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Irwin Pollock

Relative to other countries, such as the United States, there exists little scholarly work on minority groups in Canada. Aside from filling a natural academic void, minority studies are especially relevant because of this country's multi-ethnic composition. In particular, this study attempts to examine certain attitudes found within the press of one minority group — Jewish Canadians.

Canada's Jewish community has not hesitated to involve itself in almost all aspects of Canadian society — academia, science, politics, etc. It has also not hesitated to comment through its own press, on the urgent political issues of the day. In this study I will focus on one such issue: the civil rights of minority groups during the years 1930-1970.

Given the extensive changes which have occurred in Canadian society during this period, one might expect to find inconsistencies or reversals of opinion and attitude within individual publications. One
might also expect, given the highly regionalized Canadian character, to find differences among the press itself. The evidence suggests, however, the contrary: Canada's Anglo-Jewish press (publications written in English) has a consistent record, with certain exceptions, of support for the civil rights of other minority groups in Canada. This support, to a great extent, stems from the factors of political expediency and, more importantly, Judaic traditions. In demonstrating such support, the Anglo-Jewish press was expressing an attitude towards justice which had been developed and articulated in early Judaic writings.

The purpose of this study, then, is first, to describe the attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish press in Canada concerning the civil rights of Canadian minority groups, and second, to analyze these attitudes while emphasizing the factors of Judaic tradition and political expediency.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Anglo-Jewish press in Canada consists of a large body of literature written in the English language by and for Jewish Canadians. These newspapers and magazines, generally originating in the urban centers, have oriented themselves to the social aspects of the Jewish community — fund raising, social clubs, etc. But they have also reflected the political views of this community on a wide range of issues.

For the political scientist this body of literature represents a rich source of data with which to study the political views of one ethnic minority group. These newspapers and magazines have, for the most part, addressed themselves directly to the political issues of the day. Thus, in studying them one can begin to describe and analyze the political orientations and values of Canada's Jewish community.

The scope of such a study is understandably wide. Hence, I have limited myself to analyzing one broad issue which has been constantly prevalent during the time span of this study (1930-1970): the civil rights of minority groups in Canada.

1There is also a Jewish press written in Yiddish, a language spoken by many European Jews and their descendants. Jewish newspapers and magazines written in English are categorized as the Anglo-Jewish press.
Jews have always been involved politically, both directly and indirectly, in any political setting in which they have found themselves. The Canadian political setting is no exception. Even a cursory glance at the editorial content of the Anglo-Jewish press is sufficient to demonstrate significant political sensitivity.

In this study I will test the following three hypotheses:

a) that the Anglo-Jewish press in Canada has a consistent record of support for civil rights of other minority groups; b) that there has been a consistency of civil rights' attitudes within the Anglo-Jewish press in Canada; and c) that the criteria by which political attitudes relevant to this study have been formulated have been based on: 1) Judaic traditions, and 2) political expediency.

The Anglo-Jewish press is the primary source of data for this study. As Canadian Jews have tended to congregate in the major urban centres of this country, so too have their newspapers and magazines. Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, and Winnipeg have been and continue to be the centres of the Anglo-Jewish press. This press consists not of dailies, but rather, weeklies, bi-monthlies and monthlies. These publications invariably included coverage of the social aspects of their respective Jewish communities — association meetings, athletic news, etc. But they usually included a great deal of editorial comment on the Canadian political scene. These editorials are what I have examined in this study.

One of the oldest Anglo-Jewish publications, and the one most useful for my purpose, is the Canadian Jewish Chronicle.* Founded in

*Details concerning individual publications can be found in the bibliography.
Montreal in 1914, it ceased publishing in 1966 and merged with the Canadian Jewish Review. Other publications utilized in this study include The Jewish Standard (Toronto), The Chronicle Review (Montreal), the Jewish Post (Winnipeg), the Jewish Western Bulletin (Vancouver), the Canadian Jewish News (Toronto, Montreal), Today (Toronto), the Canadian Jewish Outlook (Toronto), The Jewish Record (Montreal, Toronto), the Israelite Press (Winnipeg), the Western Jewish News (Winnipeg), and the Canadian Jewish Weekly (Toronto).

Unfortunately, it has been impossible to examine the complete collections of these periodicals. Many issues have disappeared while many others have, for one reason or another, not been preserved for library use. However, I do feel that enough issues of enough newspapers and magazines exist to warrant the making of generalizations about the Anglo-Jewish press in Canada. An in-depth study of this body of literature can be undertaken.

It is important to clarify a number of terms that will continually crop up in this study. Primary among them is 'minority group'. Minority groups exist in almost every state although their position of disadvantage varies considerably from country to country. With the exception of French Canadians, the minority groups in this study do not seek the right of self-determination but, simply, equality in Canadian society.

Numerous analysts, when defining minority groups, have relied almost exclusively on the racial and cultural aspects. For example, Wirth defines a minority group as:
... a group of people who, because of their physical or cultural characteristics are singled out from the others in the society in which they live for differential and unequal treatment, and who therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination.²

Similarly, Wagley and Harris enumerate five components of a minority group:

1) Minorities are subordinate segments of complex state societies; 2) minorities have special physical or cultural traits which are held in low esteem by the dominant segments of the society; 3) minorities are self conscious units bound together by the special traits which these bring; 4) membership in a minority is transmitted by a rule of descent which is capable of affiliating succeeding generations even in the absence of readily apparent special cultural or physical traits; 5) minority peoples, by choice or necessity, tend to marry within the group.³

There is one major problem with these definitions. It is that they ignore the non-racial, non-cultural minority group. It is important to note that minority groups are often devoid of any ethnic, racial, or cultural characteristics. Such minorities would include the poor, women, certain political groups, etc.

One should also not overestimate the numerical aspect when defining 'minority group'. It would be better to emphasize the minority group's exclusion from full participation in the society in which it exists. Elliott writes that a group is a minority if:

... its members are under-represented in decision-making bodies. In addition, the minority tends to be subjectively aware of its 'differentness' and makes we/they distinctions concerning its own members and members of the dominant society.⁴


The pattern of relationships in a minority-majority situation is undoubtedly crucial. According to Hughes and Kallen, the concept of minority refers to "the category or categories of people who occupy a lower ranking or subordinate position vis a vis the majority group." In this study, we shall adhere to the latter definitions. A minority group shall be characterized as being in a state of disadvantage with respect to the majority. It also has limited access to the decision-making roles and activities relevant to the economic and political structures of society. This definition would include ethnic and racial groups such as Oriental Canadians, Black Canadians, etc. Non-ethnic, non-racial minority groups would include Canadians who belong to a Communist movement or party, religious groups, etc. Although all of these minority groups receive benefits from Canadian society (i.e., cultural grants, equal opportunity legislation) their participation in the decision-making process is severely limited because of discriminatory behaviour on the part of the majority.

It is necessary to differentiate briefly between prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice, for our purposes, is a negative attitude towards members of a minority group. It may or may not lead to discriminatory behaviour towards members of a minority group. When it does, this behaviour results in minority groups being excluded or in some ways mistreated. Prejudice and discrimination usually go hand in hand.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we need to define civil rights and civil liberties. Very simply, civil rights are those rights related to the welfare and protection of minority groups. They refer

to the constitutional and legal status of those groups separated from the majority by reasons of national origin, race, religion, political orientation or any other cleavage. In the United States the term 'civil rights' has almost become synonymous, especially in popular usage, with the situation of the American Black. The term in Canada, however, has evolved differently. Here 'civil rights' are "concerned primarily with private law rights, or the legal relationship between persons in private life."  

The term 'civil liberties' refers to the relationship between the individual and his government. When government infringes upon the personal rights and freedoms of the individual, it is a question of civil liberties. The realm of civil liberties can be subdivided into negative and positive freedoms. Negative freedoms refer to the individual's right not to have something done to him. It is the freedom from interference, either by government or by those individuals and groups susceptible to governmental influence. Positive freedoms refer to the right to do something, or the right to have something done for the individual. For example, the right to education must be counteracted by government support of a school system. "Thus, the fundamental difference between negative and positive freedom is the mere absence of constraint on the one hand and the actual power to do something on the other."  

Both civil rights and civil liberties are relevant to this study. I will, however, be focusing on minority groups and their unequal

---

6 Krauter, op. cit., p. 4.
7 Ibid., p. 3.
status in relation to the majority group. Thus I will employ the term 'civil rights' as a catch-all phrase to encompass any issues relating to this matter. These issues would relate to such basic human rights as universal suffrage, fair accommodation, equal employment opportunities, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion.

In Chapter II I look at the state of Jewish rights in Canada as well as the social position of Canadian Jews as perceived by the Anglo-Jewish press. There exists a dual interpretation by this press of the status of Jews in Canada. Chapter III is a description of the attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish press, 1930-1970, centering on the civil rights of other minority groups in Canada. Many issues are raised here: national immigration policy, the criteria of support for political figures, civil rights legislation, Canada's Bill of Rights, the civil rights of French Canadians, Black Canadians, Oriental Canadians, Native Canadians, communist groups, and fascist groups.

These issues, along with the forty year time span of this study, combine to produce an overall picture of the attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish press in relation to the civil rights of minority groups in Canada. This picture will be analyzed in Chapter IV.

Why did the Anglo-Jewish press choose to support strongly, to support mildly, or not to support the civil rights of other minority groups in Canada? The bases of support of civil rights can be sub-divided into two categories: political expediency and Judaic traditions. The first involves the belief that support for other minority groups could only aid the Jewish minority in Canada. The welfare of other minority groups was thought to have a critical influence on the well being of the
Jewish minority. As The Jewish Standard wrote, "The freedom of the Negro is as much the symbol of Jewish freedom as Jewish freedom itself is the symbol of a free world." The Anglo-Jewish press was constantly conscious of its minority voice. It believed that any advancements made toward the protection of other minority groups were strongly relevant to the Jewish community and were interpreted as being necessary for its survival and well-being.

Judaic traditions form the second area of explanation of support for the civil rights of other minority groups. Here, I will examine Judaic traditions commencing from the Old Testament through the body of literature incorporating a thousand years of Jewish thought, known as the Talmud. The foundation of Judaism rests on these two pillars. I will argue that support for minority groups found in the Anglo-Jewish press stems largely from religious factors entrenched deep in Jewish tradition. One of the basic principles on which Judaism is founded is a strong sense of social justice and morality. Acton states:

The most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities. Liberty, by this definition, is the essential condition and guardian of religion; and it is in the history of the Chosen People, accordingly, that the first illustrations of my subject are obtained.

Lenski, commenting on the factor of inequality, writes:

In the simplest societies in the world today, the fact of inequality is taken for granted, as are other familiar features of our existence . . . . Some of the earliest records of thought on this subject are found in the writings

9September, 1953, p. 3.

of the early Hebrew prophets who lived approximately 800 years before Christ. In the writings of such men as Amos, Micah, and Isaiah we find repeated denunciations of the rich and powerful members of society. They were concerned not merely with the use of wealth and power, but more significantly, with the means by which they had been acquired.\textsuperscript{10}

Non-support of the civil rights of other minorities by the Anglo-Jewish press was far less frequent than support. But when it has occurred it can be explained by the factors of social and political insecurity. The Anglo-Jewish press did not, for obvious reasons, support the civil rights of Canadian Nazi groups during the war and post-war periods. Fascist groups, as well, were deemed undeserving of the civil rights accorded to other minority groups. Invariably, the Anglo-Jewish press felt threatened by these minority groups and these feelings of insecurity took precedence over the factors leading to the general support of minority groups.

Finally, the last part of this study, Chapter V, consists of a summation of the major points and some concluding evaluation.

It is almost impossible for the researcher to rid himself of any bias in presenting and analyzing material. Of course, I have tried to present this study in as impartial a manner as possible; it is up to the reader to make the final judgement.

To understand fully how and why the Anglo-Jewish press adopted its respective stands on the civil rights of other minority groups in Canada, it is necessary first to examine how the Anglo-Jewish press interpreted the Jewish presence in Canada. Specifically, did these Anglo-Jewish publications perceive Jewish Canadians to be equal citizens?

The question of Jewish equality in Canada was perceived by the Anglo-Jewish press to be a two-sided issue. One side entailed the belief that Jewish Canadians formed an integral part of the citizenry of Canada, able and willing to contribute to Canadian society in a manner equal to that of all others in Canada. Loyalty to, and identification with, Canada were beyond question. Protection of the civil rights of Jews was expected and even demanded of governments, both provincial and federal. Such protection was equated with social progress. Full equality was seen as a realistic possibility, and anti-Semitism was seen as an aberration practiced by a small portion of the population.

The other side of the issue involved the belief that anti-Semitism in Canada was inevitable; that Jewish Canadians would never be considered as equal citizens; that their civil rights could never be
sufficiently protected by government legislation; and that they were destined to play the role of societal scapegoat when attempts were made to divert the attention of the populace from other issues.

These two themes, ostensibly contradictory, were fused, each, in turn, assuming the dominant role when political circumstance exacted a positive, optimistic outlook or a negative, fatalistic one. Let us examine these two themes in detail.

THE POSITIVE OUTLOOK

Anti-Semitic comments or actions were rarely ignored by the Anglo-Jewish press. They were often compared to their European counterparts, especially in the pre-second world war period, and therefore judged as mild in comparison. Nevertheless, anti-Semitism in Canada was confronted, vigourously analyzed, and eventually deemed as an evil which could be eradicated by education and government legislation.

Anti-Semitism was not believed to be a dominant characteristic of the English and French Canadian mentalities. For example, when anti-Semitic remarks were made by a member of Quebec Premier Duplessis' cabinet in the Assemble Nationale in 1952, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle wrote:

"We do hope that the general press, both in the other provinces of Canada and in the U.S., will not take the boorish demonstration of M. Barre as typical of the French Canadian mentality. M. Barre is a caricature, not a representative, of French Canadian opinion."

The Jewish Standard similarly interpreted the existence of an anti-Semitic newspaper, Le Goglu, which arose in the 1930's in Quebec.

¹January 11, 1952, p. 3.
It editorialized that Le Goglu was "in no way representative of French Canada, though it claims a large circulation." It went on to write that:

... one does not need to be a prophet to predict that Le Goglu will hardly become a factor in Quebec politics. Nor does it require great perspicacity to realize that this kind of humour will provide no more than a contemptuous smile in the part of French Canadians, regardless of political affiliations.²

The Jewish Standard refused to believe that a newspaper such as Le Goglu, which incorporated virulent anti-Semitic attacks, would significantly influence, in a political manner, the Quebec population. Referring to Conservative gains in Quebec in the 1930 election, it offered the view that these gains were completely unrelated to the Jewish question. "Our opinion of French Canadians is too high," it wrote, "to permit the belief that the farcical Jew-baiting methods of Le Goglu could have affected their political judgement."³

The view was also espoused that anti-Semitic sentiment was absent from the decision-making centers of Canadian politics. When a Jewish provincial parliamentarian was elevated to a Cabinet position it was felt that ability took precedence over any religious or racial prejudices. Furthermore, the appointment of a Jewish Cabinet Minister in Ontario was considered "proof of the fact that responsible opinion in Canada rejects racism and is willing to recognize merit wherever it be found."⁴ A similar reaction was evoked when David Croll, a Russian-born Canadian Jew,

²April 25, 1930, p. 375.
³August 8, 1930, p. 30.
was elected mayor of Windsor in 1930. It is important to note that while these actions evoked a positive response from the Anglo-Jewish press, not once was it expressed that Jews in Canada were exempt from any discriminatory action on the part of the majority. The perception, inherent in this positive outlook, was that discrimination was being reduced and would eventually reach a point where Jewish Canadians would not have to maintain a constant vigilance on their fellow citizens.

The atrocities committed against European Jews during the Nazi period had several influences on Jewish Canadians. One was to increase their sensitivity to any form of anti-Semitism. Another was to compare any manifestations of anti-Semitism in Canada with the European variety. Thus, the relatively mild forms of anti-Semitism in Canada were often underplayed and considered insignificant. When blatant anti-Semitism reared itself in the 1960's, one newspaper wrote:

... it would be tragic to over-emphasize the importance of the few anti-Jewish slogans and the handful of swastikas that have been painted on walls and buildings in Canada. There is, to be sure, an appreciable amount of anti-Semitism in Canada. But to suppose that this social anti-Semitism is about to erupt into anything like the Nazi bestialities is surely to deny the history of the past two centuries of Jewish life in Canada.5

Opinions such as these reinforced the perception that anti-Semitism was not a serious problem in Canada; that it was the exception rather than the rule; and that it's effect could be lessened by the work of Jewish Canadians.

To suggest that Jewish Canadians have and have had a problem of identity is to suggest the obvious. The problem of a divided loyalty between Canada and the Jewish presence in Palestine (and after 1948, Israel) stimulated the Anglo-Jewish press to do much soul-searching analysis. It was, however, a problem which many publications felt could be rationalized. There was a consensus that Jewish Canadians were an integral part of Canadian society. A 1930 editorial stated flatly that "our labour and our brains are helping in no small measure to build up the country."\(^6\) Thirty-seven years later The Chronicle Review espoused the view that Jewish Canadians had done their share in enriching the country:

> Our sons and daughters have served in the armed forces and have bled and died on scores of battlefields in the defence of Canada. Our painters have depicted the Canadian environment; our poets and novelists have taken their themes from the Canadian experience; our musicians have played here; our scientists have worked here; our entrepreneurs have done much to build the cities of Canada, to establish new industries, develop new businesses.\(^7\)

A secondary theme, almost subliminal in nature, underlies many such opinions. It is the feeling that Jewish Canadians somehow had to accomplish more than their fellow citizens to be considered on an equal footing with them. There was a feeling of indebtedness towards Canada. "Nowhere in the world," it was written, "with the possible exception of Israel, can a Jew live his life more fully than in Canada."\(^8\) This indebted-

\(^6\)Canadian Jewish Chronicle (January 3, 1930), p. 3.


\(^8\)The Jewish Standard (September 1, 1961), p. 3.
ness manifested itself, it can be argued, in a disproportionate number of accomplishments in Canadian society (i.e., academic, business, scientific, and artistic communities). The Jewish contribution to the Canadian forces in World War I is not exempt from this phenomenon. The Jewish enlistment rate was 37.8% as compared to 31.02% for the Canadian average. The rate for decorations for bravery was 4.52% for Jewish soldiers and officers, as compared to 3.38% for the Canadians of all origins. This element of disproportion is not surprising for a minority who have considered themselves tolerated guests in the Canadian community. Indeed, the view was articulated in 1969 that "Jews have found wonderful opportunities in Canada . . . and instead of searching out nooks and crannies roped off against us, let us consider the distance we have come and be grateful."10

The Anglo-Jewish press continually felt a pressing need to voice its loyalty to Canada. Editorials entitled "Canada — Our Land"11 and "Canada — Our Country"12 were common. These claims of loyalty increased markedly during times of national crisis. When the Canadian government announced general mobilization for home defence during World War II, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle editorialized that:


11Canadian Jewish Chronicle (January 6, 1956), p. 3.

All those, however, who are sincerely concerned about the fate of our land, the destiny of our Empire, the future of our civilization, do admit in this serious hour nothing less than the contemplated conscription of persons and property will do . . . . Every citizen is threatened not only nationally, but individually; and every citizen must be asked to contribute his share to the national defence.  

In a similar vein, the response to a demanding wartime budget was one of complete agreement. It was felt that extraordinary times required extraordinary measures, and that "a total war can be fought only with total sacrifice." This sacrifice was believed to be a small price to pay in exchange for full acceptance into the Canadian community — acceptance for which Jewish Canadians unceasingly lobbied. 

The need to express loyalty also surfaced when Jewish Canadians involved themselves in matters solely concerning Judaism, Israel, etc., and which had little to do with their fellow Canadians. For example, when Jewish Quebeckers asked for a separate school system in 1930, it was pointed out that "there would be nothing in the project to tend to impair the chances of young Jewry from becoming good young Canadian citizens."

The birth of Israel in 1948 was understandably an exhilarating experience for most Jewish Canadians, but it was accompanied by a defensive stance triggered to repel any attacks based on a supposed divided loyalty.

---

13 My emphasis. The choice of possessive pronouns was not haphazard.

14 June 21, 1940, p. 3.

15 Canadian Jewish Chronicle (June 26, 1942), p. 3.

16 Ibid., (January 24, 1930), p. 6.
The Anglo-Jewish press was at pains to compare its position with that of other ethnic groups in Canada which had sentimental and emotional attachments to places beyond Canada's borders. A policy of complete loyalty to Canada was then usually enunciated. "Canadian Jewry," one newspaper wrote, "considers itself to be and is — Canadian. It is 100% Canadian, and that Canadianism nothing can divide or diminish." 17 Jewish Canadians were told that loyalty to Canada and religious and emotional ties to Israel were not mutually exclusive, and were, in effect, independent of each other. The first edition of The Jewish Standard counselled that "Jews must realize that they cannot love Canada more by loving Israel less." 18 However, it was with a tinge of regret that another newspaper wrote that "not everybody's predecessors could have come over with the Mayflower." 19

These feelings and proclamations of loyalty led the Anglo-Jewish press to demand adequate protection of their civil rights. There was a pervasive belief that government legislation could ensure the quality of the Jewish minority. This legislation emanated, it was written, from a democratic spirit believed to be present in Canada.

Government legislation to protect the Jewish minority was felt to be especially warranted in Quebec. Here, various publications felt justified in demanding protection of Jewish civil rights in a province where the majority were demanding similar protection of French Canadian civil rights in other provinces. It was expected that the minority position of the Jews would be met with some degree of sympathy from both the

17Ibid., (May 28, 1948), p. 3.


19Canadian Jewish Chronicle (January 2, 1942), p. 3.
government and population of Quebec. With this in mind a speech by Quebec Premier Taschereau in 1933 was interpreted in the following manner:

The Premier, in short, declared that Canada is large enough geographically and broad enough mentally to be able to contain more than one race, and that there is room in the Dominion for harmonious living together of Englishmen and Frenchmen. The only objection that one can have to these arguments is that they are not followed to their logical conclusion. Do not the Jews in the province of Quebec constitute a minority, and are they not therefore deserving of the same rights as other minorities claim? If only he would carry forth his argument to its fullest implication and deliver the same plea on behalf of minorities, not in the province of Ontario, but in the province of Quebec!  

The test of French Canadian nationalism, according to some Anglo-Jewish publications, centered on the manner in which it treated its Jewish population. Quebec was touted as a haven of progressivism when religious toleration of Jews was practiced (i.e., when Quebec's legislature was the first in the British Empire to give complete political emancipation to the Jews; when it included a special exemption in its Sunday legislation for Jews who devoutly observed their Sabbath; and when it granted a separate school system for Jewish Quebeckers). But Quebec was also touted as a bastion of reaction when the civil rights of Jews were encroached upon, or were ignored. Civil rights, then, was the basic criterion on which judgement was passed. Let us now look at the negative, fatalistic outlook which also characterized the perception of Jewish equality in Canada.

Ibid., (November 24, 1933), p. 3.
The Negative Outlook

Three sub-themes dominate this aspect of the Anglo-Jewish press' perception of Jewish equality in Canada: the belief that anti-Semitism was inevitable; that Jewish Canadians would never be considered as equal citizens; and that the Jew in Canada was destined to play the role of societal scapegoat.

The comparisons of anti-Semitism to a "barking dog or a quarrelsome drunkard" lend credence to the view that anti-Semitism was perceived to be almost a pre-determined fact. A later editorial (1963) in one newspaper discussed the manifest and latent forms of anti-Semitism:

Some of this anti-Semitism is active and virulent, waiting only for a favourable occasion in order to manifest itself. Much more of it is hidden, repressed, expressing itself only when such expression is socially and legally acceptable. This latent anti-Semitism is encouraged by the open ability of anti-Semites to get away with their anti-Semitic activities.²¹

The belief that anti-Semitism could only be quieted and never eradicated was most often expressed with reference to the Jew in Quebec. It was in this province, until recently the home of Canada's largest Jewish community, that Jews were the target of bitterness and frustration. When, in 1936, an anti-Semitic newspaper, Le Patriote, ceased publishing, it was written that "there are others left in the province of Quebec who are apparently nearer to the mysterious treacle-pot of subsidization and whose work should satisfy even the most discriminating taste of Goebbels."²²

²¹The Jewish Standard (June 1, 1963), p. 2.

²²Canadian Jewish Chronicle (September 16, 1936), p. 4.
A return to the Middle Ages was how one newspaper termed Quebec City's refusal in 1932 to grant permission for the building of a synagogue. "We Jews," it was written, "may yet face other infringements upon our rights."\textsuperscript{23}

Anti-Semitic remarks, such as the type uttered in Canada, could only find their equal, it was believed by some, in a fascist state. Such was the case when a Quebec cabinet minister delivered certain comments in the Assemble Nationale in 1952. I have previously alluded to this incident. The 'positive outlook' interpreted these remarks as an aberration of the French Canadian character. However, the 'negative outlook' interpreted the incident in an entirely different manner:

Equally notorious is the fact that when this demagogue who holds the portfolio of Agriculture, evacuated from his mouth his boorish slander of the Jews, not a soul in that Assembly rose up to reprimand, to protest, or even to murmer his discontent. Not only did Mr. Duplessis fail to disassociate himself from his Minister's calumny, but Mr. Marler, who leads the Liberal Opposition in the House, too, maintained an incomprehensible silence . . . . The spectacle — racial demagogy and circumambient silence — was such, indeed, as could find its parallel only in a fascist state.\textsuperscript{24}

This pessimistic outlook incorporated the view that Jewish Canadians were a harassed minority, surrounded by enemies practicing systematic discrimination. This discrimination would only cease, it was presumed, after generations of education. Until then, anti-Semitism would have to be stoically accepted as fact.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., (December 2, 1932), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., (January 25, 1952), p. 3.
Acceptance was also the rule concerning the belief that even without the presence of anti-Semitism, Jewish Canadians would never be considered as equal citizens by their fellow Canadians. Thus, Jews who chose to enter public life would have to conform to unusually rigorous standards. The Jewish Record, in 1937, lectured potential Jewish candidates:

Those Jews who wish to enter the arena of politics must always remember the openness of their situation. They will make statements, give opinions and do certain things that will lend themselves to open criticism. They must not cast adverse reflection on their fellow Jews. It is the duty of the Jew in public life to always bear a high standard... The Jew in public life holds a precarious position; he must be honest and correct, a shining example of the righteousness of his fellow man.25

Similar lecturing was given to those involved with supervising Jewish immigration into Canada in the 1930's. The Canadian Chronicle warned that

... if Jewish immigrants come to this country they must under no circumstances ever become a public charge. If any of them should be thrown on the hands of the Provincial authorities, the result would be disastrous to our chances for further permits. The Jewish Immigrant Aid Societies must be in a sufficiently strong financial position to assume responsibility for all settlers brought into the country through its agency.26

Jews, it was felt, would be treated differently from other citizens. This insecurity manifested itself most clearly in matters relating to immigration (especially prior to the Second World War). When government entrance regulations in 1930 were announced, one newspaper reacted by stating that "though Jews are not specifically mentioned, in most cases it is they that the legislator has in mind when he frames his laws restricting immigration."27 Ten years later a similar reaction was evoked.

26 March 28, 1930, p. 3.
27 Canadian Jewish Chronicle (February 8, 1930), p. 3.
When Ontario Premier Hepburn offered to admit 100,000 Finnish refugees to Northern Ontario, the response by the Anglo-Jewish press was not surprising:

What is mysterious to us is how was it possible for the very observant Hepburn not to have noted that there were thousands of refugees to whom he could have extended his hospitality in the past . . . . Could it be possible that "Mitch" has mental categories for refugees and that the Finns hold a favoured position in his esteem.\textsuperscript{28}

Jewish Canadians never felt the need to form an independent political party which could formally articulate the Jewish voice in an elected assembly. But when the civil rights of Jews were perceived to be encroached upon, Anglo-Jewish newspapers and magazines did not hesitate to suggest to their readers the correct voting procedure. Prior to the 1930 general election one newspaper wrote, "that the best way to safeguard our own special interests and to be assured that our rights and privileges as citizens will not be infringed on, is by having one of our own representatives in the House."\textsuperscript{29} Non-Jewish Canadians, it was felt, were not to be entrusted with safeguarding the civil rights of Jewish Canadians. These feelings had evolved from two sources: 1) numerous anti-Semitic attacks in the name of Canadianism and Christianity which few, if any, non-Jewish groups or individuals had bothered to denounce, and 2) the perception that Jews in Canada were essentially misunderstood. The latter idea was discussed by the \textit{Jewish Post} in 1947:

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}, (March 29, 1940), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, (July 25, 1930), p. 12.
Jew is still a generic term to Gentiles . . . a term with a long history of unpleasant associations which can be aroused quite easily by either editors, ministers of foreign affairs, or radio commentators. Intelligent people could, during the war, comprehend the difference between Vichy French and Free French, or a British soldier and a Lord Haw Haw. With the Jews, however, there is that convenient tendency to lump the sensible majority with that fraction of repudiated extremists, and tar them all with the same brush.³⁰

The third sub-theme in the 'negative outlook' centres on the belief that the Jew in Canada was destined to play the role of societal scapegoat. Numerous publications articulated the view that Canada was not exempt from this phenomenon, that the 'Jew as scapegoat' tradition was deeply rooted. The political opinions of the Anglo-Jewish press cannot be fully understood without reference to Jewish history — a history marked by, inter alia, ostracism, persecution and discrimination. The Jewish Western Bulletin interpreted anti-Semitic incidents in 1934 in this historical fashion, tying the past with the present and seeing not a disjointed line, but a continuum:

Straws show which way the wind blows. Our elders remember how, in White Russia, a bad harvest meant persecution, a bank failure or revelation of graft in high places spelled "Pogrom."* The rulers needed a scapegoat, and the Jew was handy. There is a need of a scapegoat here as one is needed in all the rest of the world today, something to divert the peoples' minds from the real issues that confront them, the veritable cause of the predicament in which they find themselves, and the true method of extricating themselves therefrom.³¹

Analysis of the 'Jew as scapegoat' phenomenon and anti-Semitism in general often included different theories as to why anti-Semitism arose. Commentaries about displaced aggression, collective frustration

³⁰February 27, 1947, p. 2.

*A Russian word meaning violent mass attacks.

³¹April 19, 1934, p. 2.
on the part of the majority, the refusal of Jews to assimilate (resulting in a continuing battle with any nationalist trends), hostility towards Jews stemming from being a different race, and identification of Jews with the capitalist status quo, (thus drawing the wrath of those dissatisfied with the social and economic structure) were given as explanations of this phenomenon. Various newspapers among the Anglo-Jewish press emphasized different explanations but they were united in one conviction. It was that the persecution of Jews always preceded further persecution of other minority groups, and that anti-Semitism should serve as a type of 'early warning system' to alert those who are concerned with minority rights. For example, in 1943 Maurice Duplessis, at that point leader of the opposition, publicized a claim that Jews were negotiating to settle 100,000 refugees in the province of Quebec. Duplessis based his claim on an alleged letter he received from a particular Zionist organization (which, in fact, did not exist). In response to this episode one newspaper wrote:

    Just as long as men are permitted to choose a scapegoat at their convenience — whether it be to make political capital or whether it be for whatever malicious purpose an individual or a group may choose to use their victims — and have no fear of suffering a penalty once their lies are exposed, there is little hope for a just and better world after this war. Let it be remembered that the pattern is similar to the one followed by the Nazis. Their first victims were always the Jews. But the Jews were not the last.32

    In these two manners, then, the Anglo-Jewish press perceived Jewish equality in Canada. One essentially pessimistic and negative, the other primarily positive. A reading of the Anglo-Jewish press during this time period suggests that at one time or another almost all of the

32Jewish Post (November 18, 1943), p. 2.
publications interpreted Jewish equality in Canada in this dual fashion. But this two-sided approach was consistent only for matters concerning the issue of Jewish civil rights in Canada. Matters pertaining to the civil rights of other minority groups were interpreted almost with unanimity by the Anglo-Jewish press as a single-faceted issue. Strong support was given to other minority groups, with certain exceptions, in their struggle for full civil rights in Canada.
INTRODUCTION

The Anglo-Jewish press held an unending commitment to the establishing and strengthening of the civil rights of minority groups in Canada. This commitment was expressed both by directly addressing itself to this issue and by advocating certain ideas which encompassed the civil rights question.

I will now look at three examples demonstrating such a commitment — advocacy of a liberal immigration policy, support for a legislative base for civil rights, and the manner in which political support given to various political figures was determined. I will show that the standard by which politicians were judged was determined by their position on the issue of civil rights; that support was whole-heartedly given when politicians expressed a commitment to further the civil rights of minority groups; and that support was absent when politicians did not express this commitment.

Support was also absent when a particular understanding of Jewish civil rights was not forthcoming. The position of many publications, then, was determined by the politician's sensitivity towards the
civil rights of minority groups in Canada, particularly an understanding of the civil rights of Jewish Canadians.

**CRITERIA OF POLITICAL SUPPORT**

Because of these strict guidelines by which politicians were judged, support was, at times, ephemeral. The same politician was praised and even revered but also criticized and despised when the winds of politics blew in different directions. Quebec Premier Maurice Duplessis was a good example of one who received varying support.

A speech by Duplessis in 1943, at the time leader of the opposition, which included numerous anti-Semitic remarks, was reported by the Canadian Jewish Chronicle in an editorial entitled, "The Protocols of Zion:¹ Duplessis Edition":

... (the speech) can well serve as both an index to the wild frenzy with which this man aspires to the political heights and to the conscienceless nonchalance with which he can descend to immoral depths. For ever since this demagogue misinterpreted the mood and loyalty of the Province of Quebec, and, as natural consequence, was roundly trounced by the electorate, he has been frantically racking his brains to discover some effective technique, some political slogan, some autonomist formula — sincere or insincere did not matter — which would hoist him again into that seat of power he so heart-brokenly coveted.²

Quebec's padlock law, which gave the government the authority to close down any organization at its whim, and of which Duplessis was a major architect, came under fire from The Western Jewish News not because "it was used to shut down a Jewish organization, but because it is an attack

¹The Protocols of the Elders of Zion is a document alleging a Jewish plot to dominate the world. It has had considerable circulation in anti-Semitic circles.

²November 12, 1943, p. 3.
on the fundamental rights guaranteed Canadians under the long tradition of British law.\textsuperscript{3} The "disappearance of democracy" and "a police state" were just some of the phrases used to describe the situation which emerged during the Duplessis government. The Western Jewish News stated, "if anyone doubted the strong fascist trends of the Duplessis administration, this last padlocking and this persecution of its citizens should have convinced him."\textsuperscript{4}

Duplessis, however, also received support from the Anglo-Jewish press. When he saw it politically expedient to champion the cause of civil rights of Quebec minorities or even remain silent when his contemporaries were voicing opinions against the extension of civil rights to minority groups, one newspaper chose to describe Duplessis as being understanding of the problem of civil rights and, at times, even to laud him as a progressive. A 1935 editorial manifests this feeling:

The Premier of Quebec has, however, proven himself to be a man of individual thought apart from his able executive administratorship, and refuses to be railroaded into anything which would in his opinion, be harmful to the interests of all people of the province for the perspicacity with which he is carrying out his promises.\textsuperscript{5}

Duplessis' death in 1959 spawned eulogies in the press praising him as one sensitive to the issues of civil rights. Undoubtedly, these eulogies referred to the pre-padlock era Duplessis. As well, the political factor must be taken into account. Although Quebec was now being

\textsuperscript{3}February 2, 1950, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{5}Canadian Jewish Chronicle (December 25, 1936), p. 3.
governed by a new administration, there was an attempt not to upset the memory of a man whose state burial signified the end of an era. The Jewish Standard felt that "he never let any inequity creep into his relationships with the Jewish community or with Jewish interests." Another newspaper wrote that Duplessis understood the respect required for groups in a multi-cultural society. "He will long be recalled," it went on, "in the land which he loved."

Prime Ministers Bennett, Mackenzie King, St. Laurent, Diefenbaker and Pearson all found support within the Anglo-Jewish press. The latter looked upon these figures as, firstly, staunch and reliable friends of the Jewish community in Canada, and secondly, as leaders who were sympathetic to the plight of minority groups in Canada. A selection of excerpts from the press amply demonstrates the nature of this support. For St. Laurent and Pearson, it was their relationship to the state of Israel which was emphasized:

It is of particular interest to the Jewish citizens of the Dominion to recall the frequent contact Canadian Zionist leadership has had with Mr. St. Laurent during the past years. . . . His sympathetic understanding of Canadian Jewry's desires concerning aid to Israel and recognition of her government by the Dominion, has excited wide admiration among those who know him, and a sense of gratitude for his wise counsel.

To Canadian Jewry the name of Lester Pearson is particularly endeared. Canadian Jewry remembers with gratitude the part the Canadian delegation to UN, of which Mr. Pearson was a leading member, played in the formulation of the famous partition decision.

---

6 September 15, 1959, p. 4.
7 Canadian Jewish Chronicle (September 11, 1959), p. 4.
8 Jewish Post (August 12, 1948), p. 2.
9 Canadian Jewish Chronicle (September 17, 1948), p. 3.
For Bennett and Mackenzie King, the gestures to the Canadian Jewish community were emphasized:

Mr. Bennett was kind enough to speak highly of our people... Mr. Bennett is far and above the filth in which some of his supporters in this city (Montreal) grovelled prior and during the political campaign. We are sure that Mr. Bennett and his colleagues will, whenever the occasion requires it, render full justice to the Jewish element of the Canadian population.¹⁰

One remembers with particular gratitude Mackenzie King's gesture, made in 1940, towards the rescuing of 1,000 Jewish orphans in Vichy France. Equally memorable is his statement, made in the House of Commons during the final year of his leadership there, extending the scope of immigrational receptivity, and introducing, for thousands of DP's, the principle of sanctuary.¹¹

For Diefenbaker, it was his cordial attitude towards Jews and other ethnic groups which was acknowledged:

He knew, and the knowledge sorely disappointed him, that his cordiality toward Jews brought him no extra votes; but since his attitudes toward Jews and other ethnic groups in Canada were not politically motivated, since they were born of his own experiences and rooted in fundamental principle, his disappointment never caused him to dilute or withdraw his friendship. Let the record show that perhaps no other prime minister of this great country of ours was so sympathetic toward all minority ethnic groups, including the Jewish community.¹²

Other politicians, too, were the recipients of congratulatory comments in the Anglo-Jewish press. External Affairs Minister Paul Martin was applauded for guiding the Canadian Citizenship Act through

¹⁰Ibid., (September 5, 1930), p. 12.

¹¹Ibid., (July 28, 1950), p. 3.

the House of Commons.\textsuperscript{13} His role was felt to be in the interests of international brotherhood. Quebec Premier Daniel Johnson was labelled a 'statesman' for clearly spelling out his government's commitment to combat all forms of discrimination against minority groups in Quebec.\textsuperscript{14} Conversely, the actions of politicians such as Ontario Premier Mitch Hepburn and Quebec M.N.A. Jean Sauve were deplored on the grounds of insensitivity to the Jewish community and other minority groups in Canada.

Both support and disdain of political figures were readily subject to change when political circumstances were altered. Not subject to change, however, was the standard by which politicians were judged — the civil rights of Jews and other minorities.

### IMMIGRATION POLICY

The Anglo-Jewish press adopted a position on immigration which rested almost solely on a yearning to see fellow Jews settle in Canada, especially in the war and post-war periods. However, this position was later extended to include all persons who wished to settle in Canada. This position on immigration was influenced by the realization that Canadian immigration policy had been continually characterized by overtones of racism. To convince the general population that immigration to Canada should be stepped up, numerous publications made their appeal

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Jewish Post} (April 10, 1947), p. 2.

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Canadian Jewish Chronicle} (September 23, 1966), p. 4.
on an economic basis — that it was absurd for a relatively 'empty'
country to have a policy of restrictive immigration.

For Jewish Canadians, immigration to Canada has always been
an electoral issue. Prior to the 1930 election the Canadian Jewish
Chronicle stated:

Jewish electors are always interested in the existence of
a lenient immigration policy. Their humanitarian regard for
the ills of their co-religionists more than overrides the
economic objections as units in the industrial order that
would otherwise make them side with the Government in its
highly restrictive policy on immigration. We can take a
just pride in the spirit which urges us to place humanitarian
consideration above purely economic ones in this regard. . . .

It was during the 1930's, when European persecution of Jewish communities
became widespread, that the Anglo-Jewish press felt the need to lobby
for the liberalizing of immigration laws. The consensus was, however,
that there was no group in Canada, parliamentary or extra-parliamentary,
willing to adopt a more humanitarian attitude towards immigration — the
supposed economic interest of Canada and the wishes of organized labour
being their first concern. The Anglo-Jewish press resigned itself to
lamenting one unfortunate coincidence: European persecution of Jews
coincided with a severe economic depression in North America. Thus,
at a time when European Jews were looking to North America as a haven
from persecution, economic conditions militated against an open immigration
policy.

The lobbying for open immigration did not cease in the post-war
period. With refugees now settling in greater numbers in Canada, the

Jewish Post was conscious of the strain that new immigrants put on organized labour. It suggested a three point program that labour unions could follow:

Labour unions can take steps to guarantee their security by providing that no immigrant labourer work at lower than union rates; by training immigrants to merit union rates of pay; by helping provide labour in industrial fields that will expand only with increased immigration.16

Liberal immigration was equated with a strong ethical position. To restrict immigration was to be immoral; to ease it, according to one newspaper, was "a small increment to pay for the additional moral fibre it will build into the Canadian character."17 Self respect for Canada could be salvaged by eliminating the barriers blocking potential immigrants. These potential immigrants were not necessarily Jews, as the Jewish Western Bulletin pointed out in 1957:

The Jewish community has little to complain about with regard to bringing in Jewish immigrants . . . . It seems to us however, that we cannot be satisfied merely with taking care of "our own" in the racial or religious sense, because with regard to integration as Canadians all newcomers are "our own." The reception of newcomers is one area in which all racial and religious groups and all elements for the community, including government, labour, management, social institutions, and voluntary agencies, should learn to work together for the greater good of the entire country.18

The Anglo-Jewish press was at pains to demonstrate the folly of rejecting immigrants on economic grounds. This basis was deemed an economic absurdity accompanied by a short-sighted policy. Some of the major refutations of the economic argument included: industry and

16 May 29, 1947, p. 2.

17 Jewish Post (December 13, 1956), p. 2. This was in reference to the request for 5,000 Egyptian Jews to accompany 25,000 Hungarian refugees after the uprising in 1956.

18 April 26, 1957, p. 2.
commerce were hindered by a lack of domestic consumption; development of Canada's vast natural resources could be hastened by a larger work force; Canada's contribution to the Commonwealth could be increased with a larger population; if railways are essential to Canada's growth, "they in turn will only prove a source of profit if they cater to a larger population";\textsuperscript{19} and the average burden of taxation would be lessened with a larger source of taxation.

Analyses of the economic aspect of the immigration issue were often accompanied by references to the racist nature of Canadian immigration policy. These references were, at times, direct, lengthy and verbose, and at other times, subtle and made in passing. Who, it was often asked, was a foreigner? Canada was, after all, a nation of immigrants — British and French included. "This being so," one newspaper wrote, "the word foreigner ought to be deleted from the vocabulary of altercation as too dangerous a boomerang".\textsuperscript{20} If there was going to be a policy of selective immigration let it be selectiveness according to merit, and not according to any racial or religious criteria. This point was repeatedly expressed.

With the belief that racial and religious discrimination was actually part of Canadian immigration policy, one newspaper foresaw what implications this had for Canadian society:

> The existence of racial discrimination in Canada hardly justifies the maintenance of racial discrimination in immigration. In fact the existence of a racial ladder of immigrant

\textsuperscript{19}Canadian Jewish Chronicle (March 4, 1932), p. 6.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., (September 17, 1948), p. 3.
categories can only help to maintain racial prejudice among immigrants who do come to Canada, when they find out that some receive greater consideration than others on the basis of racial origin.\textsuperscript{21}

Instead of harbouring certain racial prejudices and practising various forms of racial discrimination, it was recommended that immigration policy should be based on need, merit and humanitarianism, and formulated only after consultation and deliberation with groups representing the interests of all Canadians.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Although aware that discrimination in employment, housing, and the like could not be eradicated with the passage of certain laws, the Anglo-Jewish press never underestimated the importance of having a legal base in order to preserve the civil rights of minority groups. This legal base was interpreted to be a standard for social behaviour. Thus, anytime a member of any assembly, federal or provincial, commenced proceedings on a bill to penalize any form of discrimination, he or she had the complete backing of the Anglo-Jewish press. It was also understood that the purpose of such legislation was not to make people good, for the state of mind underlying prejudicial thinking was left unaffected, but to protect innocent people from discriminatory actions.

Anglo-Jewish newspapers and magazines impatiently observed the difficulty in passing bills opposing discrimination. The \textit{Canadian Jewish Chronicle} deemed this difficulty a sad reflection on Canadian

\textsuperscript{21}Jewish Western Bulletin\textit{ (April 26, 1957), p. 2.}
society when governments "must haggle over ways and means of protecting a part of their citizens from the venom of racial intolerance."\textsuperscript{22}

However, when this haggling did eventually bring results and numerous bills were passed in the respective legislatures, proper enforcement of these laws and an interpretation by the courts that would eliminate all possible loopholes were urged.

On more than one occasion an Anglo-Jewish publication came to grips with the problem of conflicting civil rights — the situation whereby legislation protecting the rights of one minority restricted the rights of another. The \textit{Western Jewish News} analyzed the problem in this way:

If the legislation against discrimination is an attack upon civil liberties, then every act of government from Magna Carta on has been a similar attack. Every law which aims at the protection of some groups of citizens must necessarily restrain the rights of other groups or individuals. This is an axiom of government. The problem in each case is to decide whether protection or restraint of rights is of greater benefit to the progress of human freedom as a whole. Civil liberties must be guarded, but they must also be defined. Where the liberty of one man treads upon the liberty of another, causes him to be deprived of his self-respect and humiliates him in the society of which both are members, there is a real need for re-definition of the term.\textsuperscript{23}

Here it was felt, and this feeling was shared by most other publications, that if different groups were to live together in the same society, it was necessary to limit certain rights in order to protect all groups.

Before enumerating and elaborating on the various pieces of legislation that were of interest to the Anglo-Jewish press, it is impor-

\textsuperscript{22}March 24, 1933, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{23}July 6, 1950, p. 2.
tant to note why it placed so much emphasis on the legislative aspect in the fight against racial discrimination.

Because the Canadian constitution lacks any strong guarantees of civil rights, unlike the American (i.e., the First Amendment), and because Canada has adopted the English constitutional theory of parliamentary supremacy, the locus of decision-making vis à vis civil rights rests with our elected bodies. When the courts have entered into the civil rights field it has usually been to determine federal or provincial jurisdiction. (A major exception occurred in 1945 when the Ontario High Court, in Re Drummond Wren, ruled that a restrictive covenant limiting land sales to certain groups in Ontario was contrary to public policy).\textsuperscript{24} With this understanding of the functioning of the Canadian political system the Anglo-Jewish press took a strong interest in numerous pieces of legislation on the subject of discrimination. I will examine some of these in chronological order.

In 1932 a member of the Quebec Assemble Nationale, Mr. Peter Bercovitch, introduced "The Publications Disparaging Matter Act." The proposed law would have made it illegal to defame a religious or national group. As the law then stood, libel action could only be taken if published comments referred to individuals. The \textit{Canadian Jewish Chronicle} supported Bercovitch's efforts and wrote: "let it (Quebec) be the first to put an end to slanderous attacks on any racial and religious group forming an integral part of its citizenship."\textsuperscript{25} The bill did not pass.

\textsuperscript{24}W. S. Tarnopolsky, \textit{The Canadian Bill of Rights} (Toronto, 1966), p. 56.

\textsuperscript{25}February 5, 1932, p. 6.
Two years later a bill was brought before the Manitoba House which would have forced newspapers to stop publishing if they printed libelous material. It was quickly passed, much to the satisfaction of the Canadian Jewish Chronicle which wrote: "Manitoba leads the way in creating a legalistic machinery for enjoining journalistic rackateers from carrying on their fall work."26

In 1943 the Ontario Legislature debated a bill entitled "An Act to Prevent Discrimination Because of Race or Creed." It did not survive its second reading. After its defeat, which the Jewish Post called "humiliating news to the world", the newspaper went on to comment: "The negative action taken in Ontario is a sad commentary of our times. It sets back the clock of civilization and makes the uphill climb increasingly difficult."27

After the war, the need for civil rights legislation was deemed all the more urgent because of the blatant hypocrisy involved in fighting, inter alia, the institutionalization of racism overseas while permitting domestic discrimination. In 1946, a campaign was begun to legislate fair employment practices. These proposals made it illegal to discriminate in employment on grounds of race or religion. Because of Canada's federal structure, all provinces and the federal government must pass such laws to ensure that a citizen would be protected from such discrimination regardless of his residence. (In contrast, the fourteenth amendment of the American constitution guarantees each citizen in each

26 April 20, 1934, p. 3.

27 April 1, 1943, p. 2.
state equal protection of the laws). Concerning this discrimination Today commented: "No matter how detestable such things are, they will stop only when they are compelled to stop. Public disapproval must be translated into effective laws, on a provincial and national basis, making job discrimination illegal and meting out stiff penalties to violators." Three years later, in 1949, federal member Alistair Stewart introduced such a bill, which was eventually enacted in 1953. In typical fashion The Israelite Press emphasized the essence of the law. "This law," it wrote, "would be a base for the fight against prejudice and a standard for social reference."

When discussion of a fair employment practices act came up in Ontario, eventually the first province to pass such a law in 1951, The Jewish Standard urged its readers to insist that the bill deal with the substance of the fight against racism and not any secondary issue. It also addressed itself to the ubiquitous question as to whether legislation was the most efficient means with which to combat discrimination:

Prejudice, being a state of mind, is more amenable to psychiatric than to legislative treatment. At the same time laws have from time immemorial been used to discourage and punish overt manifestations of abnormal drives and unnatural lusts; and it is against prejudices which result in discriminatory acts that legislation outlawing racism is directed.

In 1956, after a number of provinces had already taken such action, the British Columbia government decided to introduce a fair
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employment practices act of its own. The Jewish Western Bulletin asked whether such a law was necessary in British Columbia. After listing several cases of discrimination in employment, it answered: "There are sufficient examples of employment discrimination to show that the answer is yes."³¹

The support for fair employment practices acts was echoed for fair accommodation practices acts. These are laws which make it illegal to discriminate, on racial and religious grounds, against anyone seeking accommodation in any place to which the public is normally admitted. In 1957 the Jewish Western Bulletin wrote that the federal government could set an example in housing as it had done in employment "by first amending its own regulations with regard to the Housing Act and then even perhaps by passing a special law to bar racial discrimination in all housing developments which come under federal jurisdictions."³²

When such a housing law was passed in Ontario in 1960 it was warmly welcomed by The Jewish Standard. That newspaper felt that:

... the present government of Ontario has shown its sensitivity to both the moral and the economic damage inflicted by discrimination ... The blow against discrimination struck by the latest legislation projected by the Frost administration is a blow at discrimination against all groups and it must be viewed in that light.³³

The Anglo-Jewish press took more than a passing interest in legislation against incitement to hatred of any religious, racial, or ethnic group. In 1966 the Manitoba legislature passed a resolution

³¹January 27, 1956, p. 2.
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condemning the distribution of hate literature. The Canadian Jewish Chronicle called the Manitoba action "fresh encouragement . . . for those who have consistently advocated legal curbs on the activities of the hate-mongers."  

Shortly after the provincial action, the federal government introduced its own "anti-hate propaganda law." The bill was designed to make the distribution of such materials punishable under the Canadian criminal code. The Israelite Press explained the utility of such a law:

Even if the proposed anti-hate law is never called into use, its enactment will stand as a public declaration to all who would sow discord, that none can abuse a group in Canada without incurring penalty. It is preventive medicine in this respect. Furthermore, the federal legislation would prove a peg on which to hang federal and provincial programs of education and concurrent provincial legislation so that across the country the blot of slander and innuendo directed against minorities and identifiable groups will be rooted out.  

MINORITY RIGHTS

The Anglo-Jewish press demonstrated unanimity in expressing the view that the civil rights of minority groups, with certain exceptions, were to be vigourously supported. Restrictions which were placed on one group were opposed as if they were imposed on Jewish Canadians. The fight for minority rights was thought to be indivisible — Jews should

34April 8, 1966, p. 4.

support Blacks, Chinese should support Indians, etc.

Publication after publication envisaged an ideal Canadian society. Here there would be no second class citizen. The civil rights of ethnic groups would be protected in exactly the same manner as those of the English and French majorities. All minority groups would have the right to participate equally in Canadian society, without being required to surrender any part of their culture or tradition. A continuing commitment to the cause of equality of all Canadians was to be the surest means of guaranteeing a healthy and progressive society. The rights of minority groups would be subject to equality before the law and the political expressions of such groups would be legally as respected as those of the majority. This was, in essence, an advocacy of a multicultural society.

This, in short, was how the Anglo-Jewish press expressed itself on the subject of minority rights. While articulating these attitudes, the press also reiterated its views on basic freedoms — religion, speech, and complete suffrage, all the while emphasizing the aspect of civil rights of minority groups.

Numerous incidents reflect the commitment to freedom of religion. When, in 1943, Quebec City Jews were informed that the municipal government planned to expropriate the site on which a synagogue was being erected, the Jewish Post interpreted this action as a matter of principle. It commented that "the elementary rights of freedom of worship are involved and no true Canadian can stand by and see these fundamental principles desecrated."36 Similarly, a violent attack by a group

36 July 22, 1943, p. 2.
of youths on a small sect of Christian students convening in Quebec in 1950 was interpreted by the Canadian Jewish Chronicle to be a test of the principle of freedom. It went on to write that "if their wrong is not redressed, all religion suffers, including the religion . . . of the rioters." Finally, the Canadian Jewish Weekly was in full agreement with the Supreme Court's 1955 decision in what became known as the Chaput case. Here the Court ruled on a case involving the breakup of an orderly religious meeting (in this case the Jehovah's Witnesses) by three Quebec provincial policemen. The Court declared unequivocally that the opinion of a minority was entitled to the same respect as that of the majority. The newspaper wrote that "Jewish Canadians . . . have good reason to take heart" because the Court had brought in a unanimous verdict "reaffirming the freedom of religion and rights of minorities." 

The commitment to freedom of speech was equally strong. When, in 1951, certain Members of Parliament threatened to muzzle the freedom of the CBC for broadcasting an unpopular discourse by Bertrand Russell, the response was not long in coming from the Canadian Jewish Chronicle:

We cannot but view with alarm the desire expressed by certain members of the House of Commons . . . . The Canadian people had a right to listen to a minority opinion — of this there can be no doubt. That right, indeed, is fundamental to our concept of freedom, and those politicians who on the hustings prate themselves breathless about liberty and then seek to stifle the expression of opinion which runs counter to their own . . . do not begin to understand the principle of that democracy they are presumed to represent.
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Quebec's padlock law was interpreted, inter alia, to be a blatant assault on freedom of speech. In one particular case individuals were arrested for circulating a petition protesting the padlocking of certain club-rooms. The Western Jewish News protested that:

... the Quebec government has cut off completely and without apology the right to free and peaceful expression. No charge of sedition can be read into the actions of the circulators of the petition, unless criticism of the government be seditious. When criticism without threat of use of force is interpreted as seditious, then democracy has indeed disappeared and the police state exists.48

That same newspaper commented on a similar case when, in 1949, a charge of sedition against members of Jehovah's Witnesses was dismissed by the Supreme Court. It wrote that "the basis of democracy is the right of the opposition and of the layman to criticize the action of the government in power."41

Finally, the view was adopted that the complete suffrage of all Canadians was not merely an academic question, but one that reflected on the supposed democratic spirit in Canada. Canadian Indians were denied the vote until 1960, while Japanese Canadians lost the franchise for a period of time and only regained it in 1949. For other minorities, too, including women, the acquisition of the franchise was a hard won prize. How could Canada, it was asked, reproach other countries for practicing various forms of discrimination when certain minority groups of Canadian citizens were disenfranchised? For one newspaper this contradiction acknowledged "a difference in the quality of the breeds of mankind;
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it shrieks a continued belief in the supremacy of one race over another."²

The movement for complete suffrage, it was believed, had a direct bearing on the life and welfare of every Canadian citizen.

To align oneself with the movement for civil rights of minority groups in Canada was, in the view of the Anglo-Jewish press, to maintain a strong moral position. It was a moral society which allowed its minorities to practice a separate religion; it was a moral society which allowed its minorities to express themselves openly; it was a moral society which allowed all to partake in the decision-making process, and it was a moral society which allowed its minorities to remain different.

This interpretation was the essence of democracy according to the Anglo-Jewish press. No society could call itself democratic while permitting any restriction which eroded the civil rights of its minorities. With this opinion in mind, let us examine how the Anglo-Jewish press looked at the status of other minority groups in Canada.

**French Canadians**

Being the largest minority ethnic group in Canada, and being a majority in one province, French-Canadians were viewed differently than other minorities by the Anglo-Jewish press. The history of the French Canadians was often compared to the history of the Jew — the drive for survival, the trend toward isolationism, glorification of the past, etc.

²The Western Jewish News (May 12, 1949), p. 2.
(A major difference rested on the fact that the great majority of French Canadians were settled in what they considered their homeland). However, this bond of historical similarity often yielded in significance to the belief that being a majority in Quebec, French Canadians should not expect to have the support of Jews when minorities in that province did not enjoy the civil rights which French Canadians were demanding for their brethren outside of Quebec.

After a Franco-Ontario newspaper printed a discussion of the injustices rendered to the Catholic minority of Ontario, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle had this response, written in 1932:

We heartily agree with these statements, being ourselves a minority people, but it would be much more consistent if the same tune were sung in those provinces where the Catholics are not the minority. The cause they plead might be strengthened if they could come before the authorities and show that in the province where they constitute a majority every vestage of consideration is accorded the minorities. The lack of such liberalism is, however, the greatest stumbling block in the path of any group which demands rights. No man has a right to be accorded any better treatment than that which he metes out to others, and when the Catholic minorities come before provincial legislatures demanding a status to which every minority is entitled they should not be disappointed if their transgressions recoil upon their own heads.43

Although it was often articulated in a rhetorical fashion, the view was expressed that minorities in Quebec should expect to be treated sympathetically on the grounds that French Canadians were themselves a minority in other provinces. When this sympathetic treatment was not forthcoming, neither was unconditional support for the civil rights of French Canadians. French Canadian leaders, it was written, "are well aware of the
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precariousness of their own moral position as a minority if they do not respect the rights of others." The next step was to argue that the strengthening of the civil rights of minorities within Quebec was in the best interest of French Canadians:

We have repeatedly emphasized that the legitimate interests of the French speaking section of the Canadian population can best be served by safeguarding in Quebec those minority rights that the French seek for their minorities in the other provinces."

Regardless of these misgivings, the Anglo-Jewish press did ultimately express support for the civil rights of French Canadians. This support was channelled along two major streams — a yearning for the equality of French language and culture throughout Canada and support for the priority of the French language in Quebec.

There was little doubt, in the opinion of the Anglo-Jewish press, that the aspirations of French Canada for linguistic and cultural equality throughout the country was a legitimate cause. Publications felt completely at ease in encouraging and even demanding conditions that would elevate the status of the French Canadian and award him the full civil rights that English Canadians held in all provinces. The responsibility for establishing full civil rights lay not only with French Canadians themselves, it was believed, but with all Canadians, including minority ethnic groups. The Western Jewish News, in 1949, provided a formula on which to base the drive for French Canadian equality:

"The Jewish Standard (March, 1936), p. 3.

Schools throughout the Dominion must stress the French contribution to the building of the nation, must show the French not as a vanquished race but as the first builders of and continuous contributors to a distinctively Canadian society. The French language must become the second language of the country in fact as well as in form, so that if French Canada is expected to speak English, English Canada must also be expected to speak French. Without attacking the basic structure of French living, the schools must make an attempt at unity of curriculum with French Canadian schools, so that all Canadians may have the same perspective towards Canadian history.  

Because the first language of most Quebec Jews is not French (although the immigration of a large number of North Africans, whose first language is French, has significantly altered this balance), the lumping together of Jews with the English-speaking minority has regularly occurred in analyses of Quebec's linguistic composition. But this alliance is, at best, a tenuous one. The Anglo-Jewish press has questioned this grouping, asking if Jews really belong, by any tradition or culture, to the English speaking minority. Hence, a number of publications have not hesitated to align themselves with those calling for French language priority in Quebec (although under the condition that the civil rights of minorities would be respected). The Canadian Jewish News, in 1969, expressed sympathy with the view that "the majority (in Quebec) is perturbed by the fear that Montreal may become a New Orleans with French as a remembrance of things past."  

It was in this light that Quebec Jews were urged, by various Anglo-Jewish sources, to become proficient in the French language. Similarly, Jewish parochial schools were encouraged to orient themselves to the French milieu in Quebec.
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For the Anglo-Jewish press the struggle for Black civil rights in Canada represented a struggle comparable to that of Canadian Jews. Discrimination against Blacks was felt to be merely an intensification of that against the Jew. The Jewish Standard proclaimed that "the freedom of the Negro is as much the symbol of Jewish freedom as Jewish freedom itself is the symbol of a free world."  

The case for Black civil rights in Canada centred around the small town of Dresden, Ontario, during the early 1950's. In this town (ironically once a haven for Blacks fleeing north and seeking asylum from the American civil war) a number of restaurants were found to be practicing blatant discrimination against the Black population. After numerous protests a municipal referendum was held which resulted in the sanctioning of the barring of Blacks from the city's restaurants. Numerous lawsuits resulted, one of which the Canadian Jewish Weekly chose to follow:

The prosecution of the latest charge of race discrimination laid against a Dresden restaurant owner will be followed very closely by all those interested both in breaking down the Jim Crowism in this town and preserving the Ontario anti-discrimination laws from collapse . . . .

Various Anglo-Jewish publications felt bound, by what can best be described as a moral covenant, to support the establishment and maintenance of Black civil rights. There was no questioning of this position.
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This view was most eloquently expressed by The Jewish Standard:

Those who believe in democracy, in the right of every human being to equal opportunity and equal treatment under the law, must work for the speedy integration of the Negro into American - and Canadian - life. It is not, basically, a question of law . . . . It is a simple question of ethics. No man has the right to hold another in thrall. And whatever problems granting full freedom to the Negroes creates, Jews have no choice wherever they may live, but to insist that they be given this freedom.50

**Oriental Canadians**

Canada's Oriental population, located mainly in British Columbia, has consistently had its civil rights encroached upon by governments and courts. The case of Cunningham versus Tomey Homma (1903) upheld a British Columbia statute (the British Columbia Provincial Election Act - now repealed) denying the franchise to Oriental Canadians, naturalized or not.51 In 1912, the Saskatchewan legislature made it an offence for any person to employ a white women in any capacity in a business owned or operated by an Oriental.52 Such was typical of the treatment meted out to Oriental Canadians by their fellow Canadian citizens.

Expressions of support by the Anglo-Jewish press of the civil rights of Japanese Canadians revolved around one dominant incident — the deportation of Japanese Canadian citizens and non-citizens alike, immediately following World War II. During the course of the war itself,
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all Japanese Canadians were forcibly moved from their homes and interned in camps in the British Columbia interior. Their property was expropriated. Although this internment was legal on the basis of the War Measures Act,\textsuperscript{53} its morality was another question. The Anglo-Jewish press, regularly printing reports of Nazi atrocities in Europe, was markedly silent on the issue of internment, as were most Canadians. The government action was taken in a time of acute crisis; the advantage of hindsight gives us an entirely different perspective — one which reflects poorly on the entire Canadian character.

After the surrender of Japan in 1945 the Federal Government enacted three Orders-in-Council calling for the deportation of Japanese Canadians, including Canadian nationals. The matter of the Orders' validity was referred to the Supreme Court which, by a split decision, upheld their validity. Appeals to the Privy Council proved fruitless. However, during the litigation process, the government reversed its policy and ordered the deportation proceedings to be abandoned. In the end, 3,964 Japanese Canadians were repatriated, allegedly none against their will.\textsuperscript{54}

Before the government rescinded its Orders-in-Council the Canadian Jewish Chronicle urged it to reconsider "the effect of its orders upon many innocent Japanese . . . and the international and moral implications of the orders."\textsuperscript{55} The editorial went on to ponder why the
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naturalized citizens of other enemy nations, Germany, for example, had not been subjected to similar treatment. It concluded that the Orders were "based upon unworthy considerations of race and colour."

Today also associated itself with the effort to have the government reverse its announced intention. This magazine termed the government's plan "racism pure and simple." It also reprinted an excerpt from a speech given by Rabbi Abraham Feinberg at a meeting to protest government policy towards Japanese Canadians:

I am here on behalf of 6,000,000 Jews who were slaughtered in Europe for no reason other than that they were Jews . . . . The Japanese comprise only one-half of one percent of the population of Canada; but as the trembling instrument of the Jews who were slaughtered, I will champion to my last breath the cause of any group, no matter how small, who are being persecuted or penalized because of their race, colour, or creed . . . . The wrong being contemplated against the Japanese here may be like a whisper that may start an avalanche of evil, precedent after precedent, and wrong after wrong. That was the way of Germany after Hitler.\textsuperscript{56}

In 1923 a law entitled "The Chinese Exclusion Act" entered the statute books. It was designed to exclude Chinese from entering Canada through the normal immigration channels. Also excluded were the wives and children of Chinese already in Canada. In 1947 the Canadian government decided to abolish the law. In response to that gesture the Canadian Jewish Chronicle wrote: "By the abrogation of this act, a great wrong is righted, and the Canadian government is to be congratulated upon at last taking a long step overdue."\textsuperscript{57}

However, even with that repeal, Chinese residents in Canada, who were not citizens, were still not permitted to bring their wives and
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children into the country. Chinese who were Canadian citizens were forbidden to bring in unmarried children over the age of eighteen. Europeans, on the other hand, were exempt from these regulations. Commenting on these laws, The Western Jewish News wrote:

Even if the objectionable order-in-council were removed, no one but immediate relatives of resident Chinese would be admitted to Canada. The numbers of these are so small that they would have no noticeable effect on the population as a whole. The Chinese residents would have the benefit of the normal family life of which the Canadian regulations now deprive them; they would no longer be strangers in a strange and unfriendly world. The contribution of the Japanese Canadians and of the few Chinese Canadians is ample proof of the overall value of such a plan.⁵⁸

Always conscious of minority civil rights, the Jewish Western Bulletin publicised the case of a Chinese Canadian high school graduate who was unable to find employment. The newspaper believed this to be indicative "that Chinese still suffer a disability . . . when seeking employment."⁵⁹

NATIVE CANADIANS

A large number of Anglo-Jewish publications were insistent in championing the cause of the civil rights of Canada's native peoples and in publicising what it considered their deplorable state of existence. Various newspapers and magazines emphasized the blatant discrimination practiced against native peoples as well as their disenfranchisement (Eskimos were granted the franchise in 1953 while Indians on reservations
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were given the vote in 1960).

The *Canadian Jewish Chronicle* expressed shock in discovering that Indians, in 1965, had an average lifespan of 34 years compared with the national average of over 60.\(^{60}\) An editorial in *The Western Jewish News* was characteristic of the sympathy expressed by the Anglo-Jewish press:

In the consideration of the rights and abuses of minorities, the Canadian Indian has been most overlooked. Yet his plight is in many ways the worst of all. He suffers from all the disabilities of colour and "foreignness" though he is most truly the original heir and the native. In return for what has become a token payment he has been deprived of the privileges of citizenship; his children rarely reach their proper level in society; his body is riddled with tuberculosis which benevolent government treats free. Like the magnificent animal which used to provide his livelihood, he lives a caged existence, his numbers limited by disease and his mode of life. As a result the nation has lost one of the great potentials of its culture.\(^{61}\)

When British Columbia was planning to celebrate its centenary in 1958, a weekly newspaper in that province, the *Jewish Western Bulletin*, wrote: "Surely it would be timely to consider a special effort on behalf of the Native Indians in honour of the Centenary." It went on to explain that what was needed to integrate the Indian into Canadian society was "a truly cooperative approach towards the Indian problem not only by every government but by various social agencies who could make a big contribution."\(^{62}\)

\(^{60}\)December 17, 1965, p. 4.
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Newspapers and magazines often remarked on the injustice of denying the franchise to Canada's native peoples. This was, in the eyes of one newspaper, akin to robbing them "of their sacred humanity," and a "poor form of paternalism."\textsuperscript{63} Canada's record was inexcusable, another newspaper claimed, in an editorial entitled "Giving Canadian Indians Equal Rights," in the light of Canada's acceptance of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights.\textsuperscript{64} When the franchise was extended to include Canadian Eskimos, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle termed this "a great and significant gesture . . . the vote is rightfully theirs."\textsuperscript{65}

Other issues, too, stimulated the Anglo-Jewish press to respond vigorously. For example, in 1957, one hundred and eighteen Cree Indians of the Hobbema Reserve in Alberta, on the basis of the 1951 revised Indian Act, were to be deprived of their land. The Indians petitioned the federal Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. Pickersgill, whose slow and indifferent response infuriated the Canadian Jewish Weekly. That newspaper wrote:

This is how he (Mr. Pickersgill) treats our Indians whom, on other occasions, he has urged to "assimilate" and give up their age-old culture and traditions. Rather than that, our government should ensure the health, education and trades training of our aboriginal peoples and make possible the development of their richly humanist folk-lore and culture.\textsuperscript{66}
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The Jewish Western Bulletin diligently pointed out that despite fair employment practices laws Indians were suffering blatant forms of discrimination. That newspaper also informed its readers that less than ten native Indians attended the University of British Columbia in 1958.67

COMMUNIST GROUPS

As strong as the support was in the Canadian Jewish Chronicle (and in many other Anglo-Jewish publications) for the strengthening of the civil rights of numerous minority ethnic groups, it did not extend to supporting the civil rights of communist groups. Suppression of communist groups, especially in Quebec under Duplessis' rule, was regularly condoned. The Canadian Jewish Chronicle did not subscribe to the theory that "the suppression of any organization in a democratic society is an indication of defeat, and perhaps, a convenient means of disguising that defeat."68 On the contrary, this newspaper saw the eradication of communism from Canada as a necessary function in order to remove a clear threat to the political stability of Canadian society.

In a public address given in 1936, Premier Duplessis notified the province that the communists and "other disturbers of the public order" were not to be tolerated within Quebec. In response the Canadian Jewish Chronicle wrote:

This is a warning that will find warm approval on the part of every citizen who has the welfare of the country at heart and the Premier may rest assured that he will be ardently supported. . . .69
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The following year the Quebec government passed the Communist Propaganda Act (eventually ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court).\textsuperscript{70} The law deemed it illegal for anyone to print or aid in the printing of any written material which tended to propagate communism. When Duplessis, acting in his additional capacity as Attorney General, seized some communist literature, the newspaper did not dispute the claim that the seizure was necessary but that it was difficult, if not impossible, to determine what was "communistic, and who is to determine it."\textsuperscript{71}

In 1943 the federal riding of Cartier in Quebec elected a Jewish member, a communist, by the name of Fred Rose (he ran under a Labour-Progressive label). When that riding elected a Liberal in a 1950 by-election the \textit{Canadian Jewish Chronicle} expressed relief, for it had emerged red-faced from what it called the "unfortunate Fred Rose chapter." His election, it went on, "was no more than a temporary interpolation... and by no means an endorsement of the Communist ideology and certainly not a mandate given to treason."\textsuperscript{72}

The newspaper felt itself to be truly embattled with any communist tendencies not only in Quebec, but within the entire country. In language strikingly similar to that later heard during the McCarthy hearings in the United States, the newspaper reported, in 1935, on the reception which Prime Minister Bennett's sweeping economic proposals had had on his opponents:
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Yet, it is interesting to note that Mr. Woodsworth of CCF fame and as some Tory papers will have it, of Muscovite inspiration, has endorsed several of Mr. Bennett's proposals, and is eagerly awaiting several other planks in a platform which is becoming redder each day.  

Similar vitriolic language was used to indict communists after a 1950 Supreme Court decision held a discriminatory contract clause to be unconstitutional. This opportunity was used by the newspaper to enjoin the Supreme Court in the struggle against communism. It editorialized that the "decision serves also as an additional weapon in our battle against Communism, which rejoices in the manifestation of prejudice, manifestations which it is not slow to use for its own purposes."  

FASCIST GROUPS  

The Anglo-Jewish press did not support the civil rights of fascist groups in Canada. It was quick to condemn their appearance and equally quick to rejoice in their disappearance. Comments concerning Canadian fascism coincided with the internment of certain fascists during the war, and the rise of numerous fascist political parties in the decade preceding the Second World War. Few parts of Canada were immune to fascist activities. Toronto, in 1929, saw the development of an organization called the Swastika Club. It 'protected' a recreation area, Kew Beach, from being inundated by Jews.  

Winnipeg was the site of a meeting  

---
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in 1934 of the Nationalist Party of Canada where it was suggested, inter alia, that Jews should be denied the rights of citizenship. But it was in the province of Quebec that fascism reached its zenith. Here Adrien Arcand, an admirer of Nazi racial policy and a co-publisher of the anti-Semitic newspaper Le Goglu, decided to devote himself increasingly to fascist politics, through the Parti national social chretien and Canadian fascism.

Arcand's entrance into politics had a profoundly shocking effect upon the Anglo-Jewish press. A 1938 editorial in the Canadian Jewish Chronicle denounced this "Nazi jackmanapes" as a "travesty in British idealism . . . . Arcand's threats are not only against the Jews but against all forms of political decency and liberty." Quebec was described as a "cesspool of foreign activities" subsidized and inspired by "aliens".

Anglo-Jewish publications did not suffer a 'crise de conscience' while calling for restrictions on freedom of speech and association for fascists. Considering that Arcand would diminish the civil rights of all non-Christians including those who did not subscribe to any religion, this is not surprising. In discussing fascist trends, the Jewish Post wrote:
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The poison has a tendency to spread. It jumped an ocean and spanned continents. It found fruitful soil in the Argentine and it germinated in Japan. It is the infallible weapon of the reactionary and the demagogue. It has no place in Canada. It must be outlawed as a crime against the State.\textsuperscript{82}

When Quebec City officials refused to allow Arcand to speak publicly in 1939, one newspaper commented that "the freedom of speech postulated in our unwritten law never intended that an individual hiding in that sanctuary should issue, irresponsibly and maliciously, libels and slander at the expense of any group of co-citizens."\textsuperscript{83}

The Jewish Western Bulletin, after surveying fascist trends in Canada, urged the Jew, albeit subtly, to support restrictions on the civil rights of Canadian fascists:

There are signs of Fascist persecution of the Jews in Canada, and it behooves the Canadian of Jewish race to look well to his interests in the connection. . . . As Jews we cannot afford to discount the danger to ourselves in any Fascist control of Canada. . . . Under similar circumstances the carelessly tolerant Canadian of today would soon become as the Red Iroquois of yesterday. Will the Jew of Canada be caught napping?\textsuperscript{84}

Because Arcand and other fascists of lesser popularity were considered persons whose conduct was dangerous to the war effort, they were interned by the government under the War Measures Act. Their internment lasted the duration of the war and was approved wholeheartedly by certain Anglo-Jewish publications which continually emphasized the danger of freely active fascists. The amendment to the Defence of Canada Act, passed in 1940, held that those who had been interned for
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valid reasons would lose the privilege of running for public office. This too was approved by the *Canadian Jewish Chronicle* which wrote: "To do otherwise would be to bring democracy into ridicule, and the procedures of democracy into disrespect."\(^{85}\)

That newspaper also disapproved of Arcand's release in 1945. Expressing its difficulty in forgetting Arcand's activities prior to the war, it wrote: "We believe that the authorities owe the people . . . an explanation for the extraordinary 'nolle prosequi' in the case of an avowed ally of our defeated enemy."\(^{86}\)

**A BILL OF RIGHTS**

Canada's Bill of Rights was passed by an act of Parliament in 1960 and officially entitled, "An Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms." It affirms many of the freedoms which we have already discussed and directs the courts to bear these freedoms in mind when interpreting the law. It is also, however, a document fraught with weaknesses, the most blatant of which is that it is a simple act of Parliament, therefore susceptible to alteration by a succeeding act. As well, it is a federal statute and thus not binding on the provinces. These weaknesses are, perhaps, a result of the compromises worked out to satisfy opposing factions in the debate which preceded the bill's passage. One side took the position that a bill clarifying and protecting certain freedoms should be incorporated into
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the constitution where it could be protected from alteration (unless a constitutional amendment was passed). The other side adopted the position that a government should not attempt to define basic rights and such a bill, in any form, would be dangerous.\textsuperscript{87}.

The Anglo-Jewish press, beginning in the late 1940's, conducted a strong campaign urging governments, federal in particular, to pass a bill of rights. This campaign was stimulated by two incidents — the shock of discovering the magnitude of Nazi atrocities in Europe and the passage of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations in 1948.

The issue of a bill of rights was one which, in the words of The Western Jewish News, "cannot be too often discussed, too often examined, or too often pondered." \textsuperscript{88} This advice was not taken lightly as newspapers often ran lengthy editorials discussing the subtleties of the issue. The Canadian Jewish Chronicle, for example, discussed the dangers of such a piece of legislation:

Language being what it is — all too often a quicksand of ambiguities — there is always the peril that a catalogue of rights may either be too inclusive — thus rights are admitted which lead too easily to the abuse of right — or too exclusive, and rights are omitted the necessity of which was not at the moment foreseen.\textsuperscript{89}

There was general agreement among the newspapers and magazines that civil rights should be constitutional rights and therefore incorpora-
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ted in the BNA Act, which was, and is, essentially a bill of rights for provinces, not individuals. Such was the sentiment expressed by the Canadian Jewish Weekly when, after anti-Semitic remarks were attributed to a member of the B.C. Social Credit party, it wrote:

The incident in B.C. shows that racism and anti-Semitism are by no means on the way out in Canada. This only underlines once again the need for a Bill of Rights in Canada, which would make such racist outbursts . . . beyond the law.90

Because Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights was not in any way applicable to the provinces, the problem of defining jurisdictional claims to civil rights was left unresolved. "It is hard to protect something by law," Frank Scott has written, "when you do not know whom it belongs to."91 Such being the case, the Jewish Western Bulletin proposed that the federal government take the initiative:

Perhaps it could offer a program of education and enforcement to be shared jointly with the provinces. The precedent for joint federal-provincial action already exists in such areas as old-age pensions and health insurance. It should also be possible to apply the same principle to the area of civil rights.92

Aside from the jurisdictional difficulties, that some newspaper felt the proposed Bill of Rights were too narrow in scope; that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set forth more far-reaching standards. In particular the newspaper pointed out that the U.N. document included protection against "arbitrary interference" in the "privacy, family, home or correspondence of the individual" and against attacks upon
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"honour and reutation.""93 Quebec's Padlock Law, the governmental treatment of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War, and numerous other cases all lend credence to the necessity of such protection.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF CIVIL RIGHTS SUPPORT

INTRODUCTION

Our analysis of the support of civil rights by the Anglo-Jewish press focuses on two factors: Judaic traditions (which I will examine in the second part of this chapter) and political expediency — the adoption of a certain position because it was in the political interests of Jewish Canadians to do so.

Not only do the two factors rarely conflict with each other but they are also invariably complementary. For Jewish Canadians to espouse a policy of social justice for all minorities was both politically expedient (for Jewish Canadians could only benefit from the protection accorded to the civil rights of other minority groups) and in keeping with Judaic traditions.

There is no denying that the Anglo-Jewish press was interested in and commented upon issues even remotely related to civil rights in Canada because it felt directly affected by these issues. There was a continual calculation of the repercussions of these events on the fate of Jewish Canadians. There is another factor, albeit hypothetical, which we should not overlook. It is the belief that the support given
to other minority groups would somehow be returned when Jewish Canadians were directly threatened by the majority. This belief in reciprocity may possibly explain some of the views articulated by the Anglo-Jewish press. This support may also have been an unconscious attempt to have Jewish Canadians fully accepted by the Canadian community.

Before expanding on these points let us take an analytical look at the positions of the Anglo-Jewish press on some of the civil rights issues described in Chapter II while emphasizing the factor of political expediency.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Believing that political figures play a major role in determining the fate of Jewish Canadians, the Anglo-Jewish press frequently commented on the actions of elected officials. Newspapers did not hesitate to saturate their editorials with laudatory remarks concerning politicians who were sensitive to minority rights nor did they refrain from downgrading politicians who did not demonstrate this sensitivity. The issue did not necessarily have to be specific in its reference to Jewish Canadians. For example, in early 1950, Duplessis, using powers found in his padlock law, ordered the provincial police to arrest the circulators of a petition against the padlock law. The Western Jewish News saw this as characteristic "of the strong fascist trends of the Duplessis administration."

In the same editorial it expressed its objection to this incident not because it was used to shut a Jewish organization but "because it is an attack on the fundamental rights guaranteed Canadians under the long tradi-
tion of British law." What exactly did the newspaper wish to convey with this comment? In effect it felt that Duplessis' action was an attack on the fundamental rights of Jewish Canadians because they too, being Canadian citizens, fell under the protection of British law. If one group, theoretically protected by the "tradition of British law", fell victim to Duplessis' measure, were not Jewish Canadians equally susceptible?

When Duplessis chose to remain silent when his colleagues articulated views on civil rights which the Anglo-Jewish press interpreted as narrow minded, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle felt relieved that Duplessis would not be "railroaded into anything which would, in his opinion, be harmful to the interests of all people in Quebec." In using the phrase "all people" the newspaper did not mean French Canadians whose civil rights in Quebec were, in the mind of the Anglo-Jewish press, beyond question. The phrase was employed to mean any and all minority groups, including Jewish Quebeckers, whose future depended on the whim of the majority. The Anglo-Jewish press tied the fate of Jewish Quebeckers to that of all other minority groups in Quebec. Thus, an infringement of civil rights experienced by any minority group was interpreted to be an infringement on the civil rights of Jews.

The Anglo-Jewish press unceasingly lobbied for a liberal immigration policy unfettered by any racial or religious restrictions. Again, although the effects of such a policy would be felt by numerous groups,
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Jewish Canadians would undoubtedly also benefit. Given the fact that prior to, during, and after World War II, hundreds of thousands of European Jews were looking for sanctuary, the issue was indeed a priority for the Anglo-Jewish press. Such was its importance that it determined whether support would be forthcoming to politicians. For example, after Mackenzie King's death, he was eulogized in the Anglo-Jewish press as one whose memory would be cherished "with gratitude and affection" because he increased immigration quotas and introduced "for thousands of DP's, the principle of sanctuary." Since many of those displaced persons were Jews, Mackenzie King's role in the history of Jewish Canada was assured of a sympathetic interpretation. The Anglo-Jewish press asked for the elimination of racial and religious barriers in immigration in order to reduce the number of possible restrictions on Jewish immigrants to Canada. As well, one might argue that it was politically expedient for the Anglo-Jewish press to suggest that if there was going to be a policy of selective immigration, it should be selectiveness according to merit since Jews have tended to be disproportionately represented in fields demanding some degree of higher education.

The Anglo-Jewish press was fervently interested in legislation concerning civil rights. Any bill designed to outlaw discrimination or penalize its perpetrators, had the unqualified support of all newspapers and magazines. Jews have been sensitized, through experience, to the effects of any discriminatory behaviour on the part of the majority. It is with ease that Jews recall traumatic historical incidents — the exodus from Egypt, the Spanish Inquisition, the Nazi holocaust, and endless others.

3 Canadian Jewish Chronicle (July 28, 1950), p. 3.
Thoughtful responses to discrimination have often been replaced by a reflex action — the result of a relentless onslaught of anti-Semitism. It is in this light in which we can best see and understand why the Anglo-Jewish press so enthusiastically supported any anti-discrimination legislation.

When a bill proposing to outlaw slanderous attacks on any racial or religious group was introduced in the Quebec Assemble Nationale, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle wholeheartedly supported it, writing that Quebec "should be first to put an end to slanderous attacks on any racial or religious group forming an integral part of its citizenship." There is little doubt that Jewish Quebeckers were considered to be one of those integral groups. Indeed, in the same editorial it was written that Canadian Jewry would be "very grateful" if the bill became law.

A similar bill was introduced and passed in Manitoba in 1934, much to the delight of the Anglo-Jewish press. It is no coincidence, however, that Manitoba was considered somewhat of a centre of anti-Semitism and was, in the words of one newspaper, a "seething cauldron of Nazi agitation." 5

The elimination of discrimination because of race or creed was the aim of legislation eventually defeated in the Ontario legislature in 1943. Although the bill would have protected all races and creeds, the Jewish Post, which had supported the bill, examined its defeat with one minority in mind. It wrote: "How are we going to explain to the world that while we adopt resolutions of protest and sympathy for Jews


5Ibid., (April 20, 1934), p. 3.
being slaughtered in the charnel house of Europe, we permit discrimination against Jews in our own cities and provinces?"

Legislation concerning the establishment of fair accommodation and fair employment practices acts, and anti-hate propaganda can be likewise analyzed — that is, support for the civil rights of minority groups was based on the premise that Jewish Canadians would directly or indirectly benefit. These benefits were deemed all the more vital after the Nazi experience in World War II. Indicative of this feeling were the questions posed in an editorial debating the merits of legislation against hate propaganda:

Is it to be believed that what happened in Germany could not possibly happen in any other country? Is it to be doubted that if the Weimar Republic had introduced a law against this kind of incitement, and enforced it, there might never have been a Nazi Germany?

When the Anglo-Jewish press expressed its views on basic freedoms such as religion and speech, it invariably identified them with the quest for Jewish Canadians to obtain their freedom of religion and speech. Moreover, various publications did this in such a manner as to make the freedom of Jewish Canadians the criterion with which to judge the success of their campaign. But it is in its interpretation of the fate of other minority groups that one can best see how the Anglo-Jewish press linked the struggle for Jewish civil rights in Canada with that of other minority groups.

The Anglo-Jewish press, commencing in the mid 1960's, accepted the priority of the French language in Quebec and felt that Jews in

6 April 1, 1943, p. 2.

7 Canadian Jewish Chronicle (December 9, 1966), p. 6.
Quebec should prepare themselves to loosen ties with the Anglophone community while strengthening them with the Francophone community. Various newspapers declared that the Jewish community should "look towards the future." Jews were urged to take note of the developments — a Quebec which would no longer tolerate vast disproportions in any field. This new Quebec, in which knowledge of the French language was a necessity, was considered to be a foregone conclusion. Thus, it was in the interests of the Jewish community to adapt itself to this new political setting. "It is the responsibility of Jewish leadership in Quebec," one newspaper wrote, "to take note of the developments taking place on all sides, to look to the future, and to introduce the kind of thinking within the community that will prepare our children for full and confident participation in the future." Another newspaper flatly commented that, "it is necessary for Jewish families in Quebec to become proficient in the French language .... " These statements were made to ensure that Jewish Quebeckers would not in any way suffer politically, nor be stigmatized by being unable to speak the language of the majority. As Jews in Quebec felt little dissatisfaction in learning French, the Anglo-Jewish press was not at all inhibited in supporting measures that would ensure the flourishing of the French language in Quebec.

The Anglo-Jewish press ardently supported Black Canadians in their struggle to achieve equal status in Canada and attain the civil rights which many Canadians had already gained. But this support was usually thought of as being linked to the struggle of Jewish Canadians,

---

who were urged to study what the situation of Black Canadians meant to their welfare. For example, The Jewish Standard interpreted discrimination of Black Canadians in Ontario in the early 1950's as a lesson for Jews, who, it was suggested

... should perceive in these attacks the thin wedge of an axe which may be used as mercilessly against the minority we ourselves constitute; for if Negroes may be deprived of the rights to which they are morally entitled, merely by reason of their colour or their ethnic origin, why then the same measure may logically be applied to any other minority. The problem of fighting anti-Semitism goes very deep and requires the earnest attention of every Jew who is concerned with his own future. In fighting anti-Negroism he is fighting his own fight...  

This clear articulation of the factor of political expediency was repeatedly used with reference to other minority groups as well. One should take note, however, that this warning to Jews included the description that Negroes were 'morally' entitled to their civil rights. This description was not casually employed but, rather, used in typical fashion out of a religious commitment to ensure social justice for all. I will expand on this idea in our discussion of Judaic traditions.

The re-enfranchisement of Oriental Canadians after World War II gave the Western Jewish News a chance to comment on what this meant for Jewish Canadians. After expounding on the thesis that the withholding of the ballot from Chinese and Japanese Canadians was based on the belief in the supremacy of one race over another, it wrote:

The theory of the master race and the havoc it wrought are too close to the Jewish survivors for them to be anything but uneasy when the fable of race inferiority is being retold. Jews, then, should feel happier and more comfortable that Canadians of Asian origin will not be the object of discrimination in the coming election.  

11February 5, 1950, p. 3.

12May 12, 1949, p. 2.
Democratic suffrage was once again institutionalized, thus eliminating the fear that Jewish Canadians could be disenfranchised. They were perceived to benefit indirectly from the advancements made by Oriental Canadians.

The Anglo-Jewish press rallied to the cause of any group believed to be the recipient of persecution. When a non-Jewish group was involved, the persecution was interpreted as a potential, and, at times, likely threat to Jewish Canadians. The Western Jewish News provides us with a good example of this type of thinking. In the late 1940's the Manitoba government established a committee to investigate the Hutterite colonies on the Portage plains. When the committee had completed its work it did not disband but extended its mandate. The newspaper commented:

... the committee . . . is still in existence and by its existence is in itself a form of petty persecution, since it has removed from a considerable body of Manitoba's good citizens their feeling of security in their homes and their religion. The other minority groups of this province — and that means every group in the province, since all are in some sense a minority — must defend the rights of the Hutterites as if they were their own, as indeed they are. For intolerance, like liberty, is indivisible. Levelled against the Hutterites, or Jehovah's Witnesses today, it may be directed against Roman Catholics or Jews or Freemasons tomorrow.\(^\text{13}\)

The factor of political expediency can also partially explain the attitude of the Anglo-Jewish press towards the establishment of a Canadian Bill of Rights. The Anglo-Jewish press desperately wanted a legal framework in which Jewish Canadians could legally prevent attacks on themselves based on discriminatory actions. This feeling of dependence on a legal framework dramatically increased after the war, when, having seen the experience of the European Jewish community, Jewish

\(^{13}\text{March 17, 1949, p. 2.}\)
Canadians were determined not to have their civil rights violated simply because there was no legal framework with which to counter these attacks. Thus, not being able to influence the psychological attitudes of committed anti-Semites, the Anglo-Jewish press turned to a legal base for protection. Of course, this protection, once secured for the Jewish minority, would protect all groups in Canadian society.

The belief that the plight of one minority group was shared by all minority groups, or that restrictions on one group meant potential restrictions on another, was not held exclusively by Jewish Canadians, or for that matter, any one group. David Suzuki, a noted scientist, and a Japanese Canadian, has interpreted the fate of his minority group in exactly the same way as the Anglo-Jewish press viewed the fate of Jewish Canadians. Speaking in 1971, Suzuki's remarks were aimed at other Japanese Canadians who remained indifferent when racial attacks were executed against Blacks and Jews. He stated: "How stupid to think that bigotry aimed at blacks or jews is any different from prejudice directed at us . . . . The merest puff of a whisper can turn anti-Semitism into fear of the yellow peril."\(^{14}\)

Similarly, Jean Paul Sartre, in his Reflections sur la Question Juive, posits that "we must fight for the Jew neither more nor less than we must fight for ourselves."\(^{15}\) He reasons that anti-Semitism is a problem that affects all persons, thus the Jew should receive universal support.


because anti-Semitism is the forerunner of National Socialism. He feels that the fate of the Jews will determine the fate of all mankind. Jewish freedom, then, according to Sartre, is the criterion by which to judge any democratic society. (The Jewish Standard expressed this same sentiment when writing, "Jewish freedom itself is the symbol of a free world.") He goes on to write: "No Frenchmen will be free as long as the Jews do not enjoy their rights to the full. No Frenchmen will be secure as long as a Jew, not only in France, but in the world at large, need go in fear for his life." 

Finally, a Black American newspaper, the Baltimore Afro-American, suggested that it was imperative for Blacks and Jews to unite in the struggle for civil rights; that these two minorities were threatened by a common force which did not distinguish between them. The newspaper wrote: "We would like to suggest that Blacks and Jews face no threat from one another that compares with the danger they invite by losing sight of the overriding necessity of their sticking together in an effective coalition."

Although the idea was never articulated, a careful reading of the Anglo-Jewish press over a prolonged period of time yields a feeling, subtle though it may be, that the support of other minority groups in their struggle for civil rights would eventually result in reciprocative actions, where other minority groups would support Jewish Canadians in

16 September, 1953, p. 3.

17 Sartre, op. cit., p. 128.

return for the latter's support. In time, then, the threat of anti-Semitism would be significantly reduced.

We can also interpret the Anglo-Jewish press' support of civil rights for minority groups, in an equally hypothetical fashion, to be a yearning for full acceptance into the Canadian community, for it is in that community that Jewish Canadians have considered themselves to be tolerated guests. One analyst has attributed this obsession with taking up the cause of other minorities to a history of living in exile from a Jewish homeland, "in which sufferings, persecutions, and holocausts engendered within us fears, insecurities, and inferiority complexes of all kinds. No matter how loudly we proclaim our equality, no matter how beligerantly we insist that we are really accepted, deep in our hearts we are not sure; we desperately need reassurance." That reassurance would come, in part, by demonstrating that the Jewish community would support all minority groups — French Canadians to Hutterites — whose aspirations were deemed legitimate.

**Judaic Traditions**

The factor of political expediency, alone, is inadequate in explaining the Anglo-Jewish press' commitment to civil rights. We must look for the element that makes Jewish Canadians distinct from other groups. Not only does Judaism provide the major distinguishing factor between Jewish Canadians and other minority groups, it is the sole

factor separating Jews from others in the urban middle-class. Jews, after all, maintain their identity not through a common language or residence (although they are contributing factors), but through a common religion which binds the Argentinian Jew with the one in Vancouver. Jews also have had the opportunity, through religious conversion, to rid themselves of their stigmatizing factor. (An option not open to certain other minority groups such as Black or Oriental Canadians). But they have chosen to perpetuate their religion, the overwhelming feeling being that, inherent in Judaism, are qualities worthy of protection. It is to Judaism that we must look to explain why the Anglo-Jewish press expressed itself as it did. And it is from the traditions of Judaism that the Anglo-Jewish press inherited deeply ingrained values and beliefs concerning morality and social justice. It would be incorrect, however, to claim that Judaic principles have solely and exclusively determined the philosophical attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish press. The editors of these publications were also the inheritors of a rich body of modern and Western philosophies. But it is Judaism which provides a common link among these publications, and it is in Judaic writings where we find ideas and opinions later adopted by the Anglo-Jewish press.

Let us look, for example, at a few of the numerous occasions in which the Anglo-Jewish press considered morality and social justice, two dominating themes of Judaic writings, as influential and significant factors in adopting positions on civil rights issues. In discussing French Canadian calls for full civil rights in all of Canada:
Responsible leaders of the French Canadians are well aware of the precariousness of their own moral position as a minority if they do not respect the minority rights of others.\textsuperscript{20}

In protesting the orders to deport Japanese Canadians:

This, however, should not prevent the Canadian Government from now reconsidering, in the calmer post-war light, both the effect of its orders upon many innocent Japanese, — wives and children — and the international and moral implications of the orders.\textsuperscript{21}

In analyzing the Canadian Citizenship Act:

But unless the granting of citizenship carries with it an obligation on the part of older Canadians to accept unreservedly the newer Canadians, the Canadian Citizenship Act will fail to carry a moral weight equal to its legal force.\textsuperscript{22}

In rejoicing over the abolition of the Chinese Exclusion Act:

By the abrogation of this act, a great wrong is righted, and the Canadian government is to be congratulated upon at last taking a long step overdue.\textsuperscript{23}

In expressing the significance of legislating against discrimination:

In a democratic country, a law is the expression of public opinion regarding right and wrong.\textsuperscript{24}

In revealing the significance for other minorities of racism against Blacks:

... for if Negroes may be deprived of the rights to which they are morally entitled, merely by reason of their colour or their ethnic origin, why then the same measure may logically be applied to any other minority.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{20}The Jewish Standard (March, 1936), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{21}Canadian Jewish Chronicle (December 6, 1946), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{22}The Jewish Standard (January, 1947), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{23}Canadian Jewish Chronicle (January 31, 1947), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{24}The Israelite Press (December 2, 1949), p. 2.

\textsuperscript{25}The Jewish Standard (February, 1950), p. 3.
In discussing why all persons should rally behind the Negro in his struggle for civil rights:

It is not, basically, a question of law . . . . It is a simple question of ethics. No man has the right to hold another in thrall.26

In enumerating the effects of racial discrimination:

Job discrimination, housing discrimination, discrimination in education institutions, make second class citizens of person who are both morally and legally entitled to the same facilities and opportunities as any other citizens.27

In defining the values of a democratic society:

In a truly democratic society every effort will be made to strike a balance that least interferes with the individual's freedom of opinion and expression, but the overriding consideration will inevitably be the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare.28

And finally, in explaining why other groups should support Chinese Canadians in fighting to repeal a particular order-in-council which forbade Chinese, who were not Canadian citizens, from being joined in Canada by their wives and children:

China is not in a position to uphold the rights of her nationals in Canada. The number of Chinese living in Canada is too small to carry much weight on Parliament Hill. Thus it becomes the duty of other minority groups and of thinking Canadians generally to fight for this small group — and for the principle involved in the repeal of the discriminatory order-in-council.29

When the Anglo-Jewish press demonstrated significant sensitivity toward oppressed peoples, when it harangued for justice in our social

26Ibid., (October 1, 1957), p. 2.
29The Western Jewish News (July 6, 1950), p. 2.
system, it was carrying on a tradition in secularized form, of a religion which sees justice, peace, and morality as major tenets of its philosophy. The moral standard of the Ten Commandments and Isaiah's dream of the lion co-habitating with the lamb in a world where the strong do not devour the weak, are but two of many examples of Judaic philosophy. The often times passionate sense of justice exhibited by numerous Anglo-Jewish publications can be attributed to the high degree of sensitivity to morality and social justice readily apparent in Judaism. The concept of brotherhood, for example, is explicit in the biblical commandment found in Deuteronomy 23: 7: "Thou shalt not hate an Edomite, for he is thy brother; thou shalt not hate an Egyptian because thou wast a stranger in his land." This is not to imply that Judaism has any sort of monopoly in these areas. Similar traditions have existed and do exist in other religions and philosophies. However, there is little doubt that in the case of the Anglo-Jewish press, whose attitudes we are trying to explain, Judaic traditions were considered most relevant and dominant.

It is both interesting and significant to note the occupations to which Jews have allotted the most prestige in their societies:

Cut off from major opportunities to rise in the major institutional systems of the larger society in which they lived, but of which they were not a part, the vocation with the greatest prestige came to be that of the scholar-rabbi, the man learned in Torah and Talmud. Learning and scholarship rather than power or even wealth came increasingly to be a measure of a man in the ghetto communities.  

Rabbis, biblical and Talmudic scholars, who research and articulate new interpretations of Jewish views on brotherhood, justice, etc., are still revered in most Jewish communities today.

Jews, as most groups, have been accused of discriminatory behaviour toward other minorities. In the instances where this has occurred, one can question whether this behaviour is motivated by notions of superiority (as is the case with apartheid in South Africa), or rather a wish to remain in existence. Jews, always conscious of their small numbers, have often separated themselves from the majority in order to maintain their identity.

With these thoughts in mind let us examine relevant sections of the Old Testament which, it may be assumed, influenced the views of the Anglo-Jewish press on the issue of civil rights in Canada.

The first five books of the bible — Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy — are known in Hebrew as the Torah. The Torah incorporates a written code of law, the Mosaic code. It is judiciously studied and portions are read every Sabbath of the year. The portions are so arranged that the complete Torah is read over the entire year. A pervasive theme running through the Torah, and the balance of the bible, is one of social justice. The Torah recognizes no class differences before the law. Rich or poor, and owner and worker are treated uniformly. Oppression is despised. Jews are told, "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger," the reminder being, "for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Exodus 23: 9). This is repeated again with the law, "Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or of thy strangers that are
in thy land within thy gates." (Deuteronomy 24: 14).

The duty to help one's fellow citizens, so prevalent in the Anglo-Jewish press' attitudes on the civil rights of other minority groups, is discussed in detail in the Book of Leviticus. Jews are told not to "stand against the blood of thy neighbour . . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Leviticus 19: 16-18). Elsewhere in the same book Jews are instructed how to treat non-Jews in their midst and to refrain from discriminatory behaviour:

And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself. (Leviticus 19: 33-34).

Here is the root of Jewish concern for minority rights and the philosophical base of the Anglo-Jewish press' expression of concern for Negroes, Indians, Japanese and other minorities in Canada. That all persons in the community are responsible for the welfare of others is a central tenet of this concern.

The Book of Leviticus also stresses, and it is not different from other biblical books in this respect, the principle of care for those who are inadequately prepared to care for themselves. (Let us remember the rationale of supporting Chinese Canadians in their fight against a discriminatory order-in-council. (p. 83)):

And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and the stranger. (19: 10)

And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest; thou shalt leave them unto the poor and the stranger. (23: 22).
The tendency, on the part of the Anglo-Jewish press, to sympathize with the oppressed rather than the oppressor, with those struggling to obtain civil rights rather than those wishing to deny them, and with the persecuted rather than the persecuter, derives, it can be argued, from the earliest years of Jewish history. When Moses witnessed an Egyptian whipping of a Hebrew slave he feels no hesitation about killing the Egyptian. (Exodus 2: 11-12). When the United States Congress passed a law in 1854 forcing American citizens to return runaway slaves to their legal owners, Jews could look to another law, divinely inspired, and one unquestionably more humanitarian:

Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him. (Deuteronomy 23: 15-17)

Humanitarian gestures were extended even to the enemy. This is clearly expressed in the commandment found in Exodus 23: 4-5:

If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.

The foundation of many legal systems can be found in the laws of the Mosaic Code. Here, for example, we find laws against perjury: "Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness" (Exodus 23: 1), and bribery: "Thou shalt take no gift: for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous." (Exodus 23: 8). The nature and character of the Mosaic Code are neatly summarized in the Deuteronomic dictum: "That which

is altogether just shalt thou follow." (16: 20).

These laws of the Torah, then, constitute a detailed outline for a just society. They are, in effect, a bill of rights — a written code penned with a passionate sense of justice. The Anglo-Jewish press, in displaying strong support for the civil rights of minorities in Canada, was simply carrying on a long and revered tradition.

The themes of social justice, brotherhood, and humanitarianism are not restricted to the first five books of the bible. They repeatedly appear throughout many of the other books.

The deeply held belief in humanitarianism is readily apparent in the commandment: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink." (Proverbs 25: 21). These obligations were obviously not directed solely to one's enemy, but rather, to all men:

But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right . . . and hath not oppressed any . . . hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment . . . he is just, he shall surely live . . . . (Ezekial 18: 5-9).

The prophet Isaiah, while attacking social injustice, demonstrates sensitivity towards those weaker members of society: "Seek justice, relieve the oppressed, defend the fatherless, plead for the widow." (1: 17)

Further on we read of the reasoning underlying the necessity of having days of fasting:

Is not his the fast that I have chosen? . . . to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out of thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him . . . . Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily . . . . (57: 6-8)
The Anglo-Jewish press, as we have seen in Chapter II, had a particular loathing of racial and religious discrimination. Numerous publications often expressed an acute understanding of the concept of brotherhood — that the considerations of race, religion, and nationality were essentially artificial, and that all races were, in fact, mixtures to various extents. In articulating this viewpoint, the Anglo-Jewish publications were not being original; they were repeating thoughts expressed by the earliest Jews that racial purity was a myth. Jews, as well, were not exempt from this biological mixing, as the prophet Exekiel reminded the Jew that "your mother was a Hittite, and your father was an Amorite." (16: 45)

When The Jewish Standard, referring to Negro civil rights, wrote: "No man has the right to hold another in thrall,"\textsuperscript{32} it was echoing the thoughts of Job, who challenged the morality of human bondage: "Did not he that made me in the womb make him? And did not one fashion us in the womb?" (31: 15) This belief in God as the creator of all men necessitates, in turn, a belief in the brotherhood of man. Any notions of racial superiority are in direct contradiction to this belief. This partially explains why Anglo-Jewish publications felt so at ease in castigating any form of racial discrimination. They were responding in a manner consistent with their religious beliefs.

There are numerous examples in the Old Testament of denunciations of the powerful and the oppressor. The prophet Micah, for example, passionately condemns such persons:

\textsuperscript{32}October 1, 1957, p. 2.
Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds: When the morning is light, they practise it, because it is in the power of their hand. And they covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away: so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage. Therefore, thus saith the Lord; Behold, against this family do I devise an evil, from which ye shall not remove your necks; neither shall ye go haughtily: for it will be an evil time. (2: 1-3)

Jacobs cites three instances where Hebrew prophets rebuked "the kings when they abused their powers to commit acts of injustice. Nathan rebukes David (11 Samuel 12: 1-15); Elijah castigates Ahab (1 Kings 21: 17-24); Amos defies Amaziah the priest of Beth-el and his master Jeroboam king of Israel (Amos 7: 10-17)."

Finally, we read that Jews were told not to glorify or admire wisdom, strength or wealth, but rather, "love, justice, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight, says the Lord." (Jeremiah 9: 23-24).

THE TALMUD

The Talmud is an extensive record of almost a millenium of Jewish learning and philosophising. It covers numerous subjects including law, ethics and religion. It is incorrect to describe the Talmud as a


34 In acutality there are two Talmuds — the Palestinian and the Babylonian. I am referring to the latter which is larger and more influential than the former. The Babylonian Talmud dates from approximately 300 B.C. to 500 A.D. and involved Jewish intellectuals of many generations.
book, for it spans the length of thirty-five books comprising sixty-three tractates. It would be more correct to think of the Talmud as a 'literature'. It should be noted, however, that not one of the tractates was written by a single author, nor are any of them restricted to one subject.

As a document of religion, the Talmud is second only to the bible. With the bible it has shaped the spirit of Judaism and has provided Jews with a relevant reference to contemporary living. Because it runs the gamut of ideas, the Talmud has appealed both to the mind — in its legal and intellectual discussions, and to the heart — in its popularized accounts of Jewish tradition.

The Talmud consists of 'oral' law in contrast to the 'written' law of the bible or Torah. Because post-biblical events proved, at times, unadaptable to the 'written' law, and because the Torah, divinely inspired, could not be altered, Jewish scholars were forced to search and analyze the Torah in order to derive new, specific laws which would be adaptable to their society. These scholars provided Jews with a legal framework which permitted them to live in modern societies without abandoning the principles of the Torah. These new laws regulated the moral, business, and religious lives of Jews, their residence notwithstanding. The Talmudic laws formed, in fact, an international legal system.

The Talmud has three major divisions: 1) Mishnah, which is the actual code of oral laws; 2) Gemara, which consists of commentary and elaboration of the Mishna; and 3) Midrash, which consists of sermonic
expositions and popular interpretations.

Jews, then, have studied and practised law for thousands of years. The Talmud is one of the two foundations on which that study and practise have been built, and although the years since the Talmud's canonization have seen drastic changes, Jewish perceptions and traditions are still affected by Talmudic influences. The Talmud, in fact, is studied as fervently as ever in some Jewish circles. It is, in the words of one analyst, "the fountainhead of Jewish ethics . . . the clearing house of Jewish idealism."\(^{35}\)

Again, let us review relevant parts of the Talmud and see how the Anglo-Jewish press reflected Talmudic teachings. In lobbying for fair employment and fair accommodation laws, and other anti-discrimination legislation in Canada, the Anglo-Jewish press was reiterating its commitment to the elimination of racial discrimination. The Talmud strongly stresses such a commitment, especially when relieving distress of the poor and the ill. Here no consideration should be given towards race or religion. "Charity", it is written, "knows neither race nor creed." (Gittin, 61, A). The only relevant consideration should be in discovering the most efficient means with which to offer aid. The Talmud states:

The poor of non-Jews are to be maintained with the poor of Israel; the sick of the Gentiles are to be treated and nursed like the Jewish sick; the non-Jewish dead are to be buried with the same care and dignity as those of Israel, for that is the way leading to peace. (Gittin 61A).

\(^{35}\)I. G. Dobsevage, Gems from the Talmud (New York, 1932), p. xxi.
Jewish physicians were also bound to heal non-Jews, aid in the welfare of the general non-Jewish community, visit non-Jewish invalids, and provide charity for non-Jews.\textsuperscript{36}

The Talmud denounces any concept of racial or religious superiority, but instead espouses the notion that all are equal. This philosophy is expressed powerfully in the following Talmudic passage:

Man was created through Adam, a single human being, in order to teach that whoever destroys a single human life is regarded as though he destroyed an entire world, and he who saves a single human life as though he saved an entire world. The human race began with a single individual for the sake of peace among all men, so that no man might say, "My ancestor is greater than yours," and to make it impossible for heretics to say, "There are many heavenly powers." Moreover, the creation of humanity through one ancestor proclaims the greatness of the Holy One, blessed be He. For man strikes off many coins with a single mold and they are all identical. But the King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, stamps each man in the mold of Adam, and yet no one is identical with his fellow. Finally the creation of Adam teaches that each human being is obligated to declare, "For my sake was the world created." (Sanhedrin 4: 5)

The view expressed by the Anglo-Jewish press that government legislation was necessary in protecting innocent victims from discriminatory behaviour can also be found in the Talmud. Here, Jews were told to "pray for the welfare of the government" (Aboth 3: 2) because it was that body which offered protection. Elsewhere the Talmud states:

Thou madest man as the fishes of sea — as with the fishes in the sea the big swallow the small, so with men; were it not for the fear of government the big would swallow the small. (Abodah Zorah 4A).

The Anglo-Jewish press demonstrated uneven support of politicians; those who exhibited an awareness of the civil rights of Jews and other minorities were supported, while those who did not show that awareness were disdained. Duplessis was an example of one who received varying degrees of support as his attitudes changed. Clearly the Anglo-Jewish press' support was not of the politicians themselves, but of their policies. In acting in this manner the Anglo-Jewish press was expressing agreement with the skepticism towards politicians found in the Talmud.

Be on your guard against the ruling power; for they who exercise it draw no man near to them except for their own interests; appearing as friends when it is to their own advantage, they stand not by a man in the hour of his need. (Aboth 2: 3)

A generation before Jesus adopted, in altered form, one of his well known maxims, the renowned Jewish scholar, Hillel, had written, "And what is hateful to you, do not unto another." (Shabbath 31 A). This spirit of brotherhood and interdependence pervades much of the Talmud. For example, it is written: "Let the property of your fellow man be as dear to you as your own." (Aboth 2: 12). Similarly, the Talmud informs us that the first question posed to man before the "Throne of Judgement" is, "Have you dealt honourably, faithfully, in all your dealings with your fellow-man?" (Shabbat, 31A). The Rabbis of the Talmud often utilized parables in attempting to clarify their philosophy. One such parable, demonstrating man's interdependence, is attributed to Simeon bar Yochai:
Once a number of men set out to sea. In an idle and mischevous moment, one of the passengers started to bore a hole in the bottom of the boat where he was sitting. "What are you trying to do?" cried his fellow passengers in alarm. "What does it concern you what I am doing?" replied the man. "I am not boring a hole under where you are sitting, only under my own place!"

"It may be only under your own place," retorted the others, "but should the water fill the boat, it will cap­size. Then all of us will drown."

Where justice is concerned, Talmudic law and its subsequent commentaries go into detailed elaboration. For it is this subject that is the essence of Judaism. According to the Talmud, the world rests on three pillars — justice, truth, and peace. "And the three are one, for when justice is done, truth prevails and peace is established." (Ta'anith 4: 2)

It is important here to point out that while ancient and medieval Jewish communities were frequently governed by foreign powers, they had their own elaborate court system operating under Jewish law and procedure. These laws and procedures bear a remarkable resemblance to our present and accepted systems of justice. Relatives were unable to testify; at least two witnesses were required to establish a case; circumstantial evidence was unacceptable; no man could incriminate himself; witnesses were interrogated separately; and it was necessary that the defendant's replies to his interrogator's questions indicated his awareness of his actions.39


These laws and procedures also exhibit a sense of fair play and justice in almost every aspect. In an effort to keep the litigation process as impartial as possible, the Talmud rules that:

It is the duty of both litigants to stand during the trial. If the judges wish to permit the two of them to be seated they may do so; but it is forbidden to permit one only to be seated. Nor is it allowed for one to speak at length and the other to be held to be brief. (Shebuoth 30A)

As well, another Talmudic law states that "a judge is forbidden to listen to one party before the arrival of the other." (Shebuoth 31A) In criminal cases, discrepancies in testimony led to immediate acquittal. Although a majority of one was enough for acquittal, a majority of at least two was deemed necessary for conviction. These majorities were found not in juries, but in panels of judges. The lowest courts were comprised of three judges, the superior courts had twenty-three, and the Supreme Court had seventy one judges. Adler describes how verdicts were handled, the process being characteristic of the just nature of Rabbinic jurisprudence:

When the judges after deliberating on the testimony were ready to render their opinion, they did so in the reverse order of their seniority. The youngest judge spoke first, and the oldest last. The purpose was to prevent the younger men, who may have been the disciples of the older, from being influenced by the views of their elders. Care was taken that each should render his independent judgement.

In its fervor to achieve ultimate justice, the Talmud instructed its judicial officials not to favour the poor over the rich, that

\[40\] Ibid.

\[41\] Ibid., p. 123.
is, the poor should not be treated any differently because of their low status. Charity should not have any bearing on judgement. The Talmud states:

When a poor man is one of the parties, the judge may not say, 'This is a poor man, and I and the rich man (who is the other party), are bound to support him; so I will acquit him in order that he may be supported as an innocent man,' therefore does Scripture warn 'thou shalt not favour the poor.' (Sifra 89A)

Finally, let us remind ourselves of countless efforts on the part of Anglo-Jewish publications in supporting efforts to outlaw slander, libel, and defamation of character. The Talmud, not surprisingly, also condemns these acts in some of its strongest language. It states: "He who insults his fellow man in public will have no share in the world to come." (Baba Mezia 58B) A fate of being "thrown to the dogs" was deemed correct punishment for him "who slanders, who listens to slander, and who testifies falsely." (Pesahim, 118) According to the Talmud, there are four types of people who "will never hold the Divine Presence: scorners, hypocrites, liars and slanderers." (Sotah 42A)

It can be argued, then, that the political attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish press, especially in matters concerning civil rights, were highly affected by Judaic principles of morality and social justice. It is no coincidence that the attitudes of these publications are repetitious of those found in the Torah, the other books of the Old Testament, and the Talmud. For it is these documents which are the foundations of Judaism and are meticulously read and studied, in varying degrees, in every Jewish community. The Anglo-Jewish press, in demonstrating great sensitivity towards other minority groups, the persecuted, and the
oppressed, was merely reflecting the tenets of Judaic philosophy.

This factor, coupled with the factor of political expediency, explains why the Anglo-Jewish adopted its views on civil rights. It does not explain, however, why the Anglo-Jewish press refrained from supporting the civil rights of certain minority groups, albeit a small number. In the following section I will attempt to explain this stance.

Non-Support

During the forty-year time span of this study, the Anglo-Jewish press never expressed a denial of support for any minority ethnic group struggling for its civil rights. However, it did refrain from lending any support to certain minority political groups, especially fascist ones, and went so far as to say that the freedom of Canadians was dependent on the abrogation of the civil rights of these groups.

When Canadian fascist groups sprang up in the 1930's, sported familiar Nazi symbols such as swastikas and brownshirts, and uttered all too familiar anti-Semitic remarks,\(^4\^2\) Canadian Jews immediately identified them, whether the comparison was valid or not is irrelevant here, with the German Nazi movement. In turn, that movement was identified with the persecution of Jews, Jewish deportations, and endless other acts of discrimination, the most serious of which was the murder of millions of Jews. Thus, the Anglo-Jewish press, in reflecting the views of Canada's

\(^4\)For a detailed account of Canadian fascist movements, see L. R. Betcherman, *The Swastika and the Maple Leaf* (Toronto, 1975).
Jewish community, felt a clear, direct and immediate threat from Canadian fascist groups. This German-Canadian tie was emphasized in 1934 by the Jewish Western Bulletin:

Will Canada be proclaimed a land of the Saxon and the Gaul, where an outland name will mean ostracism, and Semitic features disaster and torture as in Germany? I hear some of you laugh at the idea; Canada, you say, is a land of gently democratic backgrounds, a land having no traditions of racial strife and friction. In Germany three years ago Jews laughed and said much the same thing; those Jews do not laugh in Germany today.

The threat of persecution took precedence over the other factors leading to the general support of other minority groups—political expediency and Judaic traditions. This threat became all the more real when fascists such as Adrien Arcand, leader of the Quebec fascist movement, publicised ties with German Nazis, expressed admiration of their efforts, and began to advocate measures which would restrict the freedom of Jews in Canada.

Aside from the general threat of fascist groups to Jewish freedom in Canada, Gordis theorizes that when the right to practice Judaism has been interfered with, that alone has been reason enough to oppose certain groups:

By and large, however, the Jewish group has regarded the right to perpetuate its religion as self-evident . . . . Where that right has been interfered with, either overtly or covertly, whether by ecclesiastical authorities or by the secular state, through the law or group pressure, be it under fascism, communism, or democracy, Judaism has regarded the action as a sign of injustice, an act of discrimination and persecution to be opposed, rather than as a philosophy to be analyzed.

The analysis is applicable to the Anglo-Jewish press. It realized, as do most Jews, that the raison d'être of all Jewish communities is

\[\text{April 19, 1934, p. 2.}\]

\[\text{Gordis, op. cit., p. 32.}\]
Judaism, a distinct religion continually practiced for thousands of years by a numerically small group of people. Secular and non-secular Jews alike realize that their religion is the lifeline of any Jewish community. When the right to practice it is threatened, the right of the Jewish community to exist is likewise threatened. Therefore, as Gordis writes, any threatening actions are not treated, "as a philosophy to be analyzed," but, instead, are vigorously opposed. Thus, there was no hesitation on the part of the Anglo-Jewish press to deny to fascist groups the civil rights which Jews themselves were continually demanding.

By denying civil rights to fascist groups the Anglo-Jewish press also recognized the freedom not to have one's civil rights eroded simply as a result of one group's expression of their civil rights. It also recognized that, at a certain point, many freedoms have to be restricted.

The blatant disregard for the civil rights of communist groups was demonstrated by one publication, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle. That newspaper's views on the civil rights of communist groups were not representative of those of the Anglo-Jewish press, which, on the whole, did not comment on issues directly concerning communist groups. Unlike Canadian fascist groups, Canadian communist groups never posed a direct or immediate threat to the freedom or existence of Canada's Jewish community. Certain Canadian Jews, as well, have been moved to join a Canadian communist movement or party. To the best of my knowledge no Canadian Jew has openly expressed involvement in any type of fascist movement or party.

The Canadian Jewish Chronicle, in expressing its fear and mistrust of communist groups, was, it may be assumed, reacting not to those groups active in Canada, but was looking at communist activity beyond Canada's borders.
In this study we have concerned ourselves with describing and analyzing certain political attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish press, 1930-1970. Let us review the major points: 1) The Anglo-Jewish press perceived the state of civil rights of Jews in Canada in a dual manner. The 'positive outlook' interpreted Jews as being an integral component in Canadian society. Loyalty to, and identification with Canada were strong and regularly expressed attitudes. Full protection of Jewish civil rights was expected, demanded, and thought to be a realistic possibility. Anti-Semitism was believed to be unrepresentative of the Canadian character. The 'negative outlook' perceived anti-Semitism to be inevitable and Jewish equality impossible. Full protection of Jewish civil rights was thought to be beyond the reach of government legislation because, as one newspaper wrote, "Prejudice, being a state of mind, is more amenable to psychiatric than to legislative treatment."¹ Finally, Jews were thought to be destined to play the role of societal scapegoat in times of crisis. This dual interpretation of Jewish civil rights was espoused

¹The Jewish Standard (February 5, 1950), p. 3.
by almost all the publications. In interpreting the civil rights of other minority groups, however, this dual interpretation was replaced by a single-minded approach; full and unqualified support was given to most other minority groups in their struggle to obtain full civil rights.

2) The standard by which politicians were judged was determined by their position on the civil rights of minority groups, particularly Jewish civil rights. Support was given when politicians expressed sympathy to and understanding of minority civil rights, but it was denied when politicians did not express such feelings.

3) The Anglo-Jewish press based its views on immigration policy almost solely on humanitarian and moral grounds. Canada, it was thought, should not hesitate to play the role of an international sanctuary for refugees. However, if there was going to be a policy of selective immigration, merit should be the sole criteria of selection, not race or religion.

4) The Anglo-Jewish press supported all efforts to legislate against discrimination. Legislation against defamation, libel, slander, hate-mongering, and discrimination in employment and housing were all fervently supported.

5) The Anglo-Jewish press expressed an interest in basic freedoms such as speech, expression, and complete suffrage. It argued for the expansion and granting of these freedoms to most minority groups.

6) Numerous minority ethnic groups received strong support from the Anglo-Jewish press in their quest for civil rights in Canada. French Canadians, Black Canadians, Oriental Canadians, and Native Canadians, fall into this category.
7) Fascist groups were not deemed deserving of the civil rights accorded to other minority groups. The Anglo-Jewish press disapproved of any advances made by fascist groups in the realm of civil rights.

8) One of the largest Anglo-Jewish newspapers, the Canadian Jewish Chronicle, was noticeably anxious to deny communist groups the rights to which other minority groups were thought to be entitled. This view, however, was not representative of the opinions of the Anglo-Jewish press.

9) A constitutionally entrenched and meaningful bill of rights was advocated by the Anglo-Jewish press. The Diefenbaker Bill of Rights was accepted only on the grounds that it was, at the time, the best type of legislation politically acceptable to Canadians.

10) Political expediency and Judaic traditions, operating complementarily, explain the Anglo-Jewish press' position vis a vis civil rights.

11) The two foundations of Judaism — the Old Testament and the Talmud — are replete with examples demonstrating a strong understanding of and sensitivity to civil rights, as well as an overwhelming sense of social justice.

12) The perceived threat of fascist persecution in Canada led the Anglo-Jewish press to dismiss any thoughts that such groups should receive the civil rights demanded by other minority groups.

13) The particular fear and mistrust exhibited by the Canadian Jewish Chronicle influenced that newspaper's determination to deny communist groups their civil rights.
Let us recall and expand upon the hypotheses that we introduced in Chapter I. They were: a) that the Anglo-Jewish press has a consistent record of support for civil rights of other minority groups; b) that there has been a consistency of civil rights attitudes within the Anglo-Jewish press; and c) that the criteria by which political attitudes relevant to this study have been formulated have been based on: 1) Judaic traditions, and 2) political expediency.

In this study, we have been unable to find one publication which denied, or hesitated to show support of the civil rights of minority ethnic groups. However, as we have seen, certain minority political groups were vigourously denied this support. The advances made by other minority ethnic groups were believed to be extremely relevant to the cause of Jewish civil rights in Canada. This type of linkage thinking was rarely absent, either in implicit or explicit form, in analyses of minority problems. Our first hypothesis, then, is somewhat inaccurate. We can revise it to read, that the Anglo-Jewish press has a consistent record of support for civil rights of other minority ethnic groups, or in other words, those groups not perceived to be a threat to the civil rights of Jewish Canadians.

We have not discovered any cleavages within the Anglo-Jewish press concerning matters of civil rights. The Jewish Western Bulletin of Vancouver was equally as vociferous in supporting civil rights as were The Jewish Standard of Toronto and the Jewish Post of Winnipeg, and all other Anglo-Jewish publications. The only inconsistency among the press concerned a dual and contradictory outlook on the subject of
Jewish civil rights in Canada. These positive and negative outlooks were found within most of the publications themselves.

It seems reasonable to conclude that the two factors which we have proposed — Judaic traditions and political expediency — adequately explain why the Anglo-Jewish press adopted its attitudes on civil rights in Canada. These two factors enjoy a complementary relationship.

This study is not unique in discovering that Jews, or a Jewish medium, have a tendency to be highly sympathetic towards support for civil rights. American and Canadian university studies have concluded that of the religious groups tested, Jews demonstrated the highest rating of 'libertarianism.' In 1957 Selvin and Hagstrom surveyed students at the University of California at Berkeley.² Their intention was to investigate some of the determinants of support of civil liberties utilising a series of items incorporating the principles of the American Bill of Rights. They concluded, among many other things, that there was a significant relationship between religion and liberal attitudes, with Jewish students rating highest of any of the tested religious groups.

In 1970, Devall attempted a similar study using a random sample of undergraduate students across Canada.³ Students were asked


to agree or disagree with fourteen items "embodying principles of 'due process', freedom of speech, and 'equal protection under the law.'"

In his analysis of religious membership and attitudes toward civil liberties, Devall's study closely replicated the conclusion of Selvin and Hagstrom: Jews, of the religious groups tested, rated the highest on his scale.

In this study we have tried to demonstrate how both the Old Testament and the Talmud have given Jews a philosophical foundation on which to base their views concerning civil rights. Indeed, it is the heart of Jewish teaching which preaches the very concepts which the Anglo-Jewish press applied to Canadian politics and society — a strong commitment to combat racism, slander, and political oppression, while supporting the civil rights of other minority groups.

Judaism emphasizes the duty under God's tutelage, of man to his fellow man. This Judaic emphasis is vitally important in explaining the attitude of the Anglo-Jewish press. For man's duty to man leads directly to the sphere of social and political relationships — the issue of civil rights being primary among them. How minorities are treated, and what rights they receive from the majority are questions falling squarely into the category 'duty of man to man'.

The Judaic interpretation of human progress ends with an idealistic vision of a world embodying brotherhood, justice and peace. Whether this vision is unique to Judaism is unimportant here. What should be emphasized here is that the only common characteristic among the world's Jews is their religion, and it is a bond sufficiently strong

"Ibid., p. 436."
enough to be the dominating perpetuating force behind this minority group. Given this situation, one must always stress the religious factor when analyzing Jewish attitudes, be they political or not.

Jews, as other groups, are not a uniformly opinionated people. Nothing demonstrates this more than the tremendously varying degrees of Jewish identity among Jews, and the vastly differing interpretations of Jewish history. But if the Anglo-Jewish press in Canada is an accurate reflection of the values held by its readers, Jews in Canada seem to be united in at least two convictions: that the issue of civil rights is an issue of the highest priority, and that all minority groups advocating a strengthening of civil rights should be vigorously supported.
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