



## Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.**

Series II: Harold P. Manson File (Zionism Files), 1940-1949, undated.

Sub-series A: Main Manson File, 1940-1949.

---

Reel  
106

Box  
37

Folder  
339

22nd World Zionist Congress, 1946.

# MISSING PAGE (S)





*Election Returns*

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

November 6, 1946

Congress Elections

Joseph Baratz submitted to a conference of the labor group the following list of the delegates elected to the Congress:

General Zionists	106
Mizrachi	51
Revisionists	26
Aliyah Chadasha	6
Poale Zion	66
Left Poale Zion	10
Achduth Avodah	15
Hashomer Hatzair	17

I do not know where he got these final figures while in some countries the elections were not yet held, but if his figures are true, then the Congress will have a delegation of 317 and for a majority, 159 votes will be needed.

Let me give you a few possible combinations.

1. General Zionists	106
Mizrachi	51
Revisionists	26
	<u>183</u>

Such a combination would have a majority of votes plus.

2. General Zionists	78
(Hadasah excluded)	
Mizrachi	51
Revisionists	26
	<u>155</u>

In this combination the General Zionists would lack four votes to a majority.

3. Poale Zion	66
Left Poale Zion	10
Hadasah	26
Hashomer Hatzair	17
	<u>141</u>

In this combination labor will have no majority and the combination is almost impossible because not all Hadasah members will vote with labor and on many questions Hashomer Hatzair and the others will not vote with Mapai.

4. General Zionists	106
Poale Zion	66
	<u>192</u>

This combination would have a clear majority and would rule the Congress in every respect.

TWENTY-SECOND ZIONIST CONGRESS

Basle, December 9, 1946

 O P E N I N G  
-----

 A D D R E S S  
-----

by

DR. CHAIM WEIZMANN  
-----

(President, World Zionist Organisation)  
-----

# O P E N I N G   A D D R E S S

by

DR. CHAIM WEIZMANN,

President, World Zionist Organisation

Delivered at Basle, 9th December, 1946.

-----

## DELEGATES TO THE XXIInd ZIONIST CONGRESS -

Seven years have passed since the fateful August of 1939 when we last met together in Geneva. The final hurried hours of the Twenty-first Zionist Congress, closing its deliberations on the eve of war, are vividly before me at this moment. We parted in the gloom of the approaching storm, but also in the stubborn faith that the darkness would not be abiding. We were well aware that one of the decisive hours in the history of mankind was upon us, and we accepted its gravity with fear and with hope. We dreaded the impending holocaust which would descend upon all nations, great and small. We trusted that a better world would emerge from the ruins.

2. It seemed to us then that we had no illusions as to the cost that victory would exact. We thought we could foresee the magnitude of the toll to be paid before the Nazi onslaught on civilisation was repulsed. But we were convinced that the future would justify our trust that a world order based on the rights of peoples and individuals would be fashioned by the victors after the challenge of brute force had been crushed. Nor did it seem too much to believe that in the agony of the struggle the world would learn the meaning of the lesson whose first portent had been the torture of the Jews.

3. Now in the light of past and present events the bitter truth must be spoken. We feared too little and we hoped too much. We under-estimated the bestiality of the enemy; we over-estimated the humanity, the wisdom, the sense of justice, of our friends.

4. The shadow of tragic bereavement is upon us to-night. The great mass of European Jewry has been slaughtered; its centres of life and culture ravaged, its habitations laid waste. Systematic savagery, unique in the records of inhumanity, was turned against defenceless men, women, and children. Six

/ millions

millions have perished in a process of annihilation whose dimensions dwarf all the massacres and persecutions of Jewish history - so rich in tragedy. We can count the bodies of our dead, but our loss in terms of those imponderable values whereby human beings enrich the thought and spirit of mankind is immeasurable. We can only remember our dead as our own kith and kin, whose destiny was linked to ours by a long chain of historic tradition reaching back to the dawn of Jewish civilisation.

5. To-day we are numerically reduced and intellectually impoverished. Jewish intellect derived great strength from the ancient communities in Eastern Europe, with their unbroken tradition of learning. This learning, rooted in religion, was an important training ground for the intellect. The disciples of these schools often found their way into Western Universities, and the synthesis of Eastern and Western culture, embodied in many Jewish men of science and art, gave rise to remarkable achievements of which we were justly proud. Of all that we have been cruelly deprived. And this constitutes an irreparable loss, not only to our own people, but to all mankind.

6. Our tradition has always embodied the liberal spirit, the freedom of man's conscience and intellect, the revolt against idolatrous authority. When a violent onslaught was made upon those values, its greatest fury fell upon us. Being homeless and dispersed, we were helpless to resist, and six million dead testify to the consequences of our national homelessness. Other peoples were also cruelly attacked, but none suffered in equal degree. To-day they are liberated, their yoke shaken off. Secure in the possession of their land and hearth, they arise to rebuild their ruins, and to enter upon a new lease of free national life. But the survivors of our holocaust languish in refugee camps, without liberty or hope; and when, in a desperate bid for that liberty and hope, they strike out towards their brothers in the Homeland, they are cruelly barred from its shores, and herded behind barbed wire once again on foreign soil.

7. It was the destiny of Zionism to warn Jewry and mankind of the perils to which we were exposed by reason of our dispersion and our lack of status as a nation among the nations of the world. As the peril drew nearer, our warnings became more urgent, more desperate. Ten years ago I spoke to a Royal Commission, in your name, of these very millions who have since perished: "Jewish misery affects the fate of six million people ... They cannot get out; they cannot find employment; there is nobody who is concerned for them. They are doomed, they are exasperated, they are in despair." Do not these

/ words

words, which then portrayed the situation of six millions, apply with equal force to the few survivors to-day? And to-day, as then, we accompany our warning with an appeal not to destroy our sole remaining hope, and not to break the Covenant which the society of nations made with us, and laid as a deed of trust in British hands. When disaster fell upon our people in Europe, we asked that the gates of the National Home be not shut in the face of those who survived. History will judge whether this was an exorbitant demand; the verdict will record the consequences of its rejection. In the moment of our bitterest need, the doors of our Homeland were all but shut in our faces, in spite of many protests of liberal opinion in England and elsewhere, and contrary to the terms of the Mandate which is the legal and moral basis of British rule in Palestine.

