

If you have arrived at this page from a link within this site, you are in the right place.

Below you will find the following selected pages from *The Jew In American Politics* by Nathaniel Weyl:

The title page then pages 84-91, 118-21, 142-5, 152-3, 248-9, 264-5, 270-71.

Please scroll down to the one you want.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE JEW

IN

AMERICAN POLITICS

BY

NATHANIEL WEYL

ARLINGTON HOUSE • *New Rochelle, N. Y.*

less hostile. Social anti-Semitism was less prominent in the West and "it touched the South least of all."¹⁴

Jewish Exclusiveness

The separation of Jews and non-Jews was not always at the instigation of the latter. There has always been a strong tendency among American Jews, one that continues today, to build walls around themselves out of fear that their children will marry Gentiles and be lost to the Jewish community. A study of intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews by Erich Rosenthal revealed the extent to which this attitude still prevailed in the 1950's.

Thus, in a Southern town of 125,000 inhabitants with a comparatively small Jewish population, Jewish parents permitted their sons to date non-Jewish girls, but did not permit Gentile boys to date their daughters. Since the Jewish boys had a higher-than-average educational and economic status, they were considered desirable dates. There were not enough of them for both the Jewish and non-Jewish girls and hence the former would often be sent to colleges with a high percentage of Jewish men, for the purpose of marriage.¹⁵

Another study, cited by Rosenthal, concluded that "if adult wishes were suddenly to become the sole deciding factor, adult Jews would live closer together than they actually do, with even fewer opportunities for neighborhood contact with non-Jews."¹⁶ The reason for this desire for self-imposed ghettos was fear of intermarriage, which amounted to 13.1% of all marriages involving Jewish spouses in Washington, D.C., in 1956 and from 36.3% to 53.6% of such marriages in Iowa between 1953 and 1959.

Only 17.5% of the children of such marriages were identified by their parents as Jewish.¹⁷

A rabbi, not an isolated voice, complained that towns exist where all the leaders of the Jewish organizations are married to non-Jewish women. Despite the fact that these wives worked diligently and effectively at Jewish community problems, the rabbi found this state of affairs deplorable because:

"When a Jewish boy falls in love with a non-Jewess, the parents beseech the rabbi to speak to their son, to convince him not to take *this step that will bring disaster and grief upon them*. The first thing that the lad does, of course, is to point to the president of the congregation, the president of the Jewish Community Council, all of whom have non-Jewish wives, all active and respected in the community."¹⁸

Jewish Action Organizations

The American Jewish Committee had been organized in 1906 to assist the victims of Czarist pogroms in Kishinev and elsewhere and to serve as an agency to combat persecution of Jews abroad. In 1913, the long-established B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Covenant) launched the Anti-Defamation League which was to concern itself primarily with the mushrooming of anti-Semitism in literature, the press and the movies and with the tendency to exclude Jews from vast areas of American life.

One of the first major achievements of the American Jewish Committee was to get the New York State legislature to pass a law which made it a misdemeanor for any public accommodation to advertise a policy of excluding anyone because of race, creed or color. This measure, which

fell short of more modern equal accommodation bills because it punished, not the act itself, but merely the advertising of an intent to commit it, became law on the eve of World War I. Similar legislation was passed by other states under the pressure of the Anti-Defamation League.

The next major step was to eliminate the "Jew Comedy" from the nascent American motion picture industry. "Whenever a producer wishes to depict a betrayer of public trust, a hard-boiled, usurious money-lender, a crooked gambler, a grafter, a depraved fire-bug, a white-slaver or other villains of one kind or another, the actor is directed to represent himself as a Jew," the Anti-Defamation League complained.¹⁹ The ADL attempted to persuade the industry-sponsored National Board of Censorship to eliminate films that depicted American Jews as Shylocks or Fagins. The Board, however, was preoccupied with barring films that it considered lascivious or obscene and took no action. Jews had a substantial ownership of the theatres in which these early silent films were displayed. When one of these theatres boycotted *Rebecca's Wedding Day* in Chicago in 1916, Hollywood got the message and agreed to cease producing anti-Semitic films.

Typical of the widespread prejudice against Jews and other foreigners at the time was a World War I Army manual which declared that "foreign-born, and especially Jews, are more apt to malingering than the native born." The Anti-Defamation League protested to President Wilson who expressed shock and had the edition recalled and destroyed.

A much more serious problem was presented by great literature with a marked anti-Semitic orientation. Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* with its malign depiction of the Jewish usurer, Shylock, was one of the plays that had

to be "intensively studied" as preparation for college entrance examinations. In 1914, the Central Conference of American Rabbis successfully put pressure on the College Board to have it removed. Half a century later, when there were protests against the telecasting of *The Merchant of Venice*, the ADL stated that "a work of great artistic quality . . . cannot be subject to censorship." Nevertheless, New York's Shakespeare-in-the-Park troupe was subjected to heavy Jewish organizational pressure in the early 1960's to cancel a performance of *The Merchant of Venice*. The actors held their ground, "but the price of the pressure was an absurdly twisted production, featuring a triumphant Shylock, the like of which Shakespeare would never have recognized."²⁰

The Leo Frank Case

In the comparative quiet of the immediate pre-World War I years, the Leo M. Frank case exploded like a bomb with a slow fuse. Leo M. Frank was a young Cornell graduate in engineering, of German Jewish origin, who had settled in Atlanta as manager of the National Pencil Company factory and was married to a local Jewish girl. When still in his twenties, Frank had been elected president of the Atlanta B'nai B'rith, the honor resulting from the fact that he was an intellectual, a college graduate, of German origin and a man who had travelled in Europe, in contradistinction to the bulk of Southern Jewry who "were a single proprietary and self-employed class of retail merchants, peddlers, traveling salesmen, brokers, agents and manufacturers."²¹

On May 26, 1913, Mary Phagan, a buxom, fourteen-year-old worker in Frank's pencil factory, who had gone

there to collect pay that was owed her, was murdered in the cellar. When the police discovered the body, they noted that she had not been raped. Two barely literate pencilled notes were found beside her body, which accused a "long tall negro black" of having pushed her down and of having had sexual relations with her.

The police reasoned that the notes must be forgeries since Mary could not have written them while she was being murdered. They may have assumed that the forger of the notes, and hence the presumptive murderer, was a Northern white man because he used the word "negro" rather than "nigger."

Frank had been alone in his office during the afternoon when the murder was committed. He had the misfortune to be "far from prepossessing in appearance," being very short and thin with "prominent eyeballs, accentuated by thick eyeglasses." Testimony was introduced, most of it undoubtedly perjured, that he was in the habit of making dates with the teen-age girls who worked for him and having a Negro stand guard so he would not be caught *in flagrante*, that he frequented a brothel and that he was a sexual pervert.²²

The most amazing thing about the case, however, was not the somewhat flimsy web of circumstantial evidence, but the fact that a jury convicted Frank of murder on the evidence of Jim Conley, a Negro and ex-convict. L. F. Woodruff, a reporter for the *Georgian*, wrote about this phenomenon with wonder and amazement, characterizing Conley as "a Negro of the type that the South has been trying since reconstruction to destroy, the meagerly educated, shiftless, gin-guzzling, half-anthropoid black that any nation could well be rid of."²³

Golden's theory is that a Georgia jury condemned Frank

"because he was a Jew, a Yankee, a college graduate and a 'capitalist.'" An additional and very important ingredient in the witches' brew was the presence of Thomas E. Watson, a gifted and malevolent agrarian agitator and Baptist lawyer who had polled a million votes in 1896 as the vice presidential candidate of the People's Party. This embittered demagogue traded for more than a generation on the economic misery and discontent of the rural South, stirring up latent distrust of Catholics and Jews as aliens and enemies of "Christian America."

Watson edited a weekly hate periodical called the *Jeffersonian*. In it, he assailed the new factories that were gradually lifting the Georgia poor whites toward a more civilized standard of life. He managed to strike a modern note in his anti-Semitism in that he stressed a theme that Hitler and Streicher would expatiate upon—the alleged lasciviousness and sexual potency of Jews.

"Leo Frank was a typical young Jewish man of business, who lives for pleasure and *runs after gentile girls*," he wrote. "Every student of sociology knows that the black man's lust after the white woman is not much *fiercer than the lust of the licentious Jew for the gentile.*"²⁴

Watson referred to the man on trial as a "lascivious Sodomite;" another Georgia newspaper touched up Frank's photograph to make him look sinister and captioned the product "monster."

When the Hearst paper in Atlanta shifted sides and printed stories favorable to the defense, Watson thundered that Hearst was a half-Jew and a tool of Nathan Straus. Both statements were falsehoods.

The Jews of Atlanta did not at first regard the Frank murder trial as one involving an issue of anti-Semitism. Five members of prominent Jewish families were on the grand

jury which indicted Frank and most Atlanta Jews seem to have at first believed him guilty.

Anti-Semitism was not injected into the trial until the prosecution's cross-examination of defense witnesses. Even here, it was sometimes introduced obliquely and indirectly. The main implied charges against the Jews were that they fraternized with Negroes, thus breaking down the South's racial mores, and that they were rich exploiters of labor. The last point was made in the highfalutin style which Watson affected:

"Frank belongs to the Jewish aristocracy and it was determined by rich Jews that no aristocrat of their race should die for the death of a working girl! Yes, Mary Phagan was only a factory girl; there was no glamour of wealth or fashion about her. She had no millionaire uncle; she had no Athens kinsmen to raise fifty thousand dollars for her: no mighty connections. While the Sodomite who took her sweet life basks in the warmth of Today, the poor child's dainty flesh has fed the worms."²⁶

The trial was an outrage. While it was in progress, "large and boisterous crowds were gathered in the streets and were engaged in noisy demonstration, plainly audible in the court room, which was also crowded, and those assembled within its walls, as well as those outside, applauded whenever the State's attorney scored a point."²⁶ One of Frank's lawyers was told, "If they don't hang that Jew, we'll hang you!"

Frank was convicted and sentenced to hang. Appeal after appeal was taken. Finally, the Supreme Court turned down the defendant. In a memorable dissent by Mr. Justice Holmes, with Mr. Justice Hughes concurring, the minority observed: "Mob law does not become due process of

law by securing the assent of a terrorized jury. We are not speaking of mere disorder, or mere irregularities in procedure, but of a case where the processes of justice are actually subverted."

William Randolph Hearst took up the case and launched a nationwide crusade against Georgia justice. John M. Slaton, the courageous Governor of Georgia, commuted Frank's sentence to life imprisonment on June 21, 1915.

Two months later, a mob disarmed the guards at Milledgeville Prison Farm, seized and abducted Frank, took him in a car to a lonely spot and hanged him. The mob was apparently organized and inspired by an impromptu vigilante outfit which called itself the Knights of Mary Phagan and was a forerunner of the revived Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's.

The murderer of Mary Phagan was Jim Conley, the Negro convict whose testimony cost Leo Frank his life. He told at least three people that he had killed Mary Phagan: his lawyer, a fellow convict who swore to it a decade after the lynching, and Annie Maude Carter, a female convict whom Conley had met in prison and whom he wanted to marry. This woman informed the authorities that Conley had confessed the murder to her and she turned over to them a sheaf of letters he had written to her in 1914. These letters conclusively proved that Conley was a sex pervert and contained phrases and mistakes in spelling and grammar identical with those in the two notes found beside Mary Phagan's murdered body.

Thomas Watson always referred to the lynching of Leo Frank as an "execution." He wrote: "In putting the Sodomite murderer to death the Vigilance Committee has done what the Sheriff would have done if (Governor) Slaton

Although Communist leaders were normally taciturn about the extent to which Party membership was Jewish, Jack Stachel complained in *The Communist* for April 1929 that in Los Angeles "practically 90 per cent of the membership is Jewish." In 1945, John Williamson, another national leader of the American Communist Party, observed that, while a seventh of the Party membership was concentrated in Brooklyn, it was not in the working-class districts, but in Brownsville, Williamsburg, Coney Island and Bensonhurst, which he characterized as "primarily Jewish American communities." In 1951, the same complaint about Brooklyn was reiterated. A 1938 breakdown of Communist educational directors on a district level reported that 17 out of 34 were Jewish and only nine "American." The extent to which American Communism remained an organization of the foreign-born was revealed by a boast in *The Communist* for July 1936 that 45% of Party section organizers were now native-born as against none native-born in 1934.¹²

These estimates can be compared to data made public by then Attorney General Tom C. Clark on the national origins of 4,984 of "the more militant members of the Communist Party" in 1947. This showed that 44.0% were Russian-born, had at least one Russian parent or had a spouse of Russian stock. Only 8.6% were American-born of American parentage and not wed to spouses of foreign stock.¹³ From this, I arrived at an estimate that about 40% of the Communist Party militants in 1947 were Jewish.¹⁴

The Jewish recruits to American Communism were, for the most part, solidly middle class and professional. They were concentrated in such professional organizations as the Teachers' Union which, according to the former Communist leader, Bella Dodd, had 4,000 members, of whom 1,000 were Communist Party members.¹⁵ Based on scrutiny of surnames, Glazer concluded that all of the "Rank and

File" (Communist) teachers placed on trial by the Teachers' Union in 1932 were Jewish.¹⁶ Jewish social workers provided another fertile field for Party recruitment. To a quantitatively less significant extent, government employees, lawyers, dentists and doctors were attracted to the movement, particularly during the years of the Popular Front (1935-39) and the World War II alliance with the Soviet Union.

If Jews were prominent in both the leadership and the membership of the American Communist Party, it did not therefore follow that a significantly large proportion of American Jewry was Communist. The membership of the Communist Party seldom exceeded 50,000 and was below 25,000 most of the time. By contrast, there were over 5,000,000 Jews in the United States.

Moreover, Jews played a leading and invaluable role in the organization of anti-Communist forces and in the education of the American people on the evils of Communism and the Soviet system. Among the more outstanding of these Jewish anti-Communist editors and writers were David Lawrence, Eugene Lyons, George Sokolsky, Victor Riesel, Bertram D. Wolfe, Isaac Don Levine, Ralph de Toledano and Victor Lasky. Most of these men exposed the Communist conspiracy at a time when it was neither fashionable nor profitable to do so. They risked their incomes and their careers and, in some cases, invited physical danger as well. In such varied fields as trade unions, politics, education and the arts, one could compile similar lists of Jewish anti-Communists without any difficulty.

Reactions to Red Anti-Semitism

In 1929, massacres of Jews by Palestine Arabs were described by the *Freiheit*, New York's Communist Party

Yiddish organ, as a "pogrom." The Party promptly reprimanded the *Freiheit* for having failed to realize that these murders were a "class war . . . against British imperialism and their Zionist agents." The *Freiheit* proceeded to report the Palestine struggle in a Nazi fashion. "Indeed," comments Glazer, "the cartoons it ran of hook-nosed and bloated Jews sadistically attacking Arabs could have appeared in any German anti-Semitic newspaper."¹⁷

This was a turning point. From then on, all the major Jewish organizations became anti-Communist. This applied to the central religious bodies, to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, to the American Jewish Committee, to the American Jewish Congress, to Hadassah and to the Jewish community organizations.

The first great test of conscience for American Jewish Communists was the Soviet *volte face* in 1939. During the period of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the Communist Party caused anguish among its Jewish members by abandoning its boycott of Nazi goods. The week after the Pact was signed, the *Daily Worker* described it as "a triumph in the fight against anti-Semitism."¹⁸ In his pamphlet, *The Jewish People and the War*, Earl Browder argued that it made no difference to the Jews whether the Nazis or the Allies won!¹⁹

The *Freiheit* claimed that the Soviet invasion of Poland had been "good for the Jews" because, while two million Polish Jews fell under the yoke of Hitler, the remaining million had the privilege of being liberated by the Red Army. Typical of the Jewish reaction to this casuistry was the statement of the Zionist *Yiddisher Kempfer* that Stalin had caused the war by freeing Hitler from the need of fighting on two fronts. It added: "We reject with loathing the saving of a million Jews when it is bought at such a price."²⁰

Leading Yiddish writers and a few Jewish intellectuals

left the Party. Despite an admitted 15% decline in Communist membership, most Jewish Reds remained in its ranks.²¹ They proved that they were Marxists-Leninists first and Jews second, if at all.

The American Communist Party and its Jewish membership in particular were deeply shaken by Khrushchev's secret 1956 report on Stalin's crimes. American Communist Jews were finally forced to admit to themselves that the leading Jewish intellectuals of the Soviet Union had been exterminated under Stalin, that Jewish cultural institutions had been wiped out and that Russian Jewry had faced the danger of total deportation to Siberia.

Studying the scanty material available on Communist defections after this shattering blow, Nathan Glazer came to the conclusion that a disproportionate number of second-generation Jews (born in the United States, but of foreign-born parents) either joined the rebel Communist faction under John Gates or left the Party in disgust. The older, Yiddish-speaking Communists stayed.²² One reason for this fidelity was that they had nowhere else to go. As for the defection of some of the second-generation Jews in 1956 and immediately thereafter, it is worth recalling that the anti-Semitic policies of Stalin may not have been the main reason. Two factors of perhaps equal importance were the official exposure of the Stalin regime as one of naked terrorism and the brutal suppression of the Hungarian popular uprising by Soviet armor in November 1956.

Jewry and Communism—the Dilemma

Ideologically committed to the notion that the strength of the movement depended upon the proletariat and not the middle class, the Communist Party made little effort to

CHAPTER 11

The Anti-Defamation League and the Right

SINCE 1963, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith has been engaged in a lavishly financed campaign against what its spokesmen call "the radical right." ADL-financed books and pamphlets seek to alert the nation to this supposed danger to its existence. Libraries, schools and service organizations are flooded with tendentious literature denouncing "the radical right" as un-American.

As the Anti-Defamation League understands it, the "extreme right" does not consist merely of the little hate groups and the Nazi and anti-Semitic rabble. It is much broader. On this point, let me quote Dore Schary, motion picture director and National Chairman of the Anti-Defamation League.

"It has been estimated," Mr. Schary writes (but without

revealing who made the estimate), "that some 20 per cent of the American electorate can be grouped as Extremists on the Right Wing. Therein dwell the Radical Rightists and the Extreme Conservatives. Therein also can be found those who would vote for a candidate who ran on an anti-Semitic or anti-Negro platform. Such a candidate would attract the racists, the bigots, the kooks and the yahoos to be found among the Extremists who are tempted into accepting the phony nostrums and panaceas of any or all fake medicine men who range the political scene in America."¹

This vituperative paragraph is taken from the foreword of a major publication of the Anti-Defamation League. The grammar and incoherence of thought it displays are unhappily characteristic of Mr. Schary's prose. The significance of the quoted paragraph is that Schary groups conservatives, whom he calls "Extreme Conservatives," with "Radical Rightists" and neo-Nazis. The foreword in which Schary linked Extreme Conservatives with supporters of anti-Jewish candidates was dated June 29, 1964. A month later, the Republican National Convention nominated Barry Morris Goldwater, a half-Jew who spoke with pride of his Jewish ancestry, for the office of President of the United States. Senator Goldwater received the almost unanimous support of those very conservatives whom Schary had tried to link with anti-Semitism.

The Anti-Defamation League supposedly exists to refute slanders against the Jewish people and promote tolerance among the non-Jewish majority. It is difficult to believe that the best way of bringing this about is for the national chairman of the ADL to slander some twenty per cent of the American people as associates of "kooks," "bigots" and "yahoos." The shrillness of style, recklessness of statement

and readiness to substitute abuse and invective for a reasoned approach characterize the ADL attack on American conservatives. If this organization is supposed to promote tolerance, it presents a very bad example to the public. When one examines the activities of the ADL at a lower echelon, the picture remains basically the same. The West Coast organ of the Anti-Defamation League, for instance, stated that its civil rights director intended to "blast at the right-wing philosophy at every opportunity" and to have "every member of the B'nai B'rith appoint themselves [sic] Paul Revere. . . ." Yet in terms of the ostensible objectives of the League, its officials have no business either blasting at right-wing philosophies or, for that matter, defending them.

The Christian Anti-Communism Crusade

The most important publication in the Anti-Defamation League's campaign against the so-called right wing is *Danger on the Right*, written by two top officials of the League and published under its copyright in 1964. Typical of the methods used by the ADL against those it considers right-wing extremists is the treatment accorded Dr. Fred R. Schwarz and his Anti-Communism Crusade in this book.

The son of an Austrian Jew, Dr. Schwarz served as a college lecturer in mathematics in his native Australia, then went through medical school and became a successful physician and psychiatrist. A devout Christian, he became convinced in 1950 that the West was dangerously complacent about the threat of Communist expansion. He decided to launch an organization which would continuously sound the alarm about this menace. Since the United States was the leader of the Free World, he also decided to base his

organization, called the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, on American soil. The new organization held "freedom rallies" in major American cities (one of them filled the Hollywood Bowl), and set up schools throughout the country to educate community leaders to the danger of Communism. This last operation seemed not unrelated to Thomas Jefferson's observation that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Unable to dismiss Dr. Schwarz as an anti-Semite or a "yahoo," Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, the authors of *Danger on the Right*, rely heavily on the sneer. He is "the good doctor;" his speeches are "lurid;" throughout he is attacked as a fear peddler, and there is the nasty insinuation that he is in the anti-Communist cause for the money it brings him. This last innuendo was refuted by Dr. Schwarz in a press statement which showed that the salary and expenses he took from the Crusade were less than what he had earned as a doctor. Typical of Forster's and Epstein's reporting is the following:

"At another meeting, Schwarz's Reds were evidently short of rope and had to rely on revolvers. After working his listeners to the edges of their seats with horrendous tales, with the pauses and the studied emphasis of the trained performer, the Doctor said: 'When they come for you . . . on a dark night, in a dank cellar, and they take a wide-bore revolver with a soft nose bullet, and they place it at the nape of your neck. . . .'

". . . it seems wholly incredible that Americans in this day can be frightened by this kind of arrant nonsense, yet thousands and thousands of Americans have been influenced by the Extremists of the Radical Right and are pouring millions of dollars a year into the laps of these self-appointed America-savers."⁸

average, but Lipset described the difference as "relatively minor."⁸

History as Conspiracy

The John Birch Society nevertheless has some of the characteristics of American Populism. These include simplification of issues, a fear of foreign entanglements and a distrust of that which is foreign, an inclination to endow the traditional American majority with the virtues of rugged courage, honesty and good intentions and a belief that this constructive element is being betrayed by corrupting alien forces. Fear of these corrupting forces is characteristic both of the John Birch Society and of the various anti-Semitic groups. However, the anti-Semites see these forces as manifestations of a world Jewish conspiracy whereas the Birch supporters see them as manifestations of an international Communist conspiracy. This is the difference and it is a crucial one.

The Birch view of the world has frequently been criticized as a distorted conspiratorial view of history. A "conspiracy," according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, is a "combination of persons for an evil or unlawful purpose." Unfortunately, a great deal of modern history is precisely that, the most flagrant examples being the Nazi and Communist movements.

The John Birch Society does not merely present a conspiratorial theory of history. It goes far beyond that and presents us with a view of the world in which there are only two real forces: those of good and those of evil. These are in absolute conflict, a conflict which can end only with the destruction of one or the other of the two great adversaries. This conflict completely fills the stage of history and all

phenomena are explained in reference to it and as a part of it. This is probably the reason for the willing acceptance by some Birch supporters of the view that fluoridation of water supplies is a Communist plot to poison and stupefy the American people.

If the conflict is all-embracing, it does not follow that everyone is aware of it. On the one side, as the Birchers see it, are the Communists with their vast hosts of liberal and social-democratic allies, a power in aggregate so enormous that Welch reached the odd conclusion that the United States was already 60% to 80% Red-dominated. On the other side are the band of dedicated men and women enrolled in the John Birch Society to fight these forces while there is still time. At present on the sidelines are the great mass of honest, decent Americans who live humdrum lives in ignorance of the danger threatening their country, but who can be aroused and mobilized.

In the Zoroastrian system, all creation divides itself into that which is Ahura's and that which is Ahriman's and these two forces wage eternal battle. In the Manichaean system it is Light against Darkness, God against Satan. In Communism, the world dualism is between Proletariat and Bourgeoisie; in Nazism, between Aryan and Jew. In each instance, we have a closed system, which reduces all social phenomena to their role in an all-embracing conflict between Good and Evil which cannot be compromised, but must be fought to the death.

"Welch is himself not an anti-Semite, and anti-Semitism is not a part of his Society's program and never has been," Epstein and Forster wrote in 1964.⁹ In fact, Robert Welch has consistently urged Jews to join the Society and has welcomed them into its ranks. Among the Jewish intellectuals who had once been members of the John Birch organi-

CHAPTER 17

Jews, Negroes and Civil Rights

AN INTENSE EMOTIONAL COMMITMENT to the Negro drive for total integration and total acceptance has been a conspicuous feature of American Jewish political behavior ever since World War II. In the South particularly, this Jewish commitment is regarded as notorious. In fact, one can probably say that, to the extent that any modern political anti-Semitism exists currently in the South, it is a reaction against the prominence of Jews in pro-Communist and in pro-Negro organizations.

In recent years, interesting changes in the stance of the civil rights groups have begun to emerge. A reason for this is that the colored leadership of the militant Negro organizations has begun to discover that the spate of legislation enacted in their behalf under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has not fundamentally altered the economic con-

dition or remedied the social isolation of the vast majority of Negroes.

Accordingly, Negro militancy is striking out in new directions, directions which often disturb its white supporters, both Jewish and Gentile. Instead of demanding equality, the leaders of these pressure groups insistently clamor for special privilege. This is a view that Jews tend instinctively to reject, since the entire history of the Jewish struggle for emancipation is one that emphasizes equality of opportunity and advancement on the basis of merit alone. The Negro demand is reminiscent of such bygone institutions as the *numerus clausus* and other quota systems, which restricted the number of Jews having access to higher education and professional employment regardless of their ability.

The second new direction is toward the inchoate movement which extends from anti-war sentiment to appeasement of Communism and from appeasement of Communism to treason. It is exemplified by the unreasonable demand of Floyd B. McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) that the United States abandon the war in Vietnam and divert the billions of dollars thus saved to Negro aid.¹ The view that American national interests should be sacrificed to the ravenous appetites of racial pressure groups was not likely to arouse much enthusiasm among white Americans, regardless of their political persuasion.

The third development has been a tendency to strike out in volcanic outbursts of blind violence and in seemingly senseless political demonstrations against whites in general. This paroxysmal behavior has grown rapidly since the Negro pressure groups ceased to be controlled by white liberals and became instrumentalities of Negro leaders backed by

opportunity. But if he is at the bottom because he is the least intelligent, the least productive and the least creative component of the population, then the bottom is where he belongs. And there is no point in being sentimental and saying that society should not have a bottom. For unless there is a bottom, there cannot be a top."

This seems reasonable, but it is countered by the contemporary liberal assertion that the Negro is at the bottom, not because of adverse genetic factors, but because he is condemned to have his children educated in "de facto ghettos" and because of the heritage of chattel slavery and other disadvantages. However, a very large part of the white immigrants into the United States were reared and educated in "de facto ghettos." This applied most obviously to Italians, Jews, and Chinese. Yet two of these groups today make a greater proportionate contribution to the American creative minority than does the Anglo-Saxon majority. Chinese, Italians and Jews enjoyed ample educational opportunities even when they studied with, lived among and were taught by other Chinese, Italians and Jews.

Thus, one returns to the fundamental biogenetic point: the Negro is not held back because of de facto segregation per se. The real problem is that, on the whole, he constitutes refractory material for the educational process. To a certain extent, his progress may perhaps be accelerated by placing him in a white environment, but when this is done the white children suffer educationally from his presence. Thus, the "environmental" consideration about school segregation assumes meaning only if one reverts to the basic factor of innate mental difference.

The Negro elite or, as the late W. E. B. DuBois called it, "the talented tenth," has made impressive intellectual, political and economic gains in American society. This

group has benefited from school desegregation, but it is just as much the victim of campaigns to impose random race mixture on schools and residential districts as the white majority. The Negro elite is held back when it is compelled to associate with the most backward elements among the Negro masses. There is no reason why the intelligent Negro should be compelled to carry the stupid one on his back. A rational solution to the problem of differences in mental capacity would have been to see that racial desegregation of the public schools system was followed by immediate re-segregation on the basis of intelligence and learning aptitude and without regard to race.

Like other Americans, the Negro is entitled to equality under the law and equality of opportunity. Like other Americans, he is entitled to nothing more. If he is held down by external restraints, society should remove them. If he is held down by his own limitations, he should try to conquer them. If this is beyond his power, it is incumbent upon him to recognize and learn to live with his own limitations.

To a large extent, the recent outbreaks of Negro violence and the other bitter manifestations of black anger against the white race are the direct result of false expectations created by mass indoctrination of the colored with the mythology of twentieth century liberalism concerning race.

In short, the Negro has been persuaded that his unenviable position in white society is due, not to his own shortcomings, but to the oppression and injustice he has suffered at the hands of the white majority. He is promised that all this is to be changed through governmental action, social reform and official recognition of sins committed in the past. Yet, in a fundamental sense, there is very little change. Millions of Negroes remain slum dwellers, appallingly un-

On the basis of Census data, Moynihan reported that about 44.1% of all college-age Chinese and Japanese Americans were in college, as compared with 21.4% of college-age whites and only 8.4% of college-age Negroes. The corresponding Jewish figure was about 80%. He then pointed out triumphantly that what Jews, Chinese and Japanese have in common is "a singularly stable, cohesive and enlightened family life."

Unfortunately for this simplified approach, the Italian Americans have an unusually close-knit and harmonious family life and yet they are significantly under-represented in colleges. This Moynihan must be aware of since he and Glazer emphasized the point in their excellent study of New York City's motley population, *Beyond the Melting Pot*.²⁶ Similar considerations would apply to the Portuguese and Spanish stocks in the United States. In short, conceding the fact that a strong family life is conducive to moral conduct, identification with community and nation, positive goals, mental stability and perseverance and that the broken family is conducive to opposite traits, it does *not* follow that the family is either the only or the main factor behind the success or failure of different ethnic groups. Consider a specific area which Moynihan himself cites—that of college attendance. Americans of Southern European stock have strong family ties, yet are seriously under-represented in colleges and universities. Middle- and upper-class urban Americans of Nordic stock frequently come from broken families, yet are significantly over-represented.

In defense of his thesis, Moynihan asserts that in central Harlem, where a majority of Negro children have no fathers, the average I.Q. of sixth graders is only 86.3. At corresponding ages, Negro children with fathers show I.Q.'s which average 7.5 points higher. Moynihan assumes without

adequate evidence that the broken family is the primary cause of the low intelligence quotient.

The fallacy here is obvious. Fathers who bring up their children are likely to be, on the average, considerably more intelligent than those who habitually desert them. Women who choose responsible men to father their children are likely to be superior to women who exercise no choice or who choose foolishly. Thus, the 7.5 point difference in I.Q. between the Negro children with and without fathers may be due, either partly or entirely, to the higher innate intelligence of the parents in the first group. Moreover, if we assume that the central Harlem children are about equally divided between those with and those without fathers, the average I.Q. of both groups would still be only 90. Sir Julian Huxley estimated that a population with a mean I.Q. 10 points below the national average would produce proportionately only about one-tenth as many very superior individuals (those with I.Q.'s of 160+) as the nation as a whole.²⁷

Moynihan has been castigated in such radical-to-liberal magazines as the *Nation* and the *Christian Century*. He has been rebuked for criticizing the morality of the Negro family and has even been branded a racist. Floyd McKissick, a militant Negro organizer and agitator, attacked the Report because "it assumes that middle-class American values are the correct values for everyone in America. . . . Moynihan thinks that everyone should have a family structure like his own."

Moynihan has made several constructive suggestions for improving the Negro family structure. He thinks that idle Negro manpower should be employed in delivering the mails twice daily, thus increasing the self-respect and sense of responsibility of those thus engaged. He also urges that