

World Jewish Population

IN THE ABSENCE of exact information on the population of Jews in the various countries, we present below the best possible estimates for 1973. They were based on local censuses, communal registration, estimates of local informants, and data obtained from a special inquiry conducted in 1973 for the year 1972 (AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], p. 522).

These figures are of varying degrees of accuracy and will be revised when more precise data become available. It should be noted that some figures were taken from previous volumes, since there was no way of arriving at a valid new estimate. During the period under review a substantial number of Soviet Jews emigrated to Israel, and a small number to the United States, Canada, and other Western countries.

In the tables below, figures obtained from the inquiry are indicated by an x.

DISTRIBUTION BY CONTINENTS

The estimated world Jewish population at the end of 1973 was about 14,150,000. The decrease in the over-all total reflects the new estimate of the Jewish population in the United States, obtained by the National Jewish Population Study (pp. 296-302). Of the total number, about 6,900,000 (some 49 per cent) lived in the Americas; over 4,090,000 (29 per cent) in Europe, including the Asian parts of Turkey and the Soviet Union, and some 2,907,000 (20 per cent) were in Asia. Only some 176,000 (1.5 per cent) remained in Africa, and about 76,000 (0.5 per cent) were in Australia and New Zealand.

Table 1. DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH POPULATION BY CONTINENTS

<i>Continent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Europe (including Asiatic USSR and Turkey)	4,090,155	29
America, North, Central, and South	6,901,545	49
Asia	2,907,560	20
Africa	176,690	1.5
Australia and New Zealand	76,200	0.5
TOTAL	14,152,150*	100.0

*Because sources and dates were not always identical, there may be discrepancies between figures given in the tables below and those in other sections of this volume.

Europe

Of the more than 4,090,000 Jews in Europe, over 2,880,000 were in the Communist area, including an estimated 2,680,000 in the Soviet Union (p. 496; AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], p. 481). There were some 90,000 Jews in Rumania and 80,000 in Hungary. Only 8,000 Jews remained in Poland. About 1,200,000 Jews were in non-Communist countries. France, with a substantial number of Sephardi Jews who came after World War II and later from North Africa, had a Jewish population of some 550,000, the largest in Western Europe. Great Britain had 410,000, Belgium, 40,000, Italy, 36,000, and Germany had 32,000: 26,500 in West Germany, 5,500 in East Germany. Of these, 6,000 lived in both sectors of Berlin.

Table 2. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN EUROPE, BY COUNTRIES, 1973

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total Population¹</i>	<i>Jewish Population</i>
Albania	2,350,000	300
Austria	7,520,000	10,000
Belgium	9,760,000	40,000
Bulgaria	8,620,000	7,000
Czechoslovakia	14,580,000	14,000

Denmark	5,030,000	7,000
Finland	4,660,000	1,200
France	52,130,000	550,000 ^x
Germany	78,950,000	32,000 ^y
Gibraltar	30,000	625
Great Britain	55,930,000	410,000 ^x
Greece	8,950,000	6,500
Hungary	10,410,000	80,000
Ireland	3,030,000	4,000
Italy	54,890,000	36,000
Luxembourg	350,000	1,000
Malta	320,000	50
Netherlands	13,440,000	30,000
Norway	3,960,000	900
Poland	33,360,000	8,000
Portugal	8,590,000	580 ^x
Rumania	20,830,000	90,000
Spain	34,860,000	9,000
Sweden	8,140,000	15,000
Switzerland	6,440,000	21,000
Turkey	37,930,000	30,000 ^b
USSR	249,750,000	2,680,000 ^b
Yugoslavia	20,960,000	7,000
TOTAL	755,770,000	4,091,155

^aUnited Nations Statistical Office, *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, and other sources including local publications.

^bIncludes Asian regions of the USSR and Turkey.

^xReply to 1972 inquiry.

^yIncludes West Germany, East Germany, and both sectors of Berlin.

North, Central, and South America

The new estimate of the number of Jews in the United States, made by the National Jewish Population Study, is 5,800,000, including all persons living in Jewish households.* Canada had an estimated 305,000 Jews, and Central and South America some 757,000. There was migration of Jews from some of the countries of Latin America, but this has not yet substantially changed the Jewish population figures for the area.

*For a discussion, see "Jewish Population in the United States, 1973," pp. 295-6.

Table 3. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN NORTH, CENTRAL, AND SOUTH AMERICA AND THE WEST INDIES, BY COUNTRIES, 1973

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total Population</i> ^a	<i>Jewish Population</i>
Canada	22,130,000	305,000 ^x
Mexico	54,300,000	40,000
United States	210,400,000	5,800,000 ^b
Total North America	286,830,000	6,145,000
Barbados	240,000	85 ^x
Costa Rica	1,840,000	1,500
Cuba	8,870,000	1,500
Curaçao	150,000	700
Dominican Republic	4,430,000	110
El Salvador	3,860,000	300 ^x
Guatemala	5,540,000	1,900
Haiti	5,200,000	150
Honduras	2,780,000	200
Jamaica	1,980,000	600
Nicaragua	2,010,000	200 ^x
Panama	1,570,000	2,000
Trinidad	1,060,000	300
Total Central America and West Indies	39,530,000	9,545
Argentina	24,290,000	475,000
Bolivia	5,330,000	2,000
Brazil	101,710,000	155,000
Chile	10,230,000	30,000
Colombia	23,210,000	12,000
Ecuador	6,730,000	1,000
Paraguay	2,670,000	1,200
Peru	14,910,000	5,300
Surinam	430,000	500
Uruguay	2,990,000	50,000 ^x
Venezuela	11,290,000	15,000 ^x
Total South America	203,790,000	747,000
TOTAL	530,150,000	6,901,545

^aSee Table 2, note ^a^bSee p. 496.^xSee Table 2, note ^x

Asia, Australia, and New Zealand

The Jewish population of Asia continued to increase. Of the 2,907,000 Jews in Asia, 2,806,000 were in Israel, where the total Jewish population was now larger than the estimated Jewish population of the Soviet Union. There were 80,000 Jews in Iran and some 12,000 in India. No other country in Asia, except Turkey and the Asian areas of the USSR, had as many as 5,000 Jews. Syria had 4,000 and Lebanon 1,800. The number of Jews in any of the other Asian countries did not exceed 800.

The Jewish population of Australia was estimated at about 72,000, that of New Zealand at 4,200.

Table 4. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN ASIA, BY COUNTRIES, 1973

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total Population^a</i>	<i>Jewish Population</i>
Afghanistan	18,290,000	200
Burma	29,560,000	200
China	814,280,000	30
Cyprus	660,000	30
Hong Kong	4,016,000	200
India	574,220,000	12,000
Indonesia	124,600,000	100
Iran	31,300,000	80,000
Iraq	10,410,000	500
Israel	3,302,000	2,806,000
Japan	108,350,000	750
Lebanon	3,060,000	1,800
Pakistan	66,750,000	250
Philippines	40,220,000	500
Singapore	2,190,000	500
Syria	6,890,000	4,000
Yemen	6,060,000	500
TOTAL	1,844,158,000	2,907,560

^aSee Table 2, note ^a

Table 5. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND
1973

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total Population^a</i>	<i>Jewish Population</i>
Australia	13,130,000	72,000
New Zealand	<u>2,960,000</u>	<u>4,200</u>
TOTAL	16,090,000	76,200

^aSee Table 2, note ^a

Africa

The Jewish population of Africa continued to decline, except for South Africa where it remained at about 118,000. The process of gradual liquidation continued in the North African Jewish communities. Only 40 Jews remained in Libya, 500 in Egypt, 1,000 in Algeria, and 8,000 in Tunisia. Morocco had 31,000 Jews. The Jewish communities of the Maghreb, which were among the old Jewish settlements, were disappearing.

Table 6. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AFRICA, BY COUNTRIES, 1973

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total Population^a</i>	<i>Jewish Population</i>
Algeria	15,770,000	1,000
Egypt	35,620,000	500
Ethiopia	26,080,000	12,000
Kenya	12,480,000	400
Libya	2,160,000	40
Morocco	16,310,000	31,000
Republic of South Africa	22,990,000	117,900 ^x
Rhodesia	5,500,000	5,200 ^x
Tunisia	5,510,000	8,000
Zaire	23,560,000	250
Zambia	<u>4,640,000</u>	<u>400</u>
TOTAL	170,620,000	176,690

^aSee Table 2, note ^a^xSee Table 2, note ^x

COMMUNITIES WITH LARGEST JEWISH POPULATION

The largest Jewish communities in 1973 were in the United States, Israel, and the Soviet Union. Together they accounted for about 80 per cent of the world Jewish population. Only four other countries, France, Argentina, Great Britain, and Canada, had Jewish communities of over 200,000.

Table 7. COUNTRIES WITH LARGEST JEWISH POPULATION

<i>Country</i>	<i>Jewish Population</i>
United States	5,800,000 ^a
Israel	2,806,000
Soviet Union	2,680,000
France	550,000
Argentina	475,000
Great Britain	410,000
Canada	305,000

^aSee Table 3, note ^b.

Table 8. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION, SELECTED CITIES^a

<i>City</i>	<i>Jewish Population</i>
Amsterdam	14,000
Ankara	1,000
Antwerp	13,000
Athens	2,800
Auckland	1,500 ^x
Basle	2,300
Belgrade	1,600
Berlin (both sectors)	6,000
Berne	800
Bordeaux	6,400
Brussels	24,500
Bucharest	40,000
Budapest	65,000
Buenos Aires	350,000
Cochin	500
Copenhagen	6,000
Florence	1,400 ^x

Table 8 (contd)

Geneva	3,250
Glasgow	13,400 ^x
Guatemala City	1,500
Haifa	210,000
Helsinki	875 ^x
Istanbul	22,000
Jerusalem	266,000
Johannesburg	57,500 ^x
Kiev	170,000
Leeds	19,400 ^x
Leningrad	165,000
Lima	5,250
Lisbon	565 ^x
London (greater)	280,000 ^x
Luxembourg	850
Lyons	20,000
Madrid	3,000
Malmö	2,000
Manchester	36,000 [\]
Manila	300
Marseille	65,000
Melbourne	34,000 ^x
Mexico D.F.	30,000
Milan	9,500 ^x
Montevideo	48,000 ^x
Montreal	113,000
Moscow	285,000
Nice	20,000
Oslo	600
Ottawa	6,000
Paris	300,000
Perth	3,000 ^x
Plovdiv	1,000
Prague	3,000
Rabat	2,500
Rio de Janeiro	50,000
Rome	15,000 ^x
Salonika	1,300
São Paulo	65,000 ^x
Sarajevo	1,100
Sofia	4,000
Stockholm	8,000
Strasbourg	12,000
Subotica	400
Sydney	28,000 ^x

Teheran	50,000
Tel Aviv-Jaffa	394,000
Tokyo	400 ^x
Toronto	97,000
Toulouse	18,000
Trieste	1,200
Vancouver	8,000
Valparaiso	4,000
Vienna	9,000
Wellington	1,500 ^x
Warsaw	5,000
Winnipeg	21,000
Zagreb	1,350
Zurich	6,150

^aFor cities in the United States, see p. 305.

^xSee Table 2, note ^x

LEON SHAPIRO

Jewish Multicountry Associations

THE Jews are a world people, but, popular myths to the contrary, they are only casually organized as one. Jewish community organization is primarily a local phenomenon, frequently underdeveloped even on the countrywide level. As a religion, Judaism is congregationalist, requiring no worldwide Vatican-like authority to control its far-flung constituencies. One of the more remarkable aspects of Jewish history in the Diaspora is the extent to which common characteristics—and a common life-style—were preserved through long centuries when means of communication were virtually nonexistent. Above all, the sense that the Jews were *one* people, in whatever land they lived, persisted in modern times.

With the rise of nationalism in Europe, Jewish “national” unity, which had transcended ghetto walls, was shattered as Jewish communities became sequestered behind national boundaries and assumed the nationalities of their respective host peoples. Jewry’s own answer to the nationalist wave—the Zionist movement—brought into being what, in the modern sense, was the first effective model of Jewish community organization of international scope.¹ Indeed, Theodor Herzl was the prophet of Jewish international organization, as well as of Jewish sovereignty. In his tract, *Der Judenstaat*, he envisaged and described in great detail a “Jewish Company,” which would encompass the energies of world Jewry and direct them toward the founding of a Jewish sovereign entity, and the concentration of masses of Jews in its territory.

Herzl’s Jewish Company became the prototype of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. As an interim instrumentality, until the time was ripe for the Company, Herzl founded the World Zionist Organization (WZO). In his lifetime and later, WZO did yeoman work in propagating the Herzlian ideas and exercising diplomacy without power. The first fruit of these efforts was the Balfour Declaration of 1917, an essential step in the eventual achievement of sovereignty.

¹The Alliance Israélite Universelle, which preceded the World Zionist Organization by almost four decades, was unable to retain its “universal” character, but survived as French Jewry’s organization for philanthropic aid and political intercession abroad.

The second organization of this type, too, was a response to the nationalist challenge: it was evolved to protect the Jews of Eastern Europe from excesses by the nations that were granted independence after World War I. To that end, a committee was formed of several Jewish delegations lobbying for the same cause at the Paris Peace Conference.² The Comité des Délégations Juives continued in existence after the conference had ended to watch over the minority clauses written into the treaties with Poland and other countries, and in 1927 it reorganized itself into the Council for Jewish Minority Rights. From this there eventually emerged the World Jewish Congress, whose main task was to safeguard Jewish rights in the face of the Nazi menace. Unlike WZO, which achieved its goal, WJC was powerless to prevent the Holocaust and could only operate on the margins of the catastrophe. As early as 1942, it alerted the U.S. State Department from its headquarters in Geneva to the dimensions of the mass murder.

Both WZO and WJC continued to be active in the postwar era; but they were far from inclusive in membership. It was the hope that a new, modified structure would have greater appeal to groups that had declined to join the existing ones. This gave rise to still another model, the (World) Conference of Jewish Organizations (COJO).

The first part of this article discusses the goals and structure of these three organizations, and the nature of the interaction among them. While Jewish community organization of international scope is by no means limited to them, they represent the political, and therefore the most visible, aspect of it. Visibility, however, does not necessarily connote power, and the combined political weight of these organizations is modest. Nor is it surprising that there is no multicountry organization that can claim to speak for the Jewish communities of the world, since not even the largest community of all, that of the United States, has a countrywide body that can claim to speak for all its Jews.

True, the establishment of Israel signified the triumph of the Zionist idea; yet, it would be less than fair to attribute that victory solely, or even primarily, to the strength of WZO. What is more, since 1948 Israel has been the major Jewish factor internationally, and WZO has inevitably receded to the background.

At the same time, that period has also seen a burgeoning of Jewish multicountry groups of nonpolitical character. Here, the contributing factors were the development of air travel; individual affluence, and, through it, availability of funds in Jewish community organization; the example of expanding international organization in the world at large;

²Arthur J. Lelyveld, "The 50th Anniversary of the Committee of Jewish Delegations," *COJO Report*, July 1969 (mimeo).

the status inherent in international association, and, above all, the existence of the Jewish state as a focus for Jewish organizational activity.

Since the establishment of Israel, international Jewish organization has been directed to a far greater extent inward toward the Jewish community, rather than outward toward the world at large, as in the past. The Jewish sphere, in turn, can be subdivided into Israel-centered and Diaspora-centered activity, although most of the originally Diaspora-centered organizations eventually also encompassed Israel in their programs. This has been expressed in their support of Israeli foreign policy; in economic assistance for Israel's welfare, health, education, and other programs, and in participation in the evolving nonmaterial relationship between Israel and the Diaspora. Among Diaspora-centered concerns are Jewish education, cultural exchange, interchange of techniques and know-how, and ideological debate of the principles of representation and community organization, itself.

Traditionally, outward-directed activity has taken the form of intervention by the stronger on behalf of the weaker community: the principle of mutual assistance (*kol Israel arevim ze ba-ze*) applied on a global scale. While activity of this type is ordinarily most effective on the local level, i.e., through influence exerted by a particular Jewish population on its own government, there have been situations where the local communities lacked such influence and concerted intervention by a number of organizations or communities was more effective. Two salient examples in the postwar era were the claims for reparations from Germany and action to ease the situation of the Soviet Jews. In both cases new organizational structures were devised, and these coordinated their efforts with Israeli diplomacy pursuing similar or identical goals.

There were, however, significant differences between the two cases. The relationship with Germany was cooperative; the modes of interaction, therefore, were negotiation, agreement, and implementation. By contrast, the antagonism of the Soviet Union toward the Jewish goals gave rise to interaction involving confrontation and pressure. But since Jewish community organization has developed neither sanctions nor significant bargaining counters, success in this type of situation depends on the organization's ability to enlist the aid of friendly governments. For in a world of sovereign states, nongovernmental bodies are clearly limited in their ability to attain goals contrary to those of a sovereign state.

Of course, in their relations with Israel the multicountry Jewish groups also deal with a sovereign state, a new situation in the Jewish world, whose implications have not been adequately explored (the

element of sovereignty did not impinge on the relations between the Diaspora and Jerusalem in the Second Commonwealth). The obvious asymmetry in the relationship has been blurred by Israel's character as a Jewish community among other communities, a kind of *primus inter pares*, in a system where relationships are based on identification rather than power.³ This impression has been reinforced by Israel's policy of delegating the conduct of relations with world Jewish communities to nongovernmental organizations, primarily the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency. Another factor in this relationship was that, in the first quarter century of Israel's existence, its political and economic position remained precarious enough for Jewish activity to be largely of a supportive nature.

Nomenclature and Criteria

In our analysis of the goals, structure, and operation of the major organizations, the term "international" will be used when referring to the area and field of action, and the term "multicountry" when speaking of organizations.

A multicountry association, in the context of this article, is a group that draws its governing bodies from more than one country and, preferably, also carries out its activities multinationally. Not included are associations which, though operating in several countries, are manifestly the project of Jews in a single country, such as the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

A convenient way of grouping of the multicountry associations is by their principal goals. Here are the broad categories, with prominent examples for each (a more inclusive list appears at the end of the article):

<i>Principal Goal Characteristics</i>	<i>Organization</i>
Political—general	World Zionist Organization (WZO) World Jewish Congress (WJC) World Conference of Jewish Organizations (COJO)
Political—special purpose	World Conference of Soviet Jewry

³See Murray Horwitz, "Power, Identification, Nationalism and International Organizations." Paper submitted to Seminar in the Social Science of Organizations, Pittsburgh, 1963 (mimeo).

Distributive	Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture
Services—operational	World ORT Union
Services—coordinating	European Council of Jewish Communities
Religious	World Union for Progressive Judaism Agudas Israel World Organization
Association—fraternal	B'nai B'rith International Council
Association—special interest	World Sephardi Federation World Union of Jewish Students

The political associations listed here are also classified as “general” because their concern is with the status of the Jewish people as a whole; in this they are both outer-directed to the non-Jewish world and inner-directed to the Jewish community. Although the Israeli government has largely preempted political activity on the world scene, it has not explicitly claimed to act as the diplomatic agent for the Jewish people beyond its borders. This leaves some room for diplomatic activity by the Jewish nongovernmental organizations.

World Zionist Organization

WZO has gone through five distinct phases since its founding at the first Zionist Congress in 1897. In the initial phase, its aim was to attain a “legally secured, publicly recognized national home for the Jewish people,” a goal that was reached when the Balfour Declaration became part of the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine. In its second phase, WZO was acknowledged by Britain as the “Jewish agency” charged with representing the world Jewish interest in the implementation of the Mandate. That stage ended in 1929, when an enlarged Jewish Agency was set up in which WZO was an equal partner with non-Zionists.⁴

At the outbreak of World War II this arrangement broke down, and in the struggle for statehood WZO again became synonymous with the

⁴For a full account, see Ernest Stock, “The Reconstitution of the Jewish Agency: A Political Analysis,” *AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK*, Vol. 73 (1972), pp. 178-93.

Jewish Agency. After 1948, the combined WZO-Jewish Agency was charged with the execution of the program of immigration to Israel. This phase, the fourth, came to an end in 1969, when the Jewish Agency was reconstituted closely after the 1929 pattern.

Now (phase five) WZO resumed its independent status. The Agency was henceforth responsible for practical work in immigrant absorption, housing, education, and welfare programs in Israel; WZO was charged with implementing the "Jerusalem Program" of 1968, defining as one of the aims of Zionism, "The Unity of the Jewish People and the Centrality of Israel in Jewish Life; the Preservation of the Identity of the Jewish People through the Fostering of Jewish and Hebrew Education and of Jewish Spiritual and Cultural Values; the Protection of Jewish Rights Everywhere." This made explicit WZO's new role as a Diaspora-oriented body, where its original purpose had been to harness world Jewry's efforts on behalf of the *yishuv*. It had changed from a political body with a specific goal to a generalist one that concerned itself with the affairs of Jews in the Diaspora, based on a broad interpretation of Zionism. Specifically, WZO programs are carried out by the Departments of Education and Culture in the Diaspora (separate religious and secular departments); the Youth and Hechalutz (pioneering) Department, and the Information and Organization Department. These are functions which are ideology- or Diaspora-oriented, or deal with areas that cannot be subsumed under the headings for which tax-exempt philanthropic funds in the United States and elsewhere are being allocated.⁵

WZO retains a 50 per cent partnership in the Jewish Agency, thereby preserving for itself the legitimacy that comes with responsibility for the practical work of immigration and absorption. It was also given exclusive responsibility for encouraging and implementing immigration from the countries of the free world. Among recent additions to WZO's scope of activities was the establishment, in 1972, of a Department for Sephardi and Oriental Communities which, in its first year of operation, helped found World Sephardi Federation branches in Latin America, the United States, Canada, and Europe, and provided them with cultural programming from Israel.

The agreement for the reconstitution of the Jewish Agency provided WZO with a fixed income for its work, in return for an end to separate campaigning by Zionist groups. Its 1972-1973 budget was about \$30 million. Obviously, funds of this magnitude, spent on education, youth

⁵Although agricultural settlement work on behalf of new immigrants is the domain of the Jewish Agency, it is WZO which finances agricultural projects in the occupied areas, since philanthropic funds cannot be used for these.

work, organization, and information invest WZO with considerable influence in world Jewish affairs.

STRUCTURE

Structurally, WZO is a federation of countrywide Zionist organizations. Most of these constituent bodies are, in effect, extensions or affiliates of Israeli parties, whose ideologies however, became frozen at a certain point and, as a rule, do not reflect the evolution, mergers, and splits occurring in the Israeli party system. (Thus the name of one such group, the World Confederation of General Zionists, retains the nomenclature that ceased to exist in Israel a decade ago.)

WZO is governed by a congress, which, in the Jewish world, comes closest to being an elected parliament (apart from Israel's Knesset). Delegates to the most recent World Zionist Congress, in 1972, were elected by close to 900,000 WZO members in 38 countries. In Israel, on the other hand, delegates were chosen by the political parties in proportion to their representation in the Knesset. But the voting outside Israel, too, was largely by party lists, so that the 559-member Congress reflected, to a considerable extent, the party-political spectrum in Israel. Seats in the Congress, which meets every four years, are geographically allocated in the following proportion: 38 per cent for Israel, 29 per cent for the United States, and 33 per cent for the other Diaspora countries. The Congress elects the Executive, in which the major parties are represented, and the General Council. The latter meets once a year between congresses.

The party composition of the Zionist movement long antedates the establishment of the state. From its very inception, the movement was fragmented, so that the congresses were assemblies of parties, as well as of delegates. But despite a widespread desire for structural changes after 1948, WZO found it impossible to transcend the party structure, which undoubtedly reduced its effectiveness as a mass movement in the Diaspora. (In Israel, WZO's function as a representative body became superfluous with the institution of a democratically elected parliament.) Reform was achieved by separating the Jewish Agency—the implementing machinery—from WZO—the political-ideological structure. An attempt was also made to dilute the political character of WZO by permitting individuals to affiliate directly with countrywide Zionist federations without first joining political groups. Furthermore, nonpolitical groups, such as WIZO (Women's International Zionist Organization), the Maccabi World Union, the World Sephardi Federation, and American synagogue movements, are enrolled in WZO as associate members. Full membership, however, remains reserved for the political groups.

In the federated structure that is WZO, the influence of the center is greater than that of the sum of all its parts. This is because the center represents Israel to the Diaspora bodies: it originates programs, has a highly articulated bureaucracy, and allocates the financial resources. On the other hand, WZO's status in the Diaspora is weakened by the lack of clarity about its tasks in the era of statehood. The impact of the late David Ben Gurion's openly critical attitude toward WZO has not yet worn off. WZO's aims are broad enough, and its apparatus wide-ranging enough for it to assume the character of a conglomerate among multicountry Jewish organizations; but its political structure sets limits to its acceptance on a broad popular basis.

World Jewish Congress

The World Jewish Congress (WJC) has as its main purpose the defense of Jewish rights, and to that end it aims to be representative of the widest possible segment of world Jewry. Its specific activities in recent years have included intervention on behalf of Jews in Arab countries; pressure for the prosecution of Nazi war criminals and for indemnification payments to their victims; contacts with Christian church bodies on questions of Israel and antisemitism; assistance to small Jewish communities for cultural needs; relations with international organizations, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Organization of American States, and the Council of Europe; espousal of the cause of Soviet Jewry (WJC was a cosponsor of the 1971 World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry in Brussels), and, above all, support of Israel in its diplomatic struggles.

Like WZO, the World Jewish Congress has a federative structure; but it actually is a confederation of agencies, with the central body deliberately limiting itself in scope. The members—*independent community organizations*—are free to determine their own policies locally. WJC's constitution prohibits it from operating or speaking for any local organization in a given country, unless the latter agrees (except where no organized community exists, or where a community cannot freely express its will).

On the other hand, WJC may set up branches in countries without a "representative" organization, or where the leading groups are unwilling to participate. Thus, when the Board of Deputies of British Jews refused to affiliate, WJC established a British Section. (The British branch sponsors WJC's major research body, the Institute of

Jewish Affairs, which publishes *Journal of Jewish Sociology*, *Bulletin on Soviet and Eastern European Affairs*, *Patterns of Prejudice*, and other periodicals.)

In the United States, the American Jewish Congress was intended to function as the American arm of WJC, but when differences arose between the two groups, WJC established a North American Section, which has recently begun to enroll the rabbinical and congregational associations as affiliates. But in the Western Hemisphere, the Canadian Jewish Congress and DAIA, the organization of Argentine communities, are far more characteristic of the relationship of representative organizations with WJC.

The WJC Executive functions through four regional branches, each with its own constitution—in North America, South America, Europe and Israel—that mediate between center and affiliates. The European branch, which operates in Western Europe, also maintains ties with community organizations in Yugoslavia and Rumania. The Israeli branch does not have constituent organizations. Composed in keeping with the ubiquitous “party key,” its 18 members are drawn from the spectrum of parliamentary parties. The cultural department of the parent body is headquartered in Israel, the political department in Paris.

Considering the scope of its activities, WJC’s annual budget is low: \$1.4 million in 1973. Funds are largely derived from member organization dues; expenditures are mainly for staff salaries, office expenses, and travel. The cost of operations carried out through affiliates is, of course, not included in the WJC budget.

Since its members are organizations, the number of individuals actually connected with WJC is relatively small. Some 400 to 500 delegates attend the WJC quadrennial assemblies (actually, the Congress plenary assembles less frequently than at the scheduled four-year intervals; the sixth assembly was scheduled to meet in fall 1974). Between assemblies, an executive committee of 120 meets annually, and every member organization sends at least one delegate. There is also a governing council of 35 and a secretary general, whose seat is in Geneva. There is no limitation to how many terms the WJC leadership can serve. Its president, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, and secretary-general, Gerhart Riegner, have been in office for a great many years. The distinction between professional and lay leadership usually existing in Jewish community organization tends to be absent, or underplayed, in WJC. Among the members of the governing council is a strong contingent of prominent rabbis and Diaspora Zionist leaders.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH ISRAEL AND WZO

WJC has complemented WZO in areas where the latter could not operate, but, at the same time, has also been its potential rival. For this reason, the Zionist leadership's attitude toward WJC from the beginning has been one of ambivalence. Perhaps the beginning should be sought at the Paris Peace Conference, where the Committee of Jewish Delegations, forerunner of WJC, was pressing for Jewish minority rights, while WZO was lobbying for inclusion of the Balfour Declaration in the Mandate for Palestine. In the 1930s Dr. Weizmann, as WZO president, stayed away from the founding assembly of the Congress, persisting in his resolve to eschew Jewish politics in the Diaspora. Although a majority of the Zionist Congress voted to designate WJC as the most suitable instrument for the protection of Jewish rights, thereby ensuring WZO representation in WJC, the concern that Diaspora interests might compete with those of the *yishuv* was never far submerged and came to the fore again in the era of the state.

At the end of World War II, the effort to create a Jewish state took center stage in Jewish international concerns, and here the World Zionist Organization-Jewish Agency was destined to play the leading role. But once Israel's position was consolidated, the concept of an organization representing the interests of world Jewry outside the state again became valid. For a variety of reasons, WZO could not assume the role. *Vis-à-vis* the outside world, its close identification with Israel was a handicap. And in Israel itself, influential leadership opposed expanding its functions: "The negative attitude of Ben Gurion and many of his government officials [made it] impossible to turn the Zionist organization into the sort of institution that history would have required it to be," wrote Dr. Nahum Goldmann, who headed both WZO and WJC.⁶ He rather saw WJC as the logical candidate for taking on a task he describes in his autobiography as follows: "Since emancipation, religion has lost its predominant influence, so that other methods of strengthening Jewish solidarity have become necessary. The most natural instrument for strengthening it is an organization comprising the innumerable Jewish associations all over the world, and designed to provide the Jewish people with an address, enabling it to collaborate systematically on the solution of its problems."⁷ But WJC proved inadequate for this task, too, and Goldmann again puts part of the blame on his old adversary in Israel: "Ben Gurion never showed

⁶*The Autobiography of Nahum Goldmann* (New York, 1969), p. 324.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 125.

anything but indifference and lack of understanding for the World Jewish Congress, perhaps because he was unconsciously against a world Jewish organization that would have been harder for him to get along with than the existing multiplicity of bodies."⁸

Clearly, the notion of an organization representing world Jewry, which might espouse a position independent of Israel, had little appeal to the state's policymakers. Goldmann's habit of voicing views critical of Israel's official positions proved especially irksome, though he usually insisted that he was only expressing his personal views. A recent situation in which Goldmann's opinion ran directly counter to Israeli policy was when he came out strongly in support of Jewish cultural rights within Soviet Russia, whereas Israel wished to see exclusive emphasis placed on the right of Jews to emigrate. As a result of these and other incidents, Goldmann was not only shorn of position and influence in WZO, but his authority as president of WJC was also curtailed at the insistence of the Israeli constituency.⁹

However, the undercurrent of tension between state and Diaspora could not be ascribed to the views of a single individual. Early in 1973 the WJC Executive Committee served as a forum for airing differences in approach, when the late Louis Pincus, chairman of the WZO (and Jewish Agency) Executive, engaged in a debate with Rabbi Joachim Prinz, who was then serving as chairman of the WJC's governing council. Prinz, in effect, objected to Zionist insistence on the centrality of Israel. "Just as the Jews of the Diaspora recognize the sovereignty of Israel, so must the sovereign state of Israel and the people of Israel recognize and respect the autonomy of diaspora Jewry," he declared.¹⁰ To this Pincus replied with some heat: "Israel, as the custodian of Jewish national destiny, will talk up . . . even if you call that interfering in your 'unlimited autonomy.'" He warned that the desire of Diaspora communities to strengthen themselves independently of Israel "could lead to cleavages," and that WJC could play "either a positive or a negative role" by becoming "the kind of place where you can demonstrate the unlimited autonomy of the Diaspora being

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 324.

⁹At the February 1974 meeting of the WJC's Governing Council in Zurich. "It was the general feeling that the WJC has been a one-man show for much too long," Arye L. Dulzin, acting chairman of the WZO told the *Jerusalem Post* upon his return from that meeting, in explaining a reorganization scheme that called for a nine-man executive body to run the organization.

¹⁰*Israel and the Diaspora. Two Points of View Presented by Dr. Joachim Prinz and Louis A. Pincus at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress, Tel Aviv, June 27-July 4, 1973. Published in pamphlet form by the WJC, Geneva, September 1973 (p. 16).*

artificially stimulated by a handful of Jews . . . in leadership positions." Criticism of Israel, he insisted, should be confined to bodies that "accept the centrality of Israel," such as WZO and the Jewish Agency Assembly.¹¹ This particular debate was cut short by Pincus's untimely death; but there is little doubt that his colleagues and successors share his determination not to let Jewish organizations play a "negative role."

WJC's inability to become *the* representative organization of world Jewry cannot be attributed solely to Israeli reluctance to see the full weight of Diaspora Jewry concentrated in one organization that might elude control. A second, equally substantial, factor was the unwillingness of certain organizations in the United States and Britain to become part of WJC structure. This was also true of its predecessor in Paris, which had been less than fully representative because of the failure of the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the British Joint Foreign Committee (of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Association) to join its ranks. In the founding of WJC, the most prominent absentees were the American Jewish Committee, B'nai B'rith, and the Board of Deputies of British Jews. B'nai B'rith eventually set up its own International Committee; the Board of Deputies was about to join WJC in 1974, and the American Jewish Committee, which was not opposed to multicountry organization as such, preferred to work within a narrower framework of its own determination.

In 1946 the Committee, together with the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Anglo-Jewish Association, formed the Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations. The hope of the founding organizations that other groups would join was not realized. In 1956 the Council was granted consultative status with the United Nations and took part in formulating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a major interest of the American Jewish Committee.¹² At a Council conference held in 1955, Jacob Blaustein of the Committee disclaimed any interest in setting up an "international super-body claiming to speak for all the world's Jews."

World Conference of Jewish Organizations

Possibly with this statement in mind, Nahum Goldmann, who by then had despaired of the chances for turning WJC into the truly

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 32 ff.

¹²For the role of Jewish associations as non-governmental organizations within the framework of UN bodies, see the article on "World Jewish Associations" by Joseph J. Lador-Lederer in *Encyclopedia Judaica Yearbook*, 1973.

representative Jewish organization he envisioned, called into being, in 1958, the World Conference of Jewish Organizations (COJO).

He was encouraged by his success in setting up the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations in the United States—a forum of the heads of most major Jewish organizations. He writes:

Next I undertook to set up a similar forum on an international scale. I knew very well that I would never succeed in getting the strong, wealthy B'nai B'rith, that had just begun to address itself to international questions, or several other organizations, into WJC because of the ever-present considerations of prestige and autonomy. However, I persuaded Philip Klutznick to help me in forming an international Conference of Jewish Organizations within which all branches of the WJC, as well as the organizations I have already mentioned and a number of other Jewish groups from outside, such as the English Board of Deputies, could meet regularly and discuss international Jewish problems. This was not supposed to be a functioning corporate body but a consulting one. After lengthy negotiations it finally materialized, and COJO was founded in Rome in 1958.

Indeed, this time B'nai B'rith, through its newly established International Council, joined WJC to become a founding member of the new organization, which was later reinforced by WZO. COJO also admitted to membership such organizations as the Board of Deputies, Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas (DAIA), the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, and the American Jewish Congress. The American Jewish Committee, however, remained aloof.

Dr. Goldmann felt that COJO “performed useful work over the years in reducing to a common denominator the viewpoints of the various organizations on important international Jewish matters, and sometimes it even initiated joint action”; that “the creation of these bodies [Presidents’ Conference and COJO] relieved the chaos in Jewish public life, although it still has not been possible to establish the comprehensive world Jewish organization so sorely needed.”

Following the 1967 war, Goldmann attempted to enlarge COJO in both membership and scope. In his view, “The goal of this program was to create a kind of Jewish world parliament that, while not having the right to make binding decisions, would provide a world forum for all shades of Jewish opinion, from the Lubavicher Rabbi to committed Jewish Communists.”

But the difficulties in reorganizing and expanding COJO proved to be “almost insuperable,” as he reported. Again, he saw as the major obstacle the “reluctance of the constituent organizations to relinquish the least degree of autonomy.”¹³

¹³*The Autobiography of Nahum Goldman. op. cit.*, pp. 326-27.

Neither was the hope borne out that the Diaspora side in the Israel-Diaspora relationship might be strengthened through COJO. Goldmann's pronouncements on Middle East politics aroused dissatisfaction in COJO, and from the ensuing discussion emerged a WZO-B'nai B'rith coalition, with Goldmann in the minority. In 1971 a plan was adopted for rotating the COJO chairmanship (which had been held by Goldmann since its founding) among the three international organizations, and Goldmann resigned the position. Louis Pincus became chairman shortly before his death in July 1973, following a term by William Wexler of B'nai B'rith.

COJO continues to lay stress on its purely consultative function, as witness its annual budget of about \$30,000, which could hardly sustain much activity beyond the one annual plenary session (usually held in conjunction with the meeting of another organization, to save travel expenses), meetings of the officers, clerical help, and mailing expenses for informational materials. COJO employs as its executive secretary the person serving the Conference of Presidents in the same capacity.

JEWISH EDUCATION PROGRAM

In one area, however, COJO decided to initiate and sustain new activity of its own: Jewish education. At COJO's bidding, a World Assembly on Jewish Education was convened in Jerusalem in 1962. The 200 delegates from 30 countries resolved that COJO establish a World Education Center to promote an interchange of facilities, resources, and programming among the various systems of Jewish education all over the globe. It was to be governed by a World Council representing all major Jewish communities and educational bodies.

The project was stillborn; but it took more than six years to bring in a coroner's verdict. One of the bones of contention in the long and futile attempt to set up the Center was its proposed location. Although Jerusalem had initially been designated as the logical site, there was resistance from Diaspora quarters that feared the weight of Israeli influence. Headquarters was consequently established in New York, but to little avail. A committee appointed to study the causes of the project's failure found that the World Council was unable to function because of two shortcomings:

Firstly, the world-wide structure contemplated was so intricate and extensive as to consume the total energies of all involved. The modest budget, appropriated as a first step by the Memorial Foundation, could not provide the staff required for such a machinery. Secondly, the scope of the Council was overly ambitious, for while it targeted on the critical needs of Jewish education, it also exceeded the resources available.

Part of the blame was laid on the "parochial loyalties of some national or international organizations in the field of Jewish education that are not ready to relinquish one inch of their autonomy."¹⁴ Pincus's explanation was that an independent international professional body could not function under the conditions of Jewish life; what was needed was a lay body to provide entrée, exercise influence, and create the atmosphere essential to achieve results.

It was then decided that, rather than abandon the educational effort, it be returned to the auspices of COJO. The rationale was that COJO's international structure would succeed in promoting the aims, which the independent World Council failed to do. Consequently, a COJO Commission on Jewish Education was established, similar in purpose to the World Council but more modest in scale. Above all, the new Commission was to deal with basic strategies rather than immediate issues, and with matters that were then not being handled satisfactorily by existing agencies. The question of the site was once again debated and eventually resolved in favor of Jerusalem.

In October 1971 an office with a capable administrator was opened in the city, but activity was slow in getting under way. There were problems in financing its modest program, which was to begin with a survey of textbooks, curricula, and other auxiliary material used in Jewish schools. The office also was to serve as a clearing house for such material until a Central Pedagogical Library could be established in Jerusalem. As indicated before, COJO had no money, and a one-time grant from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture for the earlier project was soon exhausted. To ensure funding of the COJO Commission, Pincus initiated the establishment of a \$5 million endowment fund by WZO, the Joint Distribution Committee, and the government of Israel, but he died before the fund became operative, and his associates resolved to convert it into a Pincus Memorial Fund for Jewish education, to which the Jewish Agency would also contribute. However, there seemed to have been no clear-cut decision for the proceeds of the fund to be used to pay for the activities of the COJO Commission, and its financial future remained uncertain at the time of Pincus's death.

The experience of COJO in the area of Jewish education would point to one of two propositions, or both: a) Jewish education, although a universally acknowledged *desideratum*, is essentially a subject for local initiative and control; b) the launching of a permanent

¹⁴"The Early History of the World Council on Jewish Education, 1960-66; A Story of Groping and Exploration." Edited by Azriel Eisenstadt. New York, April, 1967 (mimeo).

multicountry project is a complex undertaking fraught with many pitfalls and obstacles.

Distributive Associations

CONFERENCE ON JEWISH MATERIAL CLAIMS AGAINST GERMANY

An example of how a multicountry association was set up quickly and effectively is the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (Claims Conference). It had a special, delimited purpose involving two successive tasks: 1) to press (in conjunction with the government of Israel) Jewish claims against Germany, and 2) to distribute the funds received among eligible beneficiaries. The Conference was established in 1951, and ended its active role in 1965 with the fulfillment of its stated goal. Its formal existence is being maintained for the performance of certain ongoing tasks. Among these are: monitoring the implementation of German legislation on restitution; pressing for further legislation (also in East Germany); administering a fund for former community leaders, and supporting non-Jews who had helped rescue Jews and who are in financial straits (in countries other than Israel). By 1965 the Claims Conference had allocated \$110 million, of which three-fourths was applied to the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of Nazi victims outside Israel, and the balance went mainly for cultural and educational reconstruction. Grants were made to some 250 Jewish communities and institutions in 30 countries, primarily in Europe, as well as for research and publications by authors who were Nazi victims. Institutions for the commemoration of the Holocaust were also beneficiaries.

The genesis of the Claims Conference was as follows: Early in 1951 Israel sent notes to the four Allied Powers, announcing a total \$1.5 billion Jewish claim for reconstitution from West and East Germany. (This followed preliminary contacts between officials of WJC and the West German government.) Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett then asked Nahum Goldmann, in the latter's capacity as chairman of the WZO-Jewish Agency, to invite the world's leading Jewish organizations to a conference in support of Israel's demands. The gathering was to be as representative as possible, so that its authority would be respected by the Jewish public as well as the German government. The conference met on October 21, 1951, in New York; participants were 22 organizations from the United States, England, Canada, Australia, South Africa, France, and Argentina. The meeting decided to constitute itself as the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against

Germany for the purpose of endorsing Israel's claims and presenting supplementary demands on behalf of the Jews in other countries.

Protracted negotiations led to separate agreements by the German Federal Republic with Israel and with the Claims Conference. Israel was to receive \$715 million and the Claims Conference \$107 million in reparations over the period of the agreement. Under the terms of a separate agreement with Israel, the Claims Conference participated with the Jewish Agency in distributing funds for the relief and other needs of refugees in Israel, constituting 18.3 per cent of West Germany's payments to Israel.

According to the agreements, the Claims Conference had two specific functions: 1) to distribute the funds it received for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution living outside of Israel, and 2) to seek enactment of better and more extensive legislation in Germany for the indemnification of victims of Nazism.

In the distributive phase that followed there was remarkable consensus among the many divergent organizational interests represented. This was despite strong ideological opposition to the idea of accepting payments from Germany, which only gradually receded in the "Jewish street." The success of the Claims Conference in both its diplomatic and distributive tasks can be attributed to the following factors:

1. The clearly delimited goal the group set itself;
2. The challenge of *bona fide* diplomatic activity with two sovereign states in place of the lobbying and shadowboxing that is normally the lot of nonsovereign entities;
3. The opportunity to be a fullfledged partner of Israel in these negotiations;
4. The high calibre of the negotiators;
5. The early agreement on criteria and priorities for the distribution of the funds: at the outset, policies were defined, standard procedures were established for dealing with applications, and a review committee charged with making recommendations on revising procedures where necessary.
6. The utilization of established facilities: the Claims Conference did not become an operating agency or call new instrumentalities into being; in Europe, it worked through the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.
7. The Claims Conference consciously strived to be representative of all its members on an equal basis. Each of the 22 member organizations (a 23rd was added in 1959) sent two representatives to the board of directors; at the same time, the functions of the central

body were altogether different from those of its constituents, thus eliminating overlapping and jurisdictional jealousies between center and periphery.

MEMORIAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE

As the termination of German reparations payments drew near, the idea took shape among leaders of the Claims Conference that it be succeeded by a permanent body, which would continue the work of encouraging and supporting Jewish scholarship and education, and thereby serve as a living memorial to the six million who perished in the Holocaust. To that end, the Claims Conference established in 1964 the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture and transferred to it the funds which had remained after German payments ceased. This base endowment of about \$10 million was augmented by additional amounts in subsequent years, so that the Foundation has been able to distribute about \$1.25 million annually.

Allocations (percentages based on 1973-1974 figures) were earmarked for: research and publications in Jewish fields (including documentation and commemoration of the Holocaust), 45.9 per cent; training programs for rabbis, educators, and communal workers, 19.6 per cent; university Jewish studies, 10.5 per cent; educational and cultural programs, 7.8 per cent; scholarship and fellowship programs, 16.2 per cent. Israel got by far the largest share of the total allocated, followed by Europe, and then North America. Projects sponsored by institutions receive a maximum of 25 per cent of the total cost from the Memorial Foundation.

The Foundation has 47 member organizations, each of which sends three representatives to the board of directors. Eighteen organizations are of the multicountry type (13 have the word "World" in their names) and 29 are territorial, the latter including five academic and cultural groups in Israel. Thus the Memorial Foundation is even more inclusive than the Claims Conference. Like the latter, it has a small professional staff, whose job consists mainly of sifting applications for support (these amount to several times the available financing) and making recommendations for allocations to the board and the 25-member executive committee. (The executive, which convenes between annual board meetings, can make grants not exceeding \$10,000 for a maximum period of one year.) The Foundation maintains its headquarters in New York, where it generally holds its meetings. It pays travel expenses for one delegate from each member association.

The Memorial Foundation maintains quite an elaborate apparatus for the implementation of a financially rather modest program. But it

expects to obtain additional endowment funds that will substantially increase the disposable income. Moreover, the Foundation does not see its function solely as making allocations to existing bodies or responding to the initiatives of others. It has set for itself the task of seeking out areas that are not now adequately funded, yet have a significant potential for furthering the Foundation's goals. Recently, its board decided that informal Jewish education at the college level was a neglected area; it therefore set up an *ad hoc* commission to make recommendations for the expansion of this field through the Memorial Foundation.

The Foundation is convinced that, in the decade of its existence, it has exerted decisive influence in the area of its major concentration. About 900 young scholars received doctoral grants and, a follow-up study found, fully 70 per cent of them now teach Jewish studies at the university level. Training programs supported by the Foundation have been the major source of teachers and rabbis for deprived areas of the world, including some countries in Eastern Europe.

Service Agencies

A major share of multicountry activity in the field of services (education, welfare, community organization) is performed by groups having a territorial base. Outstanding among them is the Joint (JDC), the chief overseas welfare agency of American Jews (and a partner in the United Jewish Appeal). The France-based Alliance Israélite Universelle has an illustrious record of establishing educational institutions in the Muslim world.

WORLD ORT UNION

By contrast, the World ORT Union (Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training) is a service agency which is multicountry in all respects: functional, administrative, and financial. Operations are conducted in 12 countries, where, at the beginning of 1974, some 41,000 students were enrolled in vocational-training courses of a wide variety, making ORT the largest nongovernmental system of vocational education in the world. Its major center of activity is Israel, with an enrollment of some 28,000. Other programs are conducted in Iran, Morocco, and India; in Argentina, Venezuela, and Uruguay; in France and Italy.

The World ORT Union, which has its seat in Geneva, is a federation of autonomous national organizations, constituted as an association

according to the Swiss civil code. It makes available to the local groups financial subsidies, training of personnel, and overall planning. The Union is governed by a congress meeting every six years (an emergency session was held in Jerusalem in March 1974), to which member organizations send elected delegates. A central committee of 150 meets between congresses; it, in turn, elects an executive committee of 20 to 40 members, which convenes biannually. The president of the World ORT Union is an American, as is its executive director; the executive committee chairman is French. In the lower administrative echelons, the staff is multinational.

ORT also conducts training programs in third-world countries; these are sponsored and financed by the United States foreign aid program and by international institutions, primarily the World Bank. The Central ORT Training Institute in Anières, Switzerland, has been asked by the Swiss Foreign Ministry to train teaching personnel for countries to which Switzerland wishes to give technical assistance.

The factors making for the continued effectiveness of the World ORT Union as a multicountry body can be summarized as follows:

1. It is a single-purpose organization which knew how to adapt its program to changing circumstances and requirements. Originating as a small operation in Eastern Europe before World War I, ORT developed programs that met essential needs in countries of resettlement after World War II, and now trains Jews in sophisticated technological specialties.

2. Its nonpolitical nature assured it entrée and acceptance in non-Western countries, especially in the Muslim world. (Operations in Eastern Europe, which continued in the postwar period, have since been phased out.)

3. At the same time, ORT shifted its major emphasis to Israel, making a substantial contribution to filling that country's manpower needs. Since their inception in 1949, ORT's Israeli institutions have turned out 100,000 graduates; another 100,000 entered Israel as immigrants with ORT training in some other country. (It should be noted that ORT operates two vocational high schools for Israeli Arabs and also offers vocational training to the Arabs of East Jerusalem.)

4. In its training programs, ORT was able to maintain professional standards that lent it international recognition.

5. In its financing, it was able to meet expanding needs through a combination of local support for local programs and an allocation from centralized fund raising in the United States (through JDC).

6. It accomplished a shift in leadership from Eastern Europe to the United States, and thereby succeeded in selling the ORT idea to the American Jewish public and becoming a beneficiary of central fund

raising in the United States. At the same time, ORT's somewhat elaborate three-tiered federated structure makes possible participation by representatives from all of its multicountry membership and provides a forum for bridging differences in approach, as they arise.

In almost all these aspects, ORT's ability to weather change is in contrast to the inability of its one-time sister organization, OSE (the Russian name was freely translated as *Oeuvre de Secours aux Enfants*), a kind of Jewish world health organization, to make an effective transition from its East European past to the postwar period. Having shifted its program from health care to the care of refugee children, mainly in France, OSE could not find acceptance in the United States. It all but lost its multicountry character, remaining a local service agency.

ORT's operational budget for the fiscal year 1974 was \$35 million, of which the bulk was contributed for local programs in the form of fees and contributions by the local ORT federations. About \$10 million was made available by the World ORT Union; of this, \$3 million was allocated by JDC and the balance came from membership and fund-raising drives among supporters throughout the world. ORT differentiates between operational and nonoperational countries; in the latter, membership groups are formed to enlist support and funds for operations abroad. The most active membership group is the Women's American ORT, which now contributes about \$2.5 million annually to the World ORT Union. However, its fund-raising activities are restricted by ORT's contract with JDC to avoid interference with the United Jewish Appeal campaign from which JDC derives its funds. The United States is an operational country by virtue of the Bramson ORT Training Center in New York, which trains workers for the needle trades. Founded in 1942, it is now the oldest unit in the entire ORT network.

EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES

The most recently established multicountry association of consequence is the European Council of Jewish Community Services. As its name indicates, it is a regional body serving as a deliberative forum for community leaders from some 70 communities in 18 countries (including Rumania).

The Council is the successor to the Standing Conference of European Jewish Communities, which was organized by JDC in the 1950's and functioned in close liaison with JDC's European office in Geneva. Its purpose was to stem the slow disintegration of Jewish life in postwar Europe and to help the communities transcend their local

preoccupations in the search for common solutions. When the Conference transformed itself into the Council, its offices were moved to Paris, and the appointment of a French communal worker as secretary general, in place of a JDC staff member, completed the agency's "Europeanization." The Jewish community of Great Britain is part of the new organization; the Council's publication, *Exchange*, is written in English. A meeting of the Council in Berlin, in May 1972, was considered the point of its "turning from a liaison body into a large international Jewish organization." The assembly adopted a five-year program, which provided for commissions on fund raising, young leadership training, and social services, and activated a Europe-wide Community Center Association.

In its scope and functions, the European Council is not dissimilar to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) in the United States, and, indeed, a CJFWF delegation attended an earlier Council meeting in Copenhagen for an exchange of views. In November 1972 the Council conducted a "forum" on the theme, "The Quality of Jewish Life," which was attended by 550 delegates from all its member communities. According to the Council's chairman, this forum saw the "birth of a real European Jewish consciousness." It may well be that the creation of this regional coordinating body for Jewish communal and service organizations in Europe is the most significant development on the world Jewish scene in the last decade.

Religious Associations

In the past, Jewish religious faith and practice throughout the world were so standardized and so deeply rooted that no multinational associations were necessary to further, protect, or propagate them.¹⁵ This is still true of Orthodox Judaism, and the authority of outstanding rabbinic authorities continues to transcend national boundaries without the backing of a formal organization. Indeed, both the Agudas Israel World Organization and the Mizrachi World Union were founded essentially for political purposes; the first to safeguard the interests of Orthodox Jewry outside the Zionist framework, the second to do so within it.

It is the newer, non-Orthodox religious movements which have found it expedient to set up multicountry associations to further their

¹⁵As Daniel J. Elazar puts it, "The common allegiance to halakhic Judaism and reliance upon traditional Jewish law gave the Jewish people the constitutional unity it needed." (Article on "Community" in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 5, col. 852.)

religious causes. Both the World Council of Synagogues (Conservative) and the World Union for Progressive Judaism (Reform), while basically associations of congregations (or of countrywide congregational bodies), also have an ideological, "missionary," component in that they seek to propagate their own particular variety of Judaism.

Of the two associations, the latter is the more elaborately structured and also the more militant, probably because the Reform movement encounters more determined resistance on the part of the Orthodox religious establishment in countries outside the United States, especially in Israel. There it strenuously attempts to bring innovations into the religious atmosphere, while the Orthodox jealously guard the *status quo*.

The World Union for Progressive Judaism was established in London in 1926 by representatives of Liberal, Progressive, and Reform¹⁶ congregational associations and synagogues from six countries; in 1973 it had constituents in 23 countries.

The World Union functions as a roof organization for synagogue bodies and, in countries where there are no such associations, for individual Reform congregations which "shall be autonomous and have unlimited control over their own affairs." It offers financial and organizational assistance to new congregations; is involved in the publication of prayerbooks, and organizes a biennial international conference. The Union's budget, about \$200,000 annually, is derived from membership dues and individual contributions. Most of the funds come from the United States, where the Reform movement is a dominant institutional force (the president and executive director of the World Union are Americans).

Nevertheless, the World Union moved its headquarters to Israel in 1973. Its leadership looks upon that country as a "new frontier," believing that Israel rather than America "provides the ultimate testing ground for Reform Judaism, since there is no societal pressure or inner compulsion in Israel to join a synagogue in order to identify as a Jew."¹⁷ Also, in Israel the World Union is an operating body, whereas in the United States and in Europe it performs only coordinating functions. It plays an active role in stimulating the growth of Reform congregations in the Jewish state and helps pay the salaries of their rabbis. In the continuing controversy over "Who is a Jew?," the World Union has been exerting strong pressure on the Israel government against a change in the Law of the Return. When the issue

¹⁶The terms are virtually synonymous.

¹⁷Interview with Rabbi Richard Hirsch, Executive Director of WUJP, in Jerusalem on January 25, 1974.

came to a head after the December 1973 elections, the Union was the first organized segment of Diaspora Jewry to influence effectively the legislative process in Israel, and even to affect the course of coalition formation.

Fraternal Associations

Among fraternal groups, whose main attribute is their special membership, multicountry association is a by-product rather than an end. Local groups of similar interest and membership are linked in a loose multicountry organization with an international headquarters. Such association, aside from promoting the exchange of ideas and persons, has symbolic and prestige value for the member groups. It also permits the implementation of social service projects on a joint basis (as the home for emotionally disturbed children maintained by the worldwide association for B'nai B'rith women's chapters in Jerusalem). The special membership may also have a special interest aspect, as do the World Sephardi Federation and the World Union of Jewish Students. For political expression, such groups tend to be active in and through one of the political associations.

A feature common to nearly all the agencies listed below is that they are roof organizations, that is, their membership consists of organizations. Individual membership in multicountry organizations thus remains the rare exception. In a sense, each of the Jewish multinational organizations is a federated structure; in some cases it is closely knit, with the central body the mere instrument of the members; in others, a new corporate entity has emerged, with an identity quite distinct from that of its constituents. What is absent, however, is an overarching structure that would link the principal organizations into a common polity.

Indeed, a major characteristic of Jewish international organizations in the 1970s has been the virtual eclipse of the vision of an all-inclusive representative body. The "Big Three" political organizations—WZO, WJC, and COJO—find themselves considerably short of that goal; the broadest representation was achieved by groups whose functions are distributive rather than political.

On the other hand, the status of Israel in the Jewish world has continued to ascend, and the advocates of diaspora autonomy seemed to be embracing a forlorn cause in the face of an Israel whose strength, as one of these advocates put it, "was expressed in terms of the sheer weight of her Jewish existence." Nevertheless, incipient clashes of

interest, while given occasional verbal expression, were never allowed to assume the form of open conflict. The strong undercurrent of identification with Israel throughout the Diaspora is given fresh impetus at a time of crisis, such as was provoked by the Yom Kippur war.

ERNEST STOCK

A TYPOLOGY OF JEWISH MULTICOUNTRY ASSOCIATIONS

Name of Association	Goals				
	Religious	Service		Political	
		Education Culture	Welfare Community Organization	Rights	Ideology
1. Agudas Israel World Organization	X*				Y*
2. Alliance Israelite Universelle ¹		X		Y	
3. B'nai B'rith International Council		Y	Y		
4. Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany		X	X		
5. World Conference of Jewish Organizations (COJO)		Y		X	
6. Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations				X	
7. European Council of Jewish Community Services			X		
8. International Conference of Jewish Communal Service			Y		
9. Jewish Agency for Israel		X	X		
10. Jewish Colonization Association		X	X		
11. Maccabi World Union					
12. Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture		X			
13. Mizrahi World Union	X				Y
14. ORT (World ORT Union)		X			
15. OSE (Oeuvre de Secours aux Enfants) ²			X		
16. Women's International Zionist Organization		X	X		Y
17. World Conference on Soviet Jewry ³				X	
18. World Council of Synagogues	X				
19. World Federation of YMHAs and Jewish Community Centers				X	
20. World Jewish Congress					
21. World Sephardi Federation					
22. World Union of Jewish Students					
23. World Union for Progressive Judaism	X				
24. World Zionist Organization					X
25. Zionist Youth Movements Bnei Akiva, Habonim, etc.)					Y

* X = primary; Y = secondary.

¹Although no longer multicountry by our criteria, the Alliance began its career in 1860 as the first "universal" Jewish association in modern times; it therefore deserves a place in this table.

²OSE is included because of its historic multicountry character; today, to all intents and purposes, it is a French organization.

³This is an *ad hoc* association with a single purpose. Unlike the more permanent multipurpose political associations, it has been able to enlist across-the-board participation.

Goals			Structure and Membership				Mode of Operation		
Fraternal		Youth	Federative		Autonomous	Individual Membership	Operational	Consultative	Distributive
General	Special Interest	Sports	Roof Organization	New Body					
X			X		X X		X X Y	X	
			X	X				X	X
			X					X	
X			X			X		X	
		X	X		X X		X X		X
			X	X	X		X X		X
			X		X		X		
			X	X				X X	
		X	X					X X	
	X Y	X	X	X			Y Y	X X	
			X X		X		Y X	X Y	
		X					X	Y	