8. Not much more need be said about the White Paper, which contributed not a little to our disaster in Europe, and is directly responsible for the present troubled situation in Palestine. Few documents in history have worse consequences for which to answer. I could say nothing about its political and moral character which would ring as eloquently as the denunciations which Ministers of the present Government hurled against it at the time. For six long years, while the butchery was going on in Europe, we continually drew attention to possibilities of rescue. Whenever a new country was about to come under Gestapo rule, we asked that the gates of the National Home be opened so that as many as possible of our people might be saved from the fires of the crematoria and the fumes of the gas-chambers. Our entreaties fell on deaf ears. It seemed that the White Paper was more sacred to some people than life itself. Sometimes we were told that our exclusion from Palestine was necessary in order to do justice to a nation newly-endowed with seven independent territories covering a million square miles. At other times, we were informed that the admission of our refugees might, in time of war, endanger military security.

When human need, and the instinct of self-preservation, collided with the White Paper, the result was the Struma, the Patria, and Mauritius.

9. Our grief was increased by the circumstance that the great nation which was deaf to our appeal, and to its own obligations in our most critical hour, was Great Britain - whose bonds of sympathy and association with us had been drawn close

/ by



by the Balfour Declaration of 1917. It was difficult - nay impossible - for us to believe that Britain would continue to set the White Paper above international obligations and above the dictates of humanity and justice. We believed that this was a passing phase - a momentary lapse during which the liberal conscience of Britain was dulled by international tensions.

10. We suspended our struggle against the White Paper, and threw all our strength into the pool of the Allied war effort. Thirty thousand of our young people in Palestine enlisted in the British forces, and the scientific and industrial resources of the National Home were devoted to the Allied cause. We felt entitled to hope that the victory of the ideals for which we were all fighting would automatically destroy the White Paper and annul its spirit; and that a world which was to be governed by principles of equity and justice could not possibly refuse our demand for equality among the nations. What further demonstration of the unhappy anomaly of our position could be required, now that the blood of our millions cried out to Heaven? We were encouraged in this belief by the words of British statesmen and by the generous promises of the Labour Party which was then aspiring to office. It seemed incredible that anybody could feed a people so battered and exhausted with illusory promises.

11. Yet this White Paper continues to exert a pernicious influence over the political atmosphere of the Jewish National Home, even though the Prime Minister has stated that his Government is not bound by it. We welcome this statement of principle, though we wish that it were expressed in concrete acts. The grant of 1,500 certificates a month is a slight dent in the White Paper, but that document must be not only dented, but swept entirely away before the ground is cleared for a constructive solution.

12. The bond of friendship between the Jewish people and Great Britain is one of the fine conceptions born of the Balfour Declaration which the White Paper has all but destroyed. This is a matter for deep sorrow to those of us who would like to see the British connection preserved for the common benefit of both. But the rupture is not of our making, and cannot be healed by ourselves alone. Neither is it a necessary or an inevitable breach.

13. It is, I am sure, not necessary for me to say that in the moment when the British Government undertakes to carry out the provisions of the Mandate in spirit and in letter, the

/ strain

strain between us will ease. It is not a tension arising from any fundamental conflict of interests. The sanctity of international obligations - a principle which inspired Great Britain through the perils of two great wars - cannot be casually laid aside in dealing with the Jewish people. If there is antagonism in the Yishuv directed against the British Government, it is not a token of a deep-rooted desire to drive Britain from her position in Palestine. Its sole origin is indignation at Britain's deviation from her mandatory trust. We cannot support or condone our own betrayal, and must strive with all our strength to avert it - even if the odds are against us, even if we must defend the citadel of justice unaided and alone.

14. Despite all discouragement, we held and hold to the hope of redress, and continue to consolidate our position in agricultural settlement and industrial and scientific enterprise in Palestine. In all these spheres we have achieved results which demonstrate inter alia that the country's absorptive capacity can expand far more rapidly than some experts had predicted or even we had ventured to expect. Absorptive capacity is not a static phenomenon. It is determined primarily by the intensity of development of the country at a given time. Such development is dependent upon the will and the skill of the population. Absorptive capacity, therefore, can be brought to its maximum only by those to whom it is a matter of life and death. You will hear detailed reports of the progress made in every branch of our constructive endeavour. It is an impressive record of our people's will to create new forms and opportunities of life even in the most dispiriting political circumstances. But we are unable to accept a situation in which we are forced to push our burdens uphill all the way, with but little help and much obstruction from those whose duty it is to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

15. We are sometimes told that our aspirations must be thwarted because they clash with the interests of the Arab world. The Arab-Jewish relationship is too often envisaged in terms of incompatibility and conflict. It was not always so. The Peace Settlement after the first World War opened a great area of national opportunity to the Arab peoples who had for centuries been subjected to foreign rule. They advanced towards the possession of full sovereign rights from the East Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, from the Taurus Mountains to the Indian Ocean. This territory included all the historic centres illustrious through their connection with Arab and Muslim tradition. Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad and the Holy Cities of Arabia were freed; and they owed their freedom to the liberating armies of

/ the

the Western Powers. Were not the Eastern Powers, with the sanction of the highest international tribunal, entitled to offer a chance of national independence to the Jews in that tiny segment of the Near East which had been the cradle and focus of our tradition and aspiration?

16. For the Arabs to neglect their vast possessions and covet the tiny notch granted to the Jews is neither reasonable nor enlightened; especially as we derive our rights from the same historic sanction, the same international award, which conferred statehood and sovereignty upon them. Arab nationalist leaders, such as Feisal, and their British advisers such as Sir Mark Sykes and Colonel Lawrence, saw the problem of equity in this true perspective. They understood that enlightened self-interest would enable the Arab peoples to derive much benefit from the exertions and example of a developing Jewish society. The condition which they originally stipulated was that the huge Arab world outside Palestine be enabled to achieve its independence and unity. This condition was not entirely fulfilled at once, through circumstances beyond their control. But it is now an accomplished fact. The Arab peoples possess seven independent sovereignties, they have a generous measure of representation in diplomatic and international organisations, they have territory beyond the dreams of avarice and great sources of natural wealth. By what tortuous logic can our morsel be taken away and added to their feast? How can it be moderate for them to claim seven States, and extreme for us to claim one, when our lack of national status has left us exposed to all the gusts of reaction and oppression which have blown across the face of the world?

17. Before the whole world I assert: our work in Palestine has brought no injury to the Arab peoples. On the contrary, against the sterile assumption of conflict we set the higher conception of potential accord. We wish to bring Jewish effort into harmony with the wider interests of the Middle East. But if we are to do this, the respect which we give to the national rights of others cannot be denied to us. We are not in Palestine as a collection of individuals; we are a society with national attributes. Efforts to suppress the distinctive character of a national community always lead to strife. There can be peace if, instead of suppression, we obtain the right of self-expression. In a recent letter to King Sa'ud, the President of the United States asserted that it was not against the interests of the Arab world to urge the immigration of Jews into Palestine and the

/ further



further development of the Jewish National Home. It was timely for these words to be addressed to a distinguished representative of the Arab and Muslim worlds. By assuming our rightful place in the ethnic pattern of the Middle East, we shall become a partner in the great task of development and regeneration to which we both are called.

