

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection:

Green, Max: Files, 1985-1988

Folder Title:

National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council
(3 of 7)

Box: 34

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

JOINT PROGRAM PLAN

For Jewish Community Relations

1984-85

GUIDE TO PROGRAM PLANNING OF
THE CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

NATIONAL JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council

OFFICERS

Chair

Jacqueline K. Levine, MetroWest, NJ

Vice Chairpersons

Norman S. Davis, San Antonio
Raymond Epstein, Chicago
Stuart Handmaker, Louisville
Dr. Aileen Kassen, Cleveland

Esther R. Landa, NCJW
Donald E. Lefton, Miami
Arden E. Shenker, Portland, OR
Richard S. Volpert, Los Angeles

Matthew B. Weinberg, San Francisco

Treasurer

Bernard S. White, Washington, DC

Secretary

Michael A. Pelavin, Flint

Past Chairmen

Albert E. Arent, Washington, DC
Jordan C. Band, Cleveland
Lewis D. Cole, Louisville
Aaron Goldman, Washington, DC

Irving Kane, Cleveland
Theodore R. Mann, Philadelphia
Bernard H. Trager, Bridgeport
Lewis H. Weinstein, Boston

Bennett Yanowitz, Cleveland

Executive Vice Chairman

Albert D. Chernin

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(in addition to the Officers)

National Agency Representatives

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

Edward D. Moldover
Mervin H. Riseman

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

Murray A. Gordon
Marion Wilen

B'NAI B'RITH—ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

Kenneth Bialkin
Gerald Kraft

HADASSAH

Frieda S. Lewis
Thelma C. Wolf

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE

David Ashe
Donald Slaiman

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE U.S.A.

Joseph Zoldan
Stanley N. Zwaik

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

Lenore Feldman
Barbara Mandel

UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS

Harris Gilbert
Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA

Julius Berman
Marcel Webber

UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA—

WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR CONSERVATIVE JUDAISM

Selma Weintraub
Marshall Wolke

WOMEN'S AMERICAN ORT

Bea Forrest
Beverly Minkoff

Community Representatives

Gilbert Baker, Houston
Morton Bunis, MetroWest, NJ
Steve Chernov, Milwaukee
Selig Danzig, Bridgeport
Marilyn Flanzbaum, Central NJ
Frederick N. Frank, Pittsburgh
Marilyn Glaser, Baltimore
Mara Giullanti, Hollywood, Florida
Jack B. Jacobs, Delaware
David Lebenbom, Detroit
Elsie Leviton, Palm Beach County

Nathan Lewin, Washington, DC
David Minkun, Atlanta
Michael Newmark, St. Louis
Philip Perlmutter, Boston
Dr. Lawrence Rubin, Philadelphia
Edward Sanders, Los Angeles
Gloria Schwartz, Springfield, IL
Steven Schwarz, Wilkes-Barre
Ann Sikora, Dallas
Sheldon Tenenbaum, Savannah
Peggy Tishman, New York

Ex Officio

Carol Dragul, Cincinnati
Benjamin Gettler, Cincinnati
Rae Ginsburg, Boston
Milton Goldstein, St. Louis
Shirley Joseph, NCJW
H. Ronald Klasko, Philadelphia
Stanley Lowell, New York
Rabbi Israel Miller, New York
Robert A. Riesman, Rhode Island
Ann Robison, NCJW

Robert M. Schray, Chicago
H. William Shure, New Haven
Stanley Sollins, AJCRW
Norman Tilles, Rhode Island
Barry Ungar, Philadelphia
Hon. Jerry Wagner, Hartford
Beryl B. Weinstein, Waterbury
Judith Wolf, Boston
Carolyn Zaroff, Rochester

1984-85

Joint Program Plan for Jewish Community Relations A Guide to Program Planning

The National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council's annual Joint Program Plans are products of the continual national planning process of the Jewish community relations field. Offered as a general guide for Jewish community relations programming, each Plan is meant to be used by member agencies as a basis for their own program planning, with each accepting or rejecting, modifying or expanding—according to its individual judgments, resources and needs—any of the recommendations made.

Each Plan is derived from the total experience, study, analysis and projection that comprised the NJCRAC coordinating process in the 12-month period between publication of the preceding Plan and adoption of the new one. Because the member agencies have different charters, scopes and priorities, some are neither engaged in every area of activity dealt with here, nor participate in the

course of joint program planning in the formulation or recommendations in every specific area.

Joint Program Plans seek primarily to identify and appraise changing conditions and trends that have occurred during the preceding year and their potential impact on Jewish community relations goals and concerns. This assessment provides a basis for projecting responsive positions, priorities and programs.

For the most part, no effort is made to recapitulate programs recommended in previous years or to reiterate the basic Jewish traditions and values that underlie the commitment of NJCRAC constituents to the social ideas derived from those values and traditions. It is assumed that those to whom the plan is principally addressed are fully cognizant of these matrices of Jewish thought and action—and are moved by them.

CONTENTS

Introduction	3	Government Aid to Religiously-Related Schools	33
Overview — Basic Trends and Priorities in Jewish Community Relations	5	Strategic Goals (Church-State Issues)	33
Israel and the Middle East	11	Jewish-Christian Relations	34
U.S.-Israel Relations	11	Continuing & Urgent	35
Jerusalem	12	Cults and Other Conversionary Movements	
Israel — the Peace Process	13	Strategic Goals (Interreligious Issues)	35
The PLO	14	Social and Economic Justice	36
Lebanon	14	Unemployment	36
Arab Arms Sales	15	Emergency Jobs Program	
<i>The Arab Arsenal</i>		Poverty	38
<i>Sources of Arab Arms</i>		Hunger and the Homeless	38
International Terrorism	17	Federal Budget	39
Continuing & Urgent	18	Public Education	40
United Nations Decade for Women Conference		Medicare	41
United Nations		Civil Rights	41
Arab Influence on Campus		<i>NJCRCAC Policy on Affirmative Action</i>	
<i>Counteracting Arab Propaganda</i> <i>on U.S. Aid to Israel</i>		Black-Jewish Relations	44
Strategic Goals	20	Women's Rights	45
International Concerns	21	Vietnam Veterans	46
Soviet Jewry	21	Continuing & Urgent	46
The Condition of Soviet Jewry	21	Immigration	
<i>Jewish Emigration from the U.S.S.R.</i>		Full Voting Representation for the District of Columbia	
Soviet-American Relations	22	Hispanic-Jewish Relations	
Strategic Goals	23	Strategic Goals	47
<i>Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience</i>	23	Energy	50
<i>Refusniks Who Have Waited More Than</i> <i>Ten Years</i>	25	Strategic Goals	51
Ethiopian Jewry	27	Jewish Security and Individual Freedom	52
The Condition of Ethiopian Jewry	27	Anti-Semitism	52
Famine in Africa	27	<i>Measuring Anti-Semitism</i>	
Strategic Goals	27	Constitutional Convention	54
Argentina	28	Censorship of Public Officials	55
Strategic Goals	28	Right to Reproductive Choice	55
Continuing & Urgent	28	The Death Penalty	56
Syria		Continuing & Urgent	57
Iran		The Holocaust	
Church-State and Interreligious Relationships	29	Nazi War Criminals	
Government Sanction of Religious Symbols	29	Broadcast Deregulation	
Religion in the Public Schools	31	Strategic Goals	59
		Appendix — 1944-1984: <i>Our Role in the Building of a New America</i> — NJCRCAC Chair's Plenum Address	60

(continued)

INTRODUCTION

A voluntary association of Jewish community relations agencies, the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, marking its 40th anniversary, is the instrument through which its constituency of eleven national and 111 local Jewish organizations jointly identify and evaluate developments of concern to the Jewish community, plan how to deal effectively with those concerns, seek consensus on joint policies and develop guidelines for appropriate action. The annual Joint Program Plans represent the judgments, conclusions and recommendations that emerge from this process.

Jewish community relations activities are directed toward enhancement of conditions conducive to secure and creative Jewish living. Such conditions can be achieved only within a societal framework committed to the principles of democratic pluralism; to freedom of religion, thought, and expression; equal rights, justice and opportunity; and within a climate in which differences among groups are accepted and respected, with each free to cultivate its own distinctive values while participating fully in the general life of the society.

History has bred in Jews the deep conviction that such conditions, which accord with ethical and religious values derived from Judaism and Jewish tradition, afford Jews, and all others, the best opportunity to enjoy secure and meaningful lives.

Through a broad, coordinated program of activity, Jewish community relations agencies seek to interpret Israel's position and needs to the American public and government; to marshal public opinion on behalf of justice and freedom for Soviet Jews and other oppressed Jewish communities; to promote in the United States equality of opportunity, without regard to race, religion, ancestry or sex; to secure freedom of thought, opinion and association; to insure freedom of religion and separation of church and state; and to encourage amicable relationships between all groups.

The Joint Planning Process

Program planning is a continuous process requiring the cooperation and participation of both national and local agencies. Jointly, the member agencies of the NJCRAC pool their ideas, information and experience, seeking agreement on the major problems facing the Jewish community at any given time, and how these problems can be best dealt with and their order of priority. Cooperatively, the agencies continually review existing programs and evaluate their effectiveness, being always alert to new or changed conditions to which planning must be adapted.

Using Available Resources Effectively

All member agencies are autonomous. Each engages in those aspects of community relations work

that it deems appropriate to its goals and commensurate with its resources. On occasion, the agencies may agree that, for most effective use of available resources, a particular task should be undertaken by one of them. Responsibility for such tasks is then assigned, by mutual agreement among the agencies, on a case-by-case basis. Those phases of program requiring the concerted impact of multiple influences and forces are the common responsibility of all agencies, national and local.

In implementing programmatic activities, national and local agencies play complementary roles. NJCRAC policy provides that national agencies recognize that CRCs are central bodies with primary responsibility for local community relations policy and programming. National agencies accordingly are expected to encourage their constituents to participate in programs conducted with the approval of the local CRCs, to make their services available to the CRCs and to encourage formation of CRCs where they do not exist.

NJCRAC policy also provides for recognition by CRCs that national agencies are channels through which local community relations programs can be facilitated; for CRC cooperation in programs of local affiliates of national agencies; and for respect by CRCs for the fundamental philosophies of national agencies, which should not be asked to compromise those philosophies.

Requests for consultation on means of implementing Joint Program Plan recommendations within a local community setting are given prompt attention by NJCRAC commissions and by staff. As the situation requires, these consultations may take the form of correspondence, telephone contacts or field visits. The commissions and other deliberative units of the NJCRAC meet regularly throughout the year to review developments and, consonant with Joint Program Plan positions, formulate recommendations for the guidance of member agencies.

The Purpose of the Joint Program Plan

The annual Joint Program Plan represents the national planning process of the Jewish community relations field. It is offered as a general guide and as an aid in programming and is meant to be used by member agencies as a basis for their own program planning, with each agency accepting or rejecting, modifying or expanding any of the recommendations made, according to its individual judgments, resources and needs.

The planning process that leads to each yearly Joint Program Plan is an ongoing endeavor that encourages the Jewish community relations field to look ahead to determine how trends and conditions either advance or threaten the field's goals. Those

broad judgments allow the field to jointly tailor a collective response to these trends. Thus, the Plan that results from this process identifies the long-term patterns out of which specific events emerge, enabling the field to better anticipate subsequent developments. The Plan outlines joint policy recommendations that guide specific action responses to those emerging anticipated events.

Each annual Joint Program Plan is meant to be a timely document, tied to the trends anticipated for the coming year. The Plans do not attempt to present comprehensive recapitulations of policy, and therefore recommendations made in previous years are not reiterated. Nor is there a restatement of the basic Jewish traditions and values that underlie the commitment of member organizations to the social ideals derived from those values and traditions. Recommendations once adopted continue in effect until amended or superseded by a subsequent Joint Program Plan.

In an attempt to underline the planning process reflected in the Joint Program Plan, this 1984-85 Plan is organized into sub-sections that sharply demarcate "changing conditions", "background", and finally "strategic goals" for the coming year in each of the subject areas discussed. Where it was deemed useful to reassert judgments or recommendations contained in previous Joint Program Plans the heading "continuing and urgent" was employed.

This year's Joint Program Plan also includes, as did last year's, an introductory, conspectus "Overview" section presenting broadstroke judgments that identify fundamental changes in conditions and long-term trends in the field, and in the light of this, projecting the major priorities for the field.

How the Joint Program Plan is Formulated

Prior to the February, 1984, Plenary Session, "propositions", which serve as drafts of Joint Program Plan material, were prepared by staff and circulated to the total membership and to the Plenary Session delegates. Each proposition addressed a specific subject area, incorporating tentative appraisals of past and current conditions, projections of antici-

pated developments, and proposals for policy and program adaptations.

All member organizations were urged to hold meetings to study and discuss the propositions with a view toward formulating ideas for presentation to the Plenum during the five sessions scheduled specifically for this purpose. Member organizations were asked to identify, prior to the Plenary Session, those items they felt required consideration and resolution by the Plenum. At each of these sessions, there was open discussion and action on the propositions identified as requiring debate.

Based on the discussions and actions of the Plenum, a first draft of the Plan was reviewed by the Joint Program Plan Committee, under the co-chairmanship of Jack B. Jacobs of Delaware, and Barry Ungar of Philadelphia. The Committee is comprised of the chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of the five NJCRAC standing commissions, principal executives of the eleven national member agencies and the executives of several CRCs.

A second draft, revised in accordance with decisions of the Joint Program Plan Committee, was submitted to the membership for comment, and was finally reviewed and acted upon by the Executive Committee at its June 24-25, 1984, meeting. With further revisions as ordered by the Executive Committee, the Joint Program Plan for 1984-85 appears herein, together with such dissents, exceptions and qualifications as some individual agencies expressed.

The "Overview" section had a separate formulation process. A draft "Overview" was presented to the Plenary Session as the NJCRAC Executive Vice Chairman's address. The draft was derived from meetings of the NJCRAC Israel Task Force, Israel Commission, Task Force on Domestic Concerns, Executive Committee, and Joint Program Plan Committee. The Plenum, and later the Executive Committee, discussed, modified, and adopted the "Overview" presentation. In final form, as modified by the Plenum and Executive Committee, it now appears as the opening segment of this 1984-85 Joint Program Plan, outlining consensus views of the "Basic Trends and Priorities in Jewish Community Relations."

OVERVIEW

Basic Trends and Priorities in Jewish Community Relations

Middle East

In the summer of 1982 the Jewish community relations field applauded the clear statement by the President of the goals of American policy in Lebanon which were aimed at fostering: 1) the sovereignty and unity of Lebanon under a legitimate central government; 2) the withdrawal of all foreign forces including Syrian and PLO as well as Israeli; and 3) the security of Israel's northern border with Lebanon.

The achievement of these goals would have advanced peace and stability in the Middle East and America's interests as well as those of Western-oriented Arab states and Israel.

A major obstacle to their achievement in the summer of 1982 was Syrian hegemony in Lebanon and throughout the Middle East. No movement could be made on achieving Lebanese unity with 50,000 Syrian troops in the Bekaa Valley. There was no question about Israel's readiness to withdraw. The issue then, as now, was Syrian withdrawal but the difference in the summer of 1982 was that Syria had suffered a disabling military defeat, and the Israeli guns pointed at Damascus were seen as a clear and present danger. Syria had not yet been emboldened by a massive resupply of Soviet arms and the emplacement in Syria of the Soviets' most potent anti-aircraft missile.

But the United States failed to seize the opportunity to press then for Syrian withdrawal through vigorous diplomacy. Instead, the State Department interpreted the Syrian government as giving assurances that it would withdraw after an Israeli withdrawal, and the United States chose to press first for Israeli withdrawal. The American posture was to keep Israel at arm's length on military matters to avoid antagonizing the Arabs. Rather than operate in tandem with Israeli Defense Forces, the Marines were directed to avoid cooperation or even contact with Israeli Defense Forces to the point of open hostility and confrontation.

In retrospect the State Department, according to reports, concedes the error in its 1982 strategy, and recognizes the danger of Syrian hegemony buttressed by the Soviet Union and joined to a Libyan-Iranian axis. Such strategic miscalculations were not unique to Lebanon. The same underlying premises still guide American policy in the Middle East. They are rooted in misconceptions, dating to 1948 and before, which result in a determined posture to be even-handed in our relations with the Arab world and Israel, even when it flies in the face of reality as it did in the summer of 1982. The traditional view has been that military cooperation between Israel and the United States endangers our ties to the Arabs and jeopardizes U.S. interests in the Middle East. Such a posture is based on misconceptions of Arab intentions, Arab power and Arab responsiveness to U.S. interests in the Middle East. As a result, the United

States has paid over an extended period a heavy price in Lebanon and elsewhere in the Middle East from the Persian Gulf to the Horn of Africa.

The consequences in Lebanon are, as President Reagan warned in his letter in January 1984 to Congressman Lee Hamilton, "renewed, expanded and more intense fighting in an already volatile region of the world."

As she vowed to do, Syria, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union, succeeded in destroying the May 17 agreement; effectively destroying the Lebanese government; and assuring Syrian control over Lebanon. The victors are Syria, Iran and Libya, as well as the Soviet Union, and every pro-Western Arab state feels threatened by this result, for which they too bear responsibility.

The United States is perceived as having abandoned a firm and clear commitment given the government of Lebanon by the President of the United States with the formal support of the Congress. The credibility of the United States was severely damaged among friend and foe alike, especially in the Middle East. The withdrawal of the Marines was read as a statement that terrorist attacks, even against American armed forces, can force the United States to pull out if the terrorists and the governments that support them are determined to outlast the United States, which appears to lack the patience and the will to endure such challenges. The result was a disaster for American foreign policy in the Middle East and throughout the world.

If this leads the United States to recast the "weltanschauung" that has guided its policies in the Middle East for more than 30 years, then some good can come out of this debacle. United States interests as a global power require no less. They call for a recognition of the realities that are the Middle East, and discarding illusions and myths that have led to one disaster after another.

The United States faces a Middle East in which the northern tier buffer between the Soviet Union and so-called moderate Arab states including the oil producers is comprised of Syria, Iraq and Iran, quite apart from a devastated Lebanon and Soviet-occupied Afghanistan. That configuration then stretches to South Yemen, the states of southern Arabia, reaching Ethiopia at the Horn of Africa, and then to Libya on the Mediterranean.

The principal source of instability in the Middle East is the internecine struggles among Arab states, and their inability to tolerate pluralism of any kind. As we asserted in the 1981-82 Joint Program Plan, "U.S. interests in the Middle East are threatened by the instability of the Middle Eastern regimes and incessant conflicts among them." Today American policymakers should accept what has been clear for some

time, that Western-oriented Arab states resist cooperating with the United States on strategic matters, and, instead, rely on enormous investments in advanced military hardware, which then collapses in the face of radical upheaval, revolution, and other threats.

U.S. global and Middle East interests require alliances that are really capable of sharing the burden. A new, realistic "weltanschauung" of the United States calls for an American strategic policy in the Middle East with meaningful U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation as its centerpiece. Israel's military power is singular in the Middle East, and it grows out of the character of the people and of Israel as a democracy so much like the United States. It is in fact the only reliable, vital and effective ally the U.S. has in that unstable but crucial region of the world. Thus, the announcement on November 29, 1983 by President Reagan and Prime Minister Shamir of an agreement on the principles of strategic cooperation was a significant step in this direction.

Meaningful cooperation could significantly strengthen American military presence in the Eastern Mediterranean drawing upon Israel's exceptional air force, its innovative naval capability and its strategic location as the eastern anchor of the Mediterranean. The critical need of the United States to move equipment and troops swiftly could be served by Israel, as a strategic and secure location for pre-positioning the most advanced equipment, and, indeed, even men. Lebanon demonstrated the enormous potential value to the U.S. of Israel's medical facilities, and potential as the site for pre-positioning movable hospital facilities. Lebanon also underscored the need for joint contingency planning and possible military exercises. Equally important and also mutually advantageous would be the achievement of a free-trade agreement, a complete shift to grants for military aid as well as economic aid (which represents less than 3% of the amount the U.S. spends on NATO's defense of Europe), and eased restrictions on the use of U.S. funds in Israeli research and development as well as on the American procurement of Israeli-manufactured defense items.

In the spelling out of these principles neither U.S. nor regional interests will be served by the United States yielding, as has happened so often in the past, to Arab sensibilities. Whether they admit it or not, moderate-Arab interests have been aided by Israel, such as in 1970 in the threatened invasion of Jordan by Syria.

After January 20, 1985 it is likely that the President, whether second term or new, will act on the understandable desire, as has his more recent predecessors, to break the impasse in the peace process. We are not unsympathetic to such a desire. But here too reality, not myths nor illusions, must guide policy.

Unfortunately, the critical fact continues to be what we asserted in last year's Joint Program Plan: "The heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict remains in the Arab refusal to recognize and negotiate with Israel..." Hussein still refuses to come to the table; Mubarak

distances Egypt from the Camp David Accords; a small step toward peace with Lebanon was unilaterally abrogated to the satisfaction of virtually all the Arab states, not only Syria. The Arab states, not Israel, hold the key to peace today, as they have for more than 35 years. The United States cannot pretend otherwise, although at times its postures appear otherwise. In striking contrast Israel time and again has demonstrated in direct face-to-face negotiations its readiness to be accommodating. But Israel cannot be expected to make prior sweeping concessions to those who will not come to the table, especially in the light of recent events. Negotiations must be between Israel and the Arab states, not between the United States and Israel, nor between the United States and the Arabs.

Only through a step-by-step process as delineated in the Camp David Accords, rather than through the projection of grand solutions prior to negotiations, can there be real movement toward peace in the Middle East. Were Jordan and the Palestinian Arabs on the West Bank, as well as Egypt, to have followed the Camp David route, the ultimate solution to the future of Judea and Samaria (West Bank) could have been reached by now, and at least would now be on the table. These considerations should be the basis of any new American initiatives.

Soviet Jews

The Soviet Union's brutal efforts to crush the aliyah movement was evidenced this past year in the harsh sentencing of Yosef Begun to seven years in prison and five years in internal exile. His imprisonment and that of six other "Refuseniks" took place as the doors to emigration had been virtually closed in 1983 with only 1,315 Soviet Jews permitted to leave, half of the 1982 figures and 2% of the 1979 numbers.

These developments were joined to a crackdown on the teaching of Hebrew and a propaganda campaign of the most vicious kind of calumnies in the Soviet media, linking Nazism to Zionism, which is portrayed as being at the root of sinister anti-Soviet forces. Jews seeking their roots are described as a "fifth column," recalling the charges made against Jews under Stalin. The Soviet government is waging (in the words of an American foreign correspondent) its fiercest campaign against Zionism and Jewish activities.

In its annual survey of human rights, the State Department cited as an ominous new development, "Statements by some official circles that all Jews who want to emigrate have left... Such statements appear to express a determination in some quarters to end emigration permanently."

At the same time, the Soviet Union expanded upon its use of "Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality", not only through the Anti-Zionist Committees created in 1983, but in their sending open letters to American Jews in an ill-disguised effort to combat the exposure of the repression of Soviet Jews. To this end, they enlisted some Americans who identify themselves as Jews.

With the death of Andropov, and the succession of Chernenko, which compounds the unusual and uncertain leadership situation in the Kremlin, the interregnum, which began more than a year before the death of Brezhnev, has continued uninterrupted for almost 3-4 years. The collective leadership responsible for these harsh policies will continue to exercise control in the months ahead. Thus, no fundamental change in the Soviets' policy of squeezing Soviet Jews is anticipated in the near future, unless it is affected by renewed Soviet-American dialogue in which the Administration, which has strongly identified with our concerns, vigorously pursues this issue. Such a renewal is unlikely in the current year.

In the long term the factors that led to a large-scale emigration in the 1970s are still present. The very nature of the campaign against Jews this past year indicates that the Soviet Union still will not absorb its Jewish population into the mainstream of Soviet life. They are still perceived by Soviet leadership today, as they were by Khrushchev, an "indigestible." That factor joined to the Soviet need to turn to the West as a result of the stagnation of the economy, obsolescent technology, and critical agricultural shortages led to the substantial emigration numbers of the 1970s. Those internal needs have not changed, and still could have an impact on renewing the flow of emigration.

The Soviet Union would not have opened its doors to emigration were it not for the courageous, unprecedented demands of Soviet Jewish activists and their application for visas in the hundreds of thousands. They in turn may not have done so without vigorous public activity in the West which encouraged the Jewish movement in the Soviet Union to speak out. Today the Soviet Union seeks to crush Soviet Jews into the silence that characterized them prior to 1967. Therefore maintaining the links between Western Jewry and Soviet Jews, and sustaining their efforts to foster Jewish identity among their fellow Jews, must be among the highest priorities of the Jewish community relations field.

At this critical time, it is also essential that this issue be perceived by the Soviet Union as a matter of burning concern in the West, even if we cannot achieve fundamental changes in the circumstances of Soviet Jews in the months ahead.

Understandable frustration should not lead to abandoning the strategic principles that have over the long-run produced exceptional results. Specifically, care must be taken to avoid dissipating or endangering the unique cause of Soviet Jews through coalescing the issue with campaigns in the defense of other social, ethnic, religious and nationality groups oppressed by the Soviet Union. Identifying their dire situation and demands with the distinctive, remediable demands of Soviet Jews will not advance their cause or that of Soviet Jews. The realization of the goals of some of these other groups requires radical change in the Soviet system. In comparison, what we seek from the Soviet Union for Soviet Jews is modest, and the Soviet Union has demonstrated over the course of the last 20 years a greater readiness to

respond to those demands, particularly emigration.

What may be required are new tactics and techniques for increasing the visibility of the issue, and a renewed effort to involve those prominent figures in human rights, the arts, letters, religion, commerce, and in government who are heard by the Soviets. Most important is the critical need to strengthen the nature and extent of activity on behalf of Soviet Jews by community and national agencies.

Ethiopian Jews

More than five years ago, circumstances so changed in the Horn of Africa as to enable the historic *aliyah* of Ethiopian Jews to begin. More than 25% of those Jews who lived in Ethiopia in 1979 are today in Israel, and their numbers continue to grow. Through the courage and determination of Ethiopian Jews and the heroic efforts of those long engaged in the rescue of oppressed Jews, more than 6,500 Ethiopian Jews have slipped through the crack in the door.

But their path to Israel continues to be highly vulnerable, always endangered by the volatile character of the region. Israel, as on so many other occasions in the last four decades, has met the challenge. Even in the face of crushing pressures on its economy, the government of Israel and the Jewish Agency have devoted more resources per capita to their rescue, resettlement and absorption than has been expended on any previous *aliyah*. But these efforts and the complexity of the rescue and the resettlement are not fully appreciated nor recognized by the American Jewish community. The nature of the rescue and resettlement requires fostering such understanding; doing so remains a major challenge to the Jewish community relations field.

Poverty in America and the Federal Budget

When we turn to the domestic agenda, we find the overwhelming and seemingly intractable problem of poverty of this nation even more severe than when President Lyndon Johnson warned, in his historic speech at Howard University in 1965, that equal opportunity for all Americans had to go beyond the removal of the discriminatory obstacles. The legacy of three hundred years of slavery, segregation and discrimination required a frontal assault on the social and economic consequences that it produced. In response the federal government launched a major effort in the 1960s which had some success.

But since that period, with the possible exception of the welfare reform proposals of the Nixon Administration, there has been no major federal response to the problem of poverty in this country. The problems identified in the mid-1960s still are untouched, and if anything, there has been a regression in whatever progress had been achieved. Nor is there any indication that the nation will confront these problems in the year ahead or even in the balance of this decade.

Congressman Jack Kemp's warning, quoted in the Overview published in the 1982-83 Joint Program Plan, still holds: "Today a segment of the population

is trapped into a cycle—a poverty trap which has no beginning and no end. Without government help some 43 million Americans—20% of the population—would be classified as poor...”

Today, an Administration spokesman, David Stockman, admits to more than 33 million Americans living in poverty, based on the Reagan Administration criteria. They include 3.8 million elderly, 11.3 million people in households headed by women, 1.3 million single people between 16 and 24-years old, and 18 million other adults ages 25-64.

Among these poor are the long-term acutely poor, whose numbers may reach ten million, concentrated in the metropolitan areas where the Jewish community resides. Alcoholism, drug addiction, mental illness and violence characterize their life for which society is paying a heavy price.

The family structure, which in the past has provided the security that enabled its members to face the harsh realities of life, is under siege. Census data indicate that families headed by single women were twice as likely to live in poverty. In 1982, 47% of black households with children were headed by women, up from 21% in 1960 and only 8% in 1950. The comparable proportion for white families was 15% in 1982, which also represented a substantial increase, up from 6% in 1960, and only 3% in 1950.

The problem of single-parent households is compounded by the fact that working women, on the average, earn much less than men, in spite of the growing awareness of discrimination suffered by women and their rapid increase in educational attainment, which should be reflected in increased earnings. The earning gap between white males and white females has widened by three percentage points since 1970, according to a Census Bureau study. Although the wage gap between white men and women is narrower when they first enter the labor force—86% of what men earn—the gap widens after women have worked ten years to 68% of what white men earn.

While there is comfort in that unemployment has declined from a high of 10.8 to under 8%, unemployment at current levels of more than 7% still represents a substantial figure in contrast to the goal of 4% which was set in law four years ago by the Congress. The jobless rate for blacks is still more than double the overall unemployment rate for whites, and for Hispanics more than 50% higher. The jobless rate for black teenagers continues to hover near the 50% mark.

Even the most optimistic projections do not see the figures reaching, by the end of this decade, a 5.7% rate of unemployment which was the average rate of unemployment during the seven recession cycles of the 1970s. The peak rate of unemployment during those recessions was 7.1%, lower than the current bottomed-out rate.

Yet the response to all this is to continue the pattern initiated in 1981 of making those who suffer most pay the price of runaway federal deficits. After sweeping cuts in critical social, economic and edu-

cational programs since 1981, the 1985 fiscal budget proposed by the Administration would have continued to cut federal spending for food stamps, nutrition programs, welfare, job training, social services, housing assistance, special programs that aid the disadvantaged, and several post-secondary education programs.

The Draconian cuts in the domestic agenda during the past three years were paralleled with a \$750 billion tax cut enacted in 1981. That led to a net loss to the government for fiscal years 1982-1985 of more than \$400 billion.

At the same time, the Administration proposed to spend \$264.4 billion dollars for the Defense Department in the 1985 fiscal year, a 14.5% increase over the current fiscal year. Over the five years from 1985 through 1989 the Administration proposes to spend a total of \$1,891.4 billion, nearly two trillion dollars. That would raise military expenditure to 32% of the federal budget, from 25%, and to 7.5% of the Gross National Product, from 5.3% in 1981 when President Reagan took office. As originally proposed, the military budget would be the largest since World War II, even when measured in dollars of the same value, including the peak years of the wars in Korea and Vietnam.

