TWO GENERATIONS OF ZIONISM

TWO GENERATIONS OF ZIONISM

HISTORICAL RECOLLECTIONS OF AN AMERICAN ZIONIST

By

BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT

With an introduction and amplified background (in italicized insertions)

By

GAALYAHU CORNFELD

Digitized by Project Zikaron
Touro University-NY Libraries
www.zikaron.tourolib.org
2025

SHENGOLD PUBLISHERS, INC.
New York City

Digitized by Project Zikaron
Touro University-NY Libraries
www.zikaron.tourolib.org
2025

© by G. & L. CORNFELD, TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, 1967
PUBLISHED 1967 BY SHENGOLD PUBLISHERS, INC. NEW YORK
IN COOPERATION WITH G. & L. CORNFELD, P.O.B. 3096, TEL AVIV
Printed in Israel by Israel Press Ltd.
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 67-18134

FOREWORD

"At my request, Gaalyahu Cornfeld, the well known Israeli publisher and editor has graciously agreed to add, as occasion required, the background material (in italics) which can help to a fuller understanding of the relationship between American Zionism and the development of the state of Israel. As a Sabra (a native born son of Israel), Mr. Cornfeld is particularly well qualified for such a task, both by inheritance — for his father was one of the pioneers in the Hebrew renaissance in Israel — as well as by training and accomplishments as the author and publisher of the highly prized "Pictorial Biblical Encyclopaedia," "Adam to Daniel" and "Daniel to Paul." His words provide the proper introduction to a number of stirring episodes in the historic connection between the Jews of America and the children of Israel.

New York,
April, 1967

B. A. ROSENBLATT

INTRODUCTION

The Evidence of an Early American Pioneer

Bernard (Ben) A. Rosenblatt embodies in his lifetime experience the creative policy and achievements of the Zionist upbuilding effort in Palestine, and later in the State of Israel, since the early years of this century. He has been foremost in the ranks of those who played a crucial part in the reclamation and rehabilitation of the land needed for the newly-emerging nation on its own soil. Every acre acquired and wrested back from its past neglect and sterility under these auspices has added to the sum total of our national settlement.

Those of us, his younger contemporaries, who were born or brought up from infancy in the Palestine of those days, have reason to acclaim his dedicated efforts. We do so for two reasons: not only for his role in reclaiming many vital areas in the Valley of Esdraelon, the Haifa Bay region and the Plain of Sharon — where today's thriving communities owe their existence to his initiative — but also because it was he who, since 1918, continually urged the Administration in Palestine to assign the increasing value of land towards the benefit of the *people* as a whole. This method would have saved the future Israel treasury hundreds of millions of dollars and eliminated land speculation as a dangerous element in the economy of the fledgling Jewish State.

This idea of benefiting the people, instead of advancing the self-interest of a number of individuals, was incorporated in the Platform of the Zionist Convention in Pittsburgh in 1918 and formed the substance of the message which Ben Rosenblatt brought in 1919 to (Mr. Justice) Felix Frankfurter, who was then active at the Versailles Peace Conference in Paris. The communication had been endorsed by (Mr. Justice) Louis D. Brandeis. But the British authorities turned down the Land Plan, and although Keren Kayemeth Le'Israel — the Jewish National Fund — redeemed land values in rural sectors of the country, in accordance with its plan, no similar beneficial results obtained in urban sectors.

What Were the Real Views of Brandeis?

Rosenblatt was not just an American Jew 'on the spot' when he settled in Palestine and began his activity in the national

homeland. He also became a paramount instrument in important negotiations. On various occasions he served in different capacities: he was a mediator as if to the manner born when the American Zionist movement almost split asunder in the 1920's; he was the first person to float Palestinian (Jewish municipal) bonds in the United States, the first American representative on the World Zionist Executive in Jerusalem from 1921 to 1923, the initiator of a dozen Israeli enterprises which now dominate the public scene.

His commentary on the authentic views pronounced by Justice Louis D. Brandeis in the historic polemic between the latter's Zionist faction and the Weizmann-Lipsky leadership, throws new light on that stormy episode in American Jewish annals. This is equally true of his commentary on the Biltmore Program of 1942, which projected the challenging concept of a Jewish Commonwealth or State into the thick of the Zionist political struggle with the British Government.

In passing, it may be mentioned that the term "Commonwealth" was given wide public currency for the first time by Rosenblatt, who used it as the title of the body which he set up to redeem and reclaim land in Palestine — the American Zion Commonwealth.

A Summary of Zionist and Palestinian History

Those passages which are printed in this book *in italics* represent, in the main, such phases of broad historical background of events and trends dwelt upon by Rosenblatt which it has been my privilege to contribute, in collaboration with the author.

We both felt that this supplementary concise information would be welcomed by younger readers none too familiar with happenings in these crucial decades, and helpful to those wishing to see them in the more general perspective. This volume may consequently serve as a useful aid to anyone interested in brushing up on his knowledge of Zionist and Palestinian history as seen by living witnesses, and wishing to have an authoritative interpretation of their more significant aspects.

Tel Aviv, Israel GAALYAHU CORNFELD

CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword, by Bernard A. Rosenblatt		3
Introduction, by Gaalyahu Cornfeld		5
Dedication		7
I	Childhood in Philadelphia	9
II	Early Zionism	18
III	Coming to America	24
IV	Pittsburgh — The Early 90's	30
V	High-School Years	34
VI	The First College Zionist Society	40
VII	The Collegiate Zionist League and Federation of American Zionists	44
VIII	The Modest Beginnings of Hadassah	47
	Before the Storm	53
IX	Brandeis and Zionism	55
X	The Great War	58
XI	The American Zion Commonwealth	62
	American Jewry and World War I	64
XII	The Balfour Declaration	66
XIII	Palestine at the 1919 Peace Conference	70
	The First Visit to Palestine	71
XIV	Balfouria — An American Zionist Colony	75
	Aaron Aaronson, Saviour of the Northern Front	76
XV	A Prospective Palestine Settler	84
XVI	Weizmann and Brandeis	89
XVII	The Chaminois Visit with Weizmann and the Cleveland Convention	95
XVIII	The Separation of Transjordan — Palestine's "Absorptive Capacity"	105
	The Jewish Agency	108
XIX	The Tel Aviv Bond Issue	110
XX	The Beginning of the Keren Hayesod	116
XXI	The Beginning of Herzlia	121

		Page
XXII	Proposed Union of Palestine Municipalities	125
	The Acquisition of the Haifa Bay Lands	126
	Jewish Municipal Union	129
XXIII	Palestine in Economic Crisis	132
XXIV	Tiberias Hot Springs Project	139
XXV	The Palestine Riots of 1929 and their Aftermath	143
XXVI	The Struggle with the Colonial Office	149
	Passfield's Letter to Rosenblatt	152
XXVII	The Palestine Post and the Arlosoroff Trial	160
XXVIII	Living in Haifa	164
	The Technion and the Development of Haifa	165
XXIX	The Arab Riots and the Political Solution	175
XXX	The Haifa Plan for a Federal Solution	180
	Map of Federated Palestine	187
XXXI	The Haganah and Jewish Immigration	189
	The Second World War	193
XXXII	The Biltmore Conference and the Jewish Commonwealth	196
	The Biltmore Platform	198
XXXIII	Zionism After World War II and the Land Case	203
XXXIV	The United Nations and Israel	216
XXXV	The State of Israel	223
XXXVI	The State of Israel and Social Justice	230
XXXVII	Synthesis of Political and Practical Zionism	234
	The Israel Bond Drive	236
	The Case for Land Nationalization	238
	Ben Gurion's Letter to Rosenblatt	241
	Israel's Public Debt	245
XXXVIII	Some Current Problems of the State of Israel	251
	A Sound Land Policy	254
XXXIX	Social Zionism and the Zionist Movement	257
	Public and Private Enterprise	259
	Is Calendar Reform a Threat to Judaism?	260
	The Lesson of the Suez Campaign	264
	Israel as a State for Experimentation	267
Annexes 1—13		273—286

To my grandchildren
Lionel, Sarah, Daniel, Josiah, and Nathaniel,
in the hope that they will preserve
our precious Hebrew Heritage.

CHAPTER I

CHILDHOOD IN PHILADELPHIA

It was a Saturday afternoon in the summer of 1897. As usual a group had gathered for afternoon tea at my father's house in South Fourth Street in Philadelphia and the talk turned to an item in a Yiddish newspaper about the call for a Zionist Congress to be held in Switzerland. I was only a child — a boy of 11 years — and I listened with wonder to the discussion among my elders. At the end, my father as host, summed up, "the Jews," he concluded, "could never agree to build a state."

At that, I spoke up. "We are the only people without a state. We lost the land of Israel and Herzl wrote a book to get it back. We should send an army to recover it!"But I was silenced, "Nar-ah-leh, you do not understand!" How could my father know then that 39 years later he would end his life in Tel Aviv, having spent his last 12 years in the land of Israel, albeit still called Palestine.

Nor was I gifted with extraordinary prescience, yet the enthusiasm of youth was a surer guide to the future which was to bring, within my own lifetime, the fulfillment of the ancient Jewish dream of a Return to Zion.

Later in life, I sometimes wondered what it was that had made me such an early propagandist for a Jewish State, at a time when the word "Zionism" had not even been heard. Part of the explanation may perhaps be the impression of a short poem I learned in the Hebrew school or Cheder on Lombard Street near 6th in Philadelphia in the mid 1890's. This Sheftelson school, a primitive cheder where corporal punishment was much in vogue, nevertheless emphasized devotion to the Bible. I was hardly an outstanding Hebrew student but I did seem to have a love for early Jewish History and I found one poem of mourning for the lost Zion

particularly impressive. The words come back to my mind now, many years later, as running:

Zion, Zion, City of our Lord,	ציון, ציון, עיר אלהינו
How great are thy wounds,	מה גדול שבריך
and who will heal them?	ומה ירפא לו
How terrible indeed is the	מה נורא מאד
judgment of our Holy One,	דביר קדשינו
The hand of God which...	יד האלהים אשר . . .
Every people, every nation,	כל עם ועם
Every city and every state,	עיר ומדינה
Exchange honors from day to day,	יחליפו כבד מיום אל יום
You and your people until now,	את ועמך עד ועד הנה
Have fallen from day to day.	נפלת מיום אל יום
You have fallen, daughter of Judah...	נפלת, בת יהודה . . .

Though I have forgotten the rest of the words, the effect of the poem lodged in my subconscious to become part of my later thoughts and dreams and play some part in prompting my actions.

An equal — perhaps greater — influence, of course, came from my own experience and home life as a child, and from the Russian-Jewish background my parents shared with so many of their generation of American Jews.

My father, Judah Leib, had come to Philadelphia six years before that Saturday afternoon tea party — in May 1891. He came, as so many came to America in those years, to escape the oppressive conditions in Russia and to seek freedom and fortune in the New World.

The latter part of the 19th c. saw the monolithic feudal regime of Czarist Russia slowly begin to heave itself out of the Middle Ages and, for the first time, make possible a variety of new social movements. During the past few centuries, the few million Jews of Eastern Europe and Russia had maintained their traditional form of existence almost unchanged. They had survived, but no more. Their general state of spiritual and material degradation distinguished them sharply from the Jews of Western Europe. In the Russian sphere, the Jews lived on a miserably low standard,

forbidden to live outside the specific area of the Jewish "pale," denied access — apart from a few outstanding personalities — to the general life of the gentile inhabitants of the Czar's dominions. Even with the mid-century changes that ended Russian feudalism, life for the mass of the Jews hardly changed. Their inner life continued to be upheld by traditional Judaism while poverty and oppression remained the basic conditions of their material existence.

But, after 1850, it became possible for the more enterprising or ambitious of the Jews to look for something better. Those in the higher economic and social brackets looked to assimilation for a solution to their problems. Their aspirations were fed by the liberal hopes and ideals then sweeping Western Europe. Surely the spread of enlightenment in Russia would mean their gradual emancipation, so that one day Jews might be accepted as fellow citizens in the lands where they had lived for so many generations!

Other Jews and particularly, of course, many of the younger ones, turned to the ideals and programs of Socialism. From this point of view, the conditions of the Jews were simply a pathological distortion of the generally abnormal social conditions of Russia under the Czars. With the coming social revolution, so the specific problems of Jews would be solved automatically. Jews of this way of thinking developed the Jewish Socialist "Bund" with its various links with the Russian Social Democrats.

Assimilationists and Socialists were, of course, the two extremes. Between them, the mass of Jews remained apparently inert although, very slowly, they were beginning to respond to the changes in the intellectual and social climate.

Increasingly, Jewish personalities began to make a mark in economic and political life, even in Russia. Great Jewish merchants, men who dealt in sugar, tea, flour, timber and textiles; Jewish lawyers, physicians and scholars all shared in the advance of Russian society.

A new modern literature in Yiddish, Hebrew and Russian made its appearance. A network of Jewish schools was formed, and a new interest in the theatre developed. The centres of this Jewish revival were the great cities like St. Petersburg, Odessa, Kiev, Warsaw,

Vilna, Lodz or Riga. It was shared by smaller places, like Bialystock, an industrial town of northern Poland, wedged in between the borders of Germany, Lithuania and Russia.

Secular Jewish culture was spread among the Jews of Russia and Poland by the "haskalah" movement, formed by Jewish writers and thinkers of Russia and Poland. These men, the "maskilim", who inspired and participated in a Hebrew and Yiddish literary revival, included famous names like J. L. Peretz, Ch. N. Bialik, Sholem Aleichem, S. Ash, Z. Shneour, S. Anski, J. L. Gordon, Lilienblum, Pinsker and Dubnow but there were a dozen others. Some were fired by the deeper Zionist dream of a national revival. These maskilim believed in Jewish culture, whether rooted in an independent nation in a land belonging to the Jews, or as one recognizable unit among a federation of different nationalities within the multi-national Turkish empire (which at that time embraced the whole of the Balkans and the Middle East). Either way, the ancient dream of a "Return to Zion", of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was formulated, to become a magnet for the hopes and ideals of some of the finest spirits among the Jews. To Palestine the Jews must go, to create an independent life on soil of their own!

Political Zionism as a movement was initiated by Herzl from Vienna and Paris. It became a real mass political movement within Russia, where ancient limitations and restrictions on Jewish advancement were becoming increasingly intolerable. In their thousands Jews emigrated from Russia and eastern Europe in search of freedom, dignity and opportunity. The cultural background they carried with them had been vastly enriched by the renaissance of Jewish civilization. They went mainly to America, but they were still open to the call of the Jewish homeland even though, for the moment, their steps had turned in another direction.

I was born in Grodok near Bialystock, where my father had his woollen factory. He was a native of the smaller neighboring town of Suchowoli, some 30 miles away. Suchowoli was virtually a Jewish town. Its several hundred Jewish families earned their living by running "shenks" (drinking shops) for the convenience

of the surrounding mujiks (Russian farmers) and by a certain amount of smuggling, in defiance of the hated Russian regime. However, my grandfather happened to be a lumber merchant, sending his logs down the river to the nearby German port of Koenigsberg. Of course, the forests from which the wood came almost invariably belonged to a local Polish "Poretz" (nobleman) but the lumbering operations were usually leased to a Jewish businessman.

Bialystock was a weaving town. In the years after 1850 it developed into a considerable industrial centre. Its population was mainly Jewish. The story is told of a Bialystock Jew travelling by train to Warsaw and meeting a German Jew returning to Berlin. They became acquainted and the German Jew inquired how many non-Jews there were in Bialystock, besides the 50,000 Jews. "Oh," replied the other, "We must have some Shabbas goyim, so there may be a few thousand." Then the Jew from Bialystock asked in his turn what was the number of Jews in Berlin. "Over 200,000," he was told. "Two hundred thousand," he repeated incredulously, "and how many non-Jews?" The Berliner answered, "Oh, over two million gentiles." "What," cried the Jew from Bialystock, "two million! Why do you need so many goyim?"

The story may sound exaggerated, but it is a good indication of the self-sufficiency of the enclaves of Jews living in Russia, Poland and Lithuania, including the old Jewish centres of Vilna, Grodno and Bialystock.

This area, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, was seething with intellectual activity. While Vilna represented the apex of Jewish cultural activities, Bialystock was more cosmopolitan in its outlook, perhaps as a result of its commercial importance. It was a substantial centre for the woollen industry, just as Lodz was for cotton. Remarkably enough, Bialystock's culture was German rather than Polish or Russian. My parents' wedding invitations, printed in August 1885, were in German. Prussia took over Bialystock and the surrounding district during the last invasion of Poland in 1795. The Prussians held it only until 1807, when it became part of Russia for over a century. Yet the impression of

that dozen years of German occupation seemed to have left a permanent bias in favor of the higher German culture. For example, my mother, who was a native of the small town of Grodok, some twenty miles from Bialystock, took German lessons as a young girl from the famous Dr. Zamenhof, an occulist by profession and the inventor of Esperanto.

Her father (my grandfather) "Beryl" (Hachnochi) after whom I was named, had the reputation of a pioneer. He owned and ran a woollen factory in Grodok which had been operated by hand labor for three generations under his wife's family name of Amdursky. It was my grandfather who brought from England the first steam engine ever seen in the area. The story is told that when the engine arrived in the village, there was no proper road and he had to hire a special team of horses, at great expense, to haul his new machine up the steep hill to the factory.

My mother was the eldest daughter in a family with no sons. Thus, after my grandfather's death, the factory passed to the son-in-law, my father. Once there was a strike at the factory, and my mother used to tell how she heard the workers cursing her four-year old son (myself) the only male in two generations, presumably destined to inherit the works and become their boss in due course. My mother used to attribute our "exile" in America to those bitter imprecations of our dissatisfied workers.

Not that my family's migration was anything unusual. In fact, one of the most remarkable things about Suchowoli, Bialystock and the surrounding area is the influence of its sons on Jewish immigration in America and on the upbuilding of Palestine as the state of Israel.

First, there was the son of the Rabbi of Suchowoli, Dr. Max Einhorn, who in New York acquired an international reputation as a physician, famous for his innovations in the treatment of stomach diseases. He was indeed the first to diagnose and describe the duodenal ulcer. Dying childless, he left a large fortune to the Mount Sinai Hospital who named the Max Einhorn pavilion for him.

He had grown up with my father and when they both reached the mature age of 13, their Bar Mitzvah, they had planned together

to escape from their stifling native village. My father, however, could not keep the secret and confided in his younger sister. She told her father and he prevented the departure. Dr. Einhorn, however, left for Germany and then became a doctor on a transatlantic liner before settling in New York in the early '90's. Another local celebrity, who became known as R. Smith, was the wealthy owner of a large store on 14th Street in New York. He was involved in a famous lawsuit over the corner of 34th Street and Broadway, which he owned and which blocked the expansion of the great Macy Department Store. His mother had been the local "beigel" baker in Suchowoli, but it did not take her son many years to appear as a successful merchant and real estate owner in New York.

Another success story from Suchowoli — perhaps the most outstanding — was Sol Rosenbloom, the millionaire liquor dealer of Pittsburgh. He was known both for his scholarship as a student of Maimonides and as a philanthropist whose name is associated with the building of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. (His donation was $250,000). As a boy he was in the same class as my father in the Cheder (Hebrew school) and there they studied the philosopher Maimonides (Rambam) together. Neither of them ever forgot the wisdom of that great Jewish medieval thinker, nor did they doubt that his theories could be applied to current problems. I recall meeting Sol Rosenbloom in Jerusalem in 1922. His secretary (whom I had recommended) complained to me that he had to "endure" constant lectures on the greatness of Rambam, just as I did from my father.

There was S. J. Weinstein, also from Suchowoli, who made a name for himself not only as a successful merchant but, even more important, as a valuable contributor to the Jewish upbuilding of Palestine. He was my successor as President of the American Zion Commonwealth which established the settlements at Balfouria, Afule and Herzlia and redeemed the immensely valuable Haifa Bay lands from the Arabs, by a crucial land purchase in 1924.

Finally, I might mention the name of Professor Oscar Janowsky of New York City College, an outstanding scholar and teacher.

Bialystock, equally, will be remembered rather for its native

sons than for its industrial past in Jewish life. First and foremost was Rabbi Samuel Mohliwer, founder of the Chovevei Zion movement. Then there was the physician Joseph Chazanowitz. He visited Palestine in 1890 and determined to found a national library. Within five years he had collected thousands of books and, to these, he added his own extensive library. These books became the nucleus of the collection which, in 1920, was recognized as the National Library of the Hebrew University. I remember a tale about him which I heard from my family in Bialystock, dating from the days while he was still practising medicine. He was visiting a patient and the family were sitting around to hear his verdict. After a careful examination of the patient, Dr. Chazanowitz remained sitting by the bedside, wrapped in thought. At last, striking one hand, against the other, he exclaimed "Es is schlecht" (It is bad). The family turned to him in consternation, but he continued, "The Turkish Sultan won't sign!" referring to the Charter which, according to Herzl's plan, was to entitle Jews to purchase land and settle in Palestine. Whatever truth there may be in the story, it is a good expression of the deep Zionist longings of many of the Russian Jews of the "Pale".

Bialystock seems to have been quite a centre for practical cultural actviities, in contrast to places like Vilna which was quite a seat of learning. Jean Bloch, author of the famous Appeal for Peace which resulted in the establishment of the Hague Tribunal, operated from Bialystock. The owners and editors of three Yiddish newspapers in New York before World War I were natives of Bialystock, while another editor came from Vilna.

Not that Bialystock was without its quota of academics. The Hebrew poet M. M. Dolitzky who wrote and taught in the United States after 1892 came from the town. So did Lev Wiener, a philologist who from beginning in America as a fruit peddler and day labourer became professor of Slavic languages in Kansas and Harvard, noted as an authority on Arabic-Gothic culture and as the translator of the works of Tolstoy.

Even the small town of Grodok, my mother's home and the

place where I was born, can claim to have been the birthplace of the Shapiro brothers who, after emigrating to Palestine, established the Asis fruit processing factory near Tel Aviv.

All these men came from a tiny area, wedged in near the German, Lithuanian and Polish borders. A vast number of towns in Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Galicia and the Ukraine can show a similar record.

CHAPTER II

EARLY ZIONISM

The dream of an autonomous Jewish culture rooted in the land of Palestine was first formulated by Leo Pinsker in his "Auto-Emancipation", the road to self-determination. It was given concrete form by Rabbi Samuel Mohliwer and his lieutenant, Moses L. Lilienblum, who drew up a scheme for emigration and colonization in Palestine. As a result of the publicity they achieved for their idea, a number of Zionist organizations were formed in Russia and Poland, first the Ahavat Zion, the Hibat Zion and then the Chovevei Zion movement, copied later in other Jewish centres in Roumania and elsewhere.

The Chovevei-Zion movement began in 1881-2, its strongest impulse coming from the 1881 pogrom in Russia. The slogan "to Palestine" aroused enormous enthusiasm for it offered not only the abstract aim of the reestablishment of Jewish culture in its ancient home, but also a way of escape from immediate, terrifying dangers. Societies for the purchase of land for settlement in Palestine, were formed in Russia, Poland, Roumania, even in England. The Zionist Organization as such still lay in the future (it had to await Herzl's First Zionist Congress of 1897) but under the leadership of the Odessa Committee led by Lilienblum and Pinsker and the Warsaw Committee under Saul P. Rabinowitz, the movement of the Chovevei Zion expanded in Europe and achieved real successes in Palestine.

The best known group of settlers in Palestine were the BILU pioneers. These were men and women who came from Poland and Russia to found farming communities in places like Rishon Lezion and Gedera in Judea; Zichron-Jacob, Rosh-Pina or Yessod Hama'ala in Galilee and Samaria. By determination

and perseverance these early pioneers and those who followed them survived the appalling conditions and endless heart and back breaking labour involved in settling in a primitive land. Not the least of their difficulties arose from the need to circumvent the official Turkish ban on Jewish settlement and immigration to Palestine which had been proclaimed by the Sultan in 1882 and again in 1890 in the wake of the beginnings of informal Jewish colonization movements.

The colonization movement progressed slowly in Palestine. Back in Europe, in the first years after 1880, the main stimulus came from the unfaltering propaganda of Rabbi Samuel Mohliwer who went ahead in spite of open opposition from the orthodox Rabbinate in Eastern Europe. To them, of course, a secular movement for the reestablishment of Zion was anathema. It went far beyond their mystical, pious fantasies of the coming of the Messiah. Indeed, opposition to Zionism was never lacking among the Jews — but neither was support!

It was Mohliwer who, a few years later, persuaded Baron Edmond de Rothschild to finance the weak colonizing movement and keep the program solvent. What really kept Zionism alive, though, was the patience and persistence of the colonists themselves. Between 1881 and 1890 they formed not only the indispensable embryonic backbone of the Zionist movement, but also the outward manifestation of the vital inner revolution in Jewish life. Altogether Chovevei Zion acted as the reality behind the words and theories which form the "pre-historic" background to political Zionism.

The story of the struggles and sufferings of the Bilu pioneers was a constant inspiration to the Jews still in Europe and in America. At the very least the early colonies provided a prototype or pilot plant of what settlement in Palestine could mean. They offered tangible evidence of glorious future possibilities. The heroic tenacity and endurance of the handful of pioneers was living proof of Jewish claims to be considered at the same level as other nations. The first Palestinian colonists were idealists who deliberately accepted gruelling hardships and privation as the

price of holding on to the land despite Turkish obstruction and the appalling disease, chaos and degradation of the Levant of those days. That their self-sacrifice was justified can be seen from the unquestionable fact that without the "Yishuv" (the Jewish community in the land of Palestine) the Zionist movement would never have achieved such quick political fruition after the First World War.

Not only that; the first setlers included many Hebraists who, even in the first pitiful settlements, began to lay the foundations of a secular Hebrew culture, teaching Hebrew as a spoken language long before Eliezer Ben Yehuda embarked on his famous struggle for its recognition. In the schools of the Jewish settlements, Hebrew was employed as the general medium of instruction, and not merely for the Bible and religion. Accordingly, by the end of the nineteenth century, a solid basis had been laid for the renaissance of Hebrew culture which was to take place in the twentieth. The first Hebrew teachers in Palestine — men like David Shub, Antebi, Arieh Cornfeld, Yitzhak Epstein and others — cast a long shadow in the slow development of an independent Hebrew society in the country, laying the foundations for the eventual restoration of Hebrew civilization and literature in the form of the state of Israel.

Technically, the creation of the Zionist movement was the work of Theodore Herzl. Herzl was a Viennese journalist in Paris. He had been remote from the emotional urge of pious Russian and Polish Jews "to Zion". Not that emotion played no part in his inspiration, but it came from the furore of anti-semitism aroused in France in reaction to the Dreyfus affair. Herzl's response to this initiation into the realities of Jewish insecurity was to draw up a blueprint for the creation of a Jewish state through political action. He proposed, first, that the major nations should give public recognition to the claims of the homeless Jewish people. That "declaration of rights" should be followed by mass immigration into Palestine with cooperative agricultural and industrial development of the new land supported by capital funds raised abroad. Only by such action, Herzl believed, could

the Jews be liberated from their perennially inferior status.

The Dreyfus affair and its aftermath of anti-Jewish feelings, had destroyed the illusions cherished by many Jews about the prospects for integration within the "enlightened" countries of western Europe. They were forced instead to a radical reappraisal of their total situation.

Herzl first put his plan to Baron Maurice de Hirsch and the chief Rabbis of Vienna. who rejected the whole conception as dangerous demagogic nonsense! Undeterred, Herzl put his ideas on paper in the famous pamphlet, the "Judenstaat" (the Jewish State) — the book which, translated into English, was to enlist many a youngster in future years.

At the time, the pamphlet was acclaimed and attacked with equal passion. The Jews of the "shtetel" (the small towns of Eastern Europe) natural born Zionists almost to a man, looked up to Herzl as a deliverer, come to awaken his people to their destiny of self-determination. Their response to his call, moreover, came from more than simple hatred of life in the diaspora. Their deepest instincts drew them to Palestine irresistibly. Thus while it was initially opposed both by assimilationist Jews and the ultra-orthodox Rabbis, Herzl's project received an overwhelming welcome from the shtetel born Jews. The Chovevei Zion movement, the young and ardent, the aspiring but, so far, unorganized Zionists, all rallied to his standard.

With this backing, Herzl made contact (in 1896) with the Grand Duke of Baden and with the Turkish Grand Vizier, offering them various proposals for a charter for land settlement in Palestine. He even tried to open negotiations direct with the Turkish Sultan in Constantinople, but every approach was rejected.

Despite the opposition of all the recognized Jewish authorities, Herzl's following among the Jews of Europe continued to grow. He had no success with the Jewish financiers, but when he issued his call in January 1897 for a Zionist Congress, it was answered unstintingly by his supporters. In Basle, in the summer of that year, at the first Zionist Congress ever held, the political Zionist movement was born.

Of course, Herzl's proposals were not complete innovations. Much of them had long been the declared aims of the small band of Zionist leaders in Russia, Poland and Germany which included such figures as Menachem Ussichkin, Leo Motzkin, H.N. Bialik, Shmaryahu Levin, Nahum Sokolow, Martin Buber, Berthold Feivel and the young Chaim Weizmann. In some ways these men were more sophisticated than Herzl. For them, Zionism was something which they had been developing since early youth. They certainly had a deeper understanding of the Jewish cultural tradition and the old ideals of Jewish civilization and their place in history. Herzl cherished a quixotic instinctive belief in the possibility of a miraculous transformation of his ancient weary people by the simple action of foreign rulers and Jewish millionaires. To many of the more sober leaders, a man who could maintain and preach such views without regard for cold reason or hard facts was a visionary, unrealistic and possibly dangerous! Yet, for all their misgivings and even resentment, they acclaimed his central idea and gave his international campaign an enthusiastic welcome. After that first Zionist Congress in Basle in 1897, they were all convinced Herzlian Zionists.

What appealed to the leaders was not so much the rationale or details of Herzl's plan as the magnetic personality behind it. It was Herzl's daring, energy and total dedication to his aim which was his strength and his greatness. However much of a visionary he might appear, he was a man of action: the founder of the Zionist Congress as a rallying centre for all Jews, the first since ancient times. Who but Herzl would have dared to face the Turkish Sultan in 1901 and 1902, or the young German Emperor Wilhelm II on his visit to Jerusalem on November 2nd, 1898?

Herzl presided over the first six Congresses (1898-1903) and was president of the World Zionist Organization. He was its diplomatic director, conducting negotiations with statesmen and Jewish personalities in England, Turkey, Russia, Italy and Vienna. To help forward his cause, he founded the Jewish Colonial Trust in 1900 and strongly backed the establishment of the Jewish

National Fund in 1901. It so happened, that the attorney of the Jewish Colonial Trust was for a time the young David Lloyd George.

Meanwhile, Herzl was promoting Zionist propaganda and education throughout the world. With the help of a small band of devoted helpers in Europe, Herzl was directly responsible for developing the functions of the Zionist organization and gave immense help and inspiration to the building of the Zionist Federation, of which branches were formed in every country.

In the first decade of the twentieth century, the Zionist movement expanded and developed among the Jews. In terms of international politics, however, there was no actual advance. During Herzl's lifetime the Zionist World Organization remained a grouping of national Federations, united in the Executive, or "Great Actions Committee." The movement was sustained by two elements: the annual Zionist Congresses where various colonization schemes were debated; and the expansion of cultural activities of various kinds among the Jews. The Federations were constantly occupied with the collection of national funds and the distribution of "shekels" by members.

At the same time, an intense debate went on about all the issues which confronted Jews; the familiar problems of individual Jewish life, and the major policy issues of the Zionist movement. There were great impassioned debates about proposals like the alternative colonization schemes in Sinai (1902) or Uganda (1903) which occupied the Zionist Congresses but had been well aired all through the movement before the delegates gathered with their prepared speeches. A remarkable series of negotiations were begun, aimed at the political objective of a charter for the colonization of Palestine. At the same time, the widening of horizons everywhere in Jewish society gave the Jews' community life a new energy. When Herzl died in July 1904, there was no decline in the movement he had founded, although different affiliations and organizations made their appearance, factions like the General Zionists, the religious Mizrachi party, the Socialist Poalei Zion and the Zeire Zion.

CHAPTER III

COMING TO AMERICA

My father grew up in the era of cultural ferment which nurtured so many Jewish poets, painters, scholars, scientists, lawyers and teachers as well as revolutionaries and national leaders. He was familiar with the tracts of the "maskilim" and his home in Bialystock was one of those where Jewish nationalism flourished.

Nevertheless, when hard times, i.e. the industrial crisis of 1890, struck his factory near Bialystock my father decided to go "for a year" to visit his younger brother in America (who had gone the previous year to escape the Czar's military conscription). Within a few months of his arrival in the "golden land", however, he sent steamship tickets for his wife and the children to join him. Thus it was that in January 1892, I arrived in America with my mother and sister.

I can still vividly recall the moment of parting at the Bialystock railroad station, where my grandmother bade a sad farewell to her eldest daughter and only grandson. Going to America in that generation usually meant a final parting and my childish tears were mingled with those of my elders who knew they could never expect to meet again. Years later, a mother in America, bewailing the departure of her only daughter as a settler in Israel, commented over such a tearful departure; to which my wife replied: "countries are built with mothers' tears". Reflecting on this it made me think that even such immigration to America by my parents was roughly characteristic of a method in rebuilding the House of Israel — for without the help of American Jews, forced out of Europe by Czarist

decrees, Israel's dream of statehood might have been long delayed — and not merely for lack of financial support.

The immensity of the Atlantic made an enormous impression on my childish mind. I was always asking how deep it was. My clearest recollection, though, are my mother's German songs, particularly one about two grenadiers (Heine's "Zwei Grenadiers") on the retreat from Moscow singing their heart-breaking lament for Napoleon "verloren." This was all mixed up in my memory with accounts I had heard of my father's maternal grandmother — so proudly conscious of her descent from the great medieval Rabbi Rashi — who used to recall how French soldiers had captured her village in 1812 on their way to Moscow. This was the beginning of my life-long admiration for Napoleon and my boundless sympathy for his defeat by the Russians.

Once arrived in America, our family went to live in Philadelphia. We were really Jewish pioneers in South Philadelphia and our home became a convenient meeting place for all the "landsleit", emigrants from the district around Bialystock in Russian Poland. My father would generally lead the discussion at Saturday afternoon tea, where world politics were usually on the agenda — a sort of precursor to his later "Onegei Shabbat" held in his home in the Rehavia district of Jerusalem or later on Rothschild Boulevard in Tel Aviv.

When relatives or friends emigrated in the years following 1892, they almost invariably repaired to our house for advice or material help. Sometimes they would stay several days in our large house on South Fourth Street, before finding a place to live and a way to earn a living. My father had only one piece of advice for all "green-horns" — "become a peddler and later you will be a storekeeper". With that advice, he would donate five or ten dollars for "notions" and send the newcomer out to peddle in the suburbs of Philadelphia. He had an inveterate prejudice against their becoming machine "hands" in the small factories that were springing up with "sweat shop" labor. Telling the story of the Exodus, he would mockingly inquire why the Lord ordained that the clothing of the desert wanderers should remain

intact for a whole generation? And then would answer that the Lord of Israel did not want any tailors and shoemakers (shusters and schneiders) among his chosen people: (This was the simple exaggeration of an "enlightened" misnagid's reverence for learning at the expense of manual labor.) And so, he would send off these poor immigrants, time and again, to Chester and Darby and Clifton Heights with a peddler's supply bag over their shoulders, from which they often returned at night to give an account of their wanderings.

I recall the experience of one little old Jew, "Nottie" (Nathan) by name, whom my father installed with a "peddler supply" bag only a couple of days after he arrived from "Castle Garden" (the predecessor of Ellis Island as the port of entry in New York). Nottie went off willingly enough in the morning, his graying beard betraying the immigrant Jew, but returned that evening utterly dismayed and perplexed, having sold nothing. To my father's solicitous questioning, he only answered "a schwartz yahr oif zey (a black year on them), how do they know my name? At every house I called they only answered 'Nottie, gey' (go)". It took us hardly any time to figure out that what he had been told was "not today" — the usual refrain for peddlers at the door.

In 1881 there had been some 2000 East European Jews living in Philadelphia. In the next twelve years their numbers were multiplied twelve-fold by the migration which began in 1882 in the wake of the persecutions in Russia and Roumania. By 1894, it was estimated that there were 25,000 Jews in Philadelphia. Of necessity, new communal and charitable organizations came into being to care for them, while the settlers themselves added to the synagogues, charitable "chevras" (societies) and other institutions of Jewish communal and religious life. The last decade of the nineteenth century saw the Jews of America begin to emerge as a cohesive element in the country, the Jewish community of Philadelphia being especially notable as initiators in American Jewish communal affairs.

The tide of immigration continued well up to the end of 1910, with Philadelphia continuing to receive its share of new arrivals. The outstanding cultural leader of the recent immigrants in Philadelphia was Rabbi B. Levinthal (the father of my dear friend Rabbi Israel Levinthal and his brother Judge Louis E. Levinthal). My father was his faithful supporter in the many squabbles in which the "Russicheh Schul" (Russian Synagogue), over which he presided, unfortunately indulged. Rabbi Levinthal was a revered Talmudic scholar, greatly admired both for his learning and his piety. Many years later, he was my shipmate, crossing the Atlantic to one of the earlier Zionist Conferences, and we recalled those bygone days before 1900 when, exclusive of the Reformed Temple "uptown", there was only the Hungarian Synagogue in Philadelphia, besides the Russian Schul, to provide a place of worship for the small Jewish community. His son, Israel, attended the small Hebrew school (Cheder) before our Bar Mitzvah and we became friends of long standing. I still remember vividly that at a "Hannukah" raffle held at the Cheder, he won a Hebrew Bible and I a sled — perhaps symbolic of his future Rabbinical career, as well as of my deep interest in recruiting capital for the State of Israel.

The Philadelphia Jewish community was, of course, insignificant in comparison with the thriving and throbbing life of New York's East Side. But by 1898, it already contained a nucleus of a few thousand immigrant families in addition to the older Jewish settlement (German and, smaller, Portuguese) centering around the Temple, in a different world, "uptown". Downtown, however, we already had a "Hebrew Literary Society", with its Library and Speakers' Forum and the beginnings of a Zionist Society.

Above all, America was stirred that year by the uprising in Cuba against Spanish rule, with the Jews solidly behind the government in its Declaration of War in April, 1898. I remember, as a schoolboy, how the Jewish boys would line up in opposition to the Italians (for there were no Spaniards in our school) in "fun fights" of "Rome against Jerusalem", in which we tended

to identify Italy with Spain and Jewry with America. The patriotism of the Jewish Community was made evident by the numerous Jewish volunteers who answered President McKinley's call to arms — and how much I regretted that as a twelve year old schoolboy, I could not join up and "get even" with Spain for the four hundred year old inquisition and Jewish persecution.

In my own family, this took the more practical form of a letter which my father wrote to President McKinley, suggesting some secret plan for blockading the Spanish Admiral Cevera's fleet in the harbor of Santiago de Cuba. I was never able to find out the exact nature of this naval strategem, for my father treated it as a state secret. He was invited to Washington to a conference with the Secretary of State, John Hay, (I still treasure a letter addressed to my father on the subject), but my father's knowledge of English was so limited that he had to take a cousin along with him to act as interpreter. In any event, the U.S. War Department showed its appreciation by giving an order for the manufacture of soldiers' uniforms to the clothing firm in which my father was a partner. The "Tagenblatt" of New Nork carried a short account of this visit of the "Jew from Bialystock" to the White House.

The naval secret was evidently connected with a plan to blockade Cevera's fleet, so that he could not bombard American cities (a possibility of which the New York "yellow press" was issuing frantic warnings). Indeed, young Capt. Hobson became a hero by deliberately sinking an old ship at the entrance to Santiago harbor, although the sinking did not prevent the later escape of Cevera's fleet. However that fleet was completely destroyed on July 3, 1898 by the American Navy, under Shley and Sampson.

In those days in Philadelphia I hardly experienced anti-Semitism. I do recall the antics of a blonde-haired boy, apparently of German origin, who lived across the street and sometimes annoyed me on my way to school but this was more than offset by the friendly visits of non-Jewish schoolgirls to my sister. What attracted me first to Zionism was rather pride in my

Jewish ancestry. A Jewish state seemed to me the proper fulfillment of Jewish destiny. American anti-semitism I learned of only later in life, from accounts of the experience of others.

I recall a story told me (when I was already active in Zionism) by the late Edward Norman whose father was one of the founders of the famous Sears Roebuck mail-order house. He had studied in Switzerland with the sons of other rich Americans, and when he had answered a question about his nationality with "American" he was reminded by a fellow-American that he was "only a damned Jew." The incident apparently stuck in Ed Norman's mind. Perhaps it was partly responsible for his later actions in organizing the "American Israel Cultural Program" of which he acted as President, while I served for a time as Treasurer.

There was also the moment in 1928 when I was buying a house in Kew Gardens (now in the heart of Queens in New York City) for my family, and the widow who sold us the house remarked to my wife, with genuine goodwill, that she would not be lonesome in that neighborhood, because there were a few other "foreigners" living nearby, including a Levy family across the street. My wife happened to be a fifth generation American, whose ancestors had helped to develop Texas even before the Civil War. However, in the last generation or two we have progressed considerably. Now even the President of the U.S. hails Negroes as "fellow-Americans."

CHAPTER IV

PITTSBURGH — THE EARLY 1900's

In the summer of 1900 we moved to Pittsburgh, where my father kept a clothing store on Fifth Avenue until the middle of 1904. As Philadelphia had served as a sample of Jewish immigrants in the last decade of the nineteenth century, so Pittsburgh played a similar role in the first decade of the twentieth. Whereas in 1877 there had been no more than 2,000 Jews in Pittsburgh, originating from Bavaria and Poland, their numbers rose to 15,000 by 1905, the increase being mainly Jews from Eastern Europe.

The immigrant Jewish community was largely confined to the Ghetto-like "hill district" while the older, reformed Jewish population had their homes in the more elegant "East End." There, Jewish life and institutions were under the fostering care of Rabbi Aaron M. Ashinsky, for many decades the leading Orthodox Rabbi, while Sol Rosenbloom, Judge Josiah Cohen and A. L. Weil were the leading laymen in Reform circles. Pittsburgh was the scene of a conference of Reform rabbis in 1885 at which the "Pittsburgh Platform" was accepted under the dominant influence of Isaac M. Wise, Rabbi, professor and writer, called "the master-builder of American Judaism."

At this time and, indeed, for much of the latter part of the 19th century, American Jewry was preoccupied with two superficially conflicting questions which were in fact related. On the one hand, there was the question of absorption of the immigrants and their integration into American life. On the other hand, American Jewry was much exercised with theological disputes between Orthodox and Reform versions of Judaism. Although since about 1900 hardly more than a quarter of the Jews in the United States have been affiliated with any religious body, in the earlier

days, the dividing line between the two theological points of view tended to lie between Germanic and East European groups. It was the former who maintained the larger communal institutions, hospitals, schools and charities. The other group split off into separate, Orthodox, congregations with their own Rabbis and Rabbinical organizations, or into nationalists and Hebraists, who were largely responsible for the growth of Zionism. A third, middle group found its satisfaction in "Landsmannschaften" (friendly associations of Jews according to their countries or even cities of origin) and insurance societies. An intellectual grouping of Yiddish exponents battled for Yiddish theatres and, later, Yiddish language schools, while the specifically working class, manifestly radical, had its own distinct groupings, merging at different points with the various other Jewish circles.

Perhaps as a result of this disunity, organized Zionism in America lagged behind developments in Europe by a number of years. What discovered the common denominator in American Jewry and enforced the beginnings of communal integration were outside circumstances, above all the Kishiniev pogrom of 1903, and, later the Russian pogroms of 1905-6. The brutality of these attacks on fellow-Jews still living in "the old country" fired the imagination of the radicals and they immediately made common cause with the other Jews. Their efforts were so successful that the middle class, too, were inspired by the aim of bringing succour to the afflicted in Eastern Europe. By 1906 a wholly new pattern of alliances within American Jewry had become possible. The sharp divisions of 19th century Judaism were blunted and the way opened towards mutual cooperation. The Zionist movement, for instance, spread gradually among the popular Jewish organizations while, at the same time, the policy of the Bnei-Brith, largest of the Jewish charitable organizations, reflected the new mood. The same was true of the American Jewish Congress, a more democratic organization which aimed at achieving a broader alignment of American Jews on the new lines.

Meanwhile, various pioneers of Zionism, like Adam Rosenberg

who made the trip from New York to Palestine early in the 1890's on a land purchase mission, appeared. One of their successes was the historic Christian attempt to enlist the support of U.S. President Harrison for a Jewish state. The real American Zionist movement began, however, with the election of Prof. Richard Gottheil, head of the Department of Semitic Studies at Columbia University, as President of the Federation of American Zionists in 1898, with the young Stephen S. Wise as Secretary. Like so many idealistic movements, American Zionism began among the youth. Prof. Gottheil was the son of Rabbi Gustave Gottheil of Temple Emanuel, the mainstay of Reform Judaism in the United States, where Zionism was taboo (in those days "Washington is our Zion.") It took courage to raise the flag of Zionism in such a hostile environment but courage was precisely the quality on which the movement was founded and which carried it forward.

At about the same time, Leon Zolatkoff organized the "Knights of Zion" in Chicago which the late Max Shulman headed for many years.

The first practical attempt at Palestine colonization by American Jews came a few years later from St. Louis. There Simon Goldman raised funds to establish the colony of Poriah on the hill overlooking Lake Tiberias. This was the first American "Achuza", yet for all Goldman's devotion and laborious efforts to establish the cultivation of almonds, it was a failure because of the absence of a water supply. However this was merely an initial failure, familiar to pioneers, which was to prove the forerunner of later successes. Goldman's family remained in Tiberias. His daughter married Nachmani, the devoted Keren Kayemeth representative in that area, and their family had the honor of entertaining Judge Brandeis in Poriah, in the summer of 1919 during his only trip to Palestine. I visited Poriah myself, a few weeks later on my own first trip to the country and I remember running down the hill to Kinnereth (the Lake of Galilee) with the Goldman's young son.

Achuza I and II of New York followed Goldman's effort.

These established the colony of Raananah while a Chicago Achuza developed Sejerah in lower Galilee, where David Ben Gurion worked at one time.

Meanwhile, before the end of the 19th century, a thriving Bnei Zion fraternity had developed in New York City, headed by Dr. Bluestone, whose son was later to render devoted service as one of the early doctors with the Hadassah organization in Jerusalem. Joseph Barondess, the renowned Yiddish orator and propagandist was one of the those who helped to build the Bnai Zion into an important Zionist institution.

There were two prosaic business men — who yet typified Jewish love of learning — Livingston and Lieberman, partners with a growing business, who still found time and money to develop and support the Zionist monthly magazine, the "Maccabean" which later on, when Louis Lipsky was editor, was to make American Jewish history.

CHAPTER V

HIGH-SCHOOL YEARS

In Pittsburgh, I attended the Central High School, where there were only three other Jewish students in a class of over a hundred. Jewish consciousness was being fostered there particularly by the newly-organized Zionist society led by Morris Nieman and Jacob Lichter (the older brother of Rabbi Benjamin Lichter). In 1902 I helped to organize the first High School Zionist Society, the Zion Literary Society, and a year later I was elected as the Society's delegate to the annual Zionist Convention, held that year (June, 1903) in Pittsburgh for the first time.

My earliest recollections of Zionism include a story about a Pittsburgh cigar. In 1901 I noticed my second cousin, Sam Amdursky, lighting his Pittsburgh "stogie" (as a cigar was called locally) but first putting the match to a small strip of paper that looked like some stamps. I asked him what it meant and he explained that whenever he indulged in the luxury of a 5 cent cigar, he also burned five cents worth of Jewish National Fund stamps. This was my first introduction to the Keren Kayemeth, which was to remain a life-long interest. A few years later, this early Zionist worker made a visit to Palestine — which involved a long journey across the Atlantic and through the Mediterranean Sea — and, on his return, gave me a detailed report on the Jewish Colonies in Palestine before World War I.

I remember the enormous enthusiasm which swept the small Pittsburgh Jewish community when prominent non-Jewish speakers at the 1903 Zionist Convention first publicly supported the cause of a Jewish national state. The Boston delegates came with a new refrain which all of us quickly learned, "Alef, Beth, Gimel, Daled, Hay, Vov, Zion!" It was perhaps at that moment, when I first

joined in the chant, that I became a convinced, committed Zionist, resolved to put the cause of Zionism before all else. I was joined by many of the younger generation and before long we had made Pittsburgh a strong centre of Zionist activity in the United States.

Under the deep impact which the Zionist Convention made upon the Pittsburgh community, we organized a "Jewish History Class", which met every Friday evening, under my leadership at the new Zionist Headquarters on Center Avenue, and which became the nucleus for Jewish Youth activities. In addition there were debates at the newly-organized Kaufman Settlement House. A real Jewish Community spirit developed, symptomatic of what was happening even in isolated districts, far away from the throbbing life of New York's East Side.

One of the aftermaths of the Zionist Convention was the presence of Naphtali Herz Imber, whose "HaTikvah" had been officially adopted as the Zionist anthem. He remained for many weeks after the convention, already, unfortunately, subject to recurrent spells of drunkenness. He often visited my father's store — where he was received as an honored guest, and sometimes presented with a new suit of clothes or coat.

One of the highlights I recall from our sojourn in Pittsburgh was the visit of a man who had been a shipmate of my father's on the Atlantic crossing over a decade before. Later, he became famous as George Backer, the New York builder of many outstanding real estate projects, including the Textile Building, several hotels and deluxe apartment houses. At the time of his visit, he was still only a dealer in electrical supplies, but his amazing versatility was already an indication of his future successful career. Indeed, he was a living example of what the Jew, freed from ghetto bounds, might attain for the benefit alike of himself and the country of his adoption, to which he was so devoted. My father would often tell the story of how he found him on the S.S. Columbia (in steerage, of course). He remembered him as a young clerk of about fifteen years of age, who had formerly worked for my grandfather in Bialystock. On board ship, he was already eating non-kosher food, and when my father protested,

he replied: "Lebe, I left all that behind me." The next day, as the ship was passing through the English Channel, he became sea sick and gave up the food that he had consumed the day before, which reminded him of my father's warning and he promised that he would no longer eat forbidden food. But as the weather improved over the broad Atlantic, his non-kosher appetite returned. George remained in New York while my father went on to Philadelphia to meet cousins and aunts of my mother. About a year later, George (up to then known only as Zebulon) Backer visited us in Philadelphia. At that time, under the influence of East Broadway radicalism, he had become a full-fledged Socialist-Anarchist (the terms were almost interchangeable in those days of revolt). But now, a decade later, visiting us in our home in Pittsburgh, he seemed a good example of a solid businessman, who yet remembered his liberal opinions enough to have become a faithful follower of William Jennings Bryan, the twice-defeated candidate for the Presidency, as a liberal Democrat.

As a high school student, I was able to discuss politics with him, and he told me that he thought so highly of the late Presidential candidate that he named his newly-born son after William J. Bryan. (Another son bearing his Americanized name of George became a prominent business leader later on).

Perhaps it is not out of place here to trace further the metamorphosis of this ghetto-born Jew into a typical solid American business man. Two decades later — which projects our story to the early nineteen twenties — when I was already a well-established lawyer in New York City (having served for a time as a judge in the City Magistrate's Court) — George met me by appointment in my father's place of business, with a request for help which I could not deny. By that time, George Backer had become one of the leading builders and real estate owners in New York, with entree into banks and insurance companies, who helped to finance his building operations. He was then facing a difficult trial, having been charged with bribing a labor union leader, who was unlawfully holding up one of his building operations by calling a strike, in an evident attempt at blackmail.

Of course, the real culprit was the labor union manipulator, who had deliberately called a strike to get the pay off. The famous lawyer, Samuel Untermyer, had been appointed by the state in an effort to end such nefarious traffic, and he only was interested in getting the name of the bribe taker, in order to protect not only business men, but also poor workingmen who were hoodwinked into needless strikes for the financial benefit of some labor despot. In his examination George Backer had refused to give any proper description of the men to whom he had handed the 25,000 dollar bribe in order to call off the strike — probably because he feared reprisals by some criminal gang. Backer insisted that all he could say was that there were two men who accosted him, one was tall and the other short. Now, Untermyer, a shrewd lawyer and interrogator, knew how to catch public attention. The famous daily New York World had been running a comic strip known as "Mutt and Jeff", representing two decrepit characters, one tall, the other short, who were constantly getting into trouble. "You mean Mutt and Jeff?", asked Untermyer. "Yes," answered Backer and would not offer any further description. As this was palpably untrue, Untermyer promptly had Backer indicted for perjury. The trial of the State against George Backer for perjury had been set, and Untermyer was threatening to request the judge to put Backer in jail during the trial, under an old regulation which gave the judge discretion to refuse bail to a rich defendant who might, when the trial seemed to go against him, forfeit any bail and escape from the jurisdiction of the Court. George Backer had hired eminent and expensive counsel, and felt that he had a good chance to win his freedom, but he naturally abhorred the thought that he might have to spend even a single night in jail, while the trial was on, just because he was rich. Backer knew from the public press that I was on excellent terms with Untermyer, having induced him to accept the Presidency of the Keren Hayesod only a few years before, so he wanted me to appeal to Untermyer not to press for a jail commitment, during the trial. I promised to help as far as possible.

The following morning, at Untermyer's invitation, I met him for breakfast in his ornate city home at the corner of Fifty-fourth Street and Fifth Avenue — now the site of a stately office building — and asked for that favor on behalf of my father's "landsman", who had travelled with him across the Atlantic. Fortunately, Samuel Untermyer was in a gracious mood that day, having just concluded (as I came in) a conference with the former Secretary of the Treasury, the Hon. William J. McAdoo, who was the son-in-law of President Wilson. He told me that he had just decided to sell his city home, because he spent so much time in his country house at Greystone, Yonkers. At the sale price he was getting, he figured the interest on the capital meant that he was paying 540 dollars a night to sleep there — which was too much even for him. Finally, he advised me that he would do more for "my friend" even than I had asked. He would let some one else handle the case — and "If I don't try it, he will not be convicted". And so it was. Backer never went to jail; the jury disagreed and he was never brought to trial again.

Later, George Backer wanted to show me some appreciation for my help, but I refused to accept a fee, since he had a well paid attorney and my intervention was a mere sign of friendship. He invited my parents, my wife and myself to his beautiful newly-built apartment house on West End Avenue for dinner and again pressed me to accept some recompense. I told him he could do one thing for me, as I was active in the Zionist movement (serving as the first American representative on the World Zionist Executive), and I asked him to go with me to Palestine and do some building there as he had done in the States. He held out his hand and promised to go with me "after Passover." But, unfortunately, he passed away after a short illness not long thereafter, before he could redeem his promise.

It was at this same dinner meeting at Backer's home that we also chanced to discuss American politics in the era of President Calvin Coolidge, who was the prospective Republican candidate for re-election. I was then surprised to hear that Backer, the

erstwhile radical Socialist, who later had been a devout follower of the liberal Democrat William Jennings Bryan, was now a staunch supporter of the Conservative Coolidge, "for only the Republican Party know how to rule this country." This is some indication of the strength of the American assimilative process in converting a Bialystock radical youth into a pillar of wealth and conservative politics within a single generation.

CHAPTER VI

THE FIRST COLLEGE ZIONIST SOCIETY

There was a severe steel strike in 1903. Naturally this affected the city of Pittsburgh and my father's business, so that the next year he decided to move to New York City — and I entered Columbia College that autumn. Coming from an environment which fostered Zionism — the small Jewish community of Pittsburgh became known as the banner district of the Federation of American Zionists — I was dismayed by the little interest manifested by the large Jewish community of New York in the dream of a Jewish state in Palestine.

My young cousin, in New York, to whom I mentioned the aim of Zionism, bluntly replied that she had never heard of it.

I wandered over the East Side streets at night — coming down from the new "Jewish Ghetto" of Harlem where we then lived — trying to absorb the hectic Jewish life of East Broadway, Canal and Grand streets. But I could find no glimmer of the light of Zionism in the cafes and night life of that wonderful era in the first decade of the twentieth century which stimulated the formation of the whole Jewish Labor Movement.

With the enthusiasm of youth, I determined to do my share in bringing light to the Jews (if not to the gentiles!). By December 1904 we succeeded in organizing the Columbia University Zionist Society — at just about the same time that the Harvard University Zionist Society was established through the efforts of my Pittsburgh friend, Allen Davis, and Henry Hurwitz who later became the editor of the Jewish cultural magazine, the Menorah Journal and initiated (1913) the Intercollegiate Menorah Association. It remained a moot point which society came first.

Most of the student body of Columbia University, and

especially the Jewish professors, were aghast at our introduction of a "divisive force" among the students. The truly great Professor E.R.A. Seligman, President of the American Economic Association, spoke to us privately, urging us not to raise this "partisan" issue and the Professor of Ethics and Morals, Felix Adler (founder of the Society of Ethical Culture) invited us to his study to warn us that we would only *increase* anti-Jewish prejudice by setting up a Zionist society.

Throughout his life Adler remained remote from all public Jewish activities. He saw Ethical Culture as the application of Judeo-Christian morality to contemporary life and, in keeping with this philosophy, he devoted himself to pioneering progressive education and the fight against child labor.

He sympathized with us because so few Jews could enter the student fraternities but advised us that we must bear our lot manfully, as do others "who may be born crippled or otherwise handicapped." At that point, even I, a mere freshman (although secretary of the organizing committee) objected that my Jewishness was not a handicap and we could form our own fraternity. That, we were told, would separate us from the student body and therefore, was unacceptable — "we must earn our way" into fraternities already established. With one exception, only Professor Joel E. Springarn, of the English Literature Department, was appreciative of our desire to have some special Jewish Society. I always felt that this was perhaps a reflection of his deep interest in the cause of the advancement of the rights of the Negro, in which he was a prime mover. Needless to say, only the liberal non-Jewish professors could see no objection to a specifically Jewish society, organized with the object of Zionism as its motivating force. My revered teacher, Professor Franklin H. Giddings, later agreed to lecture at our Zionist Society, even though, as he said, he was opposed to all "nationalisms". But with the help of Professor Richard Gottheil, lecturer in Semitic languages, who had served as the first President of the Federation of American Zionists (1898-1904), we managed to survive the barrage of opposition and criticism in the public press. Not long after, we

managed to have as our speaker Judah L. Magnes, then the young dynamic Rabbi of Temple Emanuel (1906-10), and when we had his blessing, we knew that we were on our way.

Too little attention has been paid to the early efforts of this fine figure of a Reform Rabbi, who dared to break with his own tradition, and preach Zionism from the pulpit of Temple Emanuel, when his senior Rabbi condemned it. Magnes was, indeed, a "young Lochinvar come out of the West"! Arriving from his native California, he blew in like a refreshing breeze upon the festering life of New York's East Side. He went downtown to study Yiddish so that he could understand and speak to the masses, and when the pogroms of 1905 broke out in the Ukraine, he stood out as a shining light, helping to form the nucleus from which was to spring the later organization for aid overseas, including the Joint Distribution Committee. He was the first to be able to bridge the chasm between the East Side Jews — now steadily increasing in numbers through mass immigration into a substantial political force — and the "Yehudim" or Jews of earlier German immigration. Magnes even enlisted the crucial support of Jacob H. Schiff, an unique figure in American Jewish philanthropy and a deeply religious Jew and his son-in-law, Felix Warburg, later chairman of the American Joint Distribution Committee, known for his leadership of the American Jewish community. Magnes was to become first Chancellor and then President and Guardian Angel of the Hebrew University for a quarter of a century, but we must never forget the significant and often lonely role which he played in the early struggles of American Zionism.

The Columbia Zionist Society prospered, so that a couple of years later, we were able to initiate a movement for a "Collegiate Zionist League", consisting of students from New York University and City College, as well as those of Columbia. This society grew and thrived, helping to educate many young rabbis to become Zionist leaders. Indeed we were so encouraged that, in the spring of 1907 — having progressed to the status of a senior at Columbia College — I determined to test public opinion

by competing for the Curtis Medal oratorial prize, making my address on the subject "Palestine: The Future Hebrew State." This was a far cry from the timid days when a Jewish subject was not matter for discussion in gentile circles. In the speech I had the temerity to compare the ungainly figure of the Russian Jew, fleeing from Czarist persecution, to the early settlers of New England, as a "Jewish Puritan", already laying the foundations of the Jewish State in the cooperative farm colonies in Palestine (see Annex 1 for the full text of the address).

None of us could foresee then that that the future Jewish State would become a reality within our own generation. I won a coveted prize with this disquisition but, more important, was the effect it had on my fellow Jewish students. My words bolstered the prestige of our Zionist Society enormously. Many years later, just after the State of Israel had been established, I was walking along Wall Street to my law office when I happened to meet a fellow student from Columbia University Law School who recalled my oration of over forty years before. Said he, "Ben, how did you know that this was going to happen?" and all I could reply was, "I took a chance." It was that chance that brought me definitely into a lifetime of Zionist endeavor, for the speech was published in full in the Maccabean Magazine (the organ of the Federation of American Zionists) in the following June, 1907.

CHAPTER VII

THE COLLEGIATE ZIONIST LEAGUE AND FEDERATION OF AMERICAN ZIONISTS

By the spring of 1911, I had become a practicing attorney-at-law while continuing to act as the active president of the Collegiate Zionist League. Returning from a case in court one day I was suddenly stricken and had to undergo an operation for appendicitis. As part of my convalescence I went to Tannersville in the Catskill Mountains as a guest in the home of Dr. Max Wolper. The Zionist Convention was scheduled to be held shortly at the Fairmount Hotel in Tannersville and I learned that the Collegiate Zionist League had named me as its delegate. I was hardly able to take an active part but on the Saturday evening before the opening session, I went to the Fairmount Hotel to greet old friends. There I was approached by Dr. J.L. Magnes and Louis Lipsky, who asked me to take on the position of "Honorary Secretary" of the Federation of American Zionists — for my good work in the Collegiate Zionist League had been brought to their attention. They explained their need for "young blood" and pressed me to accept at once, because Henrietta Szold, who had served as Honorary Secretary the preceding year, was now ill in Baltimore and would be unable to continue any longer. (The "honorary" attached to the title was simply indicative of the fact that there were no funds available for a full-time secretary and that I was to serve gratis!). Louis Lipsky had made his career as a Zionist by that time, serving brilliantly as the editor of "The Maccabean" (later on of the "New Palestine") and he was ready to take on the important post of Chairman

of the Executive Committee. The President was Dr. Harry Friedenwald, the famous surgeon of Baltimore.

The Convention itself was a good picture of youthful organization dedicated to the cause of Jewish National survival, while Lipsky, aided by Abraham Goldberg, represented the working body and I felt honored to join such a devoted group.

1911 was a momentous year for me in more ways than one. It also brought me my first contact with my wife, although this was hardly propitious at the time! It happened when the committee on nominations at that Zionist Convention at Tannersville was meeting to recommend the choice of delegates to the World Zionist Congress due to take place in Basle, Switzerland, that summer. Needless to say, the Zionist Organization could not afford to pay the expenses of such delegates, so we were restricted in our choice to those who could afford to make the trip at their own expense or were anyway visiting Europe during the summer.

Among those recommended to the convention was a young woman belonging to the congregation of Temple Emanuel, where Dr. Magnes was the rabbi. Her name was Gertrude Goldsmith. I objected that she was unknown as a Zionist "worker" and that "merely coming from Temple Emanuel and Riverside Drive" was hardly sufficient qualification for a representative at the Zionist Congress. Fortunately, I was overruled. She played her part well and became so imbued with the spirit of the Zionist women at the Congress that the very next year she acted as secretary, with Henrietta Szold as President, in the organization of the Daughters of Zion which later became the National Organization of Hadassah. Three years later she became my wife.

Compared to the World Zionist Organization, the Federation of American Zionists of those days was a very modest affair. It had relatively few functions and responsibilities and its membership was scattered throughout the cities of the United States. The great tasks before it still lay beyond the international political horizon. Nevertheless it was a time of great personalities — and a lot of hard work!

The movement had been given a vital impulse by Jacob de Haas, who had been Herzl's "English secretary", and who arrived from England in 1903 to help direct the small, but growing group of American Zionists. I remember being particularly impressed, as a young student at the Pittsburgh High School, by an address he delivered in Pittsburgh on the dangers of assimilation which he balanced by the hope that Herzl might yet secure the "Charter" which would open land purchase and immigration to Palestine to the Jews.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MODEST BEGINNINGS OF HADASSAH

The practical work of the Zionist organization for the next four years — from 1911 to the famous Boston Convention of 1915 — was carried by the small administrative committee elected by the Convention (and re-elected annually) consisting of Lipsky as Chairman, Abraham Goldberg, Senior Abel and myself as Honorary Secretary. We would meet each week, usually on Wednesday nights, frequently in a Cafe on the East Side (like Sachs on Grand Street) and after making decisions, Lipsky and I would be instructed to carry them out. The full Executive Committee, of course, included additional members.

One member of the committee, I remember, invariably objected to any proposed action with the cry, "The masses are opposed!" This happened so often that finally at one of our meetings, Bernard Richards, who had already gained quite a reputation as a humorist, lost his patience and answered, "Why do you always object that the masses are opposed? I met the masses last night in Sachs Cafe on Grand Street and *he* was not against this proposal."

One of the decisions taken by our small committee concerned the very earliest beginnings of the Hadassah organization, initiated by the American Zionist Federation. I was detailed to organize the women because, being the youngest of the committee, I was the most likely to get a good response. I claim no personal credit for this, but the share of the parent Federation in initiating the original expansion of Zionist work in Hadassah calls for acknowledgement. Years later, I referred to this stage in an article I wrote for the American Zionist of January 1960 and I quote

it now for the flavor of those days of earnest endeavor which it still conveys.

"In a recent visit to Israel, I had occasion to examine an old diary — now kept in the Z.O.A. house in Tel Aviv — of Gertrude Goldsmith (before she became my wife), containing interesting entries from the very beginning of Hadassah. Under date of January 21, 1912, or more than a month before the famous organization meeting at Purim of that year, in the vestry rooms of Temple Emanuel, there occurs the following item:

"Sunday, January 21, 1912
Miss Natelson, Miss Levensohn, Rebecca Aaronsohn, Miss Berger, Miss Schwab and myself met with Mr. Rosenblatt of the Executive Committee of the Federation of American Zionists. We outlined a plan for a Jewish Women's Society doing Zionistic work. Rebecca will take charge of the young girls and I will interview Mrs. Magnes, Mrs. Gottheil, Miss Szold and Mrs. Schechter to ask assistance organizing the big folks society".

This brings to mind the significant role played by the Z.O.A. (then under the name of Federation of American Zionists) in those early days, which may be designated as "the beginning of Hadassah" as a national institution. My wife, as a young girl, had attended as a delegate to the Zionist Congress held at Basle, in the preceding summer (1911), under the protective wing of her Rabbi of Temple Emanuel, Dr. J. L. Magnes. There she listened to women who were then organizing the WIZO in Europe and, with the enthusiasm of youth, she then and there volunteered to help organize a women's Zionist Organization in America. Miss Szold had retired as Secretary, due to illness, in the spring of 1911 and at the Tannersville Convention I was elected as her successor. The Convention had also named an Administrative Committee of four, with Louis Lipsky, as Chairman, besides Senior Abel, Abe Goldberg and myself. At one of the early meetings of this committee in the autumn of 1911, Senior Abel presented a paper outlining an ambitious program for the organization of (1) "Zion Associations" for men in the larger cities and (2) "Daughters of Zion" societies (later called chapters) for

women, and at the suggestion of Abe Goldberg, I was instructed to try to organize the women. When I inquired how and where I was to begin, they called my attention to the study circle that occasionally met at the Y.W.H.A.

Accordingly, I later telephoned Sophia Berger, the head of the Y.W.H.A., and received the discouraging reply that the circle had not been meeting recently. At my insistence, however, she agreed to call together some of the girls for a Sunday afternoon, towards the end of November or beginning of December (1911). When I appeared there to urge the Z.O.A. plan for a National Women's Zionist Organization, I found half a dozen young women including besides Miss Berger, also Lotta Levensohn, Rachel Natelson, Rebecca Aaronsohn (later to be the wife of Rabbi Barnett Brickner) and Gertrude Goldsmith. Such an ambitious program required, of course, several Sunday meetings, until we come to the entry of... January 21, 1912, above mentioned.

"Friday, January 26, 1912
Had a long talk with Henrietta Szold. She is a splendid woman. We talked over plans for Women's Zionist work in America."

"Sunday, January 28, 1912
Mrs. Magnes told me of her trip to Palestine to be taken next Saturday. Rabbi Magnes and she and Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Straus are going.
Mrs. M. Don't worry, Gertrude, no matter what happens it is going to turn out well".

"Saturday, February 3, 1912
We went to a meeting at Miss Szold's house for a discussion of the formation of a Women's Zionist Society. Present were, Miss Szold, Mr. Rosenblatt, Lotta Levensohn, Gertrude Cohen, myself, Mrs. Schechter, Mrs. Marx, Mrs. Szold, Mrs. Gottheil and Miss Berger".

"Saturday, February 10, 1912
I attended a meeting at Mrs. Gottheil's home for the formation of the "Daughters of Zion". Present were — Mrs. Gottheil, Miss Szold, Miss Alice Seligsberg, Mrs. Angel, Mr. Rosenblatt, Henrietta Szold (in chair) Miss Natelson, Miss Levensohn, Mrs. Schechter, myself, Miss Zion, Frank Schechter, Prof. Gottheil".

"Friday, February 23, 1912
Those who spoke — Miss Szold, Miss Kohn, Mrs. Schechter, Mrs. N. Taylor Phillips, Hon. N. T. Phillips, Bernard Rosenblatt, Gertrude Goldsmith and others. We finished with the Constitution and another meeting will be called.

The Committee on Organization
Sophia Berger
Gertrude Goldsmith
Emma Gottheil (Mrs. Richard)
Lotta Levensohn
Rosalie S. Phillips (Mrs. N. Taylor)
Mathilde Schechter (Mrs. S.)
Henrietta Szold"

There is a particularly interesting letter from Miss Szold, dated December 1, 1912, addressed to "Gertrude Goldsmith", dealing with the beginning of the program of nurses for Palestine, in connection with the forthcoming trip of Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Straus, part of which is worth quoting, as indicative of Miss Szold's clear vision of the future of Hadassah, and her fine sense of organization combined with the humble approach which was so characteristic of Henrietta Szold:

"I am writing this to you furthermore, in spite of the fact that I hope to see you tomorrow, as I should like you to have something definite before you as the starting point for your own consideration of the matter, rather than the sort of desultory, casual talk one can put in the hubbub of one of our drawing room meetings."

The Hadassah Organization is indissolubly linked with the name and personality of Henrietta Szold, who was so closely involved with its foundation. Henrietta Szold was the eldest daughter of Rabbi Benjamin Szold of Baltimore. She was born in Baltimore, in 1860 and began to work as a teacher while assisting in the integration of Jewish immigrants in the U.S. She became the secretary of the literary committee of the Jewish Publication Society, editing and translating many of its books.

Yet it was her character rather than her considerable abilities as a writer and administrator that made her famous. In 1909 she made a visit to Palestine where she became convinced that health, sanitation and welfare were indispensable prerequisites for Jewish settlement in the disease-ridden land. These aims she determined to put in the very forefront of the programme of American Zionism. Thus the Hadassah Organization was founded in 1912 with a two-fold objective: to raise health standards in Palestine and to foster the development of Jewish life and Zionist ideals in America. Henrietta Szold was mainly responsible for getting acceptance of the idea of educating the population of a provincial backwater of the Turkish empire to understand its medical problems and to demand medical services, both preventive and curative, of the highest standards — a concept which was later incorporated in the medical and public health programme of Palestine and Israel. It first gained acceptance as a result of the work of Henrietta Szold. In 1914, when she had retired from teaching to devote herself exclusively to Zionist activities, a start was made with the despatch of two American trained nurses to Palestine to do visiting nursing in Jerusalem. A year later a campaign was begun for the eradication of malaria and trachoma, the country's two worst afflictions. At the end of the first world war in 1918, the first Hadassah Medical Unit was sent to Palestine to continue and expand the work of caring for the health of the Yishuv.

Henrietta Szold was one — an outstanding but far from unique — example of the work done by American Jewish women for the upbuilding of Israel. All the contributions of American men in capital investment and philanthropic donations barely exceeded the contribution made by their womenfolk. Henrietta Szold's unique personality inspired a devoted following which included the gifted poetess Jessie Sampter, whose last years were spent in Givat Brenner; Nellie Straus, who settled first in Jerusalem, then in Tel Aviv; Alice Seligsberg, whose school remains her monument; also my wife, Gertrude Goldsmith.

In the early days of Hadassah, Mrs. Richard Gottheil (the

wife of the Columbia University professor who had been the first President of the Federation) and her sister Eva Leon, rendered valuable service in fund-raising and organizing new chapters. Later Mrs. David de Sola Pool (Tamar) served as president of Hadassah and as its representative on the World Zionist Council, her effectiveness presaging the later success of Rose Halpern on the Jewish Agency Executive.

Most of these women, be it remembered, came not from the ranks of recent immigrants, but from the older native stock. Their parents were opposed to Zionism, so they all had to find their own way to the Jewish renaissance. Their example and influence were a vital force among the younger generation of American Jews and it grew as time went on. Years later it became fashionable to spend a summer in a Kibbutz in Israel (two of my grandsons improved their Hebrew while serving in Kibbutzim in Galilee). Before World War I, my wife helped to found Young Judea and edited the "Cousin Judith" corner in their magazine, established to inculcate a love for the land of Israel among the younger generation. American Jewish youth remained oriented towards Israel, even after the older contacts with the Zionist Organization were lessened. A good part of the credit for this must go to the work done by the women.

I sometimes wonder how these early American advocates of a Jewish state — both men and women — were able to devote so much time and energy to their ideal while engaged in the daily struggle to gain a foothold in American economic life. The answer is, of course, that the major response came from the young. Their parents were, indeed, too busy earning their living to pay much attention to idle dreams about Israel. In other instances — as with the names of Henrietta Szold and her devoted companions, quoted above — they were young people from assimilated families "who knew not Zion" but found it in their own ardent, idealistic reaction to the needs of the moment.

BEFORE THE STORM

Much was accomplished in the few years before World War I without any blatant publicity or personal politics. Our organization, with its tiny administrative committee, laid the foundations not only of Hadassah but encouraged the Achuza movement for land purchase in Palestine, while winning the support of many young Rabbis, and more particularly the graduates of the Jewish Theological Seminary, then under the wise leadership of Professor Solomon Schechter.

It was also the period of youthful dreams about the kind of state that we would build in the land of Israel. It must be a model state! We were not going to be satisfied with a mere replica of another little South American Republic. True to the perennial Hebrew striving for justice, ours was to be a state in which social justice was the mainspring of its existence. I recall vividly how in one of our early Zionist Conventions, Henry Horvitz, the able editor of the Menorah Journal, claimed that it would be the small states that, in the future, would necessarily be in the forefront of the peace movement — a significant plea which almost pointed the way towards a League of Nations for the prevention of War. Perhaps an article that I wrote for the Maccabean magazine in the year 1912 will indicate the youthful enthusiasm that propelled us in our dream of a model state:

> There are over 70,000 Jews in the Holy Land. No individual should be permitted to own land as private property. There should be only estates in land, limited in the case of agricultural land to a period of fifty years, and all other lands to periods not exceeding seven years. After approving the co-operative principle, as promulgated by Franz Oppenheimer, and exemplified in the colony of Merhavia, I concluded with a program for "A Social Commonwealth in Zion."

It was more than a generation later that I found the philosophical justification for my enthusiasm in the "Political Tract" of Spinoza, left as a legacy to humanity: "The fields and the

whole soil, and, if it can be managed, the houses, should be public property: i.e., the property of him who holds the right of the commonwealth; and let him lease them at a yearly rent to the citizens. With this exception, let them all be free and exempt from any kind of taxation in time of peace."

CHAPTER IX

BRANDEIS AND ZIONISM

In the early summer of 1912, before the election of President Woodrow Wilson, I had the good fortune to meet Louis D. Brandeis, at the Harvard University Club in New York City, at his invitation, to discuss a book I was then writing (later published, in 1914, under the title "The Social Commonwealth") and dedicated to "LOUIS D. BRANDEIS, a Leader of the people in the Battle for Social Justice". The book was the result of Sociological studies in the Post Graduate Department of Columbia University, and dealt largely with the recurring problem of mass unemployment and its possible solution through the fostering of an organization of agricultural "Labor Colonies" (strongly reminiscent of the later development of cooperative settlements in Israel), and a collateral program of the nationalization of land values (by Government purchases) to safeguard the interest of the public as consumers (which bore the evident impress of the Jewish National Fund).

Towards the end of our discussion, in this first meeting with the later famous Justice Brandeis, I inevitably touched upon the problem of Zionism. Later I was agreeably surprised to receive a message from him, addressed to me as Honorary Secretary, at the Zionist Convention in Cleveland that summer with his first initial gift to the Zionist cause.

About the same time, Jacob de Haas, who had already made his name abroad as Herzl's "English secretary", and who was now the Editor of the Boston Jewish Advocate, had been cultivating Louis D. Brandeis, an outstanding Boston lawyer, and "educating" him on the subject of Zionism. It is high time that proper tribute

should be paid to this devoted Zionist, who discovered Herzl to England and Brandeis to American Zionism.

The following spring, when Dr. Nahum Sokolow, the veteran Leader of World Zionism, came to America in the first major propaganda tour, I accompanied him to Boston, where he made the keynote speech at Fanuiel Hall in the spring of 1913, which Brandeis attended as an interested auditor. As we sat on the platform, I asked Brandeis whether he would not say a few words of greeting, to which he replied that he preferred to hear Sokolow *speak first.* That speech with its commentary on World Jewry and the inevitability of Zionism as a prelude to the Jewish State was an inspiration, and proved to be epoch-making, for as he finished, Brandeis jumped to his feet, came forward and turned to Sokolow, saying: "Thank you, Dr. Sokolow — you have brought me back to my people", continuing with a short speech that was the beginning of his Zionist career.

The meeting was a turning point in Judge Brandeis' life. He had been born in Louisville, Kentucky to parents who had left Bohemia in 1848. His middle name was Dembitz, after an uncle remembered as a "prominent lawyer from the West" when he was a delegate to the Zionist Convention in Philadelphia in 1905.

In spite of this background, Brandeis had remained aloof all his life from things Jewish, rooted in American life as one of Boston's outstanding lawyers. He became sympathetic to Zionism, mainly under de Haas' influence and his new orientation was given outward expression in 1910 when he was called in to act as chairman of the Arbitration Board set up to settle the great cloakmakers' strike in New York. Brandeis thereafter became increasingly identified with Zionism, although not until the meeting with Dr. Sokolow did he stand out publicly as one of the leaders of the movement.

From the beginning, Brandeis brought to Zionist policy and activities the same objective attitude for which his career on the bench was renowned; the same unrelenting insistence on facts and the same humility in accepting them. He always followed un-

swervingly where reason led. "Problems to him," said justice Felix Frankfurter, "were merely stages in the continuous processes of civilization. And so we find his insistence on difficulties, on the necessity for continuity of effort, on sustained interest, on the need for constant alertness to the fact that the invention of new forces may beget new difficulties."

CHAPTER X

THE GREAT WAR

When World War I broke out in 1914 and Turkey joined the Central Powers against England, France and Russia, we realized that all our collective work in Palestine was endangered. In America, we were cut off completely from the precious little settlement that had been slowly built up in the preceding generation. The little "garden city" of Tel Aviv, only five years old, was now enemy territory. Moreover, the World Zionist Executive, with its headquarters in Berlin, was cut off from the rest of the Jewish world. Our small Administrative Committee in America summoned an extraordinary meeting, under the leadership of Louis Lipsky, then chairman, and myself as Hon. Secretary of the Federation to discuss the emergency. It met at the Hotel Marseilles in New York City towards the end of August 1914 and Brandeis was invited to attend.

There, in the small hotel on Broadway and 103rd Street, Brandeis assumed Zionist leadership, helping to formulate the program of the "Palestine Restoration Fund" which later became the United Palestine Appeal, and vitalizing the whole Zionist Organization of America. Our small Administrative Committee had been laboring towards this end for several years — I recall an appointment I had made sometime earlier for Louis Lipsky and myself to visit Oscar Straus, the former Ambassador to Turkey, and former member of President Theodore Roosevelt's Cabinet. Straus received us in a friendly fashion in his home, but replied to our efforts to enlist him in the cause of Zionism that he was convinced that Russia would eventually take over Turkey and that the Jews, therefore, would find themselves under the heavy hand of the Czar. But now, in the Hotel Marseilles

in New York City, "The Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionism Affairs" was launched as an "emergency effort". The pretentious name was largely due to Henrietta Szold with her penchant for precision. No one knew what had happened to the World Zionist Central Committee in Berlin after the outbreak of the War, but we had to set up some Zionist Committee to function in the interval, without overstepping the rights of the Zionist Congress as the ultimate authority. Now, under the inspiring leadership of Brandeis, the American Zionist Movement came of age.

All authority was transferred to the Provisional Committee, which in time came to include all the various groups of American Zionists. The Committee created the Transfer Account which during the war handled the transfer of millions of dollars from New York to individuals and institutions in all the war zones, special emphasis being laid on the maintenance of all Zionist institutions.

In 1916 Brandeis was elevated by President Wilson to the Supreme Court of the United States. Nevertheless, he continued to play a leading part in American Zionist circles, acting as honorary president of the Zionist Organization of America from 1918-1921. He had scant patience with those who feared a clash of loyalties in being an American — and a Zionist!

In discussing his approach to Zionism with Lord Balfour in Paris in June 1919, Brandeis explained that he saw Zionism as a means of channelling native Jewish idealism into constructive channels. He had come to it, he said, wholly as an American. His whole life had been free of Jewish contacts and tradition. As an American he had been confronted by the disposition of the vast number of Jews, particularly from Russia and Poland, who were pouring into the U.S. year by year. After he had chanced to real Herzl's pamphlet on Zionism — given him by Jacob de Haas — he had made a full study of the Jewish problem and had reached the conclusion that Zionism was the answer. Prof. Felix Frankfurter — who was present at the interview — seemed to think that this approach — so very typical of Brandeis — was very congenial to Balfour who was happy to discuss the question at this mundane level.

The Zionist movement made at least one net gain as a result of the outbreak of World War I. Dr. Schmaryahu Levin, the incomparable Zionist orator, who had visited America once before on a propaganda tour, when he was a member of the newly-elected Russian Duma, came again in the year following Sokolow's visit. He had just finished a highly successful tour as a Zionist propagandist in July, 1914, when it fell to my lot to arrange a farewell reception for him on the occasion of Dr. Herzl's 'yahrzeit' at the Jewish National Theater on 2nd Avenue, in New York City. I served as Chairman of a large and enthusiastic audience, and afterwards a group of us accompanied Schmaryahu Levin to the SS Crown Princessen Cecilia on which he was sailing for Europe. So little did we then dream of the impending, devastating war that was to change the whole aspect of the Zionist Movement! The ship never reached European shores, for while it was crossing the Atlantic, England declared war against Germany, and the latter, fearing the possible seizure of the large cargo of gold which the ship was carrying (then probably already earmarked for war purposes), ordered the ship to return to New York Harbor in order to avoid capture by English warships. To the Zionist Movement, this was a godsend, for it enabled us to utilize the remarkable services of Dr. Levin as the supreme Zionist propagandist, for a full three years, until the United States entered the war. After that Schmaryahu Levin, who had become an Austrian subject after escaping from Russia when the Duma was dissolved, became ipso facto an "enemy alien". Accordingly, he was invited to Canada, which was more tolerant in its construction of the term "enemy alien", and later, thanks to the efforts of the Canadian Zionists, he was even admitted to Canadian citizenship. Later, he sometimes referred to himself as a Jew with "multiple nationality" who, when confronted at any frontier with a question — "what passport have you got"? — would answer with another question — while putting his hand into the appropriate coat pocket... "what passport do you want"?... offering either Canadian, Austrian or Russian as the official might demand. Towards the end of the war, when Czechoslovakia was given the status of a belligerent ally, Schmaryahu Levin

could claim citizenship in that country too, for his original Austrian passport was from a town in Bohemia.

Schmaryahu Levin performed a remarkable task of Zionist education during the war years both in Canada and in the United States. He remained with the Zionist Federation until the end of the war and afterwards helped to launch the effective Keren Hayesod campaign in America. His remarkable oratory, his wit and good fellowship greatly aided the growth of American Zionism, which reached maturity during his presence among us.

CHAPTER XI

THE AMERICAN ZION COMMONWEALTH

Even before the epoch-making Boston Zionist Convention, in the summer of 1915, I had succeeded in getting together a small group who determined upon some practical work for Palestine, to prepare for "after the war." On February 23, 1915 we organized the Zion Commonwealth for Land Purchase and Development, at the home of my wife's parents. The first three stockholders were Alice Seligsberg (one of the active heads of Hadassah), S. J. Weinstein (who was later to succeed me as President of the organization) and myself. We had the blessing of the Zionist Organization and eventually the support of Justice Brandeis and his successor as President of the Zionist Organization of America, Judge Julian W. Mack.

The program of the American Zion Commonwealth was based on a relatively simple appeal for "land ownership in Palestine upon which immigrant Jews could be settled on a business basis, either by relatives of the land purchasers or prospective tenants who would eventually become free farmers on their own soil in the land of our forefathers."

By September 1915, the Zion Commonwealth issued its first Bulletin with a report from the Treasurer showing assets of about $2,000. A more interesting section of this report was a reference to the social policy which that organization intended to follow:

> "The company of the community reserves the right to any sub-surface or mineral wealth which may be discovered. And for the development of industrial activities, it is provided that at least ten percent of all lands purchased by the com-

pany shall not be divided among individuals, but shall be retained as "public or comunal lands" for industrial uses, including the development of cities and villages. Part of the land so retained will be utilized by the Company for any activities in industry, commerce or education which it might undertake for the benefit of its members, while other plots will be leased to individuals for industrial purposes (such as town dwellings, factories, stores and hotels), the lessee being assessed annually certain "ground rents" for the use of such land.

"By this simple arrangement, the profits which accrue automatically from the concentration of population and the natural growth of urban centers will go to the community."

By the time the First World War ended, the American Zion Commonwealth had accumulated over a quarter of a million dollars, on deposit with the Guaranty Trust Company in New York, and was ready to make its first land purchase. In the meanwhile, the social program of the Zion Commonwealth, with its radical approach to the land problem, had awakened the interest of Justice Brandeis. I prepared a memorandum urging that at the forthcoming Peace Conference, in 1919, where the terms of the British Mandate over Palestine were to be determined, a clause be insertd that all increase in land values accruing after August 1, 1914 (marking the beginning of World War I) should belong to the Government of Palestine, to be collected as additional annual rent or taxes. The argument was based on the truism that such extra wealth was clearly the result not of the individual efforts of any capitalists or land speculators, but rather the combined effects of the whole community as consumers; that such increase in land values was bound to occur following increasing Jewish immigration after the War, and that the Government of Palestine, representing the whole people, was entitled to that increase in value as the protector of the lives and property of all. This was in line with Articles 2 and 3 of the Pittsburgh Program, championed by me at the Pittsburgh Zionist Convention and adopted unanimously on June 25, 1918 as follows:

SECOND To insure in the Jewish national home in Palestine equality of opportunity we favor a policy which, with due regard to existing rights, shall tend to establish the ownership and control by the whole people of the land, of all natural resources and of all public utilities.

THIRD All land, owned or controlled by the whole people, should be leased on such conditions as will insure the fullest opportunity for development and continuity of possession.

Later, I explained this in an article in The New Palestine (see Annex 2).

AMERICAN JEWRY AND WORLD WAR I

In the early years of the First World War, one of the major preoccupations of the Allies (England and France) was to induce America to enter the war on their side. Within America opinion was deeply divided. Many prominent Jews, from families who had been settled in America for generations, remained neutral. Some of them, those of German and (Austrian) Bohemian origin, emotionally attached to German culture, were even pro-German strange as that sounds now, after Hitler. Many others had come or were descended from those who had come from Russia and Poland. Among them memories of Russian persecution were still alive, and they were repelled by any sort of alliance with the hated Czarist regime — allied to France and England.

Nevertheless, under the leadership of Brandeis, the American Zionist movement gave steadfast support to the allied cause — although at first the Yiddish newspapers, which generally reflected opinion among the masses, took the opposite side. One Yiddish newspaper, in fact — whose editor Miller, was a native of Bialystock — supported the allied cause from the very beginning, but

the paper lost so much circulation that it eventually went out of business and had to merge with another paper. There was even some division among the Zionist leaders. Dr. Judah Magnes was an avowed pacifist, even after America's entry into the war. He was arrested then for publicly expressing his views and saved from sentence only by the intervention of his brother-in-law, the famous Jewish leader and lawyer, Louis Marshall. Dr. Stephen S. Wise, who was a strong supporter of Brandeis, even took issue with Prof. Israel Friedlander over his possible "Germanism." (This charge was fully answered later by the Professor's relief work in Russia for which he paid with his life.)

The division among the Jews was mirrored in the American public at large. The German invasion of Belgium and its threat to France had tended to dispose most Americans towards a pro-Ally position, but, even so, the support or at least the neutrality of American Jewish opinion was considered important in higher allied circles. British Zionist leaders, notably Dr. Chaim Weizmann, were strong supporters of the Allies and their aid was enlisted to gain the sympathy of American Jewry for the Allied cause. Moreover, leading American Jews, especially Judge Brandeis, began to gain support in British political circles during the war years.

With the entry of America into the war (in April 1917) all ranks closed — six months before the Balfour Declaration.

CHAPTER XII

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

The Balfour Declaration can be presented as a triumph for Weizmann's powers of persuasion vis-a-vis the British government. To the British it was one move in a long complicated game of power politics played in cooperation and often competition with the French.

Throughout World War I, of course, the two major Allies, England and France, were manoeuvring with an eye to expanding their post-war influence over the Middle East — the area of the Turkish empire. Thus in 1915, Sir Henry MacMahon promised British support to the Arab independence movement while the French were making their own bid for control in the area. To avoid Anglo-French rivalry developing dangerously, a secret agreement, defining each country's sphere of influence, was made between Sir Mark Sykes and the French Representative, Picot. Palestine would be divided by a line running from Acre to Tiberias and everything north of that line, including Galilee and the Jordan headwaters, would fall to a greater Syria under French aegis, while the land to the south would be placed under an Anglo-French condominium.

This agreement cut right across the idea of Palestine as a National Home for the Jews and it persisted throughout the period leading up to the Balfour Declaration. However, the British preferred the idea of a Jewish Palestine under British auspices as part of a generally Arab Middle East. In these circumstances, Jewish pressure for a British protectorate over Palestine was a useful lever against French aims — and claims. During an informal discussion between Chaim Weizmann and Sir Robert Cecil, Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, about the integrity of the National Home, Sir Robert suggested that it would be useful if the Jews of the world expressed themselves in favour of a British protectorate over Pales-

tine; above all, if influential American Jews were to make their position clear. At that time, Weizmann was already in touch with Brandeis and when Balfour visited America in April 1917, Brandeis took the opportunity to assure him that not only a few rich and prominent Jews, but also the mass of American Jewry were behind the aim of a Jewish home in Palestine under British protection. This assurance from a man close to President Wilson, was precisely what Balfour needed — although the Declaration was still half a year away — and there can be no doubt that Brandeis' statement plus Balfour's meeting with Wilson, who also supported the efforts of American Zionists under Brandeis' leadership, weighed heavily in the balance when the British Government finally took the decision to issue the Declaration in November 1917.

With America's entry into the war and President Wilson's proclaimed aim of "no annexation, no secret treaties," the secret Sykes-Picot agreement faded out insofar as the proposal for an Anglo-French condominium over Palestine was concerned. That was a clear gain, but the war was still going on and the British had not occupied central or northern Palestine after General Allenby's first offensive of 1916-17. Provided that omission were remedied, then a "Jewish National Home" in Palestine, a project favoured by Wilson, would be a contributing factor to British plans for expansion in the Middle East.

Even after the danger of the Sykes-Picot agreement had receded, however, another technical difficulty — that of the line of demarcation between the French-dominated area of Syria and the British sphere of Palestine still lingered.

All this time, of course, the centre of political Zionist activity was England. American Jewry's role was merely supporting. The important thing was to get a clear statement from the British government about the future of Palestine which would bring the aims of Zionism nearer realization. Negotiations were taken up in 1915-16 by Sir Herbert Samuel, the Chief Rabbi Dr. Moses Gaster, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Dr. Nahum Sokolov and Mr. M. Tchlenow. The result was the Balfour Declaration. By October 1917 the proposed draft was submitted to President Wilson for his comments.

It was not the original unequivocal statement intended by Lord Balfour — too many objections had been raised in influential quarters and a compromise had had to be accepted to meet these and to ensure adequate safeguards for Arab interests. The final draft, as at last agreed, was the subject of the famous letter which Balfour addressed to Lord Rothschild on November 2nd, 1917:

> Dear Lord Rothschild,
>
> I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspiration which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet.
>
> 'His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.'
>
> I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

The Declaration was regarded as a triumph for Zionism. The door to the future Jewish state in the ancient Jewish homeland had been opened and throughout Jewry this major step forward was joyfully acclaimed. Nevertheless, with the war going on still, nothing could be done in either America or Europe to make the Declaration a practical reality.

Looking back, the most significant thing that happened between the Balfour Declaration and the Peace Conference of 1919 in America was the creation of the Restoration Fund in 1917. This was set up by the Emergency Committee in preparation for post-war needs and it was followed by a variety of appeals. The Emergency Committee remained part of the Zionist Organization

of America, which united all existing Zionist bodies, and later, it merged with the United Palestine Appeal.

In England in 1918, even before the whole of Palestine had been occupied by Allenby and the British army, the British Government appointed the international "Zionist Commission" which went to Palestine in April 1918 to advise the British military authorities in Palestine (the O.E.T.A. or Occupied Enemy Territory Administration) on the implementation of the Balfour Declaration. The Commission was enthusiastically received by the Palestinian Yishuv, very conscious of having been rescued by the British from the Turkish yoke. The Arabs remained neutral or apathetic, but the Commission encountered marked opposition from the top British brass. It could accomplish little beyond injecting new hope and life into the Yishuv and organizing a new office in Jaffa to replace the former "Palestine Office" (appointed by the last Zionist officers of the pre-war European World Zionist Organization). The Commission also set up a centre in Jerusalem to handle food supplies, immigration, education and the like. Members of the Commission, including Dr. Weizmann, lived in the tiny garden city of Tel Aviv, a suburb of Arab Jaffa, numbering at that time four streets of Jewish occupation, nestling among the orange groves a mile back from the sea.

Following the Balfour Declaration, the young Hadassah Organization had also despatched the American Zionist Medical Unit to Palestine and, more or less at the same time, recruiting for the Jewish Legion of the British Army had gone ahead in England, America and, ultimately, Palestine. The Jewish legion itself was a milestone of Jewish history. Within its ranks were men like David Ben Gurion, Itzchak Ben Zvi, Dov Joseph, Gershon Agron and countless others who were later to make Zionist history.

Even before all these developments, though, American Zionists had been preparing for an enormous increase in activity in and for Palestine "after the war."

CHAPTER XIII

PALESTINE AT THE 1919 PEACE CONFERENCE

In February 1919, the Zionist leaders came together in London for the first time since the war. The Peace Conference had just opened in Paris with Professor Felix Frankfurter (later Justice of the United States Supreme Court), attending as the representative of the Zionist Organization, the essential aim of the Zionists being, of course, to protect what had been gained through the Balfour Declaration and to ensure its implementation in terms of policy.

I had been sent by Justice Brandeis to Professor Frankfurter in Paris to put before him the Land Plan of the American Zion Commonwealth as agreed at the Pittsburgh Zionist Convention. I spent only a couple of days in Paris, but from my talks with Professor Frankfurter it became clear that Great Britain was hardly ready to undertake such a radical program, despite the publicity accorded it from the Zionist Headquarters at 77 Great Russell Street, in London.

While I was in London, I received a cable from the New York Zionist office which aroused the utmost suspicion in the British Post Office. It read "Get visas Gold Silver Berlin." At this time all currency deals were strictly forbidden. I was called to the Foreign Office to account for the apparent intended violation of both regulations and, fortunately, they accepted my explanation. The cable was in fact a request for me to obtain English visas for three rabbis: Rabbi Wolf Gold of Brooklyn, the orthodox Rabbi Silver of Chicago and Rabbi Meyer Berlin, head of the Mizrachi Organization, who wanted to attend the London Conference!

Later, in the summer of 1919, Justice Brandeis, accompanied

by Jacob de Haas, joined us in Europe. They soon went on to Palestine while Professor Frankfurter journeyed to Poland where the Jewish situation had deteriorated with the establishment of the newly-founded Polish state. I followed Justice Brandeis to Palestine in the summer, accompanied by Walter Coates, who was representing Mary (Mrs. Joseph) Fels, who had promised support for the American Zion Commonwealth because its program seemed a proper step forward in the realization of the "Single Tax," as formulated by Henry George and so enthusiastically supported by her late husband.

A news item, dated from London, appeared in the New York Times on July 1, 1919 with a caption "Brandeis Busy on Behalf of Palestine", and a sub-title "Deputizes Rosenblatt and Frankfurter to Important Tasks". The article went on to say: "The task of drawing-up the land clause prohibiting speculation in land values in Palestine, and providing that all unearned increment shall revert to the Government, has been assigned to Rosenblatt, who has made a special study of this problem."

In July, while en route to Palestine, we stopped off at Paris again for a few days, and I had the pleasure of a visit with the venerable Baron Edmond de Rothschild — "the father of Jewish Colonization in Palestine". France was then in the midst of the "crisis of the Franc", which had already fallen to a fraction of its pre-war value, and the old Baron could not refrain from referring to his dwindling capital assets. But, despite his personal problems, he never for a minute forgot his primary interest in Jewish colonization, and urged that on our trip to Palestine we might be able to do something about settling the demobilized soldiers of the Jewish Legion upon the land. This was again carried as a news item from London in the New York Times of July 19, 1919.

THE FIRST VISIT TO PALESTINE

I entered Palestine in that same week on a new railroad (built by the military) leaving Kantarah on the Suez Canal, at midnight,

en route to Lod. Early the next morning, we reached the border of Palestine at Rafah, on the Mediterranean Coast, while I was dreamily cogitating over the fact that I was coming from Egypt in six hours, compared to the forty years that it took my ancestors to reach the Promised Land. Suddenly, I was surprised to notice a young man in uniform come out, swinging himself on to the platform of the train, with a greeting "You are Rosenblatt? — I am Louis Fischer of Philadelphia" (later, the well-known writer and expert on Russian conditions). "I remember you from the Zionist Convention." When I asked him where he was going, he replied, to my surprise, that he was just taking "French leave" with a few days' visit to Tel Aviv. When I warned him that he was under military discipline, he replied that his brigade had gone on strike "because they refused to wash the mules." When I reminded him that this was no cloak and suit business on which you could blissfully go on strike — he replied that "the British knew that they were dealing with Jews" and would not be hard on deserters for a short vacation.

This was the famous morning on which I first entered the Holy Land, passing the sweet-smelling orange groves of the Jewish Colony of Rehovoth. We arrived in Tel Aviv on Friday afternoon, July 25th, 1919. The "Garden City", as the Jews then called it, had a population of some 2,300. "A most peculiar thing happened Friday morning" (as I wrote to my wife in the United States), "before our train reached Lod we passed the train that was conveying Brandeis, de Haas, Friedenwald and Robert Szold out of Palestine." On the following Monday evening, I addressed a group representing the elite of Tel Aviv, at the home of one of its earlier settlers, Bezalel Jaffe. I gave them the latest news from Paris and the Peace Conference, for there was neither a newspaper nor any telegraphic communication as yet with the outside world — explaining the importance of a possible "land clause" which I still hoped might be included in the Palestine Mandate. One of the group, who listened attentively, was S. Hoofein, the local manager of the Anglo-Palestine Company (later the Bank Leumi), which he successfully fostered as the financial bulwark of the growing

Jewish community. But Palestine Jewry was then more interested in solving the problem of the demobilized Legionnaires and the endeavor to keep some of them from returning to their countries of origin. These 2,000 or 3,000 Legionnaires, mostly from Canada and the United States, constituted indeed a real problem not only for the small Jewish community of Palestine, but likewise for the British Administration of this "Occupied Enemy Territory". A few days later, I spoke before a large group of Jewish soldiers about to be demobilized — and among my listeners there must have been both David Ben Gurion and Itzchak Ben Zvi — promising that we were making every effort to establish a farm colony where some of them might be settled.

Reference to the 1919 Paris Peace Conference brings to mind the relevant political background.

At the Zionist Conference in London that year — and shortly thereafter — leading British Zionist leaders like Chaim Weizmann, N. Sokolow and Israel Sieff together with American leaders like Louis D. Brandeis, Prof. F. Frankfurter and Jacob de Haas were able to meet the continental leaders again for the first time since the war. The meeting had something of the character of a family reunion and, like a family reunion, once the first joy of reestablishing contact had passed, a variety of divisions and contrasts began to emerge. During the four years of war, the leaders of the different Zionist groups had been living under totally different circumstances, subject to different pressures and absorbed in very different daily concerns.

Moreover, they had a very different appreciation of political realities. Some of the leaders even brought with them lists of candidates for the first Cabinet of a Jewish state! In view of the real situation, this was truly extraordinary. The Balfour Declaration was still very far from being translated into policy and it was still being fought energetically by British military chiefs and by many British politicians.

In line with the principle of "self-determination" enunciated by President Wilson, the Zionist Organization was invited to

present its case regarding Palestine at the Peace Conference. A delegation, including among others, Weizmann, Sokolov, Ussishkin and Lucien Levy presented the case for a Jewish state before the Council of Ten, composed mainly of the Foreign Secretaries of the victorious Allies. The Americans — Wilson, Lansing and House — were favourable to Zionism, as were the Brittish: Balfour, Lloyd George, Milner and Smuts. When asked to define the implementation of the phrase "a Jewish national home" Weizmann declared that the intention was "to build up gradually a nationality which would be as Jewish as the French nation was French and the British nation, British." Weizmann, then in undisputed control of the Zionist movement, and the other Zionists on the delegation won their case against opposition and indifference from Jews (Lucien Levy) and Gentiles.

CHAPTER XIV

BALFOURIA — AN AMERICAN ZIONIST COLONY

Since shortly before the war, circumstances had prevented any further expansion of the work of land acquisition and settlement in Palestine. There was no land reserve for future development. After the war this represented the most pressing problem of practical Zionism after the Balfour Declaration. The administrators of Palestine did not grant lands for settlement and any spare land which might be used for Jewish settlement was mainly in the possession of rich Arab landowners.

This, of course, was the situation which the American Zion Commonwealth had been formed to meet, even before the Jewish National Fund was launched on its large-scale land purchase and colonization schemes. The Commonwealth was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1914 and by 1921 some $250,000 had been paid up on account of the $3,000,000 subscribed by the 5,000 members enrolled.

The Jewish National Fund acquired its land through the Palestine Land Development Company, which had been founded in 1908 by the World Zionist Organization and was directed by Dr. Arthur Ruppin. Under the leadership of Ruppin and the incomparable Chankin, this agency worked in close cooperation with the American Zion Commonwealth in securing several land tracts.

Thus, when I set about redeeming the promise I had made, I appealed to Joshua Chankin for help in buying some land for a colony to be established by the American Zion Commonwealth.

Under the peculiar legal system then prevailing as a result of Turkish misrule, I was told that we must first lease the land and then, perhaps, by inserting a clause with an option to buy, we might eventually gain permission to effect a transfer of title. Chankin said that there was a small area, near the colony of Merhavia in Lower Galilee, which might be secured. He offered to travel with us "to spy out the land".

But that presented a new problem. There were only two cars (both Fords, of course) in the whole country (outside of the military vehicles in the British Army). There was one car attached to the newly-organized Hadassah Medical Unit, which could not be diverted from its essential use for hospital patients. The other car had been used by Justice Brandeis and his party in a tour of the country and it had broken down. As there was no mechanic in the Holy Land able to fix it — it reminded me of the Biblical reference in Samuel I that "There was no smith throughout all the Land of Israel" — they had to send the car to Egypt for repairs and we decided to travel by horse and wagon. Joshua Chankin would guide us from Tel Aviv north to Haifa, then east to Tiberias, passing on the way the proposed site for the settlement in the Emek.

Accordingly, one hot early morning late in July 1919, we started out, passing through Petach Tikvah. We had been warned not to attempt to enter the colony of Hedera "because the road is so difficult that your wagon will certainly stick in the sand." After travelling all day, we finally managed to reach Zichron Yaakov at about six in the evening.

AARON AARONSON, SAVIOUR OF THE NORTHERN FRONT

This early pioneer settlement is bound up with the history of the Aaronson family. This family, with a few close friends, formed the "Nili" group who undertook intelligence work for the British army during the war, transmitting vital information to the British across the Turkish lines. One of the daughters suffered

martyrdom at the hands of the Turks as a result of these activities — but this is another story, related in half a dozen books published since then.

I had met Aaron Aaronson, the honored dicoverer of "wild wheat" only a few weeks before in Paris, engaged on the task of trying to persuade the French Government to modify its claims to the Northern District of Palestine (which had been allotted to France under the Sykes-Picot treaty with Great Britain), so that Northern Galilee might be included within the terms of the Balfour Declaration as part of the Jewish National Home. He had told me then of how he had successfully appealed to the French not to cut the Jewish National Home into two parts, for far in the northeast, almost bordering on the Litani River, was the colony of Metullah, established by Baron Rothschild more than a generation earlier. The French, in a generous mood (and perhaps as a token of goodwill towards their Baron Rothschild) agreed to withdraw their claims from the long strip running north and east of Haifa to the present boundary of Lebanon, with an abrupt northern turn to include Metullah and up to the borders of Syria. The contribution of Aaron Aaronson to this phase of Zionist history cannot be exaggerated, for it won for Jewish Palestine the whole of Galilee, including the historic city of Safed. Unfortunately, Aaronson was never to see the fulfillment of his great work, for he lost his life in an aeroplane flight over the English Channel soon thereafter.

A year later, when I visited Metullah and contemplated that small village with its single street of a few houses on either side, I marvelled at the ingenuity which had enabled us to secure a viable state of Israel, for without northern Galilee and the Huleh region, and, above all, control of some of the Jordan headwaters, the Jewish National Home could hardly have been possible; and it could never have resisted, some five decades later, Arab attempts to divert the waters of the Jordan.

The thought occurred to me then — as on so many occasions — that we had built better than we knew, for the philanthropic Baron Rothschild, the man indirectly responsible for the *political*

evolution of the Jewish state, was originally opposed to political Zionism and any idea of a Jewish state. He had believed only in Jewish colonization, but it was his practical implementation of that idea that laid the foundations for the Jews' claim to their northern boundary.

We stayed overnight in Zichron Yaakov and, by leaving early the following morning, our wagon managed to reach Haifa by three in the afternoon. There was very little to see in Haifa in 1919, apart from the empty building of the Technion, completed just at the outbreak of the war. There was, of course, no Hadar HaCarmel and only a small "German-Colony" (practically deserted at that time) and a few homes beside the French monastery on top of Mount Carmel. A few hundred Jewish families, mostly Sephardim, were settled near the old harbor among the large Arab community. Only a few brave spirits dreamed of Haifa as the "City of the future" with a big modern port. There was little to support this claim, beyond its upholders' boundless optimism!

After a few hours' delay, therefore, our pair of horses and the wagon went drearily on to Nazareth, which we reached at ten in the evening. Entering this Arab Christian stronghold, we were suddenly stopped by a group of young ruffians who barred our way. We were saved, I think, only by the majestic figure of Joshua Chankin who rose from his seat with his cane in his hand and a warning in good Arabic that "they dare not molest us". I can still see him in my mind's eye with his impressive countenance and striking long, blond beard — as remarkable as the famous Italian statues of Nazareth's greatest son — defying all opposition. We stayed overnight in the small German Galilee Hotel, and the next morning proceeded down the mountain towards our destination, in Emek Jezreel, to examine the land upon which Balfouria now stands. It was a sight I shall never forget, with the early morning sun giving us our first breath-taking view of the whole valley of Jezreel — like an immense upturned saucer — which only the dream of a convinced Zionist

could then fill with the fruits of farming villages and a central town, the future City of Afuleh.

After examining the land, it became clear that its limited extent and uncertain leasehold would hardly fit into the project of a permanent settlement for demobilized soldiers. But Chankin, nevertheless, urged us to establish a temporary settlement with some Socialist group then seeking to work on the land, as an American contribution to the first colonization effort after World War I. It was then and there agreed that the settlement would be named Balfouria, in honor of the British Foreign Minister whose "Declaration" was still being celebrated throughout the Jewish world. In response to a cable we sent later to Dr. Chaim Weizmann from Tel Aviv, asking for Balfour's permission to use his name, I received the gratifying reply that he was proud to have his name associated with the Holy Land.

That same afternoon, we pressed on to Tiberias, despite the summer heat, and managed to reach the famous "Sea of Galilee" that evening, spending the night in the German-owned Hotel of Tiberias. The only relief from the mid-summer heat was to be obtained in a row-boat on Lake Kinneret (as it was affectionately called by the Hebrews of old). The next morning we drove a mile and a half further south along the Lake to glance at the ancient — and at that time dilapidated — thermal springs, famous in both Roman and Jewish history. I had no inkling then of the crucial part I was to play in the future rehabilitation of those baths. We were satisfied to make our way along the lake, "drinking in" the beautiful scenery, famous since biblical times.

In any case we had to hurry back to Tel Aviv to proceed with the plans for Balfouria. After long days of travelling at the walking pace of our ancient Patriarchal ancestors, we arrived at the Pension Moskowitz (for as yet there was no hotel in Tel Aviv), and there set about completing our plans. The land for Balfouria — a modest tract of some 3000 dunams (a dunam equals approximately a quarter of an acre) — was acquired for the American Zion Commonwealth. In Tel Aviv I was fortunate to enlist the voluntary service of Nellie Straus

of New York, a devoted member of Hadassah, who had come over to spend her last years in Palestine. She devotedly overcame all the initial difficulties in the way of Balfouria's establishment and first years. These were a trying time for the settlers, for they were more interested in ideology than profitable agriculture. Nellie Straus was given the responsibility of supervising the expenditure of monies forwarded from America. It was a thankless task, but at least the settlement took root.

In later days, I was to record some curious episodes in the development of Balfouria. In the early 20's, the problem of a water supply became rather serious, and several efforts to produce a well were unsuccessful. One settler confided to me, in all seriousness, that there was little prospect of water because he was convinced that the new well they were digging would bring up only oil — which, of course, was useless for agriculture! In the days before 1924, when Afuleh was founded, there was constant fear of attacks from the surrounding Arab settlements. I recall that on one overnight stay a large carton of stones and rocks was placed immediately next to my improvised bed. When I asked for an explanation, I was told, as a simple matter of fact, that this was to provide a lodgement for any bullet intended for my head. Yet, despite dangers and difficulties, these were truly happy days, giving the pioneer the thrill of a life well-spent.

Since my first journey to Palestine was limited to only nineteen days (from the last days of July to the first part of August in 1919) — for I had to return to London for the delayed Zionist Conference — I could spend only three days in Jerusalem. One incident from that short visit may throw some light upon conditions in the Holy City at that time. In a conversation with the American Engineer, Cantor, who had come over with the Hadassah Medical Unit, the subject of anti-malarial work in Palestine was raised. Cantor was particularly anxious to raise funds for the purchase of two donkeys to be used in sanitary work in the city. When Walter Coates gave him ten Pounds Sterling for the purpose, Cantor was overjoyed, for he assured

us that neither from the City government nor from private sources could he procure such an enormous sum — so poor was the City of David and so poverty-stricken its inhabitants.

As an antiquity, Jerusalem was, of course, unique. But no one could predict with any confidence that its future development would convert it into the beautiful capital city of the State of Israel. Even in those days, it was evident that Jerusalem had a great future as a tourist centre, for who can resist the call of the Holy City? To anyone who understands and appreciates history, this was the stage upon which was played a divine tragedy — not merely for a single soul but for a whole people. Furthermore, Jerusalem must inevitably continue to play a vital role in the future just as in the past, for the treasures of history it contains cannot be carted away, like the paintings of Venice or the sculptures of Florence. Nor has it even a tomb to which men may come in a worshipful spirit — a tomb that may be removed to Rome or Paris, for no man knows the whereabouts of the tomb of Moses nor the Prophets of Israel, while Jerusalem was only the earthly scene of the Last Days of the Founder of Christianity. It holds simply a great human memory. Because Jerusalem the Golden has a purely spiritual appeal, the treasures it offers must always remain a magnet drawing visitors and tourists.

Early the next month, I joined Justice Brandeis and Professor Frankfurter in London, and early in September, we all sailed together on the S.S. Rotterdam for New York. Walking the deck with Justice Brandeis, he told me that my proposal for land taxation could not be adopted because of Arab opposition. While I understood the difficulties inherent in my program, my youthful enthusiasm made me loathe to surrender what I thought was the cause of right and justice, merely because of the opposition of a small Arab landlord class, many of whom lived outside Palestine. When I voiced my disappointment to Judge Brandeis, he answered with the following parable:

"One who attempts to climb a steep mountain may take

> either of two courses: he may undertake the sheer upward ascent regardless of the grade and the undergrowth — a direct attack which may prove much longer and more exhausting than an alternative method of a circuitous route, step by step, so graded as to save much energy, whereby the top is reached in less time."

Therefore, said he, "We must concentrate upon a policy of prompt land purchase through the Jewish National Fund, as a public body, and through individual Jews as private investors, and through the American Zion Commonwealth as a semi-investment proposition, bringing many Jews together in one organization for land purchase and colonization." Justice Brandeis felt that we were lacking in human powers in Palestine, and that it was incumbent upon us to bring to that country young American Jews with administrative ability to carry on the heavy tasks before us. He seemed almost to voice the opinion of David Ben Gurion, uttered much later, in a plea for American Chalutzim.

Arriving in the United States, I was immediately urged to undertake a long journey, reaching as far as California, and give a first-hand report to our Zionist Districts upon conditions in Palestine. My first stop was in Chicago where the American Zionist Convention was held at the end of the summer — 1919 — and from there I went westwards. One particularly impressive meeting was held at Omaha, Nebraska, presided over by Henry Monsky, President of the local Zionist District, who later served so successfully as national president of the Bnei Brith. On my way through Salt Lake City, I passed the train carrying President Woodrow Wilson on his historic but fruitless attempt to gain support for U.S. entrance into the League of Nations, then being opposed by the Senate. At the very next stop, Colorado, this campaign and his entire active life came to an end with his tragic physical breakdown.

I arrived in Los Angeles on the eve of Rosh Hashana for a joyful reunion with my wife and year old son, David. My speaking tour was the first first-hand report on Palestine to be given after the War and it sparked off an upsurge of Zionist

activity in the Middle West and on the Pacific Coast. In Los Angeles I was invited to a combined meeting of the local Zionist Organization and Hadassah, to speak at a "Business Men's Banquet" on the subject of Palestine and Southern California. I compared the general physical characteristics of the two districts, both located on the sea with mountains inland, both having an almost identical climate. Of course, I did not fail to draw the comparison between the two countries, ending with a phrase "that if you would add $400,000,000 to Palestine you would have a Southern California, and if you took that much away from the latter country, you would have present-day Palestine".

I recall repeating the general substance of this lecture in a well-known synagogue in New York, more than a year later, after having been appointed as a Judge in the City of New York. The well-groomed and well-fed President of the Congregation approached me after the lecture and congratulated "Judge Rosenblatt on your excellent address". He went on to say that he was especially interested in the description of California, for he had been there three years before, and he was so impressed by my words that he now definitely made up his mind to make another trip to California next autumn. Evidently, as a shrewd and careful businessman, he came to the conclusion that since Palestine and California were practically the same, he might as well make the trip to the latter, which was cheaper, nearer and safer. I alway recall this incident as a typical case of a salesman who oversells his product, or a young lawyer who overtries his case. The Advocate is extolled, while the case is lost.

CHAPTER XV

A PROSPECTIVE PALESTINE SETTLER

In the first week of March, 1920, I boarded the S.S. Berengaria in New York City, en route for the second journey to Palestine. This time I travelled with my wife and two sons, the second, an infant of only eight weeks, whose coming was my explanation to Justice Brandeis for delaying my trip by a couple of months. In the letter which he wrote me, cheering me on my way, under the date of February 2, 1920, some sentences are worth recording:

> I congratulate you on being able to take your family with you. That would be very much better.
>
> You may feel assured that I, in company with the others, have entire confidence in you and that you will be able to accomplish much in Palestine. You have shown a fine spirit of real understanding; and with this and the hard work and hardship you are prepared for you — and we with you — must succeed in Palestine. I hope we shall be able to do here what is necessary to give our American Palestinians the courage they require for carrying out our ideals and idea.
>
> ... and among other reasons why we are glad you are going — and going to stay — is the fact that you will carry our conceptions of Social Zionism to be accomplished in our new-old world."

The phrase "Social Zionism" which Justice Brandeis used is one which I had first popularized in a book entitled "Social Zionism", published in 1919, after the Pittsburgh Platform of the preceding year had been adopted by the American Zionist Convention.

In Paris, my wife took sick, causing a delay of several days, in which the following incident stands out. One night, while walking along the Rue de Rivoli, I was surprised to meet Professor Israel Friedlander, the prominent Orientalist and historian of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. We had worked together for several years in the Zionist Organization of America, and I was an ardent admirer of his fine scholarship and devotion to the Zionist cause. He was taking a few weeks leave from his duties as representative of the Joint Distribution Committee in Russia and was going on to London the next morning, to spend Passover with the family of his father-in-law, Herbert Bentwich (father of Norman Bentwich, who was later to serve as the first Attorney General in Palestine). Professor Friedlander told me how loathe he was to return to Russia, yet he felt that he was in duty bound to do so in order to complete his work there. During our walk, he expressed his regrets that he could not go to Palestine with me, ending with the words: "This is the last time that I shall go to Russia."

I was to recall those parting words when the sad news came of his murder in the Ukraine a few months later, while completing his selfless mission of relief.

The Joint Distribution Committee which was set up at a momentous meeting in 1914, represented three relief organizations, the American Jewish Relief Committee, the Peoples' and the Central Committees for Relief. Rich Jews and working class Jews, religious groups, radicals and socialists all joined hands in a united effort, unique in history, to bring succour to the afflicted. The Joint Committee was responsible for all disbursements in the war zones. Its initiators were largely of German Jewish stock, men like Jacob H. Schiff, his son-in-law Felix Warburg and the late Julius Rosenwald. They were soon followed by others, largely the descendants of East European Jews, representing the mass of donors and contributors.

During the First World War and the Second and in the years between, the Joint Distribution Committee dispensed hundreds of

millions of dollars, raised by voluntary contributions, for relief and rehabilitation. This is no place to pay a proper tribute to all these American Jews who gave and worked for the Fund. Here, we can only mention the crucial assistance given to the Yishuv in Palestine in the years before the creation of the state of Israel; in the work of organizing and regulating immigration in the hectic days after World War II and in helping in the absorption of refugees in the first years of Israel's independence. Yet it can truthfully be said that for every Jew in America (numbering some three and a half million) another Jew overseas was aided in becoming a free and independent personality either in Israel or in Europe. Thus the Joint Distribution Committee represented a sort of partnership in the preservation of the ancient Jewish heritage.

While en route through Switzerland (to take ship at Trieste for Alexandria) — the best and tested way to reach Palestine in those days — my wife became ill again, but insisted that I should continue alone for I had to meet Dr. Weizmann after Passover. I reached Alexandria at the end of Passover 1920 and learned only then of the riots in Jerusalem the preceding week. The representative of the Zionist Tourist Agency handed me a telegram from Dr. Chaim Weizmann asking me to meet him at once at the Continental Hotel in Cairo. I proceeded there immediately and found Dr. Weizmann in a highly disturbed state of mind, having been a witness of the riots in Jerusalem. He was convinced they were the fault of the British military Authorities who allowed the Arab cry that "The Government is with us" to persist. He was especially outraged by the attitude of General Bols. It was particularly upsetting to hear the words: "It's lucky that the Jewish Legion was not with me, because General Bols deserved hanging!" from the peaceful Dr. Weizmann, with his absolute confidence in the British Government.

Dr. Weizmann asked me to go at once to Jerusalem and to advise Ussishkin, who was Chairman of the Zionist Commission, "to hold the fort until San Remo." Weizmann was on his

way to meet Prime Minister Lloyd George at this Italian resort, where the final terms of the Palestine Mandate were to be decided.

Later, in Palestine, in talks with British officials, I was to learn something of the British attitude. As the Governor of Jerusalem, Sir Ronald Storrs, told me over a cup of tea at his home, he could not understand why the Jewish settlers were in such a hurry, after having waited for over 1800 years since the destruction of Jerusalem. Besides, while he knew and could understand a British Yeoman and even a Russian "mujik", he could not understand a Jewish peasant in the Kibbutz who could out-argue him in philosophy and quote Shakespeare to him. If such a learned and cultured man could not understand a Jewish settler, what sympathy might we expect from the ordinary British officer, immersed in his work, who had never before encountered a "native" such as a Jew? If the Jew had come into Palestine with the attitude assumed by the Boers towards the coloured race in South Africa, he might have been understood by the British military class, but people who insisted upon being friends with their "cousins", the Arabs who — in return — promised to dump the Jews into the Mediterranean at the first opportunity, such a phenomenon naturally failed to command the respect of a Christian gentleman or British officer.

From Jerusalem, with Palestine still seething with the unrest engendered by the riots of the preceding week, I went to Tel Aviv. One night, long after midnight, I was roughly awakened from my bed in the Pension Moskowitz by Pinchas Rutenberg, the founder and later Managing Director of the important Palestine Electric Corporation. In a few short words he told me that Vladimir Jabotinsky had been arrested in Jerusalem for organizing a self-defence corps among the Jewish ex-soldiers, and that he had been taken to Acco Jail. Sleepily I asked what I could do at 2 a.m.? He replied that an American warship happened to be in Jaffa Port and that it was essential to get cables, forbidden by the military censorship in Palestine, through to the outside world. The wave of sympathy which swept over the world when

the facts were known speedily brought about the remission of Jabotinsky's heavy sentence and made him a free man.

During the following week — at a time when we had almost lost heart as a result of the Jerusalem riots — something happened to revive our spirits. I was travelling from Haifa to Tiberias with Dr. Arthur Ruppin, the heard of the Zionist Colonization Department. It was just after Passover 1920 and we stayed overnight at the German-owned Galilee Hotel in Nazareth. This time we were travelling rather comfortably, for a few American automobiles were available for longer journeys at ridiculously high prices.

In the hotel dining room at suppertime, a few British officers at the next table were indulging in the usual whisky and soda. To our surprise they were discussing the results of the San Remo Conference, which had just adjourned in the latter part of April 1920. In a country without newspapers, we may be forgiven for listening intently to every phrase dropped in a casual conversation from which, nevertheless, we might glean some important news about San Remo. To my delight and amazement, I heard one of the officers question the wisdom of the appointment of "a Jew", Sir Herbert Samuel, as the first Civil Governor of Palestine. This was the earliest intimation we had of the appointment of Lord Samuel as the first High Commissioner. It gave us some comfort in the midst of the troubles arising out of the Passover riots and we were happy in the thought that at least the appointment should facilitate the complete acceptance of the Balfour Declaration.

CHAPTER XVI

WEIZMANN AND BRANDEIS

In the summer of 1920, the World Zionist Conference was convened in London. It was a landmark in the history of Zionism. No Zionist Congress had been held since 1913, and the intervening "seven lean years" filled with war and the rumors of war had been lightened only by the issuance of the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1917, which we optimistically interpreted as the first step in the establishment of the Jewish State. However, we now found ourselves faced with the dangers incidental to the practical work of colonization, amidst a hostile indigenous population and an unfriendly administration of the "Occupied Enemy Territory" which generally regarded Zionism as foreign aggression. We had come a long way from the earlier debates between the political Zionism of the Herzlian type and the "practical" Zionists led by Ussishkin and Weizmann, who favored colonization work. Now we were all political Zionists and a synthesis had to be worked out in order to fit colonization work into the framework of the Balfour Declaration. To achieve such a synthesis, all of us looked to the commanding figure of Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who now came to the Conference with all the authority of being the first Jew to sit upon the bench of the U.S. Supreme Court and at the head of a strong delegation of American Zionists.

On my second visit to Palestine, while supervising the settlement of Balfouria, I had, at the request of Justice Brandeis, undertaken to give him (in long letters) periodic reports on the economic conditions, which might prove helpful in formulating a definite program for our continued work at the London conference.

I arrived in London on the eve of July 4, 1920 and was immediately confronted with the "general debate," the usual

forerunner of decisions at a Zionist Congress. But first, that very morning, came the sad news that Professor Friedlander had been killed by bandits, just as he had seemed to predict with his remark during our meeting in Paris that "this is the last time I shall go to Russia."

The next morning I had breakfast with Justice Brandeis and gave him an intimate report on what I had seen and heard in my three months' stay in Palestine. Brandeis then told me that he had been approached by many delegates to assume the leadership of the Zionist movement. This would mean resigning from the United States Supreme Court so as to take an active personal part in the administration of the movement. He wanted my opinion, for it was known that Professor Felix Frankfurter was opposed, feeling that Justice Brandeis was needed in America as the leader of the liberal forces in the United States. Jacob de Haas, on the other hand, and perhaps a large majority of the delegates urged Brandeis strongly to assume Zionist leadership. I told him that I agreed with Professor Frankfurter, although for different reasons, since America might find other liberal leaders, while he might render extraordinary service to Zionism in the high position he occupied. On the other hand, should he resign and move to Palestine, as leadership of Zionism implied, he would find it difficult to adjust to the new environment.

I was soon confirmed in my opinion by Brandeis' reaction to some needless waste of funds in Palestine which might have been more wisely spent. Brandeis was an uncompromising "Puritan" by heredity as well as early Boston training and he surprised me with the phrase "A dollar wasted is a dollar stolen." I was afraid that such a rigid attitude adopted in Palestine in those early days of confusion and some inevitable mismanagement would only break that great spirit, now enlisted in the cause of Jewish Nationalism, and would hardly serve the best interests of Zionism. In the event, of course, Brandeis declined the suggestion.

Later proceedings in the London Conference tended to emphasize my viewpoint. Judge Brandeis was thinking in terms of broadening the Zionist movement by including the leading figures

of British Jewry, such as Lord Reading and Sir (later Lord) Herbert Samuel, while the old staunch Zionists like Ussishkin and Weizmann would accept such support, but only while preserving the heritage of Herzlian leadership in their own hands. Yet, at first, everything seemed to go well, and Judge Brandeis was particularly impressed with the great speech Dr. Weizmann delivered in which he proposed a whole program of Palestine colonization and settlement. It was a splendid address, complete with graphs showing a suggested triangle of settlements from Tel Aviv to Beersheba and Gaza. When somebody pointed out to Brandeis that Weizmann was a political leader rather than an economist dealing with colonization problems, Brandeis replied, "He can learn!"

Hardly were the first happy days at the London Conference over, than the usual misunderstandings between East and West and even more important, a deep divergence between the two leaders — Brandeis and Weizmann — was brought right out into the open.

Weizmann had come to the Conference in the hope of widening the circle of people who could be counted on both to supply their own private initiative and to inspire confidence as an encouragement to others. The basic problem facing the Conference was that while England had accepted the Mandate, i.e. political control, the responsibility for building up the economy of Palestine remained with the Zionist Movement.

Brandeis and his followers among the Americans wanted the emphasis laid on the need for preliminary activities in preparing the land for settlement and eliminating malaria — the pernicious effects of which the East European Jews tended to discount. Weizmann and the East Europeans for their part were clamorous for a policy of immediate colonization.

Underlying these policy differences, lay the basic question of leadership. Brandeis came to the London Conference after his visit to Palestine, convinced that a complete overhaul of the Zionist apparatus was essential for the new tasks of making the Yishuv (then numbering about a quarter of a million) self

supporting as quickly as possible. This, of course was a point on which Weizmann was in full agreement. Business-like management in the new and developing colonies was essential if the whole project was not going to turn into a bottomless barrel. Both Brandeis and Weizmann were eager to enlist the support and services of men of real stature, accustomed to financial responsibilities. They even had the candidates in mind, without their knowledge. These were big names in Jewish business and financial circles in England and America, many of them non-Zionists, even anti-Zionists and notable assimilationists!

Brandeis' proposal for meeting this situation was to demand a Zionist Organization which could accommodate such people. This was logical for the immediate emergency, but completely ignored the history of the Zionist movement up to the Balfour Declaration, and also the present triumphant mood of long-standing Zionists who felt they had gained a notable victory and would hardly welcome the idea of sharing it with erstwhile opponents and detractors of Zionism.

Besides the major question of leadership, which Brandeis seemed to envisage as the necessary province of prominent British Jews, there was also the perhaps unconscious reversion to Herzlian Zionism. Herzl had wanted to prepare the land by political Charters, whereas Brandeis also emphasized economic preparation and the elimination of malaria. The result was a misunderstanding which caused a serious division in Zionist ranks the very next year. Finally, much of his confidence in Weizmann was lost when Brandeis became convinced that, fundamentally, the former was opposed to the plan of bringing in such leaders as Lord Reading and Lord Samuel.

Brandeis, more remote, emotionally and socially from the mass of Jews than was Weizmann, ignored some political realities. He announced the beginning of a new phase demanding expert techniques and the application of strict business principles to the whole question of Palestine's economic development. Finally he displayed his Reform Plan. This proposed a body invested

with plenary powers, for three years at least, backed by principally American, Jewish capital and capable of planning systematically and thoroughly. Brandeis also deplored centralization in the political field. He proposed that every national Zionist body should have full autonomy within its own country, linked together only by a loose federation — a tendency which gave the impression that he did not regard the World Zionist Executive as the seat of supreme authority.

All this, of course, was a direct challenge to Weizmann's ideas, policy and leadership. In the first place, Weizmann, much closer to the Eastern European Jewish community, had a far better grasp of mass feeling than Brandeis. Also Weizmann was deeply intolerant of other leaders. He saw no reason why his — hitherto eminently successful — leadership of World Zionism should now be dissipated among a variety of national bodies each, presumably, demanding an equal share in every decision. Moreover, objectively, Weizmann saw Brandeis' approach as a danger to the central principles of Zionism, namely the building of the Jewish Commonwealth through the concerted efforts of the entire people. The Jewish sense of solidarity was the essence of national feeling and this spirit must be fostered — not jeopardised by separate bodies based on country of residence. The Jews must redeem their national home by national instruments — and international funds. Weizmann laid special emphasis on the need for a Jewish fund such as the Keren Hayesod, rather than private capital investments. That fund must be handled by the representative body of the whole Jewish people — the Zionist Organization. Its powers and status should not be diminished, but rather enhanced. Above all, the great design of the restoration of the Jews to their homeland must not be allowed to decline into philanthropy or purely economic activity.

Organizationally, Weizmann proposed an Economic Council without jurisdiction in Zionist political affairs, i.e. without membership in the World Zionist Organization.

As to the financial question, something new was called for. The funds of the Jewish Colonial Trust, were neither sufficient

for colonization nor intended for that purpose. The meagre resources of the J.N.F. were wholly earmarked for land redemption. A new appeal was required and, in existing circumstances, that appeal would have to be addressed primarily to American Jewry.

Various possibilities were discussed in the inner circles of the Executive, the most insistent being the proposal of the Russian Jews, based on the Biblical principle of the "ma'aser" (tithe), that one-tenth of every Jew's personal income be given as voluntary taxation for the national Home. This was wildly unrealistic and the Brandeis group were not the only ones to hesitate. Nevertheless, on a wave of enthusiastic rhetoric from the platform, the "Keren Hayesod" was born as a fund for immigration and colonization amounting to no less than $100 million (£25m.), made up partly of personal investments and partly of donations.

It was perfectly plain to the Americans that a mixture of investments and donations would be unworkable and I pleaded with Justice Brandeis to oppose this untenable proposition in public at the Conference. However, instead of putting up a vigorous opposition and having the program amended before the Conference committed itself, Brandeis chose to ignore the whole question, and the resolution adopting the Keren Hayesod proposal was adopted by the World Zionist Conference, almost by default.

Its charter was immediately worked out — although most of the clauses never took effect. Nevertheless an appeal for immediate funds had been made and Weizmann plunged into the task of raising them, brushing aside all obstacles and — as I found out a short while later — undertaking to persuade all dissidents!

The London Conference ended on a disappointing note of dissension. The gap between the Weizmann and Brandeis groups seemed so complete that a split in the movement seemed inevitable. Brandeis was quite convinced that he must build up an American Zionist Organization to take on, as it were all by itself, the heavy task of building up Palestine's economy.

CHAPTER XVII

THE CHAMINOIS VISIT WITH WEIZMANN AND THE CLEVELAND CONVENTION

Late in August 1920, I left the London Conference to join my wife and children who were on vacation in Lausanne, Switzerland. Our intention had been to go on immediately to Palestine but, soon after I arrived, an invitation came from Dr. Weizmann asking me to meet him at Chaminois, France, where he was on a short holiday. My visit with him on August 30th and 31st 1920, was interspersed with numerous conversations which really laid the foundation for the beginning of the Keren Hayesod Campaign in America the following year. During that short interval, I learned to appreciate the extraordinary powers of persuasion of Dr. Weizmann, for he soon convinced me that the essential need was to consolidate and unify the World Zionist Organization as a necessary preliminary to constructive colonization in a Jewish Palestine. I decided then and there to postpone my Palestine journey and to return to America to help launch the campaign for the Keren Hayesod. In a letter which he had prepared and which he wanted me to take with me to the United States, Weizmann had lucidly and logically formulated the issue as the supremacy of the World Zionist Organization against independent American Zionist action. I must confess I fell under the spell of his eloquence and joined him in what became a veritable Zionist revolution.

The followers of Brandeis had in any case laid themselves open to serious attack, since the London Conference had sanctioned the organization of the Keren Hayesod as a sort of hybrid donation and investment fund. Weizmann was determined that

the resolution should not remain a dead letter, whereas I was committed to putting it into effect, although I sincerely believed that the elimination of the investment clause in the Keren Hayesod was essential. It seemed all the more confusing, because Brandeis emphasized the economic problems of Palestine, while Weizmann, pledged to the supremacy of the World Zionist Organization as a political movement, insisted upon the importance of practical work for Palestine colonization.

From London, where the Keren Hayesod had been founded, an appeal was issued to world Jewry, with the scale of giving set at an unprecedented level. The appeal aroused great excitement among the Jewish communities throughout the world, but the funds raised were always inadequate and Weizmann had to spend much of his time and energy on fund-raising and propaganda.

In America, the campaign was begun with the help of Dr. Schmaryahu Levin who decided to embark on it even without the approval of Brandeis and the American Zionist leadership. Brandeis still felt that the campaign should have the consent of the Zionist Organization of America but, in his calculations, he left out Weizmann's tremendous personal popularity.

And so began that famous struggle which terminated at the Cleveland Zionist Convention in June, 1921. It is difficult at this date to convey the sense of urgency and spirit of dedication which animated the participants in the political struggle within American Zionism. Together with the "Pittsburgh Program" and the later "Baltimore Platform", Cleveland takes its name with Basle, London and Vienna as crucial place names in the development of Zionism. The whole Zionist movement was involved. Dr. Weizmann came to America accompanied by Ussishkin to join Dr. Schmaryahu Levin. The Weizmann forces now sought to win not only the enrolled Zionists, but the Jewish masses, who with the end of World War I, were slowly coming to appreciate the real significance of the Balfour Declaration.

I had been appointed as a Judge in the City Magistrate's

Court in New York, early in 1921 and, as I was on excellent terms with the Mayor of the City, I persuaded him to honor the President of the World Zionist Organization, by offering the "keys to the city of New York" to Dr. Weizmann when he landed in the spring of that year. As he was accompanied by Professor Albert Einstein, who was only then coming slowly into the public eye, I suggested a double honor for both the two distinguished visitors.

When the City Council had to approve the resolution, one Alderman, representing the rich and sophisticated district that includes Fifth and Park Avenues, stated that he was willing to vote to honor the President of the World Zionist Organization, but "who is Einstein?" asked the cultured gentleman from the Republican "silk stocking" district? At once the New York newspapers took up the question and before long the poor fellow had to retire from public life, while "Weizmann and Einstein" became a sure Zionist slogan.

When Weizmann arrived, he was greeted by the largest mass demonstration ever held in New York. He had arrived at a moment (spring, 1921) when he appeared as the image of Jewish hope. At an impressive ceremony at New York City Hall, I was careful to keep my remarks as Chairman of the Reception Committee, free from any criticism of the American Zionist Administration, for I still firmly believed in a peaceful reconciliation. I ended by saying that "Dr. Weizmann comes here on a practical mission to enlist the moral and financial support of the Jews of America in a cause which means the redemption of the prophecies contained in the Book of Books. As proof of the world interest in the message which Dr. Weizmann brings, we have the privilege to welcome his associate, the world renowned scientist, Professor Albert Einstein, who comes here especially in the interest of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem".

I was not the only one trying to bring about a reconciliation between Weizmann and Brandeis, but it was no easy task. A few weeks before the Cleveland Convention, a meeting was called at the Hebrew Girls' Trade School, attended by Samuel Untermyer

and with myself in the chair. Weizmann rose to deliver an impassioned speech which, inevitably, touched on the clash between American Zionism and the World Zionist Organization. Carried away by his own eloquence, Weizmann cried, "There is no bridge between Pinsk and Washington!" Such a bombshell was hardly calculated to improve relations, and as he returned to his seat on the platform, I asked him in dismay, "What is this? What can we do now?" Weizmann was quite unmoved. "It's a good phrase anyway," he said calmly.

It was too good. The words became famous, so much being written about them that their original meaning was magnified out of all proportion.

Much has been written too about the Cleveland Zionist Convention of June, 1921. It was indeed a battle of giants. On the platform sat Dr. Weizmann, Dr. Schmaryahu Levin and Menachem Ussishkin — silent, because they were not delegates, but nevertheless, serving as a reminder that in their persons, they represented the unity and welfare of the World Zionist Organization. Presiding at the opening of the convention was Judge Julian W. Mack, whom everyone respected for his selfless devotion to the cause which he embraced so warmly late in life. As champions of the absent Judge Brandeis — whose spiritual presence was nevertheless deeply felt — there were Professor Felix Frankfurter (later Justice of the United States Supreme Court), the mighty voice of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, backed by Rabbi Hillel Silver and Jacob de Haas. Against this formidable phalanx, the initial attack on the policy of the administration was left to the "Young Turks" led by Abe Goldberg, Louis Lipsky, Emanuel Neumann, Morris Rothenberg and myself: I was perhaps at fault when I interrupted Dr. Wise, as he sought to nominate Judge Mack as permanent Chairman of the Convention. Quick as a flash he turned on me, as fully reported in the New York Times the very next morning, — with "Do you think this is a Tammany Courthouse?" There was a pause in the hushed convention until my retort: "No, Dr. Wise, neither is this a Free Synagogue". Years later, when we met in a joint speaking

engagement in upstate New York, Dr. Wise told me that he had forgiven me, for, he confessed, this was the only time he had been effectively answered.

Early the next morning, I received a telephone call from Samuel Untermyer's home at Greystone, New York, in which he read to me the whole episode from the first page of the New York Times. Untermyer had vainly tried to mediate as a peace-maker between Weizmann and Brandeis, as part of a concerted effort before the convention, during which I had acted as Dr. Weizmann's personal representative. Now that our peace-making endeavors had failed, I appealed to him to accept the Chairmanship of the Keren Hayesod, in order to save the fund, which was so essential for Jewish colonization in Palestine. He agreed and promised to send a telegram to the Convention to that effect — which reached us the same afternoon, just as the old administration — Justice Brandeis, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Prof. Felix Frankfurter, Dr. Stephen Wise, Julian Mack, Jacob de Haas, Robert Szold and others — were resigning in protest.

Even today, as one reads the speeches deliverd at that epoch-making meeting, the fierce spirit of partisanship is so mixed with whole-hearted devotion to the cause, that no one can minimize the crisis. But it was a sad moment when the great leaders left and we were reduced to a group of young men "from the East Side", fortunately now with the newly-added name of Samuel Untermyer.

Perhaps this is the place to offer a tribute to that great lawyer who entered our ranks at a crucial moment just when we needed an outstanding name. He was the senior member of the famous law firm of Guggenheimer, Untermyer and Marshall, the last member being the recognized lay leader of American Jewry. Nearly five years earlier, I had sent my book "The Social Commonwealth" to Samuel Untermyer for comment. The book had been favorably reviewed on the first page of the Sunday Book Section of the New York Times and, more important, in the Political Science Quarterly of March 1915, from which it may be permissible to quote in Annex 3. See also Annex 3a.

However, I had never discussed Zionism with him until Weizmann proposed to visit the United States. Then I felt that we required the support of all forces in launching the Keren Hayesod on behalf of the World Zionist Organization. One of the letters from Dr. Weizmann that I treasure, because it was from London in his own handwriting under date of December 11, 1920, reads as follows:

16. Addison Crescent
W.14

11/XII/20

My dear Rosenblatt,

Very many thanks for your kind note and for sending me the letter of introduction to Mr. Untermyer. I am leaving here on the 27th and shall be sailing from Rotterdam on the 4th of January. It is a fateful journey and I hope that it may prove useful. I am not very happy about the outcome of the Convention. With kind regards to both of you from both of us

Yours sincerely
Ch. Weizmann

This led to a meeting with Mr. Untermyer and his efforts as a mediator for peace between the World Zionist Organization and the American branch. After the Cleveland Convention made it only too plain that our efforts had failed, Samuel Untermyer served as President of the Keren Hayesod in the early fateful years until it became firmly established in American Jewish life.

At that moment, it seemed that the result of the Cleveland

Convention had been a fatal disruption of the movement. Four decades later, we can now see that the conflict at Cleveland between those who wanted a unified Zionist Organization, and those who offered American cooperation on a country to country basis was inevitable. But in the process, remarkable as it seems, "East Europeans" became the political Zionists, while the Herzlian Zionists, led by Justice Brandeis, concentrated on practical work, fostering the Palestine Development Council, which culminated later in the very effective work of the "Palestine Economic Corporation". The whole struggle was perhaps beneficial, for it dramatized Zionism as an important issue in American Jewish life, and helped to make Zionism the major factor in World Jewry.

Since both sides were equally devoted to the Zionist cause, the process of healing commenced almost at once; the very need to pick up what looked like the pieces of a total wreck forcing us to face the many difficulties with resolution.

Almost at once word came from Boston that the old-time New England Zionist leader, Elihu D. Stone, a lawyer prominent in the Massachusetts Republican Party, was negotiating with the powerful Senator Henry Cabot Lodge to secure a U.S. government endorsement of Great Britain's assumption of the Palestine Mandate with the pledge of a "National Home" for the Jewish people in Palestine. When I left in February 1922 to take my place as the first American member of the World Zionist Executive to which I was elected by the World Zionist Congress held at Carlsbad in August 1921, Stone was already making substantial progress in his talks with Senator Lodge and in New York we were lining up support for the move in Congress.

Soon after my arrival in Jerusalem, we received the gratifying news that the House of Representatives and the United States Senate had, by *unanimous vote* in both houses, passed the Lodge-Fish resolution endorsing the program for a "Jewish National Home." The fact that not a single dissenting voice was raised in the United States Congress was particularly gratifying, for it meant that the muted opposition even in the ranks of Reform Judaism had been overcome. The Zionist Organization had been made the

protagonist advancing *American* policy in the Near East. From Jerusalem, I cabled Senator Lodge a vote of thanks on behalf of the Yishuv, or Jewish settlement. Stone later told me of the pride with which Senator Lodge displayed the "cable from Jerusalem," expressing his appreciation in unmistakable terms. The architect of this inspiring resolution, Elihu Stone, must never be forgotten.

This is perhaps the place to record a curious fact about the three great personalities of the two decades after the Balfour Declaration — Nordau, Brandeis and Jabotinsky. While the three were agreed in demanding a maximum Zionist program, they never saw eye to eye on the methods by which that end should be achieved. I remember how Nordau pleaded at the London Zionist Conference in 1920, for a program of maximum immigration ("bring in 100,000 Jews into Palestine" even with the threat of starvation) to safeguard the Balfour Declaration. His argument was dismissed as the fantasy of an old man who did not understand the facts of life. Brandeis, the careful economist, insisted that you must first prepare the land — at least get rid of malaria (which to East European Jews was "no sickness") — before dumping innocent people into a derelict land. On the other hand, Brandeis' legal training made him insist on keeping Great Britain to her promise to "encourage Jewish immigration" and "close settlement" on the land. He seems never to have shown any sympathy for the extreme demands of Jabotinsky for a Jewish state "on both sides of the Jordan." Brandeis — like Jabotinsky — was opposed to any question of "partition" of Palestine, and would never hear of any compromise which would relieve Great Britain of her commitments and (perhaps because of his sincere admiration for British law and Anglo-Saxon justice) would never join Jabotinsky in his demand for a "Jewish majority without delay" in Palestine. In November 1921, before I left to take my place on the World Zionist Executive, I felt that I should not go to my seat in Jerusalem without calling upon Justice Brandeis in Washington. He received me cordially in his home on Connecticut Avenue despite the fact that my speech at the Cleveland Convention

five months before had been the opening address of the opposition to his leadership.

I came to him for advice on how to conduct myself on some pending issues, in which Ussishkin, as Chairman of the Palestine part of the Executive, had undertaken a definite stand — insisting that Jerusalem, instead of Tel Aviv, should be the seat of the Zionist Executive. I was somewhat discouraged over such initial disputes, and after some discussion permitted myself a pessimistic observation: "God only knows whether we shall ever live to see the Jewish State?" I was sitting near him, and quick as a flash he extended his arm to my shoulder, and like an ancient Prophet, solemnly said: "I won't live to see it, but you will — there is 30 years difference between us". As I left him, these words reminded me of the symbolic words of Herzl in his diary, prophecying in 1897: "A Jewish State in 50 Years".

When I arrived in Jerusalem, in February 1922, I remember a conversation with Ussishkin at his home in which he said that he had come to settle in Palestine, while Weizmann remained in London (implying thereby that he was the better Zionist). I cound not resist replying, "After all, changing from Ekaterinoslav to Jerusalem is hardly the same as transferring from London to Rehovoth!" At which we both laughed! The observation could equally be applied to criticisms from Eastern European or Moroccan Jews of the scant American Aliyah today!

To come to Jerusalem to join the World Zionist Executive was particularly satisfying to me. Years earlier, at the Baltimore Zionist Convention in the summer of 1917 (before the Balfour Declaration) I had sparked off a lengthy debate with a proposed resolution that the Zionist headquarters be moved from London to Jerusalem. In this I was strongly supported by Henrietta Szold but opposed by the majority of my fellow members of the American Zionist Executive. They pleaded that London must remain the centre of the Zionist Executive because of its political importance and also, because Dr. Weizmann, the chairman, had to spend so much time travelling in Europe and even in America. To this I replied that Jerusalem was just as good a place from

which to be absent as London, which brought a laugh, although the vote (for the time being) went against me.

While en route from Jerusalem to New York, in June 1922, I stopped in London to attend an important meeting of the World Zionist Executive. There, we were confronted with the fateful "White Paper" prepared by Sir Winston Churchill, as Colonial Secretary, for our immediate acceptance. The White Paper explained the decision to set up the territory of Transjordan as a separate Arab kingdom from which Jewish immigration and development were "temporarily" excluded, by their declared opinion that it would take the Jews twenty-five years before they could develop the territory west of the Jordan and, in the meanwhile, the present action would allay Arab fears and decrease animosity.

The Executive was naturally apprehensive over this "whittling away" process of the Mandate obligations, and it was only our faith in Churchill, as a true friend of the Zionist cause, that after a few days of debate, prompted us to accept this amputation of Palestine, which later resulted in the establishment of the State of Jordan.

The most surprising fact was that this acceptance, limiting the Jewish National Home, was unanimously adopted by the Executive, including the written assent of Vladimir Jabotinsky, who was later so violent in his opposition to the constant yielding of our rights under British pressure. Like the rest of us, Jabotinsky was ready to exchange the barren rights over Transjordan, where no Jews were settled, for the explicit obligation on the part of the Mandatory.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SEPARATION OF TRANSJORDAN — PALESTINE'S "ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY"

June 1922 saw the vision of the Jewish state severely shaken by the outcome of Britain's first deliberate attempt to reach a balance between Jewish and Arab claims to Palestine. King Feisal had been enthroned in Iraq in March 1921 and the then British Colonial Secretary, Winston Churchill, had decided to establish a separate Arab state in Transjordan under King Abdullah. Then, to appease the Arabs after the riots of May 1921, Sir Herbert Samuel made a speech in which he interpreted the Balfour Declaration in a distinctly limited sense. Jewish immigration was temporarily halted. Altogether the British seemed to be bowing before a growing storm of Arab and anti-Zionist agitation over her Mandate. Various safeguards were established to dispel Arab fears of being displaced by the incoming Jews, after which the British government were better placed to defend their Mandate against a hostile public opinion. Their policy, they could claim, did not imply any Arab displacement nor any concessions to the Jews such as giving them a say in the government of Palestine.

The situation — the correspondence with the Arab Executive and the Zionist Organization plus Churchill's Statement of Policy — was summed up in the White Paper of June 22, 1922. The Jews it declared, could not impose their nationality on non-Jews in Palestine and could only be entrusted with their own internal affairs. Nevertheless, there was some comfort here for Zionists. At least they had the assurance that Jews were in Palestine "as of right and not on sufferance." Both Arab and Jewish communities, it was hoped, would develop their own individual

national and cultural life without impinging on the other. The British saw the situation as representing a contest between right and right; not between right and wrong. This was a concept designed to appeal to liberal opinion. So was another, far more dubious proposition — that of "the economic absorptive capacity of the country" as the criterion by which to determine future Jewish immigration.

Later, when Justice Brandeis learned about our acceptance, he was much disturbed. He correctly pointed out that while we might have been compelled to accept something *imposed* upon us, we had no right to put our signature to a paper that reduced the Mandatory obligation of Great Britain, since Palestine, as envisaged in the Mandate, constituted a territory on both sides of the Jordan. How accurately Justice Brandeis assessed the problem was evident only later when the Mandatory power began to restrict immigration into Palestine. We had been expressly assured that Jewish immigration into the territory west of the Jordan was to be "facilitated" on the basis of the "economic absorptive capacity" of the country.

Almost immediately after our signature "temporarily" excluding Transjordan, there commenced the long debate with the Colonial Office (Winston Churchill having left that post in a Cabinet re-shuffle) about the meaning of those three crucial words. The essential word "economic" was soon dropped by the Colonial Office, giving the formula a political connotation, in which Arab objection to Jewish immigration could be used as an argument against "absorptive capacity." Indeed the Labor Government insisted on a formula which vitiated the whole agreement. Perhaps this can best be understood from the following excerpt from an article on immigration which I wrote much later for the Palestine (Jerusalem) Post, (subsequently reproduced in part in the "Jewish Frontier" of October 1943) as follows:

> Indeed, the very first article in the Mandate of Palestine provides that "the Mandatory shall have full powers of

legislation and of administration, save as they may be limited by the terms of this Mandate." This is nothing more than a legal statement that the Mandate is the fundamental law or constitution of Palestine. Accordingly, at the 14th meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, held in Geneva on June 16, 1939, the British Government felt impelled to justify the White Paper of the preceding month, and Malcolm MacDonald, as Colonial Secretary, personally appeared before the Mandates Commission and admitted "that the League of Nations had the last word" in interpreting the validity of the White Paper. A few days later, this Mandates Commission, sitting as a reviewing Board, held by majority vote that they did not feel able to state that the policy of the White Paper was in conformity with the Mandate. That is the present status of the White Paper, purporting to restrict Jewish immigration and settlement in Palestine — a regulation which stands nullified by the action of the League of Nations, which originally conferred the Mandate upon Great Britain as trustee over Palestine. Under the well-established principles of Anglo-Saxon legal procedure, such a White Paper, when disapproved by the High Tribunal of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, should have no more legal force than a law passed by one of our forty-eight states but declared null and void by the United States Supreme Court, as in contravention of the Constitution of the United States. Nor can the situation be remedied by any action of the British Parliament, for Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons on May 23, 1939, upon this very issue, stated that the White Paper constituted 'plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration, the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in five years' time by the decision of an Arab majority'. He went on to state that: "Long before those five years are past either there will be a Britain which knows how to keep its word on the Balfour Declaration and is not afraid to do so, or, believe me, we shall find ourselves relieved of many overseas responsibilities other than those comprised within the Palestine Mandate."

Any unbiased tribunal must regard the White Paper as a unilateral attempt to modify the obligation which the Mandatory Power assumed when it became the trustee over Palestine. Nor does the failure of the League of Nations to enforce its decisions because of wartime contingencies justify

a violation of the Mandatory trust. The mere fact that there is no sheriff strong enough to enforce a Court's decree does not make the violation of a trustee's duty excusable under the laws of England and America. Nor does it entitle the British Colonial Office to act both as advocate and interpreter of its obligation as trustee, in violation of a judgment, still standing, of the League of Nations Mandates Commission. It is repugnant to all principles of justice and Anglo-Saxon legal traditions for the British Colonial Office to act as judge in its own case.

THE JEWISH AGENCY

As well as giving Great Britain political responsibility for Palestine, the Mandate also granted the right of representation of the Jewish people in everything related to the Jewish National Home, to the Zionist Organization. Under a subordinate clause, the Zionist Organization was empowered to obtain the cooperation of non-Zionists. From this clause, the idea of a "Jewish Agency," representing every one of the various Jewish groupings, and mobilizing all Jewish forces for the upbuilding of Palestine, was born.

Weizmann who had always conceived of the Palestine enterprise as an undertaking of the entire Jewish people, not merely of one party within Jewry, was a passionate advocate of the formation of such an overall Jewish Agency and bent all his energies to the task of getting it organized. His aim was to win the support of philanthropists and assimilationists, including previously anti-Zionist Reform rabbis. A new trend developed which helped Weizmann to push ahead with his plans. He found a true friend in Louis Marshall, Chairman of the American Jewish Committee, who, up till then, had not been affiliated with the Zionist organization, although he was deeply involved in Jewish communal affairs. Without his unwavering support and help, Weizmann would probably never have succeeded in winning non-Zionist cooperation for the enlarged Jewish Agency.

Nevertheless, things at first moved very slowly, particularly in the U.S., where the American Jewish Committee (the key-stone in the arch of the proposed Jewish Agency) was preoccupied with various Jewish problems, in spite of all the efforts of Louis Marshall, the chairman, to implement the decision to set up the enlarged Agency. I recall a conversation in the office of Samuel Untermyer, after he became chairman of the American Keren Hayesod, in which I pointed out that we were lagging behind in getting the Jewish Agency organized.

Untermyer called for his partner, Louis Marshall who was a great figure in American Jewish life.

"Ben, here," he said, "tells me you are moving too slowly in this Agency business." Of course, Marshall answered, explaining the difficulties involved in getting agreement from the different groups concerned, which ranged from Bnei Brith to the Radical Socialists. I had to agree and to sympathize with his predicament. Nevertheless, it took us a full half decade, up to the summer of 1929, before the enlarged Jewish Agency was finally launched at the Zionist Congress held at Zurich.

CHAPTER XIX

THE TEL AVIV BOND ISSUE

The four months I spent in Palestine in the spring of 1922, were devoted largely to a plan I had suggested to Mayor Meir Dizengoff of Tel Aviv for a bond issue to be floated in the United States as the first Jewish Municipal Bond in history. Accordingly, when I returned to New York following the London meeting of the Zionist Executive, I was immediately involved in organizing the sale of the Tel Aviv bonds.

This story can best be told in excerpts from an article in the American Zionist written many years later, but referring to the program for the year 1922.

> In that year, I was serving in Jerusalem as the first American representative on the World Zionist Executive (having been elected at the Carlsbad Zionist Congress the preceding summer), when it occurred to me that the "Township of Tel Aviv" (to give it the official name under the Palestine Mandate) was badly in need of a water supply and sewage system, besides extra streets for the growing town of some 12,000 people. Accordingly, I proposed to Mayor Dizengoff that a loan of 75,000 Pounds Sterling might be procured in the United States, with the help of the Zionist Organization of America, provided the proper Palestine authorities would approve the plan.
>
> "It was easy enough to secure the support of the Council of Tel Aviv, but a municipal loan required also the consent of the British Mandatory Power, which was finally obtained through the good work of Harry Sacher, as the advocate, and the invaluable support of Norman Bentwich, the Attorney General. When the then High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, finally sanctioned the proposed bond issue, I was

invited for a dinner at the home of Mayor Dizengoff (in the premises now immortalized as the Tel Aviv Museum, which was the house where the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel was proclaimed in 1948). When I arrived at the Dizengoff home, I found that my fellow guests at dinner were to be Golinkin of Hebrew Opera fame, and the great figure of Pinchas Rutenberg, the father of Palestine electric power. Mrs. Zena Dizengoff was in the kitchen, evidently preparing the meal, when Dizengoff called out, "Come here, Zena, I want to introduce you to three "Meshugoyim" — and then he presented us to his wife as follows: "Here is a man who thinks he can give us opera in Hebrew, another who believes he can give us electricity, and finally, a third who hopes to bring us a loan from New York." That all three ventures succeeded is a measure of the "madness" which helped to build Tel Aviv and the State of Israel.

Now that I had the permission to obtain a loan for Tel Aviv, Menachem M. Ussishkin, the renowned chairman of our Palestine Zionist Executive, wished me luck. After our attendance at the Zionist Conference in London, I found myself in New York, in the summer of 1922, knocking at the doors of various banking houses in Wall Street. I naturally first called at the offices of the famous banking house of Lehman Bros., where Herbert Lehman — later Governor of New York and U.S. Senator — explained to me that it was hardly possible for their firm to underwrite the issue, because they did not deal with municipal bonds. But he graciously recommended me to the well-known banking house of White, Weld & Co., which specialized in municipal and government bonds.

Accordingly, I wended my way through Wall Street, for an interesting discussion with a representative of White, Weld & Co. at their offices. I stressed not only the soundness and financial strength of this small city of 12,000 inhabitants, but also the good will that the banking house might win among Jewish clients who would be pleased to see such an undertaking.

My argument was well received, and I was elated when told that they would give it careful consideration, and that

I should return "after the weekend" for a final decision. But when I appeared the following Monday, a leading member of the firm met me with a disconcerting look. I then listened to their explanation of the change in front. Of course, they believed my statements, because I came well recommended, and they felt confident that the representations made by me were correct, yet they still could not sponsor the issue, for "how can we put out a municipal issue of a city that does not appear on any standard map?" I had to agree that their reputation was too good to be involved in a bond issue of a town that could not be found on the map!

There was nothing left for me to do but to "peddle" the issue, with the sponsorship of a second-rate banking house that would not underwrite it, leaving the whole job of salesmanship upon my shoulders. Fortunately, the Zionist Organization of America valiantly supported me, and I must single out for special praise my old comrade-in-arms, the well-known Zionist and journalist, the late Abraham Goldberg, who travelled with me all the way to Florida and Louisiana and back to New York before one-half of the bonds were finally disposed of.

In the meanwhile, the Order of Bnei Zion had purchased £1,000 of the bonds, which encouraged me to appeal once more to Herbert Lehman in the hope that the Joint Distribution Committee, of which he was a prominent member, might invest some of its "Reconstruction Funds" in bonds of the Township of Tel Aviv. I appeared before the Committee, which met at the house of Col. Lehman, and repeated all the arguments in favor of Tel Aviv, only to be told, as Lehman had previously warned me, that the Committee could not approve bonds that really had no market, "were not liquid", etc. As I left the room, crestfallen, Col. Lehman followed me to the door, and said: "You haven't convinced the Committee, but you have convinced me. What is your largest bondholder to date?" When I told him £1,000, he said: "Alright, I will take £1,500." And Senator Lehman remained the largest Tel Aviv bondholder until the State Bank of New York took the balance of the issue later. Perhaps,

it is only due to that great American to quote from his letter to me of February 24, 1923 as follows:

> "I know that even a cultural and spiritual structure of any size is impracticable in Palestine unless it is made possible for those who live and work there to earn a decent living and to bring up their families according to fair standards. In the past, efforts of the Zionist Organization (and others interested in the development of Palestine) have been largely directed along the line of subventions or alms-giving. Palestine, on account of the necessities of the case, has been given artificial stimulation. Your proposal to place in this country and elsewhere an issue of bonds of the City of Tel Aviv is, I believe, a step in the right direction. The Municipality is assuming, as I understand it, a definite obligation and responsibility. It is not accepting a gift, but undertaking a financial obligation which can be met only through industry, effort and sound business practices. If Palestine is to grow in any direction, it must evolve its strength from within, not from the temporary and enervating stimulus of foreign charity, no matter how well intentioned or disinterested this may be.
>
> "I believe, therefore, that the sale of bonds, indicating the assumption of financial responsibility by the community, is definitely a step in the right direction and accordingly calls for my sympathetic support. I am very glad indeed to subscribe for £1,500 (par value) of the bonds of Tel Aviv which will presently be issued."

Meanwhile Abe Goldberg travelled with me, delivering speeches before ZOA districts in various cities — he speaking in Yiddish, while I spoke in English — all the way to Miami, then across to New Orleans and up to Chattanooga and back to New York. By the time we returned there was still about one-half of the issue unsold, but we had witnessed a number of incidents which are worthy of recording in the financial history of Tel Aviv.

At the meeting held in the Zionist headquarters in the City of New Orleans, I was advised to direct my remarks particularly to a successful merchant, who, in the few years since he immigrated to this country had accumulated quite a fortune, and was a good prospect for Tel Aviv bonds, as he was a convinced Zionist. I

flattered myself that I had made a good presentation of the case when I was jolted by his remark that he would not invest because, as he put it, if the financial status of Tel Aviv was so good, there was no necessity for me to travel 2,000 miles to New Orleans — it should all have been subscribed in New York! In short, the case I had made out for Tel Aviv was too strong!

In Chattanooga, the meeting was held in the local synagogue where the most important Zionist, Louis Wiener, was present. The small audience listened carefully to what I had to say about Tel Aviv and its financial stability. Wiener agreed to make an investment in bonds but only if I personally guaranteed the interest payments. I felt so flattered to be the endorser of Tel Aviv bonds, that I then and there wrote out a guarantee, good for a period of five years, in which I undertook to pay in the event of any default, the 6½% interest due semi-annually from Tel Aviv.

And so we returned to New York with about half the bonds still to be sold, when the final miracle happened. I received information that the State Bank (now merged with the Manufacturers Trust Co.) located on Grand Street, on the lower East Side of New York, in a thickly-settled Jewish district, might be interested in investing in Tel Aviv Bonds, as an indication of its friendly relationship with its Jewish depositors. I visited the State Bank and had a talk with the President, who finally agreed to take the entire balance of some £32,000 at a discount of 3%, provided I would agree to resell the same, if required by the State Bank, after a period of two or three years. It was a rather difficult undertaking on my part, so I was given a whole year's time to "peddle" the issue again to the public, if the State Bank should make such a demand. But time passed and when I later called on the State Bank to relieve me of the obligation to resell, they gladly did so, having ascertained that the Tel Aviv bonds had been classified by the Superintendent of Banks in the highest category, or A.1. — since all the interest payments had been promptly met by the City of Tel Aviv.

But in the year I was so fully occupied in selling the Tel Aviv bonds, the population of that little city had surged forward from 12,000 to over 30,000, as most Jews had abandoned Arab Jaffa and the numbers of Jews in the country had been swelled by immigration. When the economic depression later struck America in 1929, the Tel Aviv Bonds were among the very few that continued to pay interest and redemption of the principal.

It is worth recording that some £5,000 of the proceeds from the Bonds were allocated for the construction of a jetty near the Yarkon. This was the beginning of a harbor for Tel Aviv which, after the 1936 Arab riots became necessary for security reasons. But the rapidly growing city required all the money from the bonds for the extension of newly-opened streets and an electric company (see Pinchas Rutenberg's letter to me, Annex 4), so that the port had to be postponed to a later day.

It was after all the bonds had been sold that I invited Mayor Dizengoff to come to New York to receive the funds and to be entertained by the Zionist Organization of America and by the Mayor of New York City.

Many years later, incidentally, a substantial part of this Tel Aviv Bond issue — including bonds held by Senator Lehman — was resold at a premium, in Egypt through the efforts of Emanuel Neumann and his Ifico Company which he organized in Tel Aviv.

The whole bond issue was fully redeemed in 1943 and its history formed an invaluable precedent for the greater success of the Israel Government Bond issue, in the next decade after the State of Israel was established.

CHAPTER XX

THE BEGINNING OF THE KEREN HAYESOD

While I was travelling in the south, busily engaged in disposing of the Tel Aviv bonds, I received a telegram from Emanuel Neumann urging me to accept the chairmanship of the Keren Hayesod, of which he was then serving as the highly efficient Secretary and Executive Director.

At this time, the Keren Hayesod was still a "neutral" body, and many prominent Jews and Jewish organizations, not officially affiliated to Zionism, were cooperating in the fund raising campaigns. The exponents of the Keren Hayesod had developed the idea that the fund was a meeting ground for all Jews to work together for non-political purposes while each group retained its own views and its own freedom of action in local Jewish life. Without any doubt, the fund helped to pave the way for the collaboration of all groups in the Jewish Agency.

The story of the Keren Hayesod in America goes back to the preceding year, when Dr. Weizmann came over with Professor Albert Einstein. The campaign had opened in the spring of 1921, even before the fateful break at the Cleveland Zionist Convention. Indeed the central cause of that break was the launching of the Keren Hayesod without the consent of the Executive Committee of the American Zionist Organization. The campaign was conducted under the auspices of the World Zionist Organization, in the city of Philadelphia, where the Jewish newspaper "The World" and its staunch editor, S. Ginsberg, gave us unstinted support.

I recall going down to Philadelphia with Dr. Weizmann for this crucial event. On our train trip, I pointed out the absolute necessity for creating an institution that could finance mortgages

particularly in Tel Aviv, where I was surprised to learn that practically all the buildings were held free and clear since there was no bank to finance mortgage loans. This, of course, hindered the development of trade and industry, since it tied up so much capital that might otherwise have been available as a liquid fund, through the financing of mortgage loans. With the keen insight that Dr. Weizmann always displayed, he immediately responded to the challenge with a statement: "If we can raise $50,000 at the Philadelphia meeting, I shall "steal" that for a mortgage bank." Fortunately, the response in Philadelphia was so successful that we raised something beyond the required $50,000. True to Dr. Weizmann's word, this was the beginning of the "General Mortgage Bank of Palestine" which later played such an important role in the growth and development of the country.

On another occasion during this tour, I remember presiding over a big Keren Hayesod meeting in New York at which Dr. Weizmann delivered an extraordinarily effective speech. Schmaryahu Levin was sitting by my side on the platform. In those days it was Schmaryahu Levin who was the "main speaker" and I had, as usual, kept him for last. This time, as Dr. Weizmann finished his impassioned appeal which brought the house down, and returned to his seat next to us, I heard Dr. Levin say, "Chaimke, du nemst doch avek meine Chaiuneh" ("You're taking the bread out of my mouth!") and they both began to laugh.

A quotation from the American Zionist Magazine, years later will indicate the difficult tasks we had undertaken in the launching of the Keren Hayesod. Dr. Weizmann, referring to the many dinners and banquets, said to me: "I cannot look a grapefruit in the face anymore."

> ...This was only the beginning of the rough time through which the Keren Hayesod had to pass, under the actual day-to-day management of Emanuel Neumann, supported by the new administration set up under the chairmanship of Louis Lipsky. Everywhere in our campaigns for the Keren Hayesod, we encountered strong opposition, not indeed, from the old administration, who remained passive but loyal Zionists — but

from Anti-Zionists and those who deliberately insisted on misrepresenting our cause.

One example of many may be cited in the story of the Keren Hayesod campaign in Boston the following year, where Neumann organized a gathering of a fine campaign committee headed by a successful real estate man, Max Shoolman. I was at that time busily engaged in selling the Bonds of the city of Tel Aviv (the first Palestine Bond issue) as part of my duty as member of the World Zionist Executive. On my way back, in Tennessee, I received a message from Neumann, asking me to accept the chairmanship of the Keren Hayesod campaign for that year. I felt it my duty to accept, and was soon off with Emanuel Neumann for the Boston meeting at the home of Shoolman where we were fortunate in securing his top donation of $5,000.

It was just a few days before Rosh Hashana, and we returned to New York happy with this New Year's gift, which might assure the success of the campaign in Boston. To our surprise and intense disappointment, a few days later, Neumann was notified that Shoolman had decided to withhold his contribution because his Rabbi, Dr. H. Clifton Levy, in his Rosh Hashanah address in the Temple, which Shoolman attended, criticized the whole Zionist movement, including the Keren Hayesod. I thought the only thing to do was for both of us to go to Boston and "beard the lion in his den"; and so I accompanied Neumann to Boston. During the intervening week before Yom Kippur, we were able to meet with Rabbi Levy in his study. We used all our efforts to persuade the Rabbi of the difference between Keren Hayesod, which carried no political obligations, and the Zionist movement itself. We appealed to him to join with us in the practical work, despite our political differences on the matter of the Jewish state. After a friendly argument, the Rabbi agreed to support the Keren Hayesod in the following sermon for Yom Kippur.

The next week we received word that the Rabbi's Yom Kippur sermon had been so effective that Shoolman agreed to double his contribution to $10,000 which set the goal for the whole country.

After that successful campaign of 1922, the Keren Hayesod went from strength to strength until in 1927 it was merged in

the United Palestine Appeal, under the successful chairmanship of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, when the trials and tribulations of the previous half-decade were forgotten.

The letter of Dr. Weizmann of April 12, 1923 and Dr. Ruppin's handwritten note of two days before will indicate the importance attached to this work (see Annex 5—6).

At the same time, the political work to safeguard the Jewish National Home had to continue, as can be seen from the letter of Dr. Weizmann of June 20, 1922, written while I was on my way to New York, after the London Zionist Conference that summer.

Oakwood, 16 Addison Crescent, W.14

20/VI/22

My dear Ben,

As you will be in U.S.A. about the 25th just for the Convention you will no doubt have an excellent opportunity of doing some work just before the Meeting of the League of Nations.

It is most essential:

a) That strong resolutions of urging the ratification of the Mandate should be sent by the L. of N. and if possible other Jewish bodies — 1) to the British Government, particularly the P.M. and Mr. Churchill; 2) to the French Government; 3) Italian Government; 4) to the League Secretariat addressed:

Mr. Rappard, Palais des Nations.

b) A strong resolution of protest against the calumnious attacks on Zionist work in Palestine. A word should be spoken to the Vatican firmly but peacefully expressing the determination of building up Palestine but in reverence to the Christian interests.

c) Orthodox Jewry should say a word and repudiate the treacherous attempts of De Haan and his friends. That must be done in an imposing manner. Get masses *of Rabbis to pass a resolution, send on to the League.*

d) A warm *resolution of thanks must be passed to Earl of*

Balfour asking him to complete the work which he has gloriously begun.

Get masses *of resolutions by other Jewish bodies. Get Goyim to help. This all important.*

CHAIM

Canada should do same. All *on an extensive scale!!*

As is known, the United Palestine Appeal, the American Joint Distribution Committee and the National Refugee Service, eventually merged their fund raising efforts in 1939, to establish the United Jewish Appeal and its funds were utilized for the resettlement of Jews in Israel and elsewhere, and for aid to needy Jews throughout the world. Since its inception, the United Jewish Appeal itself and through its constituent and beneficiary organizations, has helped two and a half million Jewish refugees and victims of war, persecution and poverty. (After the establishment of the State of Israel, it has enabled the Jewish Agency to help a million Jews to immigrate to and settle in Israel).

Organized Jewry in America was thus able, in the last three decades, to maintain close cooperation with the practical work of the Zionist movement.

CHAPTER XXI

THE BEGINNING OF HERZLIA

The story of that thriving settlement north of Tel Aviv begins, as afterwards told in the American Zionist, with a letter from Dr. Arthur Ruppin, dated October 13, 1922, advising me that he was sailing from Europe on the SS Mauretania for New York, adding: "I shall have your most appreciated advice and cooperation at any rate for the whole of November and perhaps longer. It is of the greatest importance for our work in Palestine that by our common endeavorings the interest in America for the purchase of land and for other investments should be stirred up in the strongest manner."

Dr. Ruppin was at that time a fellow member of the Palestine Zionist Executive. Thus the duty fell upon me to guide him in securing the funds necessary for the purchase of "Jelil" (bordering on the Arab village of Sheikh Munis) along the Mediterranean coast, which developed into the future Herzlia. I recall travelling with Dr. Ruppin to Detroit where, with the help of Fred Butzel, we raised the first moneys through the American Zion Commonwealth, which I had organized some years before and which had already established the colony of Balfouria. S. J. Weinstein of New York had succeeded me as President of the American Zion Commonwealth after my election to the World Zionist Executive at the Carlsbad Congress in 1921. Together we were able to convince the President and Board of Directors of the American Zion Commonwealth that the second venture should be the new colony along the Mediterranean coast, through this new land purchase. Then and there we named it Herzlia — so that not only was the first necessary money raised

in America, but even the very name of Herzlia was chosen at our meeting in New York.

Needless to say, we had a long way to go before the colony became a fact. I accompanied Ruppin to many other cities besides Detroit, while the Directors of the American Zion Commonwealth generously risked the initial funds to complete the purchase, subject to a mortgage still to be held by the former Arab owners. It was not until two years later, when visiting my father, who had meanwhile settled in Jerusalem, that we can truly speak of the beginning of Herzlia as a firm settlement. That date, December 17, 1924, stands out vividly in my memory, for I then had the opportunity of accompanying a prominent tourist from Boston, Max Shoolman, on a visit to Herzlia. Shoolman had been a generous contributor while I had served in 1922 as Chairman of the newly-organized American Keren Hayesod to which he gave a donation of $10,000 to start the Boston campaign. I persuaded him to visit the land and see for himself the benefits accruing from his donation. But when he came to Tel Aviv about the middle of December, 1924, he complained that the buildings in Tel Aviv were inferior and would not stand up to long wear and tear as in Boston! (Shoolman had been a carpenter in his youth in Russia and had developed as a highly successful builder and rich real estate owner in Boston.) He threatened to return at once to the U.S.A.

I pleaded with him not to come to any hasty conclusion, offering to take him out to a new settlement where he could advise us how to build properly. So, on December 17, 1924, I accompanied him on a visit to the prospective settlement of Herzlia. There we had tea outside the hut occupied by one of the early settlers in Herzlia, Persitz. As we gazed upon the Mediterranean Sea on a nice, sunny day, Shoolman marvelled and finally exclaimed, "Well, we cannot get this in Boston in mid-December." As we talked, I noticed a man on horseback coming towards us. I pointed to the rider and said, "Mr. Shoolman, would you believe this man, the first settler from America in Herzlia, is a Mr. Levine, the former owner of a tobacco shop

in Chattanooga, Tennessee?" Shoolman was so impressed that he decided to postpone his return trip to America until he could see more of the country and I finally induced him to visit Jerusalem and Haifa.

I mention the story of Shoolman here, because later on he played a vital role in saving Herzlia. Several years after that first visit, he came to Palestine again. At that time Herzlia was faced with a serious problem of how to meet a mortgage payment due to Arab mortgagees. There was no cash in the treasury to meet the payment and the mortgagees were threatening to foreclose. I was visiting Shoolman at the old Herzlia Hotel in Tel Aviv, when Charles Passman, the devoted representative of the American Zion Commonwealth in Israel, came to tell me of the sad prospect that confronted us. I immediately appealed to Max Shoolman for help, and when he was convinced that I had no personal interest in the matter, he generously volunteered to advance the necessary £6,000 Sterling, which redeemed Herzlia from the threatened foreclosure. Thus the most successful settlement of the American Zion Commonwealth was assured of a glorious future. Since then, not only has more American money been made available, but other investors from Europe and Israel itself have rushed in to make Herzlia the showplace of the Sharon Valley.

There is an important footnote to what this Boston tourist did for Palestine and it concerns capital investments. I knew that the Jews of Haifa were particularly interested in developing a business center (now the old Merkaz) so as to free them from the high rents paid to Arab landlords in the dilapidated, crowded, Arab business district. Before the end of 1924, forty Haifa Jews had managed to collect a sum sufficient to buy a convenient area, near the future port, but there was no money for the construction of buildings on the site. Relying on the good impression that the Herzlia visit made on Shoolman, I asked him to visit Haifa, where a mutual friend, Isaac Harris, was presently staying. I pleaded with Shoolman to advance funds for building operations, taking back mortgages at 8% — all the work to be done under the supervision of his engineer. To my agreeable surprise, he

promised to look into the proposition, and under the guidance of Isaac Harris, he actually advanced $375,000 which made possible the development of the port area as the commercial center of Haifa. It was the first important American business investment in Israel and proved of great benefit to the whole Jewish community.

It might also be mentioned that in the development of Herzlia, which brought such an increase in land values (not to mention land speculation), *none* of the directors of the American Zion Commonwealth which had established it, profited personally from any "unearned increment." I did not want to buy any land, just because I was afraid it might lead to charges of land speculation. When some directors pointed out that as the founder and ex-President, I should purchase some land, I bought the usual allotment of "land certificates" giving me about forty dunams, and then gave it away as a present to a cousin who arrived in Palestine as an immigrant from Russia shortly thereafter. What would probably have been better, as I later learned, would have been to make a real capital investment thereby showing the way for the immigration of capital, which is just as important as that of people. Indeed, in 1927, I led a group of investors to Palestine and, after a great reception in Haifa, they established the successful and highly profitable orange plantation of "Gan Haim" (so named in honor of Dr. Weizmann and referred to by him in his letter of February 8, 1927 see Chapter XXIII). Among the investors were Max Shoolman, Solomon Lamport of New York, Asher Pierce of Montreal and Israel Matz of Brooklyn, New York, all of whom went on to make even larger investments in Israel.

Many years later, in the depths of the depression that struck America, I chanced to meet Shoolman again in New York, in the banking house of Hayden Stone and Company, where he was arranging for financial aid for his ailing Boston properties — having lost heavily after the Wall Street collapse of 1929. He then confided to me that the Haifa mortgage investment had enabled him to safeguard some of his capital — that "it was the best investment I ever made".

CHAPTER XXII

PROPOSED UNION OF PALESTINE MUNICIPALITIES

As early as May 18, 1922, I wrote from Jerusalem to Louis Lipsky, then serving as Chairman of the American Zionist Administration Committee — when I was still a member of the Zionist Executive — suggesting that I might best serve the cause of Zionism in working with Dr. Ruppin, "in the Trade and Industry Division". The quotation from the letter indicates the importance attached to capital investments in Palestine, as follows: "There is a great deal of talk about immigration, but few people realize that it is perhaps of equal importance — indeed of superior importance — to have capital immigrate to Palestine. The logical place for an American is at the head of such a department. I am convinced that there are enough investment possibilities in Palestine to attract considerable capital from America, and give us a chance to prove to the world that Palestine is not merely a land of donations, but that there are also commercial and industrial possibilities. Once that is proven, the future of Palestine is assured."

Accordingly, in the Zionist Congress of 1923, at Carlsbad, I was elected as the American representative on the Economic Council (Wirtschaftsrat), and Lipsky took my place on the Zionist Executive. Having successfully concluded the Tel Aviv bond isssue I, therefore, decided to concentrate upon the larger task of a bond issue for all the Jewish settlements of the Sharon Valley from Hadera in the north to Rehovoth in the south, including Tel Aviv as center of operations. But I was delayed for a full year by the requirements of the Keren Hayesod, as the American Campaign Chairman, and Dr. Weizmann's letter of

May 6, 1924 shows the strain under which all of us were working (see Annex 7). By this time, we had already discarded the original concept of the Keren Hayesod as a mixture of "'donations and investments" (as I had repeatedly urged), and the Keren Hayesod has remained ever since a pure donation fund, operating throughout the world, but included in America in the United Jewish Appeal.

But the need for capital funds was greater than ever, with the accelerated growth of Tel Aviv and the continued immigration from Eastern Europe. Accordingly, at the beginning of October, 1924, I left for Palestine bent upon a program to enlist large capital investments to support the growing economy of a Jewish Palestine — and more particularly through another bond issue.

THE ACQUISITION OF THE HAIFA BAY LANDS

Even before I reached Palestine (with the inevitable delays in Europe in those days of ship travel), I received a cablegram from Dr. Weizmann asking me to meet him at the Continental Hotel in Cairo. Our meeting proved of great importance for the economic upbuilding, as the quotation from my article in the Palestine (now the Jerusalem) Post, some years later shows:

> ...It was natural for the President of the World Zionist Organization to discuss with me the possibility of acquiring the important plain, washed by the Kishon and Naaman Rivers, between Haifa and Acre.
>
> Dr. Weizmann pointed out the significance of such a land purchase for development in the north of Palestine, and added that it was my duty to persuade the Board of Directors of the American Zion Commonwealth, of which I was a member, to undertake that purchase, since that organization had already rendered pioneer service in establishing two colonies: Balfouria in the Emek and Herzlia in the Sharon plain.
>
> I admitted the importance of such a task but felt that it was the logical field of operations for the Keren Kayemeth (Jewish National Fund); but Dr. Weizmann replied that be-

cause of extensive purchases in the Emek, the Keren Kayemeth could not finance such a vast undertaking, involving the acquisition of over 50,000 dunam. To my argument that the funds of the American Zion Commonwealth were too limited for such a vast enterprise, he gave the statesmanlike reply, "The whole Jewish people will be behind you". It was with this slogan still ringing in my ears that I entered Palestine, resolved to do everything possible to redeem the lands of Haifa Bay for Jewish settlement.

Of course, we all appreciated the risk involved in the enterprise, but we felt that such an opportunity to acquire the land adjoining the future port of Haifa was something we dared not neglect. Besides, I reminded the directors in New York of the articles of association of the American Zion Commonwealth, which provided that eventually lands required for industrial purposes must be resold to the Keren Kayemeth, on demand, at the same price as if it were agricultural land, so that we would be performing a national duty in redeeming the land of Haifa Bay.

As the American Zion Commonwealth was virtually a mutual association, without profits to stockholders, they accepted the argument, and cabled the first L.I. 10,000, which made possible the acquisition of the strategic area surrounding Haifa Bay — a district almost equal in size to the whole island of Manhattan — and which now bids well to become the greatest industrial region in the whole Near East.

Two years later, Palestine was in the throes of a depression, which was largely the reflection of bad economic conditions in Eastern Europe, so that many Polish Jews, who had made part payment on lands purchased in Palestine, could not consummate their purchases. There were many, even among those occupying positions of authority and responsibility, who argued that such lands, including some of the Haifa Bay lands, which had been acquired by the "Meshek" Organization of Polish Jews, should be forfeited.

Again, the American Zion Commonwealth manfully stepped into the breach — thereby drawing upon itself criticism which it did not earn — and saved every dunam of land for Jewish colonization. In that process, it deliberately sacrificed its own assets, and transferred its Haifa Bay holdings, at cost price, so that the Keren Kayemeth and the Palestine Economic Corporation secured their present Haifa Bay lands at a fraction of their actual value.

Lands that are now worth between £300 per dunam were then charged to the Keren Kayemeth on the basis of £3½ or 4 per dunam. At least five million Pounds were saved to the treasury of the Keren Kayemeth over the present cost, even assuming that such land might have been available today (a doubtful assumption) at any price.

All honor to the wisdom and perseverance of the directorate of the Keren Kayemeth and the Palestine Economic Corporation who cooperated in the enterprise that saved the Haifa Bay district as a "Jewish national domain". At the same time, let us not forget to record the part played by the individual initiative of a few visionary engineers, who led the way, and the daring part played by the American Zion Commonwealth — operating as a sister organization of the Palestine Land Development Company — which must take its place in the history of Zionist colonization only second to that of the Keren Kayemeth itself.

Needless to say, when the economic crisis after 1925 reached Palestine, and the American Zion Commonwealth was forced to borrow funds from the Jewish Colonial Trust of London, I recall remarking to Dr. Weizmann that: "Now I appreciate the remark that 'the whole Jewish People will be behind you'. They were so far behind that you could hardly see them". In any event, Haifa Bay lands were saved, without which there could hardly have emerged a viable Jewish State.

But I would not be diverted from the plan for a Bond issue based upon a union of municipalities. It was a far-reaching dream going beyond a mere financial proposition, for it envisaged an economic union that might serve as the nucleus of a Jewish State. And it was precisely this aspect that aroused all the latent fears of the Colonial Office in London (whose consent was required). We worked hard in the autumn of 1924 to perfect a plan, holding many meetings in Tel Aviv and in colonies from Hadera in the north to Rehovoth in the south.

Finally, after securing the approval of the High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, the proposed plan for union went off to London for approval, where our legal representative, Lord Nathan,

was pressing the matter. It seemed that my presence might be necessary, and I prepared to leave in January, 1925, when I was surprised to be invited to a "souvenir banquet" in Tel Aviv, on the evening of January 17, 1925, which might almost have served as the inauguration of the "Municipal Union". The occasion was graced by the presence of both Ahad Ha'Am, the philosopher, and Bialik, the poet, and presided over by Meir Dizengoff, Mayor of Tel Aviv. Perhaps, the photostat of the note sent to me by Gershon Agronsky, editor of the Palestine Post (and later Mayor of Jerusalem as Gershon Agron) just as I rose to speak, in response to the toastmaster's call, after Bialik and Ahad Ha'Am had spoken enthusiastically of the "beginning of a Jewish State", will indicate the importance attached to that occasion.

The presence here of Ahad Haam & Bialik is a great tribute to the Union. It makes me proud of at least one American

L.M.

JEWISH MUNICIPAL UNION

By January 1925, the "Jewish Municipal Union" seemed an established fact, merely awaiting de jure approval from the Colonial Office, and we were beginning to perfect the plan for a Bond issue, with the voluntary help of our honored Counsel, Harry Sacher, then resident in Jerusalem. Little did we appreciate that the significance of this incipient Jewish state-machinery was also recognized in quarters none too friendly to the development of the Jewish National Home, for all the promise of the Balfour

Declaration. I arrived in London with every prospect of the plan for a "Jewish Municipal Union" already approved by the Palestine High Commissioner Sir Herbert Samuel, being speedily approved, as our London Counsel expected.

But there seemed to be unusual delays, so in the spring I left for New York to complete the financial conditions for the acquisition of the Haifa Bay Lands, already mentioned — while keeping in constant touch with our London Counsel, who apprised me of continual delays. Finally, in May, 1925, we were presented with a political bombshell, in the shape of an attack in the Northcliffe-owned Daily Mail, voicing its opposition to a "state within a state", which the "Rosenblatt plan for a Jewish State" would foster in Palestine. It still remains a mystery how the information reached the Daily Mail, for no publicity was given by us to a matter that was being handled as a purely legal question before the Colonial Office. But this publicity was evidently the cue for the Colonial Office to pigeonhole the project — and to this day there has been neither approval nor disapproval of our far-reaching plan forwarded from Jerusalem by the High Commissioner, with his endorsement.

Perhaps an episode towards the end of the year 1924 will afford a better picture of conditions in Palestine than any mere description of the country. In the middle of November, I was informed that the war Prime Minister of Great Britain, Herbert H. Asquith, was arriving in Jerusalem on his way to Damascus. The Zionist Executive had arranged for him to stop off, en route, at the colony of Balfouria, in order to deliver personal regards to Arthur James Balfour from the settlement named in his honor. As a compliment to my part in establishing this first American settlement after the Great War, I was invited to accompany Mr. Asquith, and so spent the last Thursday of November — Thanksgiving Day — in the colony of Balfouria. Before reaching that settlement, we spent sometime in the home of an Arab notable in nearby Jenin, where Mr. Kalveriski (who accompanied us) presented Mr. Asquith to the leading Arabs of the district, and we drank cups of coffee together, with every sign of respect and

consideration, not only for our famous guest, but for ourselves.

Balfouria had grown considerably since the difficult days of 1920, it lay sprawling up the hill from the Afule-Nazareth road, with a line of newly-planted trees testifying to the interest of the settlers in enhancing the natural beauties of Emek Jezreel. It also, at last, had an American settler, Seletsky of Chester, Pennsylvania, who with his seven daughters helped, it is hoped, in that "internal immigration", to which Jewish Palestine looked forward to redress the balance of the Arab majority.

The years between 1922 and 1925 had seen a considerable acceleration in land purchases by the Jewish National Fund and in setting up agricultural cooperatives — mainly kibbutzim (communal settlements) with some moshavim (semi-cooperative settlements). By 1925 there were about 100 farming settlements of all types in Palestine. Rural development in Galilee and the Sharon was expanding — to the intense enthusiasm of Zionist circles abroad. Meanwhile, the "Fourth Aliyah", or immigration of Polish Jews in 1924-5 had stimulated the development of Tel Aviv and Haifa and was contributing to the growth of modern suburbs around ancient Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XXIII

PALESTINE IN ECONOMIC CRISIS

In the summer of 1925, I attended the Zionist Congress, in Vienna, as a delegate from the American Zionist Organization and also as a representative of the Economic Council (Wirtschaftsrat). The purchase of the Haifa Bay lands had been completed, and we were still hoping for the approval of the "Jewish Municipal Union'", which would enable us to launch a substantial Bond issue in the New York market as a banking proposition.

Perhaps never before were we so confident of the ultimate success of Zionism. Immigration was proceeding at a steadily increasing rate and, as yet, Arab opposition had not assumed dangerous proportions. The Congress was highlighted by economic plans for the development of the Haifa Bay lands, and we were making plans for encouraging immigrants with capital to enter the country. The Haifa Bay Lands were destined to become the chief industrial and residential area of the northern coast.

Towards the end of the year, my wife and two young sons left for Palestine, intending to spend a year or more there but, as my wife wrote from Haifa, on the very morning that the ship sighted the beautiful Carmel, she fell in love with the land and determined to make it an indefinite stay — at least until both sons attained their Bar Mitzvah. I still had my law practice in New York, so for the next few years I became a commuter between Palestine and America.

With the beginning of 1926, however, we were already face to face with an economic crisis, largely as a result of the "Grabski" economic policies in Poland, which beggared the Jews of that country and necessarily curtailed immigration. Yet, it was remarkable how the small Palestine Jewish community responded to this

dire threat. There was serious unemployment, which the Histadruth handled magnificently by "making work" for its members. For example, in Haifa, unemployed workers built an amphitheatre, which later became the premises of a large cinema, receiving only a small pittance for food while they were developing this "capital asset" for the future. In many ways, the Jews of Palestine in 1926 and 1927 anticipated the "Roosevelt New Deal", which later helped to pull America out of the deep depression of the '30's. Jewish workingmen proved their mettle by pulling their weight, saving their great construction company, Solel Boneh, from bankruptcy, and laying the foundation for the Histadruth as a potent factor in the economic — and political — life of Israel.

The challenge of unemployment was finally overcome, but only after heartaches and much suffering. Some of the recent immigrants, jobless and hungry, were compelled to leave the country. The year 1926 was to show, for the first and only time, an actual excess of emigrants over immigrants, yet, even as they boarded the ships which would separate them from their beloved soil, with tears in their eyes, the returnees sang the new song "Lo Nelech Mi-Po" (we shall not leave this place). I recall so vividly my young sons, returning from their classes at the Real School in Haifa, singing these sad but challenging words. The amphitheatre at Haifa (now a large cinema) stands as a living monument to those who refused to "desert the land".

My father, Louis Rosenblatt, first visited Palestine in the summer of 1924, and was so impressed with the country — which he had known before only from his deep study of the Talmud — that he decided to spend the last years of his life in the Holy Land, first in Jerusalem and then in Tel Aviv, where he was buried in the old cemetery. He had sent for my mother and two younger sisters in December, 1924, and placed them in the third house built in the Rehavia district of Jerusalem — which later, when he moved to Tel Aviv, he sold to Haim Solomon, a former Mayor of Jerusalem. My father had hoped to establish a new hotel in Jerusalem, together with Amdursky (who had a hotel in the Old City), but when that proved impractical, he

formed a partnership for the purchase of lands from Arabs in the growing district of Tel Aviv, for resale in small plots to prospective Jewish homeowners. As few of such settlers had ready cash, he generally took back long term mortgages for the sales price, conditional upon the building of a house on the premises. That way, after paying off his partner, he was responsible for the opening up of a whole new district, known as Lev Tel Aviv, stretching along Rothschild Boulevard, above Allenby Street, up to and including the present premises of Habimah and the Mann Auditorium. Indeed, the very land upon which Habimah now stands was presented by him to Tel Aviv as compensation, or assessment, for the building of roads through his lands. In this pioneer work he was employing methods learned in America, and finally himself became a tenant in a house built on one of his plots at 123 Rothschild Boulevard. He made only a modest profit on the resale of such lands, but the interest and amortization of the mortgages enabled him to live comfortably, with my mother, during the last twelve years of his life.

We sometimes are prone to minimize the importance of capital investments as against charitable contributions in the early phase of Palestine's upbuilding. But I recall a telling remark by the famous Zionist orator, Dr. Schmaryahu Levin, that the National Home will be rebuilt not only through "Yetzer Tov", but even more significantly through "Yetzer Hara" — the search for profits. On another occasion, he was shown a mansion that the well-known capitalist and philanthropist of Chicago, Julius Rosenwald, was building along Lake Michigan, which he proposed to name Tel Aviv. Dr. Levin responded by advising him rather to build something in Palestine and to call it Chicago. It is, indeed, only after it reaches the stage of offering profitable investment opportunities that a country can attain the goal of a modern civilized state.

I have been associated with a number of pioneer business enterprises in Israel which have aided materially in the development of the country. From long experience I have learned how important it is to insist firmly that such companies must be operated for profit — for only in this way can we be certain

that the enterprise is successful and the country as a whole benefitting. Any failure operates as a dampener on the enlistment of further capital for the expansion of the economy.

I was reminded of the wise remark of Dr. Weizmann to the effect that if a Jew fails in business in Berlin or New York it is manifestly the fault of the Jew, but when he fails in Palestine, the whole country is to blame. The Histadruth, or Jewish Labor movement, proved able to develop the highly successful construction and contracting cooperative society, Solel Boneh, only after a failure in the early Palestine Mandate days (when it was functioning as the public works branch of the Histadruth — as a losing proposition attempting to solve the serious problem of unemployment), because it was finally launched on a profit-making career in competition with private capital.

The efforts of the middle sector of the economy, strange to say, were never generous in their support of pioneering capital investments. The American Zion Commonwealth, perhaps because it did not emphasize profits, failed to secure the support of public institutions, despite the highly successful settlements of Herzlia and Afule, which it established, or its redemption of the strategically vital lands of Haifa Bay, which demanded an extraordinary outlay when the Jewish investors from Poland were unable to meet the commitments they had undertaken for the land they had purchased. It took some superhuman efforts to secure the necessary financial support from the Jewish Colonial Trust and the Keren Hayesod by which we were finally enabled to meet all our obligations with interest. Nevertheless, while all the lands were saved and the investors in land reaped large profits, the Company had to forgo further development. As an institution it remained moribund.

Perhaps if it had emphasized the element of profit for investors, instead of relying entirely on the patriotic appeal for land redemption, it might have fared better. Of course, the Zion Commonwealth's difficulties were partly due to the fact that, as an American institution, it was expected to draw all its support from across the Atlantic, instead of relying partly on the Yishuv for its

development program. Which reminds me of the old story that if you wanted to get support from the Zionist Executive for any cause — then headed by the famous Russian Zionist, Ussishkin — it was important that you came from Odessa — not merely Hadassah!

However, we learned and we benefitted from our mistakes. Not only Rassco but even the older Israel Land Development Co. — the original purchasers of the lands of Herzlia — began to concentrate on capital profits with dividends for individual investors. Similarly the Workers' Bank no less than the Bank Leumi was run for profit. So was the highly successful Migdal Insurance Company launched in 1934 under the leadership of my former companion on the World Zionist Executive, George Halpern, including an early investment registered in my own name. And, likewise, the Africa Palestine Investment Co. was set up by my South African friends which helped to develop Hamei Tiberia and the whole Tiberias district, once the development of that ancient spa had been begun.

In essence the capitalist economy, built upon profits, is a constant challenge to the communal economy built on the idealistic principle of "to each according to his needs." If we were to assume a *constant* profit surplus of 6% on the capital invested — and this is a high figure on which capitalists generally would be happy to agree — it means simply that for every dollar expended, fully 94 cents would go to what even inveterate Socialists must regard as "productive use." Now I venture to state that there is seldom a charity or philanthropy that could not save at least 6 cents on every dollar spent if it were only operated as efficiently as those who control our industrial enterprises. A good example is the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. which has been paying dividends of 9% to its stockholders on the capital invested, while constantly reducing its charges to the public. This is in direct contrast to European — Government controlled telephone services which are more expensive and less efficient — because there is no profit incentive for its executives.

The same conclusions can be drawn from experience in Israel.

The Palestine Economic Corporation, although a stockholding company, received a *gift* of a million dollars from American philanthropic collections many years ago, but because it was regarded (until lately) as a semi-philanthropic enterprise it has not paid cash dividends for years (despite its valuable assets) while Ampal, although controlled by the Histadruth, has been paying 6% dividends to American investors. Now that the Palestine Economic Corporation has adapted itself to a capitalist economy, I have no doubt that it will soon prove profitable both to the country as well as to it shareholders.

Another example, from America, may show the gap that separates good business management from philanthropic institutions. For half a century now, the tuition fees in "private" heavily endowed universities have spiralled so that higher education, except for scholarships is now beyond the capacity of the majority of Americans — and this in a country that prides itself on having pioneered with the slogan of a free common education for all. I paid $150 a year for my college education, where my grandchildren are now paying more than $1500 — an increase of 1000% for *fewer* lecture hours. I dare say that if American universities would have a capital structure manned by executives from the leading business enterprises, the cost of education would be considerably less, and instead of constant deficits, there would be increasing profits.

In short, while there are some public services that necessarily cannot — and should not — fit into a profit economy, like the police or the judicial system, it may be fairly asserted that dividends earned by investors on their capital are more than compensated by the growth of the country and the benefits conferred upon the public as consumers.

Perhaps the letter from Dr. Weizmann of February 8, 1927, quoted below, will indicate the importance now attached to a program for enlisting *capital* to immigrate to Palestine.

Hon. Bernard A. Rosenblatt,
Woolworth Building,
NEW YORK CITY.

My dear Ben:

I congratulate you on the successful organisation of a Business Men's Delegation, headed by Mr. Max Shoolman of Boston, which leaves for Palestine on February 21st. I have learned that the few members of the Delegation, who left earlier, consisting of Mr. Israel Matz, Mr. Solomon Ulmer, and Mr. Benjamin Lifschutz, have already achieved a measure of success in bringing American capital into the development of orange groves in Palestine. I am certain that, with your advice and counsel, this Business Men's Delegation will yield profitable results for Palestine.

Please do not fail to have this Business Delegation make a study of the possibilities of a larger loan, on a strictly business basis, to the Jewish Municipalities already existing, and on which you have spent already so much time and energy.

I wish you and your associates every success.

With kindest regards,
I am,
Sincerely yours,
Ch. Weizmann

CHAPTER XXIV

TIBERIAS HOT SPRINGS PROJECT

This story began in the autumn of 1927, when my family was fairly settled on Jerusalem Street, Hadar HaCarmel, in Haifa, and I was prompted, in line with my conviction about the need for creating opportunities for profitable investments, to respond to a proposition for the purchase of the Arab rights to Hamei Tiberia, and to develop that ancient spa into a first-class Bath Establishment. One of the Shapira brothers who were then developing the "Assis" factory for fruit juices, visited me with a proposal to "redeem" this ancient Jewish landmark. He indicated that his friend, Joshua Supraski, of Tel Aviv, might join in the enterprise. Shapira was a native of the same small town, Grodok, as my mother; and Supraski, from the birthplace of my father (both towns virtually suburbs of Bialystock). That was enough of an introduction for us to start negotiations with Emir Rizk, an Arab in Beirut, who owned 90% of the Turkish "rights" to the concession. In these negotiations, Charles Passman, representative of the American Zion Commonwealth in Palestine, was particularly helpful. (Later we also secured the balance of 10% from Suleiman Bey Nassif of Haifa.) This required an immediate outlay of £6,000 Sterling, or $30,000 cash, of which I invested one-half agreeing with Supraski that he might turn over one-half of his half to Jacob Gesundheit, who had recently arrived from South Africa as a permanent settler in Tel Aviv. We organized a Board of Directors consisting of Gesundheit, his son-in-law, Itzchak Rokach (brother of the Mayor of Tel Aviv), Supraski, myself, my father and our advocate (counsel), Bernard Joseph (later a Cabinet Minister in the State of Israel, as Dov Yoseph). Although I was the largest stockholder, I agreed to

the selection of Gesundheit as Chairman, who soon undertook a trip to South Africa to enlist further financial support in the development of the Baths.

But almost immediately we were confronted with the problem that while the concession appeared as an old Turkish grant, it had not been approved by the Mandatory Government of Palestine. It fell to my lot to renegotiate the grant or concession with the Attorney General of Palestine, Norman Bentwich, with whom I had been on terms of friendship for many years. After long drawn-out negotiations, instead of confirming the old concession, an entirely new grant for sixty-five years was approved — and we found ourselves the owners of some dilapidated buildings, where the German Consul, visiting from Jaffa, was found dead from a heart attack on the very day we became the owners. Even more ominous was the fact that the "healing waters" were already clearly diminishing, with the possible threat that the underground flow would be choked before reaching the surface and would dwindle to a mere trickle. Finally, after several visits to Europe, Supraski managed to secure the services of a Sudeten German, famous for encasing bath springs in many European spas. He worked for many months, at a large financial outlay by the newly-organized company, until we were definitely assured that the flow of curative waters would continue at a sufficiently increased rate to warrant a new, modern Bath establishment. It was only then that we dedicated the baths in a joyful ceremony at which prominent Jews from the rest of Palestine and abroad participated.

But despite the partial success of Gesundheit in securing shareholders in South Africa, we were constantly short of funds for the results of a trip I made to the United States were disappointing, America being in the throes of the great depression of 1929 and its aftermath. It was clear that much more investment capital was needed, if we were to revive the ancient Hamei-Tiberia, to which even the great figures of distant Imperial Rome had come, like the wealthy Jews of the ancient Diaspora, to partake of its curative waters. At this juncture, some five years

after the original purchase from the Arabs, the Africa Palestine Investments, Ltd., headed by Lazar Braude and seconded by Jacob Geri, stepped in with a large financial stake. Gesundheit disagreed with the new management and stepped down, so I assumed the Chairmanship, with headquarters in Haifa. We concentrated largely on the development of the beautiful gardens that now grace the Bath Establishment, in which Jack Brin, the Company Secretary, rendered valuable service, and on a campaign to acquaint Israel with the curative value of the waters. In those days, Hamei-Tiberia was regarded as second only to the Dead Sea Concession as a true indication of a developing Jewish Palestine.

I recall a curious incident in that connection on my constant travels between Haifa and Tel Aviv. There was a Jewish Railway supervisor whom I often met on the train travelling from Haifa to Ras-el-ein, where passengers alighted to take the connecting bus to Tel Aviv (which was still without a railway depot, the railway then continuing to Lod, where passengers had to change for Jerusalem, while the train went on to Egypt). This Haifa Jew, who had come from Russia, where he had had some railway experience, was a good example of a professional pessimist. He refused to learn Hebrew because he saw "no future in the country", although his wife was a practicing dentist in Haifa. He often talked to me of the "fruitless efforts the Jews were making to redeem Palestine from the Arabs and the British". On one occasion, however, to my utter surprise, he said: "You know, you have the only good investment in all Palestine, because all of us will eventually have rheumatism, and we shall have to go to your baths". So, even this confirmed pessimist could find something of value, even if it was based on a sickness which he blamed on the climate! Needless to say, it was no gold mine that an American Jew and his South African friends discovered! The initial dividends on preference stock (none on the common) were soon discontinued, and no dividends at all were paid for a full generation. Only after 1960 was there a resumption of small payments in Israel devalued Pounds, against investments in Sterling

at $5 for every Pound. But at least the country profited from this pioneer enterprise.

I too received a moral reward, for many years later, my son David (who had taught a course in Physics at Princeton University for army officers during World War II) came to teach and to study at the Technion, in 1949-51, where he received the degree of Doctor of Science, after writing a thesis on the "Thermal Waters of Tiberias Hot Springs". It is interesting to record that he wrote the thesis both in Hebrew *and* in English, since the subject of his thesis, including the radioactivity of the waters of Tiberias Hot Springs, could not be checked in Israel and had to be sent to the Sorbonne, in Paris, where the examining Professor could evaluate it by studying the English version. In any event, the future value to Israel of this remarkable Spa is undeniable.

CHAPTER XXV

THE PALESTINE RIOTS OF 1929 AND THEIR AFTERMATH

In the summer of 1929, I left for New York, where some important legal work had kept me for over a year (and where I had been joined by my family from Haifa), to attend the Zionist Congress in Zurich, Switzerland, as a delegate. There enthusiasm was running high, for we had successfully overcome opposition and were at last about to launch the enlarged Jewish Agency, as provided for in the Mandate, to cooperate with the Palestine Administration in the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Weizmann's long struggle (from 1922-1929) to get this body orgranized had at last been crowned with success. All the elements of Jewry — neutrals, sympathizers and partisans, with figures like Louis Marshall, Felix Warburg, Leon Blum, Herbert Samuel and others — had all been brought into the one "Jewish Agency." The Agency's constitution was based on a 50-50 arrangement in the Executive and the Council, with the President of the World Zionist Organization acting as president of the Agency. The non-Zionist elements represented various countries while the Zionist members and executives were selected from the membership of the General Zionist Council.

At the Congress there was only the lingering opposition of Jabotinsky, the fiery orator and leader of the Revisionist forces, who objected logically — but when is the historical process so intimately related to logic? — that the proposed extended Jewish Agency must be limited to Zionists and that professed non-Zionists should not be entrusted with half the membership of the Jewish Agency Executive. However, gradually the opposition was worn

down and at 4.30 one morning, we finally managed to put through the vote constituting the Jewish Agency.

I recall going into the lobby of the hotel, as dawn was breaking, and meeting there the leader of the American non-Zionist group, Louis Marshall, who had risen early to learn the result and was gratified at the news I brought him. It was a tragedy that he died only a few weeks later, following an operation, just after his election as chairman.

Two things stand out in memory from the record of that important Zionist Congress at Zurich. First the truly remarkable speeches of the great men who were gathered together in a show of Jewish unity. There was the particularly outstanding address by Leon Blum — later the Prime Minister of France, — matched by those of representative Jews from England and America. Leaders of the smaller countries of Europe and South America were also heard from, when the old Zionist leaders held forth in the service of a cause which seemed to be on the verge of successful realization. While Jabotinsky warned that no Jewish state was possible until a Jewish majority in Palestine was attained, "for otherwise, it would surely be destroyed even as South Africa must eventually lose out in a struggle with the majority of non-whites." (And it must be added, no one at that time could really envisage a Jewish majority with the high Arab birthrate and Jewish immigration reduced to a trickle). Ussishkin, the old warhorse of early Zionism, gave a peculiar answer to this challenge. He argued that even a majority was no guarantee of the permanence of a Jewish state, for "look", he said, "what happened to the first and second Jewish States — the States of King David and the Maccabees — both were destroyed despite a Jewish majority." However such an answer was merely rhetorical. The real and present danger was indicated by a representative from Egypt, the venerable Baron Manasseh, who warned us privately that Arab agitation against the Jewish state was growing. Like the prophet Jeremiah, he warned of the riots that were to overtake us even as the Congress prepared to adjourn.

While I was on the ship taking me from Naples to New York, all the fury of the 1929 riots broke upon Jerusalem, Hebron and

elsewhere. As our ship docked in New York harbour, the cry for help went up from the smaller settlements. Most of the delegates had not yet returnd, and I felt the full weight of our helplessness, as I joined the great Jewish community of New York, with the newspaper headlines screaming of the butchery of young Yeshiva students in Hebron and innocent strollers in the streets of Jerusalem.

The immediate cause of the August 1929 riots, directed against the most helpless and peaceful section of the Jewish community, was a (Jewish) Revisionist demonstration at the Wailing Wall which the Arabs construed as an attempt to storm the adjacent Aqsa Mosque. Fundamentally, of course, the riots erupted from the long standing Jewish-Moslem quarrel over Palestine. Any spark might have fired the smouldering resentments.

Weizmann had always done everything possible to avoid this but, just at this moment, events in Palestine were out of his control. At the same time, Lord Plumer, who had carried out a vigorous and healthy policy, had resigned as British High Commissioner in 1928 because of ill-health. The British Government was proceeding with its general policy of trying to placate the Arabs regardless of the clear intention of the Balfour Declaration.

The 1929 riots represent the turning point in Arab opposition to Zionism. They were not the work of "murderers" incited by isolated conspirators which is how most contemporary commentators regarded them. Rather, they marked the beginning of a deliberate Arab policy of revolt. In future, relations with the Arabs became the overriding concern of the Zionist movement while, on the other hand, the Arab problem was the chief cause of the paralysis of British policy. The British mandatory authorities did little enough to deal with the situation, thereby laying themselves open to accusations of partisanship from both sides.

In general the British government and people responded to the post-war mood of optimism and liberalism with hopes for a better world based on mutual tolerance between peoples and the mitigation of the more extreme forms of nationalism. In this view, it was possible to hope that the Arab national movement would

develop on conservative lines, conducive to the respect for law and order on which British imperial rule in various parts of the Near East rested. Whereupon the Jews could be gradually integrated into Palestine, cooperating with the Arabs in the economic and cultural fields and bringing the Arabs to eventual acquiescence in the creation of the Jewish National Home. The events of 1921 and 1929 shook these beliefs — along with the prestige of British imperial rule — quite significantly, but they did not destroy them.

My wife in New York, returning with my sons from the summer camp Modin, was insistent that I "do something", since most of the Zionist leaders had not yet returned from the Congress. I decided, on my own initiative, to summon a Zionist meeting at the Pennsylvania Hotel to launch an attack on the British Palestine Administration which had so miserably failed to protect life and property. A sense of horror swept over the Jewish scene in America that autumn. When I began to describe the attack on "little Motza", the outpost Jewish settlement leading to Jerusalem, there was such a wave of emotion that the audience called spontaneously that we must "go to Washington". An informal committee was immediately organized, of which I was Chairman, and we left from Pennsylvania Station, across the street from our meeting-place, that very evening, with instructions to visit President Hoover and the Secretary of State, Henry Stimson.

The very next morning our committee was received by President Hoover in Washington, with kind words of deep regret over the incidents in Palestine, advising us to see Secretary Stimson, who would lend us all possible aid. It was the Hoover made famous by his Belgium relief campaign in the First World War and who had been the leader in saving millions of Russians from starvation in that war's aftermath, who now spoke with shame and grief of the loss of life in Palestine. But it was the visit with Secretary Stimson that proved the highlight of our trip. That truly good and great man was shocked with sorrow as I reviewed the terrible fate suffered by the Yeshiva students in Hebron. He turned to our committee and in a voice filled with

emotion he said: "As a descendant of a long line of ministers of religion, I can appreciate the horror of Rabbinical students murdered in the midst of their devoted studies". Then he went on to say that if we insisted upon sending the American fleet to the borders of Palestine, he would do so. But he advised against it because he was convinced that the British Navy was able to protect lives, when called upon. Finally, we had to agree with him that perhaps a strong protest would prove most effective.

We left Washington strong in the belief that the Government of the United States, from President Hoover down, were profoundly moved by the terrible events in Palestine, and our vigorous representation was the beginning of a long series of events leading to cooperation with the Zionist Organization, culminating in American support for the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947, which made the Jewish State possible. Despite occasional setbacks in the lower echelons of the State Department, American friendship for Zionism matured and led to the epoch-making recognition of the State of Israel by President Truman on that memorable day, May 14, 1948, only an hour or two after the Declaration of Independence had been read in Tel Aviv that same Friday afternoon.

Returning to New York from our Washington visit, the same self-constituted committee set about organizing the great protest demonstration at Madison Square Garden. Later, I was to say that we Jews had no army or navy with which to oppose the unjust decrees of the British Colonial Office, but we still had a very effective instrument — we had Madison Square Garden. And this first gathering set the tone for many others in our quarrel over the "whittling down" of the Palestine Mandate for a Jewish National Home. We managed to secure some leading Jewish figures to grace the speakers' platform headed by the famous lawyer, Samuel Untermyer, as Chairman. When the Mayor of New York rose to speak, a curious incident occurred: for half a minute the lights went out, and the nimble-witted Jimmy Walker cracked: "You don't mean to tell me that some Arabs got into this building —" to an audience filled to the rafters

with over 15,000 Jews. In closing my speech, as Chairman of the Organizing Committee, when I took the pledge: "Im Eshkachekh" in Hebrew "If I forget thee, oh Jerusalem . . . " the response from the audience was so spontaneous that Samuel Untermyer turned to me and said: "It was the most impressive occasion that I ever witnessed". We went on to organize the Palestine Emergency Fund, to help the victims, which within a few weeks brought us over three million dollars — the precursor of the greater campaigns for the United Jewish Appeal.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE STRUGGLE WITH THE COLONIAL OFFICE

October, 1929, saw the Wall Street crash heralding the great American depression, which lasted for nearly a decade of severe suffering, and really ended only after the outbreak of World War II. Meanwhile, Palestine slowly recovered from the setbacks caused by the Arab attacks in the summer of 1929. As an indication of the strong feeling of identification of American Zionists with those tragic events, I might be forgiven for relating the attitude of my wife, who insisted that it was our duty to return to Palestine at once as permanent residents, despite the fact that we had only recently purchased a home in Kew Gardens, L.I. We had two sons (eleven and nine years old) attending public school. For their sake, I felt it was incumbent on me to inquire by cable from our good friend, Herman Struck, the well-known etcher, then living in Haifa, whether we should return so early after the riots. Like a true and devoted Zionist, Struck answered by cable to come — and my wife and children left by the first available boat, going direct to Haifa in March, 1930, while I followed in June, after selling our house, completing some essential law work and closing my law office.

By the time I arrived, Palestine was already beginning an economic recovery that marked the first half decade before World War II with its German and Polish Jewish immigration of a category of immigrants qualifying as "capitalists". But before we could reap the benefits of that welcome addition to the Palestine Jewish community, we had to overcome the opposition of the British Colonial Office.

Following the 1929 riots, the British Government set up the Shaw Commission to investigate the causes of those disturbances. The Commission reported much more explicitly on the dubious phraseology of the Balfour Declaration.

Afterwards, the Mandatory power despatched Sir John Hope Simpson to investigate the position of the alleged "landless Arabs" and the area available for cultivation. The culmination of these activities came with the issuance of the "Passfield White Paper" in October 1930, which implied a considerable worsening in the political situation of Zionism. The White Paper had been provoked by the attitude of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations which had expressed itself very critically about mandatory policy in Palestine.

The White Paper proposing a limitation of Jewish immigration came like a death blow to any prospect of achieving a Jewish State. With a population of 820,000 in Palestine of which only about were 160,000 Jews, the lifeline of immigration seemed to have been cut even before it had really begun in earnest.

I had left Palestine again late that summer to take testimony at the office of the American Consul in Paris in a law suit, which required me to proceed to New York to conclude a settlement, and the full impact of the "Passfield White Paper" of 1930 reached us in Washington, at a conference called by the American Jewish Congress, which I attended. Prior thereto, I had written to Lord Passfield from New York, a letter dated October 13, 1930, from which I shall quote only the reference as an introduction to his reply:

"The writer enjoyed the hospitality of your home, on the banks of the Thames, some ten years ago, when you were Sidney Webb, the economist, far removed from the turmoil of politics. We then discussed a program for land nationalization, particularly as it might be applied to the Mandated territory of Palestine, involved in the program for a Jewish National Homeland — in which I was interested as a member of the Executive Committee

of the Zionist Organization of America, under the leadership of Justice Louis D. Brandeis."

I then went on to say that I had "grave misgivings with regard to the recent policy in Palestine". I suggested a division of Palestine and Transjordan into two states, one Jewish, the other Arab, but both united in a Federal Union for economic development and allowing Jewish immigration to be determined by the Jewish State itself. His reply, reproduced in the photostat (pp. 152-153), will indicate how far apart was British policy from Zionist aspirations for a Jewish State.

Accordingly, when the Passfield White Paper struck us in Washington, in October, 1930, I proposed the usual remedy: a huge protest meeting in Madison Square Garden, where we could call upon our Government to press upon Great Britain its demand for the proper performance of the Mandate obligation, to which it was bound by treaty.

As an interesting sidelight, I might mention that upon returning to New York, I tried to secure Franklin D. Roosevelt, then serving as Governor of New York State, to address that meeting, scheduled for the last Saturday evening before his re-election to the Governorship. I arranged for Herbert Lehman, then serving as Lieutenant Governor, to take me and Robert Szold, representing the Zionist Organization, to the Roosevelt home on East 65th Street, where we met Governor Roosevelt while he was having breakfast in bed. He explained that he would be unable to attend because of a long-standing commitment to make the last speech of the campaign in his home district in Dutchess County, for otherwise the change to Madison Square Garden would inevitably be interpreted as a purely political vote-catching effort, which might have a sinister reaction. But he volunteered to write a strong letter which Lieutenant Governor Lehman was to read at the meeting, at the same time assuring us that he vividly recalled the meeting at the Paris Peace Conference, in 1919, when he served as an aide to President Wilson, that the essence of the Mandate was the development of the Jewish National Home into a Jewish State. I urged him to put these words in the letter,

Private

27.10.30

Dear W. Rosenblatt

Your interesting letter dated 13 October has only just emerged from a heap of others. You wrote just before the hurricane of denunciation from every corner of world-Jewry burst upon my head. Possibly you would have written in less friendly terms if you had waited 10 days!

I am afraid that your suggestion of remedying the Palestine situation by an adaptation of the United States Constitution is neither practicable (as incompatible with the execution

of the Mandate), nor calculated to solve the difficulties presented by the facts.

As to the hurricane of Jewish denunciations that followed your letter, the dynamic effect is lessened by the obvious fact that the denouncers have not read the Statement of Policy itself. I enclose a copy, from which you will see that (i) it does not abrogate or abandon the Mandate; (ii) it does not stop further Jewish colonisation, immigration or enterprise; and (iii) it is designed actually to enable the enlargement of the Jewish National Home.

Yours truly,
Passfield

but even Lieutenant Governor Lehman felt that his message was strong enough without a direct charge of British bad faith. Herbert Lehman's reading of Roosevelt's letter made a deep impression on this huge meeting, but the great moment came when Republican Senator Borah, then serving as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee — emphasizing the bi-partisan interest in Palestine as an American isssue — cried out in his great speech, "Britain has promised you a national Home and gave you a shambles!"

The decade from 1930 until the outbreak of World War II witnessed a low tide in American Zionism — just as Israel was growing apace under the impact of immigration from a resurgent Nazi Germany. Fortunately, in the spring of 1931, Dr. Weizmann was able to secure a letter from the British Prime Minister of the Labor Government, Ramsay MacDonald, which served in some respects as a modification of the Passfield White Paper, so far as restrictions on immigration were concerned. The Arabs dubbed it "a black letter." The letter was a curious study in the mentality of the British Labor Party, for it displayed a distinctly capitalist approach in its emphasis upon capital as the basis of a Jewish immigration into Palestine. Instead of extending a welcome hand to workingmen to enter Palestine, it proposed free immigration to any Jew possessing a minimum capital of £1000. Should a prospective immigrant have only £500, he would be refused a visa unless he qualified by some profession or special skill. Below that admission price, he might still be squeezed into a quota provided he could produce at least £250. Below that figure there was no hope at all. The doors of Palestine were closed — under the decree of Great Britain's first Labor Government.

However, the British Colonial Office failed to allow for the Jewish power of adaptation and resourcefulness. What Polish or Russian Jew did not have an American cousin who could convert him into a temporary capitalist by advancing $5,000?

The Zionist Congress of 1931 condemned the MacDonald letter but the Palestine Government went right ahead over the next two years trying to devise restrictive measures against the

increase of new Jewish settlers. Nevertheless immigration increased substantially during the next few years, aided by deteriorating conditions inside Germany, which prompted a number of Jews with real capital assets to enter the country.

By October 1931, a resurgence of settlement was in process. The country not only escaped the world depression but made clear economic headway. Immigration from Poland and Roumania which had ceased almost completely in the late twenties was renewed in 1932. Again in 1933 Jewish immigration exceeded 30,000 — the highest number reached up to that time. In 1934 it leapt again to 42,000 and the next year (1935) no less than 62,000 Jewish immigrants entered the land — many of them in the category of "capitalists."

Thanks to this immigration and to the flow of considerable funds from abroad (over £30 million between 1932-6) Palestine enjoyed a growing prosperity between 1932 and 1935. Even so, the inflow of capital could not meet fully the needs of the various investment programs instituted in the optimistic atmosphere of those years. The deficinecy was made up in part by an internal credit network of questionable merit and by the foundation of a large number of small banks which contributed to the maintenance of an artificial prosperity until 1935. The general economic well-being benefitted the Arabs no less than the Jews, for the orange groves, building and public works of the country gave employment to increasing numbers of Arabs.

The stream of immigration, swollen by the refugees from Germany, was one of the most interesting and conspicuous phenomena of Jewish world affairs. Palestine's extraordinary development had already changed world Jewish outlook materially. By 1934, indeed, the Jewish population of Palestine had grown to 250,000 and this increase was reflected in more than economic progress.

Palestinian Jewry's internal communal and political organization were similarly developing. The Knesseth Israel, as the political assembly of the Jews, was ratified in 1928 and the phenomenal revival of Hebrew as a secular spoken and literary language

had proceeded remarkably. This latter development had a far-reaching effect on Jewish cultural life not only in literature but in all the arts. At the same time, a vast corporate effort produced improved sanitation and health facilities; provisions for athletics and sports and much higher standards in town and village planning. A new Jewish national life was indeed emerging on its own soil suffused by the ideals of Zionism at its best — and most practical!

Totally new concepts like those of Labor Zionism and the Religion of Labor found expression in Palestine in those years. The Socialist approach to Labor Zionism, carried some revolutionary overtones, originating in Russia, which could set American Jewish settlers thinking in these days.

An amusing incident brought this home to my own household:

When I had built a house in Haifa in the early thirties, I recall my younger son, coming home from the 'Real-Schule' with a story that puzzled him, and forced a difficult explanation from me. A classmate of Russian Jewish parentage, with whom he had formed a real friendship, confided to him that "while I admire you, Jonathan, still when the Revolution comes, I cannot spare you as an American capitalist". And this happened at a time that my wife was assiduously studying Hebrew to fit herself for the country that she so much loved. My old friend, Abe Goldberg, once remarked: "You, Ben, are a good Zionist and devoted to the movement, but your wife, Gertrude, is a far better Palestinian" — long before Israel and Israeli had been adopted as tokens of identity. Nor did my wife forget Zion, even when we were absent in America, during World War II, after bringing our sons to American universities in the spring of 1939, when we could obtain no visas for returning until after the War. During that time, she organized the first Hebrew speaking circle in New York, of which she acted as chairman until we took up residence again in Haifa in 1946.

The firm foundations of the future Jewish state, indeed, were laid in the half decade from 1931 to 1936. The import of German Jewish capital, significant enough in itself, was more than matched

by the vital additions of industrial skill and know-how which these German Jews brought to the country. These were a distinctly individualistic type of immigrant, adding a driving force of competitive economic ideas to put side by side with the kibbutz mentality of the earlier idealistic Russian Socialist immigrants which had produced the thriving agricultural settlements. One Haifa banker put his finger on the distinction when he said that before the tide of German immigration, nearly all private investment was centered upon real estate, with the emphasis on plot buying and speculative building operations. The German Jews introduced the era of "paper" as they called it — stocks and bonds — for without ownership of some "paper" you hardly counted as a man! Accordingly a "planned economy" began to take shape slowly, not indeed harnessed to the State, which did not yet exist, but rather growing around the powerful Labor Federation, the Histadruth, which already controlled the building and contracting company Solel Boneh, and was spreading into other fields of investment in competition with private syndicates organized for profit.

One of the new syndicates I recall with particular pride, for the people who participated were motivated less by the prospect of profit than by its importance and value to the community as a whole. It was a good example of the truth that when the profit motive is channeled into a worthy cause, it can operate best for the public interest. Dr. Abraham Weinshall, the well-known Haifa advocate, was the attorney in settling the estate of an Arab resident of Alexandria in Egypt, which included large and important tracts of land in Haifa and in Tiberias, Palestine. Of particular significance was the crucial area stretching from Hadar HaCarmel to the top of Mt. Carmel which had blocked all attempts at Jewish development in that direction.

There lived in Haifa a Rumanian-born Jew, Joseph Loewy, educated and trained in Germany, who arrived in Palestine before the end of World War I, and had already pioneered in the development of the Haifa Bay lands. In the autumn of 1933, he suggested that a syndicate be organized to buy out the heritage from the

children of Count Jedid, the wealthy Alexandrian Arab whose estate Dr. Weinshall was handling. Joseph Loewy had a restless, fertile mind, in which the profit motive was always subordinated to some grandiose scheme of a public nature. (He was later one of the founders of the colony of Nahariya as well as of Ya'arot HaCarmel). He and Dr. Weinshall now formulated a plan for the purchase of the immense estate stretching from Pevsner Street on Hadar HaCarmel to the Merkaz section on top of the Carmel. Also included in this "prize-bag" was a large stretch of land near the port of Haifa (then in the process of building) as well as large areas in and around the old town of Tiberias, on the Lake of Galilee. The price required to consummate such a deal was staggering for those days — a total of £106,000 or over half a million dollars.

I had just concluded the building of a new home at the corner of Balfour and Melchett Streets, and it was there that I was approached by Dr. Weinshall and Joseph Loewy to help them in financing the prospective purchase. I can claim but little credit in the great work of this syndicate — a real redemption program — but I was able to arrange loans from the Kupat-Am Bank and to propose that the contract of purchase should be made in installments, which would enable us to sub-divide and sell enough plots to prospective home-builders within a single year, to re-pay the entire purchase price. Accordingly, I accompanied Dr. Weinshall to Alexandria, where we made the first installment payment of £20,000, in cold cash, instead of by check. It was there that we also had the valuable cooperation of Edmond Loewy, a Haifa-born Jew, then living in Alexandria (who later returned to Haifa as a permanent resident). Joseph Loewy immediately set-up a selling organization which was so successful that it disposed of enough plots to meet the entire payment within a year. While the syndicate earned substantial profits, this was small indeed compared to the profits of those individuals who purchased the plots, whose value increased many-fold soon thereafter.

Great as is the role of public institutions like the Keren Kayemeth, we cannot, and must not, minimize the significance

of individual efforts of independent pioneers in the development of the country, as evidenced by the full account which appeared in the Palestine (now Jerusalem) Post of February 23, 1934:

"HAIFA SYNDICATE ACQUIRES
COUNT JEDID'S PROPERTY"

"The transfer has just been effected of a large part of the land belonging to the late Count Jedid in the Haifa and Tiberias district through the efforts of a Haifa syndicate organized for the purchase of this land by Judge Bernard Rosenblatt and Mr. Joseph Loewy, the engineer and his associates.

Count Selim Jedid of Alexandria had purchased large tracts of land in northern Palestine in 1925. He died in 1927, and the estate remained unsettled until September, 1933 when through a decision by the Privy Council in London it became possible for the heirs to dispose of the larger part of these lands..."

I learned a valuable lesson in economics from the eldest Jedid heir, with whom we carried on the negotiations for the purchase of the Palestine lands. He told me that his father had come to Egypt from Syria, as a penniless boy of twelve. How had he been able to accumulate such a large fortune — of which the lands in Palestine were only a minor part? The answer his son gave me was that however small his earnings, even while working as a shoe-shine boy in the streets of Alexandria, Jedid senior had managed to save money, lending it out in small sums at usurious rates of interest and, said the son, "when you start early in life and live to be over 80 years old, charging interest at 20 per cent or more per annum all the time, you are bound to die rich!"

CHAPTER XXVII

THE PALESTINE POST AND THE ARLOSOROFF TRIAL

The year 1933 was a very critical one in the development of Palestine as the Jewish National Home. In the spring of that year the beloved leader of the Labor Party and head of the political department of the Jewish Agency Executive, Chaim Arlosoroff, was murdered by unknown assailants on the beach of Tel Aviv. Arlosoroff had succeeded in reducing the tensions between the Zionist movement and the British authorities aroused by the 1929 disturbances. The shock of the murder caused a serious division in Jewish life. Charges were made that some members of the Revisionist Party were responsible for his death. It seemed to many that the Palestine Government was only too anxious to get a conviction on these lines which would inevitably result in a wide-open split between the contending forces of the Revisionists and the Histadruth Labor Party. Fortunately, the decision at the trial rested with a high-principled Jewish judge who was both indifferent to party politics and also felt strongly the need to avoid introducing any system of "divide and rule" into a Jewish Palestine. The accused Revisionists were acquitted. This is not the place to describe events following that fateful murder. Arlosoroff was a fine intellectual type who, had he lived, might have become the effective leader of Jewish labor in Palestine, and then one wonders what might have been the role of David Ben Gurion and the rich heritage he leaves us.

Only a little while before Arlosoroff's death, I was a dinner guest at his home on an occasion at which Moshe Shertok (later Sharet, the first Foreign Minister and second Prime

Minister in the State of Israel) who served as Arlosoroff's secretary in the Jewish Agency Political Department, was also present. I had come to discuss possible Jewish penetration into Transjordan, based on land settlement, when at the instance of Emmanuel Neumann (then a member of the Jewish Agency Executive) I advanced the modest sum of £300 as a preliminary payment on a contract for a large tract of land in King Abdullah's territory for a possible future Jewish settlement. Nothing came of it finally, because of internal opposition, but it is noteworthy that such a small sum, needed for the preliminaries of a political program of the Jewish Agency, had then to be sought from private sources.

The immediate problem following the Arlosoroff tragedy — dramatized by the great protest march in Tel Aviv which included participants from all sections of the country — was the healing of political wounds. A key issue was the future of the Palestine Post, edited with great ability by Gershon Agronsky (who later served as Mayor Agron of Jerusalem), who was strongly pro-Labor. However, 45% of the stock of the Post was then owned by the Revisionists in the name of Jacobi of London, the rest of the stock being scattered among local residents with Agronsky holding 25% "voting rights" as editor. It soon became evident that unless the 45% Revisionist vote was eliminated, there could be no peace in a re-united community — while as the only English publication it was especially influential with the Palestine administration, its voice reaching even as far as London. Clearly the paper could remain "safe and sound" only if someone friendly to Agronsky would buy out the Revisionist interest. At this critical stage, Agronsky sought me out, in my father's home in Tel Aviv, with a plea to me to buy out the Revisionist stock in the paper, in case they forced an anti-Histadruth policy on the Palestine Post.

I at once began negotiations with London, but was advised that they would sell only to a neutral who could guarantee fair treatment in the paper of the pending trial of the Revisionists charged with the murder of Arlosoroff. After personally receiving a pledge of fair treatment from Agronsky, to which I added

my own as a prospective stock-holder and director, I became the owner of 45% of the Palestine Post, upon my cash payment of £2,000 or $10,000. I always felt that Agronsky kept his promise as an honest newspaper editor, even though the Revisionists often came up with charges to the contrary. In any event, it was fortunate that we were able to bridge over those dangerous days. In the years that I remained the chief stockholder I never sought to influence the Post or its editor. Indeed, I agreed that Goldwater, an English Jew who was then chairman of the Board, should remain at his post when I joined the Directorate. When Goldwater later died, Colonel (later Brigadier) Frederick Kisch succeeded him as chairman.

Afterwards, when things had quietened down, I tried to argue with Agronsky to conduct the paper so that it might show some profit — not because I was particularly interested in some possible small dividend, but, from my American experience, I knew that only a self-supporting newspaper could prove to be thoroughly independent. But it was on this point, for the next few years, that I met with a strong, though friendly difference of opinion with the editor. He often cited the example of the London Times (for he naturally considered the Post as authoritative as its London contemporary) as concrete proof that a great newspaper could never pay its way without support from public or private sources. I countered, of course, with the experience of the New York Times which developed both as a great institution and was yet highly profitable.

After some years, as I valued the paper and the friendship of Agronsky too highly to indulge in a financial dispute, I accepted his suggestion that I sell my shares to the Jewish Agency of Palestine, which by that time had come virtually under the control of the Labor Party. As, in these hard days (borne out by their letter to me 15.2.38, see Annex 8), the Jewish Agency did not have sufficient cash to repay my original investment of five years before, I agreed to take £1,000 on February 15, 1938 and the balance of £750 in installments "to be approved by the Zionist Congress Political Department of the Jewish Agency" — at a net

loss to me of £250 on my five years' outlay. In spite of this, I always felt that I had made a "good investment", for it saved us from ugly charges and divisive opinions in the fateful years preceding the Arab riots of 1936-39.

CHAPTER XXVIII

LIVING IN HAIFA

Perhaps a personal note may illustrate the economic conditions in the community which was to evolve into the state of Israel. Since the summer of 1930 my family had been living in a rented house on Ahad Ha'Am Street on Hadar HaCarmel, Haifa, which had been erected by a Warsaw Jew who had hoped to bring his wife there as a permanent settler. However, when she arrived and found that she could not secure the famous carp of Poland for Friday night dinners (at least so the story goes) she insisted on returning to Warsaw. So I was fortunate in securing a fine home for my family, perhaps because we had not yet developed the famous fish ponds which, in later years, provided ample carp. For nearly a decade we remained Haifa residents, although I had to commute frequently to my law office in New York.

Towards the end of January 1931, I was returning to Haifa on the s.s. Britannic, together with my father-in-law coming to see for himself how his daughter and two grandsons were "roughing it" in this pioneer country. On board, I met and sometimes talked with Newton D. Baker, who had been Secretary of War in President Wilson's administration during World War I. He was making a Mediterranean cruise with only a one-day stop-over in Haifa, so I invited him to take breakfast in our home before his scheduled visit to Nazareth, cabling my wife to invite some of our Haifa friends to meet the distinguished traveler. A quotation from the letter he wrote to my wife after his return to the States may give some impression of the attitude of friendly Americans to the Zionist program in those early days, as follows:

"May 9, 1931

It is often difficult to realize from books or descriptions the actual conditions of anything so removed from one's experience as Palestine is from mine. But actual sight of a dignified and happy Palestinian home gives one an unforgettable impression and I shall always think of the forbidding hills of the Holy Land as ennobled by the lives of the devoted people who have gone there to re-establish its spiritual tradition.

Please remember me warmly to your husband and the boys."

At the beginning of 1933 my wife persuaded me to build a new home in Haifa for us, and I purchased the corner plot at Balfour and Melchett Streets on Hadar HaCarmel, next door to the house that Dr. Weizmann built for his mother. As I recall it, I paid 45 piastres a "pick", or the equivalent in American money of about $4,000 for the plot. I was criticized for over-paying and thereby boosting prices, since I should have paid, said our friends, only 42-½ piastres. When I defended myself with the argument that the small difference was worth it since I was securing a corner plot, I was mystified to learn that the general opinion was quite the contrary, for a corner plot brought only "dust and bad air", from the dirt roads. However, this country was developing asphalt and concrete roads so rapidly that this objection was soon overcome.

We wanted to build a modest home, but our architect would have none of it. He was building for an American family, he said, and he was no more to be overruled than the typical American Jewish waiter in a restaurant in New York. The result was that three years later we sold the house because my wife objected that it was too "prosperous-looking" and we moved to rented quarters on Mount Carmel.

Nevertheless during those three years, the house served a good purpose as a rendezvous for many conferences dealing with both economic and political problems.

THE TECHNION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF HAIFA

Even before we took possession of our new home, representatives of the Haifa Jewish community had met in our rented house on Ahad Ha'Am Street to revive an ancient celebration of Shavuoth, known as "Hag Ha-Bikkurim." Just as Tel Aviv had appropriated Purim as its favorite spectacle and Jerusalem, of course, had been dedicated to Passover since the days of old, we in Haifa now aspired to become the centre for the unique celebration long associated with the giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai and the gathering of the first fruits. It was then and there decided that we should bring the first fruits of the Galilean Jewish settlements to Haifa and this established the precedent for a third Jewish festival celebration, a decade and a half before the establishment of the Jewish state.

About this time, the reconstitution of the Haifa Technion as a thriving organization took place. Despite its impressive building on Hadar Ha-Carmel, the Technion had been floundering in periodic disputes between teachers and the earlier Directorate. I was selected as Chairman of the new committee pledged to find a new Director. I proposed the name of my old friend, S. Kaplansky, who, as an engineer, could understand the needs and requirements of such an institution, while his standing, particularly with the Labor Party, which was already a major factor in Jewish communal affairs even before 1933, might secure the ultimate success of this vital institution. From our new home, my wife was active in the annual affairs — "the Neshef and Dance" — for the support of the Technion. How paltry seemed the small gifts obtained then, yet they laid the foundation for the great institution of tomorrow. It was really the devotion of my wife and other friends that persuaded me to continue to serve on the Board of Directors for the next decade, so that when Professor R. Samuel came to America in 1939 to enlist support for a re-organized "American Technion Society," it was natural for me to serve as Chairman of the initial campaign, which launched that Society upon its highly

successful career, as the Technion's mainstay and financial support in the years ahead.

Little thought is given and less honor to such pioneer efforts as those of Professor R. Samuel in his selfless service in the years 1939 and 1940. Perhaps future graduates of the Technion may yet find the means to have a monument erected truly worthy of Professor Samuel's great work. It was largely through his efforts that we finally managed to arrange the epoch-making meeting at the Hotel Commodore in New York City on the evening of May 8, 1940 (fortunately, just before the news broke of Hitler's dastardly attack upon the Netherlands and the devastation of Rotterdam the very next day), at which I served as Chairman, introducing Professor Albert Einstein who made the appeal for support of the Technion. Perhaps for the sake of the record, it may be appropriate to quote from my speech as toastmaster, introducing Dr. Einstein on that memorable occasion:

> "We have gathered tonight to pay honor to a great scientist — our gift to America — in a typically Jewish fashion: instead of engaging in extended eulogies, we shall rather, canalize our enthusiasm for the man into an institution that he may be said to symbolize. Einstein, the scientist, requires none of our praises, but Einstein gladly lends his name and voice to the great object of a scientific institute in the Holy Land.
>
> "In America, we classify our cities on the basis of industries that have made them famous: Pittsburg is the Iron City, Detroit the Automobile Town and Minneapolis the Flour City. In Palestine, despite the supposed commercialism of the Jew, our cities are associated with the educational and cultural activities which have enhanced their importance. Jerusalem, the center of the Hebrew University; Tel Aviv, the seat of the Herzlia Gymnasia, (around it, indeed, the town of Tel Aviv developed) and Haifa, the Port City, where the Hebrew Institute of Technology stands half-way up Mt. Carmel, with a superb view overlooking Haifa Bay on the right and the vast expanse of the Mediterranean Sea on the left.
>
> "Indeed, the Haifa Technion, as it was originally callled in the Germanic nomenclature of those old happy pre-war days of Whilhelm II, holds within itself a whole commentary upon that German-Jewish concept of life which was so rudely shattered

by Hitler's Nazis. Founded by the magnificent gifts of leading German-Jewish philanthropists, the Haifa Institute was intended, as it now appears, to be a spearhead of German penetration into the Near East, when the doors of the Hebrew Institute of Technology were opened in 1913. But then a hitch occurred which was to make this Institute famous in the history of Jewish Palestine. The German donors had insisted upon German as the language of instruction in the Haifa Institute of Technology, following the precedent set by the English-speaking Evelina de Rothschild School in Jerusalem and the French Mikveh Israel Agricultural School near Tel Aviv — both founded in the 19th century. But the time had passed when Palestinian Jewish students could be handed about as chattels between the rival empires seeking the inheritance of the "sick man of Europe". In 1913, Hebrew had already become the language of Jewish youth, with the result that the prospective students of the Technion went on strike against the use of the foreign German language, which a Board of Trustees, sitting in Berlin, attempted to impose upon them. And so the fine buildings, set in a beautiful campus, remained closed until the First World War decided the issue in favor of the Hebrew-speaking students and against the well-meaning philanthropists who had attempted at the same time to serve as super-German patriots. As the war clouds disappeared, the American Jewish philanthropist, Jacob H. Schiff, stepped into the breach by purchasing the rights of the impoverished post-war Berlin Society, and thus made it possible for the Haifa Technical College to operate as the first school of higher education in Palestine — with Hebrew as the language of instruction. This Institute, likewise, was the pioneer in introducing the language of the Bible into the field of modern science."

I reminded the participants in that famous meeting that the struggle over the Hebrew language was a pivotal point in the development of Jewish nationalism. Even before World War I, as early as the beginning of 1914, the New York Times quoted a report from me as Honorary Secretary of the Federation of American Zionists, that "we are firmly resolved to have no institution rather than one that will hinder the development of the Hebrew Language". This story firmly unites the history of the

Technion with the struggle over Hebrew as the national language of the State of Israel.

It was Professor Samuel who was largely responsible for enlisting the invaluable help of Col. Elyachar and Messrs. Konoff, Sporn, Halpern, Wunch and Abe Tulin, during World War II to help make the American Technion Society the main support for the Haifa institution.

After World War II, I was to speak at a meeting in Haifa, presided over by the head of the Technion, Professor S. Kaplansky, and was able to pay a well-earned tribute to Professor Samuel's outstanding achievement.

In January, 1934, Col. Josiah Wedgwood and his wife were our guests in our new home in Haifa where we held a reception for him as a tribute from the Jewish community. Col. Wedgwood then spoke in favor of a plan of "cantonization" — as something on the road to his project for Palestine as the "Seventh Dominion" within the British Commonwealth. This looks so dated now, but then it seemed like the breath of the Divine Spirit over the dead hand of the unfriendly Palestine Administration. Something he said at the time may indicate his deep sense of devotion to our Jewish efforts in Palestine in those difficult days. Referring to his own long service in Parliament, Col. Wedgwood said that while he had no regrets for the many years spent in the House of Commons and the hundreds of thousands of words he must have uttered over that long period, he still "envied you as builders of a new civilization in the Land of Promise — for what were mere words, even when voiced in an august Parliament, when compared to deeds faithfully performed in the Holy Land!"

Professor Felix Frankfurter (later to become Justice of the United States Supreme Court) and his wife, also stayed in our new home for a few days, where he met the leaders of the Haifa community.

Professor Bronislaw Huberman, founder of the Palestine Symphony Orchestra, was also our guest. My wife helped in the foundation of that thriving institution which later became the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra.

Perhaps the happiest days in Palestine before the establishment of the State of Israel was that short period beginning in 1933 (which ended with the riots in April, 1936). German-Jewish immigration, although no more than 25% in numbers, had given a strong lift to the whole economy and every able-bodied Jew was working upon plans for the extension of the Jewish National Home. There was no unemployment. Haifa was growing, with building operations stretching from Hadar-HaCarmel up to Mt. Carmel above, while Tel Aviv pursued its northerly course to Herzlia. There was, of course, the long-standing political dispute with the British Administration on the perennial subject of immigration, and an article that I wrote for The Palestine Post on January 7, 1934, recalls that issue so crucial in the development of the Jewish National Home (see Annex 9).

German-Jewish immigration continued despite the threats of restriction. During those days we were often amused by the German-Jewish attitude, not only in the use of the Hebrew language, but even in the murderous transliteration of German into English.

For example, there was the German-Jewish nurse who advertised her services in a notice, in English, as "the diplomatic midwife," meaning that she held a diploma evidently from some German institution. There was the shochet who announced in public print "I kill myself fresh" every Friday (for Shabbat), referring, of course, not to suicide but the slaughter of fresh chickens. We were the recipients of an English circular of a "barber-shop and beauty parlor known as the Toilet Paris." With some eloquence it contained the injunction that "we speak all modern languages", and then went on to warn prospective customers, "do not trust your hairs to hands not experienced; trust them only to Toilet Paris."

But, on the whole, the German-Jewish influence was highly salutory, as that community converted Mt. Carmel into a veritable summer resort for all Israel, as well as making great contributions in all other parts of the country. Furthermore, they and, of course, many others brought capital, the lifeblood for an undeveloped country which gave a great impetus to the economy.

One example of the mighty force of "capital investment" may be cited, although it was rather unique because of the character of the person concerned. Michael Pollack was a Russian Jew who, with his brother and brother-in-law had pioneered the development of the famous Baku oil wells in the Caucasus. The family had grown fabulously wealthy and one brother had settled in Paris, after arranging with the Rothschilds to become partners in their bulging enterprise. Michael Pollack continued to live in Russia, until deprived of all his possessions by the Bolsheviks who also took over some gold mines in Siberia and major steamship interests on the Volga, which Pollack controlled. He finally managed to escape to Western Europe, eventually making his way to Paris where he discovered, to his great surprise, that he was no longer a mendicant, for the Rothschilds held shares of the Royal Dutch Company which came to him as part of the transfer of the Baku oil interest to that international organization. While the company had lost that property by Communist confiscation, its far-flung oil empire meant of course that its shares were of great value.

I met Michael Pollack in Tel Aviv, in the middle twenties, when he had just arrived from London and Paris. He was a typical conservative capitalist, carefully hoarding his holdings, although sometimes generous in undertakings allied with industry. But with it all, he was an unqualified pessimist, discouraged perhaps by his Russian experience. He often talked to me then as if he had no faith in the future of a Jewish Palestine. I remember, finally, asking him what prompted him to come to Tel Aviv, in view of his pessimism, to which he gave me the unusual reply which I here condense as nearly as possible from his story in Yiddish:

"When I came to Paris and learnt that I was still a rich man, I decided to go to Berlin, where I lost money; returned to France and lost some more; then to London, losing again, so I decided that I would no longer go to a big country where I expected to make money quickly, but to find myself a small country where I can lose my money *slowly*."

Of course, Pollack was such a good businessman that he lost nothing in Palestine, but even added to his wealth by his business

acumen and ability as an industrialist. He developed the Nesher Cement Works, of which he was a major stockholder with the Rothschild family as a partner. Eventually he sold it to the Histadruth because he did not want to quarrel with his employees. He made a large profit from the land surrounding the Nesher factory.

Many stories are told of this unique first industrialist of Palestine. Once, while he lived in Haifa in a single room in the old Herzlia Hotel, as a bachelor, he said to me: "Only the other day, did I learn why I bought some land in Jerusalem years ago. Ussishkin had come to me and persuaded me to buy some land on Mt. Scopus. What did I want with land so far away from my industry? But Ussishkin, as a good salesman, persuaded me and for several years I was a landowner in Jerusalem. Only now do I understand why I needed that land. Ussishkin comes to me now, as the President of the Keren Kayemeth, and says to me, 'Look you have important plots in Jerusalem and you are doing nothing with them. Why don't you give them to the Keren Kayemeth?' So, now I know why I bought those plots in the first place!"

We became good friends and, while in Haifa, he often visited our home there. During World War II he visited us while we lived on Central Park West in New York City. Once I remarked to him that he ought to marry some fine Jewish girl in Israel so that she could have the benefit of the comforts he could provide. To this, he gave the immediate answer, "But I cannot" and when I expressed surprise, he explained: "You see, I have a still older brother in Paris who is unmarried." Incidentally, when he died in 1952, he left a large part of his estate as a charitable bequest for Israel.

Beginning in the first week of May, 1935, Palestine was subjected to a severe khamsin — that hot dry wind blowing from the Syrian Desert to the Mediterranean — which lasted nine long days. I recall visiting an office in downtown Haifa, where some Arabs appeared in connection with land sales to Jews. An Arab made the remark that, "If this khamsin lasts another day, we Arabs will all be dead." That same afternoon when

I returned home for the midday meal, my eldest son, just returning from his studies at the Reali Schule stopped, wiped the perspiration from his forehead, and said: "You know, Papa, if this khamsin continues for another day or two, all the Jews will leave Palestine." I remember telling him of the Arab complaint made an hour earlier and saying to him: "This is the real Jewish danger; the Arabs feel that they cannot and will not leave the land, while we Jews often react as mere sojourners." I then gave him a lecture on Jewish history reminding him that the real Jewish tragedy came *after* the first destruction of Jerusalem, when our ancestors deserted the land after the death of Gedaliah. It took a long time to reverse the process with the immigration of Ezra and the re-building under Nehemiah. As long as a people remains on its soil, despite conquest and even slavery, there is always the prospect of a renaissance — as witness Poland and Ireland.

I did not pretend to decide, then and there, as to which was a better or wiser course to pursue in the long run, for the Jewish people were probably saved by their exile from Palestine after the first and second destruction of the Temple, yet it is undeniable that the mere possibility of a choice between the land and exile was responsible for the Jewish tragedy of a nation without a fatherland. I quoted to him from a long-past speech I had delivered before the Baltimore Chapter of Hadassah during World War I.

> "We are liable to confuse political forms with territorial and national facts. Poland exists, and must continue to exist as long as the vast majority of the population of a certain district are Poles. Ireland exists, and must continue to exist as long as the Irish constitute the majority in the Emerald Isle. Belgium lives — no matter how many foreign armies may occupy her soil — so long as her people constitute the major fraction in the land. And in all such cases where the internal and vital signs of nationality exist, namely, actual physical possession of the territory by a large majority of the people that claim it, there is always the probability, nay, the certainty, that political independence will follow as a necessary external evidence of national life. The birth rate upon the national soil is of far more vital consequence than the death rate in victorious

> battles upon conquered territory... Our ancestors set aside the Fast of Gedaliah as a remembrance of the great loss to the Jewish nation, for they too appreciated the truth that not mere political subjection, but continued absence from the land was the great Jewish tragedy. Similarly, the Jewish nation was not destroyed when Titus took possession of the smouldering ruins of Jerusalem, but we have been in a state of "suspended animation" from the days when, after the Bar Kochba rebellion, we ceased to be the dominant population in Palestine."

Land prices were rising rapidly — as always happens in times of prosperity — and I was much perturbed that nothing was done to halt land speculation, which allowed the few to reap unconscionable profits at the expense of the many seeking living quarters. I had been urging for years that the Keren Kayemeth should step into the picture of urban land ownership — where speculation was the great evil — but the whole tradition of the Jewish National Fund was for "redemption of the soil", which was interpreted in a particularly restrictive way, limiting itself to agricultural land. This was understandable, because in those days it was really necessary to foster a farming population to feed the country. Besides, the limited means of the Keren Kayemeth naturally inclined their leaders to a policy of purchase of larger areas under public control, instead of concentrating upon the buying of plots in larger cities. Yet, in the long run, it might have proved better to acquire the more valuable urban lands, for the rental income accruing to the Keren Kayemeth from such plots would have enabled it to do much more both for farmers and consumers alike. As early as the summer of 1933, I wrote articles in The Palestine Post of August 16 and 31, to warn of the dangers posed by unrestricted land speculation, and pleading for a public policy which might halt the process. But it was a mere "cry in the wilderness". Later, immediately after the State was established, I was to propose a bond issue for redemption of all urban lands, which seemed to evoke wide support in the Hebrew press, but no concrete action was taken. It still remains a dire problem needing solution.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE ARAB RIOTS AND THE POLITICAL SOLUTION

The spring of 1936 saw the end of peaceful days for Palestine. While the British Government could be generous towards German refugees arriving in England, its Palestine policy was another matter — complicated by a variety of extraneous considerations. Like many a foundling, Palestine was proving more and more of an embarrassment to its adoptive parent. The mandatory experiment was foundering on the rock of rising tensions between Hitler's Germany and the western world. In the manoeuvring for position between the two groups, the Arabs had much more to offer, politically speaking, than the Jews. Inevitably, their support was solicited at the expense of Jewish interests — and immigration into Palestine.

In the years after 1932, Jewish immigration into Palestine had risen by leaps and bounds, demonstrating that the country's "economic absorptive capacity" was infinitely more elastic than the British administration and its experts (who ignored Jewish resource and capacity for self-sacrifice when making their calculations), had anticipated.

Between 1932 and 1936, 135,000 Jews entered the country. At that level, Jewish immigration would leave the Arabs far outnumbered within six or eight years and Palestine would be transformed into a Jewish state under Jewish rule. Arab fears of being swamped were not entirely unreasonable and were fed of course by the German and, especially, Italian Fascist governments who gladly seized on a useful weapon against British influence in the Middle East.

The resulting agitation produced widespread Arab riots, led by the Mufti, Haj Amin el Husseini, and aimed not only against the Jews but also against the mandatory power. Under the Mufti's leadership, a loose federation of Arab "parties" took shape. They presented the High Commissioner, Sir Arthur Wauchope, with an ultimatum, demanding an end to Jewish immigration and a ban on the sale of land to the Jews. The High Commissioner offered a compromise in the shape of constitutional reforms which would ensure internal administration equally shared by both sections of the population, but the proposal was rejected by both the Arabs and Jews and opposed by the British Parliament. At the same time, having become convinced that Jewish influence would always decide policy, the Arabs had reached the point of refusing all further negotiations with the British. Arab opposition to British rule was now one of the permanent features of the Palestine scene, and in this they were encouraged by successful nationalist movements against French and British rule elsewhere in the Middle East.

A wave of attacks against Jewish settlements throughout the country was the signal for riots which developed into a general strike and were then prolonged in a guerrilla warfare which lasted sporadically for the next three years.

I cannot forget the onset of these events, for it was in the afternoon of April 18, 1936, that I travelled with my late father upon his return, after taking the baths in Tiberias. I was in the front seat of the car with the driver, when we were hailed by an Arab in British uniform, near Tulkarm, asking for a lift. We took him on, but after going with us for only a short distance, he asked to be let out on a pathway that seemed to lead nowhere. Soon afterwards, our car came to a road-block which, my chauffeur remarked, looked ominous. Instead of stopping, he deliberately went off the road, speeded around the obstacle and regained the main road soon afterwards. The driver, an experienced Israeli chauffeur, remarked to me that he "did not like it", saying that the "Arab officer" looked suspect. But we thought nothing

further of it until we reached Tel Aviv about seven o'clock that evening, where there was already a hue and cry that a wagon carrying chickens, had been attacked near Tulkarm by marauding Arabs who had killed the driver and his assistant. We had passed that truck only about ten minutes before we took on the "Arab officer", but I shall never know whether the attack was postponed because we talked English, or the intended victims were saved by the presence of mind of our intrepid driver, Jacob Blum, of Haifa. In any event, this was the signal which led to serious bloodshed in Jaffa the next morning and three years of unremitting guerrilla warfare. It seemed such a pity, for the Jews of Palestine were already well on the way to realizing the dream of a Jewish State. The country seemed relaxed in April, 1936. We were slowly building economic strength, while increasing our numbers, through continuing Jewish immigration.

By the end of 1936, the Arab rebellion and general strike had been brought to a standstill by British strength. The "Higher Arab Committee" was finally persuaded to call off the General Strike by the intervention of the leaders of neighboring Saudia, Transjordan and Iraq — representing a covert triumph for British diplomacy. The Arab partisan General Kaukji was allowed to leave Palestine unmolested. The rebellious Arab peasants returned to their villages and quietly stowed their arms away in safe-hiding to wait for the next round.

The Jewish defence organization, the "Haganah", had also been strengthened until the force numbered some 21,000, apart from the 3,000 members of the "Etzel." In the spring of 1936, a large force of supernumerary Jewish police, the "Notrim", were recognized by the Government as the natural defenders of Jewish settlements. Together, these forces were to become the central core of the Haganah's military force, controlling its armory and deciding its strategy. The military developments of this period, it has been rightly observed, represented a general rehearsal for the crucial Arab-Jewish war of Independence a dozen years later.

Nevertheless, for the moment, relatively peaceful conditions

were restored. The Arabs were the richer for some distinct political gains. Arab unity, for instance, had achieved "de facto" recognition, giving other Arab governments the right to interfere in deciding Palestine's future course. Moreover the rebels had never been conclusively defeated. Moderate Arab opinion was silenced and the Mufti's influence greatly enhanced.

A commission under Lord Peel was sent out by the British Government in November 1936, to investigate and make fresh recommendations about the political future of Palestine. Weizmann submitted a survey and analysis of the Palestine situation to the commission and this remains an impressive assessment of the past, present and future position of the Jews, from every point of view, historical, social, economic and political. Weizmann's survey formed the basis for future thinking on this tormented problem for many years to come and, in the event, its prophecies were largely fulfilled. The report of the Peel Commission, when finally submitted, was in itself a state paper of great integrity and, probably, the fairest account of British policy in Palestine at the time. It advocated the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab self-governing entities, although this was hedged in by significant reservations, which partly account for the rejection of the proposals at this time by both sides.

Weizmann had tentatively accepted the plan in principle, in spite of the many reservations, regarding it as the lesser of a variety of evils. However, when he tried to persuade the Jewish Agency and the Zionist Congress to accept partition, a storm arose among the Jews. After lengthy and passionate debate, the Zionist Congress accepted the Peel solution in principle, although with radical qualifications insisting on more favourable partition lines. The Arabs rejected it outright. In Britain, the House of Commons opted for it, but the plan was sabotaged remorselessly by the Government who collected the adverse opinions of Arab states, sent out a new Commission to advise on the new frontiers and accepted its conclusions. But no satisfactory frontier was ever drawn — nor indeed could it be in the existing situation.

In America, partition was denounced by leaders of Jewish

opinion as the sacrifice of every prospect of economic viability and large-scale immigration in exchange for the mirage of political independence in an absurdly tiny area which it would be impossible to defend.

CHAPTER XXX

THE HAIFA PLAN FOR A FEDERAL SOLUTION

Ever since the onset of the Arab riots, all thoughts had turned to a possible solution to the grave problem. Like many others, I contributed something to this long debate, both within and outside Palestine. Properly envisaged, it can hardly be called an Arab problem, but rather a continuation of the everlasting Jewish problem of being a *minority,* even in the old land of Israel, where the Arabs were still the numerical majority. Were we doomed to remain forever a "protected minority" in the land of our forefathers?

The question which stood out above all others was that of free Jewish immigration into Palestine. This, the Arab majority naturally resisted as being tantamount to a surrender of their land to an eventual Jewish majority. On the other hand, without increasing Jewish immigration, the Jews were destined to evolve as a minority in the "Jewish National Home", which seemed a contradiction in its very terms. That is why all the efforts of Dr. Judah L. Magnes, the venerable head of the Hebrew University, to advocate "Ichud" or unity with the Arabs, could make little headway among the rank and file of the Jewish community, who sensed that such a program made no provision for safeguarding Jewish immigration. As often happens, in this matter of a life and death struggle, the common man saw the issue more clearly than many intellectuals.

It was soon evident that the British administration in Palestine would supplement the plans for restricted immigration by the adoption of ordinances forbidding land transfers to Jews in the

larger part of the Mandated area of Palestine. Many of us felt that we should endeavor to transfer as much land as possible into Jewish possession before the enactment of such restrictions — and one of my old friends in Haifa, Joseph Loewy, was foremost in such a program. He proposed that during a lull in the Arab riots, we go out to examine some land at Yaarot Ha-Carmel, despite the fact that only a few days previously a young Jewish girl had been kidnapped and killed by marauding Arabs on the Carmel, where they maintained an outpost, obstructing traffic. To my objection that we could not break through this obstacle, even assuming that we escaped with our lives, he countered with the proposition that he had a German-Jewish chauffeur, who spoke both English and Arabic and could easily pass as an English officer, guiding some tourists over the Carmel.

Accordingly, I reluctantly accompanied Loewy, sitting next to the blonde-haired driver, in his English make-up, while Loewy with two friends, sat in the rear of the auto. Sure enough, we were stopped by armed Arabs at the lookout, and asked for identifying passports, which none of us carried, while the driver explained that this was a tourist party, accompanying an "American judge", as he pointed to me. The Arabs insisted, however, that I must produce some identity papers, and knowing that our "Arab cousins" could neither read nor write, I ventured to pick out from my pocket a gold-embossed greeting-card which looked impressive and handed it over for observation. Sure enough, we were allowed to pass — and I still treasure the card, which in bold letters states: "Life member of the Zionist Organization of America", signed by Israel Goldstein as President. We returned safely to our homes, and later Yaarot Ha-Carmel came into Jewish possession.

I had been writing several articles in the Palestine Post on the subject of a possible reconciliation with the Arabs, while still insisting on the right to free Jewish immigration within an area to be designated as a Jewish State (almost identical with the present boundaries of the State of Israel) but united in an "economic union" and for defence with the Arab State (the present Jordan).

By the spring of 1937, I succeeded in organizing a "Haifa

Committee" to support the program for such a "federal" solution of the Arab-Jewish dispute over Palestine, in which two states would be established, each politically free and with complete control over its immigration policy, yet operating in a federal union of two states for promotion of its economic program and protection against external aggression.

Accordingly, when the "Royal Peel Commission" Report of 1937 was announced by the British Government, our Haifa Committee was ready to support such a plan, provided only that we were accorded adequate territory, and not limited to the small area suggested. In that connection, we offered an "exchange of territory" — instead of an exchange of population — so that the area which I designated as the "Nablus Triangle" (running from the Jordan west to the Sharon plain and from Jenin in the north to Ramallah in the south) be exchanged for Western Galilee, which had been excluded from the proposed Jewish State. The Haifa Committee championed the view that the Jews and Arabs could live peaceably together in two separate states, each controlling its own immigration policy, yet united in an economic union for general welfare and defence against external aggression. I called it a "Federal solution", as reminiscent of the American Federal system, with separate states bound together in a firm union, but with the added provision that each state, instead of the union itself, should control the subject of immigration. I was fortunate in securing the support of some outstanding Jews of Haifa for such a solution, as an alternative to the rejected "Ichud", which failed to provide any policy on the crucial problem of immigration. Four noted men, with their mighty names, helped to enlist support for the program of the Haifa Committee: S. Kaplansky, the head of the growing Haifa Technion, Dr. Aron Barth, at that time heading the Palestine Electric Corporation (and later the Anglo-Palestine Bank which became the Bank Leumi), Dr. S. Solovechik, who formerly served with me as a member on the World Zionist Executive, and my old friend, Herman Struck, the famous etcher, who was one of the pioneers in the development of Haifa. The plan was informally presented to the Zionist Executive in

Jerusalem by Dr. Aron Barth and S. Kaplansky, where it was favorably received with the proper suggestion that Arab opinion should be sounded on the plan.

At the same time as we were endeavoring to enlist liberal Arab opinion, I had an opportunity, on a trip to New York in the autumn of 1937, to present the Haifa Plan to the Executive Committee of the American Zionist Organization, pleading for some form of acceptance of the Peel Commission Report, even though we coupled it with a request for additional territory, since it gave us the prospect of a Jewish State.

While in New York (my family still remaining in Palestine) the Jewish National Fund — of which I had been the President in the preceding decade — tendered me a banquet at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on October 24, 1937; and this gave me an opportunity to explain and support this program of the Haifa Committee. The meeting was graced by practically all the leaders of American Zionism, including Dr. Stephen S. Wise, and Louis Lipsky, with Dr. Israel Goldstein, then President of the Jewish National Fund, as Chairman.

Perhaps a short quotation from my speech on that occasion will indicate the progress already made in the development of a Jewish Palestine in the preceding decade and a half:

> "A dozen years ago in the city of Tel Aviv — then a small township only one-sixth the fraction of its present size — I was tendered a different kind of a dinner, presided over by the venerable Mayor of Tel Aviv, while the speakers were men who seldom uttered a word in public — Ahad Ha'Am, the philosopher of the Jewish National Movement, and Bialik, the poet of the Hebrew renaissance. A little while before we had received from America the results of the Tel Aviv Bond issue, the first Jewish Government bond in history, and we were then planning a new bond issue, already sanctioned by the High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, based upon a union of the five Jewish townships, Tel Aviv, Petah Tikvah, Rishon le Zion, Rehovoth and Hadera...
>
> "Unfortunately, that proposed "Union of Jewish Municipalities" and the bond isssue was not to be realized immediately

because the Colonial Office pigeon-holed the whole plan, when the Daily Mail of London led the attack on the "Rosenblatt Plan for a Jewish State" and in a leading news item pointed out the danger of a "state within a state".

"This incident is perhaps a true measure of Palestine's progress in the short period since 1925... Today, England, herself proposes a Jewish State including Galilee and the Sharon plain, which all Jews reject as insufficient in area and resources, while some of us would even refuse any connection with a parley over the partition of Palestine, one and indivisible"."

The New Palestine carried an interesting account of the meeting particularly extolling the role of the American Zion Commonwealth in the building of Herzlia, Balfouria, Afule and the redemption of the Haifa Bay land.

In fact, however, the issue of a "partition" seemed to divide the Jews of the world between those who were willing to accept at once a state within a restricted area and those who preferred to wait and see. An article I wrote for The Palestine Post of April 2, 1938, brings back the sense of danger and confusion then prevailing (see Annex 10).

Before leaving New York, in the autumn of 1937, I gave to the Zionist Organization of America a memorandum emphasizing the cardinal principle of immigration: "Only upon the question of immigration must we be adamant. That alone, if exclusively in our hands, will determine the ultimate success of the Jewish State."

I was gratified to receive the letter from David Ben Gurion of July 16, 1937, endorsing such views (as appears in the photostat):

Meanwhile I continued the campaign for a "Federal Palestine", based upon a Jewish State with control over its immigration policy, as best expressed in my letter to the Manchester Guardian on July 25, 1938, from which it is perhaps worthwhile to quote the following:

"We have expressly stated, in resounding resolutions at Zionist Congresses, that we have no desire for domination over the Arabs of Palestine. I take it that this is no mere pious

hope or wish and, therefore, we must be ready to give effect to our own resolutions.

"There is one policy — still untried — which offers the prospect of peace plus immigration. This involves the orga-

הסוכנות היהודית בשביל ארץ ישראל
THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE.

EPHONE: MUSEUM 3817 (4 LINES).
EGRAMS: "ZIONIBURO, LONDON."
ODES: BENTLEY'S AND MOSSE'S.

77, GREAT RUSSELL STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1.

In reply please address the Secretary:
and quote the following Reference No.:
DBG.

16th July, 1937.

Mr. Bernard A. Rosenblatt,
40, Exchange Place,
New York.

Dear Rosenblatt,

Many thanks for your letter of June 29th. I was very glad to hear of your talks with our friends and of the memorandum which you sent to them. I feel quite certain that, once we have had an opportunity of personal discussion, the apparent differences of opinion will disappear and the line taken by the Executive will be accepted both by the great majority of Congress and by our American friends.

Please continue to keep me informed of the trend of opinion in America. I will greatly appreciate any pointers in regard to it that you can let me have.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

B. Ben-Gurion

nization of Palestine and Transjordan into the "Federated States of Palestine", tied to Great Britain by a pact of perpetual peace and friendship, whereby Great Britain would act as the agent for the Federated States in all foreign affairs. The Arab State, including Transjordan and that triangle of Palestine included between Jenin, Tulkarm and Ramallah, south of Nablus, in what I call the "Nablus Triangle", would afford ample area for the peaceful growth of the Arab population. The Jewish State, comprising the whole of Galilee and the Emek, stretching along the Sharon Valley and the Coastal Plain up to Gaza, with a curve to the east so as to include the newer Jerusalem, would offer reasonable prospects for Jewish economic development and immigration during the next few decades." (See Map).

Meanwhile, I left for London to represent this "Haifa Plan" for a "Federated Palestine" at the Woodhead Commission, then about to take testimony in support of the "Royal Peel Commission Report" of the preceding year. I was then advised that my evidence would be "welcomed" on Wednesday afternoon, August 17, 1938; and almost at the same time I was invited for a conversation at the Colonial Office for the morning of August 16th. There I had an interesting talk with the Colonial Secretary, who explained to me that it was part of the duty of the British to protect the Arabs, for otherwise (to quote his words) "the Jews would run rings around the Arabs".

In the preceding week I had had a long conference with Lord Samuel at his London home, in which he urged me to present my views to the Partition Commission because "Federalism", in his view, was much to be preferred to ordinary simple partition, although for himself he would have accepted a "temporary minority status for Jews" with "limited but adequate" Jewish immigration. I reminded him that Palestine Jewry was obstinately opposed to any recognition of a minority status, and to this he finally reluctantly agreed.

I reported on my appearance in the Colonial Office and as a witness before the Partition Commission the next day, in a letter of September 12, 1938, addressed to Dr. Aron Barth of the Haifa

The boundaries suggested (shown on the map) included the so-called "Nablus Triangle", a completely Arab area, formed by the Jordan (on the east), Jenin to the north, Tulkarm to the west, Ramallah just north of Jerusalem to the south and with Nablus as its centre. It seemed that later on there might be a possibility to exchange this area for a similar territory not quite so close to the heart of the Jewish state — perhaps the lands of Golan and Bashan lying between the River Yarmuk (the northern border of Transjordan) and Damascus (The area is now part of Syria). Whether or not such an exchange was feasible, it seemed better to give up any claim to the Nablus area, which was completely Arab in character.

Committee. From the letter I shall quote only excerpts, although my testimony lasted over an hour and a half:

> "The numerous questions that were put to me to explain the reason why not more water was discovered in the Emek seemed to me to be indicative of the fact that at least some of the commissioners felt that we **could** discover more water and that, therefore, it was not necessary, in line with my plea for more adequate territory for a Jewish State, to allot the whole of Galilee. In short, I drew the logical conclusion that northern Galilee seemed to be in danger, especially when I pleaded for an extension of the Jewish State up to the Litani River (so as to secure the water rights there); the Chairman responded: "You don't care where the water comes from as long as you get the water". Likewise, I am convinced that the commissioners have not yet made up their minds about the status of Haifa, to judge by the question put to me in connection with "Iraq Petroleum" and "whether the Christian Arabs would care to live under a Jewish State."

In answer to the latter rhetorical question, I replied that if the Jews could live for centuries under Christians, there was no reason why some Christian Arabs might not be accommodated in a Jewish Haifa.

We kept up our work for the Haifa Committee almost to the beginning of World War II. From the Jewish point of view this was all to the good, for it helped to solidify opinion in favor of a program which might offer us adequate territory and still ensure the all-important measure of control of immigration within that Jewish territory, plus the possibility of expansion into the Negev.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE HAGANAH AND JEWISH IMMIGRATION

In between (1937-8), unrest in Palestine had flared again. In the summer of 1937 the Arabs again took up arms against the British and during 1938 they were in control of almost the whole of the countryside, even imposing taxes on the local population. The instructions of the Zionist Executive had been that the Jewish forces should act exclusively in a defensive role; but under so much provocation, the Jewish ranks split, the Etzel beginning attacks on the Arabs as a means of intimidating them. Accordingly, at the end of 1938, the British army took over control of the countryside from the Arabs, but their opposition continued almost up to the eve of the second World War.

The Jews had only gradually adopted a decisive stand in the matter. For years, the British had been regarded as their undeclared allies and, throughout the Arab rebellion there had been a degree of Jewish-British cooperation. Yet this facade masked the slow crystallization of an anti-Zionist attitude as part of British policy, more concerned with political developments at home and the protection of British interests and lines of communication abroad. There was a parallel change in Jewish attitudes. With the whole political future of Palestine in the balance, Jewish-British amity had to give place to a more critical, even antagonistic stance. The new attitude found concrete expression in intensified illegal immigration ("aliyah beth") which brought in some 16,000 Jews up to the beginning of World War II, in defiance of all the efforts of the British police, army or navy.

By this time the Haganah had evolved into an underground military organization, backing the Zionist political leadership in

Palestine. Through the years, the Jews — whose numbers had grown to some 475,000 — had been slowly united into a solid phalanx, ready to face difficulties, attacks and privation. They had become the nucleus of a nation. And paradoxical though it may seem, that development was the direct result of the Arab rebellion which, by the same token, had missed its last opportunity of halting Jewish immigration. The rebellion had been undertaken prematurely, its strategy amateurishly directed. The Arab prestige due to their Fascist affiliation, had similarly suffered a serious setback, while the Arabs' own ineffectiveness in the field presaged their greater defeat ten years later, in 1948.

By the end of 1938, of course, the international picture had changed considerably. There had been Fascist Italy's war against Abyssinia; the Fascists had been victorious in the Spanish Civil War and Hitler's troops had already occupied Austria. With the undeclared war of the Arabs against them continuing unabated, the Jews strengthened the semi-legal defence corps, the "Haganah" (first created, illegally, in 1920), to protect Jewish lives and property against repeated, unprovoked attack. To some extent the Haganah was even able to cooperate with the British forces, mainly through the increase of the force of legal "notrim" to 21,000. They were the central camouflage for the Haganah.

Then came the debacle of Munich and the imminent prospect of war with Germany. Anxious to secure its Middle East bases, the British Government yielded to Arab demands. The Jews were called upon by the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax and the Colonial Secretary, Malcolm MacDonald, to renounce their dream of either a majority or an autonomous political entity, let alone a Jewish state, in Palestine.

Subsequently, early in 1939, the British Government issued a White Paper imposing severe restrictions upon the transfer of Arab land to Jews and making all Jewish immigration at the end of a five-year period dependant upon Arab goodwill. The British Government, in short, had repudiated earlier declarations, promises and policies. Now their intention was clear: the liquidation of the Zionist dream for good.

The proposition was rejected by Weizmann and the Jewish orgranizations with dignity and force. The stage was set, as early as 1939, for the inevitable struggle of the Jews against the British policy.

With the outbreak of World War II in September 1939, Jewish immigration into Palestine became crucial to any hope of survival from the Nazi terror. It was part of the great task of the American Zionist Organization to bring pressure upon Great Britain to ease the unjust restrictions on Jewish immigration.

I had returned to New York in the summer of 1939, to place my two sons in college. Little did I then think that we would be "marooned" in New York for six years and more, for my wife and I had planned to return to Haifa in the autumn while our boys would study in America.

On my way to New York, I stopped off in London for propaganda on behalf of the Haifa Committee, for a "Federated Palestine and a Jewish State", following my letter to the Manchester Guardian of March 14, 1939, in which I pointed out the American interest in that issue; from which the following might be quoted:

> "While some politicians in Great Britain think to win the Moslems of India by repudiating Palestine commitments, they stand to lose the confidence of the Christians of the United States. The Palestine Mandate remains the only "net gain" of the United States from the World War, as a sort of moral offset against the blood and treasure expended — for she received no colonies, her war debts remain unpaid, and she has had to console herself solely with the "moral benefits" of a treaty with Great Britain, in which the Palestine Mandate and the Jewish National Home are set forth verbatim. She must be enlisted for the preservation of world peace, but she may hesitate when the moral issue is so unclear. And while she hesitates, the peace may be lost...
>
> "Great Britain has a far greater and nobler role to play in the Near East than to barter for corridors and scraps of territory. Dimly she has perceived something of her historic responsibilities in suggesting a future federation of Arab states.

> But a safe beginning can be made only by first "federating" Palestine itself — by uniting the Arab and Jewish states, as outlined, into the "Federated States of Palestine", ruled by a Federal Council over which the British High Commissioner would preside. The Jews should welcome such a federal union with a sister Arab state which, while affording ample opportunity for local self-government, will nevertheless enable both states to profit from the benefits of a common customs and tariff system, a common currency with free trade and commerce between the states, while each state would control its own domestic affairs, with its own legal system, including the vital subject of immigration, yet under the beneficent guidance of Great Britain. A federal system of reciprocity between the states would be developed to safeguard minority rights, and a common system of defence against external aggression, which might form the keystone in a system of peace and justice in the whole Mediterranean."

Upon my arrival in New York, I tried to enlist the support of Justice Brandeis for such a federal union, visiting him at his home in Washington for that purpose. But I was disappointed, for Brandeis was adamant in his opposition to anything that "smelled of partition". True to his uncompromising attitude that England must perform in full its commitments under the Palestine Mandate, he would not yield one inch of sovereignty or territory from the developing Jewish State. Although he treated me personally in a very friendly fashion, recalling the days when we first met at the Harvard Club more than a quarter of a century before, when I was a young law clerk, he repeated that any diminution of Jewish rights in or to Palestine must be rejected. This was quite in contrast to the views of both Weizmann and Ben Gurion, who were then anxious to grasp at any part of Palestine if that would permit the flow of immigration. It is unlikely that Great Britain, in the last analysis, would have permitted the expanded immigration that might have resulted in a Jewish State, yet any concession that would offer a place of refuge for European Jewry on the eve of World War II, could hardly be rejected.

I always felt that on this issue Weizmann and Ben Gurion were right, and that in the ensuing catastrophe of World War II,

we might have saved a portion of our people, if only there had been a state in even a partitioned Palestine.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Early on the morning of September 1, 1939, as I and my family were returning by boat from a short vacation in Maine, the stillness of Long Island Sound was broken as the radio blared forth the announcement of Hitler's dastardly attack on Poland which opened World War II. I had to work from the American base for the Jewish National Home in the next half decade, both within the Zionist ranks and also to pick up loose connections in American politics, when, in the autumn of 1940, I volunteered to help in the re-election campaign of President Roosevelt. I was appointed as the Jewish Adviser to the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Edward J. Flynn. It was remarkable how strong the current ran among Jewish voters in favor of President Roosevelt, and the polls in the overwhelmingly Jewish districts in the Bronx indicated a ratio of almost 50 to one in his favor. Their influence upon the result of the electoral vote of the Empire State of New York was crucial in his election.

During the progress of that political campaign. I arranged with Emanuel Neumann for a particularly impressive Bible to be presented to the Vice-Presidential nominee, Henry Wallace, who showed himself particularly friendly to Jewish aspirations. A curious incident happened at a private interview that I had arranged with Wallace in which I endeavored to emphasize the importance of Palestine as a solution for the Jewish problem, now more essential than ever, with the threat of the Nazi terror under Hitler. To my surprise, this true friend of the Jews, who had served as a member of Roosevelt's Cabinet for nearly eight years preceding, could not understand the importance of "small" Palestine as a solution to the grievous problems of World Jewry, saying: "We will open up South America to you, which needs development and where Jewish immigration would be a blessing to those countries."

Here was a highly intelligent man and a real friend, who could see only an economic problem in Jewish persecution, to be solved by immigration to Catholic South America. But this really reflected the attitude of his Chief, for President Roosevelt also, while fully appreciative of the Jewish personalities who worked with and for him, could never be made to understand the value and importance of a "Jewish National Home" in Palestine.

UNITED PALESTINE APPEAL

New York City
November 15, 1940

Honorable Bernard A. Rosenblatt
80 Broad Street
New York, N.Y.
Dear Ben:

I want to write to you about two very important things: (1) your contribution toward the re-election of the President, which was very, very important. Whether it was wise to bar out all public Jewish participation in the campaign is a matter to be discussed in the future. Every communication that I have gotten speaks of F.D.R. as the "Jew President." That thing is settled in the minds of his enemies. But that lies in the past, and thank God for four wonderful years that lie ahead.

(2) What you write about Henry Wallace is very interesting. It reminds me of the day in December, 1918, when C.W. spoke in London of the possibility of averaging 10,000 settlers yearly in Palestine for five years, and deHaas rose up in his wrath against him. It was a great service to have gotten Wallace to come and to have made his fine address. I hope I will see him in the near future and discuss the problem with him.

With most hearty greetings and renewed congratulations, I am

Faithfully yours,
Stephen S. Wise

Four years later, when President Roosevelt was again a candidate (for his fourth term) it took all the pressure that we in the Zionist Organization could exert, particularly through the

intercession of his wife, Eleanor — who had a good understanding and emotional response towards the project of a Jewish State — to elicit a friendly statement from President Roosevelt. Even then, as a clever politician, he made the carefully amended statement, "as a candidate", to which he might not have been held responsible as an elected official. I had personally prepared this statement, which was slightly modified, and read by Senator Robert F. Wagner, to the delegates at the Atlantic City Convention of the Zionist Organization of America in the summer of 1944.

After the 1940 campaign, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee asked me what I desired as a reward for work done in the re-election of President Roosevelt — for my division had operated without any expense to the party, and indeed had accumulated quite a fund to help defray the general expense of the National Committee. I told him that I was not interested in a lawyer's usual reward of a judgeship, but asked only, if it were possible, for his recommendation to be appointed as the U.S. Minister to Egypt. In my innocence, I though I might perhaps be useful in thereby working out a friendly pact with the Arabs, supported and approved by the Government of the United States. (Little did I then understand the deep gulf that separated Jews and Arabs, despite my full decade of residence in Haifa before World War II.) A little while later I had returned to me the memorandum which I had drafted in that connection and which Flynn had faithfully presented to President Roosevelt with a notation, in ink, in the President's hand: "No can do". I told Flynn that I would make no other claim, although I was invited, with my wife, to the White House, with others, in appreciation of my work in the election campaign of 1940.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE BILTMORE CONFERENCE AND THE JEWISH COMMONWEALTH

During the year 1941, I was still active in propaganda for a "Jewish Commonwealth" in a "Federated Palestine". Later in the year "The Reconstructionist" reviewed my book on "Federated Palestine" as "an important contribution towards the solution of one of the most obstinate problems, which, if not solved justly and speedily, is certain to bring untold grief to Palestine and Jewry. It deserves the prayerful study and sympathetic consideration of all who love Zion." (November 28, 1941)

Months before that, in The New Palestine of April 11, 1941, in an article entitled "A Jewish Commonwealth in Zion", I reviewed the long history from the resolution adopted at the first meeting of the American Jewish Congress convened at the end of World War I, in December 1918, which called for a "Jewish Commonwealth", as quoted below:

> "I was a member of the Resolutions Committee, where I first offered the phrase, "Jewish Commonwealth" which seemed to me expressive of the double purpose implicit in American Zionism, then under the leadership of Justice Louis D. Brandeis...
>
> "It is altogether fitting that America, which first explored the true significance behind the phrase "The Commonwealth of Massachusetts" or the "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" should again offer the prospect for a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine — the gift of American Jewry towards the rebuilding of Zion.
>
> "It is not a mere matter of words with which we are dealing, for the content is of supreme significance. When we

talk of a **Jewish** Commonwealth, we mean a commonwealth that must be Hebraic in character and culture...

"The Jewish Commonwealth may be able to unite with a contiguous Arab sister state or confederation, to form a "more perfect union", for defence against external aggression and for the preservation of peace in the Near East. But in domestic affairs, the Jewish Commonwealth must be free to develop its unique character and culture, even as the Arab state will be sovereign in its internal affairs — while both states may offer reciprocal rights to Jews and Arabs within their respective boundaries. Geographically, the Jewish Commonwealth and the Arab State may be as separate as the fingers of a hand, while still united under the beneficent guidance of Great Britain into a firm fist to guard against aggression from any totalitarian power.

"...There is no doubt that if the Jew is once given the opportunity to translate his old ethical principles into living law, he will respond as of old, to eliminate poverty from the House of Israel and serve as a guiding star to point the way for a solution of the ever-recurring problem of unemployment...

"Perhaps in no better way can we prove our devotion to America and its principles of democracy and equal opportunity than by the successful up-building of the Jewish Commonwealth in Zion — our gift to the embattled democracies of the world."

Throughout the years 1941-43 I made a prime issue of the Anglo-American treaty, ratified twenty years before, under which America had given its consent to the British Mandate over Palestine. According to that convention, there could be no discrimination between American citizens and any other "inhabitants of Palestine." I recall a meeting of the Zionist Political Committee in the spring of 1942 at which I insisted that the question of violation of the terms of the Palestine mandate must be raised as an *American* issue — not just as a mere Jewish complaint against the British Government. We had to challenge the right of Great Britain to enforce discriminatory legislation against Jewish immigration and land purchase — particularly by American Jews — in Palestine, as American citizens, not simply as Jews.

At first I met a remarkable opposition. The more timorous

of the committee feared that any attempt to invoke American political rights under the treaty and call for action from the State Department in a matter which was only of Jewish interest, would provoke anti-Semitism. However, I persisted and was greatly heartened when the venerable leader of the Mizrachi, Rabbi Myer Berlin (Bar-Ilan University was later named after him) passed me a note of encouragement, with the words "Don't go back." (see photostat).

Since I am here I heard the first real political Zionistic opinion in speech. Don't go back.

Indeed, I had no intention of "going back" on my contention, and a little later, at a United Jewish Appeal Conference in Philadelphia, I made it the theme of my address, which was widely circulated in the American press. The call for the "Jewish Commonwealth" as the proper and logical fulfillment of the terms of the Palestine mandate was then voiced, culminating in the famous Biltmore Platform of May 1942. The demand that Great Britain comply with the terms of the Palestine Mandate was also used later as the basis for the famous law suit brought before the High Court in Jerusalem and the Privy Council in London which called for the land ordinances prohibiting land purchase by Jews to be abrogated.

THE BILTMORE PLATFORM

The phrase "Jewish Commonwealth" became the effective goal of American Zionists, preparing for the famous Biltmore Con-

ference. That crucial meeting, representing all the nationwide organizations in American Jewry, was indeed a clarion call for all Jews and resulted in the adoption of the famous Biltmore Platform. Ben Gurion came from Palestine to add his impressive and challenging call for a "Jewish Commonwealth" and Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, with unmatched oratory, answered with a similar cry from the Zionist Organization of America, so that by a vote of over 500 to a lonely 4, the "Biltmore Platform" finally represented the almost unanimous opinion of the Jews of America.

The Biltmore Platform, which denounced the 1939 British White Paper and its restriction of Jewish immigration, called for the establishment of a "Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new democratic world." Thus for the first time, an official Zionist proclamation stated the goal of Zionism as the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine, and this became the official programme of the movement. The far less precise "Jewish national home" was henceforth abandoned.

Much has been written on the subject of the Biltmore Platform and much of it gives Ben Gurion and the Palestinian delegates most of the credit for the adoption of a more militant Zionist program. In fact though, Ben Gurion was hardly the initiator of the radical changes achieved at the Biltmore Conference. The real driving force came from the American Zionists. The ground for the new programme had been prepared by American fervor and agitation and it was adopted by delegates already convinced of the need and the justification for a demand for statehood — nothing less. This admission does nothing to diminish Ben Gurion's role. He warmly endorsed the new formulation. But it is necessary to keep developments in perspective. Weizmann did not oppose the new stand although his own project of a self-governing Jewish dominion within the British Commonwealth was still uppermost in his mind.

In December, 1943, in "The New Palestine", I reviewed fully our struggle over the "Jewish Commonwealth" idea, from which

it would appear that the American political contribution to Jewish claims in Palestine was no less important than financial help for the development of the State of Israel, as may be gleaned from a few short extracts given in Annex 11.

In November, 1942, at the request of Dr. Weizmann, I arranged a meeting with Lawrence Steinhardt, former American Ambassador to Russia, who might prove helpful on our behalf with President Roosevelt. I was an old friend of Steinhardt, who was a classmate of my brother William at Columbia College, who later married Steinhardt's sister Theresa. As a nephew of the noted lawyer, Samuel Untermyer, whom two decades earlier I had persuaded to head the American Keren Hayesod, Steinhardt was thoroughly sympathetic to the Zionist cause, and volunteered to accompany me to the St. Regis Hotel, for a talk with Dr. Weizmann. While Ambassador Steinhardt was not optimistic over any possible help from the State Department, he assured us that President Roosevelt was a true friend with whom we could talk frankly about Jewish claims in Palestine. Yet it is probable that his efforts were insufficient to move the President to take a stronger position because of English fears over Arab reaction.

An earlier letter of David Ben Gurion (see photostat) shows the importance attached to these political activities.

In fact President Roosevelt tended to give a generally cool reception to Zionist claims. In the election of 1944, Roosevelt again — as usual — received more support from Jewish voters than any other candidate and this undoubtedly reflected the generally held belief that Roosevelt was a "friend to the Jewish," a sentiment confirmed by the many Jews who had access to the White House. Yet, unlike his wife, who had a fine understanding of Zionism, the President seemed to regard it as a minor issue, which could be left aside compared to the overwhelming demands of a World War. I remember a visit I made once to Des Moines, Iowa, on a speaking tour on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal, where I was taken by a local Zionist leader and physician to the editor and publisher of the Des Moines Register, who was a staunch friend of Zionism — and a leading Republican. He could not

Ambassador Hotel
Washington, D. C.
January 27, 1942

Judge Bernard A. Rosenblatt
80 Broad Street
New York, N. Y.

My Dear Rosenblatt:

I was exceedingly glad to have your letter of January 22. I think people were too much excited over the article in the New York Times. The attempt made by a few isolated rich Jews, either with the intention of intimidating the government from helping our effort in Palestine, or of sabotaging the unity of American Jewry on a positive Palestine program, should not be taken too seriously. Why should the Jews be without their Quislings?

Your talk with your friend S is good news. Felix, too, was satisfied with his conversation with the Ambassador. I am not sure that the confidence of S in the help of the State Department is well founded. But certainly we are not without friends in this country.

I will be in New York on Thursday and Friday of this week. I am not sure whether I will remain for Saturday, but if I do, I will be happy to drop in at your home. In any case I will telephone you on Friday morning.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

D. Ben-Gurion

David Ben-Gurion

understand why Jews were such supporters of a "Democratic President who did nothing for Zionism," which he regarded as a fundamental issue for Jews everywhere. I could only answer him that Jews regarded Roosevelt as a friend, who might yet help in time of real need. Perhaps Roosevelt himself felt that he could handle the problem of a Jewish State when the proper time came, even as he was reported to have said that he could handle "Uncle Joe" Stalin.

President Truman, on the other hand, appeared to grasp the significance of a Jewish National Home from the very beginning. When he ran for re-election in 1948, I urged Rabbi Silver, as Chairman of the Zionist Council (of which I was a member and head of the Political Committee) that we must throw our weight, however discreetly, through individual support, behind President Truman who was badly in need of finances for a radio program costing $100,000. Unfortunately, Rabbi Silver dismissed my suggestion with the remark — with which everyone at that time would have agreed — "Truman cannot be re-elected." These were the critical days of the Israel War of Indepndence and, while not disputing that the indications were against re-election, I still maintained that after the votes were counted, Truman would still have a couple of months in which he could give material help. Even though I pointed out that he had recognised the new Jewish State in May of that year, I still could not convince my Zionist colleagues. It is greatly to the credit of President Truman that for all our lack of faith in him, he remained steadfast in the support of Zion. (So far as his election campaign was concerned, some rich Jews fortunately rendered substantial financial aid and in a few crucial states like Ohio, the Labor Zionists were particularly helpful.)

CHAPTER XXXIII

ZIONISM AFTER WORLD WAR II AND THE LAND CASE

After Hitler's defeat and death in May 1945, the Zionist Organization was able to plan for the London Conference set for July of that year, even before the termination of the war with Japan. I was a delegate to the Conference, going by air on the Yankee Clipper, in one of the early pioneer commercial planes to cross the Atlantic, at the record-breaking speed of a day and a half, stopping off at Gander, Newfoundland, for refuelling. At that time it was considered a truly remarkable journey as compared to the fastest steamers of five or six days across the Atlantic. No one should ever discount the accelerated progress of science. In the early days of the nineteenth century when the sage, Thomas Jefferson first heard a report from two professors in New England that a meteor from outer space had fallen in Connecticut, he merely quipped that it was "much easier to believe that two Yankee professors lied than that a meteor from outer space had fallen on the earth." Perhaps, he was only reiterating the famous remark of Montaigne: "how much more likely is it that two men should lie than that one man should fly with the wind around the world in twelve hours." Both the Frenchman and the American erred through under-estimating the capacity of science which, later, became the very stuff of history.

While we were in London, the two atom bombs fell upon Japan, opening up a new fearsome era for mankind, dwarfing our concern with the future of Palestine. And yet, there seemed to be some connection between these events, which paralleled the opening drama of the Jewish State — and not merely because so many Jewish scientists, beginning with Einstein, had led the way to the

nuclear age. It was a foreshadowing of a time when even a small state might be able to safeguard its life-line, by protective weapons, so that the world would no longer necessarily be ruled by mighty masses in uniform. God was no longer to be on the side of the larger battalions.

In London we listened to the almost incredible stories of the Jewish uprising in Warsaw and the heroic defence put up by the Jews of Bialystock — stories which had not yet penetrated beyond the iron walls of war censorship. We met a few of these heroes who had managed to escape from the Nazi terror, and the Israel delegates, led by Ben Gurion, strongly voiced the demand for Jewish immigration into Palestine. It was assumed that the Labor Party, which had won the 1945 election in Great Britain, would support such a policy in accordance with its campaign pledges. Little did we guess at that time that the election of a Labor Government would inaugurate only a long period of repudiation of such pledges by Bevin, the new head of the Foreign Office.

I had come to London with strong recommendations to the American Ambassador, Joseph Winant, to try to enlist his support for the Zionist program. I found him entirely sympathetic, and in our talk at the Embassy he was particularly emphatic in the view that Jewish immigration into Palestine was an obligation which Great Britain had assumed under the Mandate, based upon the "economic absorptive capacity," and which the United States, as a party by treaty, was bound to protect. Winant pointed out that Great Britain had made this commitment not only to the Jewish people, but as part of the consideration for the United States agreement to award her the Palestine Mandate. It was gratifying to find him supporting the American position that I had championed for so many years.

The very next year we were also embroiled in a hot political campaign for the U.S. Congressional election of 1946. I had been designated as chairman of the Political Committee of the Zionist Emergency Council with the responsibility of arousing public opinion on this very issue. On September 30, 1946, we printed as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times and other

ADVERTISEMENT ADVERTISEMENT ADVERTISEMENT

AN OPEN LETTER

To The Democratic National Committee

At its recent New York State Convention, the Democratic Party included in its platform a vigorously worded plank on Palestine which pledges full support for the aspirations of the Jewish people. We regret that we are unable at this juncture in the tragic history of the Jewish people to hail this renewed expression of support from one of our country's two major political parties.

Full knowledge of the desperate condition of the homeless Jews of Europe, still suffering in concentration camps, and the inhuman policies being imposed upon the Jews of Palestine by Great Britain, prompts us to view renewed expressions of sympathy and support by the party of our National Administration as all but meaningless. *The Jewish people has had enough of promises. It wants—it desperately needs—action.*

At its last national convention, the Democratic Party of the United States declared: "We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

This was the platform on which President Truman was elected. More than two years have passed since this clear and unequivocal pledge was made—two years of misery and persecution for the Jews of Europe, two years of increased brutality and treachery by Great Britain in Palestine.

No action has been taken by the United States Government to redeem this pledge.

On August 31, 1945, the President of the United States requested British Prime Minister Attlee to admit 100,000 homeless, European Jews into Palestine.

More than a year has passed since that request was made and the Jews of Europe are still languishing in detention camps. Surely the United States has sufficient prestige and influence in the world to accomplish this act of elemental humanity.

We are approaching an election and we know that many of your spokesmen will again reaffirm adherence to American policy on Palestine as enunciated by Congress and our political parties. *We will not be content with these speeches. We do not seek new promises or new planks. The old ones are good enough. What we ask is that our Administration fulfill those old promises now.*

We ask that American policy on Palestine be carried out NOW.

GREATER NEW YORK ZIONIST ACTIONS COMMITTEE

342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Bernard A. Rosenblatt, Chairman **Rabbi Max Kirshblum, Secretary** **Louis Segal, Treasurer**

Lena Albert, Chairman, Rachel Club, Pioneer Women's Organization of America
S. Altschuler, Secretary, Branch #50, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
I. Altsitzer, Secretary, Branch #214, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
Philip April, Chairman Membership, Manhattan Region, Zionist Organization of America
Erie I. Asekhanazy, Delegate, Maccabi Athletic Club District #3, Zionist Organization of America
Tamar Bashrach, Secretary, Chapter A, Pioneer Women's Organization of America
M. A. Barshad, Treasurer, District #86, Zionist Organization of America
James Bennett, Delegate, Brandeis Zionist District Yonkers, Zionist Organization of America
Francis J. Berman, President, Flatbush Branch, Zionist Organization of America
Michael Berman, President, Louis D. Brandeis #22, Zionist Organization of America
I. Bernstein, Secretary, Branch #50, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
Mrs. H. Blinder, Treasurer, E. Tremont Club, Pioneer Women's Organization of America
David S. Blum, Secretary, Highbridge, Mizrachi Organization of America
Israel Blumert, Secretary, Branch #231, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
Rabbi Sidney M. Bogner, Pres.-Elect, Bay Shore District, Zionist Organization of America
J. Borenstein, Fin. Secy., Branch #608, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
A. D. Braham, Hon. Pres., District #24, Zionist Organization of America
Louis Chesir, Secretary, Tiferoth, Mizrachi Organization of America
Anna Cohen, Club Chairman, Hasidah Club, Pioneer Women's Organization of America
Jack S. Cohen, Hon. Pres., Ocean Parkway Zionist District, Zionist Organization of America
D. Coren, 2nd Vice Pres., Huntington District, Zionist Organization of America
Herman Fardelmann, Vice Pres., Federation of Hungarian Zionists
Mordecai Krumbein, Treasurer, Boro Park Chapter, Mizrachi Organization of America
Lee Lake, President, West Side Branch, Zionist Organization of America
Theodore Langbaum, President, Hillcrest District, Zionist Organization of America
K. Lassner, Secretary, Boro Park, Poale Zion
Julius A. Levine, President, Homecrest District #86, Zionist Organization of America
S. Levy, Chairman, Branch #401, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
Philip S. Lewis, Exec. Member, Long Beach District, Zionist Organization of America
William Lewittes, Delegate, Westchester Branch, Mizrachi Organization of America
Samuel Liniek, President, District #15, Zionist Organization of America
J. Link, Fin. Secy., Branch #325, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
Maicha Litvak, Secretary, Hagana, Jewish National Workers' Alliance
Nathan Loomer, President, Beal Jacob, Mizrachi Organization of America
Miriam G. Manzon, Chairman, Rensselhurst Branch, Poale Zion
Arthur H. Martin, Fin. Secy., Tikvah, Mizrachi Organization of America
Rev. I. A. May, Exec. Dir., Mizrachi Organization of Bronx
Paul Meltzner, Secretary, Queens Chapter, Mizrachi Organization of America
Dr. M. W. Meilinoff, President, Bayshore District, Zionist Organization of America
David Moskowitz, Vice Pres., Bronx District, Zionist Organization of America
Rabbi Hyman Muss, President, North Shore District, Zionist Organization of America
Jeremy D. Newman, Corres. Secy., West Side Branch, Poale Zion
Miriam Opochinsky, Secretary, West Bronx, Poale Zion
Simon S. Resnick, Assistant Financial Secretary, Zionist Organization of America

papers an "Open Letter" to the Democratic National Committee, demanding the fulfillment of the pledges made by the Democratic Convention earlier. The appeal had immediate repercussions and perhaps played its part in the election of a Republican Congress. It is only fair to state that President Truman never took umbrage at the criticism so voiced. On the contrary, when the time came to recognize the State of Israel, he placed America in the front ranks of that new epoch in the Jewish renaissance. For that alone, his name will go down in Jewish history, alongside that of the ancient Cyrus the Great, and the modern Arthur James Balfour.

In December, 1946, I was a delegate to the Zionist Congress at Basle, where British restriction on Jewish immigration into Palestine was the paramount issue. Dr. Weizmann was placed in a difficult role, for he could hardly denounce Great Britain, upon whom all his Zionist program had been based, while the majority of the delegates were resolved on a policy of determined opposition to Bevin's effort to subvert the Balfour Declaration and destroy the prospect of a Jewish State. It was then that Ben Gurion took the lead. As chairman of the Palestine delegation, he denounced a policy which must inevitably lead to the reduction of the Jews of Palestine to the level of a "protected minority" in the land of our forefathers. I had to make the bitter decision of agreeing with Ben Gurion. Yet I could not bring myself to vote against my old friend and leader, Chaim Weizmann. Accordingly I withheld my vote, with the usual result that neither side would forgive my stand. For the first time in many years, I was kept off the Executive of the Jewish Agency, organized by the opponents of Dr. Weizmann.

The Basle Congress was a turning point for the Zionist movement. It marked the beginning of the phase of intense conflict with Britain, and thus represented a complete reversal of Weizmann's policy of cooperation with Britain. Many of Weizmann's former supporters suddenly condemned him as a super statesman, blinded to current realities by his long decades of work with the British. It was easy to picture Weizmann as a "has-been", out of touch

with realities, either in Palestine, or in the power-relationships of the post War world.

The delegates — and numberless Jews far removed from Basle — were faced with an appalling choice. Weizmann was held in whole-hearted affection and awe by every Zionist. Yet the very distinction of his past record seemed to symbolize a policy which must be abandoned. For, inevitably, the leader was identified with that policy. For Weizmann to have led the Zionist movement into a policy of conflict with Britain would have been ludicrous. The determination to remove Weizmann from office, with which many American and Palestinian delegates came to Basle, was as much, perhaps more, a matter of policy than of personality.

Weizmann had prevoiusly, albeit without enthusiasm, advocated the Jewish Agency's acceptance of an invitation issued by the British Government to attend a conference in London in 1947. In Basle, Weizmann made his continued presidency of the Zionist Executive dependent upon the Conference's mandate to allow the Executive to attend that conference, if it saw fit "in present circumstances." That mandate was refused. The vote against Weizmann had the support of all the Palestine delegation, led by Ben Gurion, to whom the entire policy of cooperation with England was discredited and worthless. The vote was tantamount to a rejection of Weizmann as President of the Zionist Executive and, shortly afterwards, in February 1947, the deposed leader withdrew from all political activity to devote himself to the scientific work of the Weizmann Institute at Rehovoth.

My dissociation from the Executive of the Jewish Agency did not worry me at the time, for I was on my way with my family to Palestine as our "permanent home," convinced that the future belonged to the voice coming from the land of Israel rather than from any far-away Zionist Congress. I left even before the work of the Congress was concluded and took ship at Marseilles, in one of the outlandish boats that, in defiance of the British, were already picking up Jewish immigrants from all parts of Europe. It was an old Swedish boat, hardly seaworthy, and we were crowded

into improvised space with husbands and wives separated as if fleeing from persecution — and yet it was a time of joyous remembrance, with hours spent on deck singing songs of Zion, believing that the Jews of Palestine would now play the stellar role in building the Jewish state "speedily and in our own days."

The "New Judea" of November 1946 had published my article "Palestine as an American Issue" reviewing the rights arising from the Palestine Mandate and the treaty to which the United States was a party:

> "Now, it is a basic American contention that Great Britain has violated the terms of the Palestine Mandate by the issuance of the White Paper of 1939 restricting Jewish immigration and land purchase, and that such a White Paper — which the late President Roosevelt insisted "has never been approved by the American Government" — can have no legal force since it is contrary to the terms of the Mandate or the written constitution of Palestine. The very first article of the Mandate provides that: "the Mandatory Power shall have full power of legislation and administration, save as they may be limited by the terms of the Mandate."
>
> "Great Britain, in accepting the trust implicit in the Palestine Mandate, therefore agreed that her "powers of legislation and administration" were "limited" by the written constitution of Palestine.
>
> "Article 6 of the Mandate plainly states further that the Government of Palestine shall facilitate immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land...
>
> "The British Colonial Secretary, when questioned by the members of the Mandate Commission, admitted "that the League of Nations had the last word" in interpreting the validity of the White Paper. This, of course, was merely a restatement that the Palestine Mandate was the constitution or fundamental law of the country to which all regulations emanating from the Palestine administration or from London were bound to conform. A few days later, the Permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, sitting virtually as a review board on the McDonald White Paper, held by a majority vote (over-ruling the British representative of the Com-

mission) that they "did not feel able to state that the policy of the White Paper was in conformity with the Mandate". This opinion **still stands,** for no higher authority has ever passed on this subject. In stating that the McDonald White Paper was "not in conformity with the terms of the Mandate", they plainly ruled that such a measure was unconstitutional, and that, therefore, Jewish immigration could not legally be so restricted.

"Furthermore, there is an agreement between Great Britain and the United States with respect to Palestine, known as the Anglo-American Convention of December 3, 1924 (ratified the following year), in which all the terms of the Palestine Mandate are set forth, including the obligation on the part of Great Britain as trustee "to facilitate Jewish immigration and encourage the establishment of the Jewish National Home". This Anglo-American Convention specifically provides "that nothing contained in this Convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the Mandate as recited above unless such modification shall be assented to by the United States". In short, the obligation of Great Britain as trustee survives the defunct League of Nations, for by special agreement with the United States Government, wherein all the terms of the Mandate are repeated, the United States may call for an account of this "Palestine trust" which may not be changed without its consent.

"Therefore, when President Truman calls for the admission of 100,000 Jewish refugees to Palestine, he is not merely offering a plea for mercy on behalf of the surviving remnant from Hitler's gas chambers; he calls attention also to a trust obligation on the part of Great Britain which is enshrined in an agreement with the United States. To millions of Americans, this is a trust as sacred in its essence as the safeguarding of Belgium's neutrality, when the Kaiser's ministers in the last war referred to it as a "scrap of paper". Indeed, the preservation of treaty rights in Palestine or elsewhere is important to all Americans, Jews or Gentile alike, even beyond the question of saving a remnant of European Jewry."

Taken together with an article on "Transjordan and Jewish Rights" published six months before in The New Palestine, my "New Judea" article was the prelude to the legal contest on the validity of the Mandate upon which I was soon to embark, and

which, in the end, played its part in the British Government's resolve to give up the Mandate. The "constitutional question" involved was described in the following quotation from the earlier article:

> The Churchill White Paper of 1922 had provided: "In the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, the Mandatory Power shall be entitled, with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations, to postpone or withhold the application of such provisions of this Mandate as he shall consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions."
>
> "And what did the Zionist Organization receive in return for these concessions? The Jewish Agency and the Zionist Organization were no match for the British Colonial Office. All that it received was a formula consisting of three words, "Economic absorptive capacity" as the sole test for Jewish immigration into western Palestine. In short, the Jewish Agency, recognized under the Palestine Mandate as an international body, was to be permitted to bring as many Jews as possible into Palestine west of the Jordan, limited only by the "economic absorptive capacity" of the country. These three words must be carefully examined, for they were formulated by that great master of English, Winston Churchill, to express the assurance that the key to the door of Palestine would be in the hands of the Jews themselves, provided only that the country could, economically, (not politically: nothing about "Arab consent") absorb the increasing number of Jewish immigrants.
>
> "But the ink was hardly dry on this Churchill White Paper when, after a change in government in London, the process was begun whereby these simple English words, "economic absorptive capacity" were gradually twisted from their true meaning, so that while Jewish immigration reached a high record of nearly 62,000 immigrants in the single year of 1935, it was finally "cribbed, cabined and confined" into the later trickle of 1,500 per month. In short, after surrendering Transjordan for "adequate" consideration in the shape of "economic absorptive capacity", the Jews were deprived of that very consideration which was the basis of the contract — and Foreign Secretary Bevin had the temerity to charge them with being at the head of the queue in their efforts to escape from Hitler crematoriums into Jewish Palestine."

Indeed, the British Government had been pursuing a double policy designed to prevent instead of "encourage" the development of the Jewish National Home. It had also introduced a policy of land restriction which would confine that "home" to a ghetto-surrounded domain in the outskirts of Tel Aviv and the Sharon Valley, reaching only to the Emek in Galilee. Even in that restricted area, there were substantial tracts already occupied by Arabs which dare not be by-passed. With my legal training, it was clear to me that the British were violating the express terms of the Mandate, which charged them with the duty to "encourage" the development of the Jewish National Home and not to discourage the same by unconstitutional legislation. I therefore determined to test the issue in the Palestine Courts, not merely as a broken promise, but being an American, as a matter of treaty rights with my government.

Accordingly, early in 1947, I purchased a small tract of land in the Arab village of Tira from Edmond Levy, a Haifa-born Jew, who had acquired it years before the decree prohibiting land purchase in that district. Now under the ordinance, Levy could not sell it to another Jew but, presumably, only to an Arab, thereby further restricting and confining the limits of the Jewish National Home. I appeared in the Haifa Land Office (the Tabu) asking that my title be entered as the new owner of this small tract .This of course, was refused, despite my insistence that as an American I was guaranteed, under the Anglo-American treaty of 1924, equal rights with "all the inhabitants of the land". Since registration was refused, I took the issue to the High Court in Jerusalem, where the case was ably argued by my Counsel, Jacob Solomon (son of a former mayor of Jerusalem), that the ordinance was null and void being a direct violation of the provisions of the Mandate and contrary to the terms of the Anglo-American Convention ratifying the treaty terms which set-up the Palestine Mandate.

Of course, we were convinced that we could not win in the Courts of Palestine, not only because it would upset many other ordinances which might be ruled as violating the Palestine Mandate as the "fundamental law", but also because, in fairness to the

British, it might be stated that since they are not governed by a written constitution, any ordinance provided under the acts of Parliament become the law of the land. However, our argument was based on the fact of violation of a provision of a treaty between America and Great Britain, for which the latter was accountable not merely to the Jews in and out of Palestine, but primarily to the Government of the United States, under its treaty rights.

A curious angle in this dispute almost foreshadowed the future question of "who is a Jew?" — for part of my contention was the fact that the seller of the land, Edmond Levy, born in Haifa long before the British occupied Palestine, was presumably an Arab although a Jew by religion. Having legally acquired a piece of land near his birthplace, was he to be prevented from selling it to an American citizen, simply because both seller and purchaser were now both classified as Jews, even though the United States never recognized such a classification? Of course, this was a test case. My plan was to bring the issue to the Government in Washington after our inevitable defeat in the Courts of Palestine. In the meanwhile, we would have to appeal the case to the Privy Council in London, as all legal remedies must be exhausted before any effective appeal could be made in Washington. The letter from Golda Meyerson (later the famous Foreign Minister of Israel as Golda Meir) indicates the deep interest the case aroused among the Jews of Israel (as appears in photostat), for while I personally bore the out-of-pocket expenses in Palestine (and counsel served without pay), the Jewish National Fund undertook to pay the legal expenses incurred in London.

In the summer of 1947, I left for New York to bring the case to a head should the Privy Council, as predicted, rule against us. Soon after my arrival, at the suggestion of my brother William, I consulted with Judge Jerome Frank of the Circuit Court of Appeals, who happened to be related to my wife, although I had not met him previously, as his family came from Chicago. Judge Frank had at one time written in opposition to Zionism, for

הסוכנות היהודית לארץ ישראל
THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

REF. NO 8784/2/717 מספרנו

P. O. B. 92
JERUSALEM, 28th February, 1947

ת. ד. 92
ירושלים,

Dear Judge Rosenblatt,

This is to congratulate you on the success of the first step of your case against the Land Laws. This is certainly a great service and may open the way to fight the Land Laws by legal means. I do hope that you may also be successful in the further steps to be taken.

Yours very sincerely,

Goldie Myerson
Goldie Myerson

Judge Bernard Rosenbaltt,
c/o Messrs S. Horowitz & Co.,
P.O.B. 303,
Haifa.

Leaves the Hacarmel Hotel mar 9 1947
BR

11/45—3000—3010/21 סופס

which, as he told me later, he was criticized by Justice Frankfurter. Lately he had moved to a point of friendly cooperation with the objectives of the Zionist Movement, so that I felt free to consult with him. After a conference in New York, we decided to proceed together to Washington and lay the matter before the State Department, engaging counsel there to pursue the matter

further. Accordingly, we left by midnight train from Pennsylvania Station, occupying the same parlor sleeping-car. As we were undressing for bed, I said to him: "You know, Judge Frank, you really ought to help me in this matter, for we are related at least by marriage, since I am the husband of the former Gertrude Goldsmith, whose father was a first cousin of your father." (Both grandparents had come from Bavaria a century earlier and had formed the partnership of Frank and Goldsmit in New York City.) He looked at me with surprise for a minute and then said: "So you are that Russian Jew who married cousin Gertrude. I remember so well how my father bewailed the fact that cousin Fred Goldsmith's daughter was to be married not only to a Russian Jew but to a "fanatic Zionist" — a terrible come down in the early decades of the twentieth century for any German Jew! "and here I am now travelling with him to Washington to help him in that cause."

A short quotation from the Hadassah Bulletin at the time indicates the interest with which American Jewry was following this issue:

> "A test case challenging the legality of the land transfer regulations which the British Administration promulgated in 1940 on the basis of the 1939 White Paper and which are still being enforced, is now pending before Sir William Fitzgerald, Chief Justice of Palestine.
>
> The action was brought in February by Bernard A. Rosenblatt of New York, a former President of the Jewish National Fund of America, Vice-President of the Z.O.A. and former President of the Palestine Foundation Fund in the United States. Judge Rosenblatt attempted to buy four acres of land on the slopes of Mt. Carmel near Haifa. The British Administration refused to legalize the transaction on the basis of the discriminatory land transfer regulations which prohibit the sale of land to Jews in Palestine's Zone A. The four acres which Rosenblatt sought to buy are located in the prohibited zone.
>
> "Judge Rosenblatt asked for a writ of mandamus directing the Land Registry Office to show cause why the disputed acreage should not be registered in Rosenblatt's name. In

his petition, Rosenblatt charges violation of Article 15 of the League of Nations Mandate which states: "No discrimination of any kind shall be made between inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language."

The bulletin also cites the Anglo-American treaty of December 3, 1924, guaranteeing Americans in Palestine the same rights as those accorded "all other inhabitants of Palestine."

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE UNITED NATIONS AND ISRAEL

Meanwhile, events were moving swiftly. The conference with the British Government had been held — without Weizmann's participation — and had ended in deadlock. In Palestine, the wave of violence spearheaded by the Irgun (Etzel) and Haganah grew daily, bringing British public opinion into the picture as a factor to be considered.

Under all the circumstances, the British Government decided to refer the whole matter to the United Nations, where the General Assembly appointed an international commission (UNISCOP) to examine the situation and make proposals for an honourable solution. The commission visited Palestine in 1947 and, to the pained surprise of the British Government, recommended the partition of the country and the setting up of an independent Jewish state in part of Palestine.

The British Government rejected this proposition and, when anti-British activities increased in Palestine (with the authority of the Zionist Executive) ordered the arrest of most of the members of the Executive — to the utter dismay of Weizmann.

In Washington, we had retained a prominent lawyer, Abe Fortas (later a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court) to represent us before the State Department, assuming that the results in the Privy Council would be negative. But only a few weeks later, the whole problem of the Palestine Mandate was thrown into the lap of the United Nations. When the expected adverse decision of the Privy Council became known, the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947 had already been reached, endorsing the two states of Jewish Palestine and Arab Jordan. Accordingly the

State Department took the logical decision that it was no longer necessary to carry the dispute with Great Britain any further.

(Article in Herald Tribune, Annex 12).

In Palestine Post, Annex 13).

With the future of the country brought for decision to the United Nations, the fate of the Jewish state had once more entered the arena of international discussion. At the end of the debate in the General Assembly, two-thirds of the delegates to the U.N. voted in favour of the establishment of a Jewish State in part of Palestine. In view of this decision favouring partition, the British decided to withdraw from Palestine and when they carried out that withdrawal (May 14, 1948) the Jews of Palestine proclaimed the independent State of Israel.

On the very day of the U.N. decision, I left for Palestine on the s.s. Mauretania together with my wife. On board, we were able to celebrate with Meyer Weisgal (later famous for his work in the Weizmann Institute) in the cabin of Mr. Wix, a generous contributor to that institution. Little did we then realize that our celebration was premature. The very next day the Arab attack began, foreshadowing the War of Independence which finally created the state of Israel.

The day after the U.N. decision, the New Palestine (November 30th 1947) carried an article of mine showing "the role of American Jewry" indicating how partition would lead to the evolution of the Jewish state and predicting the capital role that American Jewry must play:

> "Indeed, only a few months after the report of the Peel Commission, favoring partition, an independent committee of Haifa Jews (where commercial intercourse between Jews and Arabs is closer than in other parts of Palestine) advanced a program, **on the basis of partition** whereby the two "sister states" — the Jewish Commonwealth and the Arab dominion including Transjordan, might form an economic union as a "Federated Palestine".

"Now, the "economic union" of a Jewish Commonwealth and an Arab Dominion, while separating the two states politically along geographical lines, would result in the establishment of an effective federation. Such a program is the antithesis of a false bi-nationalism, with its hodgepodge of equal representation between Jew and Arab in a political hybrid that has never existed in history. Such a program would prove fatal, for its fails to deal with the key problem of Jewish immigration. Only when undisputed control over immigration is vested in the Jewish State itself, and this right is guaranteed by the U.N., can there be peace with justice in the Holy Land.

"Only four years ago, Tel Aviv paid off the last instalment of its first Bond Issue — the first Jewish bond issue in history, which was launched in America in 1923. It was a mere forerunner of many future Palestine Bond Issues. The American Keren Hayesod provided the initial funds for the establishment of a General Mortgage Bank. The debentures of that institution must find their place in most American-Jewish homes, as a supplement to the original Jewish National Fund box."

I have often pondered how fortunate it was that the state of Israel was born in 1948 and no later: — before World War II it would have been impossible because of Arab nationalist opposition and the British policy of appeasement. In the years preceding World War II, indeed, the British administration had declined very far from the firmness and wisdom of a High Commissioner like Lord Plumer (who, when confronted with an Arab committee opposing further Jewish immigration on the grounds that "they would not be responsible for public order," replied, "You are not responsible, I am.").

Similarly, a few years after 1948, with new states being formed in Asia and Africa and being admitted into the United Nations, the formation of the state of Israel might well have proved impossible. If the French had to leave Algeria with a million refugees, less than a decade later, a united Arab front might well have thwarted the hopes of 600,000 Jewish settlers in Palestine, had they patiently waited for United Nations action

to implement the decision of November 1947, instead of being precipitated into a full-scale war.

Of course the Arabs had a case — but the case was that of the Arabs of Palestine. For the real interests of Arab nationalism, Israel could only prove a blessing in the long run by providing a link between the Middle East and Europe and the West. Even if Arab nationalist sentiment had to swallow the loss of some 8,000 square miles (one half of it practically desert) this was still less than 3% of the total combined territory of Syria, Iraq and Jordan (not to mention Egypt). It would not have been the first time a nationalist movement accepted such a loss. Italy surrendered the French Riviera with ancient Nice to Napoleon III as the price of his support, which made possible a united Italy. A *real* United Arab Republic from Egypt to Persia might well have evolved with the friendly help of the state of Israel, had the Arab leaders been able to appreciate the opportunity offered them.

On the other hand, one must sympathize with the indigenous Arab population of Israel who were the ones who really suffered. They had to give up their homeland at the behest of their "brother" Arabs only to find themselves helpless scapegoats in the Arab war against Israel. Since the creation of the state, Israel has pursued a wise policy of conciliation with her Arab population, fellow Semites who, in the opinion of many authorities, probably carry in their veins quite as much blood of the ancient vintage of the Children of Israel as do the newcomers from Europe's ghettos.

Again, though, sentiment does not alter facts. Large numbers of the Arabs of Palestine lost the lands which had been theirs for centuries, but in the years following the Second World War they were not alone in that. There was a difference, however. Eight million Germans were forced out of a renascent Poland; other millions were expelled from the Sudetenland by the revived state of Czechoslovakia. Yet not a single Arab was compelled to leave Israel after the establishment of the state. The ones who left were induced to do so by the Arab invaders of Israel, supremely confident of victory. The "Palestinian Arabs" who obeyed are now poor refugees, existing on doles from the United Nations. Whereas

West Germany was given a new lease of life by the influx of the disinherited from Poland and Czechoslovakia, the Arab "brothers" from Palestine sit confined in camps, refused entrance into Syria, Iraq or Egypt while these states await the "third round" with Israel. Thus the Arab refugees have become pawns in the game of Arab nationalism: a useful charge to level at Israel and her supporters, not human beings whose plight cries out for constructive, realistic policies of help.

Let us not minimize the role which Israel might play in the East in holding off a new "Dark Age" which might well follow the decline of 19th century Imperialism, just as the Dark Ages followed the collapse of Rome and her empire, a millennium and a half ago.

I recall a conversation I had a generation ago with Edwin Samuel, after his father, Lord Herbert Samuel, had retired as High Commissioner of Palestine. I was urging the plan of my old friend Col. Josiah Wedgwood to make Palestine the seventh dominion in the British Commonwealth, but young Samuel thought it presumptuous to expect Great Britain to accept Palestine into the holy alliance of Anglo-Saxon peoples. Thirty years later, that "holy alliance" has been thrown open to the ex-colonial peoples on their terms — as witness Britain's refusal to endorse the White Rhodesians' version of Anglo-Saxon "kith and kin."

Perhaps if Great Britain had followed a policy — like America — of incorporating conquered territories into a "Greater United States of Britain" she might have salvaged something more from her empire, at least in the empty spaces of Africa and parts of Asia.

Not that Britain was alone in her decline. The French had to open their doors to no less than a million refugees from an Algeria that had for years been technically part of France. At least those doors were opened willingly — in striking contrast to the treatment which the Arab refugees from Palestine received — yet, had events gone otherwise, an enclave of Algerian Frenchmen might have been a valuable source of European capital and know-how for the whole of North Africa, just as Israel, in the long run, could benefit all the Eastern Mediterranean Arab countries.

Perhaps I must plead quilty to the charge of harping too much on compromise and adjustment, rather than standing for "principle" at all costs. My old friend, Jacob de Haas, once remarked that if "Ben could not accept Christianity, he might offer to compromise on Mohammedanism" and to this I could only answer, "there might be something in what he said." Certainly the partition of Palestine always appealed to me as infinitely preferable to the terrible consequences of a Civil War between two communities differing in language, religion and interest yet claiming the same territory. There is a terrible example in the final disposition which set up the states of Pakistan and India.

Compromise seems to offer the only hope for reasonable solution to the Rhodesian situation, too, where geographical partition is manifestly impossible. Perhaps the idealists have gone too far, both in America and elsewhere in insisting on "one man, one vote." America itself represents a compromise where one half of the U.S. Congress, representing 50 states in the U.S. Senate, enjoy the power of a complete veto over legislation, although elected as t w o senators from each state, as unequal in population as Delaware with 500,000 inhabitants and New York with over 18,000,000. One man's vote in the big states of New York, Pennsylvania, California and Texas accordingly carries the weight of one sixth of a citizen of such small states as Delaware, Rhode Island, Nevada or Hawaii. True this compromise in the composition of the U.S. Senate is rooted historically in the organization of the original thirteen states of the Federal Union, but why cannot some similar compromise be applied to a larger area containing two states *of mind,* based upon differences of race, colour, language and religion, so as to avoid civil strike and dangerous discontent?

"One man, one vote" is of course a logical and proper method for the protection of individual life, liberty and property. The difficulty arises from the fact that while it safeguards the rights of individuals, it also inevitably operates as a control over other individuals. This is so often ignored by liberals that it is perhaps time that the franchise be examined, not only as a

protection for the weak and lowly, but also as a method of control and even a possible vehicle for discrimination against a minority — even of the well-born or intelligent.

The American experience of a Senate chosen by unequal proportions of the population may suggest a possible organization whereby the two disparate groups sharing a single territory might be represented in one legislature through a "one man, one vote" principle for the lower House while in an upper House the two "states" (of mind, or colour or religion) could be represented on the basis of equality, giving each one a virtual veto as a protection against the other. This was the system of the Tribune of ancient Rome. It would not be destructive of democratic government but, rather, could operate as a safeguard for the progressive elements so necessary for the development of any country.

Fortunately such a "Senatorial veto" is unnecessary in Israel which has been able to integrate its Arab minority (just as America is trying to integrate the Negro population), but in other areas of tension and division, a Senate giving *equal* representation to rival groups might provide a tribunal in which such fears could be released and differences composed by "ballots instead of bullets."

CHAPTER XXXV

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

In the spring of 1948, I was on a visit to the U.S.A. where my son David was on Government service as a nuclear physicist. One Friday night, at dinner in my sister's house, we heard over the radio the epoch-making announcement of President Truman's recognition of the State of Israel, immediately after the declaration of Independence had been read by Ben Gurion in Tel Aviv.

Of course, I was soon on my way back to Haifa with my wife, but I already felt that my Zionist work had largely been completed and that henceforth I would be acting rather as an observer than as an active participant in the affairs of the Jewish state. Perhaps my advice might occasionally be welcomed, particularly on matters concerned with land policy which I had studied carefully. This was a new role for me. It reminded me of the reply of a classmate whom I had asked more than forty years before to join our newly formed Columbia University Zionist Society. He had refused, saying that he expected to become a playwright (which he did, having his plays produced later on on Broadway) and, as such, he was an observer of life — not a participant. At the time, this attitude had seemed to me an extraordinary example of a "self-denying ordinance," but now I began to appreciate the value of detachment, only accessible to those free from the demands of politics and the cares of office. Now I could offer advice without any suspicion of a personal motive.

One of the first subjects which I tackled was the land problem and the role of the Jewish National Fund (Keren Kayemeth) which had been relegated to a minor role in America following the successful campaigns of the United Jewish Appeal. A few years

later I became the Chairman of its Foundation Fund which was able to build up a large reserve on which future income was assured from wills and insurance policies. Even more important was my one-man campaign, especially in the Israeli press, to make the Keren Kayemeth aware of the importance of preserving land reserves in the urban sectors of the country for the benefit of future generations.

In numerous articles I reiterated that the future income which would accrue from increasing rents could be much more significant than many years successful campaigning for contributions. I pointed out over and over again that if the Keren Kayemeth had had the wisdom to keep the titles to its initial land purchases made for the benefit of settlers in the planned "Garden City of Tel Aviv" (now represented by the enormously valuable city plots on Rothschild Boulevard, Herzl and Allenby Streets — the heart of the business section), it could have dispensed with all fund-raising campaigns for two score years before the state was established. Moreover, there was no valid reason why the plots should have been handed over to the residents instead of offering them the usual 49 year leases which could have been the pattern had all business plots, with their enormous potential for rent income, remained Keren Kayemeth property. There was nothing in the Charter of the Keren Kayemeth to restrict its land ownership to agricultural holdings for the benefit of moshavim and kibbutzim. The actual policy followed was clearly due to nothing more than a lack of understanding on the part of the early managers of the Keren Kayemeth. Only for this reason were the valuable city lands lost to become private property and the subject of land speculation. Fortunately, after their experience in the case of the port of Ashdod, the Government of Israel finally adopted the policy I had urged so strongly in my "Open Letter to the Prime Minister" (photostat) of August 23rd, 1963.

In my new role of observer, I was also able to ponder the relationship of the early founders of Zionism to the reality of the state of Israel.

Herzl had laid the foundation for the Jewish state with a

An Open Letter to the Prime Minister

FROM BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT

A LEASE FOR LIFE

THE recent scandal over a land purchase in Herzliya, which led to unwarranted land speculation, has brought to mind an ancient evasion which the State of Israel has so far failed to deal. Perhaps I have a double right to call attention to this surprising anomaly in a Socialist Government which professes to safeguard the rights of the working class. As the organizer and first President of the American Zion Commonwealth, which founded Herzliya in 1924, we tried to make special provisions that land not utilized for agricultural purposes should be held as community property, to be leased to individuals for development, but never to be sold.

I recall vividly how the late Arthur Ruppin accompanied me on a trip to Detroit, where we raised the first money necessary as advance payment for the purchase of ancient "Jelil" from the Arabs of Shachmoness. Later, I was fortunate in securing additional funds from Max Shoolman, of Boston, and Pierce, of Montreal to pay off the Arab mortgage and prevent foreclosure.

We then dreamed not merely of building a new Jewish colony, but also a just social system which would offer a modern application of the old injunction in Leviticus (25:23): "The Lord said: 'The land is Mine... Throughout the land that you hold, you must provide for redemption of the land.'"

Since long before the establishment of the State of Israel I have urged in numerous articles in *The Jerusalem Post*—as well as in "Haboker," "Ha'aretz" and "Davar"—that the ancient injunction embodied in practical terms in the Keren Kayemet must be applied to all the land in Israel. Yet our Labour Government has failed to listen to the "voice crying in the wilderness."

What is the justification or explanation, contrary to our complete acceptance of the role of the Keren Kayemet? I can conclude only that it rests upon a misreading of socialist philosophy which has over-emphasized the role of "capital" in the modern world and the exploitation of the working class by the ghost of a "surplus value."

But we should have learned by this time, by the experience of the State of Israel itself, that we can develop a "capital labour" combine, like the Solel Boneh, to protect labour by applying the principles of capital itself.

We might profit also from the example of the United States, where the capitalistic railroads are now engaged in a four-year struggle with a single labour union, and so far have failed to eliminate surplus labour — the useless firemen on Diesel engines.

No one can fail to appreciate the tremendous achievements of the Histadrut in Israel — but now we must take one further step in the evolution of a just social order. It is clear that a century after Marx, Labour knows how to take care of itself — a fact which we must all applaud.

Danger to Consumers

But quite another factor is involved in the endless struggle for economic justice. What is the profit of ever-increasing wages, when that "surplus" is devoured by increasing rents resting upon land speculation profits? In a recent article in *The Jerusalem Post* I pointed to the evils of private land ownership as a danger to all *consumers*. Capital and labour aside, we must now move rapidly to protect the public from the ravages of land speculators in our little country and its limited area, while immigration and mounting population inevitably send land prices ever higher.

Land owned by the state must *never* again be sold, but only leased to individuals or companies, under obligation for immediate improvement, and the lease itself subject to renewal at its increased value.

You do not have to search for any philosophic decree for this simple resolution. It is there before our eyes from our Torah to Rockefeller Centre, in New York. Thirty-five years ago the Rockefeller family leased from Columbia University the three blocks from 48th street to 51 street, fronting Fifth Avenue, and running one large block to the west. The university was then collecting some $300,000 rent a year from the old dilapidated buildings, on grounds originally donated by the State of New York to support education. But under the 34-year lease, Rockefeller was paying just 12 times as much, — $3,600,000, and obligated to erect buildings now worth over $125m. Since the original lease was executed, Rockefeller Centre has paid increased taxes, now exceeding $60m., to the City.

If the State of Israel is so reluctant to collect rents as a landlord, why not present some of its strategic plots to the Hebrew University and allow it to follow the example set by Columbia University and Rockefeller Centre? I am sure that if we cannot find a Rockefeller in Israel we should be able at least to organize a syndicate of Israeli financiers to profit from the benefits of paying rent under a lease rather than tying up so much cash in sterile land — as the wise Rockefellers discovered when they used the money, in the hard days of the depression, to erect the immense buildings which are now so profitable to themselves as well as to Columbia University as the landlord.

Indeed, many chain organizations (like Woolworth) find it more advisable to lease their real estate for a long term instead of tying up so much cash in inert land, for they can earn more profits by utilizing the same funds to open new stores.

In short, such a system of leasing is no deterrent for further growth but rather an impetus for still larger development. Freed from the incubus of land ownership (with its heavy cash outlays for land purchase) industrial leaders can make even larger progress in building, manufacturing and commerce.

Buying Useless

When will we learn that land buying is as useless an expenditure as paying for the labour of a slave — where we tie up cash for slave purchase that can be more profitably used to pay wages — as the example of pre-Civil War days in America has amply proved? Indeed, if I had the say, I would, even at this late date, insist upon redeeming the whole land of Israel — not already held by the Keren Kayemet for agricultural purposes — by state purchase through a special internal bond issue, and then lease the lands to the present owners. Renewal of leases on the lands would be subject to their improving them. We should thereby build up a new source of *increasing income*, sufficient to stabilize our currency once and for all, with safeguards against inflation in the future. As a former Finance Minister, you must understand the importance of an historic task that will make free the land of Israel for the people of Israel.

The author was one of the founders of the Keren Hayesod in the U.S., which later became the keystone of the U.J.A.

remarkable achievement in the organization of the Zionist Congress, which offered a rallying point for world Jewry for the first time in eighteen centuries. Dr. Weizmann followed, with the beginning of the building of the political superstructure, and the successful issuance of the Balfour Declaration, while Ben Gurion capped the climax as leader in the War of Independence. However much we may have hoped, and sometimes profited, from the resolutions of the U.N., preceded as it was in earlier decades by the intercession of President Wilson and followed by the later important recognition of the State of Israel by President Truman, the fact remains that it was the fighting of the Jews of Palestine in the war with the Arab States that ensured the existence of the people of Israel and its statehood. All that went before was essentially a "public relations campaign", however necessary, but it was the "blood and iron" of the Palestine Jews that finally brought forth the State of Israel. I can understand that idealists like Dr. Magnes and his companions in the Ihud organization should deplore the use of force in the establishment of the State of Israel, even denouncing the "Joshua method" of seeking independence through armed warfare, but when and where throughout history was national freedom ever before achieved without the use of force? The development of statehood from the savage age through some "general will" was but a figment of Rousseau's overheated imagination. Not that civilization precludes the evolution of a state without force. Herzl's "Judenstaat" was based upon a charter, but it failed to take into consideration the opposition of a native population experienced by the British East India Company, the Dutch in the Far East, and the London and Virginia Companies in the New World. The Jewish occupation of their ancient heritage may be truthfully designated as the last *attempt* to develop a state by peaceful cooperation with the indigenous population — and that too failed! It only confirms the sad facts of history, that the building of a state often demands the cement of "blood and arms".

Once peace was established, at least Israel's efforts to remedy the evils of war have set an example in the treatment of the Arab

minority which other states might follow for their own future good.

It was altogether fitting and proper that, once the Israel Parliament or "Knesseth" had been organized, it should have taken the magnanimous step of calling upon Dr. Chaim Weizmann to serve as the first President of the State of Israel, as a well-earned reward for his Zionist leadership throughout a whole generation. Dr. Weizmann, however, did not seem too happy to occupy the merely honorary position of a President without real power — a mere titular sovereignty like that of the British king — after his great battles in and out of the Zionist Congresses. I recall a particular incident in the Galei Kinnereth Hotel, in Tiberias, about a year before his death, when as Chairman of the Hamei Tiberia company (the Tiberias Hot Springs), I was on a visit there. I was sitting in the lobby of the hotel, reading, when I happened to look up as Dr. Weizmann was passing. Seeing how he peered, for his eyesight was failing, I got up and said, "How are you, Dr. Weizmann?" "Oh, its you, Ben," said he, and he sat down beside me for a short conversation about American Zionism. Finally, I asked him, "How long do you expect to stay in Tiberias?" Answering with a perceptible sigh, he said, "I do not know, for Vera (his wife) wants to return to Rehovoth and Tel Aviv, but I would rather stay here longer. Whom have I got to go back to, my "etzeh-gebers"? (meaning his Cabinet advisers). It seemed like the familiar tragedy of a leader who feels he has outlived his useful period, and has been "kicked upstairs" as an ornament of the State, while the real power remains vested in the Cabinet. I felt, even at that time though, that Dr. Weizmann was mistaken, for his word would carry weight even if his was a lone voice.

However, taking the British Parliament as a model, there was no alternative but to maintain Cabinet rule. Perhaps it might have been possible to lodge the appointment of judges — freed as they are from political pressure — in the hands of the President, subject to ratification by the Knesset (Parliament). This might still be a wise step for the State of Israel, to emphasize the independence of its judiciary, with its well-earned reputation for

impartiality, while elevating the status of the Presidency as the great non-partisan power at the head of the State.

The State of Israel, to its lasting benefit, adopted much of the substantive law of Great Britain, known as the "Common Law", together with Anglo-Saxon legal procedure, and the parliamentary system of government. However, because of the emphasis on ideology which was part of the Jewish heritage from Central European politics, there remains a strong tendency to split up politically into various parties rather than for voters to be aligned in two main parties, as in England and America, generally recognized as differentiated between traditional conservatism versus liberalism. Israel might well learn and profit from the experience of the two great democracies of the Western World, the older one based on an unwritten constitution with a sovereign Parliament, and the American contribution of constitutional government. I feel that we might perhaps supply more of the latter, for example, by giving the judiciary, headed by the Supreme Court, more latitude in interpreting the laws than that allowed by an all-powerful Parliament. In my recent book, "The American Bridge to the Israel Commonwealth", I suggested that certain "fundamental laws" (which may be regarded as a constitution) might well be ordained, which could be over-ruled only by a two-thirds vote of the Knesset, so that no single party with a slight majority could ever overstep the established limits of government. This would serve rather to solidify public opinion than to hasten division along the lines of petty politics.

Ben Gurion has long been the champion of a change in the election rules which would establish single constituencies on the model of Great Britain instead of the present system of restricting voters to party lists. While much can be said in favor of such a system, I question whether the ingrained tendency (fostered for so long in the past by Israel's dominant Labor Party) can easily by overturned. But something of a compromise program might well be accepted and this might prove beneficial. It would be advantageous to split the geographical area of Israel (small as it is) into three districts, one with Tel Aviv as the center for

the Sharon Valley, the second based upon Jerusalem, to include the whole Negev, and the third from Hadera to the northern boundary, including Galilee, with Haifa as its metropolis. The three districts might be re-adjusted after each census, so that an approximate equality of population would prevail, each district sending 40 members to a Knesset of 120 — or, alternatively, the three districts might remain fixed and intact, but adjustment be made in the number of representatives to be elected from each area, as determined by the latest census. In either case, the diverse opinions of three well-defined geographical areas would be gauged in each election and would act as a counterweight to the excessive emphasis solely upon party structure. Such a plan might also prove salutory in modifying the excesses of party politics by bringing into play the special appeals for geographical areas in a common allegiance to a united country.

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE STATE OF ISRAEL AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Once the State of Israel was proclaimed in May, 1948, and established by the shaky armistice in 1949, largely through the heroic efforts of Palestine Jewry, it was inevitable for the children of Israel to pick-up the severed thread of its long history in the struggle for social justice. That ideal, proclaimed by the prophets of Israel and enshrined in the Bible, had caused the Jews to appear over the generations, as the progenitors of social reform — from "objectionable labor leaders" to the philosophers of discontent. The world correctly saw the Jew in Marx, even when he repudiated his Judaism, and while Lasalle might argue with Bismarck over the German program for social reform, the Iron Chancellor knew that he was dealing with a son of Israel. Even the conservative Disraeli lighted the way for Tory democracy in England, while in America, Samuel Gompers, the English-born Jew, successfully launched the American Federation of Labor. It was therefore only natural that when American Zionism came of age, under the inspiring leadership of Justice Brandeis, it should have formulated the Pittsburgh Program of 1918 as a call to the Jews to build their state along lines of their historic past with social justice as its keystone. It is therefore no mere accident that from that early date up to the famous Biltmore Platform of 1942, or a whole generation before the State of Israel came into being, the Jews of America had set the pace for a "just and lasting peace" among all the peoples of the old Holy Land. That such a call should come from democratic America was "altogether

fitting and proper", for we were not obsessed by dogmas about "native populations" nor the prejudices of old Europe.

In Israel, we often take altogether too lightly the quip that if only American Jews would provide the funds, Israel could work out its destiny alone and unimpeded. In fact, the American Zionist contribution has gone far beyond mere material aid — important as that has been. Without minimizing the spiritual message of East European Jewry, as exemplified particularly in the growth and development of the Histadrut as a political and economic force, and the evolution of the kibbutz with its great social message of voluntary cooperation, there was yet need of emphasis on individual rights as an essential ingredient of social justice. One need only re-examine the clarion call of the Pittsburgh Program, formulated under the leadership of Justice Brandeis, to understand the unique role that American Jewry has played in Israel.

To the social idealism of the Second Aliyah (in the early years of this century), the immigrants who founded the kibbutzim and the industrial enterprises of the Histadruth, American Zionists added the equally important element of emphasizing the role of the Jewish National Fund and the principle of land nationalization so often neglected in practice. That objective may prove, in the future, even more valuable than the monetary contributions of American Jewry, important as they have been in the past. As early as 1919, Judge Julian W. Mack, then President of the Zionist Organization of America, wrote in the preface to my book, "Social Zionism":

> "The Pittsburgh Program (adopted June 25, 1918) represents in part this social view. The author of "Social Zionism" as one of its makers, is especially fitted to expound its principles, especially insofar as they relate to land and taxation."

Much later, after the State was already established, I emphasized what might be regarded as a distinctive American contribution as follows: (Jerusalem Post, May 28, 1961).

> "Two great economists — both contrasting and non-

professing Jews in England — dominated the thinking of the nineteenth century and have cast deep shadows on the twentieth century: David Ricardo, the capitalist, and Karl Marx, the socialist. Of the latter, his mother complained that while he was writing "Das Kapital" he was accumulating no capital, while the former was so successful as a stock speculator that he was able to retire at an early age and live to write his famous essays on economics and formulate the economic law of rent.

"Because Marx failed to grasp — or refused to accept — Ricardo's principles of rent, Socialism has ever since wandered in the no-man's-land of "surplus labor value," which has often blinded even the best of Socialist thinkers to the supreme influence of land values upon economic life.

"Henry George tried to show these evils of land speculation in America as the "unearned increment" of landlords but, generally, the surge of Socialist philosophy swept along until the Russian Revolution proved Marx the victor.

"I question, however, whether the twentieth century may not reverse the position and find Ricardo's formulation even more acceptable to advancing civilization. This intellectual struggle is nowhere more potent than in Israel, which is the heir to the thinking of both . . .

"Indeed, the problem that society must face is the distinction between legitimate profits arising from the inevitable risk undertaken by capitalists in a free economy and the illegitimate profits garnered by those who monopolize situations without performing any useful labor. This is what Ricardo, the capitalist, understood when he formulated the law of rent as a charge upon production by those who monopolize town locations and fertile fields.

"One can only speculate on the tremendous possibilities that would have opened up not only for the Jewish National Fund but for the whole State of Israel, if the Ricardo principle had been applied in the city of Tel Aviv — a principle which is so much in consonance with the Jewish National Fund. The income in rents alone from the original tract — and it certainly would have been followed in the further development of Tel Aviv — would now represent a fund more than sufficient to cover the recurring deficits in the State's annual budget. This is not criticism of the Socialist philosophy which is guiding the State of Israel. On the contrary, it is rather an

effort to correct an omission which has been too long ignored from the days of Ricardo and Marx."

It is high time that this principle of "saving the land" of Israel for the people of Israel be converted into a realized fact.

Referring to my study of "The Land Problem in the State of Israel," Professor Norman Bentwich (after his long experience as Attorney-General of Palestine under the Mandatory regime) stated: "I have always felt with Judge Rosenblatt that it might have been a still greater achievement if, at the outset of the Mandatory Administration, both the Jewish bodies and the Government had been bolder about taxation of land values."

This brings into focus the whole concept of the original American Zion Commonwealth plan, in which it was provided that we *reserved all rights* beyond the agricultural use of the land, for the *benefit of the community*. Had such a program been adopted and adhered to nationally, the additional land profits accruing from urban development (especially in Tel Aviv and its surrounding district) would have flowed into the State Treasury, instead of ending up in the pockets of private investors.

Few people realize that the mere change from building the "Garden City" of Tel Aviv with single dunam plots for homes, to multiple housing schemes, inevitably boosted the price of the land, which the landlord has done nothing to improve beyond sitting on the plots whose value has shot up with the growth of the community and the prosperity of the country.

In any system in which "social justice" has a real place, such increments would belong, of right, to the public and would be collected in rents due under the system of national ownership. This system would be of real benefit to everyone (except land speculators) since by increasing public revenue, it would at the same time make possible the reduction of taxes, help the balance of payments and serve as an added protection to our currency against inflation and devaluation.

CHAPTER XXXVII

SYNTHESIS OF POLITICAL AND PRACTICAL ZIONISM

From the London Conference of August, 1945, I went directly to Palestine, as Chairman of the American Keren Hayesod, to study the problems of resettlement to be undertaken with the funds now flowing in accelerated tempo from the United Palestine Appeal. I had conferences with Eliezer Kaplan, the Treasurer of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, and fruitful talks with David Horowitz (later to head the National Bank of Israel as its efficient chairman). Dr. Stephen S. Wise had arranged that I should meet U.S. Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, and I travelled with the latter from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv in the the end of the summer of that year. A typical American reaction came from the mouth of Senator Pepper as we overwhelmed him with statistics about the Jewish National Home. Said he: "I will not long remember all these facts, but as I speak in the United States Senate, I shall not forget the blond heads of the children of Givat Brenner with their happy faces." I also took Senator Pepper to visit the Mayor of Tel Aviv, Israel Rokach, in his office. Senator Pepper asked him: "Tell me, Mr. Mayor, how long have you been in Palestine?" Quick as a flash came the reply: "Over one hundred years, since my grandparents arrived from Europe". To this, the astonished Senator Pepper replied: "I do not understand the Arabs. I have just come from Iraq, where they told me that the Jews were recent invaders of their lands. Why, you have been longer in this land than I and my ancestors were in Florida".

Returning from Palestine via London, I received a letter from Dr. Weizmann, dated September 5, 1945, while he was deep in the

beginning of the struggle with the British Labor Government, wishing me a "pleasant journey home".

At the conclusion of World War II it semed more important than ever before to enlist American support for the Zionist program of a Jewish State. I was fully convinced that the best way to secure such help was to point out the significance of the relationship between Zionism and Judaism — for Americans, both Jews and non-Jews, naturally veer away from abstruse debates over Jewish nationalism and tend to define Jews in America as Jews by religion and Americans by nationality. This might seem queer to Welshmen or the Scotch, who insist that they do not belong to the English nation, but like the Irish, are distinct nationalities in the British Isles. But we must deal with political facts as they exist — even if only in the minds of men. Perhaps a few sentences from my article on Judaism and Zionism published in the summer of 1945 may make clear the distinction that is fundamental in American thinking:

> "There is no warrant to draw a line of demarcation between Jews by religion and Hebrews as a national group. ... The beautiful Biblical story of Ruth shows how a Moabite may enter into the congregation of Israel by freely accepting Judaism and thus become the ancestress of the great line of Judah's kings, beginning with David. Onkelos, (Aquilas) the noble Roman, who comes down to us as one of the great commentators of the Bible, is classified as a Jew despite his origin and irrespective of his residence. And certainly Rashi, in France, and Maimonides in Egypt, regarded themselves as the same **kind** of Jews as their great forerunners, Hillel of Jerusalem, who hailed from Babylon, and Rabbi Akiba, who was indigenous to the soil of Palestine. Israel is one, even as God is one. It is Judaism that makes the people of Israel a spiritual unity...
>
> "Then the answer is clear and simple for five million American Jews: the restoration of Zion — the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine — is a holy task for the "congregation of Israel", a religious duty as sacred as the observance of the Day of Atonement for individual Jews...
>
> "In such a situation, Zionist policy must be clear and

unmistakable, — the establishment of the Third Jewish Commonwealth is part of our Judaism, true for radicals and conservatives alike, and a task which constitutes the "pious work" enjoined upon us by the faith of our forefathers.

"He who dares to deny us that right and privilege is himself faithless to the best traditions of America and fails to understand the spiritual meaning of Americanism, for he would attempt to deny us an essential part of our religion."

With the establishment of the State, such theoretical problems and definitions of nationalism had necessarily to yield to the demands of a living economy. Once again in the early days of State building the question of land nationalization takes its place as a prime factor.

THE ISRAEL BOND DRIVE

At the end of December, 1948, I reviewed the issue in the Jerusalem Post, urging the launching of a "national land and liberty bond issue" to be marketed in the United States. I went on to say: "In any event we must soon be prepared to offer an external bond issue for general purposes, and it is most fitting and proper that this first great government loan shall give us land freedom."

I then went on to say that thirty years before, under the guiding hand of Justice Louis D. Brandeis, we had formulated the Pittsburgh Program on that issue.

This was really a forerunner of the Israel Bond Campaign which followed successfully a few years later. But, unfortunately, it was not coupled with a program of land redemption which might have saved Israel from the evils of land speculation.

Indeed, it took a good deal of urging to enlist the program of a bond issue itself, for many feared at the time that it might clash with the collection of funds as voluntary gifts under the United Jewish Appeal.

Thus on July 15, 1949, I was writing to Eliezer Kaplan,

the Treasurer of the Government of Israel at "Hakirya, Tel Aviv", criticizing the haphazard chase for dollars in those early days and ending with a proposal for a bond issue as follows: "Entirely too many individuals from Israel are floating around in New York trying to get dollars. I believe the Government of Israel should take drastic action at once and establish a Purchasing Commission in the United States of America through which all purchases should be canalized and dollars only allowed for purchases approved, even after licenses have been issued, so as to prevent competition between individual purchases of material in this country. You can afford to face the criticism that Israel is a Socialist State, because I am convinced that such a procedure is necessary for its future financial existence.

"Finally, this useless chase after "dollars for investment" which are so hard to get anyhow, must be converted into some kind of a bond issue, either along the lines suggested in the enclosed, or if there are legal and political difficulties in the way, certainly a consolidated loan backed by the financial strength of the cities of Tel Aviv, Haifa, or either, must be launched in the U.S.A. and if made payable in dollars, you could get it at a low rate of interest. I am afraid if we delay too long, we shall spoil the market for the future."

After that, in a personal interview with my friend Eliezer Kaplan, in Tel Aviv, he reiterated his misgivings lest the bond issue should interfere with the collection of voluntary contributions, then under the management of Henry Montor, as Executive Director. Accordingly, upon my return to the States the next year, I wrote to Montor under date of April 4, 1950, volunteering to help in the work of the United Jewish Appeal, but adding in the last paragraph a renewed plea for a bond issue: — "Personally, I feel, as I told E. Kaplan a little while ago in Israel, that we are losing too much time in not preparing for a large bond issue, where the name of Morgenthau and your help might be of great value."

The American Zionist movement under the leadership of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver was soon to face some internal trouble in the

United Jewish Appeal fund raising campaigns. Since 1945, Rabbi Silver, as successor to Stephen S. Wise, was the eloquent exponent of Political Zionism as well as leader in fund raising through the United Jewish Appeal. In the latter, he found himself in opposition to Henry Montor, the executive vice-president and the director of its campaigns, who, unfortunately, sometimes ran rough shod over people who were active in Zionist leadership. That is understandable in any public movement. But in this case, it was complicated by the support that Montor sometimes received from leaders in the State of Israel, especially after launching the campaign for the sale of Israel bonds. As a good organizer, Montor could claim to 'deliver the goods' in a financial way, but the old time Zionist leaders in America, who had to look beyond mere financial returns, were often disturbed by the side effects of Montor's operations. After 1950, the next result was a clash which only time could heal. Finally, as the State of Israel grew stronger, it began to play the major role in financial matters.

At long last, the bond issue came, but unfortunately it was not tied to a social program of land redemption — evidently, because the State's immediate need for dollars blinded those in authority to the over-riding consideration of the social benefits in solving the land problem.

THE CASE FOR LAND NATIONALIZATION

But the issue would not die down, and for a whole decade Israel was confronted by the spectacle of land speculation, so familiar to young countries of large immigration and rapid development. Much later, in an "Open Letter" to the Prime Minister published in the Jerusalem Post of May 23, 1963, I pointed to the relationship between the Socialism of the Labor Party and the older concept of land nationalization embodied in the Jewish National Fund, from which the following might be quoted:

> "But quite another factor is involved in the endless struggle for economic justice. What is the profit of ever-increasing

wages, when that "surplus" is devoured by increasing rents, resting upon land speculation profits?...

"Land owned by the State must **never** again be sold, but only leased to individuals or companies under obligation for immediate improvement, and the lease itself subject to renewal at the increased value.

"You do not have to search for any philosophic decree for this simple resolution. It is there before our eyes from our Torah to Rockefeller Center in New York. Thirty-five years ago, the Rockefeller family leased from Columbia University the three blocks from 48th Street to 51st Street, fronting Fifth Avenue, and running one large block to the west. The University was then collecting some $300,000 rent a year from the old dilapidated buildings, on grounds originally donated by the State of New York to support education. But under the 84-year lease, Rockefeller paid just twelve times as much or $3,600,000, and was obligated to erect buildings now worth over $125,000,000. Since the original lease was executed, Rockefeller Center has paid increasing taxes, now exceeding $60,000,000 to the city.

"When will we learn that land buying is as useless an expenditure as paying for the labor of a slave, — where we tie-up cash for slave purchase that can be more profitably used to pay wages — as the example of pre-Civil War days in America has amply proved?

Indeed, I would even at this late date, insist upon redeeming the whole land of Israel — not already held by the Keren Kayemeth for agricultural purposes — by State purchase through a special internal bond issue, and then lease the lands to the present owners. Renewal of leases on the lands would be subject to their improving them. We should thereby build up a new source of **increasing income,** sufficient to stabilize our currency once and for all, with safeguards against inflation in the future." **(Full text in Photostat, Ch. XXXVI)**

But perhaps, some correspondence I had with the first Prime Minister of the State of Israel, David Ben Gurion, more than a decade before, will give some indication why the State was slow to adopt this salutory program of land nationalization. Ben Gurion was understandably disturbed by the meager Jewish immigration from the West — and particularly from America. He rightly felt that to be a Zionist required immigration to Israel and that mere

money contribution or work from abroad might qualify one as a "friend of Zion" but hardly earn the name of "Zionist", — as formulated by Herzl, whose whole concept of a Jewish State and its preparatory institutions of a Congress and a Jewish Colonial Trust signified the liquidation of the Diaspora and the removal to Palestine. In this, I felt certain that Ben Gurion was altogether right and his critics were minimal Zionists. But it seemed to me that merely finding the right and the wrong of any issue did not solve the problem, and when Ben Gurion publicly castigated those who did not forthwith depart for the new State of Israel, I felt called upon to state the reasons for such a failure in my letter to him of December 14, 1951. I wrote to him as an old friend and admirer, who objected to the needless restrictions which the State of Israel was imposing upon immigrant capital and I went on to say:

> "Has it never occurred to you that the reason for the failure to receive the maximum support from American Jewry, to which you are entitled, may be due, at least in a large measure, to the failure of your administration to understand the principles upon which American democracy operates in the economic field, and to which American Jews are irrevocably committed. We have no quarrel with your socialist purpose: I was one of the framers of the Pittsburgh Platform under the inspired leadership of Justice Louis D. Brandeis, and I dare say that this pronouncement of American Zionism of a generation ago still stands as a model of social justice towards which Israel may well strive. There is a real difference of opinion, however, with respect to the needless restrictions upon economic life, with its permits and licences...
>
> "Two and a half years ago, while our credit stood high, I went personally to Tel Aviv and proposed to the Treasury a bond issue of $300,000,000 which might then have been negotiated through banking circles instead of a campaign by professional charity workers. The purpose of the bond issue, as then envisaged, was to purchase outright all the urban lands, which were inevitably destined to increase in value with the large immigration, and to use the rent income as a protection for Israel currency."

It is to the credit of the great-hearted Ben Gurion that he took the criticism with good grace and answered at once in a letter from December 24, 1951, from Jerusalem. It is indicative of his wise understanding of the economic problems and the endeavors to solve them: (see photostat).

ראש הממשלה
THE PRIME MINISTER

Jerusalem, 24th December, 1951.

My dear Rosenblatt,

Thank you for your frank letter of December 14th 1951. I feel sure that if you had read my speech as it was delivered, you might have expressed yourself differently on some points. On the other hand even the New York Times which I have before me does not mention the expression "the bankruptcy of American Zionism" which you quote against me and I am surprised that you as a Judge who, no doubt, insists on accurate presentation of evidence should attribute to me a statement which I never made and which you could never have read in the paper on which you base your protest.

I mentioned the leaders of American Zionists in my speech and expressed my disappointment that not even fifty of them had immigrated to Israel when the State was established. I did not, however, speak of "the bankruptcy of American Zionism". On the contrary I spoke in its defence by stressing that Russian Zionists too did not immigrate until great distress (pogroms, bolshevist revolution, persecution, etc.) forced them to come.

As for American Jewry (and this of course includes the Zionists in America) I believe it rendered its assistance and will continue to do so willingly and with a warm Jewish heart. I cannot say anything on the "maximum support" as expressed by you in your letter, but I believe that American Jewry has given and will continue to give great help and support.

I do not know whether you are right in saying that our Administration has failed to understand "the principles upon which American Democracy operates in the economic field and to which American Jews are irrevocably committed" and I doubt whether there is such an "irrevocable committment". I do know, however, that there is a great difference between the principles of Hoover and Coolidge and those of Roosevelt and Truman and anyway I do not believe that even America has frozen principles which stand from the time of the establishment of the American Republic to this day. Both in the political and economic fields, many things have changed and with every change there are staunch supporters of the old ways who disagree and fight any deviation from "irrevocable principles". In spite of this, however, the earth does revolve and things do change.

I presume, to start with, that I do not know the history of America as well as you do, but even I know that the political and economic regime in 1950 is not what it used to be in 1850 or even in 1900. But even if, like you, I did assume that America abides by frozen principles, it does not bind us to imitate blindly the American methods. We did not accept the constitutional system of the United States, we have no President who

has exclusive authority, we have no Senate and many other institutions that America has and we are not obliged to imitate America in the economic field.

There may be differences of opinion as to whether permits are needed but I regret that you found it necessary to compare the controls imposed in Israel with the "ukase" of the Russian Czar. Our democracy is allowed to go her way; you are quite right in thinking that the restrictions and controls prevelant here are not an integral part of the Socialist doctrine and did not stem from Socialist motives, just as the control and rationing in the States during the war were not the result of Socialist doctrine. These controls are dictated by our particular conditions which have no parallel in any other country - the result of unequalled mass immigration.

You have the right to disagree with our system, which may be the result of our democracy and the people's choice, and we are neither bound nor is there any reason why we should be bound by the system practiced in America where conditions are completely different from ours.

Permit me further to remark that I was never a Marxist - although Marxism is permissible in our midst - and I find no shame in this, but personally I do not belong to this school of thought.

./.

I do not doubt your full right to protest against the system which we find an essential necessity, but likewise we have the right to act to the best of our understanding and knowledge of the State's needs and we have no alternative but to "agree to differ".

I know we have a great deal to learn from America. But there is a fundamental difference between learning and imitating. I am prepared to learn endlessly the American technical know-how. The rest I will examine according to its merits. If it suits us - I will accept it, if it doesn't - I will not. The fact alone that this is the way it is done in America does not bind me at all.

On one point I agree with you and that is that our economic problem is grave and calls for great and concentrated efforts. I believe we will solve this problem and overcome the difficulties. We need time. The United States too were in need of foreign loans for about one hundred and fifty years. I am sure we shall attain economic independence in a much shorter time and will not require one-tenth of the time which the great and rich America required. We will do this our own way -

1. By encouraging private enterprise and private capital.
2. By ensuring, as far as we can, the minimum necessities for everybody.
3. By expanding industry, enhancing productivity and increasing exports.

./.

Finally I must add that I did not complain about American Jewry. I have full confidence in it. I merely expressed an opinion on the Zionist leaders in America and these are two quite different things.

There is no doubt that many things in our economic set-up need improvement and I hope it will be carried out.

I am sure your criticism stems from your interest in the welfare of the State but I know you will allow me to disagree with some of your comments in the same way as you are allowed to disagree with us.

Kindest personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

D. Ben-Gurion

David Ben-Gurion.

ISRAEL'S PUBLIC DEBT

It is interesting to note that almost from the foundation of the State of Israel, despite the strong influence of Socialist philosophy inherent in the Israel Labor movement, as exemplified in the development of the Histadruth, it has followed the principles laid down by Keynes for an expanding economy and the reduction of unemployment. From the very beginning, Israel embarked on a program of public works, which entailed extensive borrowing but paid off in economic well being and political stability. Indeed, Israel may be cited as the best illustration of the truth enunciated by Keynes (The Economic Consequences of the Peace, ca. 1930) that a public debt is not necessarily a burden on the individual citizen, provided it is kept within the bounds of a reasonable relationship to an expanding economy, with a corresponding rise in the gross national product.

It is true that in the early days inflation was rampant and caused a legitimate fear that the economy would get out of hand, but this was corrected with the infusion of foreign exchange which came in the wake of German reparations and the successful flotation of successive bond issues in America, ensuring the state of sufficient capital for development purposes.

We had long discarded the ideas prevalent during the Napoleonic Wars in the past century, that a growing public debt might bankrupt even a rich country like Great Britain, unless provision were made for systematic arrangements for repayment. Indeed, England went on to increase its debt during most of the nineteenth century without any fears of a collapse of its credit. Actually, devaluation of the pound Sterling came only after the first World War, precisely because of the strain on the British economy by the lack of capital investment and the consequent widespread unemployment.

The little State of Israel has shown the way to growth, which virtually has eliminated unemployment, even though at the price of currency devaluation. But people seldom realize that such devaluation often takes place imperceptibly at a 'reasonable' rate (of about 2% a year) for otherwise the economy might stagger under the weight of accumulated savings, as Keynes had warned.

Many years ago, I pointed out (in my book, 'The Social Commonwealth') the curious fact that there was always a thriving economy in war time, when we are fully employed, turning out the destructive tools of war, necessary for fighting the enemy. I suggested that in peace time we imitate this psychology by imagining a war "crisis, but instead of producing lethal weapons, we concentrate instead on public works — on the roads, public schools, hospitals and even art galleries."

Balancing the budget is, of course, an important factor in the maintenance and restoration of public confidence for capital investment, but this must also be viewed in the light of a growing national economy. Israel is perhaps the best example of such a 'balance', where immigration must be absorbed in a growing population. Even a large public debt, if properly managed (in

proportion to national income and a good taxation system), will only generate confidence for capital investment, as in the days of Alexander Hamilton in America and William Pitt in Great Britain.

On a wider scale, the continuous development of Israel is a guarantee of Jewish survival, in spite of the cruel losses of the holocaust or the threat of assimilation now facing Jews in the West. When it is remembered that only three centuries ago, after the devastating massacres in the Ukraine in 1650, there was left a surviving remnant of only 850,000 Jews (according to the estimate of Prof. Salo Baron), it is tribute to the recuperative powers of the Jews that their numbers increased to over 18 million by the beginning of World War II — largely thanks to the high reproduction rate of East European Jewry.

My maternal grandfather, for example, was one of fourteen children, eight of whom settled in America, while the rest were scattered from Poland to Berlin, Paris and London, some of their children being among the immigrants to Israel.

In the early days of the Roman Empire, when a census was taken during the reign of Claudius (about the year 40 of the Common Era), it was remarked that one in fourteen of the population of 100 million (estimated by the same authority above mentioned) was a Jew, i.e. that there were above seven million Jews, of whom only half or less lived in the old land of Israel.

We are only now beginning to make up the terrible losses of World War II, but before long, thanks to the existence of the state of Israel, our numbers may fall hardly below the estimate of those other surviving descendants of the population of imperial Rome. Evidently the "eternal Jew" will remain a world problem for successors to the legendary Haman and his more horrible Nazi descendant. It is time that the Jews plan beyond mere survival, towards a place of honor and respect in human history, comparable to the contribution our ancestors have made to the world of yesterday — and today.

Undoubtedly, one factor in the Jew's successful struggle for survival has been his mobility. As late as 1880, before Russian

persecution began, the Jews of America numbered less than a quarter of a million. With the persecutions in Eastern Europe, a stream of immigrants began which brought the total to beyond five million within 75 years. There have been those who lamented that this stream of Jewish immigration did not go direct to Palestine, forgetting that such large numbers could not possibly have been absorbed during the century. More important, though, is the fact that Jewish immigration to America made possible — albeit indirectly — the growth of the Jewish settlement in Israel from the figure of less than 100,000 just after World War I to two and a half million by 1966.

Nor has the contribution of American Jews to immigration and settlement been limited to money. The example and devotion of a man like Justice Brandeis and his lessons on sound economic policies still reverberate through the land of Israel. It might truthfully be said that just as the Russian Jewish contribution was epitomized by the Histadruth, with its emphasis on Socialism and labor, so American Jews can claim the credit for demands for land nationalization and the realization of capital investment.

The "miracle" implicit in the establishment of the Third Jewish Commonwealth must be interpreted with the Bible in one hand and with a sense of historical perspective in mind. The improvised "Dovidl" gun, which so frightened the Arabs at Safed during the War of Independence, causing them to decamp with the cry that the Jews had the atom bomb, certainly in former times would be described as "the finger of God". Indeed, many historical "miracles" can generally be accounted for in present-day scientific terms. There is no doubt, for example, that Joan of Arc *heard* voices — even if others did not — which propelled her on the course which led to the expulsion of the English from French soil. While the "Age of Reason" might describe her activity on the logical deduction from the Philosophy of Plato, with the emphasis on subjectivity, even those classified as unbelievers could still regard the relief of Orleans as a miracle of the Medieval Church.

And so, retracing history, it can hardly be denied that Moses

actually saw the burning bush, even though there was no other witness besides his unseeing flock of sheep. The miracle was nevertheless performed which moved Moses to risk his life, as an Egyptian refugee, with the cry to Pharaoh, "Let my People go". Later, when Joshua *believed* that the sun stood still while he destroyed the enemies of Israel, it was also a miracle which cannot be gainsaid by scientific proof in a modern age. It is not so much the bare facts that constitute the miracle as recorded in history, but rather the reaction in the believing man that results from that episode. This is not to say that we should accept the curious doctrine that "because it is impossible, therefore, do I believe". That is quite a different matter, for where anything can be subjected to reason, there is no reason to believe the impossible. Our beliefs must be amenable either to scientific proof or, if incapable of such proof, be accepted as a reasonable theory until repudiated by scientific proof in the future.

That is why the minimum creed which the Jew is required to accept on faith is so eminently proper and reasonable. "The Lord is One" — without strings or complications or reservations. The philosophic inquiry as to what and who put the voices in the ears of Joan of Arc or the burning bush in the eyes of Moses is probing something that no one can know — therefore these events may properly be described as miracles.

Who but a prophet could have foreseen that the beginning of Jewish colonization at Petah Tikvah in 1878 would result in a Jewish State seventy years thereafter? But Herzl wrote immediately after the conclusion of the First Zionist Congress in 1897, that there he laid the foundation of the Jewish State, and that "in fifty years" this would be a recognized fact. Indeed, on the Saturday evening of November 29, 1947, at the United Nations assembly, this was "publicly recognized", fifty years thereafter, exactly as predicted.

A miracle often works in spite of the plans and intentions of its author. Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the "Father of Jewish Colonization" in Palestine, was opposed to political Zionism and its concept of a Jewish State. But history may prove that without

his invaluable aid in colonization and support of early Jewish settlements, there could hardly have been developed a "Medinat Yisrael" — any more than there can be a soul without a body. Indeed, the Hebrew word 'nefesh' is symbolic of the picture of a Jewish Renaissance — like the dry bones which the prophet Ezekiel saw in his dream.

That Tel Aviv — the original "garden city" — should have swallowed ancient Jaffa can, of course, be explained by natural causes, but that Jaffa did not expand to include its suburbs, as in the case of any other metropolis, may be correlated as the "miraculous" growth of Tel Aviv.

That Hebrew became the language of the State of Israel may perhaps be explained by the obstinacy of a slightly-built, ailing Jew, Eliezer ben Yehuda and the single minded devotion of the secular Hebrew teachers of his generation. Yet it is the only recorded occasion in history on which a people speaking other languages deliberately cultivated an old, almost forgotten, tongue, making it their vehicle of communication in reviving the language of their Bible.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

SOME CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

It is pertinent at this time to examine the problems inherent in the development of the State of Israel. One of the major problems in the establishment of any state is the stabilization of its currency. Without this, economic progress is virtually impossible. Because of opposition to the development of the Jewish National Home, British Foreign Minister Bevin deliberately and unceremoniously kicked Palestine out of the Sterling bloc as a calculated act of sabotage, even before Great Britain withdrew its forces from the Mandated area. Fortunately, the Jewish community was already beginning the process of state-building and was somehow able to cushion the blow with experience gained during World War I when the Anglo-Palestine Bank (the predecessor of the Bank Leumi) under the wise management of S. Hoofien was able to utilize checks of the Guaranty Trust Company of New York to protect the devalued Turkish Pound. It is a pity that the Histadruth (Labor Federation), which controlled the early Government of Israel, did not see fit to make this pioneer Jewish banker its Secretary of the Treasury in the first Labor Government of Israel. Proverbially, any Labor Government is weak in its Treasury Department, perhaps because Socialists are so fearful of capitalist control that they tend to minimize the opposite dangers of inflation and devaluation.

With control over foreign affairs, the defence forces and internal police, it might have proved more than a generous gesture to place in the Cabinet one who had rendered valuable service in guiding the economy in the difficult days between the

two World Wars and their aftermath. Perhaps a policy of land nationalization, such as I had been urging for a score of years before the State was organized, might have succeeded in bolstering the currency, from the inevitably increasing values brought to the Treasury from the rental of urban lands. But this program, though often given nominal approval in the Hebrew press, (including Labor publications) was never put into practice. Accordingly, for more than a decade inflation remained a significant unbalancing factor in the economy of the new state of Israel.

Of course, in the last analysis inflation is a world problem — with a history running back to ancient Greek efforts under Solon. But few have pointed to the fact that inflation is almost necessarily bound up with human history. If interest on capital, if not usury, is at all defensible, inflation becomes a necessary accompaniment to a money economy. It has been pointed out that if the legendary Adam had started saving the equivalent of a single dollar on his exit from the Garden of Eden, his presumed descendants would have accumulated, even at a low rate of compound interest a "pile" greater than the monetary value of the whole world today. This is simply the geometrical ratio of compounding interest as equivalent to the Malthusian theory of population increase. There must be some limitation of the compounding process or the world would stagger under the weight of its own money bags as though it were under the golden curse of Midas. In the past, this tendency has been somewhat abated by the destructive wars and other catastrophes that have taken a toll from capitalist economy. In the last century, we have developed income tax as a drastic remedy to take the edge off inflation with its accompanying hazards and hardships. But few realize what the income tax has meant in forestalling such huge American fortunes as those of the Astor or Rockefeller families from encompassing the defeat, through sheer surfeit, of the richest country in history.

Perhaps two striking examples from the past might illustrate the problem. When John Cabot and his son, Sebastian, returned to England from their voyage of discovery in North America, a grateful sovereign, the thrifty, not to say miserly, Henry VII

gave them the munificent gift of Ten Pounds for their momentous achievement, which established the claims of Great Britain in the New World. This may seem a paltry present, but if the sailors had thriftily invested those funds in London real estate or established a savings bank (which did not come into being until three centuries later), there would not be sufficient wealth in all of England, but for the Cromwellian expropriations in the Civil War and the Great Fire of London in 1666, to repay the principal with accumulated interest. Even should we assume that some thrifty Londoner in the days of Pepys Diary, after watching the Great Fire, had wisely decided to invest his remaining Ten Pounds in a mortgage for London's rebuilding, even at so modest a rate of interest as 5%, that modest principal would have grown today to a value of many thousands of millions of pounds sterling — for England remained free from income tax or expropriation while Europe was at war until the days of Napoleon and the younger Pitt, when income tax was first introduced. The United States might also show similar accumulation from the days of Washington up to the time of Franklin Roosevelt, when the dollar was first devalued, for through the foresight of Alexander Hamilton, who established "the full faith and credit" of the United States, America paid full value for the depreciated currency of the Revolutionary War. In short, only *taxes* and *rents* keep us from floundering and drowning in our own riches, even while the poor suffer from unemployment and poverty. In a larger sense, therefore, a proper income tax, wisely adjusted to a prevailing economy, is indeed a blessing to both rich and poor alike.

But to prevent periodic devaluation of the currency, we need more than taxes alone, especially in an expanding economy such as Israel's, where the prime source of wealth lies in constantly increasing land values. Only by reserving that increasing rent element for the benefit of the public at large can we avoid the inevitable threat of inflation and currency devaluation. Henry George's formula of "progress and poverty" was indeed a great American contribution to the solution of this problem. Unfortunately, he treated it as a *moral* question, instead of an economic

disease. By insisting that virtually all land values should be expropriated through the "single tax" *without compensation* (because of his insistence on the issue as a moral one) he was brought face to face with the adamant opposition of the landlord class. If only his followers could have benefited from Abraham Lincoln's advice to compensate the slaveholders (which might have avoided the dire cost in human lives and property of the Civil War) and *bought the land* for the public benefit, we might have had the example of a healthy economy achieved through a simple bond issue required for the purchase of the land, and its nationalization in a *single generation.* But moral leaders are always in too much of a hurry — and so, necessary reforms generally take longer!

While public control over land is more far-reaching than any mere question of currency stabilization, the latter issue is imminent because a world in which the Common Market is already a going concern, will not long tolerate the existing confusion in its currency systems. The U.S., Great Britain, France and Germany must sooner rather than later bring their currencies into an exchangeable pattern, perhaps through the World Bank. When that time comes, a state like Israel in control of its increasing land values, would be in a position to guarantee a stable monetary system. Through a system of Government ground rent collection, we could build up a Treasury pool for the protection of the currency against devaluation and at the same time the public would secure an added source of income as a safeguard against crises and unemployment. With the long history of the Keren Kayemeth to serve as a guide, we should be able to carry through this salutory land reform in "our days."

A SOUND LAND POLICY

I may be accused of being obsessed with the "land problem" — and, if so, I plead guilty to the accusation. This was the theme running through my early book on "Social Zionism" and other later writings like the "American Bridge to the Israel Commonwealth."

I am quite convinced that if these recommendations — set out in numerous articles in the Jerusalem Post and even in the Hebrew press, the latest one in "Ha'aretz" a few years ago — had been followed, many of the pitfalls of land speculation in Israel might have been avoided, while its Treasury would have been so strengthened that fears of devaluation would have been totally banished.

By retaining land titles in the hands of the Government (or Keren Kayemeth as the appropriate public body) the *cream* of land profits would have been saved for the public, instead of being squandered in speculation and allowed to "overheat" the economy, resulting in recurrent devaluations. Unfortunately, our socialist-minded brethren in the early days in Israel — fearful of "capitalists" and their machinations — neglected the much more sinister form of capital accumulation which accrues from the unearned increment in land values. If only, in 1909, the Keren Kayemeth had *leased* the lands of Tel Aviv to the first settlers — which they were bound to do under the Fund's charter — instead of making them loans for the purchase of the lands that became Herzl and Allenby streets and Rothschild Boulevard, by the year 1958, i.e. at the end of the usual 40 year period, the Treasury would have been collecting so much in rents that they could dispense with all the expensive paraphernalia of Jewish National Fund collections in America and elsewhere.

Only Brandeis among the Zionist leaders seemed to understand the supreme importance of land policy, for although a radical in his political thinking he was not a hidebound Socialist. When he sent me to London and Paris in 1919 to plead for a clause in the "Palestine Mandate" stating that "*all* increase in land values in Palestine after August 1st, 1914 (the beginning of the World War) belonged to the State and should be appropriated for the Treasury by periodic increases in rent, commensurate with the increased value", he was exhibiting a degree of realism which none of his colleagues equalled. The point was — and is — that it is not enough for the *title* only to belong to the Government (or its agency). The principle must be accepted that increased

value must also revert to the government. The practical means of doing so could perhaps consist of a review of rents every seven or fourteen years. Only in this way could the profits on land have been kept for the people.

Apart from the obvious equity of such an arrangement, it would also have had a salutory effect on Israel's balance of payments, for diverting profits from private to public hands would have kept down consumption and contributed to the stabilization of the currency.

From the foregoing it will be seen that I would even argue in favor of a "Liberty" bond or special bond issue to buy up such land even now, as a safeguard for the future, since in the small and restricted area of Israel with its increasing population, land is bound to increase in value — as witness the orange groves being constantly torn up, up and down the country, for urban development. Control of these values is the key to all worthwhile economic reforms and development.

CHAPTER XXXIX

SOCIAL ZIONISM AND THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

Now, that the State of Israel is firmly established, it may be fairly asked whether there is any need for a continued existence of the Zionist Movement. Even if such a movement may be still necessary as a political factor to protect the small beleaguered state in the Middle East, what social ideals should hold its membership together? The answer, of course, is that the Zionist Movement never regarded the mere establishment of the Jewish State as the final goal of all its endeavors. From the publication of Herzl's "Judenstaat" with its emphasis on the rights of labor, the adoption by the Zionist Congress in 1901 of a program of land redemption, through the Jewish National Fund, up to the famous Pittsburgh Program of American Zionism in 1918, there is always the unforgettable ideal of "social justice" as the keystone for the proposed Jewish State. Zionist leaders from Herzl and Weizmann to Ben Gurion, whatever their other differences all united in emphasizing the social aspect of Zionism. And when Justice Brandeis first asked me to go to Palestine as a "representative American", he emphasized the words "Social Zionism" in his farewell letter to me.

No convinced Zionist regards the setting-up of the State of Israel as "the be all and end all" of the process of the Jewish Renaissance. Perhaps, because American Jews were generally remote from the hard days of Israel's War of Independence, they tended to regard mere political independence as only the first stage in the transition of a Jewish State into a "Jewish Social Commonwealth".

Nor did American Zionism quarrel with the Socialist approach of the Histadruth in the development of Medinat Yisrael (State of Israel). It was rather critical of the almost total absence of any provision to deal with the land problem beyond mere lip service to the collection of funds for the Keren Kayemeth. Instead of making the latter the central operation for a truly national redemption program, the powers that be in the Labor Party contented themselves with frequent repetition of outworn phrases in denouncing profits, while its own successful instruments (like the Solel Boneh, industry in the kibbutzim for instance) were inevitably established on the basis of profitable management. Not everything, of course, can be gauged on a profit basis, for neither a police force nor a University may be measured in such terms, but wherever the economy of production is an essential factor, the element of profit cannot be eliminated without paying a heavy price both in monetary loss and in economic deterioration. Side by side with profitable management, there must go hand in hand the collection of ground rent by the State, or a public body, to eliminate that "unearned increment" without which land speculation inevitably burdens the community as a whole. The collection of such rent never operates as a drag on the economy. Indeed, increasing rent collections of this kind for the public benefit is a true measure of economic progress. Socialism without land nationalization is unfair to the working class as a whole, who must pay out in increasing rents the benefits that might otherwise accrue from increased wages and a Socialist economy.

The State of Israel has already developed a system of public competition (largely through the Labor organization institutions) with the private sector of the economy, and this acts to protect the community of consumers against monopoly and unjust prices. That is all to the good, as it gives the State the scale of justice between consumers and producers alike. Now, we must eliminate the unjust profits of land speculators to assure a just social system.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

For my own part, when I realized how difficult it was to persuade the leaders in the new State of Israel to embark on a policy of complete land nationalization, I decided to help in the development of those public enterprises — like the Israel Land Development Company and Rassco — whose programs encompassed the development of real estate and the construction of buildings under public control, both institutions being offshoots of the Jewish Agency. These offered a prospect of public control, while enlisting foreign capital on a business basis. Only two years after the establishment of the State of Israel, I assumed the Presidency of the Rassco Israel Corporation in the United States, which in the following decade became a prime source of capital for building and construction in Israel. At about the same time, I became a Director in the Israel Land Development Company, having invested a substantial part of my own private assets in developing that historic company on its great career of expansion. I was also one of the pioneer investors in the Migdal Insurance Company, joining its Board of Directors from the earliest days, when it was launched by George Halpern, who had formerly been a colleague of mine on the Zionist Executive. Thus, indirectly at least, I hoped to stem the tide of land speculation which was engulfing the country.

I took a small part in the development of Nahariya in the early thirties. The major role in that pioneer effort was played by Joseph Loewy of Haifa and Dr. Soskin, then living in Jerusalem, who first organized it as a colony specializing in chicken farming and fruit growing. I was one of the little group who supplied £1,000 each, while the brunt of the pioneer development fell on the shoulders of Joseph Loewy and the Engineer Reich, who were among the first to make their homes in this northern outpost of Israel. Reich was a remarkable man who was largely responsible for converting the original Haifa Bay land purchase into a liveable area. With Joseph Loewy, he now moved to redeem the north. Nahariya was the first Jewish colony to have a "river" — however

small — running through the village. It was quite a novelty to have water flowing, as in the neighboring villages of Lebanon, with its many gushing streams. Established at the time of increasing German-Jewish immigration, Nahariya provided a natural attraction for West European Jews, to whom water seemed not a luxury but a stern necessity. Within a few years, Nahariya took on almost the character of a German enclave within the Jewish community, so that it became a joke among the older settlers, the "sabras", that no matter how much the rest of Palestine adopted the Hebrew language, Nahariya remains German (bleibt Deutsch). This was hardly fair. During the Second World War, when the struggle for Jewish immigration was at its heights, Nahariya was one of the cardinal points of entrance. Immigrants would wade ashore there from the "illegal" ships and disappear among the "German" population, who would often change clothes with the newcomers to prevent their deportation as "illegals". Like most of the early pioneer capital investments in Palestine, those who provided the funds for land purchase and development were glad to receive a part of their capital returned to them, without interest or dividends. But they did have the satisfaction of a pioneer job well done and witnessing a thriving Nahariya, self-supporting and happy in the joy of living on the coast of the cooler Galilee.

IS CALENDAR REFORM A THREAT TO JUDAISM?

The world looks instinctively forward for any message from the State of Israel, because of its historic connection with our ancient Bible. Even in lesser matters, any such message may carry weight and prove a significant contribution to human welfare. For example, we are all concerned by the vagaries of the calendar, which has been reformed time and again, from ancient Egypt through Imperial Caesar and the Gregorian calendar of the Catholic Church — not to speak of the movable months in the Moslem faith. In this history of calendar reform, the old Jewish

calendar offers a prime field for reformation by Israel lawmakers. The growing insistence on conformity in the world in matters of currrency, weights and measures and in recording time make this a matter of more than local importance. Even the Ecumenical Council held in Rome in 1963 drew attention to the need for reforming the civil calendar and unless some action is taken in time, we may be faced with a reformed calendar totally unacceptable to Jewry.

The difficulty, of course, that has harrassed all calendar makers before and since Roman times, is that the astronomical year's precise duration cannot possibly be reflected in any practical day-by-day calculation. Some adjustments have always to be made — and allowed for. The simplest solution would be a year of 364 days (precisely 52 weeks) with a "blank day" (occasionally two days) left over to keep in balance with the "real" year. But this disturbs the fixed seven-day week and, inevitably, the regular Sabbath.

This is the fear of Judaism: that any alteration in the existing pattern would undermine the sanctity and even the function of the Sabbath. The Jewish calendar is based on a fixed seven-day week, with the Sabbath falling every seventh day. However, the fifty-two weeks of the Jewish calendar bear no relation to the dates of the civil calendar. Accordingly, one proposal envisages "gathering up" the blank days until they form an extra complete week (every five or six years). On this plan, the civil calendar could be amended so that January 1st — and consequently every other day of the year, would fall on a fixed day of the week. Calendar reform which does not threaten to violate the sanctity of the Sabbath would meet with no objection from Jews.

Without interference, of course, with the religious practices of orthodox Jewry, there is an early need to adjust the civil calendar (already largely accepted in practice within the boundaries of the State of Israel) and by so doing perhaps produce a reform from which the whole world might profit. In the February, 1955, isssue of the "Jewish Forum", I attempted to give a partial

answer to this old-time problem — dismissing at once all recent attempts based upon omitting one day of the week, for "in all plans for calendar reform in the past of which we have any definite knowledge — the reforms of Julius Caesar and that of Augustus and the fundamental reforms of Pope Gregory — there was never any attempt to change the days of the week, but only the moving dates in the monthly calendar, which did not affect the religious practices of different communities."

I went on to say that a simple formula might be applied "without offending the religious sensibilities of anyone, and still make possible the achievement of a salutory reform at an early date... One suggestion for calendar reform which, under existing circumstances, may be applied only in Israel, might be offered as bridging the difference between a calendar dated from Creation, as envisaged in the "Old Testament", and the current calendar, based upon events in the New Testament. From a purely scientific point of view, it would appear incongruous to date an era in the midst of the reign of Augustus even as the method of dating of events from Adam or Noah and the Flood is open to objection. For example, to place the Battle of Marathon at 490 B.C., presents the same anomaly as the founding of Jamestown, in America, at 169 B.D.I. (before Declaration of Independence) or the discovery of America as 284 B.D.I.

"Fortunately, there is a fundamental date in the history of Israel so universal that it might well be marked off as an epoch, with the least interference to the present system of dating. We might select the date 1000 B.C.E. as the correct year for the establishment of Jerusalem as the capital city of David, from which three major faiths draw their inspiration. That date is no further "out of line" with historical facts, as we know them, than the beginning of the Christian era itself. Thus, the years would offer a system of historical dating more in line with the progress of science, since earlier times might fairly be denominated as less important. Every event before that date would be fairly characterized in Israel as B.D. (Before David), of which correct dates are neither available nor absolutely essential. Israel could

accept such a calendar in place of a system based upon Creation without any compunction.

"The present calendar, based upon the cycle of 400 years, represents a total of 97 leap year days, one every four years, with two important exceptions from that rule: the day is omitted when the century year is not divisible by 400, while the day is *added* in the century year divisible by 400."

Here then is the prospect of a salutory reform which still would require no drastic change from the present calendar — indeed, it demands merely an acceptance of a leap year based upon an extra *week* rather than an extra month (as in the religious calendar) or the extra day of the current civil calendar. The extra weeks would be so distributed over the 400 year period as to cause the least inconvenience — comparable to the Leap Years (based upon days) in the present civil calendar. The total of such leap year weeks would be 71, or 497 days, in the same 400-year cycle.

This would give us a calendar with every day of the month always falling on the same day of the week, with seasons of 91 days and 31 days for January, April, July and October and 30 days for the other months. The extra l e a p y e a r w e e k would constitute an extra benefit if placed in the spring or autumn, at the end of April or September. Each month would begin with the same day of the week (for example, Christmas Day, December 25, on a Monday, January 1 on Sunday, February 1 on Wednesday, and March 1 on Friday — and so repeated for each quarter) while the week would be preserved as a unit, as it has been throughout recorded history. No opposition should be encountered from any religious group since the sanctity of the Sabbath would be preserved and the purely religious calendar (setting the day for Easter as for Passover and the Jewish New Year) would not be interfered with.

The amended proposal for a universal calendar would simply be based upon the leap years with extra w e e k s instead of days, so that every year divisible by five — except the fortieth and eightieth (i.e. double forty) year in each century — would have

an extra leap year week (besides the year divisible by 400), so that the 71 leap year weeks (encompassing the present 497 days of the calendar, beyond the full 52 weeks a year in the cycle of 400 years) will be absorbed.

What a blessing it would prove to be if we knew that each day of the week in every month is also exactly the equivalent week day, without the stupid calculations to which we must now subject ourselves. There would be no "Friday the 13th" to plague the superstitious and, taking the United States as a good example, assuming, of course, that the first day of each year began on Sunday (the first day of the week) American Independence Day would always be on a Wednesday (as would Washington's Birthday), Thanksgiving Day always the fourth (and last) Thursday in November (November 30th) and Election Day always on November 7th, while New Years and Christmas falling on a Sunday and Monday, respectively, would give a long weekend.

Surely only the makers of calendars could object to such a system!

THE LESSON OF THE SUEZ CAMPAIGN

In October, 1956, Ben Gurion launched the Sinai Campaign which, for a time, so divided the Western Powers that the United States seemed to have cooperated with Russia in opposition to Great Britain and France, who supported Israel. Coming as it did in the midst of Russian aggression in Hungary, there was ample precedent for America to deal with the Russian ruthless attack upon Hungary as President Kennedy, six years later, answered with a stern warning order on missiles in Cuba. But, unfortunately, President Eisenhower, kindly and well-meaning, was dominated in his dealings in foreign affairs by his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who operated as a phrase-making lawyer, seeking to solve a serious international dispute over treaty rights (over the Suez Canal, etc.) by such catch words as "users' rights" and

equivocal announcements about conciliation, which Nasser treated with contempt.

All America had to do was to balance Russian doings in Hungary against Great Britain and France, who were merely charged with wrong-doing — however different the role — and to advise Russia that only after she would withdraw her armed forces from Hungary would the United States — then and then only — recommend that Great Britain and France cease the air attacks upon the Suez Canal.

After all, irrespective of Israel's claim against Egypt, Great Britain and France were acting in the western tradition of respecting and enforcing treaty rights, whereas the Soviet Union was making a bare-faced attack on a sovereign Hungary. Hungary was in no way bound to permit foreign forces to enter within its boundaries, suppress its freedom and overthrow its government. Egypt, on the other hand, had a valid treaty with Britain and France over the Suez Canal, recognized for three-quarters of a century, with only a few more years to run before Egypt might have taken peaceful possession of the Canal Zone. Nasser contemptuously tore up the treaty as a "scrap of paper", thereby giving notice to the emerging states of Africa that they might violate treaties with impunity — a lesson easily learned at the expense of the "colonial powers" who had peacefully accorded them their freedom. It was likewise notice to the world that America would yield to threats of force, even after Korea, the bill for which may still be paid in Indo-China to this very day.

The fact that Eisenhower miscalculated the degree of opposition both internal and external does not mitigate the injuries sustained through this failure to uphold treaty rights. Had Churchill still been at the helm (as he had been only one year previously) he would not have failed to consult his old comrade in arms across the Atlantic, thereby avoiding the disastrous injury sustained by Eisenhower's "amour-propre." Even if he had not secured cooperation, he might have achieved a "hands-off" policy which was all that was necessary.

Again, had the indomitable de Gaulle been in power in France

(as he was two years later) it is inconceivable that he would have stopped the bombing operations against Egypt at the behest of a distant America. In either case, Nasser would have been taught to respect treaty obligations.

But this is merely a story of "what might have been." In fact, a historic episode went awry. Israel had to abide by a very unfair settlement and submit to unjust pressures from her best friend — America. Egypt had proved a "broken reed" once more, and Israel emerged as she had so often before as the testing ground for the enforcement of rights guaranteed by international law.

Had America offered Russia a challenge which she neither could nor would accept, Nasser would have been compelled to come to terms on some basis for internationalization of the Suez Canal, to the great benefit of the world at large. But America missed the chance to serve the cause of general peace and to protect international treaties, while Nasser proceeded to serve in the role of a champion of Arab aggression and as a constant disturbing factor in the Middle East.

This was not the first time that the cause of Israel was bound up with the cause of peace and the future of the United Nations itself. The latter was to become, unwittingly, the mouthpiece of the small nations in their outworn exaggerated fear of colonialism which holds a destructive power that may eventually disrupt the United Nations, should the time come when one or more great powers refuses to accept the position of being outvoted by a majority of small states, who, taken together, might have a population and economic strength and productive power far smaller than a single great power. Israel behaved remarkably well in withdrawing from the conquered Suez Peninsula at the request of President Eisenhower. The representations made as a condition of the withdrawal were never fulfilled and Israel had to content itself with gaining merely the right to the free use of the port of Eilat, as the only tangible result of its successful campaign.

The short Suez War brings to mind the capital error that

Great Britain committed in the interval between the two World Wars in the belief that she was to remain in Egypt indefinitely. I recall a curious incident in the early twenties when I suggested to the Palestine Railway Administration that they strengthen the connecting link with Egypt by extending the railway from Kantara to Port Fuad (on the eastern side of the Suez Canal) opposite to Port Said so that Palestine might have a direct outlet on the Mediterranean Sea (before the port of Haifa was built). This would have required, of course, that the territory of the Peninsula of Suez be joined, in effect, to the Palestine Mandated Territory, while the Railway Administration modernized the route to the eastern side of the Suez Canal — which Great Britain could easily have arranged in consideration for the new concessions she was then offering Egypt. It seemed, however, that Great Britain was reluctant to add additional territory under the Mandate to give her an outlet, independent of Egypt, upon the Suez Canal. (Haifa might later have been developed as a secondary port for Galilee alone). But that is another story of "What might have been." Instead, there was a second War of Independence for Israel in October, 1956, which consolidated the Jewish State and gave her an open window to the Far East through the outlet to the Red Sea and the Gulf of Akaba.

ISRAEL AS A STATE FOR EXPERIMENTATION

Israel can and should serve as a laboratory for humanity at large — as it is already doing in such pioneer efforts as desalting the waters of the ocean — and thereby opening up a new world for a teeming population, converting deserts into fruitful fields of human habitation. But far more important than its achievements in science and industry, may be the drive for social justice which has been the keystone of the Hebraic character throughout its long history. The very ideal of Monotheism has, as the necessary corollary to the Divine Father, the idea of the

Brotherhood of Man. The message of a universal and unitary God freed the ancient world from the hazards and fear of capricious and conflicting deities, substituting the "fear of the Lord," i.e. the fear of a *just* and *loving* Father, who may find it necessary to punish even unto the third and fourth generation, but will bless his children to the "thousandth generation." The successful revolution on behalf of Monotheism resulted not merely in the destruction of false gods: it was a necessary revolution on behalf of the freedom of all, for only with the sure basis of belief in a just ruler of the universe was man able to climb the slippery steps of civilization. Nor was the mere change in dogma significant compared to the revolution in action, the elimination of the abominable crime of the sacrifice of human beings. Though it failed to abolish the primal curse of war, it helped to mitigate its barbarities, until Hitler's Nazis appeared on the scene to remind us of just how wicked a godless mankind can be.

No one can fully appreciate the Old Testament unless he understands that he is studying the history of a people. Of course, like all histories of ancient times, this early attempt to re-tell a people's story is encrusted with time-honored myths and wrapt in remembered legends that frequently demand a hard searching before the pearls of historic truth are revealed. For even the most obvious legends contain kernels of fact, which may not be brusquely brushed aside. They represent what our ancestors believed to be true. In a continuous history that belief itself becomes a vital factor. Thus, we may qualify the Five Books of Moses and the following Books of Joshua and Judges as part of the legendary history of Israel. But all subsequent history can be correctly understood only after imbibing the contents of the first seven books of our Bible. Beginning with Samuel I, we are fairly launched upon an authentic history of the Children of Israel, when there are no long geneologies with lives of hundreds of years, but the sober facts stand out in the story of the developing twelve tribes as clearly as does the history of Greece from the days of Solon, and that of Rome from the beginning of the Republic, although preceding both by half a millenium. The works

of the prophets of Israel can now be read as the wise injunctions of statesmen, who were moral as well as political leaders, even when interspersed by the accounts of dreams and portents as the voice of God.

It is only in Christian theology that we come across the strained interpretation of Isaiah, who was, indeed, a statesman of a high order (as was also the anonymous Second Isaiah). This does not detract one iota from the prophetic message, yet it helps us to understand the true history of the ancient Jews.

The New Testament, although largely a Jewish product derived from the accounts of St. Peter and St. Paul — the Jews Simon and Saul respectively — in the days of the Second Temple, is quite a different matter. It has a message to give to the world — a proposition to prove — that Jesus of Nazareth is a divine being, and its recitation of events is designed to prove that case. Some statements in the Old Testament may prove erroneous in the light of later archeology and comparative anthropology, but even so, they may throw some light on facts as do the mistakes that occur in the history of Herodotus or even Gibbon. The New Testament, on the other hand, is a "brief" in which facts are presented as if by a good lawyer, with precedents (taken largely from the Old Testament itself) marshalled and historic incidents cited to prove the case. Both the Old and New Testaments have their place of honor in the history of mankind, but only the first can be *rightly regarded as the history of a people* — where the good and the bad are equally recorded — whether about the tribal ancestor, Judah, the guilt of Reuben, or the evil intentions of Simon and Levi. There is no attempt in the Old Testament to exonerate even its great hero, David, from the guilt of adultery or murder. Omitting the legends, some of which can be explained as logical historic episodes, there is nothing in the Old Testament that intrinsically demands a defense of any particular belief. "The Lord, our God, is One", is the assertion of an axiom — a premise, but not an argument.

Accordingly, it is easy for Jews, ancient as well as modern, to accept all philosophies which do not clash with the premise of

a simple Divine force that rules the world. In short, it is a negative test of not denying God, rather than the positive acceptance of some well-worked-out creed which distinguishes Judaism from other faiths. Maimonides, in the 12th century, could assert that God is purely a spiritual force, without body or other earthly representation, and this is the accepted standard of belief alike by Orthodox and Reform Judaism. It may be hard to be a Jew in the material world of persecution and discrimination, but it is easy enough to be a Jewish philosopher, or a Rabbi, for in neither case do convictions clash with reason.

In the early days of American Zionism, when we were wont to emphasize every colonization effort as a major event in Palestine, my old friend, Abe Goldberg, used to explain that we were constantly looking through a magnifying glass — that a bee producing necessary honey in a Jewish colony seemed to us as large as a chicken producing eggs, and a mere donkey looked to us like an elephant. But, in a larger sense, that has been the Jewish connection with the land of Israel from the very beginning of our history. I recall a remark once made at an American Zionist Convention, after an early trip to Palestine, when I explained that it was hardly fair to condemn the "ten spies" who returned to Moses in the desert with a negative report on Palestine, despite the minority report of Joshua and Caleb with their clusters of grapes. The majority were physically right — they only failed to take into consideration the *spirit* of our Jewish ancestors.

Even before the advent of Hitler and Nazi Germany, the Jews, numbering less than 1% of world population, played a role in history comparable to that of a great nation. And it may be truthfully stated that this Jewish force, though small in number, was a vital element in the defeat of the Nazis — from the theories of Einstein until the final production of the atom bomb, in which Jews played a major role. It is a remarkable tribute to the power of rehabilitation and adaptation of the modern, as of the ancient, Jew that he recovered so quickly from the destruction of one-third of his people, and succeeded in building the splendid edifice of the State of Israel. Jewish history has given the lie to the oft-

repeated Napoleonic aphorism that the Lord is on the side of the "heaviest battalions".

Indeed, Jewish survival is often regarded as an enigma, even by non-Jews. Perhaps it can be partly explained by the very fact that the Jew was exiled from his beloved land — for it may well be argued that had he remained in Palestine after late Roman and early Byzantine times, during the centuries culminating in the Moslem conquest of the Near East, he might have been engulfed on his own soil. But scattered and dispersed in a foreign environment, dominated by religions which he could not reconcile with his cry "The Lord is One", he escaped the fate of submersion. The real miracle is that during all those long centuries, he preserved his ancient faith and civilization, and still harbored a love for the old land of Israel, with the unquenchable desire to rebuild it.

It is a remarkable fact that the time for redemption came when it did. Before the end of the last century, the Jews had neither the ability nor the means for state-building while external forces were inimical to such an enterprise. Herzl, and then Weizmann, came just at the right time — as did Ben Gurion, with the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel, just half a century after the First Zionist Congress. Had we delayed by a single decade, we might have been denied statehood, not only by the specious plea of colonialism on the part of a resurgent Arab nationalism, but even by our friends in Europe and America, who disavowed all "colonialism". In that sense, we may truly regard even the State of Israel not as a mere product of "historic materialism", but as a miraculous achievement of the present day.

If we rightly view Judaism as the great force that preserved the Jewish people over the centuries, a tribute which even non-believers must pay to the religion of the Jews, it must still be asserted that historic world forces helped to shape events so that by the middle of the twentieth century the State of Israel became a possibility.

And we have a right to expect more from the small commonwealth on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea than a mere

revival of the Third Jewish State, for it will necessarily be permeated by the traditions of the old prophets of Israel whose message was bound-up with the cry for individual and social justice. Already Israeli emissaries are in Asia and Africa teaching the new nations, freed from colonialism, the way towards peaceful progress, including the valuable lesson learned from agricultural kibbutz settlements and the partnership between capital and labor in industry and commerce. This little enclave of Western civilization in the Near East may yet prove a spiritual force reconciling the new free nations of erstwhile colonial domains with their European former masters, who have still so much to offer. Such a reconciliation is absolutely necessary, both for the new emerging forces in the old world and the renewed energy of the former colonial powers of Europe. In such financial and industrial development, little Israel may serve both as a teacher and a model. It may prove the value of a partnership between the old democracy of the New World and the young Commonwealth of Israel, to prepare the new nations for a regime of liberty with order. Israel may thus play the role of an honest spiritual broker between the great nations and the newly-freed states, as well as between competing ideologies and reforming creeds.

Is it too much to hope that in the future, as in the past, Israel may yet add a new message for humanity — a message of hope that "war shall be no more" — and that a new chapter may be added to our ancient Bible?

Sharon Hotel, Herzlia
November 27, 1966

ANNEX 1

THE FUTURE JEWISH STATE

"Since the destruction of Jerusalem there has been in the heart of the Jew an indefinable longing for the land of his forefathers. This yearning is co-existent with the Jew and seems to have become part of his being. It manifests itself in different ways under different conditions. In the dark ages of ghetto life this yearning for the land of Israel expressed itself in prayers to the Eternal; but with the advent of a new age and the modern spirit of nationalism and individual liberty, this old yearning has brought forth among the Jews a great movement — Zionism, which aims to establish, in Palestine, a Hebrew State...

Then I continued: "But noble ideals and beautiful theories are in themselves incapable of constructing a new state — as gunpowder stored up for future use is inactive. Economic pressure is to a theory what a lighted match is to gunpowder. A beautiful dream that may satisfy the visionaries of a nation for centuries takes practical shape, springs into life, by the force of hunger, persecution and suffering. Adversity is the mother of heroes; and suffering and privation are the schools where such heroes learn their first lessons. And so this beautiful theory of Jewish nationality — the ever-present hope and ideal — affected only the dreamers of the ghetto until this gunpowder was touched by the sparks that sprang from the massacres of Kishiniev, Odessa and Bialystock. Then the old spirit — the spirit of achievement — the spirit of ancient Israel, awoke. The dream of eighteen centuries began to take shape as a living movement. Five thousand Jews landed in Palestine within the last year. While thirty years ago, Palestine contained but few Jews, today they number one hundred thousand or about one-seventh of the entire population. There are several thousand sturdy Jews in the agricultural colonies — the Jamestown and the Plymouth of the future Hebrew state..."

Again, I went on to say: "And this state must express the Jewish spirit. Morality is the keynote of the Hebraic character; and history shows that this national genius of the Jew can be evolved only on his own soil — Palestine. The monumental work of the Hebrew has been accomplished only in the "Holy Land". The Land of Israel and the Children of Israel seem to be the only elements of a wonderful compound. The first Hebrew state gave to the

world the concept of Monotheism and the fundamental principles of morality, embellished by the thoughts of Prophets and the rhetoric of poets. From the second Hebrew state, built by the heroism of the Maccabees, the world received additional proof of the Hebraic genius. But during the last eighteen centuries, since he has been severed from his soil, the Jew has produced nothing of world-wide significance. His spiritual growth has been curtailed; he is denied the full expression of his genius. And the land of Israel seems to be linked in a common destiny with the children of Israel. Ever since the expulsion of the Jews, Palestine has been the land of sorrows and miseries — as a mother bereft of her children. Restore to her her sons and daughters, and you will behold her once more full of love, beauty, and happiness.

"Will the Jews succeed in re-establishing such a state? It is the law of evolution that, in the long run, the most fit survive, and nationality is the supreme test of a people's fitness. If the Jew deserves to succeed, if he has a national worth, his fitness to survive through twenty centuries of martyrdom, we must surely conclude that he cannot fail. Decade after decade may pass and this dream remain yet unrealized; nations may struggle for the land of the Hebrews, as hitherto they have done; but the people that has waited two thousand years for the consummation of its hope can wait a little longer. The statute of limitations does not run against an eternal people."

(Address at Columbia University 1907, for Oratorical prize)

ANNEX 2

"Present land owners of Palestine who, in the main, have done little to develop the country would reap a golden harvest from the establishment of a new government; and with the influx of Jews, land values would go sky-high, so that every Jew who migrated to Palestine from Russia, Roumania, or America — a pioneer in the Jewish Renaissance — would be compelled to purchase lands at inflated values or pay exorbitant rents, thereby helping to develop a class of absentee Palestinian landlords, who would be spending their incomes (obtained from Palestine workers) and idling their time in other parts of the world. In effect, it would be enacting a law for the restriction of Jewish immigration into Palestine, since it would make it difficult for poor Jews to secure land or living

quarters on fair terms. Now there is no reason why we should pour wealth into the hands of those who happen to hold title to lands in Palestine — when the increased value will be due not to labor on the part of the landlords, but to the new government, which Great Britain will have established. We should reserve all the rights to the land owners as land values existed on August 1, 1914, but every increase in land value since that date must, in justice, go to the Government which is making possible such increase. Furthermore, since the Government must have taxes to support it, we will be confronted with the alternative of taking it from the land which the Government has itself increased in value or through other methods of taxation (taxes on consumption of sugar, coffee, tea, and an income tax, and custom dues, etc.). In the latter case, we can appreciate the injustice of such action if we realize that it would mean that the working men and women would have to carry the burden of Government in addition to paying for the increased land values which they, and the Government, have made possible.

"On the other hand, if taxation be raised from the unearned land values no one would be disturbed in the possession of his land, but all land owners would pay taxes, annually, equivalent to the annual rental upon the **increased** land values (exclusive of buildings and improvements) since August 1, 1914. This is only another way of saying that the money secured through increased land values will be utilized for the equal benefit of all (in the shape of police protection, schools, municipal utilities, etc.), instead of being diverted for the exclusive benefit of a landlord class."

(The New Palestine, 1919)

ANNEX 3

(Extract from Political Science Quarterly March, 1915)

"It has often been asserted that the proponents of 'Socialism' and 'individualism' respectively, in the senses in which those terms are commonly employed, would ultimately so modify their several systems that all would finally occupy common ground. In an interesting and suggestive booklet, 'The Social Commonwealth,' (N. Y.) Mr. Bernard Rosenblatt outlines a socio-economic organization of society which combines the competitive and the socialistic systems. As a solution of the labor problem he suggests a **voluntary** co-

operative community to which the individual might turn and obtain a minimum wage fixed by public authority. As a substitute for the single tax which, with its program of virtual confiscation, could hardly be acceptable to one trained in the law, Mr. Rosenblatt offers a plan of expropriation with compensation. Such expropriation should not, he believes, be extended to include agricultural lands. The monopoly problem, Mr. Rosenblatt believes, could be successfully handled by public competition through the agency of such governmental bodies as were most advantageously situated for such competition. Natural monopolies would, of course, be completely taken over by the public.

Incidental elements in Mr. Rosenblatt's program are full and free education, a public medical service and public trial lawyers for the defence as well as for the prosecution. Mr. Rosenblatt discusses his proposals in some detail and with commendable enthusiasm. He would probably be the last one to maintain that his several suggestions are beyond attack. It is enough to say that with splendid idealism he has tried to find a solution for the vexing economic problems of the day..."

ANNEX 3a

Under the date of July 16, 1916, Untermyer wrote to me:

> "Permit me to congratulate you on your absorbingly interesting book "The Social Commonwealth" the reading of which, from cover to cover, I have just concluded. It is a logical, temperate, well-considered presentation of which you may well be proud, however one may differ from you on parts of your program of social, economic and industrial reform. I regard it as a valuable contribution to the vexed problem with which we are grappling and will regard it as a high privilege to support your patriotic ambition to enter public life. We are sadly in need of such men. Tell me how I can be of service. I shall regard the commission as a welcome duty."

ANNEX 4

P. RUTENBERG, C.E.

3, Bedford Square,
London, 3rd August, 1923.

Judge Bernard A. Rosenblatt,
at present **Karlsbad.**

My dear Judge Rosenblatt,

I beg to inform you that the Municipality of Tel-Aviv is bound under a contract with me, which contract has been transferred to the Jaffa Electric Company Ltd., a company belonging to the electricity concern which hitherto has gone under my name, to pay over to this Company the amount of ten thousand Egyptian Pounds in payment of the distribution net built for account of the Municipality.

I shall ask you to explain in writing to the Municipality of Tel Aviv that nothing in the correspondence between yourself and the State Department, Washington, or in the prospectus or in a general way in the conditions under which the Tel Aviv municipal loan was issued in the United States prevents the Municipality either on legal or on moral grounds from making the above mentioned payment of ten thousand Egyptian Pounds to the Jaffa Electric Company out of the proceeds of the Municipal Loan issued in the United States.

Yours sincerely,
Pinhas Rutenberg —

P.S. Please send me a copy of your letter to the Tel Aviv Municipality.
P. R.

ANNEX 5

New York, April 12, 1923

Judge Bernard A. Rosenblatt,
50 Union Square,
New York City.

Dear Judge Rosenblatt:

I have learned with a great deal of satisfaction of the final result of your numerous conferences with Dr. Ruppin which will result in the establishment of an agency in this country for the disposal and

sale of various Palestine securities, and particularly of the mortgage bonds of the General Mortgage Bank of Palestine.

I need hardly emphasize the importance to our cause of placing Palestine on the financial market in America, and I regard that task as perhaps the most important that you can perform as a member of the Zionist Executive.

It is essential that Palestine securities should be placed on a solid financial basis. And the success of the Tel-Aviv Bond issue shows that American Jews are ready for the next step in the economic upbuilding of Palestine.

I know that I can rely upon you and your associates to accomplish this end in the shortest possible time.

With best wishes for your success, I am

Yours very sincerely,
Chaim Weizmann

ANNEX 6

New York
10, April 1923

Mr. Bernard Rosenblatt,
New York.
My dear Mr. Rosenblatt,

I cannot leave the United States without telling you once more how glad I am that you have decided together with Mr. Massel and Mr. Neumann to establish an agency for the sale of Palestinian securities, especially of the bonds of the General Mortgage Bank of Palestine. As I have told you so many times before, it is one of the most important tasks to raise in America the interest of the Jewish investors in investments in Palestine. There are many possibilities of safe and profitable investments in Palestine, but the Jewish investor here does not know them or does not trust them. It should be the task of your agency to give wide and reliable information about Palestinian investments, and to create confidence in your recommendations. In this way I hope you will succeed in establishing a proper instrument for bringing together American capital and Palestinian economic requirements and to help in the most important manner in the rebuilding of Palestine.

Very Sincerely Yours,
A. Ruppin

ANNEX 7

New York, May 6, 1924

Judge B. A. Rosenblatt,
Woolworth Bldg.,
233 Broadway,
New York City.

Dear Judge Rosenblatt:

I deeply regret that since my return to New York from my Western trip I have been scheduled to attend Keren Hayesod functions practically to the last minute, and it has therefore not been possible for me to meet with you and our other friends in an intimate way and say good-bye.

I am leaving the United States with gratitude to the earnest workers for the Keren Hayesod who have made my stay so pleasant and who have cooperated in the immense task of rebuilding the Jewish National Home.

I leave behind me a group of workers on whose loyalty and devotion to the Cause I can thoroughly rely. The Keren Hayesod is I am sure, perfectly safe in the hands of such a splendid body of men and women as I have had the privilege of working with during my stay here.

It will always give me pleasure to look back upon the many hours that I spent in your company and in the company of our other sincere co-workers. I feel sure that in my absence you will continue steadfastly with the work and when on the other side, I shall look forward to hearing reports of how things are progressing.

With all good wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,
Chaim Weizmann

ANNEX 8

THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE
15th February, 1938.

Dear Mr. Rosenblatt,

In connection with the transfer to us of your 2289 Shares in the Palestine Post Limited for which we paid you today the sum of £P.1000 in cash we beg to state that we shall allocate from the budgets to be approved by the Zionist Congress for the Political

Department of the Jewish Agency for the budget years 5689, 5690, 5691, the amounts of £P.250 per annum, the payments to be made to you in instalments beginning from November 1st, 1938, as per the following list:

November	1st 1939	£P.75
February	1st 1939	£P.75
May	1st 1939	£P.100
October	1st 1939	£P.100
January	1st 1940	£P.75
April	1st 1940	£P.75
October	1st 1940	£P.100
January	1st 1941	£P.75
March	1st 1941	£P.75

Yours faithfully,
JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE
(Signed) Treasurer

Mr. Bernard A. Rosenblatt,
Jerusalem.

ANNEX 9

"The three words "economic absorptive capacity" have suddenly become of the utmost significance in the administration of the Palestine Mandate, for upon the interpretation of that single phrase the whole immigration policy of the Palestine Government seems to depend. It is, therefore, imperative that we examine the full meaning attached to that phrase and ascertain its bearing on the question of immigration and prosperity...

"In 1923, Palestine was slowly recovering from the devastation of the World War. With a population of three-quarters of a million, it possessed few of the requisites of civilized life, with no electric light, a few cheap automobiles and miserable housing conditions, even in the three towns of Jerusalem, Jaffa and Haifa. But in the same decade, almost 100,000 Jews entered Palestine and the country has been transformed in a large part from a desert into an orange grove — from a sandy waste as at Tel Aviv into a city with over 80,000 people. In the last half-decade, when all the world has been suffering under the weight of unemployment and low prices, Palestine experienced an era of rising prices and an actual dearth of labor. There is only one factor that differentiates Palestine from the rest of the world during the last five years —

the factor of immigration; so that by the theory of elimination we must associate immigration with prosperity. Every optimistic estimate with respect to economic activity in Palestine has been exceeded — in the use of electric power, transportation, export and import, income from taxation, showing a huge Government surplus — building operations and agricultural colonization...

"The Mandate from the League of Nations imposes a direct obligation upon Great Britain to "facilitate" the establishment of the Jewish National Home in addition to the Arabs already here. The only limitation upon this process is the necessary physical limitation — "the economic absorptive capacity of the country". But if it is true — of which we have ample proof — that every immigrant that settles in Tel Aviv makes possible a better existence for another Jew and another Arab in the villages that produce the food supply for Tel Aviv; that every settler in Haifa opens opportunity for livelihood for another Jew and another Arab in the Emek and the Jordan Valley, then, indeed, there is nothing to fear from the test of "economic absorptive capacity", and Palestine will proceed on its prosperous course. But we must resist every legal attempt to subvert this phrase "absorptive capacity" from its plain and clear meaning. We must do so, not only for the sake of Palestine as a whole, but for the sake of saving the world from a nationalism running amok, which may lead us to economic disaster. It is not the first time in history that Palestine must teach the world a lesson — a lesson of truth and justice, of tolerance and good-will to all.

"It is in that spirit that I submit that the question of "economic absorptive capacity" is a judicial question and not an administrative act. It requires the weighing of facts and figures and a freedom from local political influence — a question that must be decided, from time to time, by an impartial tribunal and then only enforced by the High Commissioner of Palestine. The time has come to demand that the question of "economic absorptive capacity" shall be removed from the turmoil of local interests and, as a judicial question, shall be dealt with judicially by an impartial board set up by the League of Nations itself, since it involves both the letter and the very spirit of the Palestine Mandate. In such a way shall we find the path to peace, prosperity and happiness for the people of Palestine."

(Palestine Post, January 7, 1934)

ANNEX 10

"Whether we like it or not, there is already "partition" today between the Jews and Arabs of Palestine — between Arab Nablus and Jewish Tel Aviv, between Jewish Hadar Ha-Carmel and the Arab village of Tirah, near Haifa; between all the Jewish settlements of Judea and Galilee, and the Arab villages of Samaria and the hill district. We must accept this as a fact — as unpalatable, perhaps, as the fact that during a decade and a half of the operation of the Palestine Mandate, Jews and Arabs have drawn further apart. At this late date, it hardly serves any useful purpose to apportion blame for this sad result between Arabs, Jews and the British Administration. The fact remains that Palestine has already been partitioned and our task should be to find a modus vivendi to keep it as an undivided Palestine despite partition.

"We must separate the real from the apparent issues. The real issue is the fear of Arab domination over a Jewish minority and the consequent crystallization of the Jewish National Home through the restriction of immigration — confining Jews in another ghetto, under Arab rule, similar to that in Poland or Rumania; and the reciprocal fear of the Arabs, that Palestine will ultimately become completely Jewish, despite the resolutions of Zionist Congresses respecting "non-domination". This issue is largely the result of the signal failure on the part of the British Administration to comprehend the policy of the Jewish National Home and its relation to Arab nationalism. The Mandatory Power has striven, perhaps unconsciously, towards the ideal of the establishment of a Palestine nation — to make Palestinians out of Jews and Arabs — instead of frankly working towards a solution of the problem of how can these two nations best live together in peace and amity in Palestine. Two nations, living side by side in a common country, do present a real political problem to ensure "non-domination" of one by the other — which cannot be ignored by simply calling them both Palestinians. For neither people will surrender their historic cultures in exchange for a common geographic area...

"It is really obvious that no Jew favors partition as a matter of principle, but a large number of Jews, from Tel Aviv to Los Angeles are ready to swallow the bitter pill of partition, if the net result might be the establishment of a Jewish State within boundaries adequate for national existence, and having the possibility of growth through the indispensable factor of Jewish mass immigration from Eastern and Central Europe. The dire need of Palestine for a stable peace with immigration (upon which its

economic life so largely depends), on the one hand, and the crying demands of Jews from Germany, Poland and Rumania for emigration and freedom on the other, unite in making partition a real issue. In London, Paris and New York, rich Jews may wait patiently until the proper solution of the Palestine problem is slowly evolved, but in Berlin, Warsaw and Tel Aviv, the element of time 'is of the essence . . . '

"In short, if the Jews of the world are to be presented with a choice of the **whole** of Palestine without immigration (except the miserable trickle of 1,000 immigrants a month) or the alternative of half of Palestine, but with the control of immigration in our own hands, I have no doubt as to the ultimate decision. The Jews must be ready to exchange the doubtful privilege of a discordant union with Nablus and Tulkarm for the solid joys of European immigration. Otherwise, we shall sink to the level of a cringing minority, under Arab domination. To be a hopeless minority in Poland or Rumania is bad enough, but to become a "protected" minority in the old land of Israel is a negation of Zionism — indeed "a Zionism without Zion."

(Palestine Post, April 2, 1938)

ANNEX 11

"This resolution was the climax of a long campaign in the use of the term "Jewish Commonwealth" as applicable to the Zionist ideal . . .

"The Balfour Declaration is not only an important political event, but also a fact of extraordinary economic and social significance. Great Britain might have declared its intention simply to establish Palestine as a small buffer state under its protection, and in that event, we might have had a free Palestine without a Jewish nation in Palestine, for the great majority of the inhabitants of the Holy Land today are non-Jews who, by their mere numbers, would control the political structure and would mold the character of the State. In view of that fact, England has taken an important step — she proposes to make Palestine not merely an insignificant buffer state but a homeland for the Jewish nation. The beneficiary of this high trust is the Jewish people, since it is specifically stated that a Jewish Commonwealth is to be established — not a mere Palestinian Commonwealth, nor a Commonwealth in Palestine.

The latter would be open to misconstruction and misinterpretation, but a Jewish Commonwealth in Zion can mean only one thing, namely; that "with due regard to the rights of the existing inhabitants", which, of course, all Zionists are desirous and anxious to safeguard, there shall be re-established in Palestine, the Jewish nation as of old.

The salient features of these articles had been embodied, much earlier, in a book entitled "Social Zionism" with a generous foreword by the late Judge Julian W. Mack. The whole theme of the book is the development of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine along the path of "social justice" as the keynote of its policy, from public control of the land to cooperation in industry and agriculture.

"But all through the history of Zionist relations with Great Britain, from the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the acceptance of the Palestine Mandate as a solemn trust, down to the present day, there runs "a covenant with the land" that the Jews shall be permitted to become the majority in the territory of Palestine. Otherwise, the Bronx or Brooklyn might be of more significance for Jewish survival than the old land of Israel. With this proviso, implicit in the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate, the argument about the Jewish Commonwealth simply means the fulfillment of the Palestine Mandatory trust, to the end that the Jews may continue to immigrate into Palestine "as a matter of right" and not upon sufferance (to use the picturesque phraseology of Winston Churchill), until Palestine becomes a "self-governing commonwealth", in which they constitute a majority of the population — even as Christians constitute the majority in other lands."

"In the spring of 1939, or six months before Hitler's attack on Poland, the public press was filled with heartrending accounts of the plight of 907 Jewish refugees huddled together in the s.s. St. Louis, shuttled back and forth upon the wide waters of the Atlantic, after admission was denied them in Cuba, on the ground that their visas were not in order. Germany had forced them into exile, but even the great democracies were loathe to make an exception and finally offered to make a place of refuge for less than a thousand poor souls who, after being forced out of Europe, were sustained in the hope that the visas for which they paid fabulous sums were good and valid. The debate was long and statesmanlike, while the s.s. St. Louis went back and forth with its human cargo. At last, through the superhuman efforts of Jewish relief organizations, we were fortunate in distributing these poor

victims of Nazi persecution among the four Western democracies of England, France, Belgium and Holland. Be it remembered that it took the combined powers of mercy of two world empires, aided by the generous help from two smaller nations of Europe, to take care of 907 Jews, — a symbol that we were even then living in a closed world, and a true harbinger of the stress and strain that heralded World War II.

"The New York Times of June 14, 1939 reported that the British Under secretary of the Home Office explained that this generosity was due to the exceptional circumstances resulting from "the fact that all these people had been granted visas which later were not honored". This high British official went on to state that: "it is of the first importance that the arrangements of Jewish refugees from Germany shall proceed in accordance with an orderly program, and that no encouragement shall be given to any idea that refugees may leave Germany before arrangements have been completed for their reception". The matter of "first importance", let it be noted, was not the saving of refugees, but the denial of visas!

"It is our bounden duty to our children and our children's children to find a haven of refuge where a Jew may enter "as of right and not of sufferance".

"Let us for a moment consider the plight of some 907 Irish Catholic refugees, fleeing from London, whence they might have been expelled for membership in the Irish Volunteer Army. I am not assuming that the doors of Ellis Island would have been opened to them, although speeches in their favor might have been heard in the halls of Congress and Parliament. I am not supposing that Belgium and Holland and France would have opened their doors more willingly than to refugee Jews, or without a stern warning from some high official in the British Empire. I am simply asserting the fact that in the case of some 907 Londoners of Irish Catholic "persuasion", travelling in a ship across the Atlantic, even after they had been denied admittance, the little Irish Free State, poor and partitioned, would have gladly opened its doors and claimed them as her sons and her daughters. That is the essence of the quest for a Jewish Commonwealth — not any metaphysical argument over nationalism, or any theoretical dispute over race and religion, but the world challenge: "to be or not to be, that is the question".

"We want to have a place where we may be able to invite the wandering Jew after the war, who may knock at the closed gates in the old and new world, and find the only welcome sign over the portals of the Jewish Commonwealth."

(The New Palestine, December 1943)

TRIBUNE, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23,1947

American Seeks World Court Aid To Purchase Land in Palestine

Ex-Magistrate Rosenblatt to Ask State Department to Bring His Case Before U. N. Tribunal, Cites Anglo-U. S. Treaty on Holy Land

By M. Jay Racusin

Former Magistrate Bernard A Rosenblatt disclosed yesterday that the law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, of Washington, had been retained to trp to place a Palestine land test case before the International Court of Justice under the United Nations.

As the court can only hear cases submitted by members of the United Nations which have accepted jurisdiction of the body, the law firm, Mr. Rosenblatt explained, now is preparing a petition to the State Department requesting the United States government to take the matter to the court. The petition, it was indicated, will be accompanied by a brief setting forth all the treaties conventions and other legal grounds upon which this government can and should act to protect the rights of one of its citizens. The petition and brief, said Mr. Rosenblatt, would be in the hands of the department in two weeks.

The State Department, it was said, had been apprised of the move but indicated it would have no comment until it had had an opportunity to study the document.

The case revolves about the effort last February of Mr. Rosenblatt, an American citizen, while on a four-month visit to Palestine, to purchase four acres of land near Haifa. The British mandatory government refused to legalize the transaction on the ground that Mr. Rosenblatt was a Jew and that the land sought was within the 60 per cent of the territory of Palestine which, under the British White Paper of 1939, was forbidden to be sold to Jews.

Mr. Rosenblatt took the case to the Palestine Supreme Court, charging violation of the mandate, which specifically sets forth "No discrimination of any kind shall be made between inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language."

Mr. Rosenblatt also argued that the discrimination was a violation of the Anglo-American Convention of Dec. 3, 1924, which specified that in any dispute between the two nations under the Palestine mandate, "matters which cannot be settled by negotiation", must be submitted to the World Court.

The convention also assures, Mr. Rosenblatt said, to American citizens the same rights all other nations, regardless of their religion, in the provision, "The United States and its nationals shall have and enjoy all the rights and benefits secured under the terms of this mandate to members of the League of Nations and their nationals."

Sir William Fitzgerald, the Palestine Chief Justice, ruled on June 9 that while Mr. Rosenblatt may fare better before an international tribunal, the Palestine courts had no authority to pass on orders-in-council which gave the British government alone power to revoke or amend the laws of Palestine. An appeal from this decision is now pending before the Privy Council in England, the highest court in the land.

Mr. Rosenblatt said that there was little hope of a reversal from the Privy Council and that he had decided to take the case before the international court as involving the rights of an American citizen under the mandate and the Anglo-American Convention.

The International Court of Justice, which was set up at The Hague in April of last year under the charter of the United Nations, assumed most of the jurisdictions and duties of the old Permanent Court of International Justice under the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Corfu Channel mine dispute between Britain and Albania was the first and only case so far referred to it since its establishment.

The firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter is composed of Thurman Arnold, former United States Assistant Attorney General; Abe Fortas, former Under Secretary of the Interior, and Paul Porter, former head of the Office of Price Administration who recently headed a Presidential mission to survey the economic conditions in Greece.

Readers

PRIVY COUNCIL AND U.N.

The Editor, **The Palestine Post**

Sir, — Within 48 hours of my arrival from New York, I am faced with a decision of the Privy Council in London, ruling against any appeal from the judgment upholding the discriminatory land ordinance of 1940.

Of course, as a lawyer, I shall observe the custom of refraining from criticism of a judgment, even though the Court might very well have refused to entertain jurisdiction in this case, by taking "judicial notice" of the fact that some weeks previously the United Nations had definitely decided upon Partition, which places the land in question within the Jewish State where this land ordinance of 1940 will not operate.

But, instead, the Court chose to make a final order — and went beyond the ruling of the Palestine Supreme Court — stating that the land ordinance is not contrary to the Palestine Mandate. This necessarily raises an international question, involving the rights of an American citizen under the Anglo-American treaty of December, 1924.

Accordingly, I have cabled instructions to my Attorneys, the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter of Washington, to take the matter up with the American State Department for presentation to the International Court of Justice.

The Court — again unlike the Palestine Supreme Court — awarded costs against me, remarking that the litigation was more costly than the value of the 15 dunams involved. Surely, the Court must recall the case of one John Hampden, who refused to pay "ship money," and undoubtedly the expenses of that suit was far in excess of the tax in question. But a great constitutional question was involved — the right of Charles I. to exact ship money from an Englishman without the sanction of Parliament.

I am one of a host of lawyers who are convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that the White Paper is unconstitutional, and that it would be much better to try the issue in a Court of Law as an alternative to a Cromwellian Civil War — or an American Revolution — in this little country. Accordingly, to use a famous phrase from an American Sea Captain: "We have just begun to fight."

Yours etc.,

BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT

Haifa, Jan. 1 (delayed in mail).