18. I have mentioned the name of President Truman, and here I should like to express our deep appreciation of the sympathy and support which the President and Government of the United States have consistently lent to our cause in these difficult days. Wherever American influence has been brought to bear on our problem - whether in the treatment of our survivors in Europe, or in the wider issues of the preservation and development of the Jewish National Home - we have felt the great liberal impulses of that country to be warmly alive. For all this we are deeply grateful to the American Government and people.

19. Before I turn to the principles which guide us in our search for a solution, I must pause to say a few words about some recent events in Palestine. I do not under-estimate the cruel pressures to which our youth has been subjected, and the desperate frame of mind which they engender. Our young men and women in Palestine are responsive to generous ideals which summon them to exertion, and if need be to sacrifice. In the testing hour of war they showed their mettle. No hazard was too extreme, no peril too fearful for them. They offered themselves gallantly to danger, as they have so often given themselves to hardship in pushing the frontiers of cultivation ever deeper into the waste lands. They have the chivalry which puts personal safety and interest below the appeal of our common cause.

20. It was the tragic destiny of our young generation to see their kinsmen brutally murdered in Europe while they stood by, helpless and impotent. They were prevented from receiving the few survivors whom Providence had spared. In their native homeland, the country of the National Home, they found themselves excluded on racial grounds from all but a small percentage of the land. A new Government which had promised redress came to power in England, and mobilised its armies and fleets to hunt down the pathetic shiploads of Jewish fugitives who sought a haven where they were entitled to seek it, amongst their own people in the internationally guaranteed National Home. The spirit which is called patriotism in other nations was deemed fanaticism in them. They saw an attempt to stunt the growth of their enterprise, to cut them off from their connections and

/ support

support in the Jewish Diaspora, to hand them over to Arab rule, and condemn them to permanent minority status. As the years of war drew on, their minds were assailed by the news of unspeakable, horrible, acts perpetrated upon those nearest and dearest to them. With peace came liberation - except for the Jewish people. Finally, when the immigration of 100,000 displaced Jews - urged by the Jewish Agency and repeatedly supported by the President of the United States - was made contingent on the findings of an impartial Anglo-American Committee, the positive verdict of that Committee was evaded, and remains unfulfilled to this day.

21. It is difficult in such circumstances to retain a belief in the victory of peaceful ideals, in the supremacy of moral values. And yet I affirm, without any hesitation, that we must retain it. Zionism is a modern expression of the liberal ideal. Divorced from that ideal, it loses all purpose, all hope. When we invoke the Jewish tradition as support for our national claim, we are not free to shake off the restraints of that tradition and embark on courses which Jewish morality cannot condone. Assassination, ambush, kidnapping, the murder of innocent men, are alien to the spirit of our Movement. We came to Palestine to build, not to destroy; terror distorts the essence of Zionism. It insults our history; it mocks the ideals for which a Jewish society must stand; it sullies our banner; it compromises our appeal to the world's liberal conscience. It is futile to invoke the national struggles of other nations as examples for ourselves. Not only are the circumstances different, but our purposes, too, are unique. Each people must apply its own standards to its conduct, and we are left with the task of weighing our actions in the scales of Jewish tradition. Nor must our judgment be dazzled by the glare of self-conscious heroism. Massada, for all its heroism, was a disaster in our history. It is not our purpose or our right to plunge to destruction in order to bequeath a legend of martyrdom to posterity. Zionism was to mark the end of our glorious death and the beginning of a new path leading to life. Against the "heroics" of suicidal violence I urge the courage of endurance, the heroism of superhuman restraint. I admit that it requires stronger characters, more virile nerves, than are needed for acts of violence. Whether they can rise to that genuine courage, above the moral degradation of terrorism, is the challenge which history issues to our youth.

22. These acts which are in themselves morally abhorrent are also barren of all advantage. They expose our hard-won achievements to the prospect of destruction, and they lead us

/ to a

to a bottomless abyss of nihilism and despair. Irresponsible groups who arrogate to themselves the right to involve a whole people in the responsibility for their undisciplined acts are gambling with the Jewish future. The Yishuv, through its elected representatives, has resolved to rise up against the vicious elements which threaten its good name and its very survival. This Congress will surely support the Yishuv in its steadfast resolve, and we reject any attempt to fasten on the Jewish Community of Palestine as a whole the blame for these misdeeds. The builders of the Jewish future are not those who plot murder in dark places, but those who only yesterday went out into the southern desert of the Negev and planted a dozen villages in testimony to the constructive purposes of Zionism, its resilience and its hope.

## II.

23. I now turn to the question which has been agitating the minds of Jews everywhere during the past months. It is the question of our political future in Palestine. Five years ago, under the shadow of the impending Jewish tragedy, I wrote:

"A Jewish State in Palestine would be more than merely the necessary means of securing further Jewish immigration and development. It is a moral need and postulate, and it would be a decisive step towards normality and true emancipation. I believe that after the war Jews everywhere can gain in status and security only through the rise of a Jewish State."

If this was true in 1941, it is even more true to-day. This is the logical climax of the Balfour Declaration, as its authors always understood it. Our claim for a State is sometimes represented as an act of extremism. What is natural for Bulgarians, Armenians, Transjordanians, and many other national groups which have no greater claim than ourselves upon the conscience of the world, is somehow regarded as unreasonable benefaction for the Jews. We refuse to accept this inequality. We ask for free scope in which to develop our national culture - and the culture of a nation comprises not only its literature and art, but also its political institutions, its conceptions of economic organisation, and its efforts in the field of social experiment. These things, which all other nations possess, we claim in the name of equality and of our sufferings, for ourselves.

24. Believing as we do that our claim to establish a Jewish State is justified by the mandate, and by the relative positions of the Arab world and ourselves, we cannot contemplate a solution which falls short of that claim. The establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine offers the possibility of absorbing the remnants of the Jewish communities in Europe within a relatively short time, without by any means exhausting the capacity of the country to take in Jewish immigrants from the Middle East or elsewhere. The first problem of our generation is the absorption of our million-and-a-quarter European survivors, the overwhelming majority of whom are desperately pressing against the gates of Palestine. Only the immediate establishment of a Jewish State offers the prospect of doing this. It is essential that the development of Palestine's resources should be entrusted to a Jewish authority possessing the intention and the requisite power to carry that development through at a dynamic rate. Experience has taught us that no other authority is capable of promoting development and reconstruction at a rate commensurate with our need and the country's full capacity. The Jews must be vested with the privileges and responsibilities of direct Government. The Jewish people must be enabled to seek admission at long last to the society of nations. Once secure in the possession of a full national status, we shall strive to enter into a free and harmonious relationship with other States in the Middle East.

