

REPORT

OF THE

Anti-Defamation League

TOGETHER WITH

PRINCIPLES *of* LEAGUE
AND CORRESPONDENCE

SUBMITTED TO THE

Constitution Grand Lodge Convention
I. O. B. B.

May, 1915, San Francisco, Calif.

American Jewish Committee
LIBRARY

REPORT
of the
Anti-Defamation League

Together with Principles of League
and Correspondence



Submitted to the
Constitution Grand Lodge Convention
I. O. B. B.

May, 1915, San Francisco, Calif.

366.30

A67

1914

OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
1600 FIRST NAT'L BANK BLDG.
CHICAGO

SIGMUND LIVINGSTON
Chairman Executive Committee
LEON L. LEWIS
Secretary Executive Committee

REPORT OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

The first report of the Anti-Defamation League is herewith submitted. We shall confine this report to a statement of work done.

The almost universal encouragement and support which we have received has made possible the success achieved. Even those who originally sponsored the enterprise, and who were most enthusiastic in its cause, have had their highest hopes realized to the full. Every source of defamation of the Jew, to which our attention was directed, has received careful consideration. We realized from the beginning that many delicate situations would arise; we knew that we would be subjected to the charge of supersensitiveness; we appreciated the fact that we were undertaking a Herculean task to realize the hopes of the American Jew. In planning the work, we laid upon ourselves at the very beginning certain rules and requirements which had to be enforced to make the work one of enduring success. The most important requirement was that in the treatment of every subject conservatism must be the keynote; that fairness with those with whom we had to deal was a prime essential and that only such demands would be made upon those who had the shaping of public opinion as seemed practicable and just; that we had to keep in mind the conditions with which we had to deal and to face each problem manfully and consistently. We found it necessary at all times to guard carefully against the visionary and the radical. We have not attempted reforms that could not be practically carried out. We have, however, effectively, combated by honorable means every source of defamation which could, in our opinion, be remedied.

The work falls into two principal divisions, namely, that which deals with the handling of specific cases of abuse, defamation or oppression, and secondly, the general work of a constructive nature designed to remove

the causes of prejudice. To detail in full all the several hundred cases that have arisen under the first classification and the action taken in each case by the League would unduly lengthen this report. Much of the matter also would be cumulative. To a large extent, the correspondence is very interesting, but it is so voluminous that it would be impracticable to reprint it all, or even the major part, in a report of this kind. The extent of the correspondence may be appreciated when it is understood that in the case of the suppression of a single moving picture film, the League was in extensive communication with hundreds of representatives of the League, city executives, police commissioners, social workers and censorship boards.

It will not, therefore, be the purpose of this report to detail each matter handled, but to give a statement of the principal problems of a general nature confronted, citing a few illustrative cases to indicate the scope of the work. No attempt will be made to go into the large number of miscellaneous cases submitted to us for adjustment.

MOTION PICTURES

GENERAL STATEMENT

The motion picture industry occupies so new a place in the amusement field that few of us realize its tremendous scope. It is estimated by competent authority that on March 1, 1914, there were 17,000 places of exhibition of motion pictures in the United States. The same authority states that, in conservative figures, \$319,000,000 were spent in admissions to motion picture theaters during the year 1913. In New York City it is claimed that between one-sixth and one-seventh of the population visited these places of entertainment daily. The president of one of the largest motion picture corporations in the country informed the Managing Board of the League

that in his opinion, the motion picture theatres throughout the country were attended by ten million people daily. It is safe to say that at least 25 per cent of this number consist of children. No other instrument in modern civilization is so wide-spread in its influence and makes so profound an impression upon the child-mind. The force of this statement is readily shown by the action of educators throughout the country in instituting motion picture exhibitions in the public schools as supplementary to the courses of instruction.

SITUATION IN 1913

When the League was organized in the fall of 1913, an extraordinary situation confronted it. It seemed that whenever film manufacturers desired to depict a hard-hearted money-lender, a blackmailer, a fire-bug, a depraved gambler, a swindler, a grafter or a white-slaver, they determined upon a Jewish name for the person in question, and directed the actor to simulate what is popularly regarded as a "Jewish type." There was nothing so unusual in this, as the tendency has been evident since the time of Marlowe's "Barrabas." The extraordinary element, however, was that what previously reached the attention of an infinitesimal fraction of the populace, and that fraction a matured and cultured part, was most vividly presented before the eyes of millions of the unmatured, ignorant or the uncultured. A careful survey of the existing situation showed that there were scores of films on the market which were extremely prejudicial to the welfare and happiness of our people. In addition to the criminal characterization, the Jew was often shown in caricature, in a manner similar to that employed on the burlesque and vaudeville stages. These caricaturizations were supposed to be funny, but in many instances the laughter which they stimulated was that which arises from the malicious discomfiture of another. Under the guise of fun, the most sordid, vulgar and

unclean characteristics were frequently attributed to Jews in general.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Managing Board regarded the motion picture situation as the which should have the League's immediate attention. How were we to check the influence of these obnoxious and dangerous instruments of prejudice? What pressure could we bring to bear to prevent their manufacture? One thing was apparently in our favor, namely, the fact that many of the motion picture manufacturers were themselves Jews. To the discredit of some of these be it said, however, that our protests were laughed at—we were told that we were supersensitive—that they were Jews and proud of it, and would not permit anything that could really hurt a Jew to be shown on the motion picture screen. Others considered it better business policy to ignore our communications completely.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NATIONAL BOARD OF CENSORSHIP

The National Board of Censorship then suggested itself as a possible medium for the elimination of these objectionable pictures. We soon found out, however, that little was to be hoped for from an organization created and supported by the motion picture manufacturers. There is so much misconception with regard to the sanction and power of this board that a word here as to its organization might not be out of place. The National Board of Censorship is not national in the sense of being sanctioned by any governmental authority. On the contrary, it is a voluntary association, which depends for the effectiveness of its rulings upon the good will of the motion picture manufacturers who organized it. Nominally, the board is under the auspices of the People's Institute of New York City, a philanthropic institution, but the funds for its support are being appropriated annually by the big motion picture manufacturers. The officers of the Institute have comparatively

little control over it. Our negotiations with the board stated our position most clearly. We requested that the board adopt as one of its standards a rule which would prevent the approval of any film which attacked any religious body or which would tend to arouse prejudice against any person or group of persons on account of his or their religious belief. We were met, however, with a polite refusal to recognize any justice in our contention. Mr. Orrin G. Cocks, the Extension Secretary of the Board refused to recognize the Jew as a religious entity. He could not understand why the Jew should be any more "sensitive" than the negro, the Chinaman, the Irishman or the Italian. Though there is no reasonable basis for the comparison, recent events show that the National Board, even in this regard, is not consistent. In the course of a single week, it ordered very extensive modifications in a feature film entitled "The Nigger," a dramatization of Edward Sheldon's well-known play, and in a twelve-reel feature entitled "The Birth of a Nation," a dramatization of Dixon's "The Clansman," because these films were likely to arouse prejudice and antipathy against negroes.

PLAN OF CAMPAIGN

It became clear that the only way to bring about the discontinuance of these films was to remove the demand. How was this to be done? Educate the people to stay away from theaters showing these pictures? To be consistent, we should have to advocate staying away from the motion picture theaters entirely, because it would be practically impossible for the average "movie fan" to know in advance the character of the films presented each evening. In the second place, while this extremely slow educational process was going on, the evil would be growing beyond our control.

The Executive Committee of the League felt that the only effective remedy would be an aroused public opinion,

reacting upon the receipts of the film exchanges and the manufacturers. Fortunately, by this time the League was so well represented in the principal cities of the country that the plan could be effectively carried out. Prominent Jewish communal workers had been appointed as members of the Executive Committee in the large cities. In the smaller centers, the local B'nai B'rith Lodges appointed committees to carry out our plan. A working organization was thus effected, which could be counted upon to act promptly and efficiently whenever called upon. Most of the men thus appointed were prominent socially, professionally or financially in the cities represented—men whose protests would be regarded as well-founded and reflecting the opinion of the entire Jewish community. Fortunately, too, the business structure of the industry was so homogeneous that the same plan of campaign was feasible for practically all the cases that arose.

Without definite and accurate information as to the character and nature of objectionable films, it was quite impossible, of course, to accomplish anything. To wait for the picture to be shown and then register a protest was, of course, quite useless, as but very few theaters book a film for more than one day's run. The synopses of the pictures found in the moving picture advertisements were of some help, but in most instances were so meager that little reliance could be placed upon them. It was necessary, therefore, to find some means of securing definite information in advance of the date of release. This opportunity was accorded us through the courtesy of Mayor Carter H. Harrison, of Chicago, and Major M. L. C. Funkhouser, the Second Deputy Superintendent of Police, who permitted the Managing Board to inspect all films which had Jewish characters in their cast. At the time that order was issued, there was a censorship ordinance in force in the city of Chicago, but no paid

censoring board. In most instances, the censoring was purely perfunctory, and it was only when a particularly dangerous film came in that a committee of volunteer workers was called in to assist the officers in charge of the work. From the time permission was given to us to inspect these films, however, no picture which purported to characterize the Jew was passed without notice being sent to us in advance. As the films were presented for a permit several days in advance of the date of release, we found ourselves in possession of definite information, covering all films which dealt with any phase of Jewish life. If the picture turned out to be objectionable in any particular, the Managing Board recommended to Major Funkhouser that no permit be issued, and in practically every instance our recommendation was accepted. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 1 for example of report to Police Department.) The same day the picture was inspected and found objectionable, a bulletin was sent to all the members of the Executive Committee throughout this country and Canada, advising them of the objectionable features in the film and requesting that they take such action in their respective communities as seemed desirable or expedient. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 2.) The results were exceedingly satisfactory. Our bulletins reached the various localities several days prior to the date of release and within a few days the film exchanges of all the large cities were receiving letters from local managers requesting that the film in question be taken off their booking lists. In those cities where some system of local censorship prevailed, the pictures were suppressed by action of the municipal authorities, while, in other cities, our local representative called upon all the motion picture theater managers in person and secured promises that they would not run the films, even though such action necessitated cutting down the number of reels shown at any one performance. The manufacturers soon felt

the reflex of this aroused popular opinion. Film exchanges found themselves with useless reels on their hands, and awoke to the fact that the public had at last put into active form that spirit of protest which had always moved it, but which had been dissipated by lack of system and unity. Many letters of protest from local theatrical managers reached the desks of the manufacturers, and it was soon apparent that there were few places in the country where pictures of this nature could be exhibited without arousing protests from exchange, exhibitor and audience. We did not stop there, however. Resolutions were drafted and submitted for adoption to every B'nai B'rith Lodge in the country. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 3.) These resolutions stated that the Lodge endorsed the work of the Anti-Defamation League in its fight against motion picture defamation of the Jew, and called upon all the motion picture exhibitors in the city to pledge themselves not to exhibit any pictures of this kind, and to communicate with their respective exchanges, with a view to the discontinuance of the manufacture of such films. This move contributed materially to the success of the plan. Notices were also sent to the Jewish press, describing films against which specific objections were made.

INVESTIGATION OF CENSORING ACTIVITIES

A questionnaire was sent to the administrative head of every city having a population of 10,000 or over, in order that the League might be familiar with the extent of local censorship in every center of population. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 4.) These inquiries were given careful attention in most instances, and the information secured from these and other sources was compiled in the offices of the League, so that action through the administrative body in each city might be taken in accordance with the procedure laid down by local ordinance or statute. In this connection it is proper to state that in prac-

tically all instances we have been given active and sympathetic support by the local and state censorship bodies whom we have approached. They have seen the justice of our plea, and have always been courteous and efficient.

CONDITIONS AT PRESENT TIME

Motion picture manufacturers soon came to see that we were reasonable in our objections, and that we did not wish to eliminate every characterization of the Jew from the screen; that our purpose was merely to compel them to make that characterization honest, natural, just and truly representative of the social status of the Jew. The character of the films began gradually to change. The comic film of the older days, such as "Rebecca's Wedding Day" (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 2, Bulletin No. 1), or "The Missing Diamond" (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 2, Bulletin No. 2), gradually gave place to such harmless buffoonery as was found in the series of the "Izzy" pictures, released by the Reliance Film Company. The films showing the Jew as a criminal, such as "The Mystery of the Amsterdam Diamonds" (See Appendix No. 3, Bulletin No. 6), gradually disappeared, giving place to careful and sympathetic studies of Jewish life, such as are contained in the Kalem film entitled "A Pass-over Miracle," or the Reliance film entitled "The Faith of Her Fathers." It was quite apparent that within two or three months after we had commenced our campaign, motion picture manufacturers were giving considerable attention to the communications which we sent to them. Reference to the correspondence partially reprinted in the Appendix will show that the manufacturers, with whom we have had occasion to communicate in relation to objectionable films, have indicated a desire to accede to our wishes. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 5.) In most instances, the promises they have made have been lived up to, and where recurrence of the evil has

taken place it has been due to mistakes in judgment rather than to bad faith. In fact, several large film manufacturing companies have gone to the extent of inviting us to send representatives to inspect the films while they are in process of manufacture, and the League has availed itself of the opportunity. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 6.) The natural result has been that whereas previously the so-called "Jew" pictures were released at least two or three times a month, it is now very seldom indeed that an objectionable Jewish characterization or caricaturization is sent out. For the last four or five months, it has been unnecessary to bulletin any film because of this objection. Every once in a while an objectionable picture does appear, but it is found that in practically all such cases the film in question is manufactured by a company but recently organized and not conversant with the status of public opinion, so far as it affects the defamation of the Jew. As new companies are being organized at short intervals, it is clear that we cannot afford to become quiescent. We must be constantly vigilant, in order that a precedent might not be established which would give an older company an excuse for re-entering this field, or which would lead them to underestimate the force of the popular opinion that has been aroused.

MODEL CENSORSHIP ORDINANCE

Our experiences with the local censorship boards which exist here and there proved fairly conclusively that had there been universal local censorship throughout the country, our task would have been a comparatively easy one. There are, however, few cities that make any attempt to censor motion picture films, and in most of those cities the ordinances were hastily prepared and did not permit the maximum of efficiency. State boards of censorship also have in most instances been tied up by injunction or court procedure of one kind or another.

There seemed to be a very active propaganda going on all over the country for an efficient system of censorship, and requests were received by the Secretary for information as to the Chicago system, which had proven efficient. A careful compilation of the ordinances and statutes of the various communities having censorship was made, and the Managing Board drafted a model ordinance which was sent to those communities requesting information with a view to the establishment of a local censorship board. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 7.) Until there is created a National Board of Censorship under Government authority, if such is practicable, state or local censorship would be of much help to the League.

The Executive Committee of the League is anxious to place at the disposal of those communities that may desire to introduce local censorship ordinances, all the information in its possession, and such active assistance in the preparation or passage of such ordinances as lies within its power.

TRADE PAPERS

Complaint against objectionable magazine articles may be classed under two heads: magazines of general circulation and trade journals. Most of the objectionable articles that have come to our attention have been published in the latter class of publication. Thus, we have had several cases where protest had to be made to monthly publications issued by insurance companies. In most of these cases our objections received courteous and prompt consideration. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 8.)

Agricultural magazines, manufacturers' magazines of one kind or another, medical magazines and other trade publications which hardly deserve the description magazine, have from time to time required our consideration. Space will not permit us to go into detail in all these cases; we can cite only a few which indicate the general

trend. For example, the Northwestern Agriculturist very promptly saw our point when we complained in the following case:

An article, describing a particularly tricky piece of work on the part of a fur purchaser, referred to him as a "smooth-tongued Jew." The tendency of the article was to give the impression that the Jews were cheating the trappers out of their just dues. We took the matter up with the gentleman who wrote the article and also with the editor of the magazine. The correspondence printed in the Appendix will indicate the spirit in which our communication was received. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 9.)

In only one instance did our complaint fail to receive the courtesy of a reply from the editor of a trade paper. This was a case in which the editor of the "National Bottlers' Gazette," published at 99 Nassau Street, New York City, made a statement regarding "cheap Jews who undersell honest bottlers," and advising the non-Jews to "go after them," so that the Jew will disappear from ruining the business. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 10).

MAGAZINES

Compared with trade papers, magazines of general circulation have had comparatively few objectionable articles or defamatory references to the Jew during the past year. It has been the policy of the League, where objectionable articles have been printed, to submit our case to the editor and to suggest the publication of another article which would neutralize the influence of that already published. In practically every case, the editors have apologized for the publication of the matter to which we took exception, and although they have not, in most instances accepted our proffer of a neutralizing article, they have in nearly all cases indicated their good faith by publishing in the course of the next two or three

issues an article or story which attempted to give a true and sympathetic portrait of the Jew or Jewish customs. Thus, for example, a protest addressed to the American Magazine nearly a year ago brought fruit recently in the publication of a story entitled "Experiences of a Jew's Wife", a story which describes in a vivid fashion the social persecution to which the Gentile wife of a Jew was subjected. So also the Century, in the second issue following the notorious Ross article, published a short sketch showing the terrible hardships of a Russian Jew whose business brought him to St. Petersburg. This article, was placed in direct juxtaposition to another article by Professor Ross, and indicated the intention of the editors to reach the same readers, who were following those articles. Following a protest from this office, the editors have gone further and have promised that they would publish in the near future an article by the Commissioner of Immigration, Frederick C. Howe, which would neutralize the pernicious influence of Mr. Ross' pseudoscientific article. It will be recalled that this article was entitled "The Hebrews of Eastern Europe," and purported to set forth reasons why Jews should not be admitted to the United States. But Mr. Ross does not confine himself to Jewish immigrants—he condemns the whole Jewish population of our country. The article teems with glittering generalities, innuendos and honeyed compliments. His logic is specious and inconsistent; his conclusions are based upon the thinnest fabric of truth, upon hearsay and double hearsay—many of them, in the nature of things, impossible of proof or contradiction. In fact, the whole article is quite inconsistent with the humanitarian ideals which Mr. Ross *professes* in his other publications. It indicates a brilliant mind, warped and twisted by prejudice. So far as the Century Magazine is concerned, we have gained our point. The communications, published in the Appendix, will indicate

how far the editor has gone to offset the vaporings of the learned professor. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 11.)

Mr. Ross evidently expected a strong personal attack when he wrote this article. His introduction indicates that he is courting just that sort of notoriety. He apparently had in mind the republication of these articles in book form, and depended upon the fume and stew that would arise over this particular article to advertise widely his book, which has recently been published. Some of our Wisconsin members took the matter deeply to heart, and wanted to submit charges against him before the Regents of the University of Wisconsin. Calm consideration, however, showed that, after all, the harm had been done, and any personal agitation against Mr. Ross would be likely to please him the more. We have confined ourselves, therefore, to a sober treatment of the situation. Our Milwaukee brethren are at the present time engaged in a careful comparison of this article with Mr. Ross' previous expressions and expect to submit to him the proofs of his superficial knowledge in a dignified and gentlemanly manner.

One thing has been accomplished by the publication of this article which was probably farthest from Mr. Ross' imagination. It indicated the necessity of a central clearing house of information on Jewish subjects. It showed the practical value of systematic and quantitative knowledge with regard to Jewish Affairs. It demonstrated the great value of a careful statistical survey of Jewish conditions, economic and sociological, and gave the stimulus for the compilation of such Jewish statistics as can be gathered from government publications, statistical reviews and from original investigation. This work is now being conducted through the office of the League. The field that is opened up is a tremendous one and an enviable opportunity is afforded the B'nai B'rith to act as the exponent of truth in this regard. Before many

years have passed, it is to be hoped that the thoroughness of our work in this connection will parallel that of the German B'nai B'rith Lodges, which for the past ten years have maintained in Berlin a Bureau of Jewish Statistics, which in turn has published a bi-monthly journal of Jewish data and issues from time to time monographs on the economic and sociological conditions of the Jews in the various countries of Europe.

From time to time the Saturday Evening Post has published articles or stories, which, in the opinion of the League, have been prejudicial. In every instance, where the occasion warranted action, protest was made, either by letter or through a local representative. The replies of the editor state that the Saturday Evening Post has no desire to discriminate against any people. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 12.)

Collier's Magazine, on the other hand, saw fit to completely ignore a communication addressed to them, in relation to an offensive story published in November, 1913, entitled "The Yegg's Ambition." It is to be noted however, that since that time Collier's has editorially expressed themselves in relation to matters affecting Jews in a sympathetic and eminently fair manner, and have published articles and stories dealing with Jewish characters which indicate a very fair attitude towards our people. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 13.)

Some articles have appeared in religious magazines and newspapers that indicated an attempt to arouse religious animosities. Thus, the Western Recorder, a Baptist paper, published an article making charges against the Jews, which brought forth an answer from this office. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 14.)

Ordinarily, the Catholic press of this country has indicated a sympathetic attitude towards the Jew. Catholics have been subjected to much the same sort of persecution

that the Jew has suffered, and have been in a better position to appreciate what we have gone through than other religious sects.

However, about the middle of May, we were confronted with a situation which seemed to be of a very serious nature. Signor Ernesto Nathan, ex-mayor of Rome, was appointed by the Italian government as Commissioner to the San Francisco Exposition. Because of certain alleged utterances of Nathan against the Pope and Catholicism, while mayor of Rome, the Catholic press of this country attempted to secure the withdrawal of his appointment. Resolutions to boycott the fair were passed by certain Catholic societies, and some sections of the Catholic press and a few Catholic clergymen became most vindictive in their utterances, not only against Mr. Nathan, but against all Jews. The possibilities for harm and injury to us seemed tremendous, as these papers, in their blind anger against Nathan, attempted to stir up their readers against all Jews. One paper in particular, the Western Catholic, published in Quincy, Illinois, devoted practically an entire issue to the most vile and indiscreet remarks about the Jewish people. A letter, directing attention to the injustice of these attacks, and the undeserved injury they might result in, was sent to a number of the most influential Catholic church dignitaries of this country, and the replies indicated that the action taken by those guilty of attacking the Jews was not approved of by those in high authority. A letter from the Archbishop of Melitene, Apostolic Delegate at Washington, clearly shows their attitude. He states in part:

"In reply, I wish to state that the Catholic church is opposed to provoking race hatred or attacking people because of their religion or political tenets. Hence, it is needless for me to say that I do not approve of what the Rev. M. J. Foley has written, or what any one else writes against the Jewish people in connection with Mr. Nathan's appointment as Italian Commissioner to the Panama Exposition."

As a result of this position taken by the clergy, the section of the Catholic press above referred to discontinued its attacks on Jews and confined opposition to Mr. Nathan.

In a previous section we referred to the campaign against pernicious motion picture films. For a time it seemed as though this influence was extending itself through the agency of the motion picture companies into the field of literature. Our modern publicity system devised the scheme of publishing the stories of motion picture films in magazines simultaneous with the exhibition of the picture. The Short Stories Magazine published a series of stories entitled: "The Chronicles of Cleek," simultaneously with the Edison motion picture films of the same name. We are glad to report that the action of the Edison Company in withdrawing "The Mystery of the Amsterdam Diamonds," one of this series of films, was duplicated, so far as possible, by Doubleday Page & Company, publishers of the Short Stories Magazine, with regard to the story of the same name in that series. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 15.)

It would make this report unduly long, were we to attempt to recite all the instances where complaints have been made in relation to references to the Jew in magazine articles. The Managing Board has adopted a very broad and liberal policy, and has at all times considered the general effect of a particular sentence or paragraph. Thus, every now and then, some correspondent will advise us that such and such a magazine has given a more or less important character in a story a Jewish name and ascribed to him certain objectionable characteristics. In such instances no protests have been made to the editors. We do not want to give the impression that we are going about "with a chip on our shoulders," and that we are ready to show fight at every little slip of the pen. It was deemed wiser not to dissipate our efforts in minor, comparatively harmless instances.

NEWSPAPERS

One of the first circulars issued by the League was a letter sent to all the important newspapers in the country, directing their attention to the harm which is done by the improper use of the words "Jew" or "Jewish," and inclosing a memorandum of what we regarded as the proper use. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 16.) This memorandum was prepared by Mr. Adolph Ochs, Editor of the New York Times, a member of the Executive Committee of the League, and was favorably received by the newspapers. Many of them notified us that they had had copies struck off and posted on the desks of their employees. In many cases our circular elicited favorable editorials on the part of the newspapers to which it was sent.

All of us remember instances of the improper use of these words. One favorite method on the part of some newspapers used to be to lay stress upon the Jewishness of the individual, if he happened to be a criminal, and to take no notice of his religious faith if he happened to be a philanthropist or if the news item had no criminal bearing. We have kept careful track of all references to the Jew in the newspapers since the organization of the League. For many months we subscribed to clipping bureaus. We soon found that this was unnecessary. The campaign of education which we had carried out was showing its results and in comparatively few instances did the improper use of the words occur. During the past year only about fifty cases of this kind have been referred to us. Our policy in each case has been one of education. We have assumed, what in some cases may not have been true, that it had been an oversight; that all we needed to do was to call the matter to the attention of the editor in order that it might not occur again.

The matters objected to were of all kinds and descrip-

tions, ranging from a short news item in which a burglar was described as a Jew, to a long article purporting to describe Jewish characteristics. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 17.)

Another field in which we have had even less cause for complaint, has been in connection with advertisements, want adds, and so forth, in which reference was made to the Jew. There are many employers who will not hire Jews, but there are few employers who will come out openly in print and state that they do not want Jews to apply for positions. Even then there are few newspapers which will accept such advertisements, and from the small number of cases which have come to our notice, we are convinced that those have been printed through an oversight.

Now and then objectionable newspaper advertisements slip in, but in every instance all that was required to rectify the matter was a visit or a letter from our local committee member. Thus in St. Louis: an advertisement in the Post-Dispatch by a music teacher stipulated that no lessons would be given to "Jews or Negroes." The advertisement was removed as soon as the attention of the newspaper manager was called to the same, and a full apology offered for the carelessness in allowing the same to appear in its columns. Similarly, in Atlanta, an advertisement for a salesman stipulated that "No Jews, Drunkards, Gamblers or Beginners need apply." The advertisement was deleted when called to the attention of the advertising manager.

In several cases newspapers published articles which tended to give a false and erroneous impression of Jewish customs, ethics and morality. The League undertook to answer these charges in detail and in some instances were successful in having the replies reprinted in the same paper where the objectionable article appeared.

STAGE AND VAUDEVILLE

The stage has been called a mirror held up to nature, but the Jew has seldom been naturally reflected upon the stage; in some instances a caricature of saintliness, as in Cumberland's "The Jew," in others a caricature of depravity, as in Marlowe's "Jew of Malta." Although no dramatist would dare create another "Barabbas," the tendency towards caricature is still well defined in our modern drama. In most instances such caricatures are harmless and opposition only makes them thrive the more.

In general, our purpose as laid down in the Principles to investigate carefully all plays which deal in any manner or form with Jews, has been carried out. Often very delicate questions arise as to the interpretation of lines or of motives. Frequently what is regarded by some as having an anti-Jewish stimulus is by others considered to be philo-Jewish. The Managing Board has in such instances taken the stand that it is better to err by being too conservative than by being overzealous.

Occasions have arisen, however, when the situation was so clearly objectionable that firm action was necessary. In such cases the League met with complete success in its negotiations with actors and producers. Thus, in the white slave play, known as "The Traffic," which had a long run in Chicago, and which is now playing in the large theaters of the country, an incident occurred which was not material to the development of the plot, and which seemed to be a gratuitous insult to the Jewish people. The manager of the production was requested to meet the committee at its weekly meetings and talk the matter over. After a lengthy conference, he agreed to change the name and make-up of the character referred to, making it a negative one so far as nationality, creed and make-up were concerned. He kept his promise. After the play left Chicago a bulletin was sent out from

the League office advising members of the Executive Committee of the modifications which had been enforced in the plot with a view to discovering any tendency on the part of the management to put the play back into its original form. Similar courtesies were extended by Cyril Maude, the well-known English actor, in connection with a Jewish character in "Grumpy." (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 18.)

A much more difficult field is that involved in the caricature of the Jew in vaudeville. A vaudeville actor, impersonating a Jew, may make his act objectionable or otherwise by the addition or elimination of mannerisms or idiosyncrasies, or by the simplicity or vulgarity of his dress. By this we do not mean that an act having otherwise inoffensive lines is made offensive on account of alleged Jewish mannerisms. The distinction is far more subtle. An act having merely funny lines can become most pernicious if the actor is inspired by malice. A little touch here and there, a gesture, may do more harm than the vilest tirade of a "Bassanio." Some Jews are prone to see insult where insult was never intended. Some, on the other hand, have become so accustomed to turning the other cheek, or have become so indifferent by long years of endurance, that they cannot see an insult, no matter how forcibly presented. The League has attempted to steer a middle course, and it is here that it has found its chief difficulty. Almost weekly, complaints are received against this or that vaudeville act, which, in the opinion of our correspondent, who frequently is not a member of the Executive Committee and hence not conversant with our standards, is a vile and malicious slander of the good name of Israel. At first we were inclined to make protests to the booking offices or theatrical managers based upon such complaints, without attempt at verification. We soon found, however, that by doing so we were in many cases subjecting *our-*

selves to criticism. Our correspondents, in some of these cases, belong to the first category above mentioned, namely those who cannot see a Jew behind the footlights or hear a word of Jewish dialect without immediately taking offense.

The League has lately adopted the policy of securing verbatim transcripts of all acts to which exception is taken and of making protests only where, after the most careful consideration, there can be no question but that there is an evil to be corrected. The sad part about it all is that in a large number of instances those who are responsible for the most objectionable acts are themselves Jews. Because the "stuff" which they call comedy carries well and brings a laugh of derisive pleasure from their audience, and because they themselves are Jews, they often believe that *they* are the only ones involved, and if they choose to malign themselves, no other Jew has a right to complain. Many of them are ignorant and justify the caricature which they produce by stating that "they just act natural." They fail to realize that because they are vulgar, indecent and bereft of all sense of propriety, they have no right to brand all other Jews with the same characteristics, and to justify such branding by the answer that they themselves are "just acting natural."

As in other fields of our work so here we have adopted the policy of education. We have tried to show the booking agencies that a new spirit has arisen in Israel, and that the "Jew comedian" of this type has lost favor in the public eye.

MERCHANT OF VENICE

Prior to the organization of the Anti-Defamation League, the Central Conference of American Rabbis had been sponsoring a movement which had as its purpose the discontinuance of the use of "The Merchant of

Venice" in our grammar and high schools. One obstacle to the effective accomplishment of this result has been that the College Entrance Examination Board has included "The Merchant of Venice" in the list of plays required to be intensively studied as a prerequisite to admission to institutions of higher learning. The Central Conference had communicated with the Secretary of that Board in 1912 with a view to having this requirement set aside, and the Anti-Defamation League, after its organization, followed this up by a further effort. It was not until the requirements for the school year, commencing September, 1914, were prepared, that the College Entrance Examination Board finally removed the play from the list of those to be intensively studied, and made the study of the play optional. With this obstacle removed, the opportunity for an effective campaign against the intensive study of the play was offered us. The first step was to find out exactly to what extent the drama was being used in our public schools. A circular was therefore prepared, which was sent to the superintendent of schools in every city of 10,000 or over in the United States, and also to every state superintendent of schools. In this communication we submitted reasons why the use of the play should be discontinued, and cited the decision of the College Entrance Examination Board. The replies we received were very interesting. Many of the school superintendents or the high school principals to whom letters, in some instances, were referred, stated that they had never received any complaint against the use of this play, and that they could not understand why any Jew should object to its intensive study. Many others, however, appreciated our position at once, and on the basis of our original inquiry, took immediate steps to discontinue the study of the play. For example, the Superintendent of Schools at Mobile, Alabama, advised us that the play would not be

read in their high schools the coming year. The Deputy Superintendent of Schools of San Francisco wrote us:

"We think you are correct. We will substitute something else."

Many others replied in the same vein. To quote a few—

Superintendent Curzon of Kansas City:

"I am in full sympathy with the purpose of your League and join you in your stand against the use of 'The Merchant of Venice' in our public schools."

Superintendent Farley of Brockton, Mass.:

"It has been studied intensively in our high schools. If, as you say, the College Requirements no longer include this play, it will not be studied as it has been in the past but will probably only be read."

Superintendent Clark of Somerville, Mass.:

"We intend to retire it as soon as the present stock of books is worn out, if indeed, we do not do it earlier. Personally, I shall be glad to hasten the day when the play will not be used in any of our schools."

Superintendent Corbin of Southbridge, Mass.:

"If it is not in the requirement list, we shall not study it."

Principal Cleveland of Muskegon, Mich.:

"Have taken the matter up with the English Department, and it has been determined not to study 'The Merchant of Venice' in our English classes."

Superintendent Colgrove of Virginia, Minn.:

"Your letter received. 'The Merchant of Venice' will not be among the Shakespearean plays to be studied in our high schools next year. I see no reason why any material should be chosen that is objectionable to any class of people."

Superintendent Draper of Pawtucket, R. I.:

"I have directed the principal of our high school to omit it from the class room work."

Superintendent Cooper of Seattle, Wash.:

"We have determined not to have this drama read by the public school students of this city. I am in agreement with the sentiment expressed in your letter."

Superintendent Watson of Spokane, Wash.:

"'The Merchant of Venice' stands upon our list as one of the classics to be read by the English pupils in Grade 9. I asked the

heads of the English Departments to look over their courses to determine whether or not some other of Shakespeare's plays might not be substituted for 'The Merchant of Venice' without material loss to the course. After considerable deliberation, they concluded that the course was too heavy any way, and that they could discontinue, for the present at least, the study of 'The Merchant of Venice,' without detriment to the work, and I advised them to do so."

Superintendent Geiger of Tacoma, Wash.:

"I shall be glad to see that it is omitted from our reading courses hereafter."

The work is by no means finished. Nearly one hundred cities of this country at the present day have been prevailed upon not to use "The Merchant of Venice." Many of these have already stopped it. Others will discontinue its use commencing next Fall. About seventy-five more have the matter under consideration. There are about one hundred and fifty cities which thus far have given no indication of any change of policy. These need not, however, be regarded as "dead timber," as the League intends to continue its campaign—a campaign which may take years to bring to a successful conclusion—until this play has finally been driven from the class rooms of our public and private schools.

Many of the school superintendents have not looked with favor upon this movement. They seem to think that the only basis for our objection is the fact that some of the Jewish pupils in the schools may feel personally embarrassed during the study of this play, and that, therefore, if there are no Jewish students in the class, or if no complaint has ever been received from the Jewish people of their city on this ground, that there is no necessity on their part to take any action. Thus, for example, Superintendent Wheelock of Riverside, Cal., says:

"In my seventeen years' experience here we have never heard a word of criticism on the use of the play. To be sure we have not a large Jewish population, but we have had and do have a number

of prominent families whose children attend our schools. I cannot see any reasonable ground for objection to the drama. Why should a Jew object to the reading of a story because there happens to be a Jewish character which represents some of the baser passions? You would hardly exclude 'Richard III' because his character might be taken as a reflection upon Englishmen, or "Nicholas Nickleby," because Squeers is a reflection on the schoolmaster."

On the other hand, many of the superintendents take the stand that the plot and characters of this Shakespearean drama might be turned into potent illustrations of the baneful effect of race prejudice upon human nature. There is no denying that if properly interpreted and properly understood by the pupils that the influence of the play is not bad. There is also no denying that in many schools the play is properly taught and properly interpreted. In Santa Cruz, Cal., the teacher of English informs us:

"'The Merchant of Venice' is taught in the Santa Cruz high school, but so presented as to make clear that Shylock was more sinned against than sinning; that the Jewish race is one which commands respect and should be accorded it. It is good material for the teaching of tolerance and brotherly love."

Principal Williams of Sacramento, Cal., says:

"Personally, I think it depends entirely upon the manner in which it is handled in the teaching. A wise and careful teacher could make the pupil see that while Shakespeare was influenced by the hostile attitude of his day, there is yet much in the character of Shylock to excite sympathy; that he is fully as much sinned against as sinning, and if the teacher has been so fortunate as to see Henry Irving act the part, he can leave with the child a sense of shame that Christians were ever so un-Christian as to persecute the Jews as they did in the middle ages."

Superintendent Parlin of Chelsea, Mass., says:

"I think no Jew would object to it were it taught in a truly American spirit, a spirit of justice and fair play to all."

The head of the English Department of Chicopee, Mass., says:

"I wish that our Jewish friends who are rightly jealous for the racial and religious ideal might bend their energies towards the right kind of teaching of the play."

Superintendent Dressel of Kearny, N. J., says:

"I believe very much depends upon the way a teacher handles the play."

Superintendent Asher J. Jacoby of Elmira, N. Y., says:

"The head teacher of English informs me that when she taught the play it was made the occasion for teaching a broader tolerance for the Jewish race. The students were required to read Marlow's 'Jew of Malta' for contrast with Shakespeare's treatment of the race prejudice question and were required to compare the Old and New Testament teachings on justice and mercy to show whether Jew or Christian was following his religious creed the more closely."

Unfortunately, this is not the case with the great majority of our public schools, especially in the smaller cities. Such scholarship as is prerequisite for the correct interpretation of the play is not very common among the teachers of our grade schools or even among the professors of our high schools.

We are a small minority in this country. In many of the communities where this play is studied the Jews may constitute but an infinitesimal portion of the total population. We cannot hope, therefore, to improve the method of teaching the play where improvement is necessary. *This* we can do, however; we can present our case clearly and forcibly to the school authorities in each town and city. We can direct their attention to the fact that there are many other Shakespearean dramas that might be used to as much advantage as "The Merchant of Venice." If tactfully done, there is every reason to believe that not many years will pass before this "influence for prejudice" shall have been entirely dissipated.

CARTOONS

There are three well-known humorous weeklies published in this country, namely: "Puck", "Judge", and "Life". Copies of the Principles were sent to the editors of each of these publications immediately upon the organization of the League. "Puck" and "Judge"

at once responded, placing themselves on record as opposed to the malicious caricaturing of the Jew. "Life" ignored our communication, and continued the policy which it had been pursuing for some years past of slandering and defaming the Jew at every opportunity. It has been fiendishly clever in its campaign and has conducted its anti-Jewish propaganda in such a manner that objections were very difficult. Careful analysis was made, however, of all their cartoons, jokes and articles with reference to the Jew, and based upon the results of this analysis, a complaint was lodged. In reply we were informed that we were "in error in assuming that it was 'Life's' purpose to abuse the Jews," and our attention was directed to the fact that other nationalities and peoples were also caricatured, and that comparatively less space was devoted to the caricaturization of the Jew. In reply, we wrote that it was not the quantity but the character and nature of the jokes with which we were concerned, and stated that it was unnecessary for them to reply to our letter, as the columns of the paper would clearly reflect the spirit in which our communication was received. For about four months, not a single joke or cartoon to which exception could be taken was published in "Life." Then, for some reason or another, there was a sudden reversion to the old tactics, and for three or four weeks "Life" was as bad as it ever had been in the past. Recently another change has come, and for the last five months but little has appeared to which any serious objection could be made. Every once in a while some slighting reference is made, but compared to conditions two years ago, the paper is very clean indeed in this respect. (See A. D. L. Appendix No. 19.)

Very few objectionable caricatures have appeared in newspapers. A few have appeared in trade journals, but in every instance a protest brought prompt apology, and so far as we know the offenses were not repeated.

SUMMER RESORT DISCRIMINATION

Throughout the past summer complaints of discrimination on the part of summer resort owners against Jews were received almost daily. These complaints came from all parts of the country and from the most expensive as well as the poorest class of summer hotels. Attempts were made in each case to ascertain the causes and reasons for the hotel's policy. Many of the hotels, especially the more pretentious ones, stated that economically they could not afford to entertain Jews. For example, a Minnesota hotel keeper stated that it was quite immaterial to him whether he entertained Jews or non-Jews, but that his experience had been that when Jews started to patronize a place, non-Jews, for some reason or other, gradually stopped coming, and that within a short time he found he had an entirely Jewish patronage. This, he stated, was an equally desirable condition, except for the fact that Jewish people were much more likely to desert a summer resort *en masse* and go to another, whither the finger of fashion pointed, than was the case with non-Jews, and that he would then have an empty hotel on his hands and find it necessary to establish an entirely new clientele. Other hotel keepers did not consider it incumbent upon them to make any explanation whatsoever, while still others crudely stated that the Jews were not good enough for the class of people whom they entertained, that they preferred not to receive them at all. They implied that Jews are, as a people, unrefined, loud and vulgar, who believe that money is the sole criterion of gentlemanliness, and that with money they can break into any circles, however cultured and refined those circles may be. It cannot be denied that there are Jews who belong to this category; neither can it be denied, however, that these characteristics are found in at least as large a degree among non-Jews. We have found no summer resort which openly

discriminates against non-Jews on this account. On the other hand, many summer resorts, because of these alleged characteristics, more or less politely inform every Jew who presents himself, no matter how highly educated, refined or gentlemanly he may be, that he is *persona non grata*.

No self-respecting Jew has any desire to become a guest at such a place, and the League has at no time attempted to force admission for our people. The chief evil is not in the discrimination, but in the method by which that discrimination is made known. Letter-heads, circulars, telegrams in reply to inquiries, all bear the inscription in more or less offensive manner that no Jews are taken. When an "eight dollar a week" summer resort widely advertises its discrimination in this regard, the impression must be created that the Jew is sidered, therefore, that its activities should be directed in the main at the elimination of advertising of this nature on the part of the hotels. An amendment to the United States Postal Laws was therefore drafted, providing that no advertising matter, letter-heads, circulars, etc., should be sent through the mails by any hotel, summer resort, etc., which indicated a discriminatory policy on its part against any people on account of their religious affiliation. A Bill, embodying such an amendment to the Postal Laws, has been prepared and has been sent to one of our representatives in Congress, who is also a member of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Defamation League. The bill will be introduced as soon as Congress reconvenes, and the League will exert every effort to secure its enactment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The active work of the League has been conducted for a little more than one year. It is perhaps the first time in the history of Jewry that the defamation of the Jew

has received consistent, scientific and centralized attention. The Jew has been attacked for many centuries. Now and then the attack was of such paramount importance that it brought forcible and telling protests from prominent Jews throughout the world. At various times in the past, organized protests have been made against assaults upon the character and reputation of the Jew. Even as far back as the time of Voltaire, the Jews of Utrecht found it necessary to organize themselves, to offset the pernicious influences set in motion by that great French scholar. No American Jewish body has heretofore attempted to deal with this subject in a practical and efficient manner. There are some, even to-day, who are of the opinion that it is better to suffer assaults and attacks in humble submission, rather than to raise a protest and to guard against abuse and vilification. This theory has in the main been the theory of the Jews throughout the centuries. The measure of its failure is evident to us all. The "laissez faire" doctrine does not meet the requirements of a practical, competitive world. Within our own times we have seen prejudice and antipathy grow year by year. We have seen the young, innocent mind poisoned with stories of and concerning the Jew, that all the antidotes of brotherly love could not cure. Year by year we have seen, steadily increasing, the growth of the tendency to treat the Jew as an inferior or an undesirable. In this country of equality, dedicated to the principles of democracy, we have seen a steadily increasing invasion of the personal rights of a large body of the citizens. Thus, schools have refused admittance to students because they were Jews; hotels have refused Jewish guests; clubs have barred Jews possessing the highest standing in the community; landlords have refused to rent to Jewish tenants; country clubs have refused to Jews the opportunity for healthful relaxation; social organizations of various kinds will not

receive Jews as members; even trade unions will not give an opportunity to the Jewish mechanic.

It may be said that these discriminations are of no great injury to the Jew; that he can have his own hotels, his own clubs, his own residential neighborhoods; that there are schools which will admit Jews, and trade unions that give equal rights to all, irrespective of religion. While it may be conceded that the Jew, as a body, does not suffer directly from this form of petty personal discrimination, he does, however, indirectly suffer to a most serious extent. For the very fact that there is a discrimination is sufficient to create or substantiate the belief in the general public mind that there is a justifiable ground for the discrimination. When this takes place, then the Jew as a body, does suffer a most egregious wrong. To those who have closely studied the subject, it is no secret that the tendency above set forth has invaded even the courts of the land, and that today, in many sections of the country, the Jew does not stand upon an equality with his fellow citizens in jury tribunals. That every Jew, no matter what his vocation, starts life with a handicap is a fact known only too well to all Jews. So fundamental is this fact that it has given rise to the adage that "A Jew must be of pure gold in order to be taken for silver." No Jew ever rose to success and prominence because he was a Jew, but in spite of that fact.

Is it not reasonable that we should inquire the causes of this prejudice, discrimination and antipathy, and having detected them, is it not our bounden duty to eradicate them and remedy the evil so far as lies within our power?

The greatest evil which we, in this country, have to contend with is that all Jews are judged by the lowest type. The foibles and idiosyncrasies of the few are taken by the general public as pivotal characteristics of the entire Jewish body. The character upon the stage many years

ago known as "Sam'l of Posen" has been taken by countless thousands as typifying the character of the Jewish merchant. To countless numbers Shylock, in "The Merchant of Venice", typifies the Jewish banker. By many other Barabbas and Fagin are "the Jew". Characters of this kind upon the stage or in literature leave their impress, while characters as strongly drawn—Nathan the Wise, 'Riah and Daniel Deronda—are enjoyed and quickly forgotten. The evils caused by our current literature in this regard are even greater, because the literature is more widely circulated. Our endeavor, therefore, is and must continue to be, to prevent improper and scurrilous attacks upon Jewish character and reputation and to substitute by proper education a true appreciation of the Jew as he, in fact, is.

Every scurrilous attack upon the Jew, no matter what form it may take, should receive our prompt and careful attention. To permit one attack to remain unanswered is but an invitation to another attack from the same source.

We therefore recommend:

- (1) That the campaign against every form of scurrilous attack and defamation of the Jew be energetically continued.

- (2) That every publication which tends to defame the Jew be properly and manfully answered by a publication setting forth the truth in such manner as to reach the same reading public.

- (3) That every cause of unjust discrimination against the Jew be carefully investigated and combated by honorable means.

- (4) That the campaign to eradicate from the curriculum of our public schools all literature which tends to poison the minds of children, be continued.

- (5) That the survey of the economic and sociological

condition of the Jews of this country be systematically carried out along the lines stated.

(6) That a conservative, educational plan be undertaken, so that the general public may know the facts concerning the Jew. Such a campaign should include among others the following media:

(a) By furnishing for publication articles on the status of the Jew in its various phases.

(b) By encouraging the circulation through public and university libraries of books which truthfully set forth the history, religion, traditions, ethics, culture and philosophy of the Jew.

(c) By providing ways and means of supplying the smaller colleges and universities and other educational bodies with courses of lectures on Jewish subjects and by this means educating the future teachers and ministers to the truth of and concerning the Jew.

CONCLUSION

It is indeed with the greatest satisfaction that I express my gratitude to the members of the Executive Committee for the loyal support they have given to the officers of the League and to the Managing Board. Many members reside at a great distance from the headquarters and were far away from the activities which so enthused and encouraged the local members; and yet these members have generously co-operated and have spared no effort in the performance of every required duty. Many of the tasks which they were requested to undertake were not pleasant and were often of the most delicate and difficult nature, requiring great care, tact and discretion. It is not difficult for those who are in the midst of a work to keep up their interest when the work itself lends enthusiasm and the success achieved arouses a desire for greater effort. A large measure of credit for the success

of the work must, therefore, be given to those members of the Executive Committee who did their part far out on the distant battle line.

To the Managing Board of the Executive Committee, I wish to express my deepest admiration and thanks. The members of that Board are all men actively engaged in large business affairs, men whose time is ever in great demand. Each week these men faithfully attended the meetings of the Board and have attended extra sessions as necessity required. They have diligently worked upon sub-committees and have given their very best thought and energy to this work, each one laboring conscientiously and enthusiastically in the various duties undertaken, and all without ostentation or publicity, seeking no reward. Every meeting of the Board was a source of much pleasure to me. It was such wholesome satisfaction to be able to work with men of this character in an altruistic cause for the good of Israel. The memory of this association will ever be a source of pride and gratification.

Every member of the Managing Board joins with me in extending to our efficient and untiring Secretary, Leon L. Lewis, our deepest appreciation. A large share of our success is due to his tact, initiative and executive ability.

Our task has just commenced, in fact, what has thus far been done is merely the pioneer work. What we have accomplished within the past year cannot be measured by any of the ordinary standards. How many minds would have been poisoned by the defamation, which we were able to off-set, cannot be estimated. What we shall accomplish in the future depends very largely upon the co-operation and the loyalty of those to whom is entrusted the cause of Jewry. The field is unlimited and the opportunities boundless. The prejudice which distorts the public mind is the result of centuries of animosity. We

may not hope to eradicate it within a generation. We can, however, arrest its increase; we can stop further scurrilous attacks; we can demand fair and just treatment; we can insist that each Jew be judged by the same standards as the non-Jew; we can educate and enlighten the coming generation concerning the Jew; we can, by continuing the work with ever increasing effort, speed the day when there will be less hate and more love, less cruelty and more humanity, less prejudice and more justice.

Respectfully submitted,

SIGMUND LIVINGSTON,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

APPENDIX
TO
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE REPORT

PRINCIPLES OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE.

The Anti-Defamation League of America, founded under the auspices of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, is the result of a demand by the Jewish people for concerted action against the constant and ever increasing efforts to traduce the good name of the Jew. It aims by organized effort to bring about the abatement of the defamation of the Jew, and ultimately to put an end to unfair discrimination against all citizens. To carry out these purposes, it asks for the earnest support and co-operation of all broad-minded men and women, regardless of creed. In now outlining its activities, it is conscious of a grave responsibility, and it submits its plan of work with a due regard for the seriousness of its undertaking. As occasion may require, situations not herein provided for, will be met by appropriate measures. For the present the League contemplates the following activities:

EDUCATIONAL

1. Public and university libraries will be furnished with lists of books on Jewish subjects, which, in the opinion of the League tend to show the facts regarding Jewish ethics, customs, history, religion and philosophy.

Where it is found that the endowment of institutions, either private or public, does not permit the procurement of a fairly comprehensive number of books on these subjects, it will be the aim of the League to supply them. Investigations show that a majority of the public libraries of the country do not even possess a Jewish history written by a Jewish historian.

Investigation will be made of the bibliography on Jewish subjects in libraries. Wherever it is found that books which maliciously and scurrilously traduce the character of the Jew, are kept for general circulation—especially in public stackrooms—the proper authorities will be urged to withdraw such books from general circulation, or, at least, to place a restriction on their use.

2. The services of prominent lecturers and publicists, regardless of religious affiliation, will be enlisted for the purpose of delivering lectures on Jewish subjects at universities, public schools and at appropriate gatherings.

The League will provide also for the dissemination of litera-

ture designed to give the public a true understanding of the Jew and Judaism.

3. The League recognizes the fact that the mind of the growing child must be safe-guarded against even a suggestion of prejudice; therefore, where in our educational system, either public or private, text books are used which tend to pervert the mind of the child and create prejudice, a determined campaign will be waged to eliminate all such books from the curriculum.

VIGILANCE WORK.

1. The services of clipping bureaus have been secured to keep the League advised as to matters of interest affecting the Jewish people. Information regarding defamation and discrimination should be promptly sent to the Executive Committee of the League.

2. The League will secure corresponding representatives in every State, who will submit to the central office in Chicago all matters pertaining to those subjects which come within the scope of the League.

3. We should find our strongest allies in newspapers, periodicals and magazines, the great mediums for expression and exchange of thought. We therefore heartily endorse and commend the action of certain newspapers in adopting the policy of eliminating mention of the religious denomination of malefactors. We shall bend every energy toward making this policy universal.

4. Where articles appear which present the Jew in a false and unworthy light, we shall endeavor to secure correction either by retraction, or by an answer in the next or early issue of the same publication, thereby reaching the same reading public.

5. The League will attempt to secure the co-operation of the Press in eliminating from foreign and domestic news items, all matters which give an untrue impression of the Jew.

THEATERS AND MOVING PICTURES

Investigation will be made of all plays which deal with the Jew. If, after careful study, it is apparent that a play gives an untrue or unfair portrayal of the Jew, the League will endeavor to prevent its production in its offensive form, or if already staged, to secure the elimination of the objectionable matter. Similar measures will be taken in connection with moving picture films.

LEGISLATION.

1. With a view of preventing the presentation, in moving picture theaters, of films which are malicious and scurrilous caricatures, or are objectionable in other respects, the League will endeavor to secure, in the various states of the Union, the enactment of statutes similar to the one recently passed in the State of Ohio, providing for the appointment of a Board of State Censors. Where the passage of such a statute cannot be attained similar relief will be sought from the various municipalities by securing the enactment of appropriate ordinances.

2. The League will endeavor to secure the passage of laws, where the same is practicable, making it unlawful for any hostelry, directly or indirectly, to publish, circulate, issue, display, post or mail any written or printed communication, notice or advertisement, to the effect that any of the accommodations of such places shall be refused, withheld, or denied to any person on account of his creed. The League advocates this measure because the action which it is sought to make illegal creates prejudice, and not from any desire to compel the reception of Jews in such hostelries.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 1.

(Case No. 207).

October 27, 1914.

Major M. L. C. Funkhouser,
Second Assistant Superintendent of Police,
City Hall,
City.

Dear Major Funkhouser:

Through the courtesy of your department, I had the opportunity this afternoon of viewing a "Balboa" film, entitled "Rose of the Alley". This is a three reel picture, and has to do with the hardships of a beautiful young girl, named Rose Obrien, whose mother dies, leaving her without relatives or friends. While playing in the alley one day, she is accosted by a peddler, who is named "The Fagin". The peddler is made up to imitate "The Fagin" of Dicken's story. He has a hooked nose, scraggy black beard, long coat and dilapidated hat, peculiarities which one is led by the funny papers to associate with a Jewish peddler. His mannerism and the name itself, clearly indicates that the producers wish to give the impression that this man was a Jew. "The Fagin" offers to give the girl a dress. The next day he brings the dress to her, and the child joyously dons it. "Fagin" then has her in his clutches, and compels her to pick pockets, showing her, throughout the first part of the first reel, how it should be done. She is detected, and brought to trial. "Fagin" escapes. He is at the court room at the trial, and just before Rose's case is called, a dope fiend, who has been brought in on the same charge, points out the cowering "Fagin" as the man, who has caused his corruption by giving him drugs in exchange for pocket books lifted. The Jew is then placed under arrest, and Rose released on probation. This completes the first reel. "The Fagin" does not appear in either of the two subsequent reels. In fact, the story of the second and third reel is quite complete without the first reel. It deals with the employment of the girl as a servant in a wealthy family, her love for the young man of the family and their subsequent marriage and difficulties. In the last reel, there are certain objectionable parts, with which our organization is not concerned.

After discussing the matter with several members of the Committee, we have arrived at the conclusion that the first reel of

the picture is extremely objectionable, from our point of view. I think you are familiar enough with the purposes of our organization to understand why we have arrived at this conclusion.

It is true that this picture, in its objectionable phases, is almost identical with Dicken's "Oliver Twist." Our organization has always been opposed to the presentation of such subjects on the film screen. In the case of "Oliver Twist", however, we did not register a protest because of the obvious fact that in the minds of a great majority of motion picture patrons, a great name covers a multitude of sins. We felt that if we were to register an objection to "Oliver Twist", the cry would immediately be raised that we are attempting to stifle "the classics". In that case, we would be subjecting you and ourselves as well to the same criticism that was made at the time you invited us to view "The Merchant of Venice". In the case of the present picture, however, we feel that no circumstances of this nature interfere with the expression of our real feelings, and we, therefore, respectfully request that you refuse to issue a permit for the whole of the first reel of the film.

Thanking you for your many courtesies in the past, I remain,

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 2.

January 23, 1914.

Motion Picture Bulletin No. 1.

Dear Sir:

This is the first of a series of bulletins which will be sent out from time to time, as objectionable motion picture films are brought to the attention of this office.

A "Keystone" film entitled "Rebecca's Wedding Day" has just been released. The picture is one of the worst caricatures of the Jew which has appeared. The picture was inspected by the Chicago Censoring Committee yesterday, and the police department here has ordered that it shall not be exhibited in this city.

You are requested to watch out for this film, and should it be shown in your city, or its appearance advertised, to take such steps as may be necessary to stop its exhibition. If you cannot immediately attend to this yourself, kindly have some

member of the Lodge attend to it, not only in your own city, but in those cities close by, which are not represented on our Executive Committee.

Kindly advise us what action is taken, of any.

Yours very truly,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

Motion Picture Bulletin No. 2.

January 27, 1914.

Dear Sir:

A Lubin film, entitled "A Stage Door Flirtation" has been announced for release on January 30. The picture, which covers half a film (500 feet) is supposed to be a humorous one. It is, however, a caricature of an objectionable nature.

The two principle characters are called Levi and Schwartz, and are described as "two Yiddish sports". They become infatuated with Choocheata, a dancer, and the largest part of the picture consists in the depiction of the beatings which Choocheata's husband continues to give to each of the "sports", who, of course, in no case offers any defense, but submit lamb-like to the attacks of the dancer's husband. The whole picture is vulgar in tone, and besides being distasteful to self-respecting Jews, is a most banal production.

The picture has been suppressed in Chicago. Kindly watch out for this film, which will probably appear in your city in the course of the next week, and take such steps as you may deem advisable in relation thereto. Kindly advise us what action is taken, if any.

Yours very truly,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

Motion Picture Bulletin No. 3.

January 28, 1914.

Dear Sir:

A "LUBIN" motion picture film entitled "THE MISSING DIAMOND" was suppressed yesterday by the Police Department of this city. The picture is a caricature of the most pernicious kind. The film was released January 2nd and has perhaps already appeared in your city. Kindly investigate, and if it has not yet reached your district, take such steps as you may deem advisable in relation thereto.

The two previous Bulletins which have been sent out have been productive of much good. In many cases the managers of the theaters have agreed not to show the picture. Most of them have also written to their exchanges stating that they do not want pictures of a similar nature sent to them in the future. Several members of the Committee have also taken the matter up directly with the Police Departments of their respective cities with a view to the effectual suppression of all pictures of the same kind. The NET RESULT has been that the manufacturers are beginning to wake up to the fact that a picture like "Rebecca's Wedding Day" is a poor investment. We feel confident that if we keep up this campaign for the next few weeks that we will effectually discourage the production of similar films.

Do not allow the theater managers and others whom you may see get the impression that we are attempting to suppress all depictions of the Jew in motion pictures. We have, of course, no objections to films which are honest, natural and truly representative of the actual status of the Jew. In fact, among the reels we have inspected in the past week, we have found several which we have heartily approved of.

For your PRIVATE information, we may state that negotiations are pending with both the National Board of Censorship and the motion picture manufactures. They do not seem to realize the strength of the public opinion which has grown up against films of this character, and one of the purposes of these Bulletins is to bring the matter to their attention so forcefully that they cannot doubt the earnestness of our purpose or the strength of our resources.

Kindly furnish us with a full report of the motion picture situation in your city with especial reference to these protests, so that we may have full information when we again take the matter up with the National Board and with the manufacturers.

Yours very truly,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

Motion Picture Bulletin No. 6.

June 10, 1914.

Dear Sir:

For the first time in several months we have occasion to send out a bulletin with relation to an objectionable motion picture film. On May 26th the Edison Company released a picture en-

titled "The Mystery of the Amsterdam Diamonds, (The Seventh Mystery in the Chronicles of Cleek)." This picture centers around the activities of a Jewish jeweler, named Rosenstein, who receives stolen goods in Amsterdam and attempts to smuggle them into the United States through the assistance of Mrs. Rosenstein. A permit, issued to show this film in Chicago, has been cancelled by the Superintendent of Police. We think that pictures of this kind are bound to increase prejudice against the Jew, or to instill it in the hearts of children who might otherwise harbor no illwill against us. We are, therefore, advising you of this fact so that you may take such steps as may in your opinion seem advisable.

Since the early part of the year, we have had very little difficulty with the motion picture film manufacturers. Although direct negotiations were at first of little avail, it would seem the manufacturers have come to realize that motion picture exhibitors do not wish to insult a large proportion of their patrons by showing films depicting the Jew as a thief or scoundrel of one kind or another. This is the first occasion we have had to complain of any film manufactured by the Edison Company on this score, and we feel certain that as soon as the fact is brought to their attention that films of this kind are disapproved of by exhibitors, patrons and censoring bodies, we shall have no further cause for complaint. Please keep us advised of developments in your city.

Very truly yours,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

September 3, 1914.

Motion Picture Bulletin Number 7.

Dear Sir:

A six reel motion picture, entitled "The Master Cracksmen," recently produced by the Progressive Motion Picture Manufacturing Company of New York City has been rejected by the Chicago Board of Censors, under date of August 31st. This picture is based upon the "Raffles" story by E. W. Horning, entitled "The Amateur Cracksmen." One of the reels contains a section, showing the interior of a pawn shop kept by a "fence". The "fence" is given the name of Moses, and is made up as a Jew. He is shown in the act of receiving stolen goods and goes through various gestures and antics, which are evidently

intended to identify him as a Jew. He encourages one of the thieves to steal a very valuable diamond, and one of the slides of the picture contains a statement by Moses to the effect that if the man will steal this diamond, he will be able to pay all of his debts. Among other objectionable scenes, there is one in which the Jew is shown fondly kissing his money. Aside from this, the Chicago Board regarded the picture as a pernicious one because it made a hero out of the criminal.

This picture is one of the first produced by the above mentioned company. It is a feature film, which will probably have a rather limited circulation. Once it has been contracted for by motion picture exhibitors or exchanges, it will be a difficult matter to persuade them not to exhibit the same, as the loss to them would be comparatively heavy. We would, therefore, suggest that if you think this picture is likely to appear in your city, you take the matter up with the exhibitors and exchanges at your earliest opportunity.

We are negotiating with the manufacturers so as to prevent a recurrence of the evil, and are taking this additional step of writing to all the members of our Executive Committee, because we are informed that after being turned over to the film exchanges, the manufacturers have not sufficient control over the films to compel such "cut outs" as we desire.

The Annual Report of the Anti-Defamation League will be published in the near future. The Managing Board will greatly appreciate a complete statement of all unreported cases, as well as a brief resume of the year's work in your district.

Very respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Secretary.

October 28, 1914.

Motion Picture Bulletin Number 8.

Dear Sir:

A three reel film, entitled "Rose of the Alley", has just been issued by the Box Office Attractions Company of New York, subject to release at an early date. This is a "Balboa" film, and has to do with the hardships of a beautiful young girl, named Rose O'Brien, whose mother dies, leaving her without relatives or friends. While playing in the alley one day, she is accosted by a peddler, who is named "The Fagin". The

peddler is made up to imitate "The Fagin" of Dicken's story. He has a hooked nose, scraggy black beard, long coat and dilapidated hat, peculiarities which one is led by the funny papers to associate with a Jewish peddler. His mannerisms, appearance and the name itself clearly indicate that the producers wish to give the impression that this man was a Jew. "The Fagin" offers to give the girl a dress. The next day he brings the dress to her and the child joyously dons it. "Fagin" then has her in his clutches, and compels her to pick pockets, showing her, throughout the first part of the first reel, how it should be done. She is detected, and brought to trial. "Fagin" escapes. He is in the court room at the trial, and just before Rose's case is called, a dope fiend, who has been brought in on the same charge, points out the cowering "Fagin" as the man, who has caused his corruption by giving him cocaine in exchange for pocket books lifted. The Jew is then placed under arrest, and Rose released on probation. This completes the first reel. "The Fagin" does not appear in either of the two subsequent reels. In fact, the story of the second and third reel is quite complete without the first reel. It deals with the employment of the girl as a servant in a wealthy family, her love for the young man of the family and their subsequent marriage and difficulties.

The last part of the last reel of the picture is also objectionable, but for a different reason—a reason in which our organization, as such, is not directly interested. I refer to a scene in which the heroine performs a dance, in a costume especially noticeable because of its absence.

We have taken the matter up with the Censoring Board of this city and, as a result of our action a permit for the first reel was refused and various "cuts" were made in the last reel.

We wish you would take such steps with the motion picture exchanges and exhibitors in your city as would preclude the possibility of its being shown in your city, at least, so far as the first reel thereof is concerned. In view of the very objectionable matter in the last reel we feel that you ought to have no trouble, even with those who might not agree with you so far as the objectionable matter in the first reel is concerned.

As the League must depend upon the efficiency and zeal of the members of its Executive Committee, in order to secure results, we respectfully urge that you give this matter your care-

ful consideration. We also earnestly request that every member of the Committee be constantly on the lookout for all those things which come within the purview of our organization, and that prompt report be made to this office.

Kindly advise us what success you have in suppressing the film above referred to in your community.

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

November 5. 1914.

Motion Picture Bulletin Number 9.

Dear Sir:

A "Kay Bee" two reel film, entitled "In the Clutches of the Gangsters", was denied a permit yesterday by the Chicago Board of Censorship because of the fact that it contained two criminal characters—the worst in the gang—who were described, and intended to represent, men of the Jewish faith. This picture is subject to release on November 6th., and it is very likely that it will be shown in your city as it is part of the regular Independent release series. We hope it will be possible for you to prevent the exhibition of this picture in your city.

Motion Picture Bulletin Number 8, dated October 28th., relating to the Box Office Attraction picture, entitled "Rose of the Alley", has been satisfactorily reported on by a large proportion of the members of the Committee.

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

November 6, 1914.

Motion Picture Bulletin Number 10.

Dear Sir:

An "L-CO" motion picture film, entitled: "The Fatal Wedding", circulated by the Universal Film Manufacturing Co., will be released on November 8th. This picture is a Jewish caricaturization and very objectionable. It is very similar to the "Keystone" film entitled "Rebecca's Wedding", which was bulletined from this office heretofore.

Some time ago we had the promise of Mr. Carl Laemmle, President of the Universal Film Manufacturing Co., that no

objectionable films of this nature would be manufactured by his company thereafter. The Censoring Board of the city of Chicago called the attention of this office to the picture, and exhibited the same to a committee of this League. Mr. Laemmle, and Mr. Fleckles, Vice-President of the company, were invited to attend the meeting of the Managing Board to-day. Mr. Laemmle expressed, at that meeting, his sincere regret that this film had been issued, and stated that it went through by an oversight, it having been manufactured by a director in California, who was a new man, and who had not been made acquainted with the policy of the company to avoid manufacturing pictures of this type. He immediately volunteered to withdraw the film from the territory included in the Chicago Circuit, which, he stated, was controlled by his office, but that as to other territory, he was without power. Both Mr. Laemmle and Mr. Fleckles renewed their promise of co-operation and have assured us that their company would issue no further objectionable films.

We trust that you will give this your immediate attention, and that we may have a prompt report of your action.

Very respectfully yours,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 3.

RESOLUTIONS

WHEREAS, the ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF AMERICA, founded under the auspices of the INDEPENDENT ORDER OF B'NAI B'RITH, is the result of a demand by the Jewish people for concerted action against the efforts to traduce the good name of the Jew; and

WHEREAS,Lodge, No..... of the INDEPENDENT ORDER OF B'NAI B'RITH located in this city contains among its members a large percentage of the Jewish population of, who are also members of the ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE; and

WHEREAS, we have upon occasion while attending the various places of amusement in this city been subjected to mortification and embarrassment by the false, untrue and frequently ridiculous characterizations of the Jew upon the stage and in the motion picture films; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED: That we respectfully request the managers of the various theaters and motion picture houses of this city to do all within their power to prevent the performance of acts and the exhibition of such films as contain malicious and scurrilous caricatures of the Jew;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That we respectfully request the managers of the various motion picture theaters to notify the film exchanges and manufacturers, from whom they receive films, that they do not desire pictures of the character above referred to, to be sent to them.

.....

WE, the MANAGERS OF THE THEATERS AND MOTION PICTURE HOUSES of have no desire to exhibit in our theaters, films which defame the Jew or which hold him up to ridicule and contempt, and we therefore pledge ourselves to carry out the purposes expressed in the above resolutions.

NAME	THEATERS
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 4.

February 16, 1914.

Sir:—

We know that the Executive Departments of our cities are frequently called upon to give information which is readily available through other sources, and we wish to assure you at the outset that before writing this letter we have attempted to secure all the printed literature on the subject which is extant.

In preparing a report on the present status of MOTION PICTURE CENSORSHIP in the United States, we find it impossible, however, to secure any reliable information from the facilities at hand with reference to the situation in your city. We

would appreciate it, therefore, if you would forward to us any reports, etc., which you may have on the subject, and also answer in some detail the following questions.

- (1) Is the censorship official or unofficial?
- (2) Is it authorized by any specific ordinance or statute?
If so kindly enclose copy thereof.
- (3) Who are the censors and how are they appointed?
- (4) Do they receive compensation?
- (5) Are they under civil service rules?
- (6) Are the pictures censored before or after they are exhibited?
- (7) Is any attempt made to examine all pictures, or are pictures only examined when complaint has been made, or there is reason to believe that they contain objectionable matter?
- (8) Does the censoring body attempt to examine pictures which have been approved by the National Board of Censorship?
- (9) Please detail the methods employed in censoring films.
- (10) What class of subjects do you deem unsuitable for presentation? What are the standards of judgment in censoring? Are they definitely laid down? To what extent is the matter left to the discretion of the censors?
- (11) Does the censoring body attempt to censor pictures which grossly and maliciously caricature any people, or which are designed to insult those of a particular religion.
- (12) Is there any appeal from the judgment of the censors?
- (13) Are the motion picture film exchanges and exhibitors of your city in harmony with the administration on these questions?
- (14) In your opinion, is local censorship likely to be more efficacious than state censorship? Kindly give your reasons.

Thanking you in advance for any information you may give us, we beg leave to remain,

Very respectfully,

L. L. LEWIS,
Secretary.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 5.

(Case No. 93.)

March 12, 1914.

Mr. S. Lubin,
President, Lubin Film Mfg. Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Sir:

I believe it will be to our mutual advantage for the producers of motion picture films and this committee to come to a clear understanding with relation to the continued manufacture of films defaming the Jew. We fully realize the immense influence wielded by motion pictures. This influence may be turned to good ends; at the same time it may also be perverted toward evil.

We consider that any performance which tends to arouse prejudice against any particular class or sect is pernicious and productive of evil. The staging of a performance in which the characters, supposedly Jewish, exaggerate the idiosyncracies or even the shortcomings of a few Jews, whether this be done in the guise of comedy or not, is bound to be pernicious in its results.

The audiences which view pictures of this nature are made up of people from all walks of life—the mature and the immature—those who can truly interpret the performance, and those who can not, and hence carry away with them the idea that particular idiosyncracies or short-comings are characteristic of the whole people thus mis-represented.

We have therefore taken upon ourselves the labor of preventing such performances. The authorities in charge of censoring films in this city recognize the validity of our objections and refuse a permit in every case in which we make protest. We have found the owners of theaters most willing co-operators, and have tested thoroughly our ability to cope with the situation. Thus, "Rebecca's Wedding Day", "The Missing Diamond", etc., pictures which were extremely objectionable, were stopped by the authorities in Chicago, while the notification which we promptly sent to our representatives in a hundred or more cities caused a suppression of these pictures in practically every instance.

We fully appreciate that it is a loss both to the manufacturer and to the film exchange to produce a picture of this kind, and then to be prevented from utilizing it; it is also a burden upon

us to be constantly on our guard against films of this character. There is on our part, absolutely no animus in this work, but we shall continue to protect the Jewish people of this country from motion pictures exposing them to ridicule and insult.

In view of all these facts we believe that in this work we should have the co-operation of the producers, who should give us their assurance that in the future they will produce no films which can in any manner be deemed objectionable to the Jewish people.

A letter similar to this one has been addressed to each of the offending producers. We hope to have from you a speedy reply expressing your intentions in this matter, and trust it will be helpful in spirit and will relieve our organization from much unnecessary work; and that at the same time it may save the producers unavoidable losses due to withdrawals of defamatory films through local censorship boards or otherwise.

Very respectfully yours,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SIGMUND LIVINGSTON.

Philadelphia, Pa.
March 20, 1914

Anti-Defamation League,
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:

Your communication of the 12th. inst. is at hand and in reply we would beg to advise you that we are heartily in favor of your movement. It never has been our intention to hold any race or any creed up to public ridicule and such objections as have been made to our films by sensitive persons were always recognized where possible.

Occasionally a picture has slipped through where the comedy might be regarded as offending those who looked at the humor with a more or less skeptical vision, but to guard against this, in the future we have issued instructions to all of our directors that hereafter no pictures were to be made which might reflect upon any race or religion.

Assuring you that it has always been our policy to co-operate

with every organization which has to do, with the betterment of this industry and wishing you success in your work,

Very truly yours,

LUBIN MANUFACTURING CO.

(Signed) J. M. Lowrie
General Manager.

June 11, 1914.

(Case No. 145.)

Thomas A. Edison, Inc.,
249 Lakeside Ave.,
Orange, N. J.

Gentlemen:

Our attention has been directed to a film released by your company under date of May 26, entitled "The Mystery of the Amsterdam Diamonds. (The Seventh Mystery in the Chronicles of Cleek.)" The film has to do with the smuggling of stolen diamonds into the United States. The chief character in the film is a Jewish jeweler, named Rosenstein, who through the assistance of Mrs. Rosenstein attempts to smuggle the diamonds in question into New York. He is prevented from doing so through Cleek, the detective, who disguises himself as an old Jew. The film ends with Rosenstein and his wife being thrown in prison. The scenario from which this film was made appeared in story form in the June issue of Short Stories, the author being Mr. Hamsheiw. The magazine was published by Doubleday, Page and Company. You must realize that a film of this kind is extremely objectionable to the Jewish people of this country. The film would lose none of its force if the character of the "crook" were made a negative one so far as nationality or religion were concerned. The Jewish people of this country feel very strongly upon this matter, because of the unfortunate circumstance that, as a rule, non-Jews are too apt to ascribe the misdeeds of a single Jew to a whole people. A picture of the kind above referred to, is likely therefore to make existing prejudice stronger and to instill prejudice where none may now exist.

On the other hand many non-Jews are glad to assist us in the obliteration of all those things which tend to increase prejudice against the Jew. As an instance of this I may state that the Chicago Police have cancelled the permit, which was granted for the exhibition of your picture in this city. Many film com-

panies have also seen the impropriety of sending out pictures of this character, and have assured us that no picture derogatory of the Jew would be manufactured by them. Only recently the President of the Universal Film Company pledged himself that none of the companies controlled by that corporation would sin in this respect in the future, and the President of the Lubin Manufacturing Company has given us recently similar assurances, in relation to films caricaturing the Jew in an offensive manner. We feel that this matter need only be called to your attention to have it rectified.

Thanking you for an early response, we beg leave to remain,

Very respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Secretary.

Mr. L. L. Lewis, Sec.,
Anti Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Illinois.

June 15, 1914.

Dear Sir:

In the absence of Mr. Plimpton, the manager of our negative production, who is the one most familiar with the circumstances leading up to the production of "The Mystery of the Amsterdam Diamonds", I shall undertake to answer your letter of June 11th.

In the first place I want to assure you that there was absolutely no intent on the part of the Edison Company to "increase prejudice against the Jew" through this motion picture. As you say, the story came to us from the publishers of "Short Stories" and since it was published in story form at about the time we released the film, we did not feel justified in changing any of the characterizations except in small details. In fact, I think there would have been a decided objection on the part of the publishers of "Short Stories" had we done so.

Looking at the matter now it does seem as if we might have edited the story a little more carefully in its scenario form, and in view of the circumstances which have arisen since then I wish we had done so.

Yours faithfully,

THOMAS A. EDISON, INCORPORATED.

Kinetograph Department.

(Signed) L. M. McChesney,
SALES MANAGER.

Thomas A. Edison, Inc.,
Orange, N. J.

June 27, 1914.

Mr. L. L. Lewis, Sec.,
Anti Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sir:

We reiterate that greater care will be exercised in future in the production of any films of this character and we feel that you will have no further occasion to complain because the Edison Company has offended your League, or the Jewish people generally.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS A. EDISON, INCORPORATED,
Kinetograph Department.
L. M. McChesney,
SALES MANAGER.

(Case No. 143.)

Majestic Motion Picture Co.,
Mr. J. B. Dunning, Treasurer,
29 Union Square,
New York, N. Y.

June 20, 1914.

Gentlemen:

"Some weeks ago your company issued a film entitled "The Surgeon's Experiment". We understand that this is a two reel film, and that in one of the reels the thief, who is the subject of the experiment, is shown taking stolen property to a "fence", who, although his name appears on the Film as "Wing, the Fence", is made up as a Jew, and indulges in the mannerisms and idiosyncrasies usually coupled with impersonations of a Jewish pawnbroker on the burlesque stage. This particular incident in the film was eliminated by the censoring board of this city, on the ground that it was an insult to the Jewish body of this country to stage a character of this kind as a Jew, that it was likely to increase prejudice against the Jew and to instill prejudice in the minds of children, who might otherwise bear no ill will. The part referred to was such a small portion of the entire picture, that we did not feel justified in taking the matter up in the same manner that we have

handled other pictures of this class. We have recently received many complaints, however, about this particular portion of the film. We are addressing you, therefore, in the hope that the expression of popular disapproval, which we voice, may be influential in bringing about a more careful consideration of the proprieties in the manufacture of subsequent films by your company.

The picture would have lost none of its force, and would have been equally true to life, had the character of Wing been made a negative one, so far as religion or nationality are concerned. The prejudices of many centuries are not easily wiped out. Many people, otherwise highly cultured, are densely ignorant of the true character, worth and standing of the Jewish people. They receive their impressions and information in a vivid manner through motion picture films. Children, especially, thousands of whom have never come in personal contact with Jews, frequently obtain their only knowledge of us in that manner. Our League is engaged in a work of education. Our aim and object is to eliminate, so far as possible, those things which tend to keep alive prejudice against the Jew. You, like so many others, lose sight of the fact that the modern Jew of America has become like his neighbour in practically every respect, except that of religion. His point of view is the same; his ideals are high, and his patriotism as fervid. We think, therefore, and in this we express the view of the vast majority of this country, that the only manner in which the Jew can be properly depicted is as a member and confessor of Jewish religion, and that the same restrictions which apply to representations of the followers of other religions, must apply to the Jew.

We trust that you will receive this letter in the same spirit in which it is written. Can we count upon your co-operation?

Thanking you for the courtesy of a prompt reply, we beg leave to remain,

Very respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Secretary.

Anti-Defamation League,
Chicago, Ill.

July 7, 1914.

Dear Sir:

We are in receipt of your favor of the 3rd inst., inclosing copy of your letter of the 20th ult., and same will have our attention.

We, of course, regret exceedingly that there should be anything objectionable in any of our films, and we are somewhat surprised at your letter, as we have had no other complaint of any kind from any source whatever, about this film.

We are sending a copy of your letter to our scenario and producing departments at the coast, for their information and attention.

Assuring you of our desire to make our films so there can be no criticisms, we are,

Yours very truly,
MAJESTIC MOTION PICTURE CO.
(Signed) J. B. Dunning,
Treasurer.

(Case No. 221).

Anti-Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Ill.

Nov. 12, 1914.

Gentlemen:

We wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 5, and are glad that you brought this matter to our attention.

We are recalling the film "THE ROSE OF THE ALLEY" from each one of our Exchanges throughout the country, and unless we can find a way of eliminating the character you complain of, we will not allow the picture to be shown any more.

Very truly yours,
THE BOX OFFICE ATTRACTION COMPANY.
(Signed) William Fox,
President.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 6.

(Case No. 242)

Nov. 30, 1914.

Mr. Adam Wiener,
49 Chambers St.,
New York, City, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

We are releasing in the near future two pictures depicting Hebrew life, "A Daughter of Israel" and "The Barrier of Faith". Both of these productions have been very carefully

put on, but if there are any members of your League who would like to see these pictures before they are released, we should be very pleased to give them a private exhibition, and would thank them for their criticisms.

Assuring you of our co-operation in every way possible, we are,

Very truly yours,

THE VITAGRAPH COMPANY OF AMERICA.

(Signed) Albert E. Smith.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 7.

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR REGULATION OF MOTION PICTURES

Section 1. PERMIT REQUIRED TO EXHIBIT MOVING PICTURES. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to show or exhibit in a public place or in a place where the public is admitted anywhere in the City of any picture or series of pictures of the classes or kinds commonly shown in mutoscopes, kinetoscopes, cinemetographs, and such pictures or series of pictures as are commonly shown or exhibited in so-called penny-arcades, and in all other automatic or moving picture devices, whether an admission fee is charged or not, without first having secured a permit therefor from the chief of police of the City of

Section 2. APPLICATION FOR PERMIT. Before any such permit is granted, an application in writing shall be made therefor, and the plates, films, rolls or other like apparatus by or from which such picture or series of pictures are shown or produced, or the picture or series of pictures itself is shown or exhibited, shall be shown to the chief of police, who shall inspect, or cause to be inspected, such plates, films, rolls or apparatus or such picture or series of pictures, and within three days after such inspection he shall either grant or deny the permit. In case a permit is granted it shall be in writing and in such form as the chief of police may prescribe.

Section 4. IMMORAL PICTURES—PERMIT NOT TO BE GRANTED. If a picture or series of pictures for the showing or exhibition of which an application for permit is made, is immoral or obscene, or portrays any riotous, disorderly or other unlawful scene, or has the tendency to disturb the public peace, or to defame or hold up to ridicule any religious sect, it shall

be the duty of the chief of police to refuse such permit; otherwise it shall be his duty to grant such permit.

NO TRANSFER OF OBJECTIONABLE FILMS

CONFISCATION—PENALTY. In case a permit shall be refused for any such moving picture plates, films, rolls or other like articles or apparatus from which a series of pictures for public exhibition can be produced, it shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to lease or transfer the same to any exhibitor of moving pictures or otherwise put same into circulation for purposes of exhibition within the city.

In every case where such objectionable moving picture plates, films, rolls or other like articles or apparatus from which a series of pictures for public exhibition can be produced shall be shown, exhibited or put into circulation contrary to the provisions of this ordinance the same shall be confiscated, and in addition thereto the person, firm or corporation so leasing, transferring or putting the same into circulation shall be fined not less than fifty dollars nor more than two hundred dollars for each offense.

Section 5. FEE FOR PERMIT. The permit herein provided for shall be obtained for each and every picture or series of pictures exhibited, and shall be required in addition to any license or other imposition now required by law or ordinance.

The fee for each of such permits shall be fifty cents and shall be paid to the City Treasurer before same shall be issued.

Section 6. NOTICE OF TRANSFER OR LEASE—DELIVERY OF PERMIT. When a permit to show a picture or series of pictures is once granted to an exhibitor, the picture or series of pictures may be shown by any other exhibitor; provided, that the written permit is actually delivered to such other exhibitor, and that a written notice of the transfer or lease to such other exhibitor is first duly mailed by the transferee or lessee to the chief of police. Said written notice shall contain the name and a brief description of the picture or series of pictures, the number of the permit and the location of the building or place where the transferee or lessee proposes to exhibit such picture or series of pictures. The exhibition by any transferee or lessee of any permitted picture or series of pictures, without first mailing such notice, shall be considered a violation of this article, and a separate offense shall be regarded as having been committed for each day's exhibition by the transferee or lessee of each picture or series of pictures, without the mailing of such notice.

Section 7. POSTING OF PERMIT. The written permit herein provided for shall be posted at or near the entrance to the theater, hall, room or place where any permitted picture or series of pictures is being exhibited, at such a place and in such a position that it may easily and readily be read by any person entering such theater, hall, room or place at any time when any such permitted picture or series of pictures is being exhibited, whether in the daytime or in the night time. The exhibition of any such permitted picture or series of pictures without the posting of the permit as herein provided shall be considered a violation of this section, and a separate and distinct offense shall be regarded as having been committed for each day's exhibition of any such permitted picture or series of pictures without the posting of the permit as herein provided.

Section 8. PENALTY. Anyone violating any of the provisions of this article shall be fined not less than fifty dollars nor more than one hundred dollars for each offense. A separate and distinct offense shall be regarded as having been committed for each day's exhibition of each picture or series of pictures without a permit.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 8
(Case No. 161)

New York, N. Y.
July 7, 1914.

Mr. L. L. Lewis,
Secretary, Anti-Defamation League
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sir :

Your letter of 2nd. instant is at hand.

I had not known before that your League was offended by the so-called "joke" which appeared in the May number of our Bulletin. It is customary for us to print short, humorous stories for the purpose of lightening the rather technical character of that publication. In doing so we may poke fun at people of all classes, but I assure you it is innocently intended? To do so maliciously would be utterly inconsistent with the general policy of this Company. We have 6,500 agents and more than 1,200 salaried employees. They are of all shades of religious belief, and there are many Jews among them. Some hold very important positions and those men are our warm, personal friends. Two of my closest personal friends are Jews whom I

have known intimately for more than thirty-five years. Some of our very best customers are Jews. You are quite right in saying that the percentage of dishonesty among the Jews is not greater than may be found in any other race. I have never sympathized with race prejudice and I believe that among the civilized nations in every one of them there is but little difference in the percentage of vicious or dishonest persons. And further, I think that among those nations the moral standard is quite as high in one as it is in the other. Perhaps that is because human nature is about the same the world over or because the thoughts of right-minded and intelligent men and women inevitably run along parallel lines toward high planes of ethics, no matter what their religious beliefs may be. In this great country of ours the absorption of foreign races which has been going on for so long has had a wonderful effect in softening racial and religious prejudices also in developing a spirit of great toleration.

Referring again to the stupid joke entitled "The Burning Building Clause," please receive my assurance that there will be no recurrence of anything similar to it in future numbers of that publication.

Yours truly,
FIDELITY & CASUALTY CO.,
(Signed) Robert J. Hillas
President.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 9.

(Case No. 21)

November 20, 1814.

Mr. Leon L. Lewis,
Anti-Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 19th inst. came to the writer as a great surprise and mortification. We fully agree with your attitude in regard to protesting against the use of the term "Jew" in a slighting way, there is no occasion for it whatever, and on behalf of the Northwestern Agriculturist we apologize for the slip which got into our columns. We assure you that we have taken the matter up with our assistant and given orders that

nothing of the kind shall ever again be permitted in the columns of the Northwestern Agriculturist.

Certainly we have a high regard for the Jewish people. Some of our warmest personal friends are Hebrews. Personally we do not share in any such prejudice as is indicated by the sentence in Mr. Thiessen's article, which you object to, and we endorse your protest absolutely.

Yours truly,

P. V. Collins Publishing Co.
(Signed) P. V. Collins.
President.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 10.
(Case No. 244)

Dec. 1, 1914.

National Bottlers' Gazette,
99 Nassau St.,
New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen:

Our attention has been directed to a letter dated Monessen, Pa., and signed by Mr. C. Mihm of Mihm's Bottling Works, which was republished recently in an issue of your magazine. The letter contains the following sentence:

"It is only the cheap Jew they are after, underselling an honest bottler and using cheap goods, go after them, Mr. Foust, we say, and the Jew will disappear from ruining the business."

We cannot understand why your paper considers it necessary to reprint a letter of such a nature. It may be true that there are Jews, whose competition is so keen that some manufacturers may find it necessary to resort to unfair tactics in opposing them. We do not see, however, what reason there is for referring to the religious faith of such competitors. There is probably just as much unfair competition among non-Jews as Jews. We are sure that on thinking the matter over you will realize the injustice that such a letter does to all Americans of the Jewish faith. I am told that the policy of your paper has always been one of fairness, and I can only account for the appearance of the letter upon one theory, and that is that the contents were unknown or carelessly passed over when the letter was reprinted. We feel, however, that some explanation is due.

You will note from the inclosed circular that our League is

engaged in an effort to eliminate prejudice against the Jew. It will not be productive of very much success, however, if instruments of public opinion, such as yours, persist in the misuse of the words "Jew" or "Jewish". One of the most fertile sources of prejudice in the past has been the very misuse of these words. Whenever a crime was committed by a Jew, or something done which placed the Jew in a bad light, the fact that he professed the Jewish religion was always mentioned. If he did not happen to be a Jew, his religious denomination never appeared. We have been successful, in large measure, in remedying this state of affairs in most papers and magazines, and earnestly desire your co-operation as well.

I am enclosing herewith a circular, which contains a statement of what we consider the proper use of the word "Jew". We should appreciate it if you would present copies of this to your compositors, proof-readers and editors.

Thanking you for an early response, I beg leave to remain,

Very respectfully,

LEON L. LEWIS,

Secretary.

September 16, 1914.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 11.

(Case No. 189)

The Editor, "Century",
Union Square,
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

In the September issue of "Century", there is an article entitled "The Hebrews of Eastern Europe", by Edward A. Ross. Ever since the publication of this article, our office has been flooded with complaints about the unfairness and prejudicial tone of Mr. Ross' article.

We do not believe that the editorial staff of the "Century" realized the injustice of the article, and the great possibilities of harm that might arise therefrom. We do not believe that the editorial staff of the "Century" desires to make that publication an instrument of distrust and injustice. We appreciate that no high class magazine desires to open its columns to a polemic upon any racial or religious question, and we have no desire to force such a situation upon you. We do believe, however, that it would be an act of justice on your part to publish

an article which would have a tendency to correct the false impressions which Mr. Ross' article has given rise to. We would be glad to secure without cost to you, and to forward for your approval, such an article, based on facts, written in good literary form, and prepared by some eminent sociologist. The article would make no reference to Dr. Ross.

I am instructed by the Executive Committee of the Anti-Defamation League, to ascertain whether or not you will be willing under such circumstances, to accept such article, and publish the same in an early issue, if found by you to be of equal merit and dignity as articles usually published by you.

Thanking you for an early response, I am,

Very respectfully,

LEON L. LEWIS,

Secretary of the Executive Committee.

October 5, 1914.

Mr. Leon L. Lewis,
Anti-Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Building,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

This magazine is always sorry whenever a reader disapproves of an article in its pages.

It may be of interest to you to know that we are shortly to publish a very appreciative article by Paul Warburg.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) The Editor.

December 4, 1914.

The Editor, "Century",
Union Square,
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

We were very pleased to receive your letter of October 5th., in reply to our communication of September 16th., in which you stated that you expected to publish shortly "a very appreciative article by Paul Warburg". We wrote to Mr. Warburg, proffering him the resources of our office to aid him in the gathering of data for his article, should he desire such assistance. In reply, he advised us, under date of November 30th., that he was not familiar with the matter to which we referred. and that

he had not agreed to write an article for your magazine, also stating that in view of his official position, he doubted whether it would be becoming for him to entertain such a proposition.

We do not wish to burden you with unnecessary correspondence, nor to appear to be forcing our request upon you. Our purpose in writing to you, at this time, is merely to renew the offer made to you in our letter of September 16th., which was to secure for you an article, written by some eminent professor of sociology, which would present the facts covered by Dr. Ross' article in a truly scholarly manner. Of course there would be no expense to you, nor would there be any attempt to criticize or discredit Dr. Ross.

Very respectfully,
LEON L. LEWIS,
Secretary.

December 17, 1914.

Mr. L. L. Lewis,
Secretary, Anti-Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

You misquoted me, I think. What I wrote was "We are shortly to publish a very appreciative article of Paul Warburg," not by him. This, and a sympathetic study of the people of the Ghetto are scheduled for early publication.

In reply to your suggestion as to an article covering the points taken up by Prof. Ross in his article in the September number, our Commissioner of Immigration, Frederick C. Howe, has already promised us a paper, and I know that he differs with Prof. Ross on several points.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Douglas Z. Doty.

December 19, 1914.

Mr. Douglas Z. Doty,
Editor, The Century Magazine,
Union Square,
New York City, N. Y.

My dear Sir:

Am in receipt of your letter of the 17th. inst., in relation to Professor Ross' article. The mistake was undoubtedly a steno-

graphic one, as the statement in your letter of October 5th., relating to the proposed article, contained the preposition "by" and not "of".

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the League, I wish to thank you for securing an article by Mr. Howe. We feel certain that his article will help to dispel the many false impressions which Professor Ross' article have given rise to.

Sincerely yours,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 12. (Case No. 201)

October 22, 1913.

The Curtis Publishing Company,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Gentlemen:

Our attention has been directed to the issue of the Saturday Evening Post of October 11, 1913, containing a story entitled "Deadbeats and Bad Debts", written by Forrest Crissey. One of the leading characters of this story is named "Isaacstein". The very name utilized shows the purpose of the author to characterize the Jewish people. On page 48, the author says "The alert Isaacstein had made the acquaintance of his fellow-countryman Golden"; and on page 49, the author says: "The Isaacsteins are the masters of their crooked craft and take as much pride in their achievements as does the expert safe cracksmen with an international reputation". On the same page the author says: "The deadbeat of the Isaacstein type is a deadbeat by instinct—he follows the profession because his instincts are predatory, and money made by his wits is far sweeter to him than more money gained in the pursuit of an honest calling". Many other matters in this article clearly illustrate that the author picks out the character named Isaacstein as one who is characteristic of the Jewish people.

No Jew of character and self respect can read this article without becoming conscious of the fact that he and his people have been maligned and that the characterization of his people is an intentional and inexcusable defamation. There may be cases now and then when a Jew is dishonest and a deadbeat. This, however, is in spite of the fact that he is one of the Jew-

ish people. If a Jew is a Polish Jew, he most likely possesses to a large extent the virtues and the shortcomings of the Polish people; if he is a German Jew, he possesses the virtues and shortcomings of the German people; if he is a Russian Jew, he likewise to a large extent shares both in the virtues and shortcomings of the Russian people. It is therefore improper to particularize or accentuate the dishonesty of any person and ascribe that shortcoming to the religious sect of which such individual may be a member.

It may possibly be that the author was unmindful of the serious consequences entailed by making this character a Jewish character. It is just such matters which are responsible, however, for the antipathy and prejudice against the Jewish people as a class by persons who read articles of the kind in question, and who take for granted that the shortcomings of the individual described represent a pivotal characteristic of the entire people.

We are quite confident that when you published this story you had no intention of maligning the Jewish people or in any manner giving them discomfort. We trust, however, that you can appreciate the harm and injury that may result from publications of this kind. Your magazine has a wonderful circulation and is read from one end of the country to the other. It reaches perhaps more homes than any other publication in this country. This fact makes the same of more importance than would an obscure publication of this story. It will reach people who know little of the character and standing of the Jewish people in general and whose minds are easily poisoned by pernicious characterization of the Jew. We are engaged in an educational work. The prime purpose of our organization is to enlighten the people in general as to the true character, worth and standing of the great Jewish body in this country. We know that our work will be appreciated by members of all classes who believe in equal justice to all people and who hope that the prejudice of one class of citizens against another may speedily be overcome. We earnestly solicit your assistance in our work. We can fully appreciate that publishers of periodicals have a trying task in endeavoring to publish without offense to any class a magazine on all, or general subjects, and that very frequently matters which are regarded offensive by some may not appear offensive to the publisher. We wish to assure you that we find no objection to the publication of stories de-

picting the true characteristics of the Jew, but when this is done it should certainly be a general characteristic,—one typical of the Jew as a people, and not a portraiture of the idiosyncracies and shortcomings of the individual.

This story and the objectionable parts above pointed out, was carefully read by men of deliberate and calm judgment, who concurred in the opinion that the same was unfair and likely to prove pernicious in its effect. We would therefore ask of you that the injury which has been caused may be mitigated by an explanatory note in an early issue that the character of Isaacstein was not intended as a characterization applying in general to the Jewish people, but was merely a portraiture of a type to be found among all sects and peoples; or that some other means be devised by which the misconception resulting from this article may be offset.

Any assistance which we can render to you in this connection will be most cheerfully at your disposal.

Very sincerely yours,

SIGMUND LIVINGSTON,

Chairman.

THE SATURDAY EVENING POST.

November 11, 1913.

Dear Sir:

It is quite true that in Mr. Crissey's article which we published in our issue for October 11th, and to which you call our attention in your letter of October 22nd one of the characters is given a Jewish name, but you will recall that in the same article are other names, such as, Sing Lo and McDougall, also characteristic of particular peoples. It is contrary to the policy of The Saturday Evening Post ever to discriminate against any particular race or any particular class. If you have studied our paper, you will remember that we have frequently depicted many fine characters belonging to your race, and we feel sure that on reflection you would not wish us to represent all Jews in a favorable light.

Regretting extremely that we should have published anything that could give rise to a misapprehension of our attitude in this matter, we remain,

Yours very truly,

(Signed) THE EDITORS.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 13.

(Case No. 43).

December 16, 1913.

The Editor,
Collier's Magazine.

Dear Sir:

A story entitled "The Yegg's Ambition", written by one B. N. Wall, appeared in your issue of November 29. This story was accompanied by an illustration drawn by Frank Snapp. One of the principal characters in this story is named Levisohn, who is depicted as a "fence" and described as a Jew. The idea of the author seems to have been to show the redemption of a burglar. He attempts to make the character of Farmer a sympathetic one, and so intent is he upon this purpose that he is absolutely ruthless in the manner in which he attacks the religion of nearly two millions of industrious and law abiding citizens of this country. No Jew of character and self-respect can read this story without feeling that he, his people and his religion have been maligned and that the defamation is an intentional and inexcusable one. We do not deny that there may be "fences" among the Jews as well as among any other people or religion. This is, however, in spite of the fact that they are Jews; statistics show that only a comparatively small percentage of this particular kind of crook are Jews. But even aside from that, I do not notice that the author states the particular religious affiliation of Farmer, "Chicago Joe" or of "Gorilla George". He does not seem to deem it necessary to state whether they are Catholics, Protestants or Lutherans. If he did would not thousands of your readers flood your office with indignant protests?

The purpose of the author, as we gather from a careful perusal of the story, is to show that Levisohn's act prevented Farmer from giving up his life of crime. The false sympathy thus aroused is carried further when the burglar makes the murderous assault upon Levisohn in order to make certain of his redemption; and it is brought to a climax when the proceeds of his brutal attack are sent back to the people from whom Farmer had stolen the necklace. The message the author seems to desire to impart is that the redemption of a non-Jew even though it be at the cost of robbing and murderously assaulting a Jew is a real regeneration. The character

of Levisohn is not made sympathetic in the slightest degree; on the contrary the author ascribes to him the worst characteristics of the miser and the blackmailer. The description of Levisohn, the picture on page eight, and the literal transcription of his brogue are most subtly designed to give the reader a sense of disgust and antipathy.

This story is very offensive to the Jews of this country. We are confident, however, that it was not a deliberate affront on your part, as we realize that in the management of a great magazine matters of this kind can easily escape your attention. We respectfully ask, however, that in the future some means be found of censoring stories of this kind.

Thanking you for a prompt reply, we beg leave to remain,

Most sincerely,

LEON L. LEWIS,
Secretary.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 14.

(Case No. 187).

September 16, 1914.

The Editor,
The Western Recorder,
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Sir:

In a recent issue of The Western Recorder appeared an article under the caption "The Jew as a Social Factor". The author of the same has made accusations against an entire people, which, if truthful, would indicate a most serious state of affairs. He has fallen into the too common error of accepting as true general misconceptions, and, by specious logic has given to these the authenticity of established facts. We assume that the author, as well as those interested in your publication, have no desire to disseminate false accusations against any people in this land, or to defame their character or repute. We assume further that you will welcome any suggestions which may point out to you the fallacies to which you have unconsciously given publication. If we deemed that the article was fathered by any ill will or improper motive, we assure you that we would not have written to you in the spirit which pervades this communication.

First, you charge "in all the great movements that make

for the moral uplift of mankind, he, (the Jew) is reactionary, first, last and at all times.' This is a severe and wholesale indictment,—an indictment so broad and sweeping in its extent that it bears the badge of inaccuracy upon its very face. If you have read understandingly the history of every revolution, you have found that Jewish manhood and genius were always at the forefront, battling in the cause of humanity. In the great and bitter struggles of Europe, to wrest from despotism the liberties of the people, you have found the Jew in the midst of battle. The greatest economic revolution of Europe was founded by Karl Marx and Ferdinand LaSalle, two Jews; and in the great struggle of Germany, combating the tyranic ideas of Bismark, you have Lasker, a Jew; in France, battling for the advancement of liberty, you have Crimieux, a Jew; and in England, uniting the people of the British Empire under a constitutional government, you have Disraeli, the son of a Jew.

The men, whom we have mentioned, are but a few of those who rose to pre-eminence in these world struggles. In this country, we find Jews in the early days of the revolution, struggling to make this the ideal land of liberty. When the great question of slavery overshadowed our country, the Jew was found with his fellow-citizens; thus, Isaac N. Wise with Beecher, and Judah B. Benjamin with Davis. In the great agitation against white slavery, which has recently swept over our country, the Jewish organizations were in the fore-front. Their work did not cease with the passage of resolutions. They entered energetically into the campaign; and it was a Jewish organization, the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, which drafted and had inscribed recently upon the statutes of the various states stringent general laws, putting an end to this nefarious traffic. We take it for granted that these were all great movements that make for the moral uplift of mankind.

When you drafted this accusation, you, undoubtedly, had in mind the statement made by you, that the Jew generally will be found opposed to prohibition. Even if your conclusion in this regard be correct, it certainly is not sufficient foundation for sweeping generalities which condemn an entire people. On the contrary, a careful analyst would see that there are several very good reasons why the Jew has not been more actively lined up with the forces that have fought for prohibition. A large majority of them believe that prohibition does not prohibit, and that perhaps it may not be the best way of solving

the problem. You are undoubtedly aware of the fact that alcoholism is practically an unknown quantity among the Jews. There are so few Jewish drunkards that it has never appealed to the Jew as a problem of education, and of control. A great many of the Jews believe that a stronger manhood can be created by compelling self-restraint, and by the exercise of moral force than by prohibitory laws. Another cause, and one which you have evidently not taken into consideration, is that a very large part of the Jewish population of this country comes from Germany, Austria and Russia, and upon this question they are naturally aligned with the people of those countries. It is a rare exception to see a German, or an Austrian or a Russian who believes in prohibition, and yet would it not be the height of folly to say that the German or the Austrian is against the moral uplift of mankind?

Your further implication is that money lenders and usurers, as a rule, are Jews, and that they are "proverbial for their pawnbroking propensities." This general statement is in the same class with the comparison frequently heard, "he is as rich as a Jew". It requires but a most cursory examination to show that Jews, as a people, are among the most poverty stricken in this country. The per capita Jewish wealth in this country is less than the per capita wealth of any other religious sect, except the negro churches. The charge that you make is frequently heard, and is but the result of the tendency so often encountered, to charge the shortcomings of an insignificant minority of the Jewish people against all Jews. If some Jews in Russia are money lenders, it is due not to a desire to pursue a parasitical vocation, but to the brutal regulations and restrictions of the Russian government, which prevent them from pursuing any other calling. That the charge is untrue, so far as it applies to American Jews generally, was most strikingly disclosed about two years ago, when the Chicago Tribune conducted an active campaign against money lenders and usurers. Its investigations disclosed that practically all of them, especially those most merciless in their pursuit of unfortunate debtors, were non-Jews, and the majority of them women. You can readily verify this fact by going through the files of the Tribune of that period, or by writing to the Editor of the paper.

Another misconception is that most Jews are merchants or tradesmen; while the Jew does, to some extent, engage in these

pursuits, and has a large representation in the commercial life, it is also true that the vast majority of Jews is engaged in handicraft. The Jew is found in large numbers in the factories of the large cities. Jewish artisans outnumber those engaged in other vocations manifold. The fact that the Jew has not in the past been an agriculturist is not his fault. It was un-Christian treatment by Christians which forced him from the land and made him a tradesman and an artisan. For centuries and centuries, the Jew was prohibited by Christian nations from owning or leasing land or from tilling the soil, just as to-day he is restricted in Russia. He was forced by the laws of Christian despots to eke out an existence in the mart of the world and if by reason of these persecutions his intellect has been sharpened and he has been made a financial genius, as you charge, why should Christians then blame him for these characteristics, which persecution and intolerance have developed?

You further state "The more we have studied the question, the more we have been persuaded that the persecutions of this people have not been altogether undeserved." We did not know that true Christianity ever espoused persecution in any form. We did not know that a true Christian would ever be persuaded to lend his support to persecution. In fact, this part of your article seems as though it were taken from the pages of the Apologists of the Spanish Inquisition and not the thought of the modern American Christian. If you desire really to inform yourself upon the subject matter, of which you write, we would advise that you study "Jewish Ethics" by Lazarus; and if you wish a full and accurate treatise upon the cause of persecution of the Jews, we advise you to study "Anti-Semitism, Its History and Causes" by Bernard Lazare.

In conclusion, you ascribe all of the delinquencies referred to in the article to the irreligious attitude of the Jews of this country. You state that "As a race they have ceased to be a religious people." If this be true, it is but an illustration of the tendency which exists in all religious denominations to-day, and if your logic were correct, the same consequences will follow as to non-Jews as well as Jews.

We believe, that instead of Jews being reactionary in matters that make for the uplift of mankind, they are always to be found in the vanguard; that when eventually the greatest of all moral movement will have been solved, so that universal peace will reign over the world, so that Christian nation will no longer

battle against Christian nation, and will not desecrate the most sacred of all things, by asking the benign blessing of the Almighty Father on their murderous arms, that the Jew, in his love for his fellow men will eventually fulfill his mission and bring peace to all the world. If his dispersion throughout the world and his suffering under bitter persecution for centuries shall have eventually been productive of the establishment of universal peace then indeed his mission will not have been in vain.

Respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

Sigmund Livingston,

Chairman.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 15.

(Case No. 146)

APOLOGY.

Bulletin Board of Short Stories Magazine.

"From Mr. L. L. Lewis of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Defamation League, 721 First National Bank Building, Chicago, comes a protest against 'The Mystery of the Amsterdam Diamonds,' the Cleek story in our June issue. Objection is taken to the characterization of Sol Rosenstein, a Jewish pawnbroker. As Mr. Hanshew the author, is dead, we wish to assure Mr. Lewis, the Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish people at large that the story was not intended to cast any slur nor disrespect on any one."

June 27, 1914.

L. L. Lewis, Esq. Sec.,
Executive Committee,
Anti-Defamation League,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

We regret exceedingly that the Cleek story in "Short Stories" proved to be offensive. We, of course, had no idea of printing this story to give any one offense.

The story to which you object was one of a series contracted for some time ago; and in accordance with our agreement with the author and with the Edison Moving Picture Studios, we were compelled to print 'The Mystery of the Amsterdam Dia-

monds'. Realizing that it was in many respects objectionable, we endeavored to substitute another story which was all right, but we were unable to do so. The story was edited somewhat before publication but it was impossible to cut out all the objectionable features. Of course, the story might have been told about an Irishman, or a German, or an American; but it just happened to describe a Jew, which we agree is unfortunate.

We shall be very glad to run a notice in our page devoted to 'Notes', but unfortunately it cannot appear until the October number because all the issues previous to that have gone to press.

Thanking you for your letter, we are,

Very truly yours,

DOUBLEDAY PAGE & COMPANY,

(Signed) Russell Doubleday

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 16.

NOTE ON THE WORD "JEW".

The word "JEW" implies primarily a person professing the Jewish religion. Owing to certain historical causes, the adherents of this creed are almost exclusively of one race, or, at any rate, of persons who for the most part believe themselves to be descended from the people called by the same name in the Bible. Hence there is a secondary use of the word "JEW", implying that the person belongs to a particular race or people, quite apart from his religious beliefs.

There is, however, a third use of the word "JEW", owing to the deliberate policy of the mediaeval church which purposely shut out all reputable callings to Jews, so as to impress upon Christians the superiority of the true faith. Hence, a certain touch of opprobrium and contempt has attached to the very name "JEW", which has lasted to some extent down to the present day among the common people, and even among some of the better educated, not one of whom could probably trace the real origin of his prejudice.

However unjustified and obsolete the prejudice thus attached to the word "JEW" may be, it exists in many minds and has to be reckoned with by the moulders of public opinion. Jews are naturally and deservedly more sensitive to this unconscious prejudice, and have at times attempted to introduce instead of the word "Jew" other terms, such as "HEBREW" --

"ISRAELITE" in order to obviate it. But these have failed to replace the more familiar nomenclature, and of recent years the better class of Jews have adopted the policy of boldly identifying themselves with the term "JEW" with the hope of thus wearing down the mediaeval associations connected with it.

With a view to meeting this sentiment among Jews and to avoid catering to the prejudice which all fair-minded persons, whatever their creed, would like to see disappear, rules are offered for guidance as to the proper use of the words "JEW" and "JEWISH" in the public prints:

RULES FOR GUIDANCE

(1) The words "JEW" and "JEWISH" can never be objectionable when applied to the whole body of Israel or to whole classes within the body, as, for instance, "JEWISH wives" "JEWISH children," "JEWISH young men," and the like.

(2) There can be no objection to the use of the words "JEW" or "JEWISH" when contrast is being made with other religions. "JEWS observe Passover and Christians Easter"; "JEWS are less susceptible to tuberculosis than other races"; these are perfectly fair and proper subjects of public comment. However,

(3) The application of the word "JEW" or "JEWISH" to any individual is to be avoided unless from the context it is necessary to call attention to his religion; in other words, unless the facts have some relation to his being a Jew or to his Jewishness. This rule should apply equally whether the word is used in a scandalous or discreditable connection or when it is used in connection with some praiseworthy or honorable act or achievement. Thus, if a Jew is convicted of a crime he should not be called a "JEWISH criminal"; and, on the other hand if a Jew makes a great medical or other scientific discovery, he should not be called a great "JEWISH physician" or an eminent "JEWISH scientist". In neither case had the man's Jewishness any connection with his conduct or with the disgrace or honor which that conduct entailed. The same rule applies in the case of other religions; if a Roman Catholic or a Protestant is convicted of a crime, he is not alluded to as a "CATHOLIC criminal" or a "PROTESTANT

criminal". In view of the mediaeval opprobrium still surviving in connection with the term "JEW", it is the more just and important, therefore, to avoid a similar unfairness in speaking of Jews.

(4) The word "JEW" is a noun, and should never be used as an adjective or verb. To speak of "JEW girls", or "JEW stores" is both objectionable and vulgar. The word "JEW" is a noun; "JEWISH" is the adjective. The use of the word "JEW" as a verb—"to JEW down"—is a slang survival of the mediaeval term of opprobrium, alluded to above and should be avoided altogether.

(5) The word "HEBREW" should not be used instead of "JEW". As a noun, it connotes rather the JEWISH people of the distant past, as "the ancient Hebrews." It is used also as an adjective—"the Hebrew language" "Hebrew literature", etc.—but as such it has a historical rather than a religious connotation: one cannot say "the Hebrew religion", but "the JEWISH religion."

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 17.

(Case No. 132)

May 20, 1914.

Mr. Leon L. Lewis,
Secretary, Anti-Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Building,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Sir:

I regret very much that the article by "Polly Pry" which appeared in The Evening Post April 21 has given offense to our Jewish brethren. I quite agree with you that she might have written the facts in the case in a way which would not even by implication or inference reflect on a race when the acts of only an individual were involved.

In the publication of The Evening Post there is no purpose nearer my heart than the promotion of a spirit of broad tolerance and brotherhood. There is no place in the world where this spirit can be more effectively cultivated than in Chicago with its cosmopolitan population and interdependent racial elements.

I have read the "Note on the Word Jew" which you enclosed and have given instructions that proofs of it be struck for the guidance of all reporters, copyreaders and editors.

Your first letter, I might state, was referred to the managing editor of The Post and I was under the impression that you had received the answer expressing my sentiments.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) John C. Shaffer.

April 29, 1914.

The Editor,
Chicago Evening Post,
Chicago, Illinois.

During the past few days we have received several complaints with reference to an article appearing in your issue of April 21st., by "Polly Pry", dealing with the Mexican situation. In this article the following statement appears:

"The chief of the constitutionalists' trusted agents is Felix Summerfeld, a German Jew, with the oily sycophancy of an old-clothes dealer and the far-seeing vision of his race where money is concerned, " etc. etc.

The whole trend of the article sets off the high-minded idealism of Madero by contrasting the crawling parasitism and materialism of the man Summerfeld. We know nothing of the facts alleged, nor have we any sympathy for Summerfeld if what you state is true; but we do object to the implication that the objectionable traits which he is said to possess are typical of Jews as a people generally. Furthermore, the use of the word 'Jew' in this article is essentially improper. Had he been a Roman Catholic or a Baptist, would the article have read "Felix Summerfeld, a German Roman Catholic" or "Felix Summerfeld, a German Baptist"?

We realize that in the management of a large newspaper it is a difficult matter to keep a sharp eye on the great mass of 'Copy' which each day passes through a newspaper office. On the other hand the offense in this case is so gross that it ought certainly to have caught the attention of your copyreaders. We trust that you can appreciate how Jewish citizens feel upon reading an article of this kind.

We are inclosing a Note on the proper use of the word "Jew". If you are inclined to assist us in our work and prevent the repetition of the evil, please circulate it among your

copyreaders so that they may have some rules for their guidance in relation thereto.

We trust that this matter will have your earnest attention and that we may be favored with a reply.

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Secretary.

(Case No. 48)

December 22, 1913.

Editor of the Tribune,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sir:

In the Semi-Monthly Magazine Section of the Sunday Tribune, December 14th., the first and principal story was entitled "Bringing the Fairies to Broadway". One of the characters in the story is the owner of a toyshop and is described as a Jew. He is referred to wherever mentioned as a despicable character. To illustrate, the following will serve the purpose: He is mentioned as an "evil, rapacious old Jew who owned a toyshop"; again "the little Jew met him gloomily"; again "'Naw,' snarled the Jew"; again "he could not go back to the Jew and he was too discouraged to try others".

Permit us to direct your attention to the fact that it was absolutely unnecessary to make the owner of the toyshop a Jewish character. All the other characters in this story have names such as Emanuel Fink and Amelia, but the owner of the toyshop has no name but is referred to throughout as the "old Jew". The story is written for children. What effect will such a story have upon the childish mind? Will it conduce to promote a brotherly spirit, or will it poison the childish mind against the Jews. Who can foretell how many innocent childish minds this simple story has poisoned to such a degree that all the antidotes of Christian love and brotherhood cannot counteract the evil effect! We regret deeply that stories of this kind intended for children are not written with greater care, so that they may produce good instead of sowing the seed of evil. This story will be read by children who perhaps have never met a Jew, or who know nothing of the Jew as he really is. A story of this kind naturally impresses the childish mind; a mind picture of this "evil, rapacious, old Jew" is so fixed that the child will carry it as typical of all Jews. It is only after

years of effort that the prejudice created in the child's mind can be eradicated.

This story perhaps was not edited by the staff of your paper, or if so they unconsciously passed it without being mindful of the evil it produces. We trust that you can, however, appreciate how that great body of Jewish citizens feel, who are making an earnest effort to eradicate unnecessary prejudice, so that in this country at least each citizen will be judged according to his merits and demerits. May we not bespeak your assistance in our work, so that a story that has pernicious influences of this kind may not be published and distributed by you. We trust that this subject will have your earnest personal attention and that we may be favored with a reply.

Very respectfully,

SIGMUND LIVINGSTON
Chairman.

December 30, 1914.

Mr. Sigmund Livingston, Chairman,
Anti-Defamation League,
721 First National Bank Building,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of December 22nd to the Editor of the Chicago Tribune, commenting on the Jewish character in the story BRINGING THE FAIRIES TO BROADWAY published in The Semi-Monthly Magazine of December 14th., has been referred to us.

We wish to assure you that we had no idea or intention in any way of holding the toy merchant up to ridicule as a Jew. As a matter of fact, we toned down the character a good deal in the manuscript as it originally stood, and in so far as the toy merchant was only a minor character in the story, and was only referred to briefly, as compared with the principal character, Emanuel Fink, we had no idea that there would be cause for criticism or offense. As a matter of fact, the story might be open to criticism from German-Americans who might take umbrage at the character of Emanuel Fink. In any event, it was far from our intention to give offense in any feature of the story,

If you feel so disposed, we'd be glad to have you acknowledge

this explanation in a letter to Mr. James Keeley, General Manager of the Chicago Tribune.

Your very truly,
(Signed) Wm. Griffith.
Editor Semi-Monthly Magazine.

(Case No. 276)

January 28, 1915.

The Editor,
Los Angeles Times,
Los Angeles, Cal.

Dear Sir:

In the Illustrated Weekly of your issue of November 28th., 1914, there is a story entitled: "While Court was adjourned." It is unnecessary for me to go into detail as to the contents of this story, as you have it before you, and by reading it can determine the reason for the writing of this letter. Suffice it to say, the Jew, in the story, is made out to appear as a whining, cringing, cowardly cur. He is described by the judge as "the most despicable piece of manhood that has ever been brought into this room." He is so low that the judge feels that the punishment meted out by law is too good for him, and he, therefore, feels it necessary to descend from his judicial bench and to plant "his judicial fist again and again in the flabby face of Cohen." To make the contrast more certain, the other characters in the story are named Murphy and Casey. This story is so obviously an attempt on the part of the author to arouse prejudice and hard feelings towards the Jew, and especially towards that class to which Morris Cohen is described as belonging, namely, "the type that is often successful in the management of small jewelry stores and pawn shops" that we are surprised a paper, having as high a standard and reputation as the Los Angeles Times, should publish it. Unfortunately, there are only too many persons who are willing to believe the worst of the Jew, and a story of this kind, published by a reputable organ of public opinion can do a tremendous amount of harm. It is quite possible that in publishing it, you failed to realize the injustice that was being done to two million reputable citizens of the United States.

We feel that it is unnecessary to explain why we are interested in this case, as we have been in communication with your

office previously, in reference to an article, appearing in your Weekly Supplement of October 18, 1913, which purported to describe certain Jewish types. At that time, we were assured by Mr. George N. Black, who was a Los Angeles member of our Executive Committee, that we could depend upon the editors of the Times to be fair, and that though the article in question was malicious, the publishing of it, so far as the editors of the Times were concerned, was not inspired by malice. We have written to you because we do not believe that a man of your standing and character will permit the further publication of articles that tend to injure hundreds of thousands of innocent people. We should be pleased to hear from you.

Very respectfully,
LEON L. LEWIS
Secretary.

New Times Building, First and Broadway
Los Angeles, Cal.

Feb. 22, 1915.

Mr. Leon Lewis,
Secretary, etc.
721 First National Bank Building,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of January 28th., addressed to the Editor of the Los Angeles Times, is before me.

I note your complaint against the publication in the Los Angeles Times Illustrated Weekly of November 28, 1914, of a story entitled "While Court was adjourned."

I am surprised at your complaint, wherein you assume, without sufficient justification, that the man who was "polished off" by the court (not from the bench or in banc) was a Jew "per se", and as a matter of course.

The sketch does not say so, although the inference is perhaps unmistakable.

But if he had been a Jew, do you not admit that he got what was coming to him from the indignant court—off the bench?

And if he were not a Jew, but a Gentile, a Yankee, a Dutchman or a Mexican, which he might have been in this mythical story, are you not also willing to admit that he got what was coming to him from the court sitting, or rather standing and acting, while off the bench.

One peculiarity of complainants of your ilk is that they often read in The Times, without response or objection, strong and good things said in favor of Jews and the Jewish race, and creditable things done by Jews and narrated in the Los Angeles Times, whereas, when something is published exposing a rascal of a Jew, the same as other rascals are exposed, "without regard to race, color or previous condition of servitude", a tremendous howl is set up and bitter charges are made that the Los Angeles Times is "against the Jews". The facts do not bear out such complainants in their protestations.

I suggest that you yourself should show more toleration, discrimination and saving good sense, if that feat be possible on your part.

There is such a thing as a supersensitive person "hollering before he is hurt."

Yours truly,
(Signed) Harrison Gray Otis.

Editor and General Manager.

P. S. In order to make my meaning and the attitude of The Times in this respect clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt, I might cite unnumbered instances where the side of the Jew has been taken by my journal in cases where race persecution has been undertaken by individuals, by other religious classes, and even by nations. While rascally Jews have frequently been borne down upon by us, unmercifully, and without apology, the Hebrew as a race has always received justice at our hands. We cannot be convicted of either prejudice or persecution in this regard.

Perhaps, while you are in the business of publishing things on behalf of the "Anti-Defamation League" of Chicago, you may be moved to exploit this letter. You are at liberty to do so.

March 9, 1915

Harrison Gray Otis, Editor,
Los Angeles Times,
Los Angeles, Cal.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 22nd. inst. came duly to hand. It, no doubt is extremely difficult for a non-Jew, who has not made a study of the subject, to appreciate the situation and feeling of the Jewish body in reference to defamation of their people.

The very purpose of our organization is education, so that we may be able to bring before those who have a large part in the shaping of public opinion a true understanding of this matter. We have never heard of the charge that the Los Angeles Times is "against the Jews", and we are quite confident that your publication is no different from newspapers in general in that regard, and that there has been no preconceived intent to defame in certain articles that have been published. In nearly every instance, we find matters, which are defamatory, are published without due consideration of their possible consequences, and without the least intent to hurt the feelings of any part of the public. You make the statement that we are supersensitive. We make an earnest effort to be conservative and to weigh carefully all matters called to our attention. Knowing that in matters of this character, we are ever charged with supersensitiveness, we take special care so that our action may not be attacked validly on this ground. If we fail in this, we can assure you that it is only after the most earnest efforts have been made not to be subjected thereto.

We wish to lay before you the peculiar situation of the Jewish body, so that you may appreciate why we protest against the publication of articles—particularly in fiction—which portray the mean, disagreeable, dishonest or criminal individual, personified by a Jewish character. In every country, the Jew represents but a small minority. He has no central power. There is no Jewish nation or Jewish country. In this regard, he differs from all other peoples of the earth. For many centuries, he was subjected to bitter religious persecution. He was charged with being the cause of all the misfortunes that befell the country, wherein he happened to live. Thus, he was held responsible by the general public of mediaeval Europe with causing the scourge of the Black Death. He has been charged with a systematic effort to poison wells so as to kill off the Christian population. He has been charged with ritual murder, and so powerful were these charges of centuries ago, that they have defied even the enlightenment of modern centuries, so that we saw within the last year in Russia a case, where an insignificant Jewish peasant was charged, in a court of law, with ritual murder. In later centuries, when religious persecution was diminished, the Jew became the subject of national and economic oppression, and finally added to all this, came the social persecution. During all these centuries, these animosities

against the Jew were reflected in literature, and the literature of the world on this subject has necessarily influenced the mind of to-day. Thus, the character of "Shylock", portrayed by Shakespeare, has been so fixed upon the public mind that "Shylock" typifies the Jewish character. Any man, who has honestly studied the Jewish character, knows that this is false. No matter how false the accusation directed against a people may be, the constant repetition of the same without contradiction gives to the same a presumption of authenticity. To illustrate: we frequently hear it said in an effort to describe the wealth of a man that "he is as rich as a Jew", when as a matter of fact, the per capita wealth of the Jew is the lowest of any religious sect in the country, except that of the negro church. We know full well that there are Jews who do not measure up to the standards of citizenship or morality. We do not claim for the Jew that he is any better than his neighbor. We do, however, claim that he is just as good in citizenship and morality. The one great evil that has burdened the Jew is that the general public are always willing to accept the shortcomings and idiosyncrasies of the individual Jew as typifying the characteristics of the Jew in general. Thus, if a criminal, either in fiction or in news item, is described as a Jew, it leaves the impression upon the general public that here is a crime for which the Jews in general are responsible. No other people in this country suffer from this peculiar state of affairs as does the Jew. If a Protestant commit a crime, he is regarded as an outcast, as one who has not lived up to his religious teachings, as one who has none of the virtues which characterize his brethren. If a member of any other Christian religious sect does the same, no stigma attaches to the rest of his people. But if a Jew commits a crime, immediately comment states: "All Jews are alike." Even when applied to nationalities, the same is true. Thus a German or a Frenchman may be convicted of a crime; it would not reflect any material discredit upon their fellow Germans or fellow-Frenchmen. But when a malefactor is described as a Jew, it injures the entire Jewish body, and another dose of poisonous prejudice has been fed to the world. Our organization was effected to mitigate this evil so far as lay in our power. We are asking that the general Jewish body shall not suffer because of the demerits of particular individuals. We may not be able to wipe out prejudice, existing in the general mind against the Jew, a prejudice which has been

created and strengthened by almost twenty centuries of defamation and persecution. With the co-operation of those who have the power to form public opinion, we believe we can stop the increase of prejudice and eventually relieve the public mind of sordid antipathies so that the Jew, as his fellow men, may be judged as an individual, and that each shall have such credit for his conduct as he may deserve.

You state in your letter that when creditable things are said of the Jew in the Times that no response or objection is made. If any matters are published, concerning the Jewish people, which help to bring before the public the value that the Jew has been to civilization, or which give proper credit to the sacrifices and heroism of those who have suffered because they were Jews, there can be no question but that the action on the part of such papers meets with an appreciative response in the heart of every good Jew; but the Jew does not claim any credit for what some individual Jews may accomplish in their individual vocations or endeavors. Thus the discoveries of Professor Ehrlich cannot be credited to the Jews, merely because Dr. Ehrlich happens to be a Jew. His contributions to civilization and science belong to the German nation, where he was educated and where he lives and which nation perhaps made his discoveries possible. The same is true of the discoveries of Dr. Flexner. His contributions to science cannot be claimed by the Jews. They are America's contributions, as it is an American institution which gave him the opportunity.

We trust that we have made ourselves clear on this subject matter. It is a large subject, which cannot be fully and sufficiently treated in a letter, but if you are further interested, and have the time and inclination to do so, we would recommend for your perusal two books which set forth the matter in all its phases: "Anti-Semitism" by Bernard Lazare, a non-Jew, and "Prejudice" by Dr. Joseph Krauskopf of Philadelphia, Pa., Dean of American rabbis.

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SIGMUND LIVINGSTON
Chairman.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 18.

(Case No. 309)

March 23, 1915.

Mr. Cyril Maude,
c/o Blackstone Theater,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sir:

The Anti-Defamation League of America, on whose behalf this letter is written, is a national organization, composed of representative citizens, which is making a serious study of the causes of class prejudice, and endeavors to remove them when ascertained. At a meeting of the Executive Committee last Tuesday, our attention was directed from several sources to one of the characters in "Grumpy", namely, the one called "Isaac Wolfe".

We do not base our objection at all on the manner in which this character is acted by Mr. Buckstone. That is a work of art. All that we object to is the name by which the character is known. Our thought is that the character might without trenching on the value of the play be given some other name, so that the public will not at once jump at the conclusion that he is a Jew. Nor have we any desire to saddle his iniquity upon any other people. It is a simple change, which we are certain will be countenanced by the authors of the play, to give the character in question some name which will be a negative one, so far as nationality or religion are concerned.

It may seem odd to you that we should take this stand, in view of the fact, as your Manager informs us, that no one has hitherto made any protest to you on this account. The fact that no Jew or Jewish or other organization has done so, is very likely due to the circumstance that until the formation of the Anti-Defamation League, there was no organization which made a study of this subject.

At the meeting referred to, a sub-committee consisting of Judge Philip Stein, Mrs. Henry Solomon and Mr. Israel Cowen, was appointed to call upon you and present this matter in person, as the subject was regarded rather difficult to handle in a letter. The committee, however, was unfortunately unable to reach you, and we are, therefore, at the suggestion of your Manager, taking this means of presenting the reasons for our attitude and request.

At the outset let us assure you that we are certain the char-

acter in question was given its name without the least intent to hurt the feelings of any part of the public. However, it may be that you have never stopped to consider the matter from the Jewish point of view; but if you have done so, you will realize that psychologically the position of the Jew, as shown by the history of the Christian era, is far different from that of almost every people or religious sect.

Dickens recognized this psychological difference in "Our Mutual Friend". "Riah" says:

"For it is not, in Christian countries, with the Jews as with other people. Men say 'This is a bad Greek, but there are good Greeks. This is a bad Turk, but there are good Turks'. Not so with the Jews. Men find the bad among us easily enough—among what people are not the bad easily found? but they take the worst of us as the samples of the best; they take the lowest as representatives of the highest; and they say 'All Jews are alike.'"

We are asking that the general body shall not suffer because of the demerits of particular individuals, real or fictional. If it lies within the power of anyone by the mere change of a name to minimize this prejudice of the centuries, we are sure that it will be your pleasure to lend your aid to that end; for it is by the cooperation of those who have the power to form public opinion that we can eliminate some of the causes which tend to keep prejudice and sectional and international hate alive.

As we are, I believe, deputed to speak on behalf of a very integral part of the people of the United States, in this respect, we have counted upon and therefore bespeak your co-operation.

We would be pleased to hear from you.

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Secretary.

Blackstone Theater,
Chicago, Illinois.
March 26, 1915.

Leon L. Lewis, Esq.,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Mr. Lewis:

Your letter of the 23rd. to hand. I am certain your society

will realize that the character was not created by the authors to offend any community. However, I am sorry to say that it does not lie within my power to change any part of the original manuscript.

I have this day forwarded your letter to the authors with my request to change the name and can assure you, if they will agree to it, I will do so at once.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) Cyril Maude.

A. D. L. APPENDIX NO. 19.
(Case No. 120)

April 28, 1914.

Sigmund Livingston, Esq.,
Anti-Defamation,
721 First National Bank Bldg.,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of April 21st., which, as you state, is intended to be a protest against "the abusive caricaturing of the Jewish people," you are in error in assuming that such is LIFE'S purpose. A careful examination of this paper would show that references to the Jewish people take up, as a rule, less space than that given to other nationalities, all of whom are impartially treated in our columns.

No consideration or criticism of this paper by any one class of people is fair which does not treat the paper as a whole. On the other hand, it is the obvious thing, and perhaps natural, for one class to assume that LIFE is directing its shafts against them to the exclusion of everyone else. Just as you do, they almost invariably lose their sense of perspective by seeing only the particular thing which happens to offend them.

We assume, however, that you intend to be fair, and while this paper must always reserve the right to direct its own policy, we are replying to your letter in the same spirit in which you wrote us, requesting that you bear in mind the fact that LIFE is an American paper, published upon the broadest lines; and the attempt to curtail it in any one direction, would not only weaken its influence as an American institution, but would be directly inimical to the principles and practice of the American

people, who have placed freedom of speech among their fundamentals.

Yours very truly,
LIFE PUBLISHING COMPANY

May 13, 1914.

The Editor,
"Life",
17 W. 31st. Street,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your courteous letter of the 28th. ultimo. We appreciate your disclaimer of any intent to traduce the character and standing of the Jew. You intimate that by seeing only the particular thing, which happens to offend us we have lost our sense of perspective; and you state that in order to be fair we "must treat the paper as a whole." We fully understand that fairness and liberality must be exercised in matters of this kind, and are willing to measure the conduct of others by the same fairness and impartiality by which we would have our conduct measured. You further state that caricatures of the Jew take up as a rule less space in your paper than that given other nationalities. It seems to us that it is not a matter of consequence whether there have been more caricatures of one people than another; it is not the quantity, it is the character and nature of these pictures and jokes which control our judgment, for your caricatures of the Jew damn a whole people with idiosyncrasies or foibles of the few. If in the whole world there are not two persons with exactly the same views on every subject, nor two faces perfectly alike, how is it possible to give the moral picture of a whole people with one dash of the pen? The morality of a nation is as variable as that of the individuals composing it. Just as nature varies in the individual according to physical circumstances, so does the temperament of nations vary according to political vicissitudes. If this be true of nations, it is also true with regard to Jews in particular, be they regarded as a scattered nation or a religious creed. The Jews of this country come from all the nations of Europe and Asia. Naturally they bring with them the characteristics of the people among whom they lived; but just as the characteristics of other immigrant people are lost in the second and third generations in this country, so does the Jew also rapidly adapt himself to his new environment. Loyalty to the

land of his adoption is not the least of those traits which he acquires. Wherever he has gone he has given himself wholly and unstintingly. Jewish soldiers and sailors in the Civil War outnumbered proportionately those of any other class; and but recently two Jewish marines were among the seventeen who fell at Vera Cruz. There is in this country one Jew to about every fifty inhabitants; the proportion of those who died at Vera Cruz was one Jew to every eight non-Jews.

It must be conceded that certain characteristics are popularly regarded as typical of certain nationalities. For example, the frugal Scotchman, the volatile Frenchman or the musical German are favorite subjects for caricature. Were equally harmless characteristics ascribed to the Jew there would be no occasion for this letter. But the caricatures of the Jew, appearing in your paper, are in many instances productive of the impression that Jews as a people are greedy, grasping, gold-seeking exploiters; a people devoid of culture, learning, refinement or patriotism,—devoid of all those higher virtues and talents, which history shows they possess in at least as great a degree as any other immigrant people. It would be ridiculous to deny that some Jews do possess obnoxious characteristics, but they are not thereby made "JEWISH" characteristics. It does not harm the Irishman, the German or the Swede to be made the subject of good-natured humor; but to depict one class of people, and one class only, as the money-grabbers, the boors, the unscrupulous exploiters, the parasites, and thereby to expose them to contempt and even hatred, is so bald an injustice that no "American paper published on broad lines" and imbued with the principles and practices of the American people will knowingly be guilty of it.

In view of the fact that there has been and still is so much religious prejudice in European countries, it is all the more important that the Jews of America resist any instrumentality, which adds to existing prejudices and antipathies; otherwise they would fail in their duty to posterity.

We have gone into this matter at length because you state that it is not "Life's purpose to publish abusive caricatures of the Jewish people", and that your intention is to treat all peoples impartially. Accepting your statement, we are confident that you will see the justice of our position and that hereafter the talent of your artists in seeking to find some characteristic of our people which will be amusing to all people will succeed without aiding in creating hatred against a por-

tion of the American public, even though that portion be in the minority.

A reply would be appreciated, but it is probably unnecessary for the columns of your paper will clearly reflect the spirit in which you will receive this communication.

We remain,

Very respectfully,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
SIGMUND LIVINGSTON
Chairman.