While calling for balanced federal budgets, and, indeed, a Constitutional Amendment to that end, Administration policies have resulted in the largest federal budget deficits in history, dwarfing the Great Society, New Deal and World War II deficits, whether measured by the percentage of the Gross National Product or based on dollars of the same value. The increase in interest payments on the federal debt since 1981 exceeds all the savings achieved in that same period in the reductions in health, education, welfare and social service programs.

What has been accomplished is a radical shift in national priorities that go beyond economic considerations. They express a political philosophy to limit the federal government role to assuring primarily national security with other needs to be met by the private sector or local government. This philosophy means that the programs that the Jewish community relations field has long advocated as essential to the health and well-being of this nation will not be enacted in fiscal year 1985, nor possibly at anytime in the balance of the 1980s, unless there is once again a shift in national priorities. On the contrary, there are likely to be even further cuts after January 20, 1985.

No matter who is the next President of the United States, those urgently needed programs will not be part of the federal budget, unless the President and the Congress are prepared to exercise rigorous control over defense spending and enact legislation to provide the revenues required for defense and economic and social needs.

Traditionally, the Jewish community relations field has defined its role as identifying the needs that must be met and advocating programs that would be responsive to such needs. Our function has been to call attention to the plight of the ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-

clothed, of those who are denied the basic amenities of a decent life. The field has not addressed the federal government's economic capability to undertake the programs it has urged. In a departure from this traditional role, the 1983-84 Joint Program Plan suggested, "The Jewish community relations field may have to address issues of government, economic and defense policies that we have avoided in the past.... Should we not express a judgment on an increase in the defense budget to 10%; over a 5% inflation rate, and to do so in the context of our view of national priorities?"

If we are to see the Congress adopt a comprehensive program in the 1980s to deal with those pathologies we have long recognized, the Jewish community relations field at this time should support new taxes in the light of the enormous national deficits projected for the balance of this decade. The programs that we would see enacted will not be achieved without such taxes. Our doing so would be consistent with our role in expressing judgments as to priorities in the allocation of national resources.

The Jewish community relations field recognizes the relationship between a credible foreign policy and defense expenditures and is mindful of worldwide commitments of the United States as a global power. But threats to America's national interests abroad must be prudently balanced against threats to our national interests at home. National solvency and widespread poverty demand restraints on the level of growth of the defense budget. Within that framework the Jewish community relations field should evaluate annually the rate of growth of the defense budget with a view to taking a position on the size of the defense budget. Such a position should take into account the federal budget's responsiveness to the need for a coherent, overall defense strategy, and essential domestic interests. It also would require a response to the Grace Commission recommendations for \$50 billion in defense savings over the next three years, and rigorous surveillance and controls over defense expenditures by the Congress, similar to the role played by the Truman Committee in World War II.

So, in 1984-85 we should give priority to: 1) Pressing for a major national response to the deeply entrenched poverty that exists in America; 2) Supporting measures that will assure the necessary revenues for such programs, including new equitable taxes and national industrial policies; 3) Supporting restraint in the level of growth of the defense budgets; 4) Educating the public and candidates for federal office of the necessity to adopt a national budget that reflects these priorities.

Fundamental Liberties

In the forty years since the creation of NJCRAC, we have witnessed a significant broadening of the scope of fundamental individual liberties. They have fostered conditions that have enabled Jews as individuals to enter the mainstream of American life, and

the American Jewish community to pursue its own group distinctiveness. Today, the American Jewish community enjoys a greater degree of security than at any time in the history of the diaspora. Overt and organized anti-Semitism is at a low ebb in the United States, although many in the Jewish community are not convinced.

But advances in basic liberties are not fixed in granite, even when written into the Bill of Rights and affirmed by decisions of the Supreme Court. Once again, as we move toward a Presidential election, we hear, as we did in 1980, those voices who would deny women the right to decide whether or not to bear a child or who would convert the public school system to serve again as a vehicle for fostering and inculcating religious beliefs. By 1984 we would have hoped that these issues would have been finally decided, with our basic liberties affirmed, but again we see them under sharp attack.

Of particular concern is the role played by the President in advocating these causes. Obviously, the Constitution does not bar the President of the United States from advocating Constitutional Amendments, nor from practicing his particularistic religious beliefs in his private capacity, but the First Amendment should inhibit the President of the United States, in his capacity as the Chief Magistrate of the nation, in advocating his religious beliefs in a partisan televised sermon as he did to a convention of religious broadcasters when he declared:

"If the Lord is our light, our strength and our salvation, whom shall we fear, of whom shall we be afraid? No matter where we live, we have a promise that can make all the difference—a promise from Jesus to soothe our sorrows, heal our hearts and drive away our fears. He promised there will never be a dark night that does not end. Our weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. He promised if our hearts are true, His love will be sure as sunlight. And by dying for us, Jesus showed how far our love should be ready to go all the way."

Such a public expression, as distinguished from private expressions of religious piety, is an act of religious preference by the President of the United States. It fosters the perception of the United States as a Christian nation, a conception that runs counter to the Constitution. That perception was reinforced by a 5-4 decision of the Supreme Court that characterizes the distinctive and particularistic religious symbol of the creche as a secular national expression.

Fortunately, the Congress of the United States maintained the integrity of the Bill of Rights by rejecting Constitutional Amendments to permit "voluntary" and "silent" prayer in the public schools, recognizing that for a child in a public school setting so-called "voluntary prayer" is a fiction. Whether the Congress will protect the First Amendment by rejecting the "equal access" bill remains to be seen. In each vote, more than a majority of Congress supported such practices.

These votes, the Supreme Court's decision in the *Lynch* case, the nature of the President's advocacy of

such positions and the well-organized, well-financed campaigns of others who urge similar positions, call for active and vigilant defense of these basic liberties which we as a field, in coalition with others, struggled so long and hard to achieve.

Role in 1984 Election

The positions which we have asserted may put us in conflict from time to time with various candidates who seek public office. As tax-exempt agencies, we are not partisan. As spokespeople for Jewish community relations agencies, we have not, and will not be, identified for or against any candidate for office.

But our scrupulous regard for this role does not require a year of silence from us during the quadrennial national election on those issues about which we are deeply concerned. Indeed, national elections afford this nation the opportunity for national debate and education. So we as civic groups have a special responsibility to raise those issues that we believe should be addressed in the campaign, and those issues should include the totality of the agenda of the field of Jewish community relations—the domestic agenda as well as the international.

In the Common Cause

We learned from our forty-year experience that the achievement of fundamental change either in domes-

tic or foreign policy requires fostering a sense of national purpose, national will and a sense of community. It requires a society where each individual, each group, feels a sense of responsibility of one for the other, as Jews feel one for another. It calls for disparate groups to identify their common interests and concerns and to join together in common cause, even as they strive to preserve their own distinctiveness. When this has occurred in America, profound change has been achieved, such as in the mid-60s.

But regrettably this is rare. Even we in the Jewish community, as so many other groups in American society, act as though we are alone and can go it alone. If that is a condition imposed on the Jewish community, it represents a serious danger. If it is an option that we have chosen, it represents a strategic miscalculation. In either case the field of Jewish community relations is called upon to move the Jewish community beyond itself, and to urge others in the general community to join us in coalition and common cause.

In joining with others in advocacy of universal values in America, we are also acting out the particularistic Jewish ethos that has been shaped and nurtured by the totality of our collective experience of thirty-five hundred years of Jewish survival. In preserving those values, we are fostering and protecting the American creed for all Americans, and we do so in the enlightened self-interest of the American Jewish community.

ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The American Jewish community feels a profound identification with Israel, a deep commitment to its survival and security, and an abiding concern with events and forces that affect its future. American Jews, and Americans generally, understand that the long-term national interests of the United States and Israel coincide—a premise underlined by Israel's important role as America's only politically stable and militarily effective ally in the Middle East, and reinforced by the unique cultural affinity between the two countries. Reflecting this recognition, all American administrations have been committed to Israel's survival. However, the vigilant involvement of the American Jewish community has been a vital factor in fostering policies toward that end.

U.S.-ISRAEL RELATIONS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The past year witnessed a dramatic improvement in U.S.-Israeli relations which had been severely strained for more than two years. Giving substance to its intention to improve strategic cooperation with Israel, the Administration created a Joint Political and Military Commission. The Administration also proposed, and Congress enhanced, more favorable foreign aid formulas and amounts, and the Administration decided to seek authorization to negotiate a Free Trade Area (FTA) with Israel which could represent a major breakthrough in enhancing trade between the two countries.

BACKGROUND: The American policy shift had, as one of its principal purposes, the strengthening of Israel as the region's most effective counterweight to the Syrian-Soviet threat. In part, the shift in emphasis in U.S. policy represented American judgments that its goals in Lebanon were being actively thwarted by Syria; that the U.S.-sponsored peace plan was stymied by the resistance of the so-called Arab moderates, Jordan and Saudi Arabia; and that strong measures must now be taken to counteract Syrian-Soviet influence in Lebanon and throughout the region.

Secretary of State Shultz, even during his December, 1983 series of meetings with Arab leaders, clearly and forcefully stated: "It is important to say in an Arab capital that the United States has had, does have, and will have a strong relationship with Israel, and I think everyone understands that and should understand that." Nevertheless, these very close ties have been subjected to severe strains from time to time. Those strains grow out of faulty American strategic assumptions about the value of so-called "moderate" Arab states in blocking Soviet Mideast expansion and fears of possible interruptions of the flow of Persian-Gulf oil, leading the United States at times to lean toward appeasement of Arab governments. But American policy has also been built on the deep bonds of shared democratic values and cultural affinity between Israel and the U.S. These competing demands have resulted, over the long term, in a continuing tension in American policy between a genuine commitment to Israel's security and survival, and deference to the demands of Arab states.

Reflecting an increased awareness of a commitment to Israel's status as a strategic ally of the United States, the Administration submitted to the Congress an "all grant" military aid package for Israel for fiscal year 1985 amounting to \$1.4 billion. This followed the action of Congress, with Administration approval, of increasing appropriations to Israel for fiscal year 1984 to record levels: \$910 million in economic grants and \$1.7 billion in military aid—half in grants and half in loans. On its own initiative, Congress raised total loan and grant aid to Israel to \$2.6 billion for FY '84. Accepting the Administration's "all grant" proposal for military aid—previously half grant, half loan—Congress increased FY '85 aid to the 1984 level, all in grants. The Administration's decision to provide Israel's military aid on an "all grant" basis was in keeping with a broader policy based on the premise, as stated in an advisory commission report, "There are friendly countries with legitimate security needs that simply cannot afford to borrow for necessary military equipment and services." Acting on Administration initiatives, Congress voted substantial funds in FY '84 and '85 for research and development of Israel's new fighter aircraft, the Lavi, permitting some of that money to be spent in Israel for the first time.

Another approach which will provide reciprocal benefits for both Israel and the United States is the decision to seek Congressional sanction to negotiate a Free Trade Area between Israel and the United States which will result in greater export opportunities for both countries. The so-called Free Trade Area concept provides that the United States and one or

more trading partners embark on a program to eliminate virtually all tariffs between them. A Free Trade Area agreement will provide a critically needed stimulant for Israel's troubled economy by allowing Israel to expand its exports to America. These complicated negotiations, which must ultimately be authorized by Congress, will touch on such areas as agricultural

products, high technology, footwear, and textiles. In addition, because Israel already has a similar arrangement with the European Common Market, the FTA will work to the advantage of American companies which are otherwise at a competitive disadvantage with European products in Israeli markets.

JERUSALEM

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The refusal of the United States to move its embassy to Jerusalem became a major issue as Congress and the Presidential candidates addressed the topic.

BACKGROUND: Our long-standing goal that the United States should acknowledge Jerusalem as the capital of Israel has been pursued on several levels, including a Congressional initiative to relocate the U.S. embassy in Israel's capital city, Jerusalem; the unequivocal commitments of Vice President Walter Mondale and Senator Gary Hart to relocate the embassy; support for planks in the national platforms; and proposals to modify the autonomous status of American consular offices located in Jerusalem which do not report to the embassy in Tel Aviv.

The Administration opposed the move proposal, claiming that it supports a united Jerusalem, but asserting that the ultimate status of the city must be determined in negotiations, and that the move would prejudice the outcome of such negotiations. The Administration also expressed concern that moving the embassy would undermine U.S.-Arab relations, and possibly provoke reprisals and even violence against American missions throughout the Arab world.

House and Senate proponents of shifting the embassy to Jerusalem sought a non-binding "sense-of-the-Congress" resolution. Such resolutions, while they would not require an Executive action, also obviate the possibility of a Presidential veto. By clearly declaring the will of Congress, it could be a significant step in advancing our goal.

Principal arguments put forward in Congress for the location of the U.S. embassy in Jerusalem are:

- Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and the site of its government—Tel Aviv is not the capital;
- unlike all other nations with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, only in the case of Israel is the American embassy not located in the capital;
- to persist in maintaining the U.S. embassy anywhere but in Israel's capital is to undermine the credibility of U.S. support for Israel and to encourage the belief among the Arab states that ultimately Jerusalem would come under Arab sovereignty;

- locating the American embassy in West Jerusalem would not prejudice the existing American position in regard to Jerusalem, and would lead other Western nations to emulate.

The unique nature of Jerusalem has been previously discussed in the Joint Program Plan:

- Jerusalem occupies a unique and crucial place in Jewish religion, Jewish history, Jewish peoplehood. Jerusalem has figured continuously in Jewish history since long before Christianity. Throughout their long dispersion, Jews prayed and hoped and longed for the restoration of Jerusalem to the Jewish people as the center of its civilization, the site of its destroyed and hallowed Temple, the seat of its ancient and revered religion.
- This special and unique attachment to Jerusalem, as an actual physical geographic place, is not matched in Christianity or Islam. Only Jews pray for return to Jerusalem.
- Except for brief periods of expulsion, there have always been Jews in Jerusalem: the longest continuing presence in the city is the Jewish presence; for the past century, Jews have been a majority of the population of the city.
- Religiously, Christian and Moslem interests in Jerusalem properly extend to the preservation and protection of the places holy to Christianity and Islam, and the security and stability of the Christian and Moslem populations in the city and in Israel.
- Since Jerusalem's unification in 1967, Israel has scrupulously protected the holy places of all religions and assured free access to them; this contrasts strikingly with Jordan's cruel and unlawful denial of Jewish access to Jewish holy places and the desecration of Jewish burial grounds during the Jordanian occupation.
- Israel is assisting the further development of Christian and Moslem institutions in Jerusalem and safeguarding the religious, social and cultural life of the Christian and Moslem inhabitants of the city.

- Only since Israel unified Jerusalem has it in recent years been a single entity with freedom of movement for all its residents.

- Israel has selected Jerusalem as her capital, as it is her sovereign right to do. The United States should formally recognize it as such, and transfer the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

ISRAEL—THE PEACE PROCESS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The fundamental problem in moving toward peace continues to be the refusal of the Arab states, particularly Jordan, to come to the negotiating table. As long as this condition persists, the Camp David peace process will remain stalled. Egypt, while remaining at peace with Israel, has, since it aborted the autonomy negotiations two years ago, moved even further away from the Camp David Accords, and has effectively “frozen” the process of normalization, creating a dangerous precedent for the future.

BACKGROUND: The harsh and unequivocal rejection of negotiations with Israel by King Hussein in March, 1984, further dimmed the prospects for moving the peace process forward, as did his rejection of negotiations in 1983. In a March, 1984, interview in *The New York Times*, the King stated flatly: “... there is no way by which anyone should imagine it would be possible for Arabs to sit and talk with Israel as long as things are as they are. As far as the United States is concerned, the question that is posed is: Is the United States able to elevate itself to the status of a superpower? To live up to its commitments and its frequent pronouncements of being evenhanded? We don’t see it happening. We obviously can’t deal with the United States as an ally of Israel or as a mediator.” These rejections exposed the false premise on which much of America’s long-range strategy had been based—that Jordan could be induced to come to the table, and that prior unilateral concessions by Israel would provide the key to the King’s participation. In the wake of King Hussein’s repeated rejection of direct negotiations, the Administration, through a State Department spokesperson, has made clear that the United States would not pressure Israel to meet any preconditions to negotiations. More tangibly, the Administration also withdrew its formal notification to Congress of its plan to sell 1,600 Stinger anti-aircraft missiles to Jordan and 1,200 to Saudi Arabia. This was the first time an arms sale to an Arab country had been withdrawn.

Despite the pronouncements of the Administration and the leading Democratic candidates for President that they would not press Israel for concessions in advance of negotiations, the clear pattern of American Middle East diplomacy, especially in the year following Presidential elections, has been to regard Israel, rather than the Arab states, as holding the key to peace and to vigorously encourage Israeli accommodations as a means of achieving U.S.-sponsored peace negotiations. This posture has been taken even in the face of continued rejection of negotiation by the PLO, King Hussein, and other Arab leaders.

As signatories to the Camp David Accords, Egypt, Israel and the U.S. all bear responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the Accords. While peace

between Egypt and Israel clearly prevails, adherence to the Accords has been decidedly one-sided. Israel faithfully returned the Sinai, has consistently invited the normalization of relations with Egypt, and has stood ready to begin the autonomy talks called for in the Accords. While Egyptian President Mubarak publicly proclaims Egypt’s commitment to the peace treaty with Israel in the Western media, his actions and public statements in the Arab world at least leave open to question Egypt’s commitment. Egypt has blocked further progress on normalization, scuttled the autonomy talks, and has even embraced the PLO without any sign of the PLO changing its opposition to the Camp David framework. Having signed more than 50 trade, cultural and other agreements toward normalization with Israel, Egypt has frozen virtually every agreement. In addition to withdrawing its ambassador to Israel, Egypt has imposed a formidable visa process which has discouraged Egyptian tourism to Israel. Anti-Israel and anti-Semitic news articles, commentaries and cartoons have returned to the Egyptian press. Israel has also charged that Egypt is developing a military infrastructure in the Sinai that would support troop emplacements far in excess of what is permitted in the Military Annex to the Treaty.

The U.S. has not been successful in its efforts to get Egypt to fully implement the normalization provisions of the Camp David Accords. American policy towards Egypt in this regard has been at best, ambivalent. The U.S. has encouraged Egypt’s return to the Islamic and Arab fold, believing that such an accommodation represents a counterweight to Islamic fundamentalism and anti-Israel radicalism. Egypt continues to receive approximately \$2 billion in U.S. economic and military assistance, second only to Israel.

This pattern of conduct on Egypt’s part clearly undermines efforts to fully implement the Camp David Accords and move toward a lasting peace in the Middle East. However, the fact that Egypt, once Israel’s most menacing foe, remains at peace with Israel is one of the most significant factors of present Mideast reality. It is eloquent testimony to the value of direct peace negotiations between Israel and an Arab state.

THE PLO

CHANGING CONDITIONS: Having been dealt a critical blow to its military infrastructure, and having been fragmented and forcibly dispersed from Beirut and southern Lebanon by Israel, the PLO continued to deteriorate as a military and political force. Nevertheless, Arafat has retained a significant measure of diplomatic support, even as PLO terrorist activities have increased.

BACKGROUND: Syria's successful attempt to foment a mutiny in the ranks of the PLO's major constituent group, Yasser Arafat's own Al Fatah, clearly demonstrated that whatever else it might be, the PLO is hardly the cohesive, unified, independent expression of Palestinian nationalism. Fractured into two elements, one headed by Yasser Arafat, the other dominated by the Syrians, the international standing of the PLO, already severely diminished, was further impaired as it became apparent that two rival terrorist bodies could not claim to be "the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people", as the Arab League had designated the PLO in 1974.

The terrorist character of virtually all groups under the umbrella of the PLO was again reinforced by their claims of responsibility for increasing acts of terrorism within Israel's border in the Winter and Spring of 1984. American policy has yet to address the responsibility of so-called Arab "moderate" states for the PLO's continued terrorist activities, even though the Administration has recognized such terrorism as an extension of state policy by regimes such as Syria, Libya, Iraq and Iran.

Officially, the United States has maintained its 1975 formal commitment to neither recognize nor negotiate with the PLO unless it renounces terrorism, accepts Israel's right to exist and endorses UN Resolution 242 and 338. American adherence to this stated policy was called into question by revelations,

in March 1984, of third-party American contacts with PLO representatives. However, firm statements by Secretary of State George Shultz that the U.S. would not continue such contacts, and a House rider on the 1985 Foreign Aid Bill outlawing such contacts, reinforced the long-standing American policy of shunning contact with the PLO. After Hussein's rejection, in April 1983, of negotiations, which severely undermined the Reagan Plan, Secretary of State Shultz suggested that the Arabs ought to repudiate the Rabat decisions which declared the PLO "the sole legitimate spokesman for the Palestinian people." Arafat's "diplomatic offensive" in the Arab world included a warm reception by Egyptian President Mubarak who, only weeks later at the close of a visit to Washington, then called for negotiations with the PLO. Such efforts can be expected to continue in both the Arab and Western world.

The fragmentation of the PLO, the lessening of its perceived power of intimidation, Arafat's refusal to reach an accommodation with Hussein, and Hussein's own obstinate refusal to act on behalf of the Palestinians, have led some Palestinian Arab leaders in Judea and Samaria (West Bank) to voice concern that their cause was eroding with the passage of time. With encouragement, by the U.S. as well as Israel, this may lead to the emergence of an indigenous Palestinian leadership that could play a constructive role.

LEBANON

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The near collapse of Amin Gemayel's government and the resultant withdrawal of the Multi National force essentially removed, at least for the time being, the prospect of an independent, sovereign and democratic Lebanon; projected greater Syrian influence in Lebanon and inter-Arab affairs; and enhanced Soviet influence; while it represented a substantial setback to U.S. credibility in the region and exacerbated regional instability and the possibility of conflict in the region. The cancellation of the milestone May 17 agreement between Israel and Lebanon was a major setback in efforts to achieve the shared goal of the United States and Israel to gain the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and a secure and tranquil border between Israel and Lebanon. It confronts Israel with the necessity of making other arrangements to assure the security of its northern border.

BACKGROUND: The radical change in the balance of power in Lebanon blocked the realization of America's stated objectives in Lebanon: a sovereign, independent, democratic state; the withdrawal of all foreign troops; and assured security for Israel's northern border. Focusing on obtaining Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon in

the immediate wake of the 1982 fighting, the United States chose not to exercise diplomatic leverage on Syria while Syria was both diplomatically and militarily vulnerable in the late Summer and Fall of 1982. Re-armed and emboldened by the Soviets, Syria rejected the May 17, 1983, Lebanese-Israeli agreement, and caused anti-government Lebanese factions which

she armed and supported to press its demand that Lebanon scuttle the agreement. Unable to provide a sufficient counterbalance, even with the presence of the Multi National Force, the Lebanese military fractured again along confessional lines and, in order to preserve his government, Lebanese President Amin Gemayel surrendered to the Syrians' demand, and his Cabinet cancelled the May 17 agreement.

The May 17 agreement, which ended Lebanon's formal state of war with Israel, provided a format for the withdrawal of Israeli forces, along with Syrian and PLO forces. In the absence of such an agreement,

Israel must now look after its security as it sees fit. The President and the Secretary of State have correctly placed the onus of working out a mutually acceptable plan for Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon, which assures Israel's security, upon those who demanded the abrogation of the May 17 agreement.

The ultimate erosion of America's position in Lebanon, and the corresponding ascendancy of the Syrians and Soviets, clearly underscored the lesson that the United States can rely only on its single, proven ally in the region, Israel. Strategic cooperation requires more than symbolic affirmation.

ARAB ARMS SALES

CHANGING CONDITIONS: While, increasingly, public attention focuses on diplomatic options in the Arab-Israeli conflict, the most critical underlying factor—the amount and sophistication of arms going to Arab states—continues to soar, with Western nations as well as the Soviet Union serving as the major source of arms.

BACKGROUND: The key Arab states—those which border Israel or those most active in the so-called "Rejectionist Front"—received over \$40 billion worth of arms in the 10 years between 1973 and 1983. The corresponding figure of U.S. military aid (in grants and loans) for Israel in that period was \$15.7 billion, or less than one-third of that amount. These Arab states now have outstanding orders for an additional supply of over \$67 billion in arms.

The following is a breakdown of the arms purchases of these Arab states (in billions of U.S. dollars):

	Delivered to Date	Outstanding Orders
Syria	9.2	9.2 +
Iraq	8.35	14.35 +
Jordan	0.98	3.36
Saudi Arabia	13.0	30.92
Libya	9.4	9.85 +
Total	40.93	67.68 +

(All these figures are based on the value of the U.S. dollar at the time the various arms orders were contracted.)

While these Arab states have been able to finance their arms purchases almost entirely from their inflated oil revenues, \$8.8 billion of Israel's arms purchases from the U.S. since 1973 have been financed through loans at prevailing commercial rates. Thus, Israel has not been able to maintain its customary 1:3

relative disadvantage in arms; and the nearly \$9 billion in loans—not to mention Israel's annual defense budget approaching 30% of her GNP—are major factors in her economic difficulties.

Most startling is the array of weapons assembled by the Arab confrontation states. In several critical areas, the Arab confrontation states field combined totals comparable to those fielded by all of the NATO forces in Europe. For example, the confrontation Arab states have 12,300 tanks, compared to 17,053 of NATO; and 2,370 combat aircraft, compared to 2,293 of NATO. The total armaments of all Arab states are equivalent to the combined NATO forces arrayed against the Warsaw Pact forces in Europe. (See data presented in charts describing "The Arab Arsenal" on the following page.)

The role of the West is a matter of deep concern. During the past year, the West Germans indicated a readiness to sell Saudi Arabia advanced anti-aircraft and other systems. Prohibited by law from selling arms to "regions of tension", the West German administration has simply defined Saudi Arabia as existing outside such a region. Israel and the American Jewish community have vigorously protested the moral anomaly that Germany might provide weapons to a government with a history of joining or transferring its weapons to other Arab states, in actual combat with Israel, and which bitterly resists negotiations to end the state of war with Israel.

The Arab Arsenal

Comparison of combined NATO forces in Europe and total forces of Arab states:

	Men	Divisions	Tanks	Armored Personnel Carriers	Artillery	SSM Launchers	SAM Batteries	Combat Aircraft
NATO forces in Europe*	1,768,693	42	12,999	19,986	4,405	302	195	3,107
Total forces of Arab States**	1,536,450	56	13,270	13,447	7,700	203	518	2,444

Sources: Military Balance 1983-1984; IDF Journal, Vol. II, No. 1

*NATO forces include units of Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Netherlands, and U.S.

**Arab forces include Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Saudi Arabia, and Syria.

Projected military strength of Arab "rejectionist states" by 1986:

	Tanks	APC's	Artillery	SSM Launchers	Combat Aircraft	Helicopters	SAM Batteries	Combat Vessels
Syria	4,000*	2,100	2,800	70	700	250	150	20
Iraq	3,500	3,700	2,500	60	700	450	150	24
Jordan	1,000	1,500	550	?	170	45	30	—
Saudi Arabia	700	2,300	600	?	200	100	40	17
Libya	3,100	1,500	1,600	100	600	200	150	40
Arab Rejectionist Total	12,300	11,100	6,050	230	2,370	1,045	520	101
Israel Total	3,600	8,000	1,000	12	670 (445 advanced)	175	?	23

*NOTE: Israeli authorities question the estimate of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, asserting that Syria has at least 7,000 tanks. Israel, in contrast, has 3,600 tanks.

Sources of Arab Arms

Figures below record sources of arms, in billions of dollars, procured by all Arab states:

West Europe:

1973 to present \$ 4.0 billion*

Outstanding orders to 1986 12.1 billion*

*Excluding Egypt

Soviet and Eastern Bloc:

1973 to present \$24.6 billion

Outstanding orders to 19862 billion**

**Figures for Syria, Iraq and Libya—
the highest purchasers not known.

United States:

1973 to present \$12.2 billion

Outstanding orders to 1986 14.4 billion

Of equal concern was the Reagan administration's proposal to sell shoulder-fired Stinger missiles to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The ideal terrorist weapon should it fall into their hands, the Stinger could be fired at Israeli civilian and military aircraft from positions outside of Israel's borders. The proposed sale was seen as a precursor to the sale of even more threatening weapons systems, such as the mobile I-Hawk anti-aircraft missile and the F-16 fighter. It was withdrawn

only after King Hussein once again rejected negotiations as he castigated the United States.

Even the fundamental principle of opposition to U.S. arms sales to Arab states—that such sales should only be considered to those states which have chosen to make peace with Israel—may be tested by Egyptian measures to build a military infrastructure in the western zone of the Sinai.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

CHANGING CONDITIONS: There has been a three to four-fold increase in the number of worldwide terrorist incidents since 1968, and over the past decade, 53% of all recorded terrorist incidents were directed against U.S. personnel and facilities. Lebanon brought home the horror of terrorism in the catastrophic attack that took the lives of 241 American Marines. Such acts of terrorism are not isolated or random; they are acts of well-organized, well-financed, well-trained groups that are supported, and at times even directed, by sovereign states.

BACKGROUND: The comprehensive and definitive report of the Defense Department's Special Commission on International Terrorism, created in response to the terrorist attack on American Marines, declared in a critical finding that "the systematic, carefully orchestrated terrorism which we see in the Middle East represents a new dimension of warfare... For a growing number of states, terrorism has become an alternative means of conducting state business, and the terrorists themselves are agents whose association the state cannot easily deny."

The report described the Middle East as "the cradle of international terrorism in its contemporary form." It emphasized that "certain governments and regional entities which have major interests in the outcome of the struggle in Lebanon are users of international terrorism as a means of achieving their political ends." The report, and subsequent official statements of the United States government, have made clear that the terrorist attacks, particularly the larger ones, have been orchestrated by government agencies of Iran, Syria and Libya. They provide the support mechanisms of "exceptionally well-trained, well-equipped and well-supported terrorists." They have had no hesitation in using Islamic religious beliefs as a tool to produce the suicidal acts of terrorism we have witnessed.

"The only development which would seriously impede the terrorist activities of Iranian-dominated Shiite groups in Lebanon, short of a change of regime

in Teheran, would be a decision by Syria to shut down the basing facilities in the Bekaa Valley and sever the logistical pipeline," according to the Commission.

Terrorism, aided and abetted by sovereign nations, has been a dangerous problem that Israel has had to counter from its very creation. Increasingly, others, besides Israel and the Jewish community relations field, have recognized that the PLO serves as the center of international terrorism with the active support of such governments as the Soviet Union and Syria, as well as financing from Saudi Arabia.

The increasing frequency and destructiveness of terrorist attacks carried out by suicidal agents, totally indifferent to the victims of such outrages, have moved beyond the Middle East, although their connections to that region are clear and direct. It has exploded periodically in the West, particularly in Western Europe. Such terrorism, unchecked and unchallenged, has encouraged other brutal and reckless fanatics to use terrorist attacks to achieve their goals.

Even in Israel, which has suffered so at the hands of terrorists, a small number of organized Jewish militants conducted or planned terrorist attacks on Arabs in the last four years. But in striking contrast to the Arab states, the government of Israel has deplored such acts, and security agencies of the State of Israel have moved aggressively against those responsible. The American Jewish community and the people and State of Israel view such terrorism as morally repugnant.