25. In dealing with the problem of Palestine there are two courses, and only two courses, open to Great Britain which would enable her to fulfil her obligations and inaugurate a new era of peaceful development in that country. One alternative is a return to the mandate as it was conceived by those who drew it up - a return to a period of free immigration, limited only by the economic capacity of the country. The Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry, with not all of which we agree, contains certain specific proposals which would once again breathe life and spirit into the mandate. In the first place, the immediate immigration of 100,000 Jews from Europe has been consistently urged by the United States Government on the basis of careful enquiries in Europe, supplemented by the rigorous investigation carried out by the Anglo-American Committee itself. Subsequent discussions of this project by expert committees revealed that the project is well capable of early fulfilment. Difficulties of finance and transport are not insuperable, and the moral weight of the Jewish people and of world public opinion would give momentum to this gesture of humanity which would at the same time improve the atmosphere in Palestine. Seldom has a measure recommended so widely and impressively been opposed with so little benefit or cause.



26. A return to the Mandate implies also the continuation of immigration after the entry of the 100,000, up to the full economic level of the country's power of absorption, and the institution of development schemes by irrigation and intensive cultivation for the spirit of the country as a whole. These measures, together with a policy of encouraging Palestine's growing industries, would substitute an atmosphere of optimism and expansion for the present dark apprehension which broods over the land.

27. Another measure, implicit in a return to the Mandate and likewise recommended by the Anglo-American Committee, is the abolition of the Land Ordinances which deny Jews in Palestine right of possession, or even access, to something like nine-tenths of the country. This act of discrimination has few parallels, I believe, in the statute-books of the world. It is particularly indefensible in view of the fact that the Arab cultivators whom it professes to protect are tilling more land, with more productive results, to-day than before our colonisation began. The notice "No Jews Admitted" over nine-tenths of the territory of the Holy Land is an affront to the human conscience. It must be removed together with the rest of the White Paper's evil heritage.

28. If the White Paper is thus consigned to oblivion, many of its worst consequences will perish with it: repressive emergency regulations; arbitrary arrests and detentions; suppression of civil liberties; barbed wire fortresses in the heart of Jerusalem; censorship and martial law - all the hideous legacy of the White Paper. They will be remembered only as a nightmare. And here, perhaps, I feel I must say that we also remember, as indeed we always do, that it was Britain, first among the Great Powers, which set her hand to the righting of an ancient wrong and opened for us the possibility of rebuilding our land. Whatever our grievances, and temporary tensions, we shall cherish with abiding gratitude this historic act.

29. I do not under-estimate the difficulties of Great Britain; but if the Mandatory Power feels unable to fulfil the main condition of its trust, its only alternative is to devise a new settlement in which the purposes of the Mandate are substantially fulfilled. It is morally bound to leave Palestine in a state of finality by drawing up proposals for sound constitutional development; a sound constitutional structure can only be one which recognises the existence of a Jewish nation side by side with the Arab nations. The Jewish community in Palestine will never surrender its national attributes, and its attachment to a national tradition, in order to  
/ merge

merge them into the attributes and traditions of another people. If Great Britain is unable to follow the paths of the Mandate, she should, I submit, - before retiring - vest the National Home with the full authority and status of a Jewish State.

30. As for the Arabs, the establishment of a Jewish State offers inducements of which we believe many of their most thoughtful representatives are keenly aware. It offers them finality. It will establish the possibility of an equal and dignified relationship between Arabs and Jews, whose States should find it to their interest to co-operate in the execution of joint development schemes and in the achievement of greater economic security.

31. This solution has, I suggest, the supreme merits of Finality, Independence, and Peace, which are all entirely lacking for all parties concerned in the so-called Morrison Plan of Federal Autonomy, which we must reject without hesitation or reserve. We reject it both in principle and in detail: in principle because it is neither a final solution nor one which establishes the Jewish people in political independence. It entirely excludes most of the country from the scope of Jewish colonisation, without even assuring us complete freedom in the small part which would remain to us. It is therefore very near to a total and final repudiation of the primary condition of the Mandate - to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. All the provisions of the Federal Plan, with regard to area, immigration veto, and potentialities of development, imply an early crystallisation of the Jewish National Home, and would make of it a stunted, crippled thing. This Plan is no more than a slightly modified White Paper, and because we are opposed in principle to any plan of this kind, we see no purpose in discussing its details.

32. I am aware that the establishment of a Jewish State is a bold and imaginative act. I am also aware that there is a prejudice in some quarters against a final, clear-cut solution. But the recent tragic history of Palestine does nothing to recommend a policy of uncertainty or fluidity. Time is short and the need is pressing. We are summoned by history and the plight of our people to press for a solution which will give release to our constructive energy, and intensify the processes which have rooted our people so deeply in its ancestral land. By industry and perseverance, by courage and resolution, by the rejection of terrorism and the renewal of faith in our Movement's liberal ideals - by these and these alone shall we fulfil our duty to the destiny of our people and the advancement of mankind.

Fellow-Delegates,

Fifty years have passed since Theodor Herzl projected the Juderstaat. To-day we are on the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the First Zionist Congress held in this fair and hospitable city of Basle. Looking back over the road we have travelled in these two generations, we sometimes wonder whether our achievements correspond to the high hopes which inspired our first Congress. It is well for us to remember: We were a handful of men - without means, without influence, without experience, without the support of the most powerful elements in world Jewry. Let us remember, too, that to-day, despite the terrible losses we have sustained, this Congress represents more than two million Jews who by a conscious act have identified themselves with our Movement and the Zionist ideal. The steady vision, the unwavering courage, the sacrificing labour of our pioneers have in large measure overcome the difficulties which confronted us. Our men and women drew sustenance, spiritual and material, from a grudging and neglected soil.

They stand to-day, six hundred thousand strong. Testimony to our faith and achievement - achievement in all fields of human endeavour: great institutions of learning; an ancient tongue made new again; cities and villages that have wrested life and happiness from misery and decay - testimony to the irresistible force which drives our people to become free men and women once again on the land of their fathers.

Let us pray that in unity and singleness of purpose we shall achieve peace and freedom in Zion reborn.

-----oOo -----



# קונגרס

## Congregation

Basle

No. 1.

10-12-46.

### 22nd WORLD ZIONIST CONGRESS OPENS

Large crowds waited for hours outside the Messermerse Exhibition Building yesterday before the opening of the 22nd World Zionist Congress. The great hall was packed to capacity with Congress delegates and visitors. The Zionist Actions Committee were already seated on the platform, backed by a huge portrait of Herzl, when the organ began the opening phrase of Hatikvah, and the audience rose to attention. The organ faded and there was a solemn quiet throughout the hall as Dr. Chaim Weizmann mounted the platform and walked slowly to his seat. The President received tremendous applause the moment he appeared, and the ovations continued as members of the Jewish Agency Executive followed to take their places at the long platform table. Behind them sat leading representatives of the various Zionist institutions.

At precisely four-thirty p.m. the lights blazed up over the platform and following the symbolic taps with the gavel the Congress officially opened.

Dr. Weizmann then rose to read a welcome in Hebrew greeting the Assembly and the distinguished representatives of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, Poland, Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Uruguay, Monaco, and the representatives of the leading international organisations. Particular interest was aroused in the presence of the Papal Nuncio in Switzerland who, together with the French Ambassador and the American and Russian representatives, received warm applause.

In a special word of greeting to M. Jean Decroux, Counsellor of the Federal Political Department, Dr. Karl Peter, President of the Cantonal Government of Basel and Dr. G. Baumann, Vice-President of the Cantonal Parliament of Basel, Dr. Weizmann paid warm tribute to "this fair and hospitable City of Basel" where delegates from all over the world had assembled for this Congress. Dr. Peter responded, expressing his hearty welcome to his town and his country. "We hope," Dr. Peter continued, "that this great parliament of the Jewish people will lay the foundation of a new era of constructive work. We know that Basel is a Holy City to your movement. It was in this City that the great Theodore Herzl proclaimed the Basel programme. We were deeply moved to learn that on the mountains near Jerusalem a Basel forest is to be planted. We are honoured by this tribute and assure you at all times of our sympathy and understanding. We who stood on the border of the third Reich and watched the ghastly tragedy being enacted cannot fail to understand the need of your people for a home of their own."

Dr. Peter was followed by Dr. Brannwitz, President of the Union of Swiss Jewish Communities, Dr. Gustachler, President of the Basel Jewish Community and Dr. Weiler, President of the Swiss Zionist Federation.

Dr. Weizmann then extended a warm greeting to Mr. David Remez, President of the Jewish National Council in Palestine who was one of the arrested leaders in Latrun. Mr. Remez received a great ovation as he stepped to the microphone. In a powerful address in Hebrew, Mr. Remez offered the greetings of the Jewish National Council to Congress delegates and proclaimed that the Yishuv and survivors of Jewry throughout the world constituted a united body which together demanded one thing, the right to live as a free nation in its homeland.



The Yishuv was created by Labour and not by the sword. And the Yishuv sought peace and not war. It wished to be a partner in the peace as it was a partner during the war. And the Yishuv strove for peace with the Arabs too. Throughout the world, Mr. Remez continued, countries were returning to peace conditions. But conditions of war persisted still in Palestine. "We demand a halt in this war against us and we call upon the Jewish people to rally round the Yishuv and stand steadfastly with it," Mr. Remez declared. He concluded with an invitation for the next Congress to be held in Palestine, and this was received amid loud cheers by the assembled delegates.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann then rose to deliver his address to Congress the full text of which appears in a special supplement with this issue of the Congress Bulletin. He spoke for exactly one hour in a voice that was clear and vibrant and his speech was broadcast direct to Palestine with a running commentary from Mr. Medzini, the Hebrew radio commentator.

Mr. David Ben Gurion, Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive, took over direction of the proceedings and called upon Chief Rabbi Uziel, who greeted Congress on behalf of the chief Rabbinate of Palestine. Rabbi Uziel pronounced the traditional blessing of "Shehechiyenu" to the survivors of the wartime destruction of Jewry, who were privileged to reassemble to consider the salvation of Israel, its restoration to its land, and the reconstruction of its State on the basis of Torah.

The entire assembly then rose to sing the Hatikvah and closed the first session of the 22nd World Zionist Congress.

=====

Before the session ended, Mr. David Ben Gurion announced that the next session would open at 8.30 p.m. the same evening at which an address would be delivered by Dr. Stephen Wise on "Fifty years of Zionism". A report of this session will appear in the next bulletin.

-----

#### U.S. Jewish War Veterans send greetings to Congress.

Among the many messages to Congress, was the following from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, signed by Milton H. Richman, their Commander:-

"Greetings: Our Organisation stands pledged to aid in the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine and to the immediate admission of our unfortunate displaced brethren into Palestine. My personal and official contacts with them in Europe from the time of their liberation until my separation from service with the United States Army convinces me that these objectives must be attained immediately. To that end we dedicate ourselves. To Dr. Weizmann I send greetings and best wishes for good health and continued strength."

GREATER ACTIONS COMMITTEE MEETS

The General Council of the Zionist Organisation (Greater Actions Committee) held a second meeting since its election, the first having taken place at the end of the Congress in 1939. The meeting was opened on Sunday morning by Mr. J. Sprinsek who paid tribute to the deceased members of the Actions Committee and the Jewish martyrs of Europe. He named Menahem Ussishkin, Judge Julian Mack, Henriette Szold, Archibald Fraiman, Berel Kaznelson, Benzion Messinson, Uri Rosenblatt, Dov Hov, Eliyahu Golomb, Nathan Buxbaum, Dr. Jacoby, Rabbi Mark, Rabbi Hirschfeld and Sagan, the last five having been murdered by the Nazis. He also paid tribute to the memory of Arthur Ruppin and Justice Brandeis. The members rose in silent tribute. The meeting dealt with the agenda and the Presidium of the Congress. David Ben Gurion on behalf of the Executive welcomed the members, and dealt with the arrangements proposed for the Opening Session. It was agreed that on Tuesday morning the Presidium would be elected and the Chairman of the Congress Court would report on elections. This will be followed by Dr. Silver who will speak on behalf of American Jewry. In the afternoon session there will be a Political Address by Ben Gurion and a General Debate lasting five days until Sunday, December 15th. On Monday 16th the second part of the Congress will begin and will be devoted to economic and financial matters with reports by Kaplan and Leib Jaffe on Keren Haayesod, Granovsky on Keren Kayemeth, followed by debate, and the meetings of the Commissions. On the 21st, the third session of the Congress will begin with reports of the Commissions to the Plenary Session, resolutions and a report of the Standing Committee on elections of the new Executive.

The Executive propose that the Congress elect eight Commissions and a Standing Committee which shall have a sub-Committee for dealing with the question of the location of different sections of the Executive in Jerusalem, London and America. The Commissions will be Political, Organisation, Immigration and Hachsharah, Agricultural Colonisation, Urban Colonisation and Labour, Financial, Cultural and Educational. On the question of the Congress Presidium the Executive appointed a sub-Committee of three. A discussion took place on the agenda in which Rabbi Catrovsky, Chazen and others proposed various changes. Rabbi Fishman, Myer Grossman, Rabbi Neufeld, Abraham Kaznelson, Dr. Goldstein, Mrs. Rose Halpern participated in the discussion.

PRESS CONFERENCE BY MR. M. SHERTOK.

Mr. M. Shertok, head of the political department in Jerusalem of the Jewish Agency for Palestine addressed a press conference of Foreign Correspondents in Basel this morning on the 22nd World Zionist Congress.

Outlining the special character of Congress in space and time, Mr. Shertok said that, in space, the 370 or so delegates represented Jewish communities in 61 countries in all the five Continents. As to time, it meets under normal conditions once every two years for a fortnightly session. It elects smaller bodies to function in between sessions.

Congress was meeting today after an abnormal period, perhaps the most catastrophic in the history of Jewry. It is the first Zionist Conference since the Geneva Congress which concluded its session on the eve of the outbreak of war. The decimation of European Jewry naturally produced a changed composition of representation at Congress. In 1939 45% of the delegates came from Europe, 24% from North and South America and 25% from Palestine. At this, the 22nd Congress, 25% of the delegates are from Europe, 42% from North and South America, 22% from Palestine. The centre of gravity as regards the Diaspora representation has shifted from one hemisphere to the other. The slight relative decline in the Palestine percentage despite the increased population of Palestine Jewry, reflects the remarkable growth of the Zionist movements in the Diaspora.

If the decline in European Jewish population has been catastrophic, its pressure on Palestine is in inverse ratio to its numbers. The imperative need of large parts of the surviving Jewish remnant for a home in Palestine adds poignant urgency to Congress deliberations, Mr. Shertok added.

Mr. Shertok said that the delegates who met at the last Congress represented a world electorate of one million two hundred thousand. The present Congress will speak for an electorate of more than two million.

Turning to the issues before Congress Mr. Shertok said that Congress is a sovereign body. The present executive of the Jewish Agency lays down its mandate and the new executive is elected at the end of Congress. While Congress lasts it is Congress which lays down policy and decides on outstanding matters. Mr. Shertok added that he could only indicate the main problems which would engage the attention of Congress but he could not pre-judge the results of their deliberations. The four main problems were:

1. Policy. It will be up to Congress to reaffirm or modify the policy of the movement which has been formulated by the competent bodies during the war.
2. Whether or not the Jewish Agency will take part in the second stage of the London Conference on Palestine convened by His Majesty's Government, to which it is now understood the Government of the United States might be ready to send an observer or observers in a certain contingency.
3. The election of the new Executive. The Zionist Movement consists of various parties and has a tradition of coalition Government. In Britain, said Mr. Shertok, a Coalition Government is resorted to only in time of crisis. It is a reflection of the continuous state of crisis in Jewish life that it is governed by coalition, based on a common programme. Mr. Shertok said that there is no doubt that a coalition will emerge once again.
4. Organisation and Production of practical work in Palestine.

Mr. Shertok concluded by saying that it is reasonable to expect some divergence in the first round of the Congress debate and in the various committees which will be elected, but he was convinced that the same result would be forthcoming as at previous Congresses, namely, that a substantial measure of union would be achieved.

Keren Hayesod Reception in Honour of Dr. Weizmann

On Sunday evening under the auspices of the Keren Hayesod a reception was held in honour of Dr. Chaim Weizmann at the historic Trois Rois Hotel. The distinguished gathering included members of the Executive and prominent Zionists connected with the Keren Hayesod from all countries. Mr. Leib Jaffe, welcoming the gathering, said that their hearts had been warmed by the thought that it was here that Herzl expounded his vision and formulated the ideas which still inspire them all in their work. He spoke of the expanding work of the Keren Hayesod which was carrying the Zionist idea throughout the world and through their search for gold they were discovering the golden heart of the Jewish people.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann amusingly recalled his efforts on behalf of the Fund when established in 1924. He said that the work of the Fund could not be measured in terms of money raised, but in the spiritual and physical strength gained by the Jewish people through its achievements. This fund had become the symbol of the progress of Zionism and it was their task to make it into a true national tax which will enable them to make the next step forward to their goal.

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver said that the Keren Hayesod had helped the Jewish people to write a magnificent page in their history, helping to destroy the tragic myth of the Galuth that Jews were unable to build constructively. Palestine for the Jews did not mean a monument or memorial, but a throbbing flowering life which had been made possible through the humble collections of the Keren Hayesod.

Mr. Eliezer Kaplan said that the Keren Hayesod had enabled the Zionist Movement to carry out the tasks of a state. He welcomed the courage of the Americans in aiming to raise One hundred and seventy million dollars in 1947, but warned the gathering against satisfaction with their achievement. The needs were growing daily, leaving the achievements far behind.

Sir Simon Marks recalled the establishment of the Preparation Fund in England in 1918 on the initiative of Dr. Weizmann. He emphasised the importance of contributions coming from the greatest number of Jews so that they may become practical Zionists and so that Zionists of all trends might be united in this work.

Rabbi Nurcek and Mr. Shmuel Rabinovitch of the Argentine paid tribute to Leib Jaffe's work on behalf of the Keren Hayesod.

Professor Rappard pays Tribute to Dr. Weizmann

A glowing tribute to Dr. Weizmann as a statesman and scientist was paid by Professor William Rappard of Geneva, renowned Liberal and famous historian, former member of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. Professor Rappard was presiding at a luncheon held at the Trois Rois Hotel by the leading Swiss Jews in aid of the Weizmann Institute of Scientific Research. The luncheon was attended by 150 guests and representatives of the leading Jewish institutions such as the Jewish Agency, the Z.O.A. and Hadassah. Messrs. Shortok, Kaplan, Brodetsky, Stephen Wise and Louis Lipsky were amongst the distinguished gathering which included leading Swiss academicians. Professor Rappard speaking in flawless English declared that his old friend Weizmann to whom he owed probably more than any other living man was serving many causes unflinchingly. They were not platforms for his vanity but indeed the cemeteries of his tastes and leisure. They were not pedestals for his own glorification but shrines in which he worshipped with devotion and abnegation. Professor Rappard recalled his visit to Jerusalem in 1925 for the memorable inauguration of the University



University. He narrated an anecdote of the opening, saying that Weizmann delivered a cold, formal speech and later said to Rappard "I suppose you were disappointed in my speech, but don't you realise that this was to be Balfour's day". This, said Rappard, showed the greatness of the man to submerge himself for the great cause. He said that Zionism was a cause worthy of its greatest servants. It was the most unparalleled political adventure which could succeed only if its servants rose above their average stature. Zionism was understood by very few. It took more than a common man, animated by common motives to grasp the idea of settling hundreds of thousands of Jews who wanted to go to Palestine. Professor Rappard expressed his disappointment but not his surprise that Britain had not found it possible to create conditions which would provide for the development of a prosperous Jewish State. There were many difficulties especially economic, but he instanced the similarity of Switzerland to Palestine with its limited material resources. The disproportion between the size of a country and the extent of its needs was not insoluble. The possibilities of the improvement of the soil of Palestine were infinite if they were treated with the maximum of scientific developments and research.

Professor L. Ruzicka, Professor of Chemistry at Zürich University and Nobel Prize winner spoke of Weizmann's early scientific career in Switzerland where he had graduated as Assistant Lecturer at Geneva University and where he laid the foundation of the later fermentation process which is linked with his name.

Mr. Stone, Chairman of the Board of the American Weizmann Institute and Judge Morris Rothenberg also spoke, the latter paying tribute to Switzerland's record as an asylum for the oppressed. Sir Simon Marks added a tribute and Weizmann was received with a great ovation, the whole audience rising as he began to speak.

Dr. Weizmann paid tribute to the City of Basle and drew an analogy between Palestine and Switzerland saying that the most important raw material of the Swiss people was its population. Weizmann agreed that Palestine could not be developed without the maximum scientific research nor could such development be undertaken from the distance. Absorptive capacity must be created by men and women to whom it was a question of life and death. The audience was deeply moved when he said "I feel that the Jews have been robbed, not only of six million people but of great intellectual capital. Jewish intellect has been slaughtered. In eastern Europe the cradle of Jewish scientific genius has been wantonly and cruelly destroyed. It can only be partly re-established in America. And I think that the place where it can best grow is in Palestine as a National Home grows. The Hebrew University and the research centre must develop as great power houses of intellect to replace to some extent the genius whereof we have been robbed." Referring to Britain he said "I cannot imagine that the country which did so much to initiate our work will abandon or expose it to the gusts of fury and the storms which will blow if England gives up. I am anxious to maintain this connection, build it up and I consider the present disappointment as one of many in our long career. I think we shall see Palestine rebuilt if we are steadfast and go on with the constructive path we have hitherto trod. The Jewish State founded on the ideals of liberty and freedom will be truly great."

JEWISH JOURNALISTS PRESS CONFERENCE WITH MR. B. LOCKER

Mr. Berl Locker, member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency, addressed a Press Conference of representatives of the Hebrew and Yiddish Press on the eve of the opening of the 22. Zionist Congress.

Mr. Locker surveyed the problems before the Congress and said that the responsibility rested upon the journalists to present the news in a responsible way to their readers. The fact said Mr. Locker that Poland is represented by only 16 delegates is an indication of the great changes which have taken place in Jewish life and in the composition of the Congress. Amongst the 375 delegates to the Congress there are many new people representing new forces which have associated themselves with the Jewish cause and with Jewish aspirations. There are three main problems upon which the Congress will be called upon to make decisions: (a) the political problem and our relations with the Mandatory Power; (b) whether or not the Jewish people should participate in the forthcoming London Conference; (c) the election of a leadership for the Movement.

"I am optimistic as to the results of this Congress", said Mr. Locker. Speaking of the election of the new Executive Mr. Locker said that there will be differences between those who will be elected as has always been the case. There must be no dictatorship even of the majority. There must be free discussion, but unified action. Even in the coalition there will be differences of opinion and indeed there are differences of opinion within the parties themselves. Every one of us arrives at a decision as a result of inner conflict. We are entering, said Mr. Locker, on a new phase of our work which will be a historic epoch in our movement. In reply to questions Mr. Locker denied that Dr. Weizmann had expressed himself as being opposed to what he termed "uncertificated immigration". Mr. Locker also denied the reports that Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Shertok had been requested to go to Palestine. Mr. Locker said that the Congress was not competent to decide local Jewish problems. Speaking of the movement of Jews in Europe to Palestine, Mr. Locker said it should not be regarded merely as a great tragedy. It was at the same time a historic urge which was being fulfilled. He called upon the Jewish in the Diaspora to strengthen their Jewish life. It was not only their function to resist anti-Semitism and the corrosive forces of assimilation, but to strive for cultural and educational enlightenment so as to prevent the disintegration of the Jewish people

[December 11, 1946]



# קונגרס הציוני

## Congression

Basle

No. 2

11-12-46

22nd World Zionist Congress: Second Session.

Dr. Stephen Wise on Fifty Years of Zionism

The Second Session of the Congress opened at 8.30 p.m. on Monday, 9th December with an impressive address by Dr. Stephen Wise on Fifty Years of Zionism.

"To dwell in this hour upon the great Day of Herzl is not to ignore the significant men and movements that went before, nor yet the equally significant developments of the cause and movements within the half-century that has passed since we first met within this to us little less than sacred city of Basel", Dr. Wise began. "Herzl's predecessors were unknown to him. His successors are not unknown to us," he added.

After referring to the historic Jewish figures of Moses Hess, Leo Pinsker, and the Hibbat Zion and Bilu movements, who foretold in the formula later expressed by Ahad Haam that the home of the Jews could be nowhere permanent and inalienable except in Eretz Israel, Dr. Wise said that never in history had a people so long been alienated from its own land, yet retaining its unaltered and unlessened love for the land sustaining its hope for the restoration of its nationhood.

These thoughts and feelings had at last found understanding and voice in the person and Jewish genius of Dr. Theodor Herzl. His "Judenstaat" marking one of the turning points in changing the course of Jewish history started a new epoch which was not without its evil days and terrible years, but which restored faith in the Jewish people who were resolved once again to be the master of its fate and the captain of its soul.

Analysing the meaning of Zionism as propounded by Herzl, Dr. Wise said that Herzl spoke the magic words "We can: we may fulfil our own prayers and purposes. The answer to our prayers lies with, or even within us". Herzl saw then that a Jewish State was essential to the world and would therefore be created. What Herzl could not have foreseen was the supreme effort that had been made to destroy the Jewish people. Herzl was a Titan, one of a race of giants which included glorious names like Max Nordau, David Wolffsohn, Otto Warburg, Nahum Sokolow, Menachem Ussishkin, and the one figure who functioned as a leader throughout two wars, whose stature has grown with the years and to whose political genius and statesmanship our cause was under a deep and uncancellable debt - Dr. Haim Weizmann.

Recalling the opening of the First Zionist Congress when Mr. (later Justice) Brandeis, reading in his San Francisco home the inaugural address of Dr. Herzl, had said "Now that is a cause for which I could work and give my life", Dr. Wise said that the twenty years before Herzl were not wholly unlike these last twenty years

of horror. The effect of Herzl and the First Congress upon Jewish history was tremendous. For the first time in twenty centuries Herzl had dared to propose that there be no more escape, no more retreat, no more refuge, but Going Home, the end of dependence on others.

Dr. Wise said that the story of the last fifty years would be incomplete without a tribute to the Jewish youth of the reborn Palestine who more than anything else have made the dream of self-emancipation come true.

Recalling the many crises in the movement beginning in 1920, Dr. Wise referred to the disturbances of 1929 and 1936/39, adding that nothing worse had befallen us throughout the two generations of resettlement than the White Paper. Its drastic limit of immigration was one of the most terrible crimes against the Jewish people, for hundreds of thousands of martyrs might today be living who fell victims of inexpiable crime.

Dealing with the political situation Dr. Wise declared that the stage had been reached which admitted of only two possible courses of action: either Britain cancelled the White Paper and resumed a genuine mandatory regime over Palestine or it must be assumed that Britain is resolved to abandon the Mandate. He appealed to the Mandatory Power not to continue its descent from the heights of the Balfour Declaration to the depths of Yagur and Cyprus. "Surely the British Government, an old friend of the Jewish people, cannot be satisfied with the role of betrayer of Zionism. Jews returning to Palestine merit a kinder fate than transshipment to Cyprus or to any place on earth other than Palestine. The hand of Britain that wrote the Balfour Declaration cannot be used to drag refugees from the home to which they seek to return".

To Jews, Dr. Wise said, we had to appeal in another key. We had to resist the oppression of our brothers, but "let no deeds of our own soil the blameless record of a long unsullied history. Let us not forget that 'what thou wouldst have highly thou must have holily'". Zionism, Dr. Wise said, had ever been a cause of moral and social standards, of ethical and spiritual regeneration. If these were forsworn, Zionism would sink to the low level of a rabble rousing chauvinism.

In conclusion Dr. Wise quoted Chapter 25 of Leviticus "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof ...", adding, "let mankind unite to make it a year of jubilee for the Jewish people. We have made and we shall keep Palestine Jewish and free. We call upon the nations of the world to guarantee never to suffer that freedom to be violated, to make Jews free wherever they dwell, and to make free all the inhabitants of the earth.... Let this Zionist Congress celebrating its fiftieth anniversary stand as the re-affirmation of the purpose, the unbreakable unity and the unassailable faith of the Zionist movement - and with God be the rest."



CONGRESS HONOURS JEWISH MARTYRSMoving Memorial Session

When Dr. Stephen Wise concluded his address on Monday evening, Dr. Chaim Weizmann rose whilst two electric candles were lit, and announced that the Session would now be devoted to the memory of the Jewish victims of the greatest tragedy which had ever befallen our people. A deep silence descended upon the hall and Weizmann asked the gathering to stand in solemn tribute to the victims. The lights in the hall were dimmed whilst the audience stood with bowed heads. Dr. Weizmann then began his address in Yiddish speaking with deep emotion. He said it was a holy duty for this Congress to pay tribute to their brothers and sisters exterminated in their millions by the enemy of mankind. Dr. Weizmann went on "the dark days of the inquisition, the pogroms of Eastern Europe and the other massacres of Jewish history were small and insignificant when compared with the terrible tragedy of the Jewish people in this war. No Jew in the whole world has not lost some member of his family. I do not wish now to accuse the world which stood by watching Jewish suffering with indifference - which seemed unable to help the victims or call a halt to these terrible events, or even to save a small part of these tragic millions. Perhaps the other countries were themselves too greatly affected by the events of the war." Dr. Weizmann went on to say that even at the height of the murders there were people who did not believe that such things were possible and he recalled his conversations with a statesman who refused to believe that such things could happen in the twentieth century. Dr. Weizmann continued "it is not the time to make accusations, but history will record these events and there will be a judge weighing the deeds of mankind in this time." Dr. Weizmann recalled that when the Nazis were burning the Synagogues in Germany he addressed a meeting in London and he then warned the world that today synagogues were burning but tomorrow it might well be Westminster Abbey. He had said that the fires were spreading throughout the world but the warning had fallen on deaf ears. Dr. Weizmann said "our only comfort and consolation is the building up of Eretz Israel where we shall in time find the redemption of our people. This may compensate us in some measure for the terrible losses in cultural and intellectual capital which our people have sustained. After seven terrible years we are again assembled in this beautiful city. We are in a strange land but our eyes are turned to the East. Dr. Weizmann concluded, "be strong despite all obstacles, our goal is clear and we shall reach it if not in my generation then certainly in the next. This Congress representing millions of Jews must lift itself up to be worthy of the martyrs of Israel. May their souls rest in peace."

Rabbi Brod then rose to deliver the memorial address. He said it was a hallowed tradition to honour the memory of those who had passed away since the previous Congress. At this gathering every row marks the beloved faces which are missing since we last met and whose names are included amongst the six million souls who were savagely done to death by a murderous people, a people which called itself "the Nation of writers and philosophers." They had used all their resources and all their skill to devise diabolically efficient methods to extinguish human life. The world had stood by and now had devised Mauritius and Cyprus to aid to Jewish agony. This was the world that was going to build the peace. Rabbi Brod went on "our faith lies in the hands of a great Empire, but experience has shown that the small peoples of the earth have proved to be greater than the powerful nations. The mobs of Vienna had cried "get out, get out." Our reply must be "let us go in, give us a place to lay our heads, let us build our land on Jewish efforts serving ourselves and the whole world. Thus and thus only will we honour the martyrs of Israel and bring comfort to the mourners."

After the address Cantor Lazar Rothenberg, a delegate who had fought with the Resistance Movement in Belgium, intoned the "El Molerachamim" prayer. Chief Rabbi Uziel, Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Palestine, recited the Kaddish. The Assembly was deeply moved and in this solemn mood the session of the Congress concluded.

22nd World Zionist Congress: Third Session.Dr. Yitzhak Gruenbaum on The Catastrophe of European Jewry.

The Third Session of the Congress opened at 11 a.m. on Tuesday 10th December with an address by Dr. Yitzhak Gruenbaum. The catastrophe of European Jewry, he said, particularly in Poland, and the terrible events of the war belonged to those epoch-making happenings which had hitherto decided the course of Jewish history. Not only the human sacrifices - nearly a third of the population - nor the mechanised mass murder so carefully planned by the Nazis, but also the attitude of the fighting liