community sentiment on issues of a controversial nature affecting the entire community.

Discussion and Action In the discussion which followed the motion to adopt Mr Simon's resolution question was raised regarding the interpretation of the term "constructive reconciliation", and whether the sentiment of the Council really favored parity. In a role call vote the resolution was adopted, 82 to 28.

In closing the meeting the chairman reminded the representatives that there had been no attempt on the part of any of the speakers to discredit either of the agencies or the causes represented by them. The decision of the Council was the expression of the point of view of the community insofar as it could be expressed through this representative medium. The community faced a large task and responsibility in the forthcoming Nelfare Fund campaign with its goal of \$1,400,000. He expressed the hope that the Jewish Welfare Federation would within the next few days take some action to reconcile the differences so that the community could go forward in unity to a highly successful conclusion of the campaign.

The meeting was then adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Harry I Barron Secretary



# ACTION ON "NATIONAL BUDGETING" TO BE TAKEN AT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On August 27th the Executive Committee of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds decided to present the proposal for the establishment of a National Budgeting Advisory Committee to its General Assembly early in 1946. This action sets aside the previous decision of the Board of the Council to hold a referendum on national budgeting, as described in the attached statement. The decision of the Executive Committee does not change the urgency of the matter.

The aim of the Committee To Oppose National Budgeting will be to encourage full and complete discussion in each community of the threat implied in "national budgeting." We are convinced that a careful study of the attached statement and community-wide discussion will result in a decision on the part of the community to reject "national budgeting."

Committee to Oppose National Budgeting Room 319 44 East 43rd Street New York 17, N. Y.

#### A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

### CJFWF ACTION

At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, held in Detroit on June 24th, a decision was taken to approve National Advisory Budgeting in principle and to submit the proposal for the establishment of a National Advisory Budgeting Committee to the member agencies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds for a vote in a mail referendum starting September 1, 1945 and closing November 15th, 1945. This action was taken in spite of the fact that in its most recent poll of the Budget Research Committee only three votes out of twelve were recorded in favor of the plan for national budgeting.

After careful consideration we, the members of the Committee to Oppose National Budgeting have reached the view that the proposal for a National Budgeting Committee would reverse the trend towards a democratization in the direction of Jewish affairs and would restrict the response of American Jewish communities to the increasing opportunities for Jewish rescue and reconstruction in the critical years ahead.

#### ADVISORY POWER BECOMES MANDATORY

The decision of the Committee is based on the belief that the authority of such an advisory committee would soon become mandatory and would deprive local communities of their inherent right to make their own decisions respecting their support of programs and movements in Jewish life. As it is now constituted, there is no representative body in the American Jewish Community which has been democratically chosen or democratically delegated with the authority to discuss and control fundraising and general Jewish activities on the American scene. We cannot agree to the delegation of this authority to a small hand-picked committee which could never provide as accurate a cross section of Jewish opinion as is now represented in local budgeting committees.

#### BUDGETARY CONTROL LIMITS FUNCTIONS

We cannot accept a proposal for a National Budgeting system which would delegate to a limited group of individuals having no direct responsibility to any democratic process the power: to advise on national goals; allocate or recommend the percentage of such funds which should be provided by each community; or even

to suggest the ratio of apportionment to the various agencies participating in the local Welfare Funds. The adoption and implementation of this proposal would result in entrusting to a small hand-picked committee complete power and authority over Jewish public funds. In effect such a committee, of necessity exclusive and supported by the appearance of objectivity, would usurp complete control over Jewish public funds and establish a ceiling on the aspirations and aims of all organizations depending for their support upon the Welfare Funds. Budgetary control is always the foundation for complete control over functions. Under a National Budgeting System, the recognized and elected leadership of every organization would be subject to the authority of a committee influenced only by the biases and prejudices of its individual members. It would give the Council or the committee the directive control and veto power over trends and movements in Jewish life which should be subject to the democratic acceptance or rejection of the mass of supporters who contribute to the community.

#### CONVICTION VS. NEUTRALITY

We further contest the assumption that there are "neutrals" on the national level in the American Jewish Community who can appraise the validity of any movement with greater objectivity than its protagonists. At this point in Jewish life "neutrality" can hardly be considered a virtue nor its adherents objective. The urgency of Jewish needs requires strong conviction and sympathetic understanding. The national programs of the American Jewish Community are now receiving the support of the communities throughout the country as a result of the initiative, personal concern and energetic promotion by their individual proponents on the national and local scene. The American Jewish Community owes a debt of gratitude to the protagonists of many movements, who because of a keener understanding of the problems involved, took the initiative in fostering agencies which have made important contributions in these years of urgent Jewish needs.

We cannot subscribe to a proposal which in effect would circumscribe the initiative of such movements and would result in their being confined within narrow, fixed patterns set by a few individuals. It is our belief that leadership in Jewish life should be democratically delegated by those and to those who have demonstrated a personal and warm concern for the needs of various movements in Jewish life.

### DISCOURAGES LOCAL INITIATIVE

The entrusting of the control over the Jewish funds to an impersonal administrative committee would tend to divorce the causes, for which funds are being raised

from their local supporters who have made the growth of such causes possible. Devoid of such initiative and personal interest, fund-raising on the local level for the large programs in Jewish life would tend to diminish, and local support would be arrested.

Especially at this moment when international and domestic affairs are unstable, when the political and economic developments which will inevitably influence the patterns of Jewish rescue, relief and reconstruction are in their earliest formative stages, the delegation to a limited group of such authority over future expenditures would straitjacket the agencies responsible for the many phases of Jewish rehabilitation. Their ability to meet constantly changing conditions and to take advantage of new opportunities would be circumscribed and subjected to the paralysis of red tape.

#### IMPROVED FACT-FINDING SERVICE

We readily endorse the services which the Council offers its member communities in providing information and analysis on a statistical basis of the agencies applying to individual Welfare Funds. Recognizing the problems which the officers of local communities responsible for the allocation of funds must meet in order to reach equitable and effectual distribution, we appreciate their desire for maximum, accurate and authoritative information. We, therefore, urge the Council to extend its fact-finding service to the communities and fulfill the functions in this field which have already been allocated to the Council. We call upon the Council to submit for the consideration of its members a proposal made to the Council which would permit the Council to extend its fact-finding services to its members. This proposal would give to the Council the responsibility for a more complete and adequate review of the reports submitted by agencies applying to the Welfare Funds. It would further permit the Council to establish unified accounting within agencies and to indicate duplications and shortcomings in agency activities. The fulfillment of such conditions would obviate the necessity for the union of a few Welfare Funds to engage in a more thorough fact-finding activity. We also call upon the organizations applying to the American Jewish communities for funds to give their fullest cooperation to the Council in making available complete statements of their financial programs and requirements.

### LOCAL BUDGETING AN EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

We also wish to record our recognition of the efforts of the Council and its various regional sub-divisions towards encouraging a broadening of the budgeting

powers within each community. They have thus contributed to the education of community leadership to an understanding of the nature and activity of the various causes. With the establishment of a National Advisory Budgeting Committee this trend would be arrested and reversed. Leadership in the communities would be encouraged to shift completely to the National Committee this responsibility for review and understanding of the purposes involved in fund-raising activities. The establishment of this committee would tend to remove the necessity for decisions on the local level reflecting local composition of divergent views.

### NATIONAL BUDGETING THREATENS UNITY

Keeping in mind the bitterness of the referendum in 1941 and recent differences in Jewish Public life, we view with concern the injection of a proposal which would tend to create additional dissension in the American Jewish Community. The establishment of such a committee and its potential disagreement on ideologies with any or all programs within its purview would constitute a perpetual source of irritation in the Jewish community. It would aggravate possibilities for secessions from the combined fund-raising efforts in the local communities. We, the members of the Committee To Oppose National Budgeting, therefore, earnestly appeal to the officers of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds to withdraw their proposal so that we may avoid unnecessary division in Jewish life and possible detriment to American Jewry's mobilized efforts in the war for the survival of our overseas communities and their reestablishment on secure foundations in the future. In the event of the holding of the referendum on National Budgeting, we call upon the member communities of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds to vote in opposition to the establishment of National Budgeting.

# What is

# NATIONAL ADVISORY

# BUDGETING SERVICE?



Proposed Plan for Cooperative Action presented for study by member agencies and decision at the 1946 General Assembly

# COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS, INC. 165 West 46 Street New York 19, N. Y.

#### Officers

President SIDNEY HOLLANDER, Baltimore
Chairman of the Board WILLIAM J. SHRODER, Cincinnati
Vice-Presidents STANLEY C. MYERS, Miami
WILLIAM ROSENWALD, Greenwich
SAMUEL S. SCHNEIERSON, New York
DAVID M. WATCHMAKER, Boston
HAROLD J. GOLDENBERG, Minneapolis
Treasurer IRA M. YOUNKER, New York
Executive Director . H. L. LURIE

Executive Director . . . H. L. LURIE
Field Service Director . . . PHILIP BERNSTEIN

#### Regional Chairmen

SOL BRACHMAN, Forth Worth, Southwestern
E. N. GRUESKIN, Sioux City, West Central
ISIDORE H. HERMANN, Camden, Central Atlantic
MILTON KAHN, Boston, New England

40000

EDWARD H. KAVINOKY, Buffalo, New York State JULIAN H. KROLIK, Detroit, East Central STANLEY C. MYERS, Miami, Southeastern DR. HAROLD G. TRIMBLE, Oakland, Western States

#### Board of Directors

JOSEPH M. BERNE, Cleveland JACOB BLAUSTEIN, Baltimore MAX H. BLOCK, Seattle MRS. SIDNEY C. BORG, New York CHARLES BROWN, Los Angeles MAJOR B. EINSTEIN, St. Louis HARRY M. EPSTINE, Pittsburgh MILTON P. FIRESTONE, St. Paul SAMUEL GOLDHAMMER, Cleveland SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH, Chicago JOSEPH GOLDSTEIN, Rochester SYLVAN GOTSHAL, New York WALTER A. HAAS, San Francisco ISAAC S. HELLER, New Orleans Dr. Maurice B. Hexter, New York WALTER S. HILBORN, Los Angeles LESLIE L. JACOBS, Dallas DONALD KAFFENBURGH, New York \*LT. COL. ROBERT KOSHLAND, San Francisco ALBERT H. LIEBERMAN, Philadelphia MAX LIVINGSTON, New Haven JAMES MARSHALL, New York GEORGE Z. MEDALIE, New York HENRY MONSKY, Omaha

KURT PEISER, Philadelphia HARRIS PERLSTEIN, Chicago GEORGE W. RABINOFF, Chicago CHARLES J. ROSENBLOOM, Pittsburgh BEN SADOWSKI, Toronto DR. BEN M. SELEKMAN, Boston DANIEL SHIMAN, Newark RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER, Cleveland ISIDORE SOBELOFF, Detroit ABRAHAM SRERE, Detroit WALTON L. STRAUSS, Erie EDWARD A. SUISMAN, Hartford LEON C. SUNSTEIN, Philadelphia EDWARD M. M. WARBURG, New York JAMES L. WHITE, Salt Lake City JOSEPH WILLEN, New York HENRY WINEMAN, Detroit DR. JONAH B. WISE, New York And Officers and Regional Chairmen

Louis S. Myers, Kansas City

DONALD OBERDORFER, Atlanta

HONORARY MEMBER OF THE BOARD DAVID M. HEYMAN, New York

339

<sup>\*</sup>Armed Forces

#### To Member Agencies:

After careful study over a period of years, the Board of Directors of the Council by a large majority has voted its approval of the principle of a national advisory budgeting service and recommends it to the member agencies. Included in this booklet is a listing of the 40 Board members who voted for it and the eight who voted against it.

We are assuming the end of the war will modify restrictions on travel so as to permit the holding of an early 1946 Assembly. At this Assembly the member agencies of the Council will be asked to decide whether they wish the Council to proceed to establish such a service.

The Assembly will be planned to afford adequate time for a discussion of the proposal by the delegates representing member agencies. You will want to consider the matter carefully but unless you particularly wish to do so, it is unnecessary for a member agency to reach a decision or to bind its delegates to a course of action determined in advance of the Assembly. The group discussion at the Assembly will help to clarify aspects of the project that may not have been cleared in previous discussions of the proposals. In any event, it is of the utmost importance that your official delegates to the Assembly be well informed in advance of the conference and that they be truly representative of the basic policies and objectives of your organization.

The Council is planning in advance of the Assembly to continue discussions with national and overseas agencies—the beneficiaries of the welfare funds—on the questions of importance to them in connection with advisory budgeting. It is well known that one or more of the large agencies have not yet been won over. From the point of view of the majority of the Board of Directors of the Council which voted in favor of the proposal, it is hoped that the decision reached by our member agencies will truly reflect local needs and interests, not merely mirror the desires of a beneficiary agency. In our conversations with the national and overseas agencies, we will continue our efforts to gain the affirmative support and cooperation of all of them.

Sincerely yours,

Milliam Shandson Directors

President

In addition to the material in this booklet the following is being prepared—and will be sent out to member agencies:

- A summary of arguments in behalf of the proposal by Jacob Blaustein, Chairman of the Council's Budget Research Committee.
- A summary of opposing arguments by Isaac Heller, one of the Board members of the Council who voted against the proposal in the Board referendum.

# QUESTION ON NATIONAL ADVISORY BUDGETING TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Do the delegates to the General Assembly wish to have a National Advisory Budgeting Service, as defined, established for the benefit of those member agencies that desire such a service?

#### Definition

"National Advisory Budgeting is defined as a review by a national committee selected by the Council or by the welfare fund members of the Council. It is assumed that the Committee appointed for this task would be acceptable both to the member agencies of the Council and to the national and overseas organizations as an impartial and objective group concerned primarily with reaching equitable decisions which would be helpful to fund raising and to local budgetary procedures. The national and overseas agencies would in the first instance, as heretofore, determine what their budgets should be. The national committee to be established would then review the budgets, and after objective and thorough study, would attempt, together with the national and overseas agencies, to arrive at joint decisions on the amount of funds required to carry out the specific programs. These would be recommended —in an advisory way—to the welfare funds as minimum goals for fund raising and fund distribution.

"Where joint decisions could not be reached, the Committee would advise the welfare funds as to the part of the agency's budget and program of work which had been agreed upon and would present both sides of the major items of difference.

"The Committee would not attempt to establish local quotas. The decisions reached by the Committee could be utilized by the member agencies which desired to do so as a guide in determining the distribution of the maximum funds raised in each local community."

# BRIEF STATEMENT ON HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY BUDGETING PROPOSAL

#### BEFORE THE 1941 REFERENDUM

The question of the need for national advisory budgeting was raised by communities and national and overseas agencies shortly after local welfare funds were organized as an alternative to separate direct appeals by national and overseas agencies to individual contributors. No sooner had the first federation assumed responsibility for making a joint appeal in behalf of national and overseas agencies and the first welfare fund campaign conducted than the question arose:

"What is the equitable and just basis upon which to divide funds which are raised in a combined appeal?"

The various attempts that have been made to answer this question, and the steps that have been taken to explore the needs and views of local welfare funds and of national and overseas agencies over a long period of time are evidences of the careful consideration that has been given to the problem and of its importance.

The subject of a national method of review to guide local federations and welfare funds was first raised as early as the year 1921 at a Conference of Jewish Charities and the suggestion was made that a Board of Review be established to pass upon the budgets of national agencies. Similar proposals were made in subsequent years both by leaders of local welfare funds and by representatives and officers of national and overseas agencies. Until 1932, however, there were relatively few organized welfare funds or federations which undertook responsibility for joint fund raising for national and overseas causes and little was done with the proposals for a "National Board of Review." The interest in the question, however, had led to the development in 1926 of research studies by the National Appeals Information Service, using the staff of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research for this purpose.

#### Subject becomes concern of the Council

When the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds was organized, it continued the work of the National Appeals Information Service and one of its first projects was the establishment of a Committee on Financing of National and Overseas Jewish Social Work. This Committee proposed in 1932 that the national and overseas agencies and the local welfare funds create machinery to determine the needs of the national and overseas agencies. There were at that time about 40 cities which engaged in joint fund raising for national and overseas causes. Since that date, the welfare fund movement has grown rapidly so that there are now more than 300 cities where central welfare funds are in operation, with 235 cities (including all with substantial Jewish population) associated in the Council.

With the development of regional organizations of the Council, the subject continued to be discussed at regional as well as local meetings. In May 1940, as a result of resolutions passed by several regions asking that a national budgeting service be established by the Council, the Board decided to proceed cautiously and, instead of responding to the specific demand for the creation of a national budgeting service as such, set up a committee to study first whether it was desirable that such a service be established.

This committee was organized in June 1940 and called the Committee on the Study of National Budgeting Proposals. It was composed of eighteen individuals from ten communities and included persons in close contact with various national and overseas agencies. They were Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore; Mrs. Dora Ehrlich, Detroit; A. Richard Frank, Chicago; Samuel Goldhamer, Cleveland; Samuel A. Goldsmith, Chicago; William Haber, New York; Joseph C. Hyman, New York; George Levison, San Francisco; Solomon Lowenstein, New York; Henry Montor, New York; Stanley C. Myers, Miami; William Rosenwald, Greenwich; Ben M. Selekman, Boston; William J. Shroder, Cincinnati; Edward M. M. Warburg, New York; James L. White, Salt Lake City; Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland; Ira M. Younker, New York.

The Study Committee approached the problem objectively in an earnest effort to find the answer as to whether advisory budgeting service was desirable and necessary. A thorough and comprehensive memorandum on the subject was prepared, setting up fully the objective of a national budgeting service and its possible advantages and disadvantages. After careful study and full discussion, the Committee, with only a few dissenting votes, concluded that a national advisory budgeting service was desirable and necessary and should be put into effect, and reported its recommendations to the Council Board. The Board, after considered review, accepted the report and submitted to the General Assembly held at Atlanta in January 1941 the recommendation that steps be taken immediately to set up a national advisory budgeting committee with facilities for adequate studies of national and overseas agencies and recommendations on legitimate needs.

These recommendations were vigorously debated at the Atlanta Assembly which was also concerned at that time with the disruption of the United Jewish Appeal. Those opposed to national advisory budgeting were in favor of more intensive studies of the national and overseas agencies, but rejected the use of these findings for recommendations on the budgetary needs of agencies. Technical difficulties in voting at the Assembly at that time indicated the desirability of obtaining a decision from the member agencies of the Council through a mail vote. The referendum was conducted early in 1941.

#### THE 1941 REFERENDUM

The question of national advisory budgeting was submitted by the Council to its member agencies, with full material for their consideration including both the majority report of the Committee on the Study of National Budgeting Proposals favoring the proposal and the minority

report of the few members opposed to it. The referendum resulted in a vote of 135 in favor of the proposal and 119 opposed.

In spite of this majority of member agency votes, the Council Study Committee negotiated a compromise proposal with the opposition group for an experimental period, since expired. The Council Board decided to recommend this more limited type of program to the member agencies in place of the full national advisory budgeting proposal. This compromise was effected in consideration of the practical phases of a newly-developed program; also in an effort to secure the cooperation of the opposition group, which was highly desirable for the success of the project; and in addition, because of the narrow margin of the affirmative majority in the referendum.

This limited program involved intensive fact-finding studies but failed to set up a national board of review which would hold hearings with the national and overseas agencies appealing for welfare fund support and translate the findings into specific recommendations of minimum agency needs. This compromise proposal was formally adopted by the delegates to the General Assembly of the Council at Chicago in January 1942.

#### EXPERIENCE-1941 TO 1945

Since 1941, member agencies of the Council have had four years additional experience with local budgeting needs and the limited research and study services available to them. Both they and the national and overseas agencies have probably recognized more clearly the desirability of achieving a mutually satisfactory basis for national and local cooperation in supporting worthwhile Jewish causes. The studies and reports prepared by the Council and submitted to the member agencies do not include the essential element of judgments by a national review committee of the requirements of the national and overseas agencies and do not give advice to the member agencies with respect thereto.

#### FURTHER EXPLORATION OF NATIONAL ADVISORY BUDGETING PROPOSAL

At the 1944 General Assembly in Pittsburgh, delegates again brought up the question in a session which was exploring the needs of local budgeting committees. There was an overwhelming sentiment that the present limited services of the Council are not adequate, and the request was made that the subject of advisory budgeting service be re-studied and that recommendations be made to the next General Assembly. The Assembly passed a resolution to that effect, after which the Council Board referred the question to the Budget Research Committee which had been established in 1942 to take responsibility for the fact-finding studies of the Council for national and overseas agencies.

The Budget Research Committee, in addition to studying the problem and meeting with national and overseas agencies, met with representatives of leading welfare fund cities in the fall of 1944. At this meeting there was almost complete agreement on the part of welfare fund

leaders of the need for extending the current services of the Council to include advisory budgeting.

The report of the Budget Research Committee was presented and reviewed at the meeting of the substitute Assembly in Cincinnati in February 1945 and there was agreement on the need for advisory budgeting service by a large majority vote. Because of transportation difficulties and consequent limited attendance, it was considered advisable to submit the question again to all members of the Board of Directors of the Council by mail referendum. This referendum resulted in an expression of opinion from all but five of the Board members, 40 voting in favor of national advisory budgeting service and eight opposed.

At its meeting in Detroit in June 1945, the results of the Board referendum were received and discussed, and the Board by large majority voted its approval of a national advisory budgeting service and decided to submit the question with its recommendation to the member agencies of the Council. It is up to the member agencies of the Council to determine at the next General Assembly whether they want this advisory service.



# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PROPOSED NATIONAL ADVISORY BUDGETING SERVICE

The following are answers to various questions which have been raised regarding the proposal for advisory budgeting service. The Council will be glad to answer any additional questions.

#### 1. How did the proposal for national advisory budgeting originate?

The proposal grew out of repeated and continuing requests from member agencies and Council regional organizations. The Budget Research Committee and the Council's Board of Directors for many years have studied carefully the experience of our member agencies and have analyzed the Council's fact finding and reporting services. As a result thereof, the Council Board is submitting this proposal in order to meet the needs of the member agencies. (See also "Brief Statement on History and Background," pp. 4-7.)

#### 2. What is the difference between the proposed plan and the present budget services of the Council?

At the present time the Council reports factually on expenditures, income, services, and administration of national and overseas agencies. The Council is not authorized, however, to raise any direct questions concerning the campaign goals of an agency, nor offer any advice as to whether the goals are adequate, inadequate, or excessive for the functions which the agency seeks to perform. The proposed plan aims to fill this gap by means of a survey and committee process which would secure and analyze necessary detailed information, confer with the national and overseas agencies, and attempt to arrive at a mutual understanding of what the needs are and how much money is required to meet these needs. National campaign goals of agencies could then be related more clearly to the functions of other agencies in the same field of work, and duplications would become obvious and could be avoided. The aim is to establish a method for developing the closest kind of cooperation between the welfare funds and the national and overseas agencies supported by them.

#### 3. How would local budget committees function under the proposed plan?

It is expected that the local budget committee would function as it does now. The only difference would be the additional information and advice available to it to use as it saw fit. It would still be required to weigh the needs of each agency included in its particular welfare fund and based on the wishes of its own community, determine what it wants to allocate to each national and overseas organization.

#### 4. Would the Advisory Budgeting Committee recommend local quotas?

No. Each community, as now, would have to decide which national and overseas agencies it wishes to include in its welfare fund, and would continue to determine for itself what proportions of the various national budgets it should raise as its local obligation.

#### 5. Would the advice of the Committee be binding upon communities?

No. The plan specifically provides that the service shall be advisory only. No committee can wield any binding powers or influence the independent and autonomous character of local welfare funds, unless the communities would choose to be so bound. There is nothing in the present proposal that contemplates or asks such authority. Each community now has, and would retain, full power to make its own budgetary decisions.

#### 6. Who would select the Advisory Budgeting Committee?

The committee would represent the member welfare fund agencies of the Council. The definition states "it is assumed that the committee appointed for this task would be acceptable both to the member agencies and to the national and overseas agencies as an impartial and objective group concerned primarily with reaching equitable decisions which would be helpful to fund raising and to budget processes." There are several alternative practical methods for selecting a competent, objective, and impartial committee which can be utilized by the Council member agencies, and the method to be employed will be one which meets with their approval.

#### 7. Would the national and overseas agencies have any voice in the selection of the Committee?

As noted above, it is assumed that the committee to be selected would be acceptable to the national and overseas agencies and it is therefore clearly intended to consult with them with a view of naming a committee with which they will willingly cooperate for mutually beneficial objectives.

#### 8. How large would the Committee be?

In preliminary discussions there has been some suggestion that 15 persons would constitute a good working committee. This is still to be determined, however, and the committee may be larger.

#### 9. How would the Committee arrive at its decisions?

The committee would function very much in the way that the well organized federation budget committees function for local needs. The committee would study the various agencies—their background, experience, programs, needs, etc. The committee would also have the benefit of an augmented research staff which would provide necessary factual information. The national and overseas agencies would present their programs and discuss their respective needs directly with the National Advisory Budgeting Committee and endeavor to clear up any questions the committee might raise. The committee would attempt to reach an agreement with each agency as to its minimum national goal to be presented to the welfare funds.

#### 10. Would the Committee formulate the budget of each national and overseas agency?

No. The committee would in no way usurp the prerogatives and responsibilities of the agencies in mapping out their own programs. Each agency, as it does now, would prepare its budget based upon its own conviction as to necessary services in the light of existing needs. It would then submit that budget to the National Advisory Budgeting Committee. The latter would function as a review body in considering these proposed budgets and in suggesting minimum required goals for the agencies.

#### 11. Would the National Advisory Budgeting Committee advise as to percentages or would it advise as to minimum national agency goals in terms of dollars?

The committee would advise the communities on the minimum national budgets in terms of dollars required and not in terms of percentages. Thus, the committee would not report to communities that "X" agency ought to get \_\_ per cent, "Y" agency \_\_ per cent and "Z" agency \_\_ per cent of any overall total. Instead, it would report that "X" agency required a national minimum of \$\_\_\_\_\_\_, "Y" agency \$\_\_\_\_\_\_, and "Z" agency \$\_\_\_\_\_.

# 12. What if a national or overseas agency does not agree with the conclusions of the National Advisory Budgeting Committee?

If there were such disagreement the National Advisory Budgeting Committee would inform the welfare funds as to that part of the agency's budget which had been agreed upon and would submit both points of view on the major items of difference.

#### 13. How would the plan affect the administration of national and overseas agencies?

Each organization would continue to be administered by its own board and governing body as it is now. It would continue to have full autonomy over its own services and over the total funds which it raises.

#### 14. Would the plan tend to freeze local giving and prevent expansion?

No. The definition states that it is intended for the program to "be helpful to fund raising." As a matter of fact, welfare funds would be stimulated to increased fund-raising efforts as a result of the findings and advice of a responsible committee, which had convinced itself of the validity of the various Jewish needs and programs. The advice would not be determined by judgments as to any total sum which American Jews could raise in a given year, and then dividing that hypothetical sum among the agencies. Rather, it is expected that the advice of the Advisory Budgeting Committee would reflect actual needs.

# 15. Could the proposed Advisory Budgeting Service operate if one or more of the larger national agencies decide not to cooperate with the proposed plan?

National Advisory Budgeting Service can operate partially but not fully on such a basis. Once it is established that such an advisory budgeting service is desired by a substantial majority of welfare funds, it is expected that the national and overseas agencies would be willing to cooperate.

#### 16. Have there been any national budget plans in operation in the past?

Yes. The United Jewish Appeal is an approach to a limited form of national budgeting on an inter-agency basis. The UJA determines the total campaign goal and how the funds raised are to be divided among the Joint Distribution Committee, United Palestine Appeal, and the National Refugee Service. Similarly, the Joint Defense Appeal in another field divides the funds raised between the American Jewish Committee and the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League. The American Fund for Palestine Institutions and the Federated Council for Palestine Institutions are other such national budgeting arrangements for large groups of beneficiaries. These are national formulas determined exclusively by the participating national agencies themselves. However, in none of these plans is there any direct participation by the welfare funds which support the appeals.

#### 17. What is the Council's position on the National Advisory Budgeting question?

Your local organization and the 265 other member agencies are the Council and determine its policies through annual General Assemblies of local delegates. The Council Board of Directors for many years has studied member agency requests for budgeting service and in a recent mail ballot, favored national advisory budgeting by a vote of 40 to 8. The Board is thus recommending the proposal to the member agencies; and is submitting it to the 1946 Assembly for decision. The action of the Assembly will become the position of the Council.

#### 18. How will the Assembly vote be tabulated?

The vote will be tabulated according to the provisions of the By-Laws which have been adopted by the member agencies. According to the By-Laws, Article III, Section 2: "The number of votes a member organization shall be entitled to cast shall be related to the Jewish population of the community in which it is located as published in the current edition of the American Jewish Year Book."

"Member organizations located in any one City, Village or Town (or similar political subdivision however named) or in a combination of similar political sub-divisions conducting their social program on a unified basis (but in no combination in which its components shall hold independent memberships in the Council) shall be entitled to votes in the General Assembly in accordance with the following formula:

- (a) For Jewish populations up to nine thousand, nine hundred ninety-nine (9,999), one vote for each five thousand (5,000) or fraction thereof.
- (b) For Jewish populations of ten thousand (10,000) to ninety-nine thousand nine hundred ninety-nine (99,999), one additional vote for each ten thousand (10,000) or fraction thereof above the basic nine thousand nine hundred ninety-nine (9,999).
- (c) For Jewish populations of one hundred thousand (100,000) or above, one additional vote for each fifty thousand (50,000) or fraction thereof, above the basic ninety-nine thousand nine hundred ninety-nine (99,999)."

"In case there is more than one organization located in the same community the voting rights of the delegates of any such community shall be divided equally between the member organizations unless such organizations agree upon a different division. Where the organizations involved deem equal division inequitable and are unable to reach an agreement, any member organization may appeal to the Credentials Committee and the decision of the Credentials Committee shall be official."

The number of votes to which your community is entitled is listed on page 14 or 15.

#### 19. What are the qualifications for delegates and for voting at the General Assembly?

In accordance with the By-Laws, "The General Assembly shall consist of accredited delegates of member organizations . . ." "Each member organization may accredit as many delegates as it desires, and may determine which of them shall exercise its voting rights or it may grant its assigned number of votes to its entire delegation . . ." "Each member organization shall have the right to decide whether the votes to which it is entitled shall be cast by its delegates as a unit or on an individual basis. Unless the organization certifies its own decision to the Council at least one week prior to the Assembly, its delegates shall cast their votes on an individual basis."

"A member organization may appoint alternates for delegates to any meeting of the General Assembly."

"Any delegate in his absence and that of his alternate, if any, may appoint a proxy in writing, provided the proxy is a delegate from the same community and is present in person at the meeting of the General Assembly."

"The appointment of delegates and alternates shall be duly certified to the Secretary of the Council at least eight days prior to the opening of the General Assembly, to permit the Credentials Committee to pass on the certifications and make report to the General Assembly."

# RECORD OF BOARD REFERENDUM ON THE PRINCIPLE OF NATIONAL ADVISORY BUDGETING

(As reported at Meeting of Board of Directors-June 23-24, 1945)

To the question: "Do you favor in principle the establishment of advisory budgeting service to be set up as a national service for the member agencies of the Council?"—

# The following members of the Board of Directors voted YES:

- JOSEPH M. BERNE, Former President, now Board member, Cleveland Jewish Welfare Federation and Welfare Fund
- JACOB BLAUSTEIN, Former President, now member of Board, Baltimore Associated Jewish Charities; Chairman of Executive Committee, American Jewish Committee; former Chairman, now member of Baltimore Jewish Welfare Fund Allocations Committee
- MAX H. BLOCK, Member of Board, Seattle Federated Jewish Fund; Vice-Chairman, Western States Region, CJFWF
- Mrs. Sidney C. Borg, Member of Board, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
- SOL Brachman, Former President, now member of Board, Fort Worth Jewish Federation; Chairman, Southwestern States Region, CJFWF
- MAJOR B. EINSTEIN, Former Chairman, St. Louis Jewish Welfare Fund; member of Board, St. Louis Jewish Federation
- HARRY M. EPSTINE, Member of Board, Pittsburgh United Jewish Fund
- Leon C. Sunstein, President, Philadelphia Allied Jewish Appeal
- MILTON P. FIRESTONE, Member of Board, St. Paul United Jewish Fund
- SAMUEL GOLDHAMER, Executive Director, Cleveland Jewish Welfare Federation; Executive Director, Cleveland Jewish Welfare Fund
- JOSEPH GOLDSTEIN, Vice-President, Rochester United Jewish Welfare Fund; Co-Chairman, Budget Committee, Rochester United Jewish Welfare Fund
- Walter A. Haas, President, San Francisco Jewish National Welfare Fund
- ISADORE H. HERMANN, Former President, now member of Board, Camden Federation of Jewish Charities; Chairman, Central Atlantic Region, CJFWF

- MAURICE B. HEXTER, Executive Vice-President, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
- WALTER S. HILBORN, President, Los Angeles Federation of Jewish Welfare Organizations; member of Board, Los Angeles United Jewish Welfare Fund; Treasurer, Jewish Community Council, Los Angeles
- SIDNEY HOLLANDER, President, CJFWF; member of Board, Baltimore Associated Jewish Charities
- LESLIE L. JACOBS, Vice-President, Dallas Jewish Welfare Federation; former Chairman, Southwestern Region, CJFWF
- MILTON KAHN, Vice-President, Boston Associated Jewish Philanthropies; former Campaign Chairman, Boston Combined Jewish Appeal; Chairman, New England Region, CJFWF
- EDWARD H. KAVINOKY, Member of Board, Buffalo United Jewish Fund; member of Board, Jewish Federation for Social Service; Chairman, New York State Region, CJFWF
- JULIAN H. KROLIK, Vice-President, Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation; Chairman, East Central Region, CJFWF; Treasurer, Detroit Jewish Community Council
- Albert H. Lieberman, 1st Vice-President, Philadelphia Allied Jewish Appeal; Chairman, National Council, JDC
- JAMES MARSHALL, Former President, now member New York City Board of Education; member of Board of Directors, American Friends of Hebrew University
- LOUIS S. MYERS, President, Kansas City Jewish Welfare Federation; former Chairman, West Central Region, CJFWF
- STANLEY C. MYERS, Former President, now member of Board, Greater Miami Jewish Federation; member UJA Allocations Committee 1944; Chairman, Southeastern Region, CJFWF

#### YES Votes (continued)

- DONALD OBERDORFER, President, Atlanta Jewish Community Council; Vice-President, National Jewish Welfare Board
- Kurt Peiser, Executive Director, Philadelphia Allied Jewish Appeal; Executive Director, Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities
- HARRIS PERLSTEIN, Member of Board, Chicago Jewish Welfare Fund; former President, Chicago Jewish Charities
- GEORGE W. RABINOFF, Associate Director, Chicago Jewish Charities
- BEN SADOWSKI, President, Committee of Canadian Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; former Vice-President, United Jewish Welfare Fund, Toronto
- BEN M. SELEKMAN, Former Executive Director, now Consultant to Boston Associated Jewish Philanthropies and United Jewish Appeal
- DANIEL SHIMAN, President, Essex County Council of Jewish Agencies, Newark
- WILLIAM J. SHRODER, Member of Board, Cincinnati United Jewish Social Agencies; Chairman of Board, CJFWF; former President, Cincinnati Jewish Community Council; former Chairman, honorary member of Board, Cincinnati, Jewish Welfare Fund
- ISIDORE SOBELOFF, Executive Director, Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation
- WALTON L. STRAUSS, President, Erie Jewish Community Council; Vice-President, East Central Region, CJFWF
- EDWARD A. SUISMAN, Vice-President, Hartford Jewish Welfare Fund; Budget Chairman, Jewish Welfare Fund
- HAROLD G. TRIMBLE, Chairman of Oakland, California Jewish Welfare Fund Budget Committee; Chairman, Western States Region, CJFWF
- JAMES L. WHITE, President, Salt Lake City United Jewish Council; President, B'nai B'rith District
- JOSEPH WILLEN, Executive Vice-President, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
- HENRY WINEMAN, Member of Board, Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation; former President, Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation
- IRA M. YOUNKER, Treasurer, CJFWF, New York; member of Board, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies

#### The following members voted NO:

- CHARLES BROWN, Vice-President, Los Angeles Jewish Community Council; National Co-Chairman, Western Region, UPA
- HAROLD J. GOLDENBERG, President, Minneapolis Federation for Jewish Service; Regional Chairman of United Palestine Appeal
- ISAAC S. HELLER, President, New Orleans Jewish Welfare Fund; Vice-President, Southeastern Region, CJFWF
- MAX LIVINGSTON, President, New Haven Jewish Community Council
- HENRY MONSKY, Former President, Omaha Federation for Jewish Service; President, National B'nai B'rith
- CHARLES J. ROSENBLOOM, President, Pittsburgh United Jewish Fund; National Treasurer, United Palestine Appeal
- ABBA HILLEL SILVER, Board member, Cleveland Jewish Welfare Federation; Chairman, Zionist Emergency Council; former Chairman, now member, Cleveland Jewish Welfare Fund
- DAVID M. WATCHMAKER, Member of Board, Boston Associated Jewish Philanthropies

# The following members made an indefinite reply or did not vote:

- SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH, Executive Director, Chicago Jewish Charities; Executive Director, Chicago Jewish Welfare Fund
- SYLVAN GOTSHAL, President, New York City United Jewish Appeal
- E. N. GRUESKIN, Former President, Sioux City Jewish Federation; Budget Chairman, Sioux City Jewish Federation; Chairman, West Central Region, CJFWF
- GEORGE Z. MEDALIE, Former President, now member of Board of New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
- WILLIAM ROSENWALD, Vice-President, CJFWF, Greenwich, Conn.; National Co-Chairman, UJA; member of Board, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
- SAMUEL S. SCHNEIERSON, Member of Board, New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; Vice-President, CJFWF
- JONAH B. WISE, National Co-Chairman, UJA, New York; Chairman, Fund Raising, JDC

#### LIST OF MEMBER AGENCIES AND NUMBER OF ASSIGNED VOTES (Assorbing to Council By Laws)

Accord	ing to	Council by-Laws)	
	No. of Votes	City and Member Agency	No. o
Akron, Ohio-JSSFJWF	2	Easton, PaJCC	1
Albany, N. YJWF		Edmonton, Alberta, CanJF	1
Albuquerque, N. M.—JFC	1	Elgin, Ill.—JWC	1
Alexandria, La,-JWF	1	Elizabeth, N. JJC	3
Allentown, PaUJC	1	Elmira, N. YJWF	1
Altoona, PaFJP	1	El Paso, TexJF	1
Appleton, WiscUJC	1	Erie, PaJCC	1
Ardmore, OklaJF	1	Evansville, IndJCC	1
Asheville, N. CFJC	1	Fall River, MassUJA	2
Atlanta, GaFJSS JWF	3	Fargo, N. DFWF	
Atlantic City, N. JFJC		Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass.—JCC	1

Albuquerque, N. M.—JFC	1	Elgin, Ill.—JWC	1
Alexandria, La,-JWF	1	Elizabeth, N. JJC	3
Allentown, PaUJC	1	Elmira, N. YJWF	1
Altoona, PaFJP	1	El Paso, Tex.—JF	1
Appleton, WiscUJC	1	Erie, Pa.—JCC	1
Ardmore, Okla.—JF	1	Evansville, Ind.—JCC	1
Asheville, N. CFJC	1	Fall River, MassUJA	2
Atlanta, GaFJSSJWF	3	Fargo, N. DFWF	1
Atlantic City, N. JFJC	3	Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass.—JCC	1
Augusta, GaFJC	1	Flint, MichFJC	1
Aurora, Ill.—JCD	1	Fort Wayne, IndJF	1
Austin, TexJF	1	Fort Worth, Tex.—JF	1
Bakersfield, CalifUJWF	1	Fresno, CalifJNWF	1
Baltimore, MdAJCJWF	9	Galveston, Texas-UJWA	1
Baton Rouge, La.—JWF	1	Gary, Ind.—JWF	1
Battle Creek, MichJWF	1	Gastonia, N. CJWF	1
Bay City, MichNMJWF	1	Grand Rapids, MichJCF	1
Bayonne, N. J.–JCC	3	Greensboro, N. CJUC	1
Benton Harbor, Mich.—JCC	1	Guelph, Ontario, Canada-JWF	1
Binghamton, N. Y.—JCC	1	Hackensack, N. JUJA	1
Birmingham, Ala.—UJF	2	Hamilton, Ontario, CanJSS UJWF	1
Boston, Mass.—AJPUJC	13	Hammond, IndUJA	1
Bridgeport, Conn.—JWB&CSJCC	3	Hampton, VaHPJCC	1
Brockton, Mass.—UJA	1	Harrisburg, PaUJC	1
Buffalo, N. YJFSSUJF	4	Hartford, Conn.—JWF	4
Butler, Pa.—JCC	1	Hibbing, Minn.—FCC	-1
Butte, Mont.—JWC	1	High Point, N. C.—JFC	1
Camden, N. J.—FJC AJA	2	Houston, TexJCC	3
Canton, Ohio—IWF	1	Huntington, W. Va.—FJC	1
Cedar Rapids, Iowa—AJC	1	Indianapolis, Ind.—JFJWF	3
Champaign, Ill.—FJC	1	Jackson, Miss.—JWFund	1
Charleston, W. Va.—FJC	1	Jacksonville, Fla.—JCC	1
Charlotte, N. C.—FJC	1	Jersey City, N. J.–UJA	4
Chartanooga, Tenn.—JWF	1	Johnstown, Pa.—UJA	1
Chester, Pa.—AJA	1	Joliet, Ill.—JWC	1
	17	Joplin, Mo.–JWF	1
Chicago, Ill.—JCJWF	4	Kansas City, Mo.—JWF UJC	4
Cleveland, Ohio—JWF JWFund	12	Kenosha, Wisc.—JWF	1
Cleveland, Miss.—CJD	1	Kitchener, Ontario, Can.—JFC	1
Columbus, Ohio—UJFJWF	2	Knoxville, Tenn.—JWF	1
	1	Lafayette, Ind.—FJC	1
Columbus, Ga.—JWF	1	Lancaster, Pa.—OJC	1
Corpus Christi, Tex.—JWF	1	Lansing, Mich.—FJC	1
Corsicana, Tex.—JF	1	Lima, Ohio—AJA	1
Cumberland, Md.—JCF	3	Lincoln, Neb.—IWF	1
Dallas, Tex.—JWF	1	Little Rock, Ark.—JWF	1
Danbury, Conn.—JF			1
Davenport, Iowa-JC	1	Log Beach, Calif.—UJWF	10
Dayton, Ohio—JCC	1		3
Decatur, III.—JF	1	Louisville, Ky.—CJO	1
Denver, Col.—AJC	3		1
Des Moines, Iowa—JWF	1	Lynchburg, Va.—JCC	3
Detroit, Mich.—JWF	11	Lynn, Mass.—UJA	1
Dothan, Ala.—JWF	1	Macon, Ga.—FJC	1
Duluth, Minn.—JWF	1	Madison, Wisc.—JWF	3
East Chicago, Ind.—JWC	1	Memphis, Tenn.—FJWAJWF	2
	1/		

City and Member Agency Vo		City and Member Agency	Votes
	1		
Meriden, Conn.—JWF	2	San Jose, Calif.—JWF	. 1
Miami, Fla.—GMJF	-	Santa Ana, Calif.—UWFOC	
Middletown, N. YUJA	1	Savannah, GaUJA	
Milwaukee, Wisc.—JWF	4	Schenectady, N. YJCC	
Minneapolis, Minn.—FJS	4	Scranton, PaJF JWS	
Mobile, Ala.—FJC	1	Seattle, WashFJF	
Monroe, La.—UJC N.E. La	1	Selma, Ala.—JWF	
Montgomery, AlaJF	1	Sharon, PaUJA SV	
McKeesport, PaUJF	2	Sheboygan, WiscFJC	. 1
Muskegon, MichUJC	1	Shreveport, LaJF	
Muscle Shoals Area, AlaMSJFC	1	Sioux City, Iowa-FJSS	. 1
Nashville, TennJCC	1	Sioux Falls, S. D.—JWF	. 1
Newark, N. JECCJA	10	South Bend, IndJWF	. 1
New Bedford, Mass.—FJO	1	Southern Illinois—JF	
New Haven, Conn.—JCC	4	Spokane, WashJWA	
New Orleans, La.—JC&EFJWF	2	Springfield, Ill.—JF	
Newport News, Va.—JCC	1	Springfield, Mass.—JWF	
New York, N. Y.—(including Brooklyn) UJA NYFJP	50	St. Catharines, Ontario, Can.—JF	
Newburgh, N. Y.—UJC	1	St. Joseph, Mo.—FJC	
	1	St. Louis, MoJFJWF	
Niagara Falls, N. YJF	2	St. Paul, Minn.—UJF	
Norfolk, VaUJF			
Norwalk, Conn.—JCC	1	Steubenville, Ohio—JCC	
Oakland, CalifJFUJWF	2	Stockton, Calif.—NJWF	1
Oklahoma City, Okla.—JCC	1	Suffolk, VaJF	
Omaha, NebFJS	3	Syracuse, N. YJWF	
Passaic, N. JJCC	3	Tacoma, Wash.—FJF	1
Paterson, N. JJCC	4	Tallahassee, Fla.—FJC	1
Pensacola, FlaFJC	1	Tampa, Fla.—JWO	1
Peoria, IllJWF	1	Terre Haute, Ind.—JF	1
Perth Amboy, N. JCJO	1	Texarkana, Tex.—JF	. 1
Petersburg, VaUJCF	1	Toledo, Ohio-FJUJF	
Philadelphia, PaFJC AJA	15	Toronto, Ontario, CanUJWF	
Phoenix, Ariz.—JCC	1	Trenton, N. JJF	
Pine Bluff, Ark.—JFC	1	Troy, N. YJWF	
Pittsburgh, Pa.—FJP UJF	7	Tucson, ArizJCC	
Pittsburgh, Pa.—Tri-State JWC	3	Tulsa, Okla.—JCC	
Pittsfield, Mass.—JWF	1	Tuscaloosa, Ala.—FJC	
Plainfield, N. JCJO	1	Tyler, Tex.—FJC	**
Plainfield, N. J.—CJO	1		
Pontiac, MichFJC	1	Uniontown, Pa.—UJF	
Port Arthur, Tex.—FJC		Utica, N. Y.—JCC	
Port Chester, N. YJCC	1	Valdosta, Ga.—JJCCF	
Portland, MeJF	1	Vancouver, B. C., Can.—JAC JEWF	
Portland, OreFJCOJWF	3	Ventura, Calif.—CJC	
Pottsville, PaUJC	1	Vicksburg, Miss.—JWF	
Poughkeepsie, N. YJWF	1	Virginia, Minn.—FJS	
Providence, R. IJF&CS	*	Waco, TexFJCUJA	
Reading, Pa.—JCC	1	Warren, Ohio-JF	***
Richmond, VaJCC	2	Washington, D. CUJA JCC JSSA	
Riverside, CalifUJWF	1	Waterbury, Conn.—JFA	
Roanoke, Va.—RCROR	1	Waterloo, Iowa-JF	
Rochester, N. YUJWF	4	Wheeling, W. VaJCC	
Rockford, Ill.—FJC	1	Wichita, KanMK. JWF	
Rock Island, Ill.—UJC	1	Wilkes-Barre, Pa.—WVJC	
Sacramento, Calif.—UJWF	1	Williamsport, Pa.—FJC	
Saginaw, Mich.—JWF	1	Wilmington, Del.—JFD	
Salem, Ohio–JF	1	Windsor, Ontario, Can.—UJWF	
Salt Lake City, Utah—UJC	1		
	2	Winnipeg, Manitoba, Can.—JWF	
San Antonio, Tex.—JSSF		Winston-Salem, N. C.—JCC	
San Bernardino, Calif.—UJA	1	Worcester, Mass.—JWF	
San Diego, Calif.—UJF	1	York, Pa.—JCC	
San Francisco, Calif JNWF	6	Youngstown, Ohio-JF	***
*Non-voting (affiliated for limited service).	15		

TOP SECRET

CONTENTS OF FILE OF CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS ON PALESTINE SUPPLIED BY DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS FOR USE OF ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

1). Despatch No. 1473 from American Legation at Cairo, Egypt, December 15, 1938, (Unrestricted), transmitting a note concerning Palestine from King Ibn Saud to President Roosevelt, together with additional correspondence, (Cairo Despatch No. 1474, December 17; memorandum dated January 9, 1939, from Acting Secretary of State Summer Welles to the President with draft reply; strictly confidential instructions to Cairo, Beirut, Baghdad, and Jerusalem, transmitting copies of President's reply.)

(State Department file number; 867N.01/1364)

2). Memorandum of conversation dated March 30, 1943, between the Egyptian Minister and Under Secretary Welles, together with note dated March 29, on Palestine question handed to Mr. Welles by Egyptian Minister; memorandum of conversation of March 30, 1943, between the Egyptian Minister and Mr. Paul H. Alling of Division of Near Eastern Affairs on this same subject; note of Egyptian Minister dated February 2, 1943; Department's reply of April 6, 1943, to these two communications; and strictly confidential instructions to Jerusalem, Beirut, Cairo, Baghdad, Ankara, and Jidda.

(State Department file number: FW867N.00/628)

- 3). Telegram dated May 26, 1943, to American Legation, Cairo, (strictly confidential), containing message from President Roosevelt to King Ibn Saud stating that in the view of this Government no decision altering the basic situation of Palestine should be reached without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews. (first time this assurance given Arabs by U.S.) (State Department file number: 890.00/93)
  - 4). Despatch No. 1034, May 11, 1943, from Cairo containing a letter dated April 30, 1943, from King Ibn Saud to President Roosevelt on Palestine; letter dated May 29, 1943, from Acting Secretary of State Welles to President Roosevelt; and Department's strictly confidential instructions to American Legations at Jidda and Cairo transmitting the President's reply in which the same assurance as under No. 3 is reiterated.

    (State Department file number: 890F.00/89)
  - 5). Telegram No. 1605 of October 26, 1943, to Legation at Cairo, (Secret), containing a statement to be given the Acting Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia relative to this Government's position on Arab union, to the effect that we sympathize with the aspirations of the peoples of the Near East to attain full independence and strengthen the ties between them, providing such a development is in line with the Atlantic Charter, etc.

(State Department file number: none)

- 6). Memorandum, February 24, 1944, from Mr. Alling of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs to Mr. Wallace Murray of that office and Under Secretary Stettinius relative to conversation between Mr. Alling and the Egyptian Minister together with note of February 24 on Palestine from Egyptian Minister and memorandum of February 26, 1944, from Mr. Murray to Assistant Secretary of State Breckenridge Long and Under Secretary Stettinius summarizing the Arab reaction to the introduction of the Palestine Resolutions into Congress. (State Department file number: FW867N.01/2315)
  - Department's reply of March 28 to Egyptian Minister (stating that Arabs and Jews should be consulted) and Department's telegram No. 657 of March 28 to Cairo (restricted, repeated to Baghdad, Jerusalem, Beirut, Damascus and Jidda) giving text of Department's note.
- 7). Telegram No. 503 of March 4, 1944, from Cairo (restricted) containing communication from king of Yemen, Department's note of March 31 to Egyptian Minister containing for transmission to king of Yemen same assurance as above under (6) and telegram No. 692 of March 31 to Cairo (restricted, repeated to Jerusalem, Baghdad, Jidda, Damascus and Beirut) giving text of Department's note. (State Department file number: 867N.01/2231)
- 8). Telegram No. 38 of March 13, 1944, to Jidda (secret) transmitting message to King Ibn Saud from President Roosevelt regarding the Palestine Resolutions and renewed assurances outlined above under (3) and (4).
- 9). Telegram No. 531 to Cairo of March 15, 1944, to Jidda (secret, repeated to Beirut, Damascus, Jerusalem, Jidda and Baghdad) containing a message to the Egyptian Prime Minister in reply to his inquiry regarding press accounts of statement made by Rabbi Wise and Rabbi Silver after seeing President Roosevelt on March 9. Department's telegram, which was approved by the President, renews assurance of consultation with both Arabs and Jews.
- 10). Telegram dated March 3, 1944, from Amir Abdullah of Trans-Jordan to President Roosevelt regarding Palestine Resolutions, memoranda exchanged between the President and Department with respect to preparation of reply and Department's telegram No. 54 of March 3, 1944, to American Consul General in Jerusalem (secret) containing President's reply assuring Amir that Arabs as well as Jews should be consulted.

(State Department file number: None)

- 11). Cairo telegram No. 2362, August 10, 1944, (Plain) summarizing speech of Egyptian Prime Minister on Palestine during which he made public assurances mentioned above.
- 12). Correspondence between Arab leaders and PresidentsRoosevelt and Truman arising out of a concerted approach made to President Roosevelt by Arab leaders on Palestine question under date of March 10, 1945:
  - a). King Ibn Saud King's letter of March 10 and President Roosevelt's reply of April 5 were made public October 18, 1945, and are the only letters in this correspondence which have been published in this country or by this Government.
  - b). Regent of Iraq Despatch No. 657 dated March 12, 1945, from Baghdad (secret) transmitting letter to President Roosevelt dated March 10, from Prince Abdul Ilah, Regent of Iraq and Department's instructions No. 312 of April 21 to Baghdad (unrestricted) containing reply signed by President

- Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, (the date of his death) reiterating that in the view of the Government of the United States no decision affecting the basic situation in Palestine should be reached without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews.
  - c). President of Syria Despatch No. 695 of March 14, 1945, (confidential) from American Legation at Beirut transmitting letter dated March 11 (10?), President Shukri el-Kuwatly of Syria to President Roosevelt and Department's unrestricted instruction No. 120 of April 21 to Damascus enclosing reply dated April 12, 1945, from President Roosevelt containing identical assurances as (b) above.
  - d). Prime Minister of Lebanon The corresponding communication in the case of Lebanon was addressed by the Prime Minister of that country to the Secretary of State. Beirut's Despatch No. 692 of March 12, 1945, (confidential) transmitting the letter from Prime Minister is attached together with the Department's confidential instruction No. 368 of April 11 transmitting a reply of the same date from Secretary of State Stettinius containing an identical assurance with that given above under (b). (State Department file number: 867N.01/3-1245)
  - 4). Amir of Trans-Jordan This letter was transmitted through the British Government and did not reach Washington until after President Roosevelt's death. Attached are copies of the Amir's letter of March 10 and of the Department's unrestricted instructions to London and Jerusalem under date of May 21, 1945, transmitting President Truman's reply dated May 17, which contains an assurance identical with that given above under (b).
  - f). Prime Minister of Egypt The Egyptian Prime Minister's letter was also received after President Roosevelt's death. Attached are the Egyptian Minister's note of May 25 to Acting Secretary of State Grew transmitting the Prime Minister's letter of April 31 to President Truman and its enclosures on Palestine together with President Truman's reply dated June 4 and containing an assurance identical with that given above under (b).
- 13) Memorandum (secret) dated March 22, 1945, from Acting Secretary of State Grew to President Roosevelt containing draft of reply (approved by the President and transmitted to Baghdad in Department's secret telegram of March 24) in reply to inquiry of Iraqi Prime Minister concerning Reuters report of statement made on March 16, 1945, by Rabbi Wise to the effect that the President still adhered to the position taken in his letter of October 15, 1944 endorsing the Democratic platform on Palestine. The reply to the Iraqi Prime Minister points out that while the Rabbi's statement was substantially correct, it referred to possible action at some future time and that in writing his letter to Senator Wagner endorsing the Democratic platform the President was, of course, keeping in mind the assurance made to certain Near Eastern Governments regarding consultation with Arabs as well as Jews. This telegram repeated to London, Cairo, Beirut, Jerusalem, Damascus, and Jidda.

(State Department file number: 867N.01/3 - 1845)

14) Department's telegram No. 163 of August 18, 1945, to Jerusalem, (confidential) repeated to Cairo, Baghdad, Jidda, Beirut and Damascus, giving substance of remarks made by President Truman at his August 16 press conference to the effect that he had discussed Palestine with Churchill and Attlee at Potsdam, that we want to let as many Jews into Palestine as possible but that the matter would have to be worked out with the British and the Arabs on a peaceful basis as he had no desire to send American soldiers to keep the peace in Palestine.

15). Copy of memorandum of conversation of October 12, 1945, between the Secretary of State, Byrnes, Under Secretary Acheson, Mr. Loy W. Henderson of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs and the Ministers of Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon together with Aide Memoire on Palestine handed the Secretary by the four Ministers, in reply to which Secretary Byrnes stated that there had been no change in this Government's policy on Palestine.

(State Department file number: 867N.01/10-1245)

- 16). Department's telegram No. 314 of October 23, 1945, to Baghdad (unrestricted), repeated to Cairo, Jidda, Jerusalem, Damascus, Beirut, containing reply to Oraqi Prime Minister of September 26 inquiring whether it is true that President Truman has requested Prime Minister Attlee to admit 100,000 Jews to Palestine. Reply points out that President and Prime Minister have engaged in exploratory correspondence on this subject, that Palestine was naturally mentioned as one of the possible havens for homeless Jews, but that there has been no change in this Government's previously announced attitude on Palestine.
- 17). Department's telegram No. 254 Bis November 19, 1945, (unrestricted to Jerusalem, repeated to London, Cairo, Jidda, Beirut and Damascus) containing reply from President Truman to Amir of Trans—Jordan in reply to latter's telegram of September 29 and assuring Amir that there has been no change in this Government's policy towards Palestine.

15). Copy of memorendum of convergetion of Ostober 12, 1945, between the flooretery of State, figures, Under Semestary Acheson, Mr. Loy W. Henderson of the Office of News Santern end Almicent iffeirs and the Ministers of Egypt, Syris, Ireq and Lebenon together with Aide Momoire on Palestine handed the Secretary by the four Ministers, in reply to which Secretary Syrmes stated that there had been no change in this Government's policy on Falestine.

State paparteent file marber: 867N.01/10-1845)

- 16). Department's telegram No. 514 of October 25, 1925, to Baghdad (unreducioned), repeated to Cairo, Jidda, Jerusalen, Danasous, Beirnt, containing reply to Oregi Prime Minister of September 26 inquiring whether 15 is true that
  President Truern has requested frime Minister Attlee to admit 100,000 Jest to President and Prime Minister Lave engaged and Prime Minister Lave engaged and Prime Minister Lave engaged and the control of the position and repeated from the Cartesian and Cartesian a
- 17). Department's telegrem No. 254 Bis Hovember 19, 1945, (unrestricted to Jerussies, repeated to London, Cairo, Jidde, Beirut and Damascus) containing reply from Premen to Amir of Trans-Jordan in reply to latter's telegrem of September 29 and scentley Amir that there has been in change in this Covernment's policy towards belowing.

WRHS OSO OGO

11/ 940 H/ 940 I did not answer the third question because I believe that the United States should enter the League of Nations even if the present obligation to participate in the use of armed sanctions against an aggressor nation remains in the Covenant.

I should say "because" rather than "even if".

A League of Nations which has not the power to enforce its decisions on a recalcitrant nation through economic or military sanctions, is a futility and an encumbrance. Moral suasion and public opinion are hardly enough to keep an <u>individual</u> in the straight and narrow path. As a practical program for insuring that <u>nations</u> shall observe international law it is the height of credulity. Before we enter the League, however, we should demand a revision of the Constitution of the League so that in the future it will not be dominated by two or three major powers.

I did not answer Question 6. If there are religious groups who wish to propagate the idea that the United States should never sanction or participate in any war, they should be free to do so. I would not join such a movement for I am not a pacifist. Those who think that war in the modern world can be ended through pacifism or through the advocacy of disarmament, are simply barking up the wrong tree. They are wasting a lot of time and energy which might well be applied to the solution of the basic causes of war -- the mal-distribution of the world's wealth among the nations of the earth and their free and fair access to the sources of raw material and markets. Furthermore, they are also guilty of befuddling the minds of people as with sentimentalism rather than compelling them to think realistically about the economic problems which must be solved before the world will have peace.

Answer to Question 7. Defend existing covenants such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact, perfect existing agencies such as the League of Nations and the World Court. Then wrestle with the basic problem of the fair distribution of the world's raw material and markets.

Sent to Bishop Baker and Colleagues Post Office Box 442 Grand Central Station to the transfer that and the statements New York, N.Y.

tree. They are tarting a lot of time and every which might be applied to

any war, they should be thee the year

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, The Temple, E. 55th & Central Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Rabbi Silver:

I beg to remain

In your letter of August 10th which I received some days ago you wrote that you had instructed the Secretary of the Palestine Development Council to send me all information relative to the purposes and activities of this organisation. This information has not me yet been received by me.

In your letter you suggest that I should call a special meeting of the Executive Board. During the past twenty years, in which I have been a member of the Executive Board, I do not remember that a special meeting was ever called, and I feel that such a meeting should be called only in consideration of some matter of particular interest to the Union. Should I call such a meeting with a different purpose in view it might subject me personally to severe cirticism, and in the end not carry out successfully the purpose for which such meeting was called.

I appreciate the keen interest that you have in the matter in question, and I promise you that at the next meeting of the Executive Board I will see to it that the matter in question is presented in the proper form. That is the best that I can do in this matter, and I trust it will be understood by you.

With the assurance of personal regards

Very sincerely yours,

Charles Shohl

President.

T. Febers and Wel. Funts 1986 6-4, 17879, 1860

The passing of Eugene Warner leaves a deep sense of loss in the welfare movement of his country and, especially, his own city of Buffalo. For he was among the advance guard of zealous innovators and supporters of social and civic service. His belief in the rights of man sent him restlessly and eagerly into many fields of action. And it is to that man whose ready action was always based upon deep humanitarian sympathies that we pay tribute.

### ABROGATION OF "WHITE PAPER"

MR. LURIE read a communication received from MR. HARRY L. SHAPIRO, Director of the American Zionist Emergency Council, asking that our Council pass a resolution at the General Assembly urging the United States Government to use its influence to bring about the abrogation of the British "White Paper."

Since the Council had no standing Committee on Resolutions and the request was not controversial and would undoubtedly meet with the unanimous approval of our member agencies, the Board considered it necessary to take action directly.

Upon motion, the Board therefore authorized MR. JEROME CURTIS to draft a resolution to be recommended for adoption at the Business Session of the Assembly on Sunday. The resolution follows:

WHEREAS, Palestine has been the haven of refuge to hundreds of thousands of persecuted Jews and

WHEREAS, untold numbers of European Jewry look to Palestine as their source of hope and life, and

WHEREAS, the British White Paper on Palestine, if put into effect, would close the door to the entry of Jewish refugees, and would drastically restrict the opportunity for refugees already in Palestine to become economically independent, and

WHEREAS, the British White Paper on Palestine has been repudiated by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, and

WHEREAS, the Jews of America are unanimously opposed to this proposed action on the part of the mandatory power, and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds representing 210 organized Jewish communities in America appeals to our Government with all of the earnestness at its command to make every effort to persuade our British ally to abrogate the White Paper on Palestine and thereby to keep the doors of Palestine open for the persecuted and oppressed Jews of Europe.

#### PROCEDURE ON RESOLUTIONS

This subject brought up the general question of resolutions and formal actions by the Assembly. The Assembly Business Session usually consisted of reports and recommendations submitted to the Assembly by the Board of Directors. Since the Assembly is a meeting of the delegates it is also possible for individuals, groups, and regional representatives to propose items for Assembly action. At this Assembly, several program sections were meeting and were likely to formulate recommendations and resolutions which they might wish to present to the General Assembly for action.

Mr. Morris D. Waldman, Secretary American Jewish Committee 461 Fourth Avenue New York, New York

Dear Mr. Waldman:

I received from Dr. Linfield, the Director of the Jewish Statistical Bureau, a copy of a memorandum which he prepared for you, on the agitation for the introduction of a religious classification in the forthcoming census of our country, and I noted the recommendations which he made. As Chairman of the Jewish Welfare Fund of Cleveland and as a member of the Committee of Sponsors of the Jewish Statistical Bureau, I beg to urge favorable action on the recommendations made by Dr. Linfield. I see a menace in the practice of national organizations, like the American Jewish Committee, engaging in the collection of statistics of Jews, such as Jewish population statistics, as a secular minority of the American people. This practice plays into the hands of those that urge our Government to collect statistics of Jews, whether under the cloak of a religious census or not. I strongly believe that the collection of statistics of Jews should be done by the Jewish Statistical Bureau, which is divorced from Jewish rights and propaganda interests, and which could do this work in connection with Jewish religious life. I see advantages in the introduction of annual statistics of Jews in place of decennial statistics, provided these are connected with Jewish religious life, similar to the work done by other religious denominations.

Very sincerely yours,
ABBA H. SILVER

AHS: A

Some Statements Made by British Statesmen
Indicating That the Balfour Declaration at the Time of Its Publication
and in the Years Following Was Understood to Mean the
Ultimate Establishment of a Jewish State, Republic or Commonwealth

# Mr. A. J. (afterwards Lord) Balfour (Secretary for Foreign Affairs)

"As to the meaning of the words 'National Home', to which the Zionists attach so much importance, he understood it to mean some form of British, American, or other protectorate, under which full facilities would be given to the Jews to work out their own salvation and to build up, by means of education, agriculture and industry, a real centre of national culture and focus of national life. It did not necessarily involve the early establishment of an independent Jewish State, which was a matter for gradual development in accordance with the ordinary laws of political evolution."

(At a meeting of the War Cabinet at the end of October 1917 when Balfour submitted the proposed Declaration to the Cabinet for approval, as recorded by Mr. David Lloyd George. The Truth About the Peace Treaties, Vol. II, p. 1137)

# Cyril P. Scott (Editor, Manchester Guardian)

"What it means is that, assuming our military successes to be continued and the whole of Palestine brought securely under our control, then at the conclusion of peace our deliberate policy will be to encourage in every way in our power Jewish immigration, to give full security, and no doubt a large measure of local autonomy, to the Jewish immigrants, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State."

(From The Manchester Guardian, November 10, 1917, the day of publication of the Balfour Declaration, one week after it was issued)

#### Lord Robert Cecil

"...Our wish is that Arabian countries shall be for the Arabs, Armenia for the Armenians, and Judaea for the Jews."

(Speech at London Opera House, December 2, 1917. Great Britain, Palestine and the Jews, Zionist Organization, London, 1918)

## Mr. Neville Chamberlain

"If the new Jewish State which is to be established there is to be... associated with some great progressive people, such as those of the American Commonwealth or of the British Empire, then in such a case it seems to me that those fears which I have mentioned would be groundless, and that the existence of this new Jewish State would only add to the dignity and influence of Jews in other countries."

(From a speech at the Alexandra Theatre, Birmingham, October 13, 1918. <u>Jewish Chronicle</u>, October 18, 1918)

### General Smuts (A member of the War Cabinet)

"From those parts of the world where the Jews are oppressed and unhappy, where they are not welcomed by the rest of the Christian population, from those parts of the world you will yet see an ever-increasing stream of emigration towards Palestine; and in generations to come you will see a great Jewish State rising there once more."

(At a meeting in Johannesburg, November 3, 1919. Zionist Bulletin, December 10, 1919)

# Mr. Herbert (now Lord) Samuel (For a time member of the Lloyd George Cabinet)

"The policy propounded before the Peace Conference, to which the Zionist leaders unshakably adhere, is the promotion to the fullest degree that the land conditions of the country allow, of Jewish immigration and of Jewish settlement, the concession to Jewish authorities of many of the great public works of which the country stands so greatly in need, the active promotion of Jewish cultural development and the fullest measure of local self-government, in order that with the minimum of delay the country may become a purely self-governing Commonwealth under the auspices of an established Jewish majority."

(From a speech at the London Opera House on November 2, 1919. Zionist Bulletin, November 5, 1919)

# Mr. Winston Churchill (Secretary of State for War)

"If, as may well happen, there should be created in our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred in the history of the world which would from every point of view be beneficial, and would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire."

(Illustrated Sunday Herald, February 8, 1920)

Section on Palestine from Document 246

(David Hunter Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, Vol. IV, pp. 263-264) Outline of Tentative Report and Recommendations Prepared by the Intelligence Section, in Accordance with Instructions, for the President and the Plenipotentiaries January 21, 1919

#### \*26. PALESTINE.

\*78

# It is recommended:

- 1) That there be established a separate state of Palestine.
- 2) That this state be placed under Great Britain as a mandatory of the League of Nations.
- 3) That the Jews be invited to return to Palestine and settle there, being assured by the Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the protection of the personal (especially the religious) and the property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish-state in fact.
- 4) That the holy places and religious rights of all creeds in Palestine be placed under the protection of the League of Nations and its mandatory.

# DISCUSSION.

- 1) It is recommended that there be established a separate state of Palestine.
  - \*The separation of the Palestinian area from Syria finds justification in the religious experience of mankind. The Jewish and Christian churches were born in Palestine, and Jerusalem was for long years, at different periods, the capital of each. And while the relation of the Mohammedans to Palestine is not so intimate, from the beginning they have regarded Jerusalem as a holy place. Only by establishing Palestine as a separate state can justice be done to these great facts.

As drawn upon the map, the new state would control its own source of water power and irrigation, on Mount Hermon in the east to the Jordan; a feature of great importance since the success of the new state would depend upon the possibilities of agricultural development.

2) It is recommended that this state be placed under Great Britain as a mandatory of the League of Nations.

Palestine would obviously need wise and firm guidance. Its population is without political experience, is racially composite, and could easily become distracted by fanaticism and bitter religious differences.

The success of Great Britain in dealing with similar situations, her relation to Egypt, and her administrative achievements since General Allenby freed Palestine from the Turk, all indicate her as the logical mandatory.

Palestine and settle there, being assured by the Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the pro\*80 tection \*of the personal (especially the religious) and the property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish state in fact.

It is right that Palestine should become a Jewish state, if the Jews, being given the full opportunity, make it such. It was the cradle and home of their vital race, which has made large spiritual contributions to mankind, and is the only land in which they can hope to find a home of their own; they being in this last respect unique among significant peoples.

At present, however, the Jews form barely a sixth of the total population of 700,000 in Palestine, and whether they are to form a majority, or even a plurality, of the population in the future state remains uncertain. Palestine, in short, is far from being a Jewish country now. England, as mandatory, can be relied on to give the Jews the privileged position they should have without sacrificing the rights of non-Jews.

4) It is recommended that the holy places and religious rights of all creeds in Palestine be placed under the protection of the League of Nations and its mandatory.

The basis for this recommendation is self-evident.

Commonwealth." This objective demands the formulation of an intelligent political, economic and immigration program which will insure the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

B. To attain the objective the following program is submitted:

- (1) The continuation of our efforts to secure the reorganization of the Z.O.A. on the lines proposed prior to the Pittsburgh Convention, viz., a small responsible administrative body composed of the heads of active departmental committees, directly responsible to the convention, and an executive committee elected to represent the regional divisions of the Organization by the direct vote of the members in the districts.
- (2) The organization of shekel groups throughout the country, so as to insure a large untrammeled American delegation elected directly in accordance with the constitution of the World Zionist organization.
- (3) The formulation of proposed measures to effectuate the necessary reforms in Palestine in the matters of (a) taxation; (b) custom; (c) transpotation; (d) harbors; (e) distribution of state and waste lands; (f) land laws; (g) immigration; (h) education; (i) sanitation and (j) security. Acting in accord and through the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, we should urge and strive for the adoption of these measures of reform by the Mandatory power. The Zionist Public of America should be kept informed of the political and economic problems and conditions in Palestine with a view to consolidating and making effective the voice of American Zionists in Support of needed reforms.
- (4) The presentation of the economic, commercial and agricultural possibilities of Palestine including markets, raw materials, transportation, competitive conditions, labor conditions, finances, etc.
- (5) The stimulation and enlistment of the interest and participation of American Jews in developing the commerce, industry and agriculture of the land by public, semi-public and private enterprises.

its share of the Jewish Agency budget it will mean the raising of at least twice the amount that was provided in 1938 for the Jewish Agency alone.

All of us in the Zionist Organization of America, and I particularly, want to place durselves at the service of yourself and the United Palestine Appeal so that where defects in our fundraising effort exist we may eliminate them through united Zionist action.

The resolution adopted by the Executive of the Zionist Organization of America felt that a conference of all the fundraising agencies for Palestine might, under the impetus of the events in Palestine, create a new united front. At such a conference questions could be discussed that relate to the Joint Distribution Committee, the Welfare Funds and the President's Advisory Committee on Refugees. The latter subject was discussed by Dr. Wise, who is a member of the Committee and who reports that it is contemplated to launch a nationwide drive that would appeal to the community at large and not only to Jews. The United action on the part of all Zionist forces will be essential if the whole or overwhelming bulk of the money is not to go to agencies devoted to other purposes than Palestine upbuilding.

Please let me have your reaction to the resolutions adopted by the Executive of the Zionist Organization of America and also how the Z.O.A. may cooperate in any plans you have in mind for an intensification of interest in the United Palestine Appeal.

With best wishes to you and yours for Ketivah Vahatimah Tovah, I am

Cordially yours.

(signed) SOLOMON GOLDMAN

President '

At both conventions, the position of American Jewry, as established at the first session of the Conference, was made clear to the platform builders. The Zionist delegation to the Republican Convention was headed by Dr. Silver. The delegation to the Democratic Convention was headed by Dr. Wise and associated with him were Mr. Shulman and Dr. Goldstein.

On October 12th, in a statement given to Dr. Silver in New York, Governor Thomas E. Dewey forthrightly endorsed his party's platform declaration on Palestine and pledged his support for the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth. Governor Dewey's statement follows:

In 1944, the Council of Federations and Weffare Funds, voicing the demand of an impatient and indignant American Jewry, brought about the creation of the National Community Relations Advisory Council to coordinate all civic-defense work in the United States. Last year, your committee recommended "that the CCAR write to the four major civic-defense agencies urging them most strongly, for the sake of a strengthened American Jewry to coordinate their work through the National Community Relations Advisory Council and to submit all details of their civic-defense program for scrutiny by this organization." There is little indication that any progress is being made in this direction; on the other hand, there is evidence that no real effort is being made to provide a unified leadership in civic-defense work.

Your committee is of the opinion that the real organizational basis of American life lies in the local Jewish Community Council and in an eventual National Jewish Community Council which will either supervise and coordinate or ultimately take over all civic defense work. Your committee, therefore, looks with favor on the attempts of some Jewish Community Councils -- which have recently met in Cleveland -- which are now urging the Council of Federation and Welfare Funds to encourage the formation of new regional organizations based on the Community Council idea, and to establish specialized services in the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds to further the community council idea. We recommend, therefore, that this Conference express its approval of this attempt to further local, regional, and national community council organizations and development, and further that it send copies of this statement of approval to the callers of the Cleveland Conference on Jewish Community Councils and likewise to the leaders of the national organizations now participating in the National Community Relations Advisory Councile

Undated

## REQUESTS FOR PERSONAL CONTACTS WITH MEMBERS OF THE

## SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

STATE	SENATOR	CONTACT	COPY
California	Hiram Johnson	Rabbi Edgar F. Magnin Los Angeles	Gustave L. Goldstein Theodore Strimling
Delaware	James M. Tunnell	Milton Kutz Wilmington	Ben V. Codor Aaron Finger
Florida	Claude Pepper	Rabbi Max Shapiro Miami	
Georgia	Walter R. George	Julian V. Boehm Atlanta	Sol B. Benamy
Indiana	Frederick Van Nuys	Rabbi Israel Chodos Indianapolis	Daniel Frisch
Iowa	Guy M. Gillette	Dr. Abraham G. Fleischman Des Moines	Rabbi Sholom H.Epstin Waterloo Barney Baron Sioux City Jack Wolfe
Kansas	Arthur Capper	Rabbi Carl Manello Wichita	
Kentucky	Alben W. Barkley	Charles Strull Louisville	
Maine	Wallace H. WhitemJr.	Israel Bernstein Portland	Philip W. Lown Auburn Nobart Schapiro
Michigan	Arthur Vandenberg	Philip Slomovitz Detroit	
Minnesota	Henrik Shipstead	Harold J. Goldenberg — Minneapolis	Jesse B. Calmenson St. Paul Mrs. Irving Levy St. Paul
Missouri	Bennett C. Clark	Rabbi Julius Gordon St. Louis	
Pennsylva <b>nai</b>	Joseph F. Guffey James J. Davis	Charles J. Rosenbloom Pittsburgh	
Rhode Island	Theodore Green	Archibald Silverman Providence	
Texas	Tom Connally	Herman P. Taubman Dallas	Sol Brachman Fort Worth

STATE	SENATOR	CONTACT	COPY
Utah	Elbert Thomas	James L. White	
Virginia	Carter Glass	Joseph L. Hecht Norfolk	Morton Cushner
Wisconsin	Robert M. LaFollette, Jr.	H.D. Schwartz Milwaukee	Robert A. Hess Elkan C. Voorsanger





Mr. Neumann: Agree with Mr. Shulman that we should not comment on Mr. Stettinius' statement. The only thing is whether we should say anything to the Zionists of America.

Mr. Shulman: Cannot the Zionists of America restrain themselves for 24 hours?

Wr. Manson: With regard to the press release of the State Dept. Reporting

confidentially the background material given to the press together with the statement

by the Press Relations man. He spoke of the terrorism in Palestine, the Moyne incident,

Britain's insecure position, the fact that even pressure on Gt. Britain has not been

able to secure a new policy.

Mr. Shulman: We should wait and see. I would caution against issuing any statement.

Dr. Goldstein: Urge that the message be sent to Mr. Stettinius tonight.

Dr. Silver: I asked one or two Senators, especially Sen. Vandenberg, how we should present this to the public. V. said we ought not to present it in any defeatist mood. We ought to present it in this way: The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has thought so favorably about this that it spent four sessions in the last week deliberating on it. It wanted to move affirmatively. It was only the strong intervention of the State Dept. two and three times to postpone action. From that point of view our statement should be drafted, saying that the House Foreign Affairs Comm. did act, that the Senate Committee favored it strongly. (Vandenberg quoted St. as saying that it may be possible to proceed in 60-90 days).

Mr. Shulman: (referring to the draft statement to be sent to Mr. St.): This, taken on its face value, is in clear conflict with the statement issued today by St.

Still think that it is most advisable that this statement be issued and that it be signed by the Secretary of State. If we cannot get the publication of this statement at this time, it is important to get it understood that it will be issued to the public on a date to be decided on.

Even though we may not be able to get the statement to be released, failing that, we ought to consider the possibility of getting assurances from the President that he does not intend to retreat from the position he took with us in his public statement of Oct. 15th.

<u>Dr. Joseph:</u> It is not logical. They are not saying in todays statement that there is conflict with the President's first statement. They take the position that if there is action on the part of Congress it will mean more than a statement from the President or the State Dept.

Mr. Shulman: If the choice is a perfectly innocuous statement which we can publish and a bill on which we can call payment at a certain time, the latter is preferable.

Mr. Warhaftig: Believe a weaker statement that we can publish is better than a statement that we cannot publish.

There followed some discussion on the wording of the statement to be sent to Mr. Stettinius. IT WAS AGREED that this statement should be similar to that discussed early that morning.

Mr. Neumann: Suggest issuing a statement that we are withholding comment at the moment and are awaiting further explanation.

AGREED that Dr. Joseph was to phone this statement to Dr. Wise with this information: that Mr. Stettinius wants it at once and that he will send it to the President within an hour. Dr. Wise should send the statement by Nightletter telegram so that St. will have it first thing in the morning. Also that the statement should not be too long.

Also AGREED that if they refuse to issue this statement we try to get such a statement not for publication.

DECIDED to hold the next meeting of the plenum Wednesday, Dec. 20th.

Dr. Silver: There se ms to be an erroneous impression that I want to correct, that only the plenum can act on political matters. We are a political body and everything we do is political. The only reason why I have usually shifted political matters to the plenum is that on the 3rd Mondays we have had two meetings, so I usually took up administrative matters at the Exec. Committee meeting in the afternoon and left the political matters for the plenum meeting in the evening. If you want to change that, it can be done. But it would not be right, since the plenum meets only once a month.

Dr. Goldste in: But you yourself indicated that the plunum lays down policy.

The meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.



The Committee shall, from time to time, report to the Board on the progress of its work, recommending such modifications or expansions of the program as may seem desirable. But should the Committee at any time recommend by a two-thirds vote that the full national advisory budget service as originally projected be adopted the Board shall, before putting such recommendation into effect, submit same to a meeting of the Assembly of the Council for its approval.



1. QUESTION: If Christ were to return to Jerusalem, what message do you think he would bring to His oppressed people - the Jews - in Germany and elsewhere in Europe?

ANSWER: The message would be: "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely. (Matt. 5.11)

2. QUESTION: Would Christ, in your opinion, look upon the return of the Jews to the Holyland as a fulfillment of Bible prophecy?

ANSWER: Yes. Bound up with the messianic faith of Israel at all times was the restoration of the people to Palestine and the rehabilitation of its national life.

3. QUESTION: In the light of the present rearmament race, what would be the text of your sermon if you were preaching to the rulers of the world?

ANSWER: My text would be: "For not by their own sword did they get the land in possession,

Neither did their own arm save them.

But Thy right hand, and Thine arm, and the light of Thy countenance,

Because Thou wast favorable unto them." (Ps. 44.4)

4. QUESTION: What are the main points you would seek to bring out in your sermon to the rulers?

ANSWER: I would stress the old but forever ignored truth which mankind should have learned by now after having passed through so many seas of blood - that no victory is ever achieved through arms and that no permanent security is ever established through physical power. It is only in the "light of God's countenance", in the building of a social order based on justice, truth and the supremacy of moral law that a nation can find its enduring salvation.

5. QUESTION: What is your favorite Bible passage?

Answer: Psalm 90.

5th - That the capital requirements for the enterprises undertaken, which shall each be undertaken as separate and distinct entities, shall be determined by the Palestine Development Council.

6th - That the raising of the necessary capital for the various specific enterprises may be allotted in the discretion of the Council to various cities, as particular objectives for the various respective cities.

7th - That Palestinians are to be included in the management and operation of the enterprises, so far as possible.

8th - The cooperative principle shall be applied in all enterprises as far as practicable. This includes the principle that profits
shall be limited to a reasonable return, on the investment; and Palestinians may purchase shares of stock from any stockholder at any time at
par so that ultimately control and operation, shall pass into the hands
of Palestinian Jews and the corporation or enterprise shall become or
shall be a part of a cooperation society.

9th - It is understood that the enterprises contemplated shall involve a capitalization in the aggregate of not less than \$5,000,000. It is recommended that the authorized capital of the cooperative wholesale supply Society be \$1,000,000. The figure of \$5,000,000 mentioned is not suggested as a goal or limit, but as a minimum. Contemplation of future activities should, however, not interfere with immediate action and operation should be commenced by the management, as soon as possible. It is supposed that, in the discretion of the management, the cooperative wholesale supply Society may commence operations as soon as \$250,000 is raised.

## THE ALATHIAN ROSTER AT PRESENT

X Ferninand Q. Blanchard 1688 Lee Road, C. 18	Euclid Avenue Congregational Church Euclid Avenue at East 96th Street, C. 6		2638 5556
John Bruere 2845 Scarborough Road, C. 18	Calvary Presbyterian Church 2020 East 79th Street, C. 3		8448 0278
X Harold F. Carr  1447 Arthur Avenue, C. 7	Lakewood Methodist Church 15700 Detroit Avenue, C. 7		8644 5731
13705 Shaker Blvd., C. 20	Trinity Cathedral Euclid Avenue at East 22nd Street, C. 14		3630 1471
A. Dale Fiers  3331 Bradford Rd., C. 18	Euclid Avenue Christian Church 9990 Euclid Avenue, C. 6		4388 0106
will coll Miles H. Krumbine 26400 South Woodland Road, Chag	Plymouth Church Weymouth and Coventry Rds., C. 20 rin Falls, Ohio TERR		3510 9021
X Oscar T. Olson  3315 Chalfont Road, C. 20	Epworth-Euclid Methodist Church 1919 East 107th Street, C. 6		1200 2964
Waymon Parsons 3264 Chalfont Road, C. 20	Heights Christian Church 3451 Avalon Road, C. 20		4800 3965
Harold Cooke Phillips 2907 Hampshire Road, C. 18	First Baptist Church of Greater Cleveland Fairmount Blvd. and Eaton Road, C. 18		<b>74</b> 80 2581
Abba Hillel Silver  19810 Shaker Blvd., C. 22	The Temple Ansel Road and East 105th Street, C. 6		0150 1090
X Beverly D. Tucker  2521 Fairmount Blvd., C. 6	Trinity Cathedral 2241 Prospect Avenue, C. 14		6665 6666
Howard M. Wells  1817 Hillside Road, C. 12	First Presbyterian Church 16200 Euclid Avenue, C. 12		-2777 1733
Louis C. Wright  14901 Lake Avenue, C. 7	Church of the Covenant 11205 Euclid Avenue, C. 6	BO	0482 8910
TOTOT	Em Mill		

We welcome to our membership Dale Fiers.

Here is the host and reader schedule for 1949 - 1950---

DATE	HOST	READER
October 24, 1949	Wells	Carr
November 21, 1949	Wright	Bruere
December 19, 1949	Blanchard	Blanchard
January 23, 1950	Bruere	Wright
February 27, 1950	Emerson	Wells
March 27, 1950	Fiers	Tucker
April 24, 1950	WRHS Krumbine MERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES	Silver

Happy summer - - with much fuel for the winter's fire.

H. M. Wells

1Than Jollo