United Nations Decade for Women Conference

The threat remains that the final 1985 Conference for Women will be used as a vehicle for anti-Israel propaganda, as were the Decade's previous Mexico City and Copenhagen Conferences. The passage of the Kassebaum amendment to the State Department appropriations bill presents a significant device for countering this threat. (See discussion on page 18 of 1983-84 Joint Program Plan.) The measure mandates Presidential oversight of preparations for the Conference to determine if it is being politicized, and if so, the possibility of withholding U.S. funds and participation.

United Nations

The maneuverings on the Women's Decade Conference are part of the unabated pattern of continued attempts by a bloc of Soviet-Arab-Third World nations to use the U.N. as an arena for attack against the U.S. as well as Israel. This pattern has created an atmosphere of insensitivity to anti-Semitism, such as the Libyan Ambassador's anti-Semitic slurs aimed at the American Jewish community. These moves have been challenged, almost alone, by the vigorous posture of the United States delegation under Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick. Also on the positive side, the diminished status of the PLO was reflected in UN debate. Significantly, several black African nations have begun to break away from the Arab bloc, reflecting disappointment over Arab oil prices, diplomatic distortions of their legitimate concerns with South Africa, and increasingly positive relations with Israel.

Arab Influence on Campus

The campus continues to be a primary target and fertile field for anti-Israel activities with a multiplicity of Palestinian, Arab and Third-World groups sponsoring speakers and demonstrations. While the level of such activity may have slackened somewhat since Israel's action in Lebanon in 1982, the prevailing intensity of such anti-Israel efforts has, at best, levelled off at a much higher plateau. Thus, even more attention to the campus is warranted, particularly through the creation of campus or community-based Israel Task Forces,

as recommended by the Campus Advisory Committee of the NJCRAC Israel Task Force, thereby bringing together the national and local resources of community relations councils with pro-Israel student and faculty groups.

Arab influence on American campuses continues to be an urgent concern, particularly in its potential, already realized in several instances, for politicization and anti-Israel bias in the Middle East Outreach programs situated at twelve major campuses throughout the United States. These programs are all partially funded by grants from the U.S. Department of Education; and most of them are associated through the Middle East Outreach Council (MEOC), a private association heavily funded, like several of the individual Outreach programs, by U.S. oil companies. A principal objective of the Outreach centers is to provide local public school systems with curriculum material, teacher training seminars, and other programs related to the Middle East. In one case, such programs were determined by local school authorities to be unbalanced, biased and unscholarly. Jewish community relations agencies, acting in consultation with the Campus Advisory Committee of the NJCRAC Israel Task Force, and with due consideration to the question of academic freedom, should continue to monitor, and where appropriate, actively intervene when such programs manifest an unbalanced, anti-Israel orientation.

Substantial grants and contracts from Arab sources continue to flow into American universities. Million-dollar chairs for Middle East studies continue to be established at major universities (e.g. Hopkins, Harvard, Georgetown). Large development contracts with Arab governments also continue to be signed. Sometimes these contracts are discriminatory against Jews, either in substance or in practice—as revealed in a \$400,000 judgment against Baylor University Medical School which had discriminated against Jewish faculty in a contract with a Persian-Gulf country.

There is also growing evidence that Arab students and pro-Arab faculty are vociferously insisting that Middle East Centers must be directed only by those favorable to the Arab cause because they are the only ones with access to most of the countries in the Middle East and North Africa. Several Middle East Centers have formally or informally accepted this requirement.

Counteracting Arab Propaganda on U.S. Aid to Israel

A flyer distributed by the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee claims on its front cover that "Every day for the past 10 years the U.S. sends (sic) Israel \$7,000,000 a day... and not one cent of this goes for Jobs, Peace and Freedom." In at least two "college towns," Ann Arbor, Michigan and Berkeley, California, petitions were circulated to place a resolution on their city ballots to have the city write letters to relevant U.S. officials to cut off aid to Israel in the amount that Israel spends, "to retain, settle and administer the Arab territories occupied in and after 1967."

It is *simply not true* that "not one cent of this (aid) goes for Jobs, Peace and Freedom." Leaving aside the questions of peace and freedom, it must be noted that of the approximately \$22 billion in U.S. aid for Israel in the last 10 years, the overwhelming amount, about \$19 billion, was spent in the United States! This is not money that is leaving the United States. It is pumped directly into the overall U.S. economy. Whether in grants or loans, in military or economic assistance, funds are spent in the United States. The only exceptions are special cases, of which there are only three major examples over the last decade: funds for the development of the Merkavah tank, and the Lavi fighter aircraft; and the funds Israel received which covered one-half the amount necessary for building the airfields in the Negev as part of the agreement to relinquish the Sinai. Even here, most of the funds received from the U.S. were paid to American companies relocating the airfields. Further, they were overwhelmingly in the form of loans which are in the process of being repaid to the U.S.

Second, the \$22 billion figure is itself misleading since the money allocated to Israel is given in a combination of grants and loans. During recent years these have been market-rate loans, and they are being repaid. For example, in fiscal year 1982, Israel repaid approximately \$800 million on its debt to the U.S. Thus, if one deducts the amount repaid (\$.8 billion) from the amount allocated (\$2.2 billion), the total for 1982 comes to \$1.4 billion — significantly less than \$7 million/day! Moreover, Israel's debt payments to the U.S. are mounting. For fiscal year 1984 they will be \$1.2 billion!

Given the fact that almost all the money is spent in the U.S., and that a significant amount of it is in loans which are repaid, the figures which the anti-Israel campaign uses must be seen as misleading. Yet, even using these figures, there must be some

perspective given. Based on official Department of Commerce accounts, America's bill for imported petroleum from 1974 to 1982 was approximately \$421 billion, or \$130 million/day. Thus, the Arab oil producers, whose actions were basically responsible for the increase in price, cost the United States far more than \$7 million/day.

Moreover, if one views the aid to Israel in terms of support for an ally vitally necessary for U.S. defense interests, even these misleading figures pale in comparison to other defense expenditures. For example, the total U.S. defense budget for 1983 was \$258 billion. The NATO-related expenses by the U.S. for 1983 alone were \$133 billion! \$2.2 billion is hardly comparable. The Vietnam War cost \$404 billion! According to an article in the *Journal of Arab American Affairs*, Iraq spends approximately \$1 billion/month on its war with Iran. It was forced to take out a loan of \$25 billion from the Gulf Cooperation Council. Iran is spending \$16 million daily for this war.

It should not be forgotten that Israel is one of America's most reliable allies. One measure of this is shown graphically in the Anti-Defamation League's pamphlet, "Keeping Score at the U.N." It shows that Israel supported the United States in the U.N. more often than any other nation, 86.2% of the time. By contrast, even the NATO nations (where the U.S. has spent \$133 billion of its defense budget) support the U.S. less frequently than Israel does. The U.K. scores 80.1%, France, only 68.8%, and Greece 33.2%. Japan, our most important Pacific ally, supports us only 67.2% in the U.N. Furthermore, the voting record of the Arab states more closely resembles that of the U.S.S.R., which supported the U.S. only 20.6%. Egypt's support is 26.2%, Saudi Arabia 24.0%, Jordan 20.8%, Qatar 20.7%, Bahrain 20.6%, U.A.E. 20.2%, Kuwait 20.2%, Syria 14.4%, and Libya 13.6%.

Finally, one must note that above and beyond Israel's value to American defense interests, Israel in fact saves the U.S. money! Major General George Keegan, the former head of intelligence for the U.S. Air Force, asserts that over the years Israel has saved the U.S. \$50 billion in intelligence costs alone! Numerous other areas of savings have been identified, including savings for U.S. naval power made possible by the Israeli presence in the Mediterranean, by Israel's effect as a deterrent to the Soviet Union, by the refinement of U.S. arms battle-tested in Lebanon, etc.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations agencies should stress in their interpretive efforts:

- Syrian aggrandizement and growing Soviet influence in Lebanon can only be effectively countered through an open and vigorous demonstration of U.S.-Israeli strategic and political cooperation in regional matters;
- new, close relations between the U.S. and Israel, underscoring the economic and military benefits derived by the United States as well as the congruity between U.S. and Israeli interests in the region;
- the sharp contrast between Israel's stability and reliability as a regional ally, and the inherent instability and lack of cooperation even among so-called "moderate," Western-leaning Arab states;
- the fundamental terrorist nature of all segments of the PLO, apparent in the continuing PLO campaign of murderous terrorist attacks, internal PLO fratricide, the continued dedication of all PLO segments to the annihilation of the State of Israel, and their implacable opposition to any attempts to carry the peace process forward;
- the PLO's fragmentation as forcefully belieing the myth of the PLO as a legitimate quasi-sovereign force with whom negotiations must be undertaken;
- the vital need for the United States to continue to scrupulously maintain its long-standing policy of refusing to negotiate with, and shunning contacts with, the PLO unless the PLO renounces terrorism, endorses UN Resolutions 242 and 338, and recognizes Israel's right to exist;
- the danger that some Western Europeans might attempt to breathe new life into Arafat's PLO by reasserting the Venice Declaration of the Common Market calling for a PLO role in negotiations;
- the clear distinction between the PLO and authentic emerging Palestinian leadership in Judea and Samaria (West Bank), with emphasis on the PLO's long-standing role as the major impediment to any realization of Palestinian rights;
- Arab intransigence that has forestalled any progress in negotiating peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors, in contrast to Israel's readiness to negotiate. While Arab states, particularly Jordan, refused to negotiate with Israel, they try to appear in the West as receptive to negotiations;
- negotiation must not prejudice ultimate agreements by the setting of preconditions;
- the Camp David Accords, subscribed to by Israel, Egypt and the United States, posit a period of Palestinian autonomy as the next step in the phased peace process. (See 1982-83 Joint Program Plan);
- Egypt's distancing itself from the peace process, and its "freezing" of the peace treaty with Israel, set a dangerous precedent for the future. The United States, as party to the peace treaty, should exercise its good offices to have Egypt renew the process of normalization with Israel and recommit itself to the Camp David peace process;
- that Jerusalem, having been designated by Israel as its capital, should be the site of America's embassy to Israel, and that Congress, the Democratic and Republican parties, and the Administration should declare their support for, and undertake appropriate measures to bring about, this goal;
- the "value received" for America's generous foreign aid to Israel, utilizing public statements of Administration officials, members of Congress, foreign policy influentials;
- the need for an aggressive coordinated response to attacks on aid to Israel, on the basis of national guidelines;
- the mutual benefits to both the United States and Israel should be emphasized in interpretive materials and in campaigns supporting the FTA negotiations;
- in seeking support for the U.S.-Israel FTA agreement, sensitivity to the concerns of those Congresspeople who are sympathetic to Israel but who may also support trade restrictions in response to the needs of their districts;
- deepening public awareness of the recommendations of the Defense Department Commission on Terrorism, urging national policy which seeks to deter terrorist attacks through political and diplomatic actions and a wide range of timely military response capabilities;
- urging the United States and other Western powers to take measures which hold accountable those governments that nurture and sustain terrorist groups, including those countries with whom they enjoy positive relationships such as Saudi Arabia and Iraq.

INTERNATIONAL CONCERNS

The American Jewish community, with its profound sense of *Klal Yisrael*, has always been deeply concerned with the fate of fellow Jews throughout the world. This commitment to the entire Jewish family is linked to a sense of responsibility imposed by American Jewry's unique and fortunate position, which allows it to respond to the needs of other Jewish communities that are in difficulty or danger. In responding, the American Jewish community must be sensitive to the concerns of the Jewish communities it seeks to help.

The plight of Jews in the Soviet Union has been a major concern of American and world Jewry for nearly two decades, and is today an even more compelling priority. During this period, a heroic movement of *aliyah* activists emerged within the U.S.S.R. Successive American administrations have responded constructively to the cause of Soviet Jewry. Past events have demonstrated that Soviet regimes are not unmoved by world opinion and governmental action, as evidenced by the substantial numbers of Soviet Jews who were allowed to emigrate during various periods of time since the Soviet Jewry movement began. The critical element in all of this is the role of the American Jewish community.

In more recent years, the American Jewish community has given major attention to the plight of the ancient Jewish community of Ethiopia. Efforts to aid Ethiopian Jewry have proceeded in a manner that recognizes both the urgent dangers faced by the *Beta Yisrael*, and the delicate and complex nature of the problems surrounding any steps to assist them.

SOVIET JEWRY

THE CONDITION OF SOVIET JEWRY

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The critical situation faced Soviet Jews grew even more dire during the past year. Last year's trickle of emigration dropped even lower to mere dozens per month; anti-Semitism grew visibly; the activities of the "Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public" were expanded; the severity of imprisonment and harassment aimed at *aliyah* activists increased; and the isolation of Soviet Jews became still more intense.

BACKGROUND: The number of Soviet Jews allowed to leave the U.S.S.R. dropped during the last year to a level even lower than the previous year's shockingly low figures. A total of 1,314 Soviet Jews were allowed to leave in 1983, compared to 2,688 in 1982. In the first six months of 1984, only 484 were allowed to leave; with monthly figures dropping below 100, except for one month, and as low as 51 in March, 1984. This contrasts with the over 4,000 per month that were allowed to leave during the emigration high-point of 1979.

There was no indication of a policy change with the accession of Chernenko, but rather a continuation of Andropov's policies, which, in turn, continued the pattern set in Brezhnev's last years. Anti-Semitic and anti-"Zionist" articles and books continued to be published and widely distributed. Paraded by the Soviet government as representative of Soviet Jews and their views, the "Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public" has branched out to several cities, and has stigmatized as disloyal and subversive *aliyah* activists and those wishing to study Hebrew and other aspects of Jewish culture. The harsh sentence

Jewish Emigration from the U.S.S.R.

Source: Soviet Jewry Research Bureau of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry

1974...	20,628	1977...	16,736
1975...	13,221	1978...	28,864
1976...	14,261	1979...	51,320

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
Jan.	2,803	850	290	81	88
Feb.	3,023	1,407	283	125	90
Mar.	3,049	1,249	289	101	51
April	2,469	1,155	288	114	74
May	1,976	1,141	205	116	109
June	1,767	866	182	102	72
July	1,205	779	186	167	
Aug.	770	430	238	130	
Sept.	1,307	405	246	135	
Oct.	1,424	368	168	90	
Nov.	789	363	137	56	
Dec.	889	434	176	97	
	21,471	9,447	2,688	1,314	484

given to Iosef Begun, who for years continued to teach Hebrew and Jewish culture despite relentless official attempts to stop him; and the imprisonment and harassment of other activists, underscore the perilous position of the Jewish movement.

The harsh repression has also been coupled with new tactics in external propaganda which attempts to counter the charges about repression of Soviet Jews and denial of emigration, and to create the

image of a well-integrated and prospering Jewish community. One example was the "open letter" sent this past year to the American Jewish community by 50 Soviet citizens who identified themselves as Jews. There also appeared indications of interest by the Soviet Union in contacts with Western Jewish organizations, apparently as a means of fostering these "public relations" approaches.

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: Since the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, relations between the United States and the Soviet Union have progressively deteriorated, limiting the leverage that the United States has on the Soviet Union on the issue of Soviet Jews. Nevertheless, even in this period, the strong support of Soviet Jewry by the Administration does have some effect on the Soviet regime, and has a significant impact on Soviet Jews, world opinion and Western governments.

BACKGROUND: While the immediate prognosis for a thaw in U.S.-Soviet relations is not bright, the long-term pattern of the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union suggests that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. will eventually take steps to ameliorate the strains between them, which might provide a more promising context for moving the Soviet Union to alter its policies on Soviet Jews.

In the face of limited, direct leverage on Soviet leadership, and a virtual halt to emigration, increased public exposure of the conditions of Soviet Jewry, and direct contact with Soviet Jews remain the constant objectives of community action. Activities in the West should demonstrate to the Soviet government that the plight of Soviet Jewry continues to be a deep concern throughout the Western world, particularly in the United States. A more active role by West European governments could have an impact on the Soviet regime. Equally important, it is vital that Soviet Jews themselves are aware of the determined and continued support of world Jewry, and from men and women of conscience of all religions and nationalities. Such activity during this period will contribute to this issue remaining high on the agenda of high-level bilateral discussions whenever they are resumed.

In the past year, the Administration continued its vigorous support of Soviet Jews. Both President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz have made numerous public statements backing the cause of Soviet Jews; they were particularly outspoken in responding to harsh treatment of *aliyah* activists; and have actively encouraged similar support from Western European allies. The bi-partisan support of the cause of Soviet Jewry was reinforced by statements of support for Soviet Jews from Democratic Presidential nominee Walter Mondale. Congressional supporters of Soviet Jewry's cause have also continued to be

prominently active in giving visibility to the concerns of the American people, and of conveying those concerns through their contacts with Soviet officials about this issue.

The Congressional Committee on the Post Office has been pressing the U.S.S.R. to comply with international postal regulations, and to end its interception of mail to Soviet Jews from the West. The Voice of America has recently increased its Jewish-content broadcasting time to the Soviet Union from 10 minutes to 25 minutes.

The Presidential and Congressional campaigns present opportunities to spotlight the issue as candidates express public positions on it, including a readiness to maintain sustained contact with specific Refuseniks through correspondence and other means.

Even at this time of limited contact with the Soviet Union, opportunities exist for raising the Soviet Jewry human rights issue in all existing or proposed political, economic, scientific and cultural exchanges including: the Helsinki process, particularly the coming year's preparatory meetings for the Cultural Forum in Budapest; and the Experts Meeting on Human Rights in Ottawa. In addition, those with business contacts with the U.S.S.R. could be utilized to raise the Soviet Jewry issue.

This heightened Soviet Jewry support activity at the national and community level, especially in coalition with those who share this concern, provides the interest and support needed to sustain the movement through the continuing critical times expected. In this setting, success cannot be measured in immediate, direct cause-and-effect results in altering Soviet Jewry's status; it can be measured in the increased interest and activity generated on community and national levels in the U.S., and in the rest of the Western world.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations field should:

- encourage the United States to continue to serve as a vigorous advocate on behalf of Soviet Jews, even in the current absence of major U.S. leverage;
- recognize that the 1984 election campaign provides an opportunity, both on the Presidential and Congressional level, for raising public awareness about the issue of Soviet Jewry;
- organize through each CRC an appropriate structure and resources for assuring sustained activity on the local level for Soviet Jewry;
- broaden the base of the Soviet Jewry movement by reaching beyond the mainstream of American politics to include groups such as those in the peace movement, and others toward whom the U.S.S.R. has indicated a special sensitivity;
- establish nationally synchronized Soviet Jewry events, including a specific annual date for a national day of solidarity with Soviet Jews;
- encourage a sustained and substantial flow of telegrams and letters to Soviet officials on a systematic basis;
- increase direct contact with Soviet Jews through visits, letters and telephone calls, including visits by legislators from the U.S. and Western Europe;
- assist congressional efforts to press the Soviet Union to cease intercepting international mail, by providing data based on accurate record-keeping of mail sent to Soviet Jews;
- encourage the Voice of America to increase Jewish content broadcasting to the Soviet Union.

Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience

Source: Soviet Jewry Research Bureau of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry

CAUTION: Consult with NJCRAC for current accuracy before releasing names and addresses for correspondence or other purposes.

MOSHE ABRAMOV: Ritual Slaughterer (Shokhet), b 1956. Arrested: 12/19/83. Charge: "hooliganism." Tried: January 1984. Sentence: 3 years imprisonment; modified to "working for the national economy" (to 1/86). Address: Navoi; Uzbek SSR, USSR. Sister: Mina Aminov; 11 Zigelbaum St.; Kiriat Shalom; Tel Aviv, Israel.

IOSIF BEGUN: Mathematician and Hebrew Teacher, b 1932. Arrested for an unprecedented third time: 11/6/82. Charge: "Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Sentence: 7 years labor camp, 5 years internal exile (to 11/94). Previous arrests: (1) 3/77: "Parasitism," sentenced to 2 years internal exile. (2) 5/78: "violation of passport regulations." Completed exile term 8/80. Address: Permskaya Oblast; Chusovskoy Rayon; St. Polovinka, Uchr. VS 389/37; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Inna Begun; Dmitriyevna Raketny Bulvar 11/1-51; Moscow 129243; RSFSR, USSR.

ALEKSANDR CHERNIAK: Construction Engineer, b 1949. Charges: "forgery" and "embezzlement." Tried: March 1984. Sentence: 4 years imprisonment with foreclosure of personal property. Address: Unknown.

YURI FEDEROV: (Tried with Jewish defendants in the First Lenin-grad Trial) Student, b 1943. Arrested: 6/15/70. Charge(s): "Treason," "Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda," "Anti-Soviet organization," "Stealing state property." Tried: 12/70. Sentence: 15 years (to 6/85). Camp: Perm. Address: UCHR. V5 389/36, Posiolok Kutchino Chusovskoy Rayon; Permskaya Oblast; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Natalia Federova, emigrated to USA: 278 Barrow Street; Jersey City, NJ 07302.

IGOR GUBERMAN: Author/Electrical Engineer, b 1936. Arrested 8/13/79. Charge(s): "Acquisition or marketing of property known to have been criminally acquired (icons)." Tried: 3/11/80. Sentence: 5 years, with confiscation of property (to 8/84). 12/80 transferred from camp to "labor for the national economy" at a "free

settlement under guard." Address: Do Vostrebvaniya (Poste restante); Borodino, Rybinsky Rayon; Krasnoyarsky Krai; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Tatyana Guberman; Zelenogradskaya 23-2-173; Moscow 125475; RSFSR, USSR. Sister-in-law: Nina Patlas; Merkaz Klita Gilo "Aleph" 80/37; Jerusalem, Israel.

BORIS KANEVSKY: Mathematician, b 1945. Arrested: 6/17/82. Charge(s): "Circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 1/21/83. Sentence: 5 years internal exile (to 6/87). Address: Posiolok Vagai; Tumenskaya Oblast, 626140; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Elizaveta Kanevsky, 1-YJ Masfilmovskiy 5-14-176, Moscow, RSFSR, USSR.

FELIKS KOCHUBIEVSKY: Elect. Eng., b 1930. Arrested: 9/12/82. Charge(s): "Circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 12/6/82. Sentence: 2½ years in labor camp (to 3/85). Address: 618 Solikamsk, 2-Permskaya Oblast, P/ya 389/15, Otryad 1, Brigada 13, 618500; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Valentina Kochubievsky, Vatutina 75-1-45, Novosibirsk 630064, RSFSR, USSR. Sons: Viascheslav and Aleksandr Kochubievsky; Harav Bloi 5-6; Petakh Tikva, Israel.

MARK OTCHERETYANSKY: Construction Engineer, b 1940. Arrested: 1983. Charge: "violation of passport regulations." Tried: October 1983. Sentence: 1 year imprisonment. Previous arrest: June 1980 "abusing position," sentenced to 1 year labor camp; released after 3 months. Address: Unknown. Wife: Olga Otchertyansky, ul. Strazhenko 11/49, Kiev 252165, Ukr. SSR, USSR.

ALEKSANDR PARITSKY: Radio Electronics Engineer, b 1938. Arrested: 8/28/81. Charge(s): "Circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 11/11/81. Sentence: 3 years in a labor camp (to 1984). Address: P.Ya.94-4, Vydrino, Kabansky Rayon, Buryatskaya ASSR, 671111, RSFR, USSR. Wife: Polina Paritsky; Tankopiya 19-2-48; Kharkov 310091; Ukr.SSR, USSR. Brother: Itzhak Paritsky; Ben Tzvi 10-8; Azur, Israel.

(continued on next page)

Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience

(continued)

VALERY SENDEROV: (Arrested with Jewish colleague, Boris Kanevsky.) Mathematician, *b* 1945. Arrested: 6/17/82. Charge: "Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Tried: 2/28/83. Sentence: 7 years labor camp, 5 years internal exile (to 6/94). Address: VS-389/35; Permskaya Oblast; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Elena Krichagina, Ulansky Per. 14, Apt. 54, Moscow 101000, RSFSR, USSR.

ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY: Computer Technologist, *b* 1948. Arrested: 3/15/77. Charge(s): "Treason," "Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Tried: 7/14/78. Sentence: 3 years imprisonment, 10 years special regime camp (to 3/90). Camp: Chistopol. Address: Uch.UE-148/ST4; Chistopol; Tatarskaya ASSR; USSR 422950. Mother: Ida Milgrom; Ul. Kooperativnaya 8; Istra; Moskovskaya Oblast; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Avital Shcharansky; 34 Shderot Herzeli; Jerusalem, Israel 96105.

LEV SHEFER: Engineer, *b* 1931. Arrested: September 1981. Charge: "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Tried: April 1982. Sentence: 5 years imprisonment (to 9/86). Previously served 3 years in 1970's for "anti-Soviet" activities. Address: Permskaya Oblast, Chusovskoy Rayon, St. Vsesvyatskaya, Posiolok Tsentralny 385/19, (Moscow, Uchr. 5110/1 V.S. 389/35), RSFSR, USSR. Mother: Maria Shefer, ul. Bazhova 125/113, Sverdlovsk, RSFSR, USSR.

SIMON SHNIRMAN: Chemical Technician, *b* 1957. Arrested: 5/78. Charge: "Draft evasion." Tried: 6/27/78. Sentence: 2½ years imprisonment (completed 11/80.) Rearrested: 1/12/83. Charge: "Draft evasion." Tried: 2/15/83. Sentence: 3 years in a labor camp. Address: Unknown. Mother: Faina Shnirman, Ul. Kirova 79-31, 334518 Kerch, Krymskaya Oblast, Ukr.SSR, USSR.

YURI TARNOPOLSKY: Chemist, *b* 1936. Arrested: 3/16/83. Charge: "Circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 6/29/83. Sentence: 3 years in a labor camp. Address: 672022 Chita; P/Ya G14/8; 5th Group; RSFSR, USSR. Wife: Olga, Per. Krasnoznamenny 2-17, Kharkov 310002, Ukr.SSR, USSR.

STANISLAV ZUBKO: Chemist, *b* 1937. Arrested: 5/16/81. Charge(s): "Illegal keeping of arms," "Illegal possession of drugs." Tried: 7/21/81. Sentence: 4 years in labor camp (to 5/85). Address: Uchr. MX-224/31; Izyaslav, 281200; Khmel'nitskaya Oblast; Ukr. SSR, USSR. Mother: Anna Levitskaya; Dneprovskaya 11-15; Kiev-98; Ukr.SSR, USSR.

ZAKHAR ZUNSHAIN: Physicist, *b* 1951. Arrested: 3/6/84. Charge: "circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 6/28/84. Sentence: 3 years imprisonment (to 3/87). Address: Unknown. Wife: Tatyana Zunshain, ul. Lenina 111/22, Riga, Latvian SSR, USSR.

Former Prisoners of Conscience Released After Completion of Their Term But Still Not Permitted to Emigrate

Source: Soviet Jewry Research Bureau of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry

CAUTION: Consult with NJCRAC for current accuracy before releasing names and addresses for correspondence or other purposes.

VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY: Computer Scientist, *b* 1935. Applied for emigration: October 1972. Arrested: 11/13/80. "Defaming the Soviet state." Completed internal exile sentence: March 1984. Address: Vernadsky Pr., 99-1-128; Moscow 117526; RSFSR, USSR.

BORIS CHERNOBILSKY: Radio Engineer, *b* 1944. Applied for emigration: 1975. Arrested: 11/26/81. "resisting a policeman." Completed 1 year sentence: December 1982. Address: Uralskaya 6-3-25, Moscow B-207, RSFSR, USSR.

LEV ELBERT: Construction Engineer, *b* 1948. Applied for emigration: 1976. Arrested: 4/83. Charge: "Draft evasion." Tried: 5/25/83. Completed 1-year sentence: June 1984. Address: Unknown. Wife: Inna Mizrukina, Volgogradskaya 6-33, Kiev, Ukr.SSR, USSR. Brother-in-law: Dr. Alexander Mizrukhin, Eli Kohen 51-37, Kiryat Yam, Israel.

KIM FRIDMAN: Radio Technician, *b* 1934. Applied for emigration: 1971. Arrested: March 1981. "parasitism." Completed one year labor camp sentence: March 1982. Address: Andrievskaya 12-8; Kiev 70; Ukr.SSR, USSR. Relative in Israel: Wife.

GRIGORY GEISHIS: Student, *b* 1960. Applied for emigration; Dec. 1978. Arrested: 7/14/80. "Draft evasion." Tried: 8/8/80. Completed 2-year sentence: July 1982. Address: Prospekt Stachek 132-2-60; Leningrad 198207; RSFSR, USSR.

GRIGORY GOLDSHEIN: Physicist, *b* 1931. Applied for emigration: December 1971. Arrested: January 1978: "parasitism." Completed 1-year sentence: March 1979. Address: Oktibraskaya 2nd; Mikrorajon 2-124; Tbilisi 380080; Gruz.SSR, USSR. Relative in Israel: Brother-in-law.

BORIS KALENDARIOV: Student (physics), *b* 1957. Applied for emigration: November 1973. Arrested: March 1979 "draft evasion." Completed 2-year sentence: March 1981. Address: Basseinaya Ul. 12-81; Leningrad 196070; RSFSR, USSR. Relative in Israel: Sister.

VLADIMIR KISLIK: Physicist, *b* 1935. Applied for emigration: 1973. Arrested: 3/19/81. "Malicious hooliganism." Tried: 5/26/81. Completed 3-year sentence (labor camp, changed in 1982 to "work for the national economy"); March 1984. Address: Rusanovsky Bulvar 10-122; Kiev; Ukr.SSR, USSR. Wife and Son: Evhenia Barras and Maksim Kislik; Kiriat Shareit Givat Hatakhmoshet 2; Holon, Israel.

EVGENY LEIN: Mathematician, *b* 1939. Applied for emigration: April 1978. Arrested: May 1981 "Resisting a representative of authority." Sentenced to two years compulsory labor; completed one year due to early (June 1982) release. Address: Engelsa Prospekt 135-21; Leningrad; RSFSR, USSR.

OSIP LOKSHIN: Lawyer, *b* 1942. Applied for emigration: 1980. Arrested: 5/30/81. "Circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 9/22/81. Completed 3-year sentence in labor camp: May 1984. Address: Korolenko 3-21 Kishinev; Mold.SSR, USSR.

ALEKSEI MURZHENKO: (Tried with Jewish defendants in the First Leningrad Trial). Student/Worker, *b* 1942. Arrested: 6/15/70: "Treason," "Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda," "Anti-Soviet organization," "Stealing state property." Tried: 12/70. Completed 14-year sentence: June 1984. Address: Rusanovsky Blvr. 5-58; Kiev; Ukr.SSR, USSR.

MARK NASHPITZ: Dentist, *b* 1948. Applied for emigration: January 1970. Arrested: February 1975 "disturbing public order." Completed internal exile: July 1979. Address: Osipenko Ul. 17; Strunino; Vladimirskaya Oblast 601601; RSFSR, USSR. Relatives in Israel: Parents.

IDA NUDEL: Economist, *b* 1931. Applied for emigration: 1971. Arrested: June 1978 "malicious hooliganism." Completed 4 years internal exile sentence March 1982. Address: ul. Sovetskaya, 69-2; Bendery 278100; Moldavian SSR, USSR. Relative in Israel: Sister.

ALEKSANDR PANAREV: *b* 1964. Family applied for emigration: 1973. Tried: 4/83: "Draft evasion." Released one month early from 1-year prison sentence: April 1984. Redrafted: June 1984. Address: Unknown. Mother: Klavdia Panareva, Tbilisskoye Shosse 45/2, Sukhumi, Georgian SSR, USSR. Aunt: Ida Shteinberg, Hacarmel St. 20/28, Nazeret-Ilit, Israel.

VALERY PILNIKOV: Electrical Engineer, *b* 1938. Applied for emigration: 1973. Arrested: 5/16/80. Charge(s): "Malicious hooliganism." Tried: 6/25/80. Completed 5-year labor camp sentence one year early for good behavior: May 1984. Address: Vasilkovskaya 55-14; Kiev; Ukr.SSR, USSR.

(continued on next page)

Former Prisoners of Conscience Released After Completion of Their Term But Still Not Permitted to Emigrate

(continued)

DMITRI SHCHIGLIK: Naval Engineer, *b* 1927. Applied for emigration: February 1973. Arrested: July, 1980—"parasitism" and "non-payment of child support." Completed 1-year sentence: July 1981. Address: Ul. Osipenko 17, Strunino, Vladimirskaya Oblast, RSFSR, USSR.

ISAAK SHKOLNIK: Mechanic, *b* 1936. Applied for emigration: 1972. Arrested: July 1972—"anti-Soviet agitation, treason." Completed 7-year sentence: July 1979. Address: Ul. Tarnogorodskogo 23-307; Vinnitsa, USSR. Relatives in Israel: Wife and daughter.

VLADIMIR SLEPAK: Radio Engineer, *b* 1927. Applied for emigration: 1970. Arrested: 6/78—"malicious hooliganism." Completed 5-year sentence: December 1982. Address: Gorkogo 15-77, Moscow, RSF, USSR.

MOISEY TONKONOGY: Electrical Mechanic, *b* 1952. Applied for

emigration: October 1973. Arrested: March 1980—"parasitism." Completed 1-year sentence: February 1981. Address: ul. Sholem Aleikhema 14-35; Odessa; Ukrainian SSR, USSR. Relatives in Israel: Parents.

VLADIMIR TSUKERMAN: Sailor, *b* 1947. Applied for emigration: 1978. Arrested: 5/30/81. Charge(s): "Circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system." Tried: 9/22/81. Completed 3-year labor camp sentence: May 1984. Address: Unknown. Wife: Ina Tsukerman; 47 Habiliun Street; Ramat Gan, Israel.

ALEKSANDR VILIG: Worker, *b* 1956. Applied for emigration: 1978. Arrested: February 1979—"draft evasion." Completed 1½-year sentence: September 1980. Address: Aksena Khristeva 52; Bolgrad; Odeskaya Oblast; Mold.SSR, USSR. Relative in Israel: Aunt.

Refuseniks Who Have Waited More Than 10 Years

Source: Soviet Jewry Research Bureau of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry

CAUTION: Consult with NJCRAC for current accuracy before releasing names and addresses for correspondence or other purposes.

Reason given for refusal is stated or shown by letter symbol at end of first line of each entry: (C) Access to Classified Information; (K) Insufficient Kinship or No Reunification of Families; (M) Military Service; (NR) No Reason

*Symbols: (h's), (w's), (r's), used if reason given relates to status of husband, wife or other relative *b*: year of birth*

First Applied in 1970:

PRESTIN, Vladimir: Electron. Eng., *b* 1934, Married + 1 (C) Uralskaya 6-4-11; B207; Moscow, RSFSR, USSR

SMELIANSKY, Emmanuel: Eng., *b* 1932, Married + 1 (C) Tashkentskaya 17-1-42; Moscow 109444; RSFSR, USSR

ZITSERMAN, Boris: Worker, *b* 1947, Single (M) Engelsa 18-27; Riga, Latvian SSR; USSR

First Applied in 1971:

ABRAMOVICH, Pavel: Electron. Eng., *b* 1939, Married + 1 (C) Baikalskaya 30-2-87; Moscow 107207; RSFSR, USSR

FAIERMARK, Viktor: Physical Chemist, *b* 1941 (C) Sredne Kalitinkovskaya 24-30; Moscow 109029; RSFSR, USSR

GENDIN, Lev: Electron. Eng., *b* 1941 (C) Malysheva 19-19; Moscow 109263; RSFSR, USSR

GOLDBERG, Stella: Pianist *b* 1931, Married + 1 (*) 2-aya Pugachovskaya 8-5-72; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

GOLDSHTEIN, Isai: Physicist, *b* 1938, Married + 1 (C) Octiabrskaya 2-oi Mikroralon 2-124; Tbilisi 380080; Georgian SSR, USSR

KOSHAROVSKY, Yuli: Radio Eng., *b* 1941, Married + 2 (C,K) Gerasima Kurina 4-3-52; Moscow 121108; RSFSR, USSR

LERNER, Aleksandr: Cyberneticist, *b* 1913, + 1 (C) Dimitry Ulyanova 4-2-322; Moscow 117333; RSFSR, USSR

MAKSIMENKO, Viktor: *b* 1952, Married (Unknown) 11-aya Parkovaya 42-2-58; Moscow 105215; RSFSR, USSR

NOVIKOV, Mark: Electron. Eng., *b* 1919, Married + 1 (C) 3-aya Priadilnaya 5-14; Moscow 105483; RSFSR, USSR

NOVIKOVA, Isabella: Electron. Eng., *b* 1943, Divorced + 1 (C) Chzerskaia 32-2-77; Moscow 111396; RSFSR, USSR

First Applied in 1972:

BOGOMOLNY, Benjamin: (1966)** Math., *b* 1946, Married (C) Sherbahovskaya 16-18-135; Moscow 105318; RSFSR, USSR

BRAILOVSKY, Irina: Computer Sci., *b* 1935, Married + 2 (C) Vernadsky Prospekt 99-1-128; Moscow 117526; RSFSR, USSR

ELISTRATOV, Viktor: Electron. Eng., *b* 1939, Married (C) Cherkizovskaya 1-2-50; Moscow 107061; RSFSR, USSR

FINKELSTEIN, Salomon: Tech./Mech., *b* 1949, Married + 1 (M) Pervomalskaya 2a-16; Chernovtsy, Ukrainian SSR; USSR

FRADKIN, Daniel: Math. Teacher, *b* 1939, Married + 2 (C) Shosse Revolyutsii 45-140; Leningrad K 248; RSFSR, USSR

GABERMAN, Edita: Housewife, *b* 1909, Widow + 3 (r's M)

Pervomalskaya Naberezhnaya 3-56; Mukachevo, Ukrainian SSR, USSR

GOIKHMAN, Yakov: Building Tech., *b* 1946, Married + 1 (M) Kolarova 6-3; Chernovtsy, Ukrainian SSR; USSR

GRAUER, Mark: Electrical Eng., *b* 1947, Married + 1 (C) Perevaslavskaya 6-18; Chernovtsy, Ukrainian SSR; USSR

INDITSKY, Solomon: Pensioner, *b* 1912, Married + 1 (C) 5-aya Parkovaya 54-3-31; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

KATS, Tsilia: Economist, *b* 1954, Married + 1 (h's M) Zelinskovo 32-1-37; Kishinev 277038; Moldavian SSR, USSR

KERZHNER, Evgeniya: *b* 1951, Divorced + 1 (r's C) Geroev Panfilovtoev 12-1-180; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

LEKHTMAN, Solomon: Electrician, *b* 1944, Married + 1 (M) Lenina 12-16; Beltsy, Moldavian SSR; USSR

LEMBERG, Grigory: Auto. Mech. *b* 1945, Single (M) Merkela 9-4; Riga, Latvian SSR; USSR

LIVSHITS, Veniamin: Pensioner, *b* 1908, Married + 1 (C) Leiklos 7-3; Vilnius 232000, Latvian SSR; USSR

LVOVSKY, Mark: Chem. Eng., *b* 1939, Married + 1 (C) Kondratiluka 12-11; Moscow 129515; RSFSR, USSR

OSNIS, Marat: Mathematician, *b* 1947, Married + 2 (C) Ordzhonikidze 11-5; Chernovtsy, Ukrainian SSR; USSR

OVSISHCHER, Lev: Econo. (former Col.), *b* 1919, Married (M) Yanko Kupala 17-30-112; Minsk, Belorussian SSR; USSR

RAIZ, Vladimir: Molecular Biologist, *b* 1941, Married + 2 (C) Karno 18-4; Vilnius, Lithuanian SSR; USSR

RAKHLENKO, Yakov: Radio Tech., *b* 1949, Married (M) Karmanitsky Per 5-35; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

SHACHNOVSKY, Vladimir: Mathematician, *b* 1941 Married (C) Proezd Cherepanovych 70-76; Moscow A-183; RSFSR, USSR

First Applied in 1973:

BALBARER, Boris: Pediatrician; *b* 1944 (M) Belskogo 16-1-46; Kishinev 43; Moldavian SSR, USSR

BUKHMAN, Aron: Metal Spinner, *b* 1942, Married + 2 (M) Serafimovicha 13-16; Kiev 152, Ukrainian SSR, USSR

ESSAS, Ilya: Physics & Math., *b* 1946, Married + 3 (w's C) Chasovaya 26-91; Moscow 125315; RSFSR, USSR

FELDMAN, Efim: Worker, *b* 1951, Single (Family of 3) (M) Malomoskovskaya 5-103; Moscow 1-164; RSFSR, USSR

FLOMENBLIT, Fima: Computer Sci., *b* 1937, Single (K) Dorozhnaya St. 3-1-8; Yablonavka, Krasnodar 353222; RSFSR, USSR

(continued on next page)

Refuseniks Who Have Waited More Than 10 Years

(continued)

CAUTION: Consult with NJCRAC for current accuracy before releasing names and addresses for correspondence or other purposes.

First Applied in 1973: (continued)

KHAIMCHAYEV, Isaak: Cand. Tech. Sci., b 1937; Married + 2 (w's C)
Festivalnaya 22-2-192; Moscow 125414; RSFSR, USSR

KOZANEVICH, Mikhail: Radio Eng., b 1947, Married + 1 (C)
Pr. Bolshhevikov 9-2-145; Leningrad RSFSR, USSR

LENSKIS, Samuil: Pensioner, b 1912, Married (C)
Churlionio 13-13; Vilnius, Lithuanian SSR, USSR

LESHCHINER, Boris: Driver, b 1945, Single (M)
Generala Potapova 6-85; Kiev 252157, Ukrainian SSR, USSR

LIBERMAN, Evgeny: Cons. Eng., b 1946, Married (C)
Novatorov 40-6-1; Moscow 117421; RSFSR, USSR

LUTSKAYA-KALENDAREVA, Evgeniya:
Engineer, b 1923, Married + 1 (C)
Basseinaya 12-81; Leningrad 196070; RSFSR, USSR

MALAMUD, Boris: Worker, b 1950, Single (M)
29 Bereznia 16-7; Chernovtsy, Ukrainian SSR, USSR

MENDELEEV, Oscar: Electron. Eng., b 1928, Married + 2 (C)
Bulvar Rainisa 14-2-6; Moscow 123459; RSFSR, USSR

NIKULINA, Ideya: Tech., b 1937, Married + 1 (C)
Baranova 26-7; Odessa, Ukrainian SSR, USSR

ROSENSTEIN, Grigory: Dr. of Cybernetics, b 1937, Married + 2 (C)
Butlerova 2-1-69; Moscow 117485; RSFSR, USSR

RUDZEVITSKY, Mikhail: Aero. Eng., b 1949, Single (Family of 4) (C)
Khotinskaya 24-28; Beltsy, Moldavian SSR, USSR

SHOSTAKOVSKY, Ilya: Electron. Eng., b 1946, Married + 1 (C)
Podkovrova 7-4; Leningrad 191736; RSFSR, USSR

SHTILBANS, Viktor: Physician, b 1941, Married (Family of 4) (C)
Petropavlovskaya 8-29; Leningrad; RSFSR, USSR

SIMOVICH, Sara: Nurse, b 1947, Married + 2 (r's C)
Verkyn 20-27; Vilnius; Lithuanian SSR, USSR

SIPEL, Grisha: Mech. Eng., b 1947, Married + 2 (M)
Ramigalos 82-1; Panevezhis; Lithuanian SSR, USSR

SOIFER, Moshe: Electrical Eng., b 1926, Married + 1 (C)
Zorge 15-10; Novosibirsk 88; RSFSR, USSR

TARATUTA, Aba: Mathemat./Eng., b 1930, Married + 1 (C)
Kosmonautov 27-1-71; Leningrad; RSFSR, USSR

TSITVERBLIT, Isaak: Elect. Eng., b 1919, Married + 1 (C)
Kavkazskaya 7-28; Kiev 35; Ukrainian SSR, USSR

VAINSTEIN, Leonid: Mech. Eng., b 1947, Married + 1 (M)
Pr. Mira 31-95; Kishinev 32; Moldavian SSR, USSR

VAISBLIT, Ilya: Pensioner (Radio Eng.), b 1918, Married + 2 (C)
Pr. Vernadskogo 11-19-282; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

VIGDOROV, Grigory: Former Econ. Student, b 1947, Married + 2 (M)
Malakhitovaya 102-165; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

YAKIR, Evgeny: Engineer, b 1931, Married + 1 (C)
Profsoyuznaya 96-5-35; Moscow 117485; RSFSR, USSR

YAKUBOVICH, Klara: b 1924, Married (Family of 6, 2 children) (r's M)
Mukachevskaya 19; Mukachevo; Ukrainian SSR, USSR

YAMPOLSKY, Aleksandr: Electron. Eng., b 1944, Single (Family of 2) (C)
Petra Lavrova 47-12; Leningrad 192123; RSFSR, USSR

First Applied in 1974:

ABEZGAUS, Aleksandr: Engineer, b 1949, Married + 3 (C)
Veshniakovskaya 1-3-136; Moscow 402; RSFSR, USSR

BESPROZVANY, Ilya: Mech. Eng., b 1939, Married + 1 (C)
Iskrovsky Pr. 21-269; Leningrad 193232; RSFSR, USSR

BLITSHEIN, Lev: Plant Administrator, b 1930 (C)
Bolshaya Pereyaslavskaya 3-2-2; Moscow 129041; RSFSR, USSR

****First applied with parents**

FURMAN, Lev: Elect. Eng., b 1947, Married (C)
Pestelia 13-15-16; Leningrad; RSFSR, USSR

GELMAN, Grigory: b 1946, Married (Family of 4) (M)
Vasilevsky Ostrov 7-aya Linia 30-2; Leningrad 199004; RSFSR, USSR

GOLFAND, Yuri Abramovich: Physicist, b 1922, Married + 1 (C)
Leninsky Pr. 88-3-4; Moscow 117313; RSFSR, USSR

GUREVICH, Aron: Elect. Eng., b 1938, Married + 2 (w's C)
Boitsovaya 22-6-7; Moscow 197150; RSFSR, USSR

KAZAKEVICH, Lazar: Engineer, b 1927, Married + 2 (w's C)
Tikhoretsky Pr. 12-1-17; Leningrad 194064; RSFSR, USSR

KNOKH, Vladimir: Radio Eng., b 1944, Married + 1 (C)
Vavilova 4-1-68; Leningrad 195257; RSFSR, USSR

KOGAN, Isaac: Elect. Eng., b 1946, Married + 3 (C)
Kolokolnaya 5-26; Leningrad; RSFSR, USSR

KREMEN, Mikhail: Radio Eng., b 1937, Married + 2 (C)
Molotovskikh 11-2-64; Moscow 111537; RSFSR, USSR

KRIVONOS, Pavel: Engineer, Married + 1 (C)
Krasny Kazanets 19-1-43; Moscow 111325; RSFSR, USSR

KUN, Boris: Aircraft Engineer, b 1947, Married + 1 (C)
Shchelkovskoe Shosse 77-1-160; Moscow B-207; RSFSR, USSR

KUSAEVA, Burkha: Retired Hairdresser, b 1922, Mar'd. + 3 (K)
Sechenova 13; Dushanbe; Tadzh SSR, USSR

LIVSHITS, Boris: Pensioner, b 1910, Married (r's C)
Shosseinaya 3-41, Liubertsy; Moskovskaya Obl.; RSFSR, USSR

MAY, Arkady: Elect. Eng., b 1922, Married + 1 (C)
Leningradskoe Shosse 112-1-3-709; Moscow 125445; RSFSR, USSR

MANASHIROV, Aziz: Carpenter, b 1949, Married + 1 (M)
Khandadai Tagieva 39-44; Derbent; RSFSR, USSR

VOLVOVSKY, Leonid: Computer Sci., b 1942, Married + 1 (C)
Krylova 14-115; Gorky; RSFSR, USSR

MARIASIN, Aleksandr: Engineer, b 1924, Married + 2 (C)
Karla Marksa 62-37; Riga; Latvian SSR, USSR

MEIMAN, Naum: Math. Physicist, b 1911, Married (C)
Naberezhnaya Gorkovo 4-22-57; Moscow; RSFSR, USSR

MULERIS, Khaim: Engineer, b 1947, Married + 1 (M)
Laisves Alieja 72a-16; Kaunas; Lithuanian SSR, USSR

POTIK, Igor: (1960, 1964)** Elect. Eng., b 1947, Single (Family of 2) (M)
Purvtziema 44A-4; Riga 9; Latvian SSR, USSR

PRUDKOV, Aleksandr: b 1945, Married + 1 (M)
Shmidtta 7-8; Odessa 270023; Ukrainian SSR, USSR

SHABASHOV, Leonid: Chem. Eng., b 1946, Married + 1 (C)
Podvoyskogo 26-82; Moscow 123317; RSFSR, USSR

SHAKHNOVICH, Mikhail: b 1943, Married + 1 (M)
Magnitogorskaya 2-149; Leningrad 195027; RSFSR, USSR

SHALUMOV, Viacheslav: b 1959, Married + 2 (M)
Primorskaya 31; Derbent; RSFSR, USSR

SHTROM, Riva: Pensioner, b 1903, Widow (NR)
Marshala Biriuzova 8-2-184; Moscow D-298; RSFSR, USSR

SOSNA, Rimma: Elec. Eng., b 1930, Married + 1 (C)
Lermontovskiy 40-27; Leningrad 198005; RSFSR, USSR

STRELOSHIK, Boris: Eng., b 1943, Single (Family of 3) (C)
Chapayevsky Per 5-1-102; Moscow 125252; RSFSR, USSR

UCHITEL, Ilia: Technician, b 1944, Married + 2 (M)
Shumskovo 6-47; Kiev 173; Ukrainian SSR, USSR

VAIS, Ekaterina: b 1909, Widow + 2 (r's M)
Zakarpattie, Vinogradsky Rayon; Chero-Tisovo; Ukrainian SSR, USSR

VODOVOZ, David: Driver, b 1951, Married (M)
Kuzhechnaya 34-4; Kishinev; Mold. SSR, USSR

*** Relative of "Illegal emigrant"**

ETHIOPIAN JEWRY

THE CONDITION OF ETHIOPIAN JEWRY

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The pattern of the last four years of a progressive increase in significant numbers of Ethiopian Jews arriving in Israel continued this past year. Nevertheless, the complexity and dangerous conditions involved in Ethiopian *aliyah* continue as drought and famine conditions have worsened in the Gondar. Conditions of the 20,000 Jews of Ethiopia remain precarious, without success at restoring the teaching of Hebrew, or the medical, educational and agricultural facilities previously provided by the closed-down ORT programs.

BACKGROUND: More than 7,000 *Beta Yisrael* now reside in Israel, with over 2,000 Ethiopian Jews arriving in 1983. Meanwhile, within Ethiopia, forces of assimilation and dissolution of the *Beta Yisrael* community continue, such as the refusal of the government to allow the reopening of any of the 26 ORT schools that have remained closed since 1980; a perception on the part of the *Beta Yisrael* that the teaching of Hebrew and religious practices is frowned upon by authorities, and army conscription that takes young *Beta Yisrael* from their village world, where they are not likely to return.

Contact with the *Beta Yisrael* significantly in-

creased through 11 recent missions, including two NJCRAC missions. The missions, from the U.S., Israel and France, broke the previous near-total isolation of the Ethiopian Jews, and brought a needed sense of support from world Jewry.

The impressive absorption efforts in Israel have continued with more resources expended, per capita, than for any other immigrant group. The Jewish Agency and the Israeli government have continued to maintain the most sophisticated absorption efforts in recent Israeli history, adding specialized health and community services to the usual Hebrew and social integration assistance.

FAMINE IN AFRICA

CHANGING CONDITIONS: As to the broader context, Ethiopia has been one of the countries affected by the deepening severe drought, now in its second year, that has resulted in the threat of catastrophic famine facing more than 150 million people in 24 African countries.

BACKGROUND: In Ethiopia, over three million people are threatened—50 to 100 children are dying daily in Northern Ethiopia as a result of the drought. Although the Gondar province is one of the regions of Ethiopia most severely affected, most Ethiopian Jews live in areas of the province where rainfall has been adequate and thus not threatened by the famine at this time.

In 1983 the U.S. government responded to the wors-

ening famine by restoring aid to Ethiopia; a measure encouraged and welcomed by the American Jewish community. But, although the aid restoration was viewed a positive step, the \$6.7 million-dollar level was pitifully small compared to the needs of the famine-stricken country. Various bills to provide famine relief to African countries were introduced in Congress, but bringing public attention to the crisis, and public support behind the aid measures, will be needed.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations field should:

- provide detailed information and interpretive resources to communities, stressing the successes, obstacles, and highly delicate nature of the Ethiopian Jewry issue. Special emphasis should be given to reporting on the absorption work being carried on in Israel, and to the progress being made in integrating the *Beta Yisrael* into Israeli society;
- encourage missions to Ethiopia to provide first-hand information, express solidarity with Ethiopian Jews, and convey world Jewry's concern and involvement;

STRATEGIC GOALS *(continued)*

- maintain, through the NJCRAC Committee on Ethiopian Jews, a unified and coordinated approach and close liaison with the primary authority responsible for relief and rescue. Independent initiatives outside of this framework should be avoided, as it would jeopardize proven successful efforts and Ethiopian Jews;
- continue to systematically monitor and review the state of *Beta Yisrael* relief and rescue, deepen Jewish community understanding of absorption efforts into Israeli society, and provide an avenue for open two-way communication between the American Jewish community and those who world Jewry has charged with direct responsibility;
- exercise appropriate care and discretion in dealing with this delicate and complex issue, including consultation with NJCRAC prior to contact with public officials or media figures;
- vigorously support special measures of emergency famine relief by the United States to the many countries in Africa facing this disaster, without regard to the political ideology of the recipient countries.

ARGENTINA

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The replacement of Argentina's military regime with a democratically elected government headed by a leader in the fight for civil rights has led to a series of major actions to reverse the long history of cruel repression in that nation.

BACKGROUND: The election of President Raul Alfonsin in October, 1983 brought an end to seven years of repression by a military regime that became infamous for the number of its indiscriminately detained and "disappeared" victims, who include many Jews. President Alfonsin, during and prior to his campaign, specifically and unequivocally denounced anti-Semitism. He as well

as his Radical Civic Union Party, have had a long history of struggles for human rights and respect for law. Nonetheless, disturbing anti-Semitic incidents have taken place since President Alfonsin's inauguration, and some anti-Semitic publications are still circulating. Hopefully, a proposed law that would punish severely all acts of religious and racial discrimination will be approved by the Congress.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations field should:

- in close consultation with Argentinian Jewry, monitor and assess developments in Argentina, help garner support for the democratic government now in office to assist it in overcoming the acute economic and political problems it inherited.

CONTINUING & URGENT

Syria

The recent murder and mutilation of a young Jewish mother and her two children in Aleppo underscores the vulnerability of the estimated 4,500 Jews remaining in Syria. Emigration remains closed without prospect for immediate change in this policy. We should continue to seek the removal of restrictions on the Jewish community of Syria and their right to leave. We must continue to carefully monitor this situation—especially in light of developments in Lebanon—and exchange

information with appropriate governments and Jewish agencies.

Iran

Although no overt action has been taken recently against the Jews remaining in Iran, the Iranian Jewish community remains vulnerable. Emigration is virtually closed off, and Jews remain in prison, together with large numbers of Bahais and thousands of other Iranians. Continued monitoring of this extremely delicate situation is required.

CHURCH-STATE AND INTERRELIGIOUS RELATIONSHIPS

The Jewish community has always been profoundly aware that maintaining a firm line of separation between church and state is essential to religious freedom and the religious voluntarism which foster the creative and distinctive survival of diverse religious groups, such as our own. There has always been an ebb and flow of attempts to breach the wall of separation between church and state in America. Now, we are in a period in which efforts to bring religion into our public life are intensifying, as are the efforts by some to identify the United States as a Christian country. The attack on the separation principle and religious pluralism has been promoted by the executive, the legislative and judicial branches of the federal and state governments, and has been directed at various aspects of public life. Vigorous efforts to protect the principle of church-state separation are vital at this time.

GOVERNMENT SANCTION OF RELIGIOUS SYMBOLS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Lynch v. Donnelly*, and a subsequent U.S. Court of Appeals decision in *McCreary v. Stone* (the Scarsdale case), which allowed government involvement in publicly displayed Nativity scenes, represent a significant weakening of the wall of separation between church and state, and the conception of an American society in which the State is neutral in regard to religious beliefs, and non-belief.

BACKGROUND: In a 5-4 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in March 1984, in the case of *Lynch v. Donnelly*, that municipal support of Nativity scenes does not violate First Amendment guarantees of separation of church and state. In the case involving the city of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, a Nativity scene was part of a Christmas display that also included a Christmas tree, Santa Claus, reindeer, and other figures and decorations. Pawtucket tax funds were used to purchase and maintain the display, including the creche, which was displayed on private property. The case was on appeal from the First Circuit Court of Appeals that had affirmed a District Court decision banning the creche on Constitutional grounds.*

*In July, 1984, in *McCreary v. Stone*, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (NY) unanimously ruled that a privately-funded creche, standing alone in a public park, was permissible. In this Scarsdale, NY, case, the Appeals Court applied the Supreme Court's reasoning in *Lynch* as it reversed an earlier District Court decision. The Appeals Courts refused to accept a distinction between *McCreary* and *Lynch* based on the grounds that *Lynch* dealt with a creche in a larger secular display, while the creche in *McCreary* stood alone. The Court pointed out that in *Lynch*, the decision was based on "the creche in the context of the Christmas season", and not upon the physical secular context within which the Nativity display was situated. In direct contrast with this case and *Lynch*, a federal District Court ruled, also in July 1984, in the case of *Levin v. City of Birmingham*, that a creche which also stood by itself on public property was not permissible. The creche was displayed on the front lawn of the Birmingham, Michigan, City Hall, and was paid for with public funds. It had been a feature of the city's annual holiday display for decades. In a summary judgment, the District Court judge cited Supreme Court Justice O'Connor's opinion in *Lynch*, and declared that the Birmingham creche represented an endorsement of a specific faith which "sends a message to non-adherents that they are outsiders and not full members of the political community", that it had potential for divisiveness in the community because of its religious nature, and that it entailed excessive entanglement in religion on the city's part.

In his majority opinion in *Lynch*, Chief Justice Warren Burger found that the creche, as part of a larger display, had no primary religious purpose, but that it represented the general acceptance of Christmas in our society. "It would be ironic", the Chief Justice stated, "if the inclusion of a single symbol of a particular historic religious event, as part of a celebration acknowledged in the Western world for 20 centuries, and in this country... for two centuries, would so 'taint' the city's exhibit as to render it violative of the Establishment Clause." Chief Justice Burger characterized the Nativity scene as a "passive symbol" to be equated with *objets d'art*.

Burger's opinion for the majority runs counter to the basic premises of the separation principle set forth in earlier decisions of the Court. Citing departures from the separation principle, Burger asserts that separation is not possible in an absolute sense, and appears to reject the concept of the "wall of separation" as an ideal to be achieved. On the contrary, Chief Justice Burger appears to introduce a new principle that "the Constitution (does not) require complete separation of church and state; it affirmatively mandates *accommodation*, not merely *tolerance*, of all religions." (Our emphasis added.)

In applying the so-called "tripartite test" (must have a secular purpose, primary effect neither advances nor inhibits religion, avoids excessive government entanglement with religion) used by the Court since 1971, the Chief Justice appears to narrow the criteria of "establishment" to "whether, in reality, it establishes a religion or religious faith", which

interprets "establishment" in its most limited, literal sense. This limiting criterion had already been used by the Chief Justice in last year's Nebraska chaplaincy case, *Marsh v. Chambers*, in which the practice of opening legislative sessions with a prayer delivered by a chaplain paid by the state was held to be constitutional.

Asserting "that the 'fears and political problems' that gave rise to the Religion Clauses in the 18th century are of far less concern today", Burger, speaking for the majority, refused to invalidate inclusion of the creche on the grounds that such problems are no longer present today. Noting that the creche in Pawtucket had been annually displayed for over forty years without generating controversy, the Chief Justice asserted: "A litigant cannot, by the very act of commencing a law suit... create the appearance of divisiveness and then exploit it as evidence of entanglement" of government with religion.

Justice William Brennan, in his dissent in *Lynch*, argued that the Pawtucket display "amounts to an impermissible governmental endorsement of a particular faith." Justice Brennan asserted that "the creche retains a specifically Christian religious meaning.... It is the chief symbol of the characteristically Christian belief that a divine Savior was brought into the world and that the purpose of this miraculous birth was to illuminate a path toward salvation and redemption. For Christians, that path is exclusive, precious and holy. But for those who do not share these beliefs, the symbolic re-enactment of the birth of a divine being who has been miraculously incarnated as a man stands as a dramatic reminder of their differences with Christian faith.... To be so excluded on religious grounds by one's elected government is an insult and an injury that, until today, could not be countenanced by the Establishment Clause."

Justice Brennan declared, "The essence of the creche's symbolic purpose and effect is to prompt the observer to experience a sense of simple awe and wonder appropriate to the contemplation of one of the central elements of Christian dogma—that God sent His son into the world to be a Messiah. Contrary to the Court's suggestion, the creche is far from a mere representation of 'a particular historic religious event.' It is, instead, best understood as a mystical recreation of an event that lies at the heart of Christian faith. To suggest, as the Court does, that such a symbol is merely 'traditional' and therefore no different from Santa's house or reindeer is not only offensive to those for whom the creche has profound significance, but insulting to those who insist for religious or personal reasons that the story of Christ is in no sense a part of 'history' nor an unavoidable element of our national 'heritage.'"

In concurring with the majority opinion, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor agreed that there was no actual finding of political divisiveness in the Pawtucket situa-

tion, and therefore, the display should be allowed. "It is significant... that the creche display apparently caused no political divisiveness prior to the filing of this lawsuit, although Pawtucket had incorporated the creche in its annual Christmas display for some years." However, she acknowledges that government endorsement of religion "sends a message to non-adherents that they are outsiders and not full members of the political community, and an accompanying message to adherents that they are insiders, favored members of the political community. Disapproval sends the opposite message." Justice O'Connor reasoned that those practices which have the effect of communicating this "insider-outsider" message of government endorsement of religion are prohibited, but she did not deem the Pawtucket creche in that category.

Justice O'Connor went on to assert that the existence of political divisiveness "may be evidence that institutional entanglement is excessive or that government practice is perceived as an entanglement of religion. But the constitutional inquiry should focus ultimately on the character of the government activity that might cause such divisiveness, not the divisiveness itself... every government practice must be judged in its unique circumstances to determine whether it constitutes an endorsement or disapproval of religion. In making the determination, courts must keep in mind both the fundamental place held by the Establishment Clause in our constitutional scheme and the myriad, subtle ways in which the Establishment Clause values can be eroded. Government practices that purport to celebrate or acknowledge events with religious significance must be subject to careful judicial scrutiny."

Justice O'Connor's concurring opinion in *Lynch v. Donnelly* suggests an even greater ambivalence on the Court than a 5-4 decision would indicate, and that a majority of the present Court might be willing to consider evidence of divisiveness in deciding future cases challenging government involvement in religious symbols, displays, or practice. Her opinion tends to place much greater emphasis on identifying actual experiences and demonstrating the actual effects of failure to meet the criteria of the three-part test.

Justice Brennan, in his dissent in *Lynch*, has pointed out that "the decision implicitly leaves open questions concerning the constitutionality of the public display of other distinctively religious symbols such as a cross." Going beyond the cross, the decision also leaves open questions about whether other religious symbols, such as crucifixes, Chanukah menorahs, and creches in public schools, could be interpreted as passive religious art forms. Sharing Justice Brennan's views, we continue to maintain that state support for public displays of any of these religious symbols are violative of the First Amendment.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 33.)

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: In crucial votes in March 1984, the Senate rejected Constitutional Amendments, vigorously supported by the Administration and its allies, that would have allowed prayer in the public schools, and amended the Bill of Rights for the first time in 200 years. While the House, soon after, in May 1984, first defeated another attempt to open the schools to religious practices, through the device of so-called "equal access" legislation, in the summer of 1984, Congress passed an "equal access" measure. Then, in a surprise move in July 1984, the House passed a measure that would allow "silent prayer" in public schools, and as the Joint Program Plan was going to print, the Senate was moving toward a vote. Supporters of religious activity in the schools will press these issues in the federal election campaigns, and depending on the election results, they are likely to continue as major issues in the 99th Congress.

Invoking the judicial precedents of nearly four decades, the lower courts continued to bar attempts to introduce religious practices into the public schools with decisions this past year striking down "moment-of-silence" laws in Alabama and in New Jersey, and "equal access" practices in Oklahoma, Georgia and Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court has agreed to rule on a "moment-of-silence" case during the coming year.

BACKGROUND: The past year saw a renewed emphasis and increased activity by advocates of religion in the public schools with the President taking a leadership role in again advancing school prayer, as well as a general stance of injecting government into the religious sphere. It has also become a major item again on the dockets of the courts, particularly the Supreme Court, more so than at any time in the past 20 years. Thus, the issue has become a matter of deep concern for American Jews.

Efforts to bring religion into the schools emerged in the drive to gain Senate passage of a Constitutional Amendment allowing prayer in the public schools. In sharp contrast to its 1979 vote supporting legislation to strip federal courts, including the Supreme Court, of jurisdiction over challenges to "voluntary" school prayer, the Senate, in a vote in March 1984 (in which the entire Senate voted), rejected a Constitutional Amendment allowing organized vocal prayer in the public schools. By a vote of 56-44, the measure failed to gain the two-thirds needed for Congressional approval of a Constitutional Amendment, despite intense pressure from the Administration and others outside of Congress. The Amendment was based on an Administration formulation. In an earlier vote, an Amendment that would have permitted *silent* prayer was tabled, and *de facto* defeated, by a vote of 81-15.

After the Senate's defeat of the school prayer Amendment, the issue appeared dead during the session of the 98th Congress. Then, in a surprise move the day immediately after it passed the "equal access" measure, on July 26, 1984, the House approved, by a 356 to 50 vote, a rider on an omnibus education bill that that would allow "silent prayer" in public schools. The measure provides that "no state or local agency shall deny individuals in the public schools the opportunity to participate in moments of silent prayer." Immediately prior to this vote, the House rejected, by a 215 to 194 vote, a rider that would have cut off federal funds to any school district whose schools prohibit "voluntary" vocal prayer. At the time the Joint Program Plan was being processed

for printing, the silent prayer measure still awaited action by a House-Senate Conference Committee. The legislation, which does not take the form of a Constitutional Amendment, flies in the face of four recent court decisions that have held silent prayer to be violative of the First Amendment, reflecting milestone Supreme Court decisions on religion in the schools.

In spite of a constitutional ban on prayer in the public schools, approximately half the states now have statutes requiring or allowing some form of silent meditation in the schools. Those statutes were passed prior to the decisions in the *Jaffree v. Wallace* case, where the U.S. Court of Appeals struck down an Alabama "moment-of-silence" law, and *May v. Cooperman*, in which a federal District Court invalidated a similar New Jersey statute.

The key to their legality may rest in a Supreme Court decision in the *Jaffree* case, which is expected in the coming year. Both "moment-of-silence" and vocal composed prayer laws were overturned by the Appeals Court in *Jaffree*. The Justice Department entered the *Jaffree* case, asking the Supreme Court to overturn the Court of Appeals' decision, which represented an unprecedented action by the Executive Branch in a case involving religion in the schools. In accepting the case for review, the Supreme Court summarily upheld the lower court's invalidation of the vocal prayer statute tested in *Jaffree*, and agreed to address the "moment-of-silence" aspects of the case. In the similar *May v. Cooperman* case, New Jersey officials have deferred a decision on whether to go forward on an appeal until the *Jaffree* case is decided.*

The Jewish community relations field has for some time firmly opposed attempts to institute "silent prayer" or "moments-of-silence" in the public schools, pointing to the serious consequences of the issue. The field's position is based on the recognition that the institutionalization of prayer, in any form, spoken or silent, fosters what in essence is a religious exercise that in a public school setting can

* An *amicus curiae* brief will be submitted in the *Jaffree* case by the American Jewish Congress on behalf of the NJCRAC and its member agencies.

have a coercive effect on a school child, and, at bottom, debases distinctive religious expression which is vital to maintaining particularistic religious beliefs. Paradoxically, what silent prayer does is foster religious indifferentism. So-called "moments-of-silence" legislation is no more than a legal subterfuge for the introduction of prayer into the schools, barred twenty years ago by the Supreme Court.

It appears that a number of school districts have ignored the Supreme Court's edicts on prayer in the schools by allowing and even encouraging classroom prayer, but how widespread such practices are has yet to be systematically surveyed. Similarly, attempts to teach the doctrine of Biblical creation, under the rubric of "Scientific Creationism", continue in some school districts in the Midwest, Far West, and South, in spite of legal rulings against the practice. Such teaching, as a federal District Court declared in 1982, "has no scientific merit...and (its) only real effect is the advancement of religion." This practice, as the 1982-83 Joint Program Plan states, is "a blatant intrusion of religion into the public schools."

Another route to bring religion into the public schools has been the effort to pass so-called "equal access" legislation which would allow private religious groups to use public school facilities during non-instructional periods. After the Senate defeated the school prayer Amendment, advocates of bringing religion into the schools emphasized this device, with a concerted drive to gain House passage of an "equal access" bill in May, 1984. The proposed legislation, introduced by Representative Don Bonker (D-WA), would have cut off federal education funds to any state or local entity containing a school that refused to allow student religious groups, if others are allowed, to meet in secondary schools during non-instructional periods (which is defined as time immediately before or after, as well as during, the school day). The bill, in a 270-151 vote, failed to gain the two-thirds margin needed under the "suspension-of-the-rules" procedure that was used to bring it to the House floor. Subsequently, in June 1984, the Senate passed a "compromise" version of "equal access", introduced by Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR), in the form of an amendment to an unrelated appropriations bill. The measure would make it unlawful to deny equal access "to any students who wish to conduct a meeting...on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings". The measure, which refers to voluntary, student-initiated, meetings held immediately before or after instructional hours, passed the Senate by a vote of 88-11. As the Joint Program Plan was being processed for printing, on July 25, 1984, the House used a "suspension-of-the-rules" procedure to bring this "equal access" measure to the floor for a vote where it passed by a 337 to 77 margin.

The Jewish community relations field has a long-standing position opposing such measures. "Safe-guarding Religious Liberty", a compilation of the joint positions of NJCRAC and the Synagogue Council of America, states: "We are opposed to the use of public school premises during school hours for religious education, meetings, or worship...The NJCRAC has interpreted this to include the use of school facilities immediately before or after school hours."

The Jewish community relations field, and the interreligious forces actively opposing such legislation, have warned of the grave potential such measures would pose. The version passed by Congress in 1984 extends "equal access" to "political" and "philosophical" groups as well, but this in no way softens or diminishes the threat to church-state separation contained in allowing religious activities in the public schools. The measure opens the schools to outside religious groups including proselytizers and clergy, in violation of a series of Supreme Court decisions prohibiting bible reading, prayers, worship, and religious instruction on school premises, and opens the door to cults since determining the legitimacy of religious groups by school officials would be constitutionally prohibited. Although the measure refers to "student-initiated" groups, outsiders, including any cult or religious organizer or proselytizer who is "invited" to the school by students, will be permitted to take part in a group's activities. The coercive potential of peer pressure in a high school setting to participate in these religious activities could be great. Religious "clubs" allowed by such measures could easily devolve into *de facto* "chapels" functioning within the public schools.

The federal courts have found religious activities introduced into the schools under "equal access" devices to be violative of the First Amendment. In *Nartowicz v. Clayton County*, the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals (Georgia) unanimously ruled that meetings of a "Youth for Christ" club on school premises, during the school day, were *a priori* of a non-secular nature, and therefore violated the Establishment Clause in that a state or state-sponsored practice must have a secular purpose in order to be constitutional. It also ruled that the use of the school's bulletin boards for posting announcements of church-sponsored activities was improper, involving excessive government entanglement in religion. In *Bender v. Williamsport*, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals (Pennsylvania) ruled in a 2-1 decision that the formation of a student organization that would be devoted to prayer and other religious activities, and that would meet during regularly scheduled student activity periods, was unconstitutional. The court held that this activity would have had no secular purpose, would give the impression of official approval and endorsement, and as such would have the effect of advancing religion. The court held that the interest of

protecting free speech within the context of a school's activity period was outweighed in this case by Establishment Clause concerns. Another case pending on these issues is *Bell v. Little Axe*, in which a federal District Court in Oklahoma prohibited "morning prayer clubs" during the public school's in-

structional day, but permitted them after the end of regular school hours. The case is on appeal in the Tenth Circuit.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start below.)

GOVERNMENT AID TO RELIGIOUSLY-RELATED SCHOOLS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: In a significant action in 1983, the Senate defeated the Administration's tuition tax credit proposal, which now appears to be doomed. But the Supreme Court decision of June, 1983, in the *Mueller v. Allen* case, upholding the constitutionality of a Minnesota law permitting state income tax deductions for certain expenses of both public and private school students, has given a new impetus to advocates of government aid to non-public education, particularly at the state level.

BACKGROUND: In November, 1983, the Senate defeated the Administration's tuition tax credit proposal, the Educational Opportunity and Equity Act of 1983. Sponsoring the bill, Senator Robert Dole (R-KS) and other Senators have indicated they will not press this issue in the near future unless proponents can counter strongly-held beliefs in Congress that tuition tax credits would be detrimental to public school education.

Proposals that would establish state income tax deductions for expenses related to certain public and private school expenses, modeled on the Minnesota statute, have been introduced in 13 state legislatures, and the number is likely to grow as most state legislatures reconvene in 1985. It is also likely that advocates of government aid to private schools will press for federal legislation modeled on the Minnesota statute.

Continued legal challenges to tuition tax aid statutes similar to the Minnesota law have been urged in

light of the closeness of the 5-4 decision in the *Mueller* case, in addition to resistance to any new initiatives in this area.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 34.)

NOTE: *The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America supports the Moynihan-Packwood tax credit proposal; also the use of voucher plans and legislation consonant with previous Supreme Court decisions which would provide aid to students and the secular programs of parochial schools. These positions are consistent with the belief that parochial schools are important to the maintenance of culture and religious identities, which is itself integral to the unique complexion of American society.*

STRATEGIC GOALS (Church-State Issues)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- firmly oppose, in coalition with other groups, all attempts to bring religious practices into the public schools, such as organized vocal prayer, "moments-of-silence," so-called "equal access" measures, and "Scientific Creationism";
- engage in a more extensive and systematic campaign to challenge religion on public property;
- utilize to these ends all the appropriate community relations processes, ranging from dialogue with other groups, especially religious groups, with a view toward fostering consensus on church-state issues, to litigation as a last resort;
- place emphasis on identifying the actual experiences and effects of government support of religious symbols, as well as religious practices in the public schools, to demonstrate the divisiveness of such practices on the community, and the failure to meet the three-part test of the separation principle;

(continued on next page)

STRATEGIC GOALS *(continued)*

- undertake educational efforts within the Jewish and general communities on the threats to both religious freedom and the integrity of religion itself posed by allowing religious practices in the public schools, and religious symbols on public property;
- develop a comprehensive set of guidelines embodying long-tested strategies and tactics for countering such practices;
- continue to oppose all efforts, at both the state and federal levels, that would allow tuition tax credits;
- mount statewide efforts, in concert with other like-minded groups around the country, to oppose state tuition tax deductions schemes suggested by the *Mueller* decision.

JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The past year saw a continued reduction in tensions between the leadership of the Protestant and Jewish communities over issues involving the Middle East. However, the National Council of Churches testified in Congress against moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, and hostility to Israel continues to be voiced by individuals in the leadership of major national denominational bodies.

Jewish-Catholic relations continued to improve during the past year. The Catholic Church's vigorous emphasis on nuclear arms control, and opposition to capital punishment, open avenues for cooperation between the Church and like-minded groups, including the Jewish community, in spite of sharp differences on other fundamental issues. Those differences were expressed particularly in regard to the status of Jerusalem by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, which testified against moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, and by statements by Pope John Paul reiterating the Vatican's call for international guarantees on Jerusalem.

BACKGROUND: The sharp differences which have characterized the relationships between the National Council of Churches (NCC) and the Jewish community appeared to have lessened, as a result of the perception of restraint in NCC posture on Middle East issues. A recent, November 1983, NCC statement, reflected such restraint in its analysis of Lebanon. Nor have there been recent reiterations of previous calls by the NCC for Israel to accept the "Reagan Plan". Additionally, there appears to be less emphasis of late by the NCC on so-called "revolution theology". In sharp contrast, leaders of the United Presbyterians and the United Church of Christ have continued their condemnations of Israel's activities in Lebanon. A noteworthy development in the year commemorating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Martin Luther, was a repudiation by the Lutheran World Federation of "the sins of Luther's anti-Jewish remarks", and an assertion by the Lutheran body that "all occasions for similar sins in the present or the future must be removed from our churches".

On the local level, there has been increased activity in areas of Jewish-Christian programming and cooperation, particularly in the areas of teacher training and Holocaust studies, and on a broad range of social issues of common concern. Strong support of Israel on the part of the evangelical groups con-

tinued, while major differences remain on other issues.

The Catholic Church's continued forceful opposition to abortion and its strong support for aid to parochial schools have not been impediments to coalitions with groups who share opinions on other issues such as nuclear arms control, capital punishment, or domestic social action issues. Concern has been expressed by some about certain references in the *Pastoral Letter on War and Peace*, issued in 1983 by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The letter contrasts the "negative" aspects of Hebrew scripture containing the concept of a "Warrior God", with the "best" aspects of Christian scripture that deal with the subject of war and peace. The meeting of Pope John Paul II with Yasser Arafat in 1982, coming on the heels of other Vatican-PLO contacts, did not cause a deterioration of Jewish-Catholic relations in the United States during the past year. On the contrary, there has been significant dissent on the issue in the Catholic community, at a number of levels, with Catholic leaders, both in the U.S. and abroad, engaging in public criticism of these events. But concern was renewed by the Pope's April, 1984, comprehensive apostolic letter addressed to Catholics in Israel and to all people in the Middle East. The Pope called for a "special statute, internationally guaranteed" for Jerusalem "so that no party could jeopardize it". John

Paul II's words were taken, at the time, as a call for internationalization of Jerusalem. Subsequent clarification of the Holy See's position, revealed that the Vatican, consistent with its position since 1967, was calling for a statute of international guarantees, independent of any power governing the city, supported by the major powers or the United Nations. Moreover,

the letter recognized Israel's "desired security and just tranquility that is the prerogative of every nation". However, The National Conference of Catholic Bishops presented Congressional testimony opposing moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section appear below.)

CONTINUING & URGENT

Cults and Other Conversionary Movements:

Special targets of cults, as well as evangelical groups, have been adolescents, students, the aged, and individual members of newly-arrived communities such as Soviet immigrants. Evidencing a substantial expenditure, the publication of full-page newspaper ads by "Jews for Jesus" in newspapers throughout the United States and in *Newsweek* was, in some communities, the first

local manifestation of "Jews for Jesus" activity.

As we have previously noted, in the 1983-84 Joint Program Plan, the "continuing proselytizing efforts (of cults and other conversionary movements), especially in some localities, raise serious community relations problems and often engender resentment and anger within the Jewish community. Sensitive attention to this issue is required, as well as forthrightly addressing it when the problem appears in any particular setting."

STRATEGIC GOALS (Interreligious Issues)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- encourage joint efforts with the Catholic and Protestant communities on issues where views are shared, such as nuclear arms control, capital punishment, and domestic social action items, while the absence of agreement on other matters of fundamental importance to each group should not be viewed as an impediment to cooperative efforts;
- conduct efforts to deepen the understanding of Israel among these other religious groups, particularly the fostering of visits to Israel as part of interreligious programming;
- establish dialogue groups to encourage and develop better understanding and communication between Protestants and Jews, and Catholics and Jews.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE

The fundamental premise of the field of Jewish community relations is to foster conditions conducive to Jewish security and creative Jewish living in a free society. Such conditions require a society committed to equal rights, justice and opportunity. Their denial breeds social tensions, conflicts and dislocations, and have led to threats to the democratic process in general, and to the Jewish community in particular. The stake of the American Jewish community in a strong democratic society is reinforced by the moral imperative on the Jewish community to pursue social justice. This commitment flows from Jewish religious mandates, tradition, and the millennial experience of the Jewish people.

UNEMPLOYMENT

CHANGING CONDITIONS: An upturn in economic indicators, including a decline in unemployment figures during the past year, indicated that an economic recovery is underway, although the nature and extent of the recovery remain unclear. But even optimistic observers anticipate that unemployment rates during the next three to four years will continue to be well above the average rate of unemployment during the 1960s and 1970s, including even periods of recession.

BACKGROUND: There are indications that the pattern of unemployment is due to structural and technological factors in the economy as well as cyclical factors. This unemployment cannot be alleviated merely by government programs of emergency employment or assistance, despite the need for such programs. While emergency programs are essential to relieve immediate distress, they must be complemented by ambitious and imaginative federal government initiatives to create new employment opportunities, to train and retrain the work force to meet changing economic and technological conditions, and to minimize the human costs of industrial and geographical shifts in the nation's economy. Congress, which last year failed to enact proposed legislation aimed at providing jobs for the long-term unemployed, may be even less responsive to such approaches in the coming year. The unemployment rate has declined, but it hovers at levels higher than at any time in the past 20 years. Thus chronic unemployment, causing a high toll in human suffering and economic loss, will continue to be a pressing problem.

The burden of this chronic unemployment, moreover, will continue to fall disproportionately on vulnerable segments of the population—notably minority youth, female heads of households, and workers in declining industries or declining geographic areas.

Segments of the Jewish community have also been hard hit by unemployment. The National Association of Jewish Vocational Services has reported marked increases in caseloads over the past two years, as well as a change in the type of clients. Case records show a recent increase in professional, technical and managerial-level clients; women entering or returning to the labor market; retirees seeking to augment their fixed incomes; college students with liberal arts degrees trying to enter the work force; former owners of small businesses that have failed; and Soviet emigres who have been laid off or re-trenched. These findings reflect the adverse impact on sectors of the economy to which many Jews have long been drawn. In these areas, there has been marked unemployment due to cuts in government funding, leading to loss of social work and service jobs; low student enrollment, resulting in fewer teaching posts; and a drastic increase in the number of small business failures.

Responding adequately to the human and social problems caused by long-term unemployment will require the coordinated efforts, on an unprecedented scale, of federal, state and local government, private enterprise, labor unions, nonprofit organizations working for social and economic betterment, and educational institutions. Without such efforts, the country may face growing social dislocations with consequences for all of American society.

While Congressional interest in jobs programs has been waning, the national election may foster national debate of structural and long-term causes of unemployment, including proposals for a national industrial policy. Proponents of such a policy, arguing that it is needed to adapt to the shifts that have occurred in the American industrial economy, seek a national program to revitalize troubled, basic industries and to encourage development of promising new high-technology ventures. Others question the efficacy of such an emphasis on revitalizing "smoke-

stack" industries, contending that an entirely new approach is needed instead. Still others assert that such basic economic decision-making is best left to the market forces of a free economy.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 47.)

The "Emergency Jobs Program—of the Full Employment Action Council", which NJCRAC endorsed in the 1983-84 Joint Program Plan, is reprinted below.

EMERGENCY JOBS PROGRAM

of the Full Employment Action Council

(endorsed by NJCRAC in February, 1983)

We support creation of jobs to meet national needs and increased assistance to the unemployed, including through the following measures:

I. Job Creation

1) Community Service Jobs

A community service jobs program would provide temporary assistance for the unemployed while addressing presently unmet service and maintenance responsibilities of state and local governments. Community service jobs have a tangible benefit to the community, including in public safety and health, energy conservation, education and social service activities essential to the public welfare.

2) Infrastructure

Major public works projects and rehabilitation, renovation and repair of community facilities would create meaningful jobs. These include jobs in water and sewer systems, roads, highways, bridges, mass transit, railroads and port development.

3) Youth Conservation Corps

A conservation corps program that puts young people to work in high priority conservation projects would reduce the staggering levels of youth unemployment while addressing the backlog of conservation work on this nation's public lands. Postponing work only increases the cost of accomplishing it later. Also, youth conservation programs have a proven record of cost-effectiveness. A corps could involve both a summer and year-round component.

4) Jobs in Housing

Support for housing programs would put many thousands of people to work on meet-

ing the nation's needs for adequate shelter. Interest subsidies for the purchase of new homes and funding for new low and middle-income rental, housing for the elderly and other public housing could be provided. Funds for public housing modernization would preserve and upgrade low-rent public housing projects, extend their lives and produce an immediate jobs impact.

II. Investment in Human Capital

Classroom study, on-the-job training, work experience, and job placement assistance are vitally needed to help improve the skills of low-wage earners, inexperienced job seekers, dislocated workers, older workers, displaced homemakers and others facing the challenges of changing demand and advancing technology. Building up our nation's physical capital of plants and equipment without a similar investment in human capital is misguided. We recommend a level of funding for training programs that is adequate to meet actual need.

III. Increased Benefits to Long-Term Jobless

In order to lighten the suffering of the long-term jobless, we advocate the following steps:

1) Extended Unemployment Benefits

Increase to 65 the weeks for which an unemployed worker may collect unemployment compensation. This is consistent with benefits in previous recessions.

Repeal changes in the Extended Benefits (EB) program which were enacted in 1981 and which have greatly restricted the payment of benefits.

2) Emergency Assistance to the Jobless

Provide emergency assistance such as health care to the unemployed.

POVERTY

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The plight of those who are caught in a cycle of poverty continuing from generation to generation remains a serious and persistent problem in our society. Although the problems of this group continue to require attention, the general public reaction to the chronic poor has tended to be one of indifference or the acceptance of the notion that poverty is a problem beyond solution. At the same time, a growing number of working class people, professionals and shopkeepers have suddenly found themselves descending into poverty or the edge of poverty. The poverty of this group, which includes a growing number of Jews, is more transitory than that of the larger number of chronic poor. Their problems are vastly different and potentially may be more accessible to solutions.

BACKGROUND: Increasingly, the poverty population reflects the phenomenon of the "feminization of poverty." A disproportionate segment of the poverty population consists of female heads of households and their children. The economic plight of these families is often such that severely limited funds sometimes even compels choices among the most fundamental necessities of life, including food and heat. Many factors, including a breakdown in family structure, the growing rate of teenage pregnancy, and the lack of education, job skills and support services, contribute to the feminization of poverty, which is particularly acute among young black women. Another manifestation of the feminization of poverty is the growing number of poor older women of all racial and ethnic backgrounds, many of them plunged into poverty due to divorce or widowhood, lack of job skills, and inadequate or non-existent pensions. These factors have had an impact on the Jewish community, with women comprising the majority of the Jewish poor.

The feminization of poverty, and increased hardships for the poor in general, have been particularly exacerbated by the cuts enacted by the Administration over the past three years in social welfare programs, including food stamps, day care, A.F.D.C., housing and jobs. Nevertheless, the Administration

has continued its pattern of seeking even further cuts for the 1985 fiscal year in domestic social welfare programs.

There is yet another group whose problems have received little attention and who seem destined to sink lower and lower into chronic poverty. This group consists of the working poor, including workers whose hours have been reduced to part-time with the national shift to part-time service occupations, those without health benefits, and those who lack promotional and career-ladder opportunities.

Poverty has increasingly taken its toll in the Jewish community as well. For example, the Jewish Federation of Chicago's 1983 *Chicago Metropolitan Jewish Population Study* showed that about 15% of the estimated Jewish population is economically disadvantaged and vulnerable—largely the elderly and young families. A study in St. Louis revealed a similar trend. Another study, done by the Jewish Board of Family and Children Services of New York, found that "middle to lower-middle class families, who up until now have been able to sustain themselves financially, are beginning to fall through the safety net, creating a new group of poor in our communities".

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 47.)

HUNGER AND THE HOMELESS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: There is increasing evidence that the problems of hunger and homelessness in America are growing rather than receding, even in the face of an improved economy. Federal remedial efforts have been minimal, and neither state governments nor the private sector are equipped to handle the dimensions of the problem.

BACKGROUND: At a series of hearings held around the country by the President's Task Force on Food Assistance, representatives of religious groups, advocacy groups and private assistance agencies testified that hunger is on the rise as a national problem. In its final report, the Task Force concluded that hunger does persist in Amer-

ica, but that allegations that hunger is rampant cannot be documented. It also claimed that individuals at or below the poverty line had not been harmed by federal cuts, while conceding that cuts had reduced benefits for many just above the poverty line.

Among the Task Force's proposals is a recommendation that Congress convert the food stamp pro-

gram into block grants, and make participation in existing federal food assistance programs optional for the states. Although the Task Force did recommend modest increases in the assets a food stamp recipient could own, and in the maximum stamp allotment, other proposals would reduce benefits for some families, in effect penalizing those who accept employment at the lowest salary levels. The 1984 elections may determine the extent to which these proposals will be addressed by the 99th Congress.

The findings and recommendations of the Task Force were widely criticized by a variety of religious, labor, civil rights and elderly groups, the National Governors' Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, and numerous members of Congress. They charged that the Task Force had underestimated the problem of hunger, and that it had failed to recommend adequate remedies. In hearings held by the House Agriculture Subcommittee, testimony based on studies conducted by the President of the Public Health Association of New York City, the President of the Illinois chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and a lecturer at the Harvard School of Public Health, indicated that an increase in hunger and malnutrition had occurred.

The problem of hunger has been exacerbated by

deep cuts in federal food stamp and food assistance programs. Census Bureau statistics indicate that when the poverty rate rose in the past, there were increases in the rate of participation in non-cash benefit programs such as food stamps and school lunches. But this was not the case in 1982, due to Administration cuts in food stamp outlays by about 13% in the last two years, and child nutrition programs by about 28%, according to Congressional Budget Office studies. About 1,000,000 people have lost their eligibility for food stamps, and benefits for most recipients have been cut back, mainly due to postponement of benefit increases designed to keep up with inflation. Three million children, one-third of them low-income, have been dropped from the school lunch program. These cuts have come at a time when 15% of the population, a 17-year high, fell below the poverty line. The cuts have taken a high toll on the working poor and "new poor," who are not protected by the so-called "safety net." Thus, the Task Force's proposal to convert the food stamp program to block grants, as distinguished from categorical grants, has been sharply criticized because it would mean the loss of federal standards for services and benefits, as well as likely further funding decreases.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 47.)

FEDERAL BUDGET

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The impact of the federal budget deficit, now more than \$190 billion and growing, and the stringent measures expected to be advanced to deal with it, will have a profound effect on issues of direct concern to the Jewish community relations field, especially in light of a growing consensus in the Congress that such deficits threaten the American economy in both the short run and long run. Debate over the deficit promises to be a dominant issue in the coming year, particularly during the national election campaigns. Various proposals for tax increases and budget cuts will be advocated that involve fundamental choices about national priorities.

BACKGROUND: The continued increase in the federal budget deficit, now approaching \$200 billion with no abatement in sight, was a matter of deep concern during the past year to public officials of both parties, economists, and American commerce, as well as foreign leaders. The interplay of continuing high national debt, high interest rates, a strong dollar, record trade deficits, and high net interest paid on national debt has triggered concern about short and long-term consequences for the economy, raising possibilities such as re-igniting inflation, and by extension, impacting on the nation's continued health and well-being. The debate over the national deficit is directly tied to a debate over the shift in priorities in the national budget from social welfare and economic opportunity programs, to those of national defense. The debate over the economy and national priorities has stimulated concern as to whether the comprehensive federal programs needed to assist the economically disadvantaged (as

previously described in sections on "Unemployment", "Poverty", and "Hunger and the Homeless") could be realized in the coming years. Similarly, basic questions of tax policy are raised by the deficit issue, including total revenues needed, the advisability of continuing tax cutting policies, and where the tax burden should fall.

The ramifications of the deficit issue and related questions, including issues of tax policy, entitlements and expenditure priorities that were previously deemed beyond the scope of the field, now are recognized as having direct consequences on the programs advocated by the Jewish community relations field to meet the problems of unemployment, poverty, hunger, and the homeless previously discussed. As the generally accepted goal of limiting federal deficits is pursued, not only is it less likely that Congress will allocate the increased funding required by social programs to meet these ills, but they may be threatened by further cuts, even beyond those stringent

reductions that have already crippled many needed programs. Such programs will require a reallocation of national expenditures for other budget categories such as defense, and a tax policy to increase national revenue.

In the midst of the national debate on how to limit federal deficits approaching \$200 billion per year, the

NOTE: *The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith abstains from the recommendations on the federal budget and reductions in social program funds.*

NOTE: *The Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. (JWV) believes that the fundamental American liberties can be preserved only by an adequate and proper national defense that considers our requirements, and the obligations to our friends and allies. Such programs are outside of social programs. JWV does not*

Administration has revived its advocacy of a Constitutional Amendment that would require a balanced federal budget. (See section on "Constitutional Convention" under "Jewish Security and Individual Freedom.")

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 48.)

believe that the Jewish community or any other segment of the American community should deal with the defense budget on a percentage basis, or in relationship to the social budget. JWV agrees with the statement of Representative Julian Dixon to the NJCRAC Plenary Session that the defense budget should be considered on an item-by-item basis. The issue of national security and survival is not one to be debated in the context of community relations or social welfare terms.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

CHANGING CONDITIONS: Several major national studies of the fundamental problems in public education and proposed remedies were issued this past year, stimulating more public debate of the issue than has occurred in two decades. They reflect profound and widespread concern about the condition of American public education. Some states have already responded by taking action on specific reform measures, and others are beginning to consider them as the improved fiscal situation of many states enhances the possibilities for increased state funding of education. In contrast, the Congress has limited its response to resisting further cuts in federal aid to education, rather than initiating broad-scale reform measures to improve public education.

BACKGROUND: The national debate that has been triggered by the recent studies of public education has addressed a broad array of issues such as: improving the quality of teaching, including proposals for merit pay, across-the-board pay increases, and incentive proposals; re-vamping curriculum, including clarifying educational goals, improving proficiency in language skills and other core areas such as social studies, mathematics, science, and foreign languages; providing more hours for instructional time, longer school days, or school years; emphasizing the transition between school and work; promoting civic responsibility; linking computers and technology to educational goals; promoting flexibility in school size and the use of time; and promoting parent and citizen involvement in the public schools.

Although virtually all of the recent studies agree on the areas that need to be strengthened, sharp differences exist over how best to achieve them. For example, would merit pay or overall higher teacher salaries best promote improved teaching? Would longer hours or more flexible use of the school day promote

an improved quality of education? Teachers' groups have advocated reforms that would focus increased resources on the classroom and teacher.

The Administration contends that tougher academic standards, discipline, pay and promotion geared to teacher performance, as well as school prayer, tuition tax credits and vouchers would improve the public schools more than an infusion of federal funds.

Although education experts disagree on the specifics of educational reforms needed, they are united in their criticism of the Administration's cuts in federal funding of public education. On the contrary, education advocates, including the Jewish community relations field, call for maintaining and even strengthening federal aid to education. But it is clear that education advocates, if they are to play a role in the increasingly complex national education debate, must grapple with the various reform proposals under discussion.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 48.)

MEDICARE

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The imminent financial crisis faced by Medicare will make Congressional review of the ailing system a priority in the coming year. The benefit structure, which has been criticized as well, is also expected to be scrutinized by Congress.

BACKGROUND: Recently, the Congressional Budget Office completed a study indicating that Medicare's Health Insurance Fund will be depleted by the end of the decade, and that without changes in current laws, Medicare's cumulative deficit from 1990 to 1995 will exceed \$250 billion. Coming up with proposals to alleviate Medicare's financial crisis is expected to be even more difficult than was devising options for rescuing Social Security, since the dimensions of the Medicare shortfall are even greater. In addition to its concern about the ramifications of the problems of Medicare for the entire nation, the Jewish community is also concerned about the direct effects on the Jewish community itself, both because of the high proportion of Jewish elderly, and because of the impact the system has on Jewish community-supported voluntary health institutions.

Meanwhile, the President has proposed extensive

cuts in Medicare—\$18 billion dollars over the next four years: \$2 billion dollars in fiscal 1985, \$4 billion dollars in fiscal 1986, \$5 billion dollars in fiscal 1987, and \$7 billion dollars in fiscal 1988. This would be accomplished by recycling proposals made last year to hold down payments to doctors and the states, and shifting more of the cost of care to patients by: 1) freezing fees paid to physicians treating Medicare patients at their current levels for one year; 2) introducing a catastrophic health insurance feature into Medicare which would require patients to pay more for the first 60 days of hospital care, and would have the government provide greater protection against the costs of long-term illnesses; 3) increasing the cost of premiums for patients and the amount they must pay toward doctor bills before Medicare contributes.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 48.)

CIVIL RIGHTS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The Administration has opposed race-conscious quotas, which the Jewish community also has strongly opposed. But the Jewish community also has long advocated effective affirmative action programs and effective enforcement of civil rights laws. The Administration is not vigorously pressing either affirmative action or the enforcement of civil rights. The Administration's pattern of cutting funds for key civil rights enforcement areas and weakening enforcement approaches has assumed new urgency in light of that aspect of the Supreme Court's *Grove City* decision which would restrict the coverage of Title IX, prohibiting sex discrimination by recipients of federal education assistance. Although strengthening the enforcement provisions of the 1968 Fair Housing Act remains a priority for civil rights advocates, the momentum for advancing such legislation in Congress has slowed down.

BACKGROUND: While strongly supportive of a comprehensive affirmative action program, the Jewish community relations field has had a long-standing position against the use of quotas, a position shared by the current Administration. But the field also has been concerned when preoccupation with quotas deflects attention from conditions in American society that are more directly responsible for the obstacles in achieving full equality of opportunity. (See "NJCRAC Policy on Affirmative Action", originally adopted by the Plenum in June, 1973, and amended in 1975 and 1981, on the following page.)

While the Administration has moved positively in some areas, such as voting rights, controversy can be expected to continue over the Administration's record on enforcement of existing civil rights statutes. The future of the Legal Services Corporation,

which the Administration has sought to cripple through restrictive regulations, failure to nominate Board members whom the Senate finds acceptable, and severe cutbacks in funding, will continue to be an issue in the coming year. The Administration has similarly cut budgets and key activities of various federal civil rights enforcement agencies, including those of the Departments of Justice, Education, Labor, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In its "Special Analysis of Civil Rights Activities," the Administration stated that civil rights expenditures increased in fiscal year 1984, and thus there was "a substantial increase in the priority accorded civil rights." However, a closer examination of the data indicate that key civil rights expenditures are

(Background continued on page 43)

NJCRAC Policy on Affirmative Action
(originally adopted in June 1973, and amended in 1975 and 1981)

We recognize that past discrimination and other deprivations leave their mark on future generations: that, in the words of the late President Lyndon B. Johnson, "Until we overcome unequal history, we cannot overcome unequal opportunity."

Members of racial, religious, ethnic and other groups have all too often been the victims of such unequal history in our country. American Indians are the victims of the most severe discrimination. By far the largest of the groups are the blacks, whose history in America began in slavery and has been marred—in law as well as in practice—by denial, deprivation and segregation solely because of race. Many Spanish-speaking persons, including Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and other Hispanics, also are grossly discriminated against, as members of a group.

Sex discrimination, too, has long been practiced in our society, depriving women of equality of opportunity.

A just society has an obligation to seek to overcome the evils of past discrimination and other deprivations—inferior education, lack of training, inadequate preparation—by affording special help to its victims, so as to hasten their productive participation in the society.

If it fails to do so, our society will harbor inequality for generations, with attendant increases in inter-group hostility. The security of Jews as a group will not be immune from those consequences.

We reaffirm our support of affirmative actions, by both government and the private sector, that provide:

- a) Compensatory education, training, retraining, apprenticeship, job counseling and placement, financial assistance and other forms of help for the deprived and disadvantaged, to enable them as speedily as possible to realize their potential capabilities for participation in the main stream of American life. The sole criterion of eligibility for such special services must be individual need; the services must not be limited or offered preferentially on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion or sex.
- b) Intensive recruitment of qualified and qualifiable individuals, utilizing not only traditional referral sources, but all those public and private resources that reach members of disadvantaged groups.
- c) An ongoing review of established job and admissions requirements, including examinations and other selection methods, to make certain that they are performance-related and free of bias.

Among the relevant qualifications for certain posts in certain circumstances, a special ability to deal with a particular race or religion or ethnic group or sex may be one. However, we reject the proposition that race, color or ethnicity is a qualification or disqualification for any post.

Merit and Qualification: We believe that individual merit is the touchstone of equality of opportunity. At the same time, we recognize that individual merit is not susceptible of precise mathematical definition and that test scores, however unbiased, are not the only relevant criteria for determining merit and qualifications. Also relevant in determining merit and qualifications are such factors as poverty, cultural deprivation, inadequate schooling, discrimination or other deprivation in the individuals' experience, as well as such personal characteristics as motivation, determination, perseverance and resourcefulness; and we believe that all such factors should be taken into account.

Quotas: Experience has shown that implementation of affirmative action programs has resulted in practices that are inconsistent with the principle of nondiscrimination and the goal of equal opportunity such programs are designed to achieve. We oppose such practices, foremost among which is the use of quotas and proportional representation in hiring, upgrading and admission of members of minority groups.*

We regard quotas as inconsistent with principles of equality; and as harmful in the long run to all, including those groups, some individual members of which may benefit from specific quotas under specific circumstances at specific times.

The government is responsible for vigorously enforcing affirmative action programs. It is equally responsible for preventing abuses in such programs. Measures to help meet these responsibilities must be built into all affirmative action programs. We urge that steps be taken to assure that field personnel are familiar with this policy and comply with its provisions. Grievance procedures should be set up to provide speedy and effective adjudication of all complaints.

We recognize the need for numerical data and statistical procedures to measure and help assure the effectiveness of affirmative action programs. However, such data and procedures must not be used to conceal the application in fact of quotas or other discriminatory practices. Such information must be gathered and compiled without infringing upon the principles of privacy and nondiscrimination.

(continued on next page)

NJCRCAC Policy on Affirmative Action (continued)

Periodic enumerations of work forces or student bodies, based on observation or other techniques, may properly be used to evaluate affirmative action policies, provided that 1) questions concerning race, color, ethnicity, place of birth or religion do not

appear on application forms, 2) individuals are at no time required to identify themselves by any of the above, and 3) no records of any individual's race, religion or ethnic origin are maintained by an employer or educational institution.

**The 1984 NJCRCAC Plenary Session requested that NJCRCAC review the question of court orders directing the use of quotas for specified time periods in cases in which this is deemed by the court the only available remedy for systematic, sustained discrimination. This position was rejected by the NJCRCAC Executive Committee in October, 1981.*

BACKGROUND (continued from page 41)

even lower than they were last year, and the increases are being channeled away from important enforcement programs. For example, although the Civil Rights Commission found that the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) budget for fiscal year '83 was inadequate to fulfill its court-imposed obligations in the *Adams* order affecting higher education desegregation, and that OCR could face a possible contempt ruling, the budget was nevertheless further cut in fiscal year '84.

There has been an easing of enforcement procedures under the Federal Contracts Compliance Programs (OFCCP) which enforces anti-discrimination rules governing firms receiving federal funds. OFCCP has barred only one contractor, as compared with 13 during the previous Administration. Rather than insisting on strict conciliation agreements, the tendency has been to rely on "letters of commitment," or promises to improve. A similar pattern has been evidenced in EEOC.

The February, 1984 Supreme Court decision in the *Grove City v. Bell* case could have far-reaching ramifications. In that decision, the majority held that Title IX's sex-discrimination prohibition applied only to the federally-aided financial assistance program at Pennsylvania's Grove City College, which received Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG), and not to any other programs or activities of the college. Thus, the Court narrowed the scope of coverage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits sex discrimination in any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. The Administration had supported the position taken by the Supreme Court.

The ruling reverses the long-standing federal policy of interpreting Title IX's anti-discrimination prohibitions to cover entire institutions rather than just specific federally-assisted programs or activities. Thus, it raises the fear that many institutions, whose only form of federal aid is student assistance pro-

grams, would be free to practice sex discrimination in other areas such as course offerings and extracurricular activities. Moreover, the decision may have immediate consequences for other federal civil rights laws that use similar language to bar discrimination on the basis of: race and national origin (Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act), handicap (section 504 of 1973 Rehabilitation Act), and age (the Age Discrimination Act of 1975). The Administration already indicated its intention to interpret these laws narrowly in the future, consistent with the Supreme Court's ruling in *Grove City*.

In response to the *Grove City* decision, in April, 1984, the Civil Rights Act of 1984 was introduced in both the Senate (S. 2568) and House (H.R. 5490) with broad bipartisanship sponsorship. Designed to reverse the *Grove City* decision, the legislation would clarify that under Title IX, Title VI, section 504 and the Age Discrimination Act, the term "recipient" refers to an entire institution, rather than only to the program or activity receiving federal aid. Similarly, federal funds could be terminated if discrimination were found within the institution, and not simply in the specific "program or activity." Civil rights advocates maintain that, in light of the *Grove City* decision, existing federal civil rights statutes would be rendered ineffective without passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1984. The House passed its bill, H.R. 5490, on June 26, but at the time of the Joint Program Plan's adoption, the outlook in the Senate was less certain.

The United States Civil Rights Commission continued to be a focus of controversy. The new Commission quickly took a number of actions aimed at reassessing policies of previous Commissions as well as initiating new studies. The question is whether some of these actions represent a negative shift in philosophy and an approach that will undermine the Commission's role as an independent watchdog for the nation in the fulfillment of equal opportunity and equal justice for those who long suffered their denial.

The 98th Congress did not take any action on the Kennedy-Mathias bill to strengthen fair housing enforcement, but fair housing legislation will be pressed

anew in the next session of Congress.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 48.)

NOTE: *The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith dissents from that portion of the Program Plan criticizing the Administration's civil rights record, insofar as it fails to reflect any of the positive steps taken by the Justice Department on such issues as racial quotas, religious discrimination, Sabbath observer rights, sex discrimination and racial and ethnic harassment.*

NOTE: *Women's American ORT asserts that the NJCRAC statement on civil rights and the Policy on Affirmative Action explicitly*

and categorically reject quotas as a remedial measure in affirmative action plans. Women's American ORT takes exception from that view and asserts its approval of the use of court-ordered quotas in cases of proven, prior discrimination. Women's American ORT believes that NJCRAC should acknowledge the clear distinction between quotas designed to exclude specific groups and those designed to provide for those who have been the primary victims of segregation and discrimination in our society.

BLACK-JEWISH RELATIONS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: Relations between the black and Jewish communities continue to be marked by distance, differences and misunderstandings over quotas and the Middle East, and by limited cooperation and lack of familiarity with the full range of one another's domestic agenda. Jesse Jackson's Presidential candidacy, the growing movement of blacks into the political mainstream of electoral politics, and the role of Jews in the election of black mayors in several major cities, call attention to both the strains between the black and Jewish communities and the opportunities for working together.

BACKGROUND: The serious candidacy of a black for the Democratic nomination for President was recognized by the Jewish community as an historic advance toward achieving equal opportunity for all Americans, especially for women and those whose religious, racial or ethnic background have previously represented an overwhelming obstacle to seeking a major party's nomination for President. Predictably, Jesse Jackson's candidacy struck a responsive chord among blacks that galvanized them to provide unprecedented support for his primary campaign, bringing thousands of new black participants into the electoral process.

Regrettably, the nature of Jesse Jackson's positions and campaign also led to new strains in black-Jewish relations. For the first time in the post-World War II era, anti-Semitism was manifested by a major candidate who then failed to respond with a swift and immediate apology, and who long delayed before dissociating himself from the statements (but not the man) of a leading supporter who expressed anti-Semitism, threatened violence, even singled out Adolph Hitler as a "great man" and a model of national leadership, and who referred to Judaism as a "gutter religion." Of equal concern was the perception that such anti-Semitism was not instantly denounced by other Presidential candidates and major national political figures, as political figures have met such anti-Semitism in the past. Jackson's candi-

dacy also led, for the first time, to a major candidate advocating the cause of the PLO and a Palestinian state. But this appeal failed to gain widespread support, except for Arab-Americans who involved themselves in Jackson's campaign.

Jackson's speech to the Democratic National Convention, with its appeal for blacks and Jews to "turn to each other and not on each other", and his apology for causing discomfort, creating pain or reviving fears, seemed to recognize that the intrusion of anti-Semitism in the election campaign had been painful. But a single speech, however impressive and heartening, cannot alone remove the scars inflicted during the eight months of Jackson's campaign. To overcome the bitter divisiveness caused by his campaign, the conciliatory spirit of his Convention speech will have to be reflected in the future speeches and actions of Jesse Jackson.

Jesse Jackson's goal of creating a multi-group "rainbow coalition" failed. His voter support was virtually limited to the black community. This is in sharp contrast to other black candidates for major office, such as the mayors of Los Angeles and Philadelphia, who forged genuine "rainbow" coalitions to achieve their mayoral victories. The Jewish community constituted a prominent element in such multi-group coalitions, providing pivotal votes for black candidates for major office, including Congress and mayor of some of the country's largest cities, such as

Chicago. Such coalitions grow out of the political realities of the multi-group population in major urban centers, and are vital for any successful campaign in these cities.

Consequently, the most promising prospect for rebuilding ties between the black and Jewish communities has been through these electoral coalitions, with black elected officials serving as prime points of contact. The congruity of interests between black elected officials and the Jewish community is reflected in the voting records of members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who have overwhelmingly shown support on issues of the most fundamental concern to the Jewish community and American society, such as foreign aid and "equal access" legislation, for example. The growth of these multi-group coalitions, with prominent black and Jewish participation, also underscores the positive contact that has existed on the local level for many years between the black and Jewish communities, in spite of differences and misunderstandings, nationally, over such issues as quotas and the Middle East, and the limited cooperation and lack of familiarity with each community's full scope of domestic agendas at the national level.

Despite the Jewish community relations field's advocacy of affirmative action and concern over the Administration's attempt to dilute affirmative action requirements, such as standards for federal government contractors enforced by the Department of Labor's Office of Contract Compliance, the Jewish

community relations field's position has tended to be seen by the black community solely in terms of the issue of quotas. These misconceptions are likely to detract from coalition efforts on the civil rights and social welfare goals shared by black and Jewish organizations, especially in light of the long pattern of distance between them. The "Policy on Affirmative Action", originally adopted by the NJCRAC in June 1973 (reprinted in the section on "Civil Rights" on page 42), spells out the comprehensive program of affirmative action long advocated by the Jewish community relations field.

The distance between black and Jewish organizations reflects a growing trend in intergroup relations that cuts across all racial, ethnic and religious groups, and makes successful coalition politics an increasingly difficult goal, as subgroups in American society tend increasingly to focus solely on their agenda, without reference to national goals and in isolation from other groups that may share their concerns and goals. This tendency toward individual isolation can be countered by encouraging efforts on the social welfare agenda of the Jewish community relations field, which mirrors so many goals of the black community. Cooperation should be encouraged on shared issues of concern, such as unemployment, hunger and the homeless, public education, Medicare, health care, housing, the feminization of poverty, and apartheid in South Africa.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 49.)

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The increasing ability of sex equity advocates to call attention to the so-called "gender gap" may have long-term political results, despite the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment by the House in 1983. In 1984, Congress passed two parts of the Economic Equity Act: pension reform, and child-support enforcement legislation.

BACKGROUND: Even though women's rights suffered a stinging blow in 1983 when the Equal Rights Amendment was defeated in the House, passage of some provisions of the Economic Equity Act, aimed at promoting equity for women, was achieved. Advocates shifted away from their original priority of nondiscrimination in insurance, which ran up against massive lobbying from the insurance industry, and successfully garnered support, including that of the Administration, for the pension reform and child-support enforcement provisions of the comprehensive Economic Equity Act.

The pension reform, or pension equity, legislation passed by Congress strengthens the rights of spouses to pensions if a worker dies before the retirement age, and permits workers to leave employ-

ment and subsequently return without suffering a break in service counted for enrollment or vesting (entitlement to receive benefits) in their employers' pension plans.

The child-support enforcement legislation requires states to provide for mandatory withholding from the wages of parents who are behind in child support payments. It also makes state assistance available to all those who request help in collecting child-support payments, going beyond current law which only provides for such assistance to AFDC recipients. The state assistance will be encouraged through federal incentive payments to complying states.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 49.)

VIETNAM VETERANS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The special problems encountered by Vietnam-era veterans, though certainly not a sudden or recent phenomenon, has gained increasing attention, and there is now a growing movement to provide these veterans with the assistance they both need and deserve.

BACKGROUND: Millions of Americans, including Jewish personnel, served with distinction in Vietnam, but the widespread sentiment against the war often resulted in callous and insensitive treatment of the veterans returning from Vietnam. Since the war, many of these veterans have had serious family problems, low job tenure, and other stress-related problems. These veterans, no

less than the veterans of any other American war, deserve assistance in dealing with the variety of difficult post-service problems they have encountered, as well as recognition of the contributions and sacrifices that they made at their country's call.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section start on page 49.)

CONTINUING & URGENT

Immigration

Comprehensive immigration reform legislation had been passed by both the House and Senate at the time the Joint Program Plan was adopted on June 24, 1984. But major differences between the two versions had yet to be reconciled, a Conference Committee had not been appointed, and the final outcome was unclear, with strong resistance to the measure remaining. The Jewish community remains strongly in favor of basic immigration reform, guided by NJCRAC's carefully drawn policy on immigration legislation. That policy, as presented in the 1983-84 Joint Program Plan, included:

- swift, simple and humane amnesty for undocumented aliens who arrived in the U.S. before a specified prior date, with entitlement to national and local government services and full civil rights during any waiting period prior to admission for permanent residence, and support for the current policy of the federal government assuming local costs for services to undocumented aliens;
- an increase in the total number of immigrants allowed into the U.S. under existing immigration statutes, and opposition to the inclusion of immediate relatives under any ceiling;
- a substantial increase in enforcement against illegal entry and a method for deterring employers from employing undocumented

aliens, with adequate safeguards for civil liberties. (NJCRAC takes no position on sanctions.)

- opposition to the concept of guest workers; and
 - ination of judicial review of such processes.
 - full opportunity to fair hearings on requests for political asylum, and opposition to the elimination of judicial review of such processes.
- The 1984 Plenum agreed in principle that the NJCRAC position should also include:
- recognition of the right of sanctuary for political refugees from oppressive regimes, whether or not those regimes are aligned with the U.S.; and
 - opposition to a system of national identity cards.

Full Voting Representation for the District of Columbia

The looming August, 1985, deadline for ratifying the Constitutional Amendment that would give citizens of the District of Columbia *voting* representation in Congress lends special urgency to this issue. Only 14 states have ratified the Amendment so far. Virtually every state legislature will be in session in early 1985, presenting an opportunity to act before the ratification deadline. The 1984 elections provide a propitious context for educating the public and candidates on the issue. The NJCRAC position in support of this Constitutional Amendment was first expressed in the 1978-1979 Joint Program Plan, and a call to support the measure was reiterated in the 1983-84 Plan.

NOTE: *The National Council of Jewish Women does not currently have a position on amnesty for undocumented aliens.*

(continued on next page)

Hispanic-Jewish Relations

The relationship between the Jewish community and Hispanic communities continues to present opportunities for fruitful cooperation. As the 1983-84 Joint Program Plan stated, in part:

"The mobilization of the Hispanic community into a growing political force is a significant factor on the contemporary national political scene. Hispanic Americans constitute the country's second largest and fastest-growing minority. If present trends continue, Hispanics could replace blacks as the nation's largest minority group by the year 2,000—

a projection that has major political implication...

"In some communities, Hispanics are moving rapidly into the political mainstream of electoral politics; in others their numbers do not yet translate into concomitant political influence. Not surprisingly, the cities in which the Jewish community is already engaged in Hispanic-Jewish dialogue are those in which the Hispanic community is most organized politically, providing ready vehicles for that dialogue. But, even in cities where the Hispanic community has not yet been politically well organized, there are growing signs that it is beginning to jell, and that opportunities for local Jewish-Hispanic contacts will increase."

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations field should:

- continue to press for a comprehensive national attack on unemployment, set forth in the goals of the "Emergency Jobs Program of the Full Employment Action Council," as stated in the 1983-43 *Joint Program Plan* (reprinted on page 37);
 - pursue coalition efforts, at the national, state and community levels, with labor unions, business groups, minority groups, women's groups, church groups, community and service organizations, and educational research institutions to educate the public about the scope and causes of unemployment, *particularly the problem of the generationally chronic poor*, and the need for both comprehensive emergency jobs programs and longer-term programs to deal with chronic, structural and technological unemployment;
 - support specific measures to alleviate the economic plight of the unemployed, including continuation of the federal emergency food and shelter program (see section on Hunger and the Homeless) and passage of health insurance for the unemployed and the working poor in the form of an entitlement program, with mandatory state participation;
 - encourage the identification and analysis of various model programs developed in different parts of the country aimed at alleviating the problems of chronic and structural unemployment, with a view toward replicating those that appear most promising;
 - study proposals advanced for a national industrial policy in order to define how such an approach would affect Jewish community relations concerns and goals, and develop criteria for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of various proposals under discussion.
- (for background see pages 36-37.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- increase the Jewish community's awareness about the persistence and social costs of American poverty and deepen its understanding of the problems of the "new poor," the chronic poor, and the feminization of poverty;
 - advocate a comprehensive and vigorous federal, state and local government program to break the cycle of generational poverty, with special emphasis on the problem of the feminization of poverty;
 - undertake efforts to restore essential services in existing social programs that have been severely cut, in addition to defending against further budget cuts;
 - explore proposals for comprehensive reform of the nation's economic assistance programs.
- (for background see page 38.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- engage in educational efforts within the Jewish community to bring about an increased awareness of the need to assist the homeless in the Jewish community;
- join in coalition with other groups in efforts to raise public awareness about the overall problems of hunger and homelessness and the need to press for action to alleviate them;

(continued on next page)

STRATEGIC GOALS *(continued)*

- join with other groups in enlisting business community involvement in efforts to provide direct assistance to the hungry and homeless through participation in programs such as community food banks, feeding programs, and shelter for the homeless, without diminishing efforts to gain critically needed government action;
- continue to oppose any further cuts in federal food assistance programs, and press for repealing cuts enacted in the last two years, and maintaining categorical grants;
- challenge the findings and oppose the recommendations of the President's Task Force on Food Assistance;
- press for continuation and expansion of the federal emergency food and shelter programs;
- encourage the development of programs providing permanent low-cost housing for families and individuals.

(for background see pages 38-39.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- join with other groups in opposing deficit-limiting approaches that further curtail needed social programs, many already crippled by earlier cuts, and in advocating that no program, including the defense budget be immune from careful scrutiny;
- examine, within the framework of Jewish community relations goals, various options to deal with the federal deficit, including adjusting national budget priorities and increasing federal revenues through taxes and other means;
- continue its long-standing opposition to a Constitutional Amendment requiring a balanced federal budget, and especially to the dangerously open-ended scheme of calling a Constitutional Convention to consider such a proposal. (See section on "Constitutional Convention" under Individual Freedom and Jewish Security.)

(for background see pages 39-40.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- examine the various recommendations of studies of public education, using the Carnegie Commission Report as the point of departure, with a view to developing national positions;
- join in coalition efforts with other concerned citizens groups to promote the enactment of those positions, particularly on the state and local level;
- vigilantly monitor federal funding for public education, and press for strengthening and enhancing existing funding patterns to insure funding levels adequate to meet demonstrated needs.

(for background see page 40.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- study the problems of Medicare and options for reform, with a view toward formulating a position. There is initial consensus that any federal reforms should not place an inequitable burden on the elderly or on institutions in the voluntary sector that service them. Further, steps aimed at cost containment should take into consideration the full spectrum of health care programs for the elderly;
- support the creation of a nonpartisan Presidential Commission to review options for revising the nation's Medicare system, similar to the one that studied and recommended revisions in the Social Security System.

(for background see page 41.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- join in coalition with other groups in support of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which would cancel the effect of the *Grove City College* decision by restoring the scope of existing federal civil rights laws to that originally intended by Congress;
- join in coalition with civil rights groups at the national and local levels to support passage of the Kennedy-Mathias Bill to strengthen fair housing enforcement, and give special outreach emphasis to groups particularly affected by the legislation, such as blacks, women, and the handicapped (the bill prohibits discrimination against families with children, and the handicapped);

(continued on next page)

STRATEGIC GOALS *(continued)*

- join in coalition efforts to oppose the elimination or severe weakening of the Legal Services Corporation, both for the needed services it provides the poor and for its advancement of the principle of the rule of law;
- join with others in calling concerned attention to the Administration's record on enforcement of existing civil rights statutes, and its consequences on the basic gains in the field of civil rights over the past twenty years;
- monitor the direction of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in the context of the charge that Congress has placed upon it.

(for background see pages 41-44.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- deepen its awareness of the current and emerging program priorities of the black community, including the agenda of black political leadership, in order to identify potential mutual issues of shared concern;
- make efforts to more vigorously interpret its position in support of comprehensive affirmative action programs that promote equal opportunity, especially to key leadership in the black community, and join with them and others in seeking its implementation;
- seek out, nationally and locally, opportunities to work with the black community on specific issues of shared concern, based on the following guidelines:
 1. Issue-oriented action, based on common concerns, should be advanced, rather than sole reliance on "dialogue," which when divorced from issues is not an effective route for strengthening black-Jewish relations. However, experience shows that misunderstandings cannot be eliminated by joint action projects alone. A dialogue process that builds on shared action efforts would provide a context for the in-depth communication needed to bridge the gaps that have developed;
 2. Efforts should be made to reach out to black political leadership as a means for strengthening black-Jewish relations;
 3. Working with the black community should be within the context of an overall strategy for improving intergroup relations;
 4. Symbolic actions, such as participation in observances of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, and support for making it a state as well as a federal holiday, may have value extending even beyond the symbolic;
 5. Foreign policy issues on which there is agreement, such as opposition to South Africa's policy of apartheid, should be highlighted.

(for background see pages 44-45.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- work in close coalition with women's and civil rights groups to vigorously advocate enactment of the Economic Equity Act, building on the successful passage of its pension reform and child-support enforcement provisions;
- continue to press for adoption of a strong federal Equal Rights Amendment, as well as for equal rights amendments to state constitutions. However, it must be recognized that a federal ERA remains an overriding priority;
- call attention to the "feminization of poverty" (see discussion of "Poverty"), and to the special approaches needed to deal with the problems faced by the female poor, such as provision of day care and other specialized support services.

(for background see page 45.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- join in efforts to provide Vietnam veterans with appropriate assistance, including the continuation of job training, in dealing with the personal post-service problems they have encountered, and should support appropriate recognition of the contributions made by Vietnam veterans.

(for background see page 46.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- continue efforts to support immigration reform legislation, in accordance with the principles stated on page 46, until such legislation is successfully enacted.

Our economy and our culture are so energy-intensive that any alteration in the availability or cost of energy affects every aspect of our national life—employment, food, housing, clothing, transportation, leisure, recreation.

Our diminished, but still substantial dependence on imported petroleum, and the almost total dependence of many industrialized and developing countries—including our close allies—on such sources, tends to affect the flexibility and scope of our government's international relations. The ability of our government to formulate and conduct foreign policy undominated by energy considerations, and without fear of economic reprisal, must be a clear, conscious, and fundamental objective.

As Jewish community relations agencies, we also perceive the prospects for attainment of the domestic social goals to which we are committed as correlated with the resolution of the energy problem—we are aware that the maintenance of harmonious relationships among groups in our society is facilitated by economic well-being and threatened by economic strain.

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The worldwide abundance of oil continued during the past year, resulting in lower prices, and in a continuing weakening of the economic and political power impact of OPEC. Reversing a five-year pattern of decreasing oil consumption, recent figures show an upturn in consumption, and that trend is likely to continue. Neither the Administration nor the Congress, however, seemed willing to advocate and implement policies to which this country was previously committed. Such policies would lessen American dependence on Persian-Gulf oil.

BACKGROUND: With petroleum from new sources, such as Mexico and the North Sea, increasingly on the market, even Western European and Japanese demand for Persian-Gulf oil has decreased, leading to the further weakening of the economic and political power of the oil-producing Persian-Gulf nations. At the same time, indications of economic recovery in the U.S. and the West are harbingers of increasing energy demand, which may result in the flattening-out and even a rise in oil prices in the not-distant future. In addition, there is a reversion among many consumers, and some in industry, to pre-conservation policies that led to higher rates of consumption. Indeed, industry analysts pointed to a rise in the domestic consumption of petroleum for the first time in five years. During the first half of 1984, American oil consumption averaged 15.9 million barrels a day (bpd), up from an average consumption of 15.2 million bpd during 1983.

The Administration has given indications that dependence on Persian-Gulf oil will be allowed to continue. The recent *National Energy Policy Plan*—an Administration document mandated by Congress for submission every two years—appears to resign the U.S. to dependence to some extent on oil supplies from OPEC for at least twenty years, a posture that departs substantially from the goal of reducing American energy dependence that was articulated by the Carter, Ford and Nixon administrations. (As of March, 1984, the U.S. was importing 28 percent of its oil sup-

plies; less than 5 percent of American oil imports are derived from Persian-Gulf sources.) The current *National Energy Policy Plan* reflects the Administration's broader policy stance of allowing market forces full sway, instead of advocating more active policies and initiatives. There have been similar indications from the Administration: attempts were made to cut back funding for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, ending in a compromise with Congress on a fill-rate of 186,000 barrels per day (bpd), down from the 1983 rate of 220,000 bpd; no oil-import-tax legislation was sent to Congress this past year, nor is any likely during the next year; and little emphasis was placed on research and development projects. During the primary elections the issue of Persian-Gulf oil and its broader policy ramifications became a matter of debate, which may be reflected in the Fall Presidential campaign.

At the same time, the U.S. Supreme Court, in an important 5-4 decision, ruled that leases for drilling sites for off-shore oil need not be approved by state agencies. The Court, in the case of *Secretary of the Interior v. California*, in ruling that a state cannot intervene until after a drilling lease is signed, in effect said that the federal government need not consider the environmental concerns of the coastal states when offering oil and gas leases for sale on the continental shelf. In response to this decision, legislation aimed at severely inhibiting future drilling on the continental shelf may be pressed in Congress. The Jewish

community relations field's policy on offshore drilling, as stated in the 1983-84 Joint Program Plan, is "in favor of offshore drilling, with due regard to adequate onshore and offshore environmental safeguards." Legislation on the issue should be evaluated within that framework.

The overall picture continues to be one that indi-

cates an advocacy of steps insuring the long-term lessening of American dependence on foreign energy sources, particularly those from the Persian-Gulf area. These steps would be beneficial both to American, Western, and other allied economies, and would help further our foreign-policy goals.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations field should:

- urge Congress and the Administration to renew the earlier priority emphasis on energy, and to pursue policies that would insure a lessening of America's long-term dependence on foreign oil sources, particularly Persian-Gulf sources;
- renew its emphasis on energy conservation.

To these ends, we reiterate our long-standing positions advocating:

- strong federal measures mandating energy conservation through tax incentives, disincentives, and other means to: (a) raise energy-efficient standards in housing and other buildings, in motor vehicles, industrial machinery, appliances, etc.; (b) recycle, recover and convert waste material; and (c) convert existing machinery and equipment to the use of fuels other than oil;
- filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which includes providing for the necessary storage capacity;
- the encouragement of off-shore drilling, with due regard for environmental safeguards;
- the encouragement of greater use of non-depletive energy sources, including hydro, solar, and wind power, as well as the use of small generating facilities in homes and industry;
- the increased utilization of our enormous coal resources with governmental encouragement of investment in the technology necessary to maintain environmental standards;
- governmental programs to advance the development of synfuels;
- the encouragement of the use of nuclear energy, with due regard for the recommendations of the 1980 Kemeny Commission on the imperative need for strengthening the standards to be imposed on the design, construction, operation, licensing and inspection of nuclear plants, and solving the crucial problems of nuclear-waste disposal;
- the enactment of an emergency oil allocation law.

NOTE: *The National Council of Jewish Women favors a moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants until their safe use, and the safe transportation and disposal of their wastes, are assured.*

JEWISH SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

A long-held principle of community relations is that the security of Jews in America depends not only on the nature and extent of overt anti-Semitism, but also on the strength of the democratic process and those traditions and institutions that foster and protect individual freedom. Therefore, in addition to our concern with manifestations of anti-Jewish attitudes, we must maintain vigilance against threats to an open, democratic, pluralistic society.

ANTI-SEMITISM

CHANGING CONDITIONS: A persistent perception pervades much of the American Jewish community in that anti-Semitism lies as a dormant threat to Jewish security. But the standard measures of anti-Semitic attitudes of the American public continue to indicate a long-term trend of a diminution of overt anti-Semitism.

BACKGROUND: The well-documented assessment of a continuing steady decline in anti-Semitism in America collides with a prevalent perception in the Jewish community that anti-Semitism remains a significant threat, or potential threat, in the U.S. The existence of this phenomenon within the Jewish community has been reported by many practitioners in the Jewish community relations field, and has been corroborated by survey reports. The 1981 study, *Anti-Semitism in the United States*, prepared by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, asserts, "The perceptions of American Jews regarding how non-Jews feel about them is consistently more negative than the beliefs actually expressed by non-Jews". Steven M. Cohen refers to American Jews' "anxieties over the security of their own position in American society" in his *Attitudes of American Jews Toward Israel and Israelis: The 1983 National Survey of American Jews and Jewish Leaders*. Cohen states:

"Despite notable advances in politics, the media, business, academia and other prestigious or powerful spheres of American society, Jews still feel potentially threatened by American anti-Semitism. Over two-thirds (69%) agreed that 'Anti-Semitism in America may, in the future become a serious problem for American Jews.' Only one-third or so gave answers expressing lack of anxiety over the Jewish position in America. Thus, only a third (37%) agreed that 'Anti-Semitism is currently not a serious problem for American Jews,' and a similar number (27%) agreed with the mildly worded statement that 'Virtually all positions of influence in America are open to Jews.'"

In contrast, almost two-thirds (64%) of the leaders surveyed agreed that anti-Semitism is currently not "a serious problem", compared to the only 37% of the cross-section of the Jewish community who took that view.

Despite this perception, the long-term downward trend of anti-Semitism in America is substantiated by impressive evidence, evaluated on the basis of the broad range of indices developed by the Jewish community relations field to assess anti-Semitism—see next page for the criteria, which include measurements of:

- Prevailing attitudes towards Jews;
- Overt acts of aggression against Jews;
- Discrimination against Jews;
- Expressions of anti-Semitism by public figures;
- Organized Anti-Semitic movements;
- Official reactions to anti-Semitism;
- Responses to conflict situations and "risk" social conditions.

This downward trend, found on the basis of these indices, is corroborated by such findings as: Virtually all recent attitudinal surveys, such as the 1981 Yankelovich study, report a steady decline in anti-Jewish responses from national samplings of the American public, and community-level studies, such as last year's survey in Albany, New York. Similarly, measurements of overt anti-Jewish acts, such as the annual audit conducted by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, show a continued decline for a second year in a row, while incidents of anti-Jewish discrim-

(continued on page 54)

Measuring Anti-Semitism

(Reprinted from 1982-83 Joint Program Plan)

There are many ways in which the state of anti-Semitism, and/or the potential for anti-Semitism can be assessed:

1. **Prevailing attitudes towards Jews:** These measurements of American public opinion have been made regularly for about a half century by a number of different agencies, often repeating exactly the same questions. The questions tend to concentrate on negative stereotypes (e.g., "Are Jewish businessmen more dishonest than others?"), on predispositions to action (e.g., "Would you object to a Jewish neighbor?"), and on general feelings (e.g., "Which of the following groups do you dislike?"). Comparing the answers to the same questions from year to year provides some trends for analysis.
2. **Covert acts of aggression against Jews:** These refer to the reported number of anti-Semitic graffiti, vandalism on Jewish buildings, mailed threats and the like. For the most part they are anonymous; and they are signals of *something*. Comprehensive measurements of these phenomena would require a highly systematic and universal system for reporting these acts; but a uniform information-gathering system—such as that being developed by the ADL—which could provide significant trends for analysis.
3. **Discrimination against Jews:** These are more institutionalized forms of behavioral rejection: discrimination in employment, in housing, in places of public accommodation; and any disability for Jews in being appointed or elected to public office. There are some discrete systematic measurements of these phenomena; e.g., trend measurements of Jewish employment in executive positions; numbers of Jewish public officials appointed or elected; cases brought before statutory human rights bodies.
4. **Expressions of anti-Semitism by public figures:** Anti-Semitic expressions by public personalities—whether in politics, journalism, or other realms of public life—are usually given effective currency in the media. Although a systematic monitoring of media could provide some trend measurement, the evidence on this phenomenon has so far been largely impressionistic.
5. **Responses to conflict situation:** Prevailing attitudes towards Jews can be tested sharply by situations of severe conflict or pressure. For example: the oil embargo of 1973-74 and the gasoline lines of 1979 might have triggered sharp anti-Israel attitudes; that they did not, was significant.
6. **Official reactions to anti-Semitism:** Presumably, one index to a society's readiness for anti-Semitism is the extent and the alacrity with which public officials and official bodies, publicly reject any expression or manifestation of anti-Semitism. Although a systematic monitoring of media could capture this phenomenon, it has so far largely been an impressionistic measurement.
7. **Anti-Semitic "mass" movements:** One critical measure of anti-Semitism, although at a somewhat advanced stage, would be the relative growth of any movement for "organized anti-Semitism," such as neo-Nazi groups or the Ku Klux Klan. This growth has been subject to some measurement by law enforcement agencies and others.
8. **Personal experience with anti-Semitism:** This would entail the survey measurement of how many experiences Jews have had personally in a given period with anti-Semitic remarks or actions. There may be some overlap with other measurements. There has been some corroborative survey measurement of these trends, but the evidence is mainly impressionistic.
9. **"Risk" social conditions:** The potential for anti-Semitism is often prognosticated by an assessment of those objective conditions in society that traditionally have created a risk for the growth of anti-Semitism, notably; economic breakdown; intergroup or interclass conflict; and general breakdown in law and order. Indeed, any critical issue that tends to seriously polarize the community, regardless of the subject matter of that issue, must be regarded as a "risk factor." The state of Israeli-American relations has been added to this list. Obviously, no single one of these "measurements," unrelated to the others, can provide a definitive assessment of the state of anti-Semitism at any time.

ination and personal experiences with anti-Semitism also appear at a low ebb. Anti-Semitic comments by public figures are relatively rare.

Presidential candidate Jesse Jackson's "Hymie" ethnic slurs received overwhelming public and media condemnation. However, some aspects of the Jackson campaign, including the prominent role of Black Muslim leader Louis Farrakhan, raised concern about its potential for encouraging anti-Semitism in the black community. Although Farrakhan's outrageous reference to Hitler as a "very great man", his threat against the reporter who revealed Jackson's "Hymie" statements, and his characterization of Judaism as a "gutter religion", were repudiated by Jackson, the candidate resisted repudiating Farrakhan. He did make an appeal at the Democratic National Convention to

blacks and Jews to "turn to each other and not on each other" following an apology, apparently to Jews, for causing discomfort, creating pain or reviving fear. (See discussion in "Social and Economic Justice" section under "Black-Jewish Relations".)

Extremist and anti-Semitic groups exist only on the lunatic fringe. The national debate over the presence of American servicemen in the Middle East, and the loss of over 210 U.S. Marines in the Beirut terrorist attack, did not trigger, as some feared, anti-Semitic or anti-Israel scapegoating. Nor has there been in the United States the widespread use of anti-Zionism as a thin cover for anti-Semitism, as there has been in Western Europe and in international forums.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section appear on page 59.)

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The threat of a Constitutional Convention escalated with the passage of a "Call" by the Missouri Legislature in 1983. With 32 states having already passed such "Calls", ratification by two additional states would mandate the calling of a Constitutional Convention.

BACKGROUND: In the wake of passage of a "Call" by Missouri, a number of states, including California, Washington, Ohio and Vermont are expected to take up the issue in 1985. In Michigan, which was thought to be a "safe" state, the State Senate, in a surprising vote, passed a Constitutional Convention Call, and future consideration by the Michigan House poses the threat of passage by the state. Although the situation varies in each of the states, well-financed forces in support of a Constitutional Convention are gathering increasing strength.

Parallel with these developments is the effort to promote rescission drives, which we welcome, in those states that have previously passed Calls.

In Congress, meanwhile, there have been attempts at legislation supporting the Constitutional Convention campaign. One bill, introduced in the Senate by Senator Orin Hatch (R-UT), would develop specific procedures as a preliminary to such a Convention, and, most disturbingly, would establish a 10-year period during which state Convention Calls would be valid, instead of the usual practice of a 7-year period in which passage of Constitutional Amendments by state legislatures are considered "contemporaneous", and therefore valid in arriving at the total three-quarters of the states needed. Another measure, introduced in the House by Representative Ken Kramer (R-CO), would merge all previous Calls, provide for the calling of a Convention when two more states pass Calls, and would limit the Convention to considering the balanced budget issue, although the absence of any precedents except the first Constitutional Convention (which was to have amended the

Articles of Confederation, but led to the Constitution) leaves open the constitutional question as to whether such Congressional directives that define agenda are binding on the Convention.

The process for amending the Constitution through a Constitutional Convention could render democratic institutions and constitutional safeguards vulnerable to amendment. As the 1979-1980 Joint Program Plan stated:

"Inherent in a constitutional convention is its great potential for sharp, bitter conflict with dangerous consequences to the nature and structure of the United States. Possible results include modifications in the Bill of Rights and an opportunity for every special interest group to seek to revise the Constitution. The pitfalls and potential disastrous consequences of a constitutional convention are among the reasons it has never been used as a method for amending the Constitution."

"There are no laws, rules or precedents for how a constitutional convention would be convened, how it would operate, how and by whom delegates would be selected. It is feared that a convention could not be limited to a single issue but would instead open a 'Pandora's box' of amendments which could drastically and radically change the Constitution that has served this nation so well for nearly two centuries."

Probably the most fundamental question is whether Congress has the constitutional authority to define answers to these questions and any others which could arise. It is not even known whether or not the Convention could bypass Congress and submit amendments directly to the states. Because there are no answers, there would be appeals going back and forth from one branch of government to another and a

constitutional crisis which could do such serious damage that the fabric of American democracy might never be fully repaired."

In addition to opposing the dangerous process of calling a Constitutional Convention, the NJCRAC also opposes, as such, the substance of a Constitutional Amendment to balance the budget on its merits. Such an Amendment would have a chilling

effect on social programs that the Jewish community relations field has long advocated, unfairly and unrealistically transfer the burden of social needs to the states, and seriously impede the ability of Congress to respond quickly to crises.

(Strategic goals flow from this section appear on page 59.)

CENSORSHIP OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

CHANGING CONDITIONS: In the face of vocal Congressional and public opposition, the President rescinded a 1983 Presidential Order that would have imposed life-long, stringent censorship requirements on more than 100,000 federal employees who handle classified information on national security policy.

BACKGROUND: The Presidential Directive of March 11, 1983, which was rescinded in February, 1984, would have required more than 100,000 Americans in government service, and thousands more who succeeded them, to submit to government censorship for a lifetime. Members of Congress, the media, and civil liberty groups charged that it was a flagrant abuse of the First Amendment which would have shielded the government from the exposure of criticism that has been so vital to the strength of the American democratic process. The Directive would have set up a sweeping system of prior restraint affecting federal employees, and could have had a chilling effect on legitimate public discussion of government policies, especially issues of immediate current concern.

Other measures that tended toward tightening censorship were carried out, however. The Administration revoked guidelines developed by the Carter Administration that would have required the government to consider a variety of factors before seeking to enjoin unintentional and possibly meaningless disclosures of information which may have been improperly classified in the first place.

President Reagan also reversed, by Executive Order, the efforts of the Carter Administration to limit the potentially sweeping censorship authority conferred on the federal government. Presidential Executive Order 12356 eliminated the requirement that government officials consider the public's right to know in determining classification; eliminated the requirement that in order for information to be classified it must have identifiable potential damage to national security; failed to provide for automatic declassification, even where the classified information had already been disclosed; authorized the reclassification of previously declassified material; eliminated the requirement that classified material be reviewed for declassification after six years; allowed the classification or reclassification of unclassified material following the receipt of a request for it under the Freedom of Information Act; and developed several new categories of classifiable information.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section appear on page 59.)

RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The jurisdiction for defending the right to reproductive choice has narrowed almost exclusively to the federal level, due to the sweeping nature of last June's Supreme Court *Akron* opinion, which emphatically struck down a variety of state and local attempts to circumvent the Court's decade-old *Roe v. Wade* decision guaranteeing the right to choose abortion. Despite the sweeping nature of the 1983 Supreme Court decision, anti-abortion forces can be expected to continue to relentlessly pursue their goal, in Congress, of severely restricting or prohibiting abortion, either through a Constitutional Amendment or restrictive federal legislation, even though they suffered significant defeats and only limited success.

(continued on next page)

BACKGROUND: In 1983, in a significant vote, the Senate rejected an anti-abortion Constitutional Amendment, sponsored by Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT), that would have permitted the states to regulate abortion. Moreover, the Administration dropped its attempts to impose a "squeal rule" after two appellate courts struck down the proposed regulation that would have compelled federally-assisted birth control clinics to notify parents of teenagers seeking contraceptives.

The tactic of attaching riders to legislation was widely exercised this past year, with Congressional efforts, at attaching stringent anti-abortion riders to legislation such as the Civil Rights Commission reauthorization and health insurance for the unemployed. These efforts failed. Although pro-choice advocates were successful in defeating such riders to non-authorizing legislation, Medicaid funding for abortions continued to be severely restricted through a rider to the Department of Health and Human Services appropriations bill. Moreover, a new restriction that prohibits federal workers from using insurance benefits to cover abortions was passed for the first

time, through a rider to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill.

In addition to possible reconsideration of a Constitutional Amendment, restrictive legislation was introduced by Senator Roger Jepsen (R-IA) and Rep. Henry Hyde (R-IL), and supported by the President. It would assert Congressional findings concerning the protection of the fetus, which would encourage states to pass new anti-abortion laws, and would make permanent the temporary ban on federal funding of abortions.

President Reagan has given renewed emphasis to this issue, and it is likely to become a major issue in the federal election.

(Strategic goals flowing from this section appear on page 59.)

NOTE: *The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America opposes any public policy encouraging abortion, unless sanctioned by Halacha.*

THE DEATH PENALTY

CHANGING CONDITIONS: The sharp increase in the number of executions throughout the country this past year is likely to continue during the coming year and beyond. This reflects the impact of the Supreme Court's 1976 ruling that lifted the Court's 1972 invalidation of all then-existing state death penalty laws, and its ruling in January 1984 in the case of *Pulley v. Harris*, that states may carry out the death penalty without conducting a special review to insure that the sentence is in line with other sentences in the state for similar crimes. Nearly 1,300 prisoners are now on "death row".

BACKGROUND: The carrying out of death sentences in the United States was virtually halted in 1972 after the Supreme Court ruled, in *Furman v. Georgia*, that the prevailing system of imposing capital punishment was so arbitrary that it constituted "cruel and unusual punishment" prohibited by the Eighth Amendment. Subsequently, in the 1976 case of *Gregg v. Georgia*, the Supreme Court clarified, some claim "modified", its position by declaring that "the punishment of death does not invariably violate the Constitution". In light of these decisions, every state that had a death penalty provision rewrote its capital punishment statutes, with a total of 38 states now providing for death sentences under these rewritten laws. An exhaustive process of appeals by almost all inmates on "death row" ensued. Although the first execution in the nation after the *Furman* case came in 1978, it is only now that most of these appeals have reached, or are about to reach, their final stages.

Moreover, there has been a recent trend on the part of a Supreme Court majority to favor curtailing the long appeal processes, with many stays of execution, usually involved in capital cases. Indeed, some observers have noted a mood of "impatience" on the

part of the Supreme Court's majority. Justice Harry A. Blackmun, although sharing the Court majority's view that capital punishment is not necessarily unconstitutional, has objected to the Court majority's "untoward rush to judgment" in denying stays of execution pending further appeals. Thus, an accelerated pace of carrying out the almost 1,300 pending death penalties in the U.S. has already begun, and can be expected to continue during the coming year.

A recently emerging public mood more favorable to the death penalty has also brought renewed focus to the issue. A 1981 Gallup poll revealed that two-thirds of Americans queried endorsed capital punishment, a finding substantiated by every recent public opinion survey. This compares to surveys of only a decade ago, when the public was evenly divided on the death penalty. The new mood of support for capital punishment promises to bring debate in states that now do not provide for capital punishment, or have limited its application. In addition, a bill to re-establish a federal death penalty for treason, espionage, Presidential assassination or attempted assassination, and other crimes, passed the Senate in January, 1984. Companion legislation in the House has been bottled up in a sub-committee of the House

Judiciary Committee, and is not likely to reach the House floor in the 98th Congress. However, the potential danger posed by the measure will continue into the 99th Congress.

The Jewish community relations field, along with most major American religious groups, Jewish, Catholic and Protestant, have overwhelmingly called for abolition of the death penalty. Most mainstream Protestant denominations, such as Episcopalian, Methodist, and Presbyterian, have continued to oppose capital punishment since their declarations against it in the 1950s. The Catholic Church has now become a forceful voice against the death penalty with a definitive statement calling for its abolition overwhelmingly voted by the American Catholic Bishops in 1980. In January 1983, Pope John Paul II spoke out publicly against the death penalty as he called for "clemency or pardon for those condemned to death." Most Jewish religious and secular groups that have addressed the issue have come out firmly against capital punishment. The Jewish community relations field's position, stated in the 1977-78 Joint Program Plan, is reprinted below:

We regard the taking of human life by authority of law as barbaric, repugnant to the traditional Jewish regard for the sanctity of human life.

We remain convinced, as we were in 1973, and as was a majority of the Supreme Court justices in Furman v. Georgia, that capital punishment is not a deterrent to crime. Studies have shown that in contiguous states with similar demographic patterns, crime rates do not differ significantly between those states that provide for the death penalty and those states that do not.

Where discretionary, the death penalty often is imposed differentially upon convicted felons of different races and economic status.

In many cases, mandatory capital punishment defeats its own purpose by making juries reluctant to convict defendants of crimes for which death is the certain sentence, and inducing prosecutors to indict for lesser offenses rather than run the risk of acquittal on capital charges because of that reluctance.

We RECOMMEND that Jewish community relations agencies (a) interpret this position to the Jewish community; (b) disseminate the position publicly in all suitable contexts; specifically, when and if sentences of death are imposed; (c) oppose enactment of state laws imposing capital punishment and support repeal of existing such laws; (d) join in litigations challenging the constitutionality of such laws.

[NOTE: The Jewish War Veterans has no position on capital punishment.]

(Strategic goals flowing from this section appear on page 59.)

CONTINUING & URGENT

The Holocaust

The 40th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps, which will be marked in 1985, should be the focus of major community relations activities during the coming year, in cooperation with survivor and "second generation" groups. The liberation anniversary, with its marking of the role played by the U.S. and allied armies and governments, presents an opportunity for expanding the involvement of the American general community in Holocaust remembrance, and for stressing the universality of the lessons of the Holocaust.

Efforts to perpetuate the memory and lessons of the Holocaust were enhanced during the past year by community efforts to establish local and

regional Holocaust research centers. While this development deserves the active encouragement of the Jewish community relations field, its ramifications also require careful consideration. The proposed national museum to be created by the United States Holocaust Memorial Council in the nation's capital deserves support, both for its own value, and as an encouragement for similar local efforts. Local centers should also aid in ongoing community educational efforts, which should continue to advance the development of public school and college curricula about the Holocaust, as well as special observances on notable dates commemorating the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, Kristalnacht, and other dates memorializing Jewish resistance and martyrdom. This should include participation in the offi-

(continued on next page)

cial government-sponsored observances of the "Days of Remembrance to the Victims of the Holocaust" that are scheduled in all 50 states and hundreds of municipalities, mirroring the national observance under the aegis of the President. Communities should seek to enlist survivors and their children in such activities.

May, 1984, marked the First International Gathering of the Second Generation—the network of children of Jewish Holocaust survivors. It served to focus attention on the need to continue remembrance of the Holocaust, and help to bring members of this "second generation" into groups that could further this work.

Nazi War Criminals

The recent renewal of public interest in the issue of unprosecuted Nazi war criminals, triggered by the infamous Klaus Barbie case and revelations of American complicity in his escape after the war, continued with the revelation of two similar cases. Newly available U.S. Army documents reveal that Robert Jan Verbelen, a Belgian S.S. officer and police commandant who was tried *in absentia* for war crimes and sentenced to death by a Belgian military court in 1947, was employed by American counterintelligence, under an alias, from 1947 to 1956. Verbelen, who still lives in Vienna, was found guilty of 67 charges, including the killing of Jews, and the torture of two American pilots who were then shipped to Buchenwald. Verbelen claims to have organized an American spy network of 100 Soviet-bloc agents in Austria after the war. In another case, Israel asked the Chilean government to extradite Walter Rauf, a former S.S. Colonel accused of inventing and administering mobile gas chambers in which as many as 250,000 Jews were killed. Chile rejected a 1962 request by West Germany to extradite Rauf. Rauf's death, in May 1984, made the extradition issue moot, but left open questions about his escape from Europe and from justice.

The Verbelen case reinforces long-held suspicions that there was a broad pattern of U.S. protection for Nazi war criminals who were employed by the U.S. during the Cold War. The past efforts of the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations that brought these cases to light deserve commendation, but in view of the recent revelations, an intensification of its activities is called

for in the future. A full-scale investigation of the entire pattern of conspiracy, including any possibility of continuing American links to unprosecuted Nazi war criminals, is now needed. The failure of the GAO investigation to produce a report on the matter after two years is a matter of deep concern. The evidence that has already come to light demands a full and searching investigation into the shocking charges that American authorities allowed, and even abetted, the harboring of Nazi murderers in the free world for over three decades.

Broadcast Deregulation

Efforts aimed at deregulation of the broadcast industry continued to be an active issue in the Congress during the past year, with the Administration continuing to press for legislation, the result of which would impede challenges to racist and anti-Semitic radio stations, and would eliminate the "fairness doctrine".

Such legislation, if enacted by the House, would eliminate the comparative-renewal process in license renewals and would thus impede challenges to radio stations, such as KTTL-FM of Dodge City, Kansas, that broadcast material of a racist and anti-Semitic nature.

Legislation was introduced in the Senate (S.1917) during the past year that would repeal the "fairness doctrine" of the Communications Act of 1934. The "fairness doctrine" requires that discussion of public issues be presented on broadcast stations and that each side of an issue be given fair coverage.

More recently, the Federal Communications Commission has engaged in efforts to eliminate the "fairness doctrine" by administrative means. The Commission issued a "notice of inquiry" for the purpose of re-assessing the wisdom of a broadly-based general fairness doctrine, notwithstanding the fact that, at present, the "fairness doctrine" may be mandated by federal statute. The Jewish community relations field should continue to resist legislative and administrative efforts at deregulation of the broadcast industry, which would impede challenges to license renewals of anti-Semitic or racist stations, and eliminate the fairness doctrine, equal-time provisions, and the personal-attack rule.

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Jewish community relations field should:

- maintain its careful monitoring of anti-Semitism;
- condemn in clear and forceful terms any injection of anti-Semitism into political campaigns and call upon candidates to disassociate themselves unequivocally from all supporters who are affiliated with anti-Semitic organizations or whose public expressions reflect anti-Semitism;
- initiate educational efforts to sensitize opinion molders in the general society to the dangers to American democracy posed by anti-Semitism;
- emphasize the fostering of intergroup coalitions to undertake educational efforts against anti-Semitism and all other forms of bigotry and discrimination;
- encourage studies which assess the nature and extent of overt anti-Semitism, anti-Semitic attitudes and anti-Jewish discrimination, both nationwide and locally;
- deepen the understanding within the Jewish community of criteria for measuring anti-Semitism;
- foster dialogues between Jewish community leadership, and the grass roots of the Jewish community, on perceptions of anti-Semitism and the criteria for assessing it;
- establish and maintain ongoing relationships with law-enforcement agencies, including local police departments, district attorneys or county prosecutors, etc., to increase their responsiveness to recognizing and investigating incidents of anti-Semitic vandalism and violence as "bias" crimes, and actively prosecuting perpetrators of such crimes;
- call public attention to the continued existence and activities of extremist groups, and the need to combat them.

(for background see pages 52-54.)

The Jewish community relations field, focusing on key states, should:

- give a high priority to national and state coalition efforts with like-minded groups to oppose the Call to a Constitutional Convention, with emphasis placed on outreach to the press, church groups, and minority legislators;
- support the rescinding of calls for a Constitutional Convention in those states that previously approved them;
- oppose legislative measures in Congress designed to further the calling of a Constitutional Convention, especially any attempts to extend the time period in which Convention Calls passed by states would be considered valid;
- undertake educational efforts to counter studies arguing the merits of a Constitutional Convention.

(for background see pages 54-55.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- continue to vigorously oppose censorship, based on the long-standing NJCRAC guidelines, and actively advance the cause of freedom of information as a cornerstone of the democratic process;
- continue to oppose any attempts at instituting governmental censorship, such as those contained in the rescinded Presidential Directive on Safeguarding National Security Information, in coalition with other groups concerned about the potential for undermining the First Amendment guarantee of free speech and unnecessarily squelching legitimate discussion of national policy issues.

(for background see page 55.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- continue, in concert with pro-choice groups, to oppose attempts to restrict the right of reproductive choice on both the federal and state levels.

(for background see pages 55-56.)

The Jewish community relations field should:

- oppose, in coalition with other groups, attempts at both state and federal levels, to re-establish or expand the use of capital punishment, and support efforts to repeal existing death penalty statutes.

(for background see pages 56-57.)

APPENDIX

1944-1984: OUR ROLE IN THE BUILDING OF A NEW AMERICA

Chair's Address, by Jacqueline K. Levine

*Plenary Session, National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council
Washington, DC—February 27, 1984*

In the winter of 1944, when NJCRAC was created, in Pittsburgh, at the General Assembly by the Council of Jewish Federations, the world was in darkness. We cannot recall that period without remembering and, yes, even feeling the sense of helplessness and powerlessness in the face of the horror of the time: the conscious, systematic, deliberate, extermination of the Jews of Europe. The year in which we were founded was 1944, but in fact humanity was experiencing 1984. It was that period, not today, which represented the ultimate expression of the totalitarianism that Orwell was to describe four years later. The peoples of Europe were under the evil sway of one man, who exercised complete domination over their thought, expression and behavior through modern technology and modern management. The norm of that society was cruelty, and the forces of darkness of Nazi Europe were paralleled by those of the Soviet Union, totally dominated by another brutal, paranoid dictator. It was not fiction; 1944 was 1984.

In that world, the United States represented hope, light, and freedom. But even this arsenal of democracy, this giant among nations had cracks in its armor. Japanese-Americans were interned in relocation camps, and there were no protests, no demonstrations. We were on the brink of the era of witch hunting during which careers, even lives, were destroyed while high government officials, Congress, and the media were intimidated into silence. Further, more than 80 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, and the subsequent adoption of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, black Americans suffered the most brutal forms of segregation and oppression in the south, and in the north as well. Lynching was still not an uncommon occurrence in American society, and anti-lynch laws could not even reach the floor of Congress for a vote.

We as an American Jewish community suffered the indignities of anti-Semitism, even as this nation fought the ultimate expression of anti-Semitism in Europe. Personal humiliations were common and endemic, but the suffering went beyond personal hurt. Jews suffered discrimination in higher education. Quotas were part of the American way of life. Jews were denied employment in major corporations. Restrictive covenants, enforced by law, denied them housing in certain areas. Discrimination in resorts was commonplace. The most extreme anti-Semitic groups enjoyed widespread popular support, and their echoes could be heard in the halls of Con-

gress and in state legislatures. Father Coughlin broadcast his anti-Semitic slanders, every Sunday, while Charles Lindbergh praised Nazi Germany.

We Jews lived in a Protestant America, and most particularly, this was evident in our public school system. In the daily routine of schools we were reminded, through prayer and Bible reading, that this was a Christian nation.

We were an immigrant Jewish population, preoccupied with the struggle to meet the needs of our families amidst economic disaster. The challenge to the Jewish community then was to enable individual Jews to enter that society, not on how to maintain Jewish identity in a free, open, and voluntary society. The challenge for us then was to hold America to its promise of dignity and equality.

Changing Fundamental Conditions

It was in that world and at that time that four national agencies—the American Jewish Congress, American Jewish Committee, Jewish Labor Committee and Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith—and fourteen Jewish community relations councils were joined together at the initiative of the federation movement to create the NJCRAC, or as it was then known, NCRAC—the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council.

We were called into being at the nadir of Jewish survival. But we were also, in 1944, at the dawn of a new era. It was to radically alter the nature of Jewish life in ways only scarcely imagined during the 2,000 years of the diaspora, and to revolutionize the nature and character of American society. Our network of agencies played a vital role in bringing about these revolutionary changes. We were to operate on the premise that the security of the American Jewish community was ultimately dependent upon the strength of the American democratic system and we envisioned a society which would enable ethnic, religious, and social groups to fulfill their own distinctive aspirations on a voluntary basis. As a Jewish community relations field, we were not satisfied with a society, however tolerant and benevolent, which continued to remind us of our place in a Christian America. We insisted upon more than toleration. We had to be an integral part of American society while maintaining our own distinctiveness, in order to function as the non-conformists which we were, and are. We wanted a society which was open to non-conformity, in which, in Horace Kallen's words, there was "equality of the different," of different social groups and cul-

tures as well as of different individuals.

We wanted opportunity in the areas of employment and education and in all other arenas in which Americans competed. We wanted to be judged solely upon the bases of our own individual capabilities. We wanted a society in which the state and its instrumentalities were totally neutral among religious beliefs, and also between belief and non-belief.

To achieve such a society we looked to the foundation of American liberties, to the Bill of Rights, and particularly to the First Amendment. We sought to translate the Bill of Rights into the reality of American life. We recognized that the realization of the American creed could not be achieved by exhortation alone, but required the sanction of law, which also served to set the standard of what was expected of all Americans. Our goal was not public relations, or good will, or love, which we would have welcomed, then as now, but our due as American citizens: those fundamental rights of equality to which every American as an individual was entitled. We understood that those rights were indivisible. They could not be enjoyed by some, and denied to others. The strategy for assuring the security of the Jewish community was correct in the 1940s, and it is still correct in 1984.

It led our field into partnership with the NAACP in developing a total package of civil rights legislation: fair employment practices, fair housing practices, fair education practices, laws and state and city commissions on human relations. Although focused upon discrimination suffered by Jews, we knew that our goals had to be universal ones, concerned for the rights of all people in the society.

We knew then, as we know now, that we alone could not achieve our aims, that coalitions were essential. Nationally we joined with the NAACP in creating the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. In communities in all parts of the United States, CRCs took the lead in creating similar coalitions, generally called human relations councils.

The initial successes were achieved on the community level, but nationally, Southern power in the Congress and the use of the filibuster were insurmountable obstacles. So state-by-state, city-by-city, law-by-law CRCs were in the vanguard of creating in the 1940s and 1950s the infrastructure of civil rights legislation that led to the historic acts of Congress in the mid-1960s.

If one were asked to identify the singular contribution of the American Jewish community to the making of American democracy, the answer would have to be that, just as we built the infrastructure of civil rights laws, so did we play a vital role in giving life to the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is, as Madison and Jefferson envisioned, the cornerstone of our liberties, guaranteeing the separation of church and state, the supremacy of conscience, freedom of belief, freedom of speech, and freedom of the written word.

By the early 1960s the separation principle was being enforced in case after case by the Supreme Court.

Those historic Court opinions reflected what we as a Jewish community relations field argued in our many briefs in the 1940s and the 1950s. No longer would our children be subjected to daily religious rituals in the public schools which affected their image and status as Americans and as Jews. As a result of those landmark decisions, we are a different Jewish community living in a different America.

Our dream of the kind of nation we wanted was nurtured in the *shtetl*, but it coincided with that of the 18th century political philosophers who shaped the character of this nation. We were the children of the Age of Enlightenment. We were the spiritual heirs of Jefferson and Madison.

We helped radically alter the demographic nature of American society in our single-minded drive to repeal the racist barriers to immigration, established in American law at the height of the power of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. That infamous law cost thousands of Jewish lives in the 1930s. We fought bitterly against its codification in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952, but we lost, despite President Truman's veto. But we were not content to accept the issue as settled. Supported by such great Senators as Herbert Lehman, we fought to keep the issue alive in the 1950s, when few others cared. In bill after bill in the gloom of the 1950s, we set forth the ideals which we knew had to be enacted into American immigration law.

Following our practice, we in the Jewish community relations field, together with a few other close friends, forged a new coalition which was to be called the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, today the National Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Forum. We acted almost alone until 1960 when a young candidate for President picked up our banner and the issue once again became a priority concern. By 1965 the repeal of the vicious national origins quota system was overwhelmingly approved by the Congress.

These were not small, peripheral or marginal changes. They changed the face of America, and because of them, we can speak and act more effectively today, as a strong secure Jewish community, on behalf of not only American Jews, but of Jews abroad who are endangered by oppression or besieged by Arab armies.

By the 1960s we had become a new, indigenous American Jewish community, radically different in profile from that Jewish community of 1944. We were primarily native-born; exceptionally well-educated; affluent; secure; articulate; fully integrated into American society, yet proudly identified as a Jewish community. And, our use of political power became ever-more sophisticated.

Advocacy of Soviet Jewry Cause

These changes which had evolved over the course of a generation coincided with a major shift in the priorities of the Jewish community relations field. We had been preoccupied with our status as Americans

and the status of our fellow Americans, especially the black community. As threats to our security as American Jews diminished, we were moved in new directions as a result of threats to the security of our fellow Jews abroad.

We had never lost consciousness of our brothers and sisters in the Soviet Union. In the nightmare of the Holocaust we knew of their terrible suffering, of the blood of Jews which flowed in Babi Yar. We did not forget them in the "*schwartzte yoren*"—the black years from 1948-1953 under Stalin. We stood by, virtually helpless, as we witnessed them being murdered; disappearing; imprisoned in forced labor camps. We watched the destruction of once-great Jewish institutions—Jewish schools, Jewish theatres, Jewish papers, Jewish culture. We saw synagogue after synagogue closed.

We were not inactive. We tried to ameliorate their plight, albeit discreetly, but we were not successful. Even after Stalin, Jews fulfilled their traditional role as scapegoats. They were "chosen" for execution for economic crimes that were endemic in the Soviet Union, as instructive lessons to all Soviet citizens. They suffered a government-directed anti-Semitic campaign manifest as in Kichko's notorious book until it was withdrawn by worldwide outrage. For a time they were even barred from the baking of matzah for Passover.

The Jews of the Soviet Union were cut off from their past and denied their future. They were cut off from Jewish life abroad, except for the presence in Moscow of the Embassy of Israel. They were discouraged from being Jews, and were not accepted into significant sectors of Russian life. They were cultural amnesiacs, atomized, isolated and alienated—seemingly forgotten. And they were barred from leaving—fewer than 100 Jews a year were able to get out. They were a frightened and intimidated Jewish community without hope.

In the face of all this, we as an American Jewish community, particularly in the Jewish community relations field, could no longer rely on discreet channels to petition for Soviet Jews. This new Jewish community of the 1960s was no longer the powerless Jewish community of an earlier generation. We chose to challenge the Soviet Union in the marketplace of ideas. We would focus the spotlight of public opinion on the Kremlin's malevolent repression of Soviet Jews. We acted on the audacious belief that public denunciations in this country would lead the Soviet Union to modify its policies against the Jews. What madness!

In response to the passionate appeals of Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel and demands from communities, American Jewish organizations convened and then established the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry as a permanent body, with NJCRAC staffing it from 1965 until 1970 when the very success of the effort began to overwhelm our limited resources. That led to the creation of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry as the successor

body, and to the very special relationship between NJCRAC and the National Conference which exists to this day.

In that campaign of the 1960s the invisible Jews of the Soviet Union became an issue on the international agenda. That was our first achievement. We aroused the consciences of men and women—Sartre; Simone de Beauvoir; Bertrand Russell; Martin Luther King. Even the Communist parties of France and Italy took note of their plight. We placed the matter on the agenda of the United States government. All American diplomatic channels were to be used by our government on behalf of Soviet Jews.

This led to a significant response from the government of the Soviet Union, which anticipated immigration developments when Kosygin publicly signaled a crack in Soviet emigration policy at the end of 1966.

Most important, we renewed the link with Soviet Jews, and thereby ended their isolation. American Jews and Soviet Jews touched each other through our public expressions of outrage, so that by 1969 the Jews of the Soviet Union were engaged in incredible acts of courage in publicly petitioning for their rights under Soviet law and constitution. In the very shadow of the Kremlin, in unprecedented actions, they demanded the right to return to their national Jewish homeland. Those exceptional acts were to become routine in the decade that followed.

The Soviet Union responded with an iron fist, but they could not quell the Soviet Jewish freedom movement. They had to accommodate it as well. The 1970s saw the incredible movement from the Soviet Union of thousands of Soviet Jews, which we would not have dared to dream in 1964. But we also witnessed thousands more applying for visas to Israel, only to be denied that fundamental human right.

The redemption of Soviet Jews was a miracle which was achieved not through the power of the sword, but through the righteousness of our words. We accomplished this miracle by being single-minded in our efforts, isolating this issue from all other issues which referred to the Soviet Union. Our demands were not revolutionary; we did not seek a change in the Soviet system. We called upon the Soviet Union to fulfill the commitments of the Soviet Union's Constitution and of international treaties to which it was a signator.

Our strength lay in our ability to take the long view, knowing that this struggle would not end in a day or a week or a year or a decade. In the perspective of these past 20 years, our determination has not weakened. We will continue the struggle through the balance of the eighties and, if necessary, through the balance of the twentieth century.

We know that the combined courage of Soviet Jews and our efforts in the West shall lead to the time when thousands more will emerge from the Soviet Union to recite the deeds of the Jewish people in the land of Israel, and rebuild their lives in the West.

Fostering U.S. Support for Israel

Our generation of Jews have been blessed with miracles, unlike any other generation in the last two thousand years. And the most miraculous miracle of all was the creation of the State of Israel in 1948. After two thousand years, after endless persecutions, after the anguish of the Holocaust, the Jewish state was reborn, as if out of the ashes of Auschwitz. Prayers uttered day after day, century after century, were finally fulfilled. The dream became reality. Those prayers, and those dreams, were fulfilled by the exceptional bravery and idealism of Jewish *chalutzim*, nurtured in the *shtetl*, and tested in the swamps of the Galilee, and then on the battlefields against armies of more than a hundred million Arabs.

The Jewish state, formally declared in 1948 although its infrastructure was already firmly in place, desired only to live in peace with its neighbors. For peace, it was ready to make all kinds of accommodations, and compromises, including territorial concessions. But the readiness to accommodate, before and after 1948, was answered by the Arab states in "holy war"—*jihads* aimed at the destruction of the State of Israel. Only Egypt has broken from the unending Arab path of warfare against Israel, and poor Lebanon, which tried, but now is broken.

In 1948 Israel was besieged, but not alone. The family of nations had welcomed her into their midst. The United States was the first to recognize Israel, and even the Soviet Union joined in supporting her creation. By the mid-1950s Soviet weapons of war were flowing into the Arab world on a massive basis to spur them on in their determination to drive Israel from the Middle East. The flow of Soviet arms has continued, almost uninterrupted, to this very day.

The values which led the nations of the world to vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations for the creation of the State of Israel were soon corrupted by oil and petrodollars. In the course of time, Israel stood almost alone but for the special relationship with the United States.

As the role of the United States became increasingly critical to the security and survival of the State of Israel, the Jewish community relations field, year-by-year, steadily increased its emphasis on American foreign policy in the Middle East. Our priorities and role were clearly defined for us by May 1967, when Israel was threatened by new Arab oppression and rebuffed by her closest ally, France, leaving the United States as the only major power in support of Israel. No longer did we rationalize our role as we did in the early fifties, in terms of responding to the community relations consequences of the Middle East. Our responsibility was clear: the security and survival of the State of Israel.

We have had no choice since 1967 but to devote maximum resources and efforts to assure the strong support of the United States for Israel. Tragically, the Arab states did not respond to the olive branch extended by Israel immediately upon the conclusion of

the Six-Day War. Rather, they continued on their relentless, senseless destructive path of war: wars of attrition, terrorism, the Yom Kippur War, and the oil embargo. The response of the world, except for the United States, was at best indifference and at worst treachery, indeed, anti-Semitism, in the United Nations, and cynical and perfidious policies of Western nations such as Britain and France.

As we meet today, the relationship between Israel and the United States is as good as it ever has been. But we in the Jewish community relations field know full well the complexity of that relationship and try to avoid wild swings between euphoria or despair in our assessments of U.S. policy. We know that the United States does have a firm commitment to the survival and security of Israel, and that that commitment is based on a special affinity with Israel in terms of its values and aspirations as well as a recognition of a congruity of strategic interests. That commitment, we are convinced, is strong and enduring, though constantly tested by oil and petrodollars.

So, our focus has been on public policy. It is within that framework that we assess public attitudes and the media treatment of the Middle East. We set for ourselves clearly defined public policy goals, and we have resisted being deflected, even when overwhelming anxieties of many in the Jewish community would have altered our course and priorities. As you may recall, we were thus pressed in the winter of 1973-74 during the oil embargo, and the summer of 1982 in the war in Lebanon. The wisdom of the course we set has been demonstrated in the perspective of time. Our success in dealing with the Middle East grows out of our knowing where we wanted to go and why.

Of course, United States policy is not a function of what we have accomplished alone. We, above all, understand that our nation has been receptive to our appeals because of its affinity with Israel. We have been effective because the Jewish community, in all of its varied segments, has consistently joined together in pursuing the goals we have set for ourselves. We have been effective because our concern for Israel is consonant with America's interests, America's values, America's aspirations. We have spoken in that language because we, as American Jewish community relations agencies, are rooted in American society, even as we are rooted in the stream of Jewish history. It has led us to develop the skills and understanding so necessary in this complex arena—skills which will continue to be called upon until peace finally comes to the Middle East, a peace which Israel, American Jewry, and the United States fervently desires.

Cooperation in the Common Cause

In the perspective of these forty years, our achievements on both domestic and international agendas have been extraordinary, and they were achieved by the Jewish community relations field as a whole. Each agency, national or local, made its own special contribution. They represent the collective efforts of

agencies, each functioning in its own particular way.

No one agency could have achieved this alone. It could only have been accomplished by our network of agencies, national and local, working as a harmonious whole. They did not function in isolation, in a state of anarchy, each acting as it chose to without reference to the efforts of the others. As a field, through the NJCRAC process, we have consciously, deliberately joined together in reaching agreement on the priority issues of Jewish community relations. We determine the positions we should take on those issues, the strategies, approaches, and programs best calculated to advance them, and the best means for improving the methods, approaches and techniques of the field. Together we designed the blueprints of our joint efforts. Together we celebrate our successes.

We were able to do this because our constituents are committed to the common cause. They *do* believe in *k'lal Yisrael*. They *do* believe in the unity of the Jewish people. Toward that higher goal, agencies, again and again, have demonstrated a readiness to subordinate their own institutional interests. The result is all that we have seen achieved in these past forty years.

But this process of cooperation has worked because we in NJCRAC also recognize the distinctiveness of each agency. We respect the autonomy of each agency. We recognize that the cooperation extended by agencies to each other through the NJCRAC process can be based only on voluntarism. That respect for the autonomy and distinctiveness of our member agencies and our appreciation of the pluralistic character of the Jewish community has been essential to our effectiveness. NJCRAC's charge was to serve as a "consultative, coordinating, and advisory council," not as a functional agency, separate and apart from our member agencies.

Over the years there have been those who urged that the field could be more effectively organized through a strong, central, functional, monolithic, national body. Even were it possible to create such an instrumentality, I believe that such an agency could not have achieved the results of these four decades. It would not have reached the diverse constituencies that make up the Jewish community which are critical to our effectiveness. Nor would it have fostered the varied expressions of Jewish life so vital to the creative survival of the Jewish community in America. To the extent that those varied expressions are diminished, is the extent to which we will become a sterile Jewish community.

That unique process that the Council of Jewish Federations created forty years ago of joining communities and national agencies in partnership on the basis of pluralism, unity and voluntarism has well served the American Jewish community and American society.

Yet we cannot pretend that there have not been severe strains and tensions in the process of achieving full cooperation among community and national

agencies. Even in these forty years, we still do not have the whole-hearted trust and mutual respect that is so necessary to the fulfillment of our common cause. While being the strongest advocates for working in coalition in the general community on a broad range of issues, Jewish community relations agencies, national or local, at times still shrink from giving fully to that ongoing process that coalesces the resources of the Jewish community for the common weal. Such a coalition is absolutely essential to the goals of the Jewish community. Ad hoc responses are not sufficient, nor is a body made up solely of national agencies or a faction of those agencies. A coalition made up only of community agencies would not be responsive to the needs of the Jewish community. Our strength as a field is in the unique partnership of national and community agencies. Of course, there will be conflicts of interests among agencies, but through "true and considerate regard by all," as it is written in our Statement of Purposes, for the opinions of each agency and for the joint judgments reached together, we can respond to the common cause and still respect the integrity and autonomy of each agency as we have done.

The process of cooperation and mutual trust can always be strengthened through our own internal deliberations. As a modest, yet I believe, important step in that direction, I will appoint a small committee to reflect upon how we are fulfilling our Statement of Purposes. This committee, balanced between national agencies and communities, will consider together how we are meeting our defined charge. I am pleased to announce that Raymond Epstein has accepted the Chairmanship of this committee. Its point of departure will be these 40 years of experience which have worked; its charge will be how to assure our continued effectiveness in meeting the challenges of the balance of the 20th century.

Challenges in the Future

What are those challenges? Our recitation of what we have achieved might make it appear that we have conquered all frontiers. But if everything is so good, then why is it so bad?

As I have indicated, what we did achieve is little short of a miracle in regard to Soviet Jews, but that very accomplishment underscores the enormity of the task which lies before us. The basic principles which guided us in bringing out thousands of Soviet Jews were effective in the past, but will they work for us in overcoming the crisis of the present? The time may have come for a major reassessment conference to re-examine the premises of our efforts of these past two decades. We may very well arrive at the conclusion that those principles are still valid and that what is required is the readiness to persevere over the long haul. But we do have an obligation to submit them to a re-examination. Thus, I propose that we consider holding a reassessment conference on the premises and strategy for Soviet Jewry with the

cooperation of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry.

In regard to Israel, we pray that, before this century ends, indeed before this decade ends, we shall see peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Four decades of Arab intransigence does not encourage such hope. A new Sadat is not on the horizon and we are likely to face more threats to Israel's security and survival. The future of Judea and Samaria (the West Bank) will remain open, and it will continue to test the unity of the American Jewish community and possibly of U.S.-Israeli ties. We may be called upon to give increased attention to the nature of Israel as a Jewish state in which all Jews have a profound stake, and also to the manner in which religious pluralism is permitted to express itself in Israel.

In many ways the international agenda may be clearer for us than the domestic agenda. In these forty years the nature and extent of individual freedoms have radically expanded in America, particularly through Supreme Court decisions. Nevertheless, the new technology and new roles of government may pose serious threats to individual freedoms.

As much as we welcome the expansion of individualism, we should recognize that it may be fostering a stress on individualism that is not responsive to community, eroding the sense of national purpose and national will, internationally and domestically, and weakening the family unit and group cohesiveness including that of the Jewish community.

Eighteen years after the passage of comprehensive civil rights legislation, we continue to pay a terrible price for the legacy and consequences of 300 years of slavery and segregation. The problems of the permanent underclass appear to be virtually intractable. They seem to be invisible in the affluence that is enjoyed by a majority of Americans. Today we see broadside attacks on voluntary and court-ordered efforts to eliminate these legacies of segregation and discrimination. We see the poor ravaged by the effects of cuts in social programs and the depression which swept their communities. A national consensus to confront these enormous problems continues

to elude us, and the prospects for a national assault on these issues in the decade ahead are dim, although failure to act can endanger the social fabric of this nation.

I am not among those who foresee a disappearing Jewish community as we move towards the end of the 20th century. But we do have to ask ourselves what kind of Jewish community we will be as we move into the 21st century. The moral imperatives of economic and social justice, which were part of the muscle fiber of the Jewish community relations field in earlier years, tragically seem to grow weaker as a driving force in Jewish life. They are further diminished by the fact that many Jews who are moved by a sense of social justice are not conscious of the Jewish roots of their value system. Today they may do what is right, but they are unable to transmit that precious heritage to the next generation. Only when Jews consciously act out those values as Jews, only when they are aware of the Jewishness which motivates them, can they preserve these values. Otherwise, they will disappear, along with those "good people" who see their Jewishness as marginal to their existence.

We as a Jewish community relations field are not prophets or preachers. We are practitioners who have the ability to mobilize the Jewish community in the common and good cause. But we provide the channels by which Jews, as Jews, can act on the fundamental issues that confront society, and in our so doing we can foster a Jewish consciousness that preserves our heritage. We serve as the vehicles for preserving the best that is Jewish and, as we do so, we also preserve the best that is American. But we must once again be on the cutting edge. We must once again address the critical issues of this nation as we did in our earlier years. We must be neither resigned nor passive in the face of age-old evils, nor inured to the scabrous ugliness of poverty, to the scourge of war or to hatreds directed against those who are different. That is what our Judaism mandates. That is what being "a good Jew" means. That is what NJCRAC is all about.

NJCRAC Staff

Charney V. Bromberg

Associate Director

Abraham J. Bayer

Director, International Commission

Jerome A. Chanes

Program Associate for Domestic Concerns

Jerome L. Levinrad

Director of Leadership Development

Paul Minkoff

Director of Public Information

Marlene Provizer

Director of Domestic Concerns

Irwin Schulman

Senior Community Consultant

Fredelle Z. Spiegel

*Director, Campus Advisory Committee
of the NJCRAC Israel Task Force*

Barry Weise

Director, Ethiopian Jewry Desk

Dov S. Zakheim

Administrator/Comptroller

NATIONAL JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

NATIONAL AGENCIES

American Jewish Committee
 American Jewish Congress
 B'nai-B'rith—Anti-Defamation League
 Hadassah
 Jewish Labor Committee
 Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.

National Council of Jewish Women
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
 United Synagogue of America—Women's League
 for Conservative Judaism
 Women's American ORT

Local, State and County Agencies* and their Locations

ALABAMA

BIRMINGHAM JCC
ARIZONA

GREATER PHOENIX Jewish Federation
 TUCSON CRC of the JCC
CALIFORNIA

GREATER LONG BEACH AND WEST ORANGE COUNTY Jewish
 Community Federation
 LOS ANGELES CRC of Jewish Federation-Council
 OAKLAND Greater East Bay JCRC
 ORANGE COUNTY Jewish Federation
 SACRAMENTO JCRC
 SAN DIEGO CRC of United Jewish Federation
 SAN FRANCISCO JCRC
 GREATER SAN JOSE JCRC
CONNECTICUT

GREATER BRIDGEPORT Jewish Federation
 GREATER DANBURY CRC of Jewish Federation
 GREATER HARTFORD CRC of Jewish Federation
 NEW HAVEN Jewish Federation
 EASTERN CONN. Jewish Federation
 GREATER NORWALK Jewish Federation
 STAMFORD United Jewish Federation
 WATERBURY Jewish Federation
 JCRC of Connecticut
DELAWARE

WILMINGTON Jewish Federation of Delaware
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GREATER WASHINGTON JCC
FLORIDA

SOUTH BROWARD Jewish Federation
 GREATER FORT LAUDERDALE Jewish Federation
 JACKSONVILLE JCC
 GREATER MIAMI Jewish Federation
 GREATER ORLANDO Jewish Federation
 PALM BEACH COUNTY Jewish Federation
 PINELLAS COUNTY Jewish Federation
 SARASOTA Jewish Federation
GEORGIA

ATLANTA Jewish Federation
 SAVANNAH Jewish Council
ILLINOIS

METROPOLITAN CHICAGO Public Affairs Committee of Jewish United Fund
 PEORIA Jewish Federation
 SPRINGFIELD Jewish Federation
INDIANA

INDIANAPOLIS JCRC
 SOUTH BEND Jewish Federation of St. Joseph Valley
 JCRC of Indiana
IOWA

GREATER DES MOINES Jewish Federation
KANSAS

KANSAS CITY, see Missouri
KENTUCKY

LOUISVILLE Jewish Community Federation
LOUISIANA

GREATER NEW ORLEANS Jewish Federation
 SHREVEPORT Jewish Federation
MAINE

PORTLAND Southern Maine Jewish Federation—Community Council
MARYLAND

BALTIMORE JCRC
 (Montgomery County, see D.C.)
MASSACHUSETTS

METROPOLITAN BOSTON JCC
 MARBLEHEAD North Shore Jewish Federation
 GREATER NEW BEDFORD Jewish Federation
 SPRINGFIELD Jewish Federation
 WORCESTER Jewish Federation
MICHIGAN

METROPOLITAN DETROIT JCC
 FLINT Jewish Federation
MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS Minnesota and Dakotas JCRC—Anti-Defamation League

MISSOURI

GREATER KANSAS CITY Jewish Community Relations Bureau
 ST. LOUIS JCRC
NEBRASKA

OMAHA JCRCCommittee of Jewish Federation
NEW JERSEY

ATLANTIC COUNTY Federation of Jewish Agencies
 BERGEN COUNTY JCRC of United Jewish Community
 CHERRY HILL JCRC of Southern New Jersey Jewish Federation
 DELAWARE VALLEY Jewish Federation
 EAST ORANGE MetroWest New Jersey Jewish Community Federation
 NORTHERN MIDDLESEX COUNTY Jewish Federation
 RARITAN VALLEY Jewish Federation
 UNION Central New Jersey Jewish Federation
 WAYNE North Jersey Jewish Federation
NEW MEXICO

ALBUQUERQUE JCC
NEW YORK

GREATER ALBANY Jewish Federation
 BINGHAMTON Jewish Federation of Broome County
 BROOKLYN JCC
 GREATER BUFFALO Jewish Federation
 ELMIRA CRC of Jewish Welfare Fund
 GREATER KINGSTON Jewish Federation
 NEW YORK JCRC
 ROCHESTER Jewish Community Federation
 GREATER SCHENECTADY Jewish Federation
 SYRACUSE Jewish Federation
 UTICA JCC
OHIO

AKRON Jewish Community Federation
 CANTON Jewish Community Federation
 CINCINNATI JCRC
 CLEVELAND Jewish Community Federation
 COLUMBUS CRC of Jewish Federation
 GREATER DAYTON CRC of Jewish Federation
 TOLEDO CRC of Jewish Welfare Federation
 YOUNGSTOWN JCRC of Jewish Federation
OKLAHOMA

OKLAHOMA CITY JCC
 TULSA JCC
OREGON

PORTLAND Jewish Federation
PENNSYLVANIA

ALLENTOWN CRC of Jewish Federation
 ERIE JCC
 GREATER PHILADELPHIA JCRC
 PITTSBURGH CRC of United Jewish Federation
 SCRANTON-LACKAWANNA Jewish Council
 GREATER WILKES-BARRE Jewish Federation
RHODE ISLAND

PROVIDENCE CRC of Rhode Island Jewish Federation
SOUTH CAROLINA

CHARLESTON JCRCCommittee
 COLUMBIA CRC of Jewish Welfare Federation
TENNESSEE

MEMPHIS JCRC
 NASHVILLE AND MIDDLE TENNESSEE Jewish Federation
TEXAS

AUSTIN JCC
 GREATER DALLAS JCRC of Jewish Federation
 EL PASO JCRCCommittee
 GREATER HOUSTON Jewish Federation
 FORT WORTH Jewish Federation
 SAN ANTONIO JCRC of Jewish Federation
VIRGINIA

NEWPORT NEWS-HAMPTON Jewish Federation
 RICHMOND Jewish Community Federation
 TIDEWATER United Jewish Federation
 (Northern Virginia, see D.C.)
WASHINGTON

GREATER SEATTLE Jewish Federation
WISCONSIN
 MADISON JCC
 MILWAUKEE Jewish Council

* Community Relations Committee (CRC); Jewish Community Council (JCC); Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC)