



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**

**MS-763: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman Collection, 1930-2004.**

Series E: Sermons, Speeches, and Writings, 1933-1959.

---

Box  
10

Folder  
11

Early speeches. 1933-1937.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the  
American Jewish Archives website.

---

THE JEW IN LITERATURE

When we survey the great body of Jewish literature, we find that in the main part it is composed of works of religious nature. The treasure house of Jewish literature **is** filled with religious tomes. It is only a natural result that a people of religion, as we have been termed, should create religious literature.

The first and greatest of all the works, the Book of Books, the Holy Bible, as the most influential, and the most important, naturally heads our list. As Zangwill, the novelist, <sup>once</sup> ~~eme~~ said: "Beside this one book with its infinite editions...all other literatures seem 'trifles light as air.' " If all else should be destroyed, the fame of the Jew in literature could rest on this one creation alone. We have been termed the people of the Book, and, according to Heine, "it was Mohamet who named the Jews the 'People of the Book,' a name which in eastern countries has remained theirs to the present day, and is deeply significant." "The Bible thoroughly known is a literature in itself--the rarest and the richest in all departments of thought or imagination which exists," remarked J.A. Froude. A most beautiful compliment and an excellent description of the Bible ~~is~~ offered us in the words of verses 24, 28, 29 of Ecclesiasticus. "There is none that hath ever made an end of learning it, and there is none that will ever find out all its mysteries. For its wisdom is richer than any sea and its word deeper than any abyss."

We must not ~~dwell long enough on our Bible to forget~~ entirely another of the priceless pieces of literature which enhance the beauty of <sup>our literature</sup> ~~the past~~. "The Talmud," in the words of Mary F. Robinson, "which was as a second life to the men of the Ghetto, was not only a book of philosophy or devotion, it was a reservoir of national life; it was the faithful mirror of the civilization of Babylon and Judea, and, at



the same time, a magical phantasmagoria of all the wild dreams, the fables, the legends, the scraps of science more or less exact, the reveries,<sup>and</sup> the audacious theories discovered by the Wandering Jew in his endless travels. Every generation of Judaism has accumulated its facts and fancies there. Even the Bible itself did not come so close to the daily life of the Ghetto as did the Talmud and the Mishna. The Bible was a thing eternal, apart, unchanging. The Talmud was a daily companion, living, breathing, contemporary, with a hundred remedies for a hundred needs." As Emanuel Deutsch says, "The Talmud is the work which embodies the civil and canonical law of the Jewish people, forming a kind of supplement to the Bible---a supplement such as took 1,000 years of a nation's life to produce. It is not merely a dull treatise, but it appeals to the imagination and the feelings, and to all that is noblest and purest."

During the Middle Ages we have the numerous codes, the most important of which is the "Yod Hachezakah," a codification of the Jewish Law by Moses Maimonides, the interpretations and commentaries on the various books of the Law, and a number of philosophical treatises, including the famous "Guide for the Perplexed," and the works of Jehudah Halevi. Also during this period were written the hundreds of commentaries on the Bible which are so enlightening and valuable.

It is very easy to explain this prominence of religious works in our literature. The Jew has constantly been persecuted. Even in this modern day and age, he is undergoing trial in Germany. The only source of solace, the only salvation for his tortured soul has been his religion. He has turned to it instinctively in his moments of terror. It is only natural to expect that any form of literary expression should take the form of religious expression. Whatever Jewish genius flourished during the dark days expressed itself in religion.

We must also realize that the life of the Jew, in persecution and



in those rare, peaceful moments when he is not hounded by his enemies, is inseparably bound up with religion. He gave the principle of monotheism to the world. The Jew is the founder of all religion. He introduced the conception of complete faith in one supreme being. The presence of the Bible in the rank of Jewish literature, lent itself admirably to the commentaries and interpretations which form such a large bulk of the main body. The orthodox Jew frowned dissapprovingly on fiction, calling it an unsubstantial thing, and an unreal thing. To our forefathers, a work which did not deal with some serious problem, which did not teach a moral lesson, was not worth reading.

According to ~~the~~ Abrahams ~~says~~, "Rabbinism was a sequel to the Bible, and if, like all sequels, it was unequal to <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ original, it nevertheless shared its greatness. The works of all Jews ~~are~~ up to the modern period were the sequel to this sequel. Through them all may be detected the unifying principle that literature in its truest sense includes life itself; that intellect is the handmaid to conscience; and that the best books are those which teach men how to live. This underlying unity gave more harmony to Jewish literature than is possessed by many literatures more distinctively national. The Maxim, 'Righteousness delivers from death,' applies to books as well as to men. A literature whose consistent theme is Righteousness, is immortal."

In modern days, with more or less the emancipation of the Jew, we find Jewish writers in every country enriching the secular field of literature. The Jew ~~is~~ making a name for himself in Russian literature, English literature, German literature, in fact in literature all over the world. It is interesting at this point to note the number of Jews who have won the Nobel Prize for Literature. From these statistics it would seem that the place the Jew ~~is~~ occupying in world literature is rapidly becoming more prominent.



The winners of the Nobel Prize in Literature were Paul Heyse, a half-Jew, a Jew man with a Jewish mother, Henri Bergson, a world renowned philosopher, and Grazia Deledda, an Italian-Jew. When we take into consideration the minority of the Jewish race, and the other extenuating circumstances, we can see the excellence of this proportion.

With the rapid rise of a nationalistic feeling in the Jewish world, we find the creation of two streams of modern literature. These can be classified as a growth of Yiddish and a growth of Hebrew. Both these divisions are strictly secular in nature. Some really great literary figures have been created by the Yiddish movement. It is to this effort in Jewish literature that we owe Peritz, Sholom Aleichem, a humorist of such standing that he has been called the Jewish Mark Twain, and Sholom Asch, one of the greatest of novelists. Besides these, we also have in the new Yiddish literature plays of great literary merit and value. We have the Dybhuk, Yoshe Kalb, and "God of Vengeance," by Sholom Asch. These plays have been translated and have <sup>become world</sup> famous.

~~(The outstanding figure in the new Hebrew field is Bialik, the internationally known poet.)~~

There is also a significant Hebrew literature which sprang up and flourished in Eastern Europe with the inception of the Jewish national movement idea. With the exception here and there of a Tchernichofsky, who is purely a pagan poet, most of the writers and poets wrote national literature. This literature was enriched by the works of such writers as Bialik, Brenner, Shnayer, and Frischman, <sup>all of</sup> whose works are studied in advanced Hebrew schools all over the world and in Palestine. Today there is a tremendous literary development in Palestine. There is a new book printed <sup>there</sup> every day ~~over there~~.

The outstanding figure in the new Hebrew field is Bialik, the internationally known poet. He has again made of Hebrew a language that may be used to sway



be used to sway the world. His works are known the world over, and it is through his genius and herculean efforts that what has been termed <sup>is</sup> the most beautiful and expressive language in the world ~~has~~ again coming into its own. He came very near to receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature, and is now ~~also~~ writing scholarly researches.

Here in America and also abroad we have at present writers of exceptional renown, but their works are not conducive to the creation of a strictly Jewish literature. Ludwig Lewisohn, famous for his "The Island Within," and other works, and Irving Fineman, author of "Hear, Ye Sons," together with many lesser literary men, are striving to create a Jewish-American literature. In Europe, we have Feuchtwanger in Germany, Zangwill in England, and Edmund Flegg in France, succeeding in creating an Anglo-Jewish literature.

But the greatest future for a ~~distinct~~ distinctively original and unique and completely Jewish literature lies, of course, in Palestine, as the ~~works already published~~ ~~products today already~~ indicate. Even Tchernichofsky, the purely pagan poet of the Russian Ghetto days has changed his style of a violently antagonistic attitude to things traditionally Jewish, and has begun to write a new poetry which reveals his awakened feeling for his traditional past and his hopes for a great Jewish future.

During his travels, Tchernichofsky once found himself standing deep in thought in a tumbledown Jewish house of worship in Theodosia, which insinuated itself into his heart like a "chaste legend told by a grandmother." He caressed with his eyes every mark left by the passage of time on the walls, the ceiling, the worn floor. It was as if he longed to embrace all the generations that had for centuries prayed there. A maternal voice seemed to whisper to him:

Peace unto thee, my son! Hast thou too come back?

During these hundreds of years I have seen many



Captives--men of renown--those who escaped baptism--  
Some withered, others sprouted again, like grasses---  
From the north, and the west, they join altogether in "The Lord  
is One!"

"Hast thou too come back?" This may be said not only to Tchernichofsky,  
but to the whole of modern Hebrew literature. Though it may seek distant,  
foreign seas far from its fatherland and its spiritual inheritance,  
though it may desire to break the old tablets and to herald undiscovered  
wastes, it finds itself at the last--after encircling the whole earth---  
back in its own harbor.

1935



Since-time-immemorial, Since man's intellect <sup>developed to</sup> ~~reached~~ the point where he began to question what he had hitherto taken for granted, there has always been the question in his mind as to whether it payed him to be good, to "walk in the way of the Lord." On innumerable occassions, under all kinds of circumstances, the question of whether evil is punished and good is rewarded has faced the human being, and never, throughout the ages, from the time of ancient Babylon to the present day in the twentieth century, has a definite answer, a definite solution to the problem been presented.

In no one of the three great books which are the inspirational sources and the legal codes of the three greatest religions in the world, in neither the Bible, the New Testament, or the Koran can an answer be found. Is evil punished and is good rewarded? Does a Divine Hand reward or punish man's actions? In no book of ~~any~~ religion is this ~~purely~~ theological question solved. In the world today there seems to be a particularly apparent lack of justice. On every hand, in every walk of life, we see people, good, God-fearing, upright people suffering, being punished apparently for sins which they did not committ. Even taking into consideration the chaos and uncertainty of the period, we are forced to wonder when we see crime of heretofore unexcelled proportions going unpunished. Is there a God who metes out justice, who lays His benevolent hand on the brow of the good, and Whose thunderbolt flashes out at the wicked?

This very question is discussed at length and in a very beautiful manner in the Book of Job. For sheer literary beauty  
*profound + stirring*



2

and merit, the Book stands practically unsurpassed, and the value of its theological discussions have stood the test of the centuries. The story of the Book is so interesting and valuable that it merits being repeated.

The significant action of the drama, for the story of Job has often been classified as a drama, takes place <sup>within</sup> ~~in~~ the spirit of Job <sup>himself.</sup> The plot is of the simplest, but the thought and reasoning <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ profound and subtle. Once, at a heavenly council, Satan <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ granted power by the Almighty to put to trial the steadfastness of Job, a man loyal and believing in God, a man righteous and perfect, whom <sup>the Lord</sup> ~~God~~ had blessed with prosperity and honor. At first Job is deprived of his children and all his possessions. <sup>Still,</sup> ~~His~~ faith in the ~~divine~~ wisdom of God remains unshaken, ~~however~~. In his second trial, he <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ stricken with a painful and repellent skin disease. As he sits alone and forsaken, torn in body and mind, three friends, who had heard of his misfortunes, came to visit him and console him.

For seven days and nights they all sit in silence, and then Job speaks and curses the day of his birth and prays for death. The first of the three friends answers him, and thus begins a debate which consists of speeches by the friends and of answers by Job. Job's friends stand firm on the <sup>orthodox</sup> ~~ancient~~ belief that God rewards the righteous and punishes the wicked. Hence, Job, who has been afflicted, must have sinned in some way. But Job knows better. He knows that he, who is upright and innocent of all sin, has been cruelly punished. Why? is the question he flings at God and man.

The story sweeps on to a smashing climax in which the voice of God speaks to Job out of the storm. But no clear and definite answer to the question comes from the Voice. What Job hears ~~from the Voice~~



is a series of questions which overwhelm him with a sense of his own insignificant nothingness beside the incomparable might and supreme majesty of <sup>the Lord</sup> God. The Voice reduces him ~~to~~ <sup>that he should</sup> a feeling of penitence by asking Job who ~~will~~ <sup>is man's</sup> ~~shall~~ <sup>spirit</sup> challenge God's judgment.

A revolution now takes place in the ~~soul~~ of Job. His questions are still unanswered, his problem is still unsolved, but his soul is at peace. He has achieved a faith, an unquestioning acceptance and resignation to all acts of God, and this faith gives him, in return, strength and serenity of spirit. He is no longer torn and troubled. And so, <sup>to satisfy the demands of poetic justice,</sup> in the epilogue to the Book, the author returns from his sublime theme to the simple legend. Job is restored to health and prosperity, and after a long life of honor he dies ~~content~~ <sup>and reconciled</sup> to God.

We of today are still faced by the same problem for which Job found no solution but which his great, unshakable faith caused him to accept unquestioningly. Man today needs the ~~comfort~~ of religion as he has never needed it before. Man today needs the absolutely unquestioning faith and belief which Job acquired as he has never needed <sup>this</sup> before. This faith is necessary for the very life of man's moral soul. The question has not been answered and it is not within the scope of man's limited intellect to answer it. Man must therefore acquire faith, supreme, unswerving faith if he is to retain any belief at all in God. We can only hope that some day <sup>the Lord</sup> ~~and~~ will deem it advisable to answer our problem and supply the justification of our faith in Him, but until then, we must find faith and cherish it as the only thing which can preserve the religious, the moral, the spiritual sides of our existence.



When we begin to make a detailed investigation of the latest fad--Technocracy--we find, to our surprise, despite the prevalent ballyhoo about its being the realization of the Utopian dream to do away with unemployment and to reconstruct our social and political structure--despite these things we find that it has some very evident and very bad fallacies. To begin with, we find that in Technocracy there is not one new idea. The theories of Mr. Scott--the head Technocrat--are all unoriginal.

In "The Nation" for the week of February 1, there is an excellent article by Henry Hazlitt on Technocracy. He tells how Mr. Scott's ideas that wealth be measured in energy were derived from books published in 1926 by Dutton Co. His idea that the country ought to be run by engineers and technicians as well as his aversion to the present complicated "price system" are clearly derived from a book "The Engineers and the Price System," by Veblen, published in 1921. His theory of overproduction goes back to Karl Marx, who borrowed it from Karl Rodbertus, who published it in the 1840's.

We could go on and pick every one of Scott's "new" ideas to pieces, but suffice it to say that if there is a new thought in his whole repertoire of theories and ideas, we have failed to find it. Therefore his only excuse for organizing such a group of men--and women too--with such ideas would be if he could find a practical way of adapting his theories to our whole structure, economic, political, and social, so that they would do some good, or if he could give statistical proof of the worth of his ideas.



He has very discreetly said nothing of how he expects to effect the change. After all, they can't expect to go up to the politicians and captains of industry and say, "Come on boys, you're incompetent; we're the ones with the brains; hand over the country to us." It is easy to see that there is no feasibility to this method, yet this is apparently what they intend to do, for they have said nothing to indicate that they plan to do otherwise.

His figures are also extremely inaccurate. The Technocrats tell us that "a photograph of a modern steel-rolling mill in full operation will show a large plant without a human being in sight." The implication of this is that the progress of the machine has been displacing men from the steel industry at an appalling rate. It has been found, by consulting census figures, that in 1887 there were in this country 24 steel workers for every 10,000 of population, while in 1929 there were 32 steel workers for every 10,000 of population.

*abe* The Technocrats have stated that one man with a machine could produce 9,000 times as many electric-light bulbs as he could by hand in 1914. Mr. Simeon Strunsky, in an article in the New York Times Sunday magazine section, has shown, again by the simple process of looking up official figures, that machinery has increased the rate of productivity not 9,000-fold, but only 30-fold. In other words, Technocracy has overstated the electric-light bulb situation 300-fold.

The Minneapolis flour mills, the Technocrats tell us, turn out 30,000 barrels a day per man. Mr. Strunsky finds that figures at Washington show that in 1929 we produced in



this country 154,000,000 barrels of flour. At the alleged Minneapolis rate, this flour could have been produced by the labor of seventeen men. Actually, the milling industry employed in that year 27,028 men. The discrepancy there is enormous, and Mr. Strunsky finds a similiar error in Technocracy's figures for the brick industry. In this phase of the Technocratical errors we could also go on practically indefinitely, but there is no sense to that. We have proved conclusively that all Scott's figures are inaccurate, and we have also been convinced that he has no feasible plan for bringing about the change whereby the engineers and technicians are going to take over the White House. Thus we arrive at the conclusion that Scott and his Technocrats have done nothing to help solve our present problems.

However, for the sake of argument, even though there is nothing about the idea which is Scott's, even though the statistics of the party are wrong, regardless of the fact that he has no plan to get his party in power, we will answer his points. Let us first discuss technological unemployment--the alleged existence of which is the basic reason for the formation of his party. Mr. Scott himself, in Harper's Magazine for January, asserted that since 1918 there has been an increasing net decline in employment in the country. His statement is as follows:

"A careful examination of available statistical information reveals that the high point in the number of workers employed in this country in all industries was reached in 1918 and has with fluctuations declined more and more rapidly



since that time."

*fake  
on price  
system* Now if we concentrate our attention on factory employment alone, this appears to be true. But it becomes increasingly doubtful when we survey the whole field. James S. Thomas, in an article in the "Nation's Business," quoting Department of Commerce figures, has pointed out that while 1,957,000 men had been displaced from industry, agriculture, and railroads in the period from 1920 to 1928, this decline was more than offset by the employment in the same period of 2,527,000 men in occupations such as the automobile industry, insurance, barbers, teachers, radio industry, motion-picture industry, and any other number of other employments. These figures prove that as a general thing since 1918, when Scott says technological unemployment began, up to 1928, <sup>employment</sup> was on the up-grade.

Even without the census figures of employment, we still have the significant barometer of wage-rate figures. In a table compiled from government figures, we find that in the whole period of twenty-seven years between 1890 and 1917, the index of real earnings moved up and down within a range of eight points; but in the ten-year period beginning with 1918, the very year set by Howard Scott as that in which technological unemployment at a rapidly-increasing rate set in, in that period the index of real wages rose within a range of 28 points, a rate with which we have no comparable record.

It is another contention of Technocracy that machines are gradually putting men permanently out of work, and that soon they will ruin the structure of our present civilization. Let us see what the answer of orthodox economics has been to this



contention that machinery displaces men. It admits that it may do so for a certain period and in a specific industry, but never permanently and over the whole field.

Machinery that displaces men also radically reduces costs of production, and reduces them roughly in proportion to the percentage of men it displaces. If the demand for the product for which this labor-saving machine has been invented is elastic, that is if cutting the price will increase the quantity demanded, then cutting the price in half would double the quantity in demand. Therefore, though half the labor force would otherwise have been laid off, it will be retained or re-employed to make the additional quantity.

If the demand for the product is inelastic, that is if cutting the price in half does not at all increase the quantity sold, it will still remain true that buyers, by having to spend so much less for that article, will have left over that much more to spend on all other articles; and other industries, consequently, on which the money left over from the cut-in-half product is spent, will do a bigger business, will have to employ more men, and thus labor dropped from the industry into which the labor-saving device has been introduced are absorbed by some other industry.

For instance, to clarify, if a new, labor-saving machine is invented and used in the Ford automobile factories, the cost of producing a Ford auto is lowered and the price which the buyer must pay is naturally lowered. With a lower price, an article like a Ford car would have a great increase in the quantity which is demanded. If more cars are needed, more men



will have to be set to work running these machines, and so regardless of the type of machine invented, if the product is a good seller, the men will have to be taken on again.

If the product is not a good seller, it does not make any difference either way. Let us take a hypothetical, though utterly ridiculous case, pink shoe-laces. Not many pairs of pink shoe-laces are sold. If a new machine is invented to produce pink shoe-laces at one half the price they formally were, that would be very nice, but still most people do not indulge in pink shoe-laces, and so regardless of the decrease in price, there would be practically no increase in the quantity on demand.

On the other hand, all those people who do buy pink shoe-laces, have the other half of the money which they formally spent on pink shoe-laces to spend on something else. This extra is sunk in another product, which expands and increases. Men are needed to supply the increased demand grown up in other industries, and the men laid off by the pink shoe-lace factories are absorbed by other concerns. Thus we see how the cycle works, and we come to the conclusion that machines do not lay men out of work permanently.

Finally, let us discuss one more aspect of Technocracy--figuring values on the standard of energy. They propose to abolish not only the gold standard, but the whole "price system," and to rate everything in terms of energy. Mr. Scott says that a dollar is worth so much today, so much more in 1900 or so much less in 2000, that the buying power of the dollar is variable, and its value is different at different times.



Mr. Scott is reminded by Henry Hazlitt, author of the afore-mentioned article in this week's "Nation", that a dollar is 25.8 grains of gold, and that 25.8 grains of gold are worth the same in 1900, 1933, or 2000. Of course the value of this gold may change, but so may the value of the erg, joule, or calorie, in which energy is to be measured. Recently, someone suggested an electric dollar based on kilowatt-hours, but that is equally foolish. Thus, in probing a little below the surface, we can really see how shallow the whole idea is. The figures on which they intend to base their experimental government are all wrong. They have no suggestion as to how they intend to get the power. Their systems of value are silly. Their ideas are unoriginal. In fact, there are more fallacious arguments being presented for Technocracy than there are sound ones. It is only when one makes a slightly detailed study of a subject that one understands and appreciates its good and its bad, and I hope that through my little explanation you have acquired a definite idea of the fallacious aspect of Technocracy.

March, 1933



Bridgport  
Fall, 1937

1.

There operate in the world today some 60 or 62 sovereign Powers, each one of which claims for itself at least the theoretical right to act independently and to assert itself according to national discretion. In this apparently democratic world structure there is the greatest disorder: constant friction which is always a potential threat of war, increasing economic rivalry which has led to so much of the misery we see around us. After studying this situation for several years, and perceiving such things as national honor and prestige, which have provoked nations into war; national consciousness, which has caused Hitler to agitate for the inclusion of all Germans within a national territory and Mussolini to shriek for a place in the sun; and finally national spirit or fanatical patriotism, with which the Japanese national religion, Shinto, has even been inculcated, so that the Japanese man deems it an honor to die on the battlefield for his country - having studied and perceived all these manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism which are so brutal and uncivilized, the intelligent young man of today, if he does not choose to be a complete cynic, must begin to think in terms of internationalism, of some sort of ideal brotherhood of nations, in which national borders would disappear, or if they must exist, be unfortified so that a peaceful interchange of man's goods and services could take place in an atmosphere of friendly tolerance.

I am an internationalist even at the expense of losing my individual identity, my Judaism, for I am not inseparably connected either with the ritual or sentiment of Judaism.



When the time comes to make a choice between national loyalties and international ones, my ideals would direct me to the latter. Yet practicality dictates that until the time for this choice does arrive, we should make a conscious effort to preserve Judaism as a national culture - a national culture, mind you, for the Jews have contributed so overwhelmingly to the culture of the world, in proportion to their national size, that they should be maintained as an entity so long as a national system exists on our planet.

And this curious anomaly, this apparent paradox in my position brings us to the point at hand - "Whither Judaism?" I feel that until the time comes when the Jewish nation should submit its national independence and existence to the ideal of internationalism, that independence should be preserved. The reasons for this we need not go into - we all feel a spiritual and cultural, as well as religious closeness to the tradition in which we have been steeped - it is enough that for the sake of this comfort alone we should be willing to work for Judaism up to the point when we are willing to turn it over to some international committee. None but the most extreme idealist will deny this.

The question then logically poses itself - what is the best way in which to preserve Judaism, what is the best technique to keep us safe from the constant attacks taking place against us in the world today? The Zionists offer one solution, the Assimilationists offer another. Apparently the latter should be more to my liking, since if the Jews gradually lose their identity (assuming that they were allowed



to), that will mean one more nation, as such, wiped off the earth. Yet I do not feel that way, as I have stated before. The Jewish nation, or racial group, cannot take the lead in the move toward internationalism - it would meet with no success, and would be able to influence no other nations to follow it. Until the movement for internationalism becomes widespread and looks capable of final consummation, I want Judaism to remain intact. It is a question of Realpolitik v. Idealism.

The Zionist ideal of having the Jews gather in one place, which can again flourish as a center of Jewish unity and influence, and which can draw to it as a haven Jews from persecuted areas in the world, is a good idea. I do not agree with the Zionists, however, that Palestine is such a place. It is too small, unsafe, and largely barren, to suggest but a few of the difficulties. It is perfectly understandable how Palestine, as the original homeland of the Jews, would be the first choice, yet Palestine does not seem to me to be the best place, from any point of view, economic, social, military, or political, where the Jews could hope to survive and prosper.

We Jews are peculiar and individual from the aspect that where we are, there exist our institutions. In other words, we are not people of a stationary character - we are drifters, and thus we do not have buildings or cities, a localized language or a form of government, which serve to keep us loyal to one spot. The only exception to this is the soil of Palestine, which has become sacred to the memory,



but that is something which could be sacrificed. Where a Frenchman is, there is not France; yet where a Jew stands, there does stand Judaism, for he has his heritage and his institutions, his Talmud and his language within himself. Thus Judaism exists everywhere, while France exists only as that place in Europe, geographically definable between Italy, Germany, Spain, Belgium, etc.

Anywhere, then, where travels the Jew, is his national feeling, and the object simply is to pick out the best spot for him to settle, from all rational considerations. Judaism, I feel, will exist and flourish in whatever place is selected. Many have said that Australia is a very logical possibility, and it will serve our purpose to examine that land as typical.

One criticism that is particularly pertinent, coming as it does from Jews as well as from Christians, is that we are, and have become, in general, too urban, too tied up in society, too concerned and too intrusive into all the fields of endeavor. A dictator in South America recently issued a decree that he would allow the Jews to remain in his land only if they all left the cities and became farmers. I am not attempting to justify or refute this conception - its evaluation as true or false does not concern us for the moment. The fact remains that this comment does exist, and many have called for the Jews to return to Thoreau's "simple life", that life which the ancient Hebrews once practiced. In Australia an agricultural economy could be developed, perhaps under government subsidy, perhaps under private subscription, but an economy different from the complex industrial and mercantile one into which the western Jew has grown. In Australia



there would be no fear of physical violence or military attacks: in Australia, there is land, room for expansion, room for as many Jews as would want to come there.

There is no time and there is nothing further to be gained by continuing along this line. It is purely hypothetical, Australia could be named Country X as far as selecting any actual example is concerned. And the incidental problems, such as engendering in the young generation a love for the new land instead of a love for Palestine, could also be well taken care of by experts. Hitler has learned how to enthuse the youth - we Jews could produce someone as clever as he is, I imagine.

To summarize the main points - I believe that no nation should exist as such. While nations do exist, however, there is no reason why the Jewish nation should not be given an equal chance to flourish. Palestine, is though, is not the place where the Jewish nation can expand, despite a sentimental connection with and affection for the land. Some other place should be selected, purely from the point of what advantages it has to offer, and negotiations begun for some sort of arrangement. The practical problems of compromise and final settlement, of what type of government and what sort of status for the Jew, along with the many other questions which would arise, are no more difficult than those which confront us in Palestine today.

"Whither Judaism?" should be answered by the slogan, "Back to the Land - but not Palestine."