

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18673

Someday, I hope, we shall return to the maxim that it is best to deal with tyrants at arm's length and to shun official invitations and the conviviality of social functions because, whether we will it or not, these inevitably imply acceptance of approbation of their regimes.

I am under no illusions. I do not expect any immediate change in policy in response to the statement I have made today. However, conscience compels me to speak out publicly. I do so in the knowledge that there are millions of Americans who think as I do, and in the conviction that ultimately the validity of the position I have here outlined will be accepted by those in charge of our foreign policy.

### ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Soviet persecution of the Jewish people has reached new levels of prejudice and inhumanity. The continued arrests of Jewish citizens for alleged economic offenses, the prohibition of the sale of matzohs for the celebration of religious holidays, the closing of seminaries and synagogues, the desecration of holy burial grounds, and finally, the sentencing of a rabbi to death, reveal to the world an ugly picture of anti-Semitism and religious intolerance.

Soviet pretensions of equal rights for all nationalities in the Soviet Union are a farce indeed when minority groups such as members of the Jewish faith are placed under an intolerable burden of suspicion, restriction, and persecution.

Mr. President, this matter has been raised on the floor of the Senate in a number of different forms, and I, among others, have joined in a variety of different overtures to press this matter to the attention of the Soviet Government and to urge upon our own Government a more vigorous defense of human rights where they are so tragically jeopardized.

The results, I am reluctant to admit, are altogether negligible. In fact, there is evidence that Soviet anti-Semitism is very definitely on the increase. The reasons are not entirely clear. Partly, no doubt, the Soviet Union wishes to find a scapegoat for its own economic failures which have most recently culminated in the Soviet need to import huge quantities of Western foods. Partly, also, the Soviet Government may wish to demonstrate to the Red Chinese and other Communist parties that it remains an ardent supporter of the most stringent Communist economic policies and an opponent of nationalism in any form. But whatever the reasons that lie behind the resurgence of Soviet religious persecution, there is increasing dissatisfaction with the passive attitude that has been taken by the U.S. Government on this issue. State Department officials who discuss the agenda of the General Assembly dwell at length on human rights

in general. There will be a draft declaration on the elimination of racial discrimination and no doubt a lot of talk about anticolonialism. But unless our Government takes the initiative of bringing the matter of Soviet anti-Semitism to the floor, I see no indication that this important matter will even be considered by the U.N. this year.

Mr. President, I am very much disappointed that the Department of State is not willing to take the initiative in bringing this problem more forcibly to world attention. In recent correspondence to me, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman refers to the pressure that the Soviet Union is putting on all religious groups, but particularly those of the Jewish faith. Unfortunately, there is no indication of any initiatives that the United States is prepared to take.

Mr. President, there is one initiative that we could very easily take at this juncture—an initiative well within our power and one which would dramatically show to the world our concern for religious toleration in every corner of the globe. We could formally propose as one of the conditions for the sale of U.S. grain to the Soviet Union that the wheat from the United States be available for religious celebrations without reference to faith or denomination throughout the Soviet Union. Whether the Soviets would agree to such a condition and abide by it in good faith remains to be seen. But such a public appeal by the United States could not fail to make an impact on world opinion. It would point up more effectively than anything else we could do at this point the hypocrisy of Soviet plans and the discrimination and restrictions that the Communists place upon manifestations of religious feeling.

Mr. President, such a move on the part of the United States would, I sincerely believe, go far to mitigate the present Soviet wave of persecution against the Jewish people, and I am urging the Secretary of State to give this proposal urgent consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, if he has a minute?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is specifically referring to the baking of matzoh, which is prohibited in the Soviet Union. The Senator's statement is absolutely correct. I, too, have communicated with the Secretary of State, and I wish to endorse and support the Senator's recommendation. It may be that the action proposed cannot be taken; but at least the United States ought to raise the question as showing its interest in this subject. I congratulate my colleague for raising the question.

### EMPLOYMENT AT THE BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am concerned over the long-term outlook for employment at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. There is, let me make clear, no immediate crisis. Employment, in fact, has remained relatively stable over the last 12 months. But the long-term trend

is unfortunately down. In 1953, Navy yards did 93 percent of repair, alteration, and conversion work plus 45 percent of new construction. The trend since that time has been steadily downward. In 1958, the Navy yards got 88 percent of repair, alteration, and conversion work, with 20 percent of new construction. Last year, however, Navy yards received only 64.6 percent of repair work and 13 percent of new construction. This year, fiscal 1964, Navy yards are scheduled to get about 62.5 percent of repair work and 18 percent of new construction.

What does this mean specifically for New York? Again, I repeat, the immediate outlook is good, but for the long term there are serious problems. I am assured by Secretary of the Navy Korth that the New York Navy Shipyard has a great deal of work at the moment and, in fact, that additional ship construction work at this time "would create a serious overload there." Also, over the last year, since the third quarter of fiscal 1963, there have been no substantial reductions in employment at the Navy yard.

A bookkeeping shift, upgrading the U.S. Naval Applied Science Laboratory, technically transferred 800 employees from the Navy yard payroll to a separate payroll. The shift of 800 employees, which was not a reduction, accounts for the difference in figures between the third quarter of 1963 when the employment range was set between 11,800 and 12,300, and the figures just provided to me by the Bureau of Ships, indicating an employment range of 11,000 to 11,500 for the second quarter of fiscal 1964, that is, October through December of 1963. For the moment, then, there is no reason for alarm.

However, in reviewing the proposed further assignments for fiscal 1964, the Navy shipbuilding program does not as yet allot a significant amount of work to the New York Naval Shipyard. Brooklyn will get two destroyer conversions and no new construction. This compares with four destroyer conversions for the Boston Navy Yard, three destroy conversions that will go both to the Philadelphia and Norfolk Navy Yards; two destroyer conversions plus a nuclear-powered submarine that will go to the Mare Island Shipyard; and one destroyer conversion plus the construction of a new destroyer tender that will go to Puget Sound Naval Shipyard. Unfortunately, the Brooklyn Navy Yard will not have an opportunity to work on any of the three new amphibious transport docks—LPD's—which they have worked on in the past, but the Navy Department does assure me that the Navy does not intend to allocate all its new ship construction jobs to private yards, as had been feared in some quarters. Therefore the New York Naval Shipyard may in the future have an opportunity for more such work.

Mr. President, although Secretary of the Navy Korth's letter is encouraging for the moment, there is obviously continuing need for the interest and support of the Members of Congress from New York in the possible long-term dangers for the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I very definitely intend to follow further

18674

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 16

developments closely and do everything in my power to insure that a fair and adequate workload is assigned to the Brooklyn Navy Yard, which has made itself known throughout the naval and shipbuilding world as the can-do yard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks letters from Admiral Brockett, Chief of the Bureau of Ships; Hon. Paul Fay, Jr., Under Secretary of the Navy; and Hon. Fred Korfh, Secretary of the Navy, as well as the projected Navy yard work allocations for this year. There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
BUREAU OF SHIPS,

Washington, D.C., September 30, 1963.  
Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I am writing to apprise you of employment prospects at the New York Naval Shipyard for the second quarter of fiscal 1964.

As of August 31, 1963, employment totaled 11,426. An employment range of 11,000 to 11,500 has been established for operations at this shipyard for the next quarter. This is the same employment range previously forecast for the first quarter of fiscal 1964.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BROCKETT,  
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,  
Chief of Bureau.

OCTOBER 11, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of September 27, 1963, mentioned reports that "the Navy is planning to allocate all new ship construction jobs to private yards, leaving only repair and conversion work to the Navy yards," and asked whether any decision has been reached on this matter.

The above-mentioned reports are incorrect. The Navy has no plans for allocating all new ship construction jobs to private yards. However, as you know, it has been the Navy's long-standing practice to award the bulk of new construction projects to private yards, and the major portion of ship repair and conversion work to naval shipyards. This is in keeping with the capabilities and planned wartime missions of these yards.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. FAY, Jr.,  
Under Secretary of the Navy.

OCTOBER 12, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your telegram of September 30, 1963, in which you asked why none of the three amphibious transport docks (LPD) in the Navy's fiscal 1964 shipbuilding program had been assigned to the New York Naval Shipyard for construction.

Four LPDs from previous years programs are now being constructed at New York. Additional work being performed at this shipyard includes conversion of the *Gilbert Island* (AKV-39) to a major communications relay ship (AGMR), and conversions of *Rich* (DD-820), *Charles P. Cecil* (DD-835) and *George K. Mackenzie* (DD-836) under the fleet rehabilitation and modernization program (Fram). Overhauls of the guided missile cruiser *Springfield* (CLG-7), attack aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* (CVA-42), and the Military Sea Transportation Service Ship *Michelson* (TAGS-32), also are

underway at New York. In addition, as you know, two Fram destroyer conversions in the Navy's 1964 program have been assigned to New York.

I am advised that assignment of an additional ship construction project to the New York Naval Shipyard at this time would create a serious overload there, unless completion schedules were significantly adjusted.

As the Chief, Bureau of Ships, indicated in a recent letter to you, a fairly stable employment level is forecast for New York for the second quarter of fiscal 1964. I assure you that this shipyard will continue to be given thorough consideration in the assignment of naval ship work.

Sincerely yours,

FRED KORFH.

NAVY ANNOUNCES 1964 SHIPBUILDING  
PROGRAM

Further assignments of construction and conversion of ships in the Navy's fiscal year 1964 shipbuilding program were announced today by the Navy. Naval shipyard assignments follow:

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Mare Island Naval Shipyard: One nuclear-powered attack submarine (SSN).

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard: One nuclear-powered attack submarine (SSN).

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard: One destroyer tender (AD).

CONVERSIONS

Boston Naval Shipyard: Four destroyers (DD).

New York Naval Shipyard: Two destroyers (DD).

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard: Three destroyers (DD).

Norfolk Naval Shipyard: Three destroyers (DD).

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard: One destroyer (DD).

Mare Island Naval Shipyard: Two destroyers (DD).

San Francisco Naval Shipyard: One destroyer (DD).

Long Beach Naval Shipyard: One destroyer (DD).

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard: Two destroyers (DD).

ADDRESS BY B. BARRET GRIFFITH,  
OF COLORADO SPRINGS, BEFORE  
INVESTMENT FORUM IN MAN-  
CHESTER, VT.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-  
out objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, on October 4, Mr. B. Barret Griffith, of Colorado Springs, made an address before an investment forum in Manchester, Vt. His perceptive analysis of the investment picture is a good indicator of the status of the Nation's economy. Many of his remarks have application not only to the investor but also to the Government's fiscal policy. I commend the address to the consideration of Senators, especially in view of the pending tax legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Griffith's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY B. BARRET GRIFFITH

Many of us are indebted to Humphrey Neill and to his contrary opinion viewpoint. He has made us realize that there is no substitute for thinking. For years almost every one of us in our speculating and investing experiences has spent considerable time and effort in trying to manufacture an index, a tool, or a gimmick of some sort upon which we could rely to forecast security prices. We have been motivated in this effort by our own individual laziness. We have been seeking a substitute for the hard job of thinking. There is none.

Like maps and compasses, charts and indexes may be useful. However, as in the case of maps and compasses, unless an individual knows continuously exactly where he is, maps, compasses, charts and indexes are equally useless. For example, the thoughtfulness of knowing when one is lost in the mountains that he should walk down hill is more valuable than a pocketful of maps, and the latest model compass. Similarly, the thoughtfulness to recognize the status of majority opinion after security prices have been in an uptrend, or in a downtrend for some time may be of more value than all the day-to-day price charts, moving averages and bellwether indexes that all of us together have manufactured, in my humble opinion.

Applying this thoughtfulness to the present, we find that stock prices have been moving up from an extreme low in June 1962. Generally speaking, stocks are not the bargains they were a year ago. High level business activity seems to be headed higher; the availability of credit appears to be ample; our Government apparently looks toward better economic growth, and more votes from higher spending and lower taxes; raw material prices have been down for years although consumer prices are up and wholesale prices are flat. Considerable opinion seems still to hold to two views: (1) That the very long-term trend of stock prices remains upward after the 1961-62 stock market break and (2) profit from common stocks grows in proportion to the length of time that common stocks are held. Apparently, most speculators and investors do not believe that shorter term ups and downs in stock market prices have replaced both standard bull markets and standard bear markets since the late 1950's. Considerable opinion seems to hold to the common stock cult, which seems to have been born from the purposeful monetary inflation which we have seen during the last 30 years. Many people hold the opinion that common stocks are the best things to hold during inflation, and that inflation is with us, and will be with us for some time. In consequence, it may have been worthwhile to try to think through purposeful monetary inflation and what it means to us individual speculators and so-called investors.

First, neither inflation nor anything else can forever have happy and pleasing effects. It just doesn't make sense for us to assume that it does. Whisky leads to hangovers, and a forever-winning gambler runs out of friends and customers. It is just too easy to believe that continuous inflation guarantees continuously higher stock prices. Maybe inflation's happy jolt is coming to the point of lasting only while we are enjoying Government expenditures of the credit money it has manufactured, and before the expenditure tab has to be paid. With the public becoming wiser and more knowledgeable each day about monetary inflation, the happy honeymoons from the purposeful monetary inflation seem to be getting shorter and shorter. Federal Government finances itself by three means: by taxes, by selling bonds, and by printing spendable credit money through bond sales to banks to create Government checking accounts. Is

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6475

the grooming of his distinguished predecessor, the late A. Whitney Griswold, an impressive set of personal qualifications. He has left no doubt in anyone's mind that he considers the faculty the heart of the university. In order to assure that ability, rather than mere seniority, is to be the yardstick, he has insentimentally cut through protocol to promote young and promising talent.

Refusing to be drawn into a partisan position in the futile argument between the two cultures of science and the humanities, he has, by supporting excellence in both, confirmed that a modern university cannot withdraw either from scientific productivity or from the traditional ways of scholarship.

Some academic conservatives may have had doubts about Mr. Brewster because he occasionally violated sacred channels. They may find it hard to adjust to his more personal approach to the college presidency. American university leadership has gone through many phases, from the predominantly ministerial one, which also played a large part in Yale's history, through the chairmanship by quiet scholars and, after World War II, the unhappy reliance on business executives and military figures.

Mr. Brewster represents a new generation of intellectual but decisive leaders who know that tomorrow's university, while still depending on its strong individual character, must be deeply conscious of national duties.

**The Unfriendly Witness****EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist calling to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Beverly Hills Times.

The article follows:

**THE UNFRIENDLY WITNESS**

(By Irwin M. Moskowitz)

Once upon a time, a congressional investigator decided to conduct a hearing into a movement called Women Strike for Peace. The movement was loosely organized and had no definite long-range plans, but it had aroused suspicion by choosing a title in which three out of four words were controversial.

It came to pass that the Congressman, who was noted for his diligent research, uncovered the fact that the idea of a women's peace-strike originated with a play called "Lysistrata." So the conscientious Congressman issued a subpoena for the playwright.

You might assume that the playwright, being a citizen of ancient Athens, did not feel obligated to honor the subpoena. But he was one of literature's authentic immortals, so he was able and willing to heed this strange summons of posterity.

"The witness will please identify himself for the record," began the Congressman.

"I am Aristophanes, of the tribe Pandionis and the deme Cydathene."

"Tribe? Demic? That's all Greek to me."

"An astute observation."

"Oh? Well, uh, may we have your age?"

"I was born about 2,500 years ago."

"I'll have to admonish the witness not to play the comic with us."

"I am not playing. I am what I am, a writer of dramatic comedy. Some say I am the greatest."

"Was Lysistrata a comedy?"

"Of course. Nobody could possibly take seriously the idea of women joining together in a boycott of love to compel men to sign a peace treaty. Females obviously don't have that kind of willpower."

"The whole idea was only a joke?"

"Not entirely. I was serious about the underlying viewpoint, a viewpoint I expressed in play after play."

"What was that viewpoint?"

"That civilization was heading for needless destruction because two superpowers, my nation's alliance and the Spartan bloc, were each being jostled into conflict by fire-eating generals and profligate politicians."

"What was your solution?"

"Coexistence, with the first step being that each side withdraw from positions that threaten the integrity of the other's power."

"Say, have you been talking with Adlai Stevenson?"

"You mean that fellow whose bias for peaceful negotiation was exposed by the 'Saturday evening papyrus'?" No, I had the idea first. Ask anyone at the Acropolis."

"You'll probably want to take the fifth on this, but would you tell us if your writings ever got you into trouble with the authorities?"

"Take the fifth? Oh, yes, I mustn't forget your quaint American idiom. Thanks, but I feel no need for a drink at this time."

"Mr. Aristophanes, will you answer my question?"

"Certainly. Aside from a small fine for lampooning one demagog a little too vigorously, all I ever suffered was some name-calling."

"For instance?"

"Appeaser, traitor, enemy agent. I also was suspected of being that most terrifying of all creatures, a pacifist."

"You sound like some kind of leftist. Would you rather be Red than dead?"

"We Greeks have a word for such questions. It's sophistry."

"Do you deny that, in one of your plays, you have a group of women seize control of the government and install a system of communism?"

"Sir, I happen to have been a wealthy landowner, a conservative who thoroughly identified with aristocracy. The play to which you refer is actually a satire of the Communist proposals of visionaries, like Plato."

"Where can we find him?"

"Go to Hellas."

"How dare you."

"What the Zeus is the matter with you?"

"How would you like to be held in contempt?"

"That wouldn't be a new experience for me. Besides, I can't spare the time right now. The Muses are calling and I must hie off homeward. I leave you with the wish that the gods will protect your nation from the real enemies."

The witness vanished.

The congressional investigator, undaunted, began preparing a subpoena for Plato.

**A Factual Study: The American Council for Judaism****EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the American Examiner—an independent newspaper published in New York that reports the activities of the American

Jewish community—has published the full text of a pamphlet analyzing the program and platform of the American Council for Judaism. The analysis, prepared by the New York Board of Rabbis, appeared in the Examiner from July 18, 1963 to September 5, 1963. I believe that it constitutes a valuable point-by-point refutation of this organization's supposed representations on behalf of Americans of the Jewish faith.

So that no one will be further misled by this group I commend the rabbis' condemnation of this organization to the attention of our colleagues, preceded by the statement of Dr. Israel Mowshowitz, president of the New York Board of Rabbis:

[From the American Examiner, July 18, 1963]  
STATEMENT BY DR. ISRAEL MOWSHOWITZ, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF RABBIS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE RELEASE OF THE FACTUAL STUDY OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM BY THE BOARD

The New York Board of Rabbis, the largest representative rabbinic body in the world, with a membership of 800 Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Rabbis, reaffirms the position of the three major national rabbinical bodies in America that the American Council for Judaism does not represent any valid interpretation of Judaism. We repudiate its ideology and tactics as inimical and alien to the true spirit of Judaism. While we do not deny the right of that body to speak, we would fall in our elemental duty to truth and to our responsible position as the united voice of religious Jewry if we did not make it clear that the Council for Judaism does not speak in the name of our religious traditions, and that it does not speak for the religious Jewish community.

The American Council for Judaism has consistently misrepresented the Jewish people before the bar of public opinion. It has welcomed every opportunity to malign and impugn the integrity of Jewish institutions, organizations, and causes; and it has consistently distorted and caricatured the precepts of Judaism which it purports to teach. Worst of all, in the most tragic era of Jewish history, it sought to deny to Jews fleeing Hitler's Europe a haven in Palestine, and undermined and obstructed the life-giving work of rescue and rehabilitation carried on by the Jewish community.

Our factual study released today offers clear proof that the group calling itself the American Council for Judaism is neither American nor Jewish in spirit or in concept. It is revealed to be a political organization consisting, by its own claim, of less than one-half of 1 percent of American Jews which was organized in the first instance for the express purpose of denying the right of refugees fleeing occupied Europe to enter Palestine, at the very moment the Nazis were implementing the final solution.

During the 20 years of its existence the activities of the council have consisted of an assault against the United Jewish Appeal, the major lifesaving instrumentality of the American Jewish community. They have attempted to impugn the patriotism of American Jews who have, together with other Americans, shown concern for the welfare of the people of Israel. They have had as their principal aim the incitement of prejudice against the State of Israel, thus contributing to tension and unrest in the Middle East, a policy we believe to be contrary to the best interest of both America and Israel.

Judaism, we believe, has sufficient breadth and depth to embrace varied points of view, but we solemnly declare that there is no room in Jewish life for Jews whose words and deeds would result in the destruction of the State of Israel, in the weakening of Jewish religious

A6476

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 16

commitment, and in incalculable harm to the Jewish people everywhere.

We view with contempt the council's tactics of reviving anti-Semitic slanders of dual loyalties. American Jews who have served their country in peace and in war need not defend themselves against such baseless vicious charges. As Americans concerned with the survival of democratic values everywhere, we pray for the strengthening and survival of the State of Israel as a stronghold of democracy in the Middle East. It is thus in keeping with the best traditions of America to support Israel, or indeed, any other nation which strengthens the democratic and moral climate of our troubled world.

As religious leaders we are dismayed that the council's philosophy is one of complete negation: it would deny the existence of a Jewish people, it rejects traditional Jewish ceremonies, and scoffs at the basic American concept of the right of every citizen to help other peoples struggling for freedom. The council is an organization which claims to be "religious," yet it has no religious commitment. It claims to be "American," yet it misinterprets America as a monolithic structure where all cultural and spiritual variations must be obliterated. It purports to speak for Judaism, yet it is against every best interest of the Jewish community. It has no positive program of its own, but is founded on a platform of negation and hate.

The New York Board of Rabbis is confident that the American people will reject with contempt the political machinations of this small band of misguided individuals who suffer from insecurity and tragic self-hatred. Our love of God, our love of America, our religious commitment and the ties of our religious fellowship with Jews throughout the world—enjoin us to continue our efforts to save oppressed Jews everywhere, and to extend the arm of brotherhood to the people of Israel who are bound to the people of America in a common commitment to the democratic ideals which stem from our Judeo-Christian tradition, upon which both America and Israel are founded.

[From the American Examiner, July 18, 1963]

**THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE PLATFORM AND PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—PART I**

**HISTORY AND NATURE OF THE COUNCIL**

The American Jewish community is a heterogeneous community. Within it there are many diverse voluntary associations devoted to religious, educational, cultural, social, and philanthropic purposes.

Yet despite their differences, virtually all responsible American Jewish groups, both secular, and religious, have united in denouncing one organization, namely, the American Council for Judaism, in unmistakable terms. These groups include all of the Jewish community relations agencies; denunciations having come from the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Jewish War Veterans, and from many organizations, national, and local, that comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council. (The NCRAC is the coordinating body for six national agencies and 84 local Jewish Community Relations Councils throughout the country. Its national organization constituents: American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, United Synagogue of America, and Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.) Many other groups, both Zionist and non-Zionist likewise have spoken in the same vein.

It is most noteworthy, however, that the American Council for Judaism (which carries the word 'Judaism' in its title and therefore presumably is an organization with a religious orientation) has been strongly repudiated by each of the three national rabbinic bodies which speak for the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative Rabbinate in the United States.

The Rabbinical Council of America, on behalf of the Orthodox Rabbinate in this country, has gone on record as follows:

"Whereas the shocking conduct of the American Council for Judaism and all its members, seeking to question the loyalty of the vast majority of American Jews who support Israel, have brought disgrace and distress to our people.

"Be it resolved that the Rabbinical Council of America go on record denouncing the activities of the American Council for Judaism and dissociating them from the religious community of Israel. The American Council for Judaism is in no wise to be considered a religious Jewish group."

The Rabbinical Assembly of America, representing the Conservative Rabbinate in the United States:

"The Rabbinical Assembly of America repudiates the attempt of a small group of Jews, represented in the American Council for Judaism, to confuse the American public and Government as to the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of Jews in this country towards Israel. . . . We feel it our duty to caution the American public against taking seriously those who claim to represent what they do not represent.

"It is regrettable that this small group, which calls itself 'Jews by religion only' assumes the right to misinterpret the Jewish religion so as to be completely at odds with the authoritative views expressed today by the three major groups in Jewish religious belief."

The Central Conference of American Rabbis on behalf of the Reform Rabbis in the United States:

"The Central Conference of American Rabbis reaffirms its repudiation of the American Council for Judaism and declares that the latter does not represent liberal, Reform Judaism or any other valid interpretation of Judaism." The Council for Judaism "has sought to influence the United States Department of State in a policy contrary to the best interests of both the United States and the State of Israel; and it has distorted and misrepresented the nature and meaning of Judaism."

These statements by the rabbinic bodies representing all the religious groupings of Jews in America are directed at an organization founded late in 1943 for the seemingly innocent purpose of "affirming the exclusively religious nature of Judaism." Any student of Jewish history and tradition can refute this point of view as an excessively narrow definition of Jewish reality without theological foundation. But why has the American Council for Judaism been repudiated so strongly by every respectable element in Judaism? Why has the activity of this infinitesimal fringe group, representing less than one half of one percent of American Jews, according to their own account, aroused such a tempest of indignation?

To understand the strong sentiment against the American Council for Judaism, it is necessary to know something about its history and activities from the time of its inception. At that time Hitler's plans for the extermination of the Jews of Europe had moved forward apace. Jews, fleeing for their lives, were pounding at the gates of the world and only a fortunate few found sanctuary. The Evian Conference of 32 nations, convened by President Roosevelt in 1938, to consider resettlement opportunities for those whose lives were in peril was a complete fiasco in terms of persuading countries to

relax their immigration laws. And, for all practical purposes, the spirit of that conference persisted through the war.

Leaky refugee ships moved from port to port, without haven. Jews were being herded together in extermination camps. Every Jew who remained in Europe was marked for death. The one refuge to which the Jews could lay claim on historical grounds, on the basis of the Balfour Declaration and the stipulation contained in the League of Nations Mandate, was Palestine.

[From the American Examiner, July 25, 1963]

**THE NEW YORK BOARD'S EVALUATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM'S PROGRAM, PLATFORM—PART 2**

**OPPOSITION TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL**

It was at that point in time, December 1942, that the American Council for Judaism was founded. In a declaration of principle issued in 1943 it proclaimed its primary political program: "We oppose the effort to establish a National Jewish State in Palestine or anywhere else as a philosophy of defeatism and one which does not offer a practical solution of the Jewish problem. We dissent from all those related doctrines that stress the racialism, the nationalism and the theoretical homelessness of Jews. We oppose such doctrines as inimical to the welfare of Jews in Palestine, in America, or wherever Jews may dwell."

In this way, a privileged handful of Jews, dwelling securely in America, sought to destroy the one hope of their brothers dwelling in the valley of the shadow of death.

By 1944, the whole world was becoming aware of the position of the Jewish remnant in Europe. The House and Senate reaffirmed a resolution passed in 1922 calling for the establishment in Palestine of a refuge and home for harassed Jews. In April 1946, the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry recommended the immediate admission to Palestine of 100,000 Jews and, as the mandatory power procrastinated, survivors sought to make their way independently to Palestine.

**OPPOSITION TO JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO PALESTINE**

The American Council for Judaism directed a letter to President Truman on May 14, 1946, stating: "We declare and affirm that any immigrant Jew who enters Palestine contrary to its law is an illegal immigrant."

At that point, Dr. Louis Wolsey of Philadelphia, first provisional president of the American Council for Judaism, withdrew from the organization, stating in the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent: "I very definitely believe in freedom of immigration and the unqualified right of the Jew to migrate to Palestine if he wishes, and to make it possible for him to settle there. Because of this I find it intellectually dishonest for me to retain the position of vice president of the American Council for Judaism any longer."

While Rabbi Wolsey opposed Jewish nationalism because he yearned for the ultimate disappearance of all nationalism, it became clear to him that the efforts of the American Council for Judaism were directed only against the attempts of the pathetic survivors of Hitler to find a home in Palestine.

In February 1947, the United Nations was informed by the British Government that it would relinquish the mandate the following year. A special U.N. session was called and an 11-nation U.N. Special Committee on Palestine was appointed to review the situation and recommend a solution. It handed down a majority report calling for partition of the country into separate Arab and Jewish States. On November 29, 1947, this recommendation was accepted by a two-thirds vote of the U.N. General Assembly. The U.N. partition decision was sharply criticized by the Council for Judaism for creating what Mr. Lessing Rosenwald, its president, termed

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6477

"another self-imposed ghetto." Writing in the March 13, 1948, issue of Collier's, Rosenwald declared that a homeland "is the last thing that the Jews themselves want."

From this brief history we can begin to understand the revulsion of American Jews and of the responsible Jewish leadership to the program and tactics of the American Council for Judaism. No ideological innovation could have aroused such a powerful and united reaction of opposition. This universal reaction came because American Jews realized that the action of the Council for Judaism struck at the life of the Jewish people itself. At the moment of greatest tragedy, in a history that goes back 4,000 years, the American Council for Judaism did its utmost to prevent the United Nations, the American Government, the Jews of America and the 650,000 Jews in Palestine, from establishing a refuge and a home in Palestine for the remnant fleeing the Nazi holocaust.

It is not unfair to assume that had the American Council for Judaism succeeded, many of the Jews now alive and free in Israel, might have perished. Life is the most precious of Jewish values. He who saves a single life, says the tradition, is as though he had preserved the entire world.

#### OPPOSITION AFTER ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, the American Council for Judaism has been engaged primarily, as from the beginning, in an intensive program of political and propaganda activities whose purpose is to cut off American Jewish support for Israel and to influence the U.S. Government in a policy contrary to the best interests of Israel, and we believe, of the United States and world peace.

The program has aspects whose validity and practical implications we will examine:

1. Propagating an exclusively religious definition of Judaism which distorts and misrepresents its historic character.

2. Charging the overwhelming majority of American Jews with dual loyalty because they show concern for their surviving brothers in Israel. In the opinion of all Jewish community relations organizations, the American Council for Judaism utterances project an unfavorable image of Jews, which lend themselves to exploitation by hate groups and Arab propagandists.

3. Obstructing the lifesaving work of the United Jewish Appeal, which has rescued over a million and a half Jews in the past 25 years, and helped twice that number to rebuild their lives.

4. Continuing a program of political action, under the cloak of religious ideology, in an effort to influence negatively U.S. policy toward Israel and block Jewish immigration to Israel, the one country willing to accept Jews fleeing Arab and Iron Curtain countries in large numbers.

Only \$18,525 out of its total budget of \$406,500 was allocated to religious education in the published budget for 1962, the rest to anti-Zionist and anti-Israel propaganda.

#### Zionism and Americanism

No one would question the right of the American Council for Judaism to propagate its erroneous interpretation of Judaism, though it does not speak for the religious community. What is deeply resented, however, are its past efforts to block the establishment of Israel, immigration of Jews to Israel, and its continuing campaign against the raising of funds for the settlement of immigrants in Israel through the United Jewish Appeal. What is most unconscionable are the aspersions cast upon the patriotism of American Zionists and friends of Israel, constituting virtually all of American Jewry.

Jews have felt at home in America as in no other country during their 2,000 years of dispersion. American Jews give their Government their unqualified loyalty, in peace and in war. It is not only that America

secured their lives and their rights. The cherished ideals of America are those to which the Jew can answer a fervent amen. Americanism like Judaism is based on Biblical foundations. America has never asked Jews to deny their background or their faith nor to dam up the springs of love and compassion for their fellow Jews in lands of darkness and persecution or in the new land of Israel.

#### ACCUSES U.S. JEWS OF DUAL LOYALTIES

American Jews were accused of "dual loyalty" by Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive vice president of the American Council for Judaism, in a pamphlet entitled "Four Articles on the Law of Return."

"The thesis of the American Council for Judaism," wrote Rabbi Berger, "is that the Zionist-Israel axis imposes upon Jews outside of Israel, Americans of Jewish faith included, a status of double nationality."

#### WHAT IS THE LAW OF RETURN?

In truth, the law of return is an unprecedented humanitarian law enacted by the State of Israel offering automatic citizenship to any Jew who needs or wishes to settle there. Under this law, Israel has taken in over a million Jews—including the lame, the sick, and the aged—discharging its historic responsibility and fulfilling the expectations of the United Nations which voted for its establishment.

Lessing Rosenwald went even further, accusing the U.S. State Department of confirming this status of double nationality for American Jews. At the 10th annual conference of the American Council for Judaism which met in San Francisco in May 1953, Mr. Rosenwald asserted:

"Our Department of State has placed its American Jewish citizens in a category of Americans subject to 'dual nationality' and made them subject to 'dual nationality' regulations in connection with visits to Israel."

The most recent development of this argument introduces a new twist. Prof. W. T. Mallison addressed the 1962 convention of the American Council for Judaism in Chicago where a chapter of the brief he helped to prepare for submission to the State Department was distributed. Mallison states that it is the legal obligation of the American Government to prevent Israel from granting automatic citizenship to Jews who wish to settle in Israel in order to protect the citizenship status of American Jews.

#### NO BASIS FOR ACJ CHARGES

One need not be a jurist to recognize that it is impossible for Israel, unilaterally, to change the status of American Jews whose rights are defined and protected by the laws and courts of the United States. Judge H. G. Hershenson of Chicago promptly made this point saying:

"There is no basis in law for statements issued by spokesmen for the American Council for Judaism here in Chicago that alleged actions by Zionists and Israelis jeopardize the status and rights of American citizens of the Jewish faith which are secured by the Constitution and the laws of our country."

"American Jews give their exclusive loyalty to America as Israelis give theirs to Israel. The relationship between Jews in America and Jews in Israel is a voluntary one; it is rooted in love and faith and historic tradition and motivated by a shared compassion for Jews who need Israel as a haven and a home."

The Decalogue Society of Lawyers, an association of 1,600 Jewish lawyers in Chicago, said "The loyalty of American Jews to the United States has been repeatedly demonstrated. Jews who have aided Israel have done so from a humanitarian point of view to aid a struggling democracy, just as other Americans throughout our history aided freedom in other parts of the world. Such help is in keeping with the time-honored

tradition of America and is not repugnant to American ideals."

#### JUSTICE BRANDEIS ON DUAL LOYALTY

The clearest rejoinder to the accusation of "dual loyalties" was made 40 years ago by the late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, in an address to the Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis:

"Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his State, and of his city; for being loyal to his family and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish-American who contributed toward advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlements in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better American for doing so."

Justices Brandeis, Cardozo, Frankfurter, and Goldberg—each of the four Jews appointed to the Supreme Court—have been warm friends, if not leaders, of Zionism.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 1, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM: IN PURSUIT OF ITS GOALS, THE COUNCIL MAINTAINS A CLOSE LIAISON WITH ISRAEL'S FOE—ITS STATEMENTS ARE QUOTED WITH APPROVAL BY ANTI-SEMITIC FORCES—PART 3

#### THE CHRISTIAN REPLY TO THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM

The council also approaches Christian personalities in the United States with the view of dissuading them from helping Israel or Zionism, on the grounds that "a number of Jewish people do not endorse the idea of allegiance to Israel which is part of the Zionist creed." The council had written in this vein to the then Governor McKeldin of Maryland who had urged Americans to purchase Israel bonds.

The Governor replied: "Your reaction excites in me nothing short of amazement. Suffice to say that Zionism as universally understood does not call for political allegiance from American citizens to the Government of Israel. I have never heard it suggested that Americans who purchased British or Argentine or Peruvian bonds created any problems of allegiance. The concern you express over the danger of a split allegiance is excessive and unwholesome, and misconstrues the requirements of true allegiance to the United States and its ideals."

Among others who rejected the American Council for Judaism line of reasoning were Dr. Coert Rylaarsdam of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, who wrote: "I am a Christian who has been an outspoken friend and supporter of the Zionist movement. I do not believe that the American loyalty of a Jew is compromised by the existence of the State of Israel, nor do I believe that it destroys the universality of the faith he professes. I am not persuaded that your council is rendering either Judaism or America a positive service. I rather feel that you are an embarrassment to Judaism and fail to appreciate the great civilizing and critical function which is the historic mission and heritage of Israel."

The Reverend Dr. John Haynes Holmes replied in this fashion: "I would adjure the Council for Judaism, and frightened souls generally, not to be alarmed. Zion has added a new chapter to the history of human freedom. It is to the greater glory of America, that, through her Jewish citizens, she has been allowed to make a contribution to the triumph of Zion's cause, just as it was glorious that, through her Irish citizens in former days, she was privileged to play a part in the heroic drama of Ireland's deliverance."

A6478

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Over the years, thousands of Christian leaders throughout the Nation, including leaders in government and public affairs, have voiced similar sentiments and have seen only the fullest consonance between Zionism and America's interests. President Kennedy, in a message to the 1962 convention of the Zionist Organization of America, said: "This Nation, from the time of President Wilson, has established and continued a tradition of friendship with Israel because we are committed to all free societies that seek a path to peace, honor, and individual right. . . . In the prophetic spirit of Zionism all freemen today look to a better world and in the experience of Zionism we know that it takes courage and perseverance and dedication to achieve it. Toward this larger and greater adventure for all mankind, your energies are now summoned."

## CULTURAL PLURALISM

The richness and variety of American culture results from the fact that it is made up of the contributions of many diverse cultural and ethnic groups. America does not ask us to give up our heritage, for this would be a disservice, but rather to contribute its value to America, thereby enriching the fabric of American life. Modern anthropologists reject the idea of the melting pot and prefer to think of American culture as a symphony in which diverse tones blend in glorious harmony.

## JEWISH MILITARY CHAPLAINS SPEAK OUT

The Jewish military chaplains in World War II, in whose ranks Rabbi Elmer Berger of the American Council for Judaism failed to serve, stated: "In view of the defamatory statements and innuendoes made repeatedly by responsible representatives of the American Council for Judaism, impugning the patriotism of American Zionists, we the undersigned rabbis, serving as chaplains in the Armed Forces of our Nation, register our deep resentment and disapproval of such reckless and un-American allegations.

"Of the 305 surviving chaplains of the Jewish faith who responded unhesitatingly to the call of our country in its hour of need, 228 have already identified themselves with Zionism, with replies expected from many still overseas. For anyone to insinuate that Zionism tends to diminish the full measure of devotion of these 228 rabbis to America is the height of impudence.

"Such an accusation comes with particularly bad grace from an organization which numbers amongst its leadership men who did not respond to the call of the responsible Jewish commission to serve in the chaplaincy."

*The council's political program and its consequences*

The council carries on an intensive political and public relations program designed to weaken the State of Israel: (1) by frightening American Jews into the belief that their support of Israel will be suspect, hoping thus to reduce contributions for the absorption of Jewish refugees, and investment funds for the upbuilding of the country; (2) by attempting to drive a wedge between American Jewry and Israel so as to limit both moral support for Israel as well as cut off any spiritual and cultural kinship; and (3) by efforts to discredit American Jewry in the eyes of the non-Jewish community.

While a portion of the council's campaign is geared to some in the higher income brackets in the Jewish community, its major effort is directed to public officials, the communications media, Christian clergymen, and the academic community. In the pursuit of its goals, the council carries on a close liaison with the enemies of Israel, and its pronouncements and utterances are frequently quoted, with approval, in the anti-Semitic press. Posing as a religious organization, it is able to carry on these activities under a tax-exempt status.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS GROUPS EVALUATE  
ACJ PROGRAM

The major community relations agencies of the U.S. Jewish community, all of them non-Zionist, have all been highly critical of the council's program and activities. The American Jewish committee, after subjecting the activities of the council to sober, scientific analysis, came to the conclusion that "it is determined to discourage and oppose those approaches and procedures, that, far from accomplishing what is intended, project an image of the American Jew as one possessing frail and tenuous ties to his America. . . . The methods of the Council for Judaism do not serve the best interests of American Jews."

"The council publicity is replete with symbols that may well serve to crystallize certain stereotypes of the Jew," says the committee. Council literature contains frequent references to the "international Zionist conspiracy," "Zionist control of press and communications," "Zionist financial power," etc. These phrases, reminiscent of those to be found in the Protocol of the Elders of Zion and other hate propaganda, spill over to the entire Jewish population in the United States and tend to confirm anti-Semitic stereotypes.

They are applied not only to Zionist affiliates but to philanthropic supporters of the United Jewish Appeal, and most American Jews who feel positively toward Israel. The anti-Semites are quick to exploit such statements which corroborate their point of view because they emanate from a Jewish source, "regarded as all the more trustworthy."

Thus, says the committee, "the image of communism blends with that of Zionism, sharpening the picture that anti-Semites have been painting for years by using 'Zionism' as a euphemism for Jew and Judaism, and also working in the red streak of communism. . . . The council provides fodder for anti-Semites. Their characterizations of the Zionists are seized upon to authenticate, ratify, and justify already existing hostile attitudes toward Jews in general."

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Congress have reached the same conclusion, as have all the constituent organizations of the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Says the NCRAC: "Such organizations as the Council for Judaism appear to have accepted and integrated into their own propaganda some of the most extreme and dangerous falsehoods and distortions put forth by the Arab propaganda apparatus." (The ADL has already documented the fact that Arab propagandists in this country, acting on orders from their home ministries, are helping to foster a new growth of anti-Semitism.)

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 8, 1963]

**THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—THE POPULARITY OF THE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM WITH AMERICA'S LUNATIC FRINGE IS NO ACCIDENT. SINCE IT ZEALOUSLY PUSHES THE HATE GROUPS' PROPAGANDA—PART 4**

**"JEWS CONTROL THE PRESS," SAYS AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM**

Rabbi Elmer Berger and the executive director of the council, Leonard Sussman, have recently reiterated the myth of Jewish control of the press in trade magazines such as "Editor and Publisher" (Oct. 20, 1962) and before gatherings of public relations people and journalists.

In an address titled "Ten Commandments for the Mass Media," carried by the wire services, Rabbi Berger renewed the allegation of Jewish domination of mass communication which is also given wide currency by Arab spokesmen. Parenthetically, despite the council's complaints about Zionist domination of the press, the Council for Judaism

has managed to receive press notices out of all proportion to its small membership.

BLAMES JEWISH PERSECUTION ON ZIONIST  
CONSPIRACY

On numerous occasions, the council spokesmen have attributed Jewish insecurity and suffering in many parts of the world—such as the Soviet Union, north Africa, and parts of Latin America—not to any indigenous factors, but rather to an ubiquitous and powerful Zionist conspiracy which, they insinuate, either brings on or fabricates the situation. Castrolism, neonazism, and threatening revolutionary rumbling in various parts of the world which menace Jewish security are never blamed on Communists, Fascist, or indigenous poverty or other factors; they are always attributed to the Zionist conspiracy.

One is at a loss to understand why the American Council for Judaism is so anxious to exonerate Communists, Arab nationalist extremists, and Fascist hooligans in order to blame Jews, an allegation that defies credibility while it reinforces the myth of international power.

One would have expected that the leaders of the Council for Judaism, as Jews, would have spoken up in defense of the right of Soviet Jews to practice their religion. Our State Department recently expressed strong disapproval over continuing Soviet restrictions on religious freedom, and said:

"In the case of Jews, these pressures are such as to prevent the normal maintenance and development of Jewish religious and cultural life." Firm voices of protest on this issue have also been raised by prominent Americans of all faiths. But the Council for Judaism remains silent on this subject.

Who more than an organization "for Judaism," claiming to believe in the universality of Judaism's teachings, should be concerned with the free practice of Judaism by Jews throughout the world? Yet, as recently as April 19, 1963, the council's executive director, Leonard Sussman, declared: "The council has never taken a position on the status of the Jews in the Soviet Union."

## THE COUNCIL AND THE HATE GROUPS

It is quite evident that Arab propagandists with the aid of their anti-Jewish supporters are attempting to isolate the Jews of America from their fellow citizens, and in this effort the Council for Judaism becomes aligned, regardless of motivation. Indeed, the anti-Semites applaud the council. The following citations serve as illustrations:

GERALD L. K. SMITH: "TAKE BERGER'S ADVICE"

Gerald L. K. Smith, probably the most vicious anti-Semitic demagogue in the country, said: "If the Jews of America are wise, they will take the advice of Rabbi Elmer Berger, who some months ago said: 'It is time for the American Jew to realize that he must be an American first and a Jew second.'"

Smith, who in the report of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion (Department of Illinois) as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1951, has been described as "a threat to American unity," also singled out Berger for commendation in an article entitled "The Super-Ghetto," which appeared in the February 1952 issue of the Cross and the Flag: "The super-ghetto of all time is now being built," he asserted. "It is the Jew-Palestine state being built by and for Jews exclusively. Rabbi Berger, who is an anti-Zionist Jew, insists that the racketeers among Jews are deliberately inspiring anti-Semitism in order that Jews be scared into this superghetto which they erroneously call Israel."

Picking up the dual loyalties issue—a key theme in the council's propaganda arsenal—Jack B. Tenney, collaborator of Smith, in a pamphlet entitled "Zionist Network: A Tenney Report," writes: "Among the hundreds of American Jewish organizations flourishing in

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6479

the United States today, only one stands out clearly as basically American."

HART: "OUR ATTITUDE IS PRACTICALLY IDENTICAL."

A hate-monger whose views coincided with those of the Council for Judaism was the late Merwin K. Hart, editor of the "Economic Council Letter," a man who, the American Legion (see above) has stated, "injects anti-Semitism into his newsletters \* \* \* by hammering against a so-called Zionist menace and a plot to destroy the Christian religion \* \* \*." How closely Hart's outlook paralleled that of the American Council for Judaism is evident from a statement in the February 18, 1950, issue of his Letter:

"As a matter of fact, our attitude toward Zionists is practically identical with that of the American Council for Judaism under the leadership of Mr. Lessing Rosenwald."

BERGER AND ROSENWALDS: "LOYAL AMERICANS"

The late Conde McGinley, editor of "Common Sense," probably the most widely circulated anti-Semitic sheet in the United States, was also impressed with the work of the American Council for Judaism. In the February 15, 1951, issue of his publication, McGinley printed two lists of names. One list he entitled "Dupes for Zionists." It contains among others, the names of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, John Foster Dulles, Admiral Chester Nimitz, Robert Patterson, Gen. George Marshall, Thomas E. Dewey, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Charles E. Wilson, and other American leaders. Directly beneath it is a list entitled "Loyal Americans." This list includes the names of Lessing Rosenwald and Elmer Berger.

The popularity of the American Council for Judaism with the lunatic fringe is not an accident. The judgment of the American Jewish Committee, the ADL, and others, is correct. The statements of the Council for Judaism reinforce false stereotypes of the Jew and project an image of the Jew as disloyal to America. By so doing, the council furthers the propaganda line of the hate groups.

THE COUNCIL AND THE ARAB PROPAGANDISTS

We shall not dwell here on the political issues which divide Israel and the Arab states. Conceivably, fairminded Americans could well take positions on different sides of the fence with regard to some of the issues involved. But is it not of special significance that the Council for Judaism has in every instance supported the Arab position against Israel, even on those issues where there is overwhelming American sympathy for Israel's case?

The council approves the Arab effort to cut off American financial support for Israel, and it justifies the Arab boycott of American firms who deal with Israel or who employ Jews. It has even failed to speak up against the closing of the Suez Canal to ships bound for Israel, despite a U.N. resolution calling for such action.

Over the years, Berger has expressed views strikingly similar to those voiced by Arab representatives to the United States and the U.N.

[From the American Examiner,  
Aug. 15, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—THE COUNCIL HAS NOT ONLY DISASSOCIATED ITSELF FROM UJA'S HUMANITARIAN, COMPASSIONATE WORK OF RESCUE, REHABILITATION BUT SEEKS TO WEAKEN AND DISCREDIT IT—PART 5

The council maintains a continuing liaison with Arab officials in this country to whom they taught the efficacy of the use of the dual loyalties argument. This liaison has reached the point where the Council's speakers are frequently recommended by the Arab Office of Information to address various groups and a Council for Judaism speaker

has been used as a substitute for an Arab speaker when the Arabs, for one reason or another, were unable to fill the engagement.

It is also a matter of demonstrable knowledge that a letter from the American Council for Judaism, addressed to official representatives of Arab governments, makes it possible for an American Jew who would otherwise be barred from an Arab country, to enter that country.

The Arabs themselves, and for very good reason, consider the American Council for Judaism an ally. The May 1956 issue of the "Middle East Forum," an anti-Israel publication of the alumni of the American University of Beirut, carries an article entitled "Who Speaks for Arabs?" Among those listed are the Arab Information Center, the American Friends of the Middle East, the National Association of Federation of Syrian-Lebanese-American Clubs, and—the American Council for Judaism. The article is illustrated by a cartoon of these four groups attempting to alert sleeping Uncle Sam to the dangers of Zionism.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM AND AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Rabbi Elmer Berger is a member of the board of directors and a prime mover in the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME), an organization openly identified with the Arab point of view. Representatives of Arab governments speak frequently on AFME platforms, and AFME maintains offices in all Arab Middle East countries, but not in Israel.

As Garland Evans Hopkins, former executive vice president of AFME has stated: "No American can 'wage peace' in the Middle East as long as our policy is largely influenced by a small minority whose primary concern is the best interest of a foreign government." AFME supports the Arab point of view 100 percent in all areas of controversy between Israel and the Arab States.

BERGER BRIEFS ARAB STUDENTS ON HOW TO COMBAT ZIONISM

On January 15, 1963, Rabbi Berger addressed the Organization of Arab Students at Earl Hall, Columbia University, saying, "Zionism is now a sovereign state claiming sovereignty over a disputed territory." Fifteen years after the U.N. decision and the establishment of the Jewish state by world community, Rabbi Berger refuses to recognize its right to exist, thus concurring with the Arab States who plan to destroy it.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM FOUNDER REPUDIATES AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM CAMPAIGN AGAINST ISRAEL

Rabbi Irving Reichert, a founder of the council, in resigning from that organization, was quoted in the New York Times of July 22, 1956: "(The council should halt) its obstructionist campaign against the welfare and legitimate aspirations of Israel and its people."

THE COUNCIL AND THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

The full horror of Germany's final solution to the Jewish problem was documented at the historic Eichmann trial. It will long be debated whether the free world, during those terrible days, did all that was humanly possible to save as many Jews as might have been saved. But this much is certain: the American Jewish community can point proudly to the magnificent work of the United Jewish Appeal as proof that it was willing to give heroically so that others might live.

One tiny but affluent segment of the American Jewish population has not only disassociated itself from this work of rescue and rehabilitation but has sought to weaken and discredit it. That group is the American Council for Judaism.

Is it because it still refuses to recognize the validity and necessity for a State of Israel, hoping to weaken it for the day of

the anticipated Arab onslaught? Or is it because the council's leaders wish to disassociate themselves, on racial grounds, from their less fortunate brethren who have settled in Israel? Mr. Monroe Deutsch, an honorary vice president of the council, speaking of Israel at the organization's 10th annual conference (1953), said: "We would not feel at home in a community made up in large part of orientals and of those who are directly from Slavic lands."

ACJ AND ITS PHILANTHROPIC FUND

Sensitive to criticism on grounds of their lack of charity, the wealthy members of the Council for Judaism have, in recent years, founded a Philanthropic Fund which has disbursed relatively small amounts. Its supporters have figuratively given pennies where UJA supporters of similar economic status have given thousands.

In a fundraising letter dated February 28, 1963, circulated to its membership, the ACJ stated that it hoped to raise close to \$100,000 for the relief of North African Jewish refugees in France. The Joint Distribution Committee, which is supported by the UJA, expects to allocate a total of \$5 million in 1963 for the same purpose. The total fundraising goal of the ACJ Philanthropic Fund for 1963 was set at \$250,000, as against a goal of \$96 million set by the United Jewish Appeal.

While the amount of money raised by the Philanthropic Fund is relatively insignificant, its campaign has served as the occasion for renewed attacks upon the United Jewish Appeal and energetic efforts to dissuade American Jews from giving to the UJA.

THE ATTACK ON THE UJA

The main thrust of the ACJ attack upon UJA is twofold. It maintains that UJA money is used for political rather than for philanthropic purposes and that UJA discriminates against Jews who elect to go to countries other than Israel.

The United Jewish Appeal, whose leaders and supporters include such outstanding American Jews as Senator Herbert Lehman, Justice Arthur Goldberg, Senator Jacob Javits, Mr. William Rosenwald, Mr. Edward Warburg, and Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, has stated unequivocally that its funds go only for philanthropic purposes. Yet the ACJ continues blithely to repeat the charges.

Every U.S. President has publicly endorsed the work of the UJA: Most recently, President Kennedy sent his congratulations to the UJA on its 25th anniversary, saying: "In the continuing effort to fulfill its primary aims of rescue, relief, and rehabilitation, the UJA is adhering to the finest humanitarian traditions of our country. I understand that during the UJA's quarter century of operations its funds have been utilized to rescue more than one and a half million persons and provide direct relief and rehabilitation for more than twice that number. This is an impressive record."

The beneficiaries of the UJA funds are: (a) The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee which has a program of relief and rehabilitation in 27 countries other than Israel and which conducts the Malben program in behalf of the sick, the handicapped and the aged refugees in Israel.

The JDC, with its nearly 50 years' distinguished record of humanitarian service, receives one-third of the proceeds of the United Jewish Appeal.

ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) receives one-third of its global budget for support of its network of vocational schools from the JDC. These schools are located in many countries.

(b) The United Israel Appeal/Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., which finances an extensive program of immigrant absorption and rehabilitation in Israel, including housing, agricultural settlement, social services, youth care and training, etc. The Jewish

A6480

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 16

Agency for Israel, Inc., is an American corporation on whose board serve some of the outstanding leaders in Jewish communities around the country.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 22, 1963]

**THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—"WE CONSIDER IT OUR DUTY TO STATE THAT THE TOTAL ORGANIZED JEWISH COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES HAS REJECTED THE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM AND ALL THAT IT STANDS FOR"—PART 8**

The third beneficiary of United Jewish Appeal (UJA) funds is the New York Association for New Americans, which gives vital assistance to indigent Jewish refugees who settle in the New York metropolitan area. The entire budget of this organization is covered by the UJA.

In addition to the foregoing, the UJA supplements the regular budget of the United HIAS Service for the resettlement of refugees in countries other than Israel.

The funds of the UJA are available (through JDC, NYANA, and UHIAS) to needy Jews who choose to go to countries other than Israel, no less than they are to Jews who migrate to Israel. Indeed, the responsible leadership of American Jewry, the same leadership which has given unstinting support to the UJA, has been prominent in the struggle for the liberalization of U.S. immigration. United HIAS, a UJA-supported agency, has worked consistently to open up immigration opportunities in other countries.

The UJA spends more money on Jews settling in Israel than it does for Jews settling in other countries, simply because immigration restrictions in Western countries are such that Israel is the only country to which Jews, in search of a haven, can go regardless of numbers, health or the financial capacity to support themselves.

More money is needed to provide a home and a job for a settler in the new country of Israel because it is frequently necessary to build the home and create the job. Moreover, a new immigrant in the United States, for example, is frequently aided by the welfare agencies of the local community.

Since 1948, UJA funds have been used to resettle approximately 1,100,000 Jews in Israel and approximately 400,000 in other countries.

**OTHER ASSAULTS ON THE UJA**

In its desperate and, on the whole, unsuccessful attempt to discourage giving to the UJA, the Council for Judaism has additionally sought to give the impression (1) that the UJA has stood in danger of losing its tax exempt status; (2) that helping Jews to settle in Israel promotes tension in the Middle East and is detrimental to American interests there; and (3) that Israel's policy of the "ingathering of exiles," which the UJA furthers by helping to finance the migration of Jewish refugees to Israel, jeopardizes the position of the Jews of the United States and of the Jews in all the countries where they live.

There is not a scintilla of truth in any of these charges.

**KENNEDY REBUFFS THE ACJ**

Many Americans are becoming increasingly concerned over the harmful effects of the ACJ program. On the eve of the 20th annual conference of the Council for Judaism held in May, 1963, ACJ leaders had solicited a message of greeting from President Kennedy. But the White House, taking into consideration recent extremist activities of that organization, viewed as harmful to American-Israel relations—and noting charges by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States that the Council had sought to "whitewash" Soviet anti-Semitism—decided to abstain from sending the customary greetings to the ACJ conference.

**THE JEWISH COMMUNITY SPEAKS—A SPECIAL WORD TO THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY**

While the objectives and minute following of the Council for Judaism are well known in most Jewish circles, it is entirely possible that our Christian friends could easily be misled as to the authenticity of that body as a Jewish "religious" group and that Christians could also be misled into thinking that the Council represents a significant segment of American Jews. Such impressions could understandably be reached as a result of the Council's aggressive publicity campaign and its attractively produced informational materials which are given the widest circulation, particularly in Christian circles.

The New York Board of Rabbis, therefore, considers it useful to enlighten those who may be laboring under any such misconception. We consider it our duty, therefore, to inform the reader on these matters so that the uninformed will come to know that the total organized Jewish community in the United States has rejected the Council for Judaism and all that it stands for.

In previous sections of this study we quoted the findings and reactions of many Jewish organizations. We cite here some additional pertinent statements relevant to this subject, some of which have been made as recently as the past few months.

**THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE**

Soon after the formation of the council and its announced objectives, the American Jewish Conference, the most representative organ of Jews ever to be established in the United States, combining both Zionist and non-Zionist bodies, denounced the Council for Judaism as a disruptive force and "repudiated the council's attempt to sabotage the collective Jewish will." The conference represented 65 national Jewish organizations as well as scores of local Jewish communities who sent delegates who were democratically elected to serve. Among the 65 national organizations were the following:

American Association for Jewish Education, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Free Sons of Israel, Hadassah, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish National Workers Alliance, Jewish War Veterans, National Council for Jewish Education, National Council of Young Israel, Rabbinical Assembly of America, Rabbinical Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, United Synagogue of America, Zionist Organization of America.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 29, 1963]

**THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—"THE CARAVAN OF THE BUILDERS MOVED ON," DR. SILVER OBSERVED OF THE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM'S INSIDIOUS PROPAGANDA—"BUT THE DOGS ARE STILL BARKING"—PART 7**

In previous sections of this study we quoted the findings of many Jewish organizations. We cite here some additional pertinent statements relevant to this subject:

Prof. Albert Einstein: "The American Council for Judaism is a fairly exact copy of the Zentralverein Deutscher Staatsburg Juedischen Glaubens (Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith) of unhappy memory, which in the days of our crucial need showed itself utterly impotent, and corroded the Jewish group by undermining that inner certitude by which our people could have overcome the trials of this difficult age."

Dr. Stephen S. Wise: "The American Council for Judaism has made an attempt to divide Jews between faith and people. Faith and people are not two different and separable factors. We are not going to accept a new Torah from a group of men who come to us with the readiness to destroy the

democratic character and conduct of the people of Israel."

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver: "These (ACJ) Jews did everything in their power to prevent the establishment of the State of Israel. They put every conceivable stumbling block in the way. They joined forces with the enemies of Israel not of our faith. They knocked on every door to inform against their own people. Though they were themselves religiously indifferent, they suddenly discovered, as a shrewd part of their strategy, a vast devotion to abstract Judaism, under that cloak, as a council for Judaism, they proceeded to spread their insidious political propaganda. They lost out. The caravan of the builders moved on but the dogs are still barking."

Rabbi Robert Gordis, of the Jewish Theological Seminary, prominent leader in conservative Judaism: "The American Council for Judaism is not American, for it contravenes the basic principles of American democracy. Nor is the council dedicated to the cause of Judaism, for it betrays those instincts, those ideals and aspirations which have been flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone for 3,000 years."

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, prominent leader in orthodox Judaism: "By divorcing ourselves from this group, by denouncing its statements, by administering a forceful and effective rebuke that will be understood by Jews and non-Jews, we affirm that these men, by their statements, have placed themselves outside the pale and camp of Israel."

The Reverend Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress, said recently: "The American Council for Judaism speaks for only a small band of people whose aims are destructive, whose methods are deplorable. It would seek to deprive hundreds of thousands of American Jews of their basic right to espouse a cause which is consonant with our American democratic way of life. Its target is the negation of support for Israel on the part of Americans who feel a spiritual and cultural affinity with Israel."

"The American Council for Judaism, with its inadequate grasp both of Americanism and Judaism distorts the meaning of Zionism and the nature of Zionist devotion. It seeks to cast suspicion on fellow Jews, and even, despite pious protestations of humanitarianism, seeks to undermine the United Jewish Appeal, source of blessing and life for millions of hapless Jews throughout the world. As president of the American Jewish Congress, an organization which defends the rights of all Americans whose civil liberties are threatened, I condemn and repudiate everything for which the American Council for Judaism stands."

Mr. Label Katz, president of the B'nai B'rith Organization, in a recent statement: "The American Council for Judaism, representing an infinitesimal segment of Jews—more political than religious in their concerns—has, through its activities and pronouncements, wrought considerable harm in the area of community relations by projecting an inaccurate stereotype of the Jew as disloyal to America, merely because Jews have demonstrated a legitimate, humanitarian and spiritual concern for the State of Israel and its inhabitants."

"While we would not deny this group its right to speak, it should be known that it does not speak for any sizable segment of the Jewish community, and what it says manifests not only a distortion of the Jewish tradition, but exhibits a lack of understanding of the pluralistic, democratic nature of our American society."

Mr. Lewis H. Weinstein, chairman of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, in a 1963 statement, reaffirmed the position of the NCRAC taken originally in 1950 which "condemned the council for Judaism for its unfounded charges and in-



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6481

nuendoes on the loyalty of American Jews. Such charges are shared only by the professional anti-Semites who seize upon any pretext for fulminating against Jews. The baseless slurs of the council violate every principle of truth and decency." He further stated:

"The views expressed in 1950, as those of the overwhelming majority of American Jews, have been frequently reaffirmed during the past 13 years, and are more strongly held today than ever before."

## THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS SPEAKS

"The Jewish War Veterans condemns the actions of the American Council for Judaism, in supporting, aiding and abetting the Soviet-Arab ambitions, and points out that the council is acting as the instrument of the Arab bloc, and that it be revealed as a threat to the security and defense of the United States. We invite all loyal Americans of the Jewish faith to aid in negating the dangerous practices of the council and to join us in eliminating this hazard to our national safety."

Mr. Morton London, president of the JWV, in April 1963, noted that the statements of the council were being used by the Soviet Embassy in Washington and by Communist periodicals "to minimize and obscure the true plight of Russian Jews." He further said: "It is particularly ironic that an organization which has the word 'Judaism' in its title can function so cynically as a cover for Russian anti-Semitism."

## JUDAISM AND THE LOVE OF ZION

The love of Zion is a constantly reiterated theme in the classic literature of the Jewish faith. The dream of the return to Zion was never relinquished during the centuries of dispersion and martyrdom. Jeremiah advised the exiles to pray for the peace of the land in which they lived. The Talmud taught that the law of the land in which Jews live is binding upon them. In this spirit, Jews are loyal to the lands in which they dwell. While they continued to serve God and man all over the world, Jews prayed for the restoration of Zion.

Judaism teaches that the whole earth is filled with the glory of God and that He is to be praised from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. Yet, the same religion which first proclaimed the concern of the universal God for all children of men, was, not inconsistently, concerned with the fate of the people of Israel and the land of Israel.

## LOVE OF ZION IN THE BIBLE

And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, "Unto thy seed will I give this land."—Genesis 12: 7.

From the dawn of Jewish history, from one end of the Bible to the other, the destiny of the people of Israel is linked with the land of Israel. It was promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their children forever. Moses died on Mount Nebo, longing to enter it. There the prophets preached their imperishable message of justice and peace for Israel and all mankind; there the Psalmist sang of his love for God and God's love for man. When the prophet threatened punishment, it was in terms of exile from the land; when he spoke words of comfort and consolation, it was in terms of return to the land; and when he dreamed of the messianic age, it was an age which would witness the return to Zion as a prelude to an era of peace and justice for all the children of men.

Who can forget Jeremiah's poignant picture of Rachel weeping for her exiled children and God's promise that they shall return from the land of the enemy. Everyone who has thrilled to the rhapsody of Zion redeemed, will remember the latter chapters of Isaiah, beginning with "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak to the heart of Jerusalem." The conclud-

ing words of Amos seem to speak to us of our time: "And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel and they shall build the waste cities and dwell in them, and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof \* \* \* and I will plant them on their land and they shall no more be uprooted from their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God."

The centrality of Zion in Scripture is so clear that it is remarkable that any have sought to deny it.

[From the American Examiner, Sept. 5, 1963]

RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—"WHAT IS INCOMPREHENSIBLE IN THE COUNCIL'S POSITION," SAY THE RABBIS, "IS THE FALSE CLAIM OF A CONTRADICTION BETWEEN LOVE FOR ISRAEL AND UNIVERSAL JUDAISM"—CONCLUSION

More than the Bible and the Talmud, the Siddur or prayerbook was the constant companion of the Jew through the centuries of oppression and through it he voiced his sorrow and his joy, his longings and his dreams. Three times a day, wherever he was he prayed to the God of the universe, but he turned his face toward Jerusalem. Three times a day, in the principal prayer of the liturgy, the Amidah, he asked God to sound the great shofar for his freedom and to gather up the exiled ones from the ends of the earth. In spite of the rack, the stake and the crematory, he continued to believe in the redemption of Zion.

In the grace recited when his infant child was brought into the covenant of Abraham, the Jew prayed: "Build Jerusalem, thy holy city, speedily in our days." The 13-year-old Bar Mitzvah boy in the concluding blessings chanted, "Have mercy on Zion, for it is the house of our life." Under the wedding canopy the cantor sang, "Soon may there be heard in the cities of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem, the voice of joy and gladness, the voice of groom and bride." And when the bereaved family entered the synagogue after the week of mourning they were greeted with "May God comfort you among the other mourners of Zion and Jerusalem."

The Reform Prayer book contains Psalm 12, with its prayer for the peace of Jerusalem, and Micah 4, which proclaims, "Out of Zion shall come for the Law and the word of God from Jerusalem." A new prayer on page 88 asks God to uphold "the hands of our brothers who toil to rebuild Zion," and speaks of the eternal hope for the restoration of Zion, as a living witness to the truth of God's word which shall lead the nations to the reign of peace.

## UNIVERSALISM AND PARTICULARISM IN JUDAISM

It was the prophets of Israel who first emphasized the concern of the universal God for all the children of men; yet these same prophets were passionately concerned with the fate of their people, Israel, and prophesied both their dispersion because of their sins and their ultimate ingathering to Israel and redemption. Love of Israel was not inconsistent with love of mankind either in the mind of the prophet or in the mind of God.

The universal God is not a discovery of the American Council for Judaism; it is the central principle of Judaism. Generations of believing Jews read the prophets with love, and wept over the destruction of Jerusalem and rejoiced at the promise of its restoration. Only arrogance and ignorance can describe these faithful generations of martyrs as deficient in their understanding of the universal God.

What is incomprehensible in the approach of the Council for Judaism is the baseless claim that there is a contradiction between love for Israel and universal Judaism. Neither the prophets nor their descendants felt any such conflict; they "loved God, Israel and

all mankind with all their heart, all their soul, and all their might."

Some 19th century Jewish thinkers, concerned for the future of a war-ravaged world whose situation they regarded as the result of nationalism, dreamed of a world made one under God in which nations, as such, would disappear. And there has always been a small band of Jews, with less exalted motives, who felt that the Zionist element in Jewish tradition might not constitute good public relations in the countries where they had so recently acquired citizenship. Others who were captivated by Isaiah's vision of a world without war, failed to grasp its full meaning. A close reading reveals that Isaiah, who was an intense patriot, saw a continuing role for the people of Israel in the land of Israel, even in the end of days.

"The word that Isaiah the son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." "And it shall come to pass in the end of days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established as the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills";

"And all nations shall flow unto it.

"And many peoples shall go and say:

"Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.

"To the house of God of Jacob;

"And He will teach us of His ways,

"And we will walk in His paths."

"For out of Zion shall go forth the law,

"And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And He shall judge between the nations,

"And shall decide for many peoples;

"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,

"And their spears into pruning hooks;

"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,

"Neither shall they learn war anymore"—

Isaiah 2:1-4.

Many noted scholars call our attention to the profundity of the prophet's thought, which does not regard the disappearance of particular peoples as a prerequisite to a peaceful world. Nationalism is not negated, but nations are required to submit to God's law of justice. "And many peoples shall go and say: 'Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord \* \* \* For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'" Again, "And He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide for many peoples," and finally, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

The destruction of individual nations, the super-personalities, that walk the world stage, would be an act of cultural and spiritual vandalism, reducing God's variegated world to drab homogeneity. Conflicting national interests must be resolved without violence, as conflicting individual interests are, by submission to the law of God. This is the Jewish vision of the end of days.

Some 19th century theologians seized upon one-half of the prophetic message and misconstrued the implications of prophetic universalism. These men were opposed to all nationalism. The American Council for Judaism, however, is neither so consistent, nor so benevolently misguided. It affirms its American nationalism and sympathizes with Arab nationalism. The only people whose national aspirations it assails—is Israel; it thus dishonors and distorts the universalism of the prophets.

The children of Israel were bound to God at Sinai as a "kingdom of priests and a holy people." The individual Jew serves God wherever he lives, but in a Jewish society he has the opportunity to implement more fully the social morality of his faith.

To Martin Buber, Israel represents an opportunity to recreate the holy community in an authentic relationship to God. To social idealists such as Einstein, Brandeis, and Ben-Gurion, it offered the means to make real the prophetic dream of a just society. Tradi-

tionists like Rabbi Meir Berlin, Rabbi Alkalai, and Rabbi Kalischer, and modern American religious leaders like Dr. Stephen Wise, Dr. Judah Magnes, and Dr. Abba Hillel Silver were drawn to Zionism by a deep religious impulse.

The modern Jew sees in Israel not merely a refuge for his hapless brethren, though this is justification enough, but a cultural center and a spiritual opportunity. He gives thanks that the prayers of generations have been answered in his time because he has been privileged to see the beginning of the redemption of Israel, which his tradition teaches is the prelude to the redemption of all mankind and the establishment of a just and peaceful world.

After the holocaust of Nazi Europe and the death of 6 million Jews, we today are privileged to witness the first flowering of the redemption. This prophetic fulfillment stands as a symbol and a sign that men can, under God, achieve the ancient holy dream of a world in which nation shall not lift up sword against nation, one in which they shall not learn war anymore.

### Medicare Today

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

**HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspapers are an important part of the backbone of our Republic. I am pleased to insert herewith a very fine editorial of the Mineola American, which appeared in its October 8 edition, regarding the problems of medical care for the aging. This editorial makes a great deal of sense.

#### MEDICARE TODAY

One may be justified in asking "What has happened to medicare?"—the bill for providing medical benefits of various kinds to everyone drawing social security payments.

When this measure was introduced, it will be remembered, all of the administration guns were brought up in its support. No other domestic measure was pushed so hard, and administration leaders apparently scented success. The result, to use the vernacular, was "no dice." Congress, in the face of all the pressure, just said no, and no again.

Medicare is back—old bills like old soldiers, even after repeated failure, never seem to die. But the big guns are silent. Token support comes from its sponsors, but little more.

Why? The answer is that congressional coolness is the direct result of several diverse but important factors.

1. The past-65 population group is nowhere near as bad off financially as the medicare crew have asserted. By and large, taking all elements into consideration, they seem to be better off, on the average, than younger groups.

2. Medicare would give the benefits, on a blanket basis, to great numbers of social security beneficiaries who neither want nor need it. At the same time, it would have excluded millions of elderly people not within the social security framework.

3. The cost, according to independent experts, would reach unsupportable heights, many billions a year.

4. The existing Kerr-Mills bill—for providing Federal medical financial aid to the elderly in need, under a system of State administration—is working well and is being extended.

5. The voluntary medical insurance plans, offered by Blue Cross and Blue Shield and commercial insurance companies, are doing a superb job of providing protection to all who want it, at moderate cost.

6. There is a very distinct feeling in this country that we've already gone too far in welfare statism, and that medicare would take us a long step farther along the road of government domination of everything and everybody.

And that seems to be the status of medicare today.

### Goldwater Right on TV Debates

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Milburn P. Akers, a feature writer for the Chicago Sun-Times, wrote a most interesting article on presidential TV debates which appears in today's issue of the Sun-Times. I would like to bring Mr. Akers's views to the attention of my colleagues, therefore, under permission granted, I would like to have this article printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the Record:

#### GOLDWATER RIGHT ON TV DEBATES

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has wisely declined Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's challenge to a joint discussion or debate of issues confronting the two Republican aspirants for the presidential nomination. Likewise, President Kennedy, who owes a considerable measure of his 1960 political success to his debates with Richard M. Nixon, would do well to refuse to participate in a series of 1964 TV spectaculars.

Such debates settle little other than which candidate is the more photogenic. The Nixon-Kennedy debates, which demonstrated little, if anything, as to which man would make the better President of the United States, undoubtedly had a sizable, perhaps determinative, effect upon the outcome of that election.

They were interesting productions as TV extravaganzas go. But they afforded little insight into the character and qualifications of either man; in fact, they afforded little knowledge of what either man actually believed or what he represented. But they produced effects.

A TV debate, limited in time and in scope, doesn't give a candidate ample time in which to develop a theme. They become exercises in semantics. Skill in debate and quickness in recall aren't necessarily qualifications for the Presidency. Wisdom and leadership—qualities which don't necessarily project in such encounters—are more important.

To liken the Nixon-Kennedy debates of 1960 to the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 is to show a woeful lack of knowledge of the encounters between the two aspirants for the Illinois senatorship of more than a century ago. One Lincoln-Douglas debate afforded the two forensic antagonists more time to develop their themes and state their convictions than either Mr. Kennedy or Vice President Nixon had put together in their entire set of such appearances.

As President, Mr. Kennedy should not be subjected to such debates. One slip could create an international incident. Mr. Kennedy is an experienced debater. He might not make that slip. But the chance shouldn't be taken.

Whoever wins the Republican presidential nomination should realize that fact and not press for such an encounter. There is a vast difference in a debate in which neither speaker is President of the United States, as was the case in the Nixon-Kennedy series.

GOLDWATER rejected Rockefeller's challenge to debate with the suggestion that Republicans should be seeking to build up the party; not tear down one another. Preconvention debates between members of the same party would very likely have the effect the Senator envisions. One of the two—GOLDWATER or Rockefeller—would project the better TV image, would, undoubtedly, be more glib than the other and would, consequently, have much the better of the series.

Neither the Presidency of the United States, nor a nomination by a major party for that office, should be made even partly dependent upon a TV show. If that is the proper way to decide the Presidency the Republicans might well nominate Jack Benny and the Democrats Jerry Lewis.

Solo TV appearances by presidential aspirants can contribute to the public's knowledge of a candidate's qualities. On them, minor contrasts which loom so large in a joint appearance mean far less. The fact that one man is tall and the other man short, that one man is made up well and the other is made up poorly, that one man is glib and the other a bit ponderous or that one has almost instantaneous recall and the other one doesn't mean little when the time comes to make decision of war or peace. Yet such trivialities create great reactions by a not inconsiderable portion of a TV audience. TV stars may properly be judged by their abilities to capture the affections of TV audiences. But a successful appearance in a TV extravaganza, or an unsuccessful one, doesn't necessarily indicate that a candidate is or isn't qualified for the Presidency.

Politically, GOLDWATER made the right decision in rejecting Rockefeller's challenge. GOLDWATER is far ahead in his contest with the New York Governor for nomination. Why should he risk his position? Nixon, in a somewhat similar position in 1960, made that mistake.

Politics aside, however: Mr. Kennedy, who will be the 1964 Democratic nominee, doesn't need the exposure as he did in 1960. But more important is the fact that a President of the United States, no matter who he may be, or what the circumstances are, should not risk the chance inherent in all ad-lib exchanges of making a slip which could reverberate in all the chancelleries of the world. Whoever the ultimate Republican nominee may be shouldn't expect him to do so.

### The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of H.R. 3846, as amended, reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on October 11, 1963. This bill, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963, would serve a laudable purpose—the development of natural resources of our Nation. However, one amendment seeks to impose admission fees, including annual fees of as much as \$7 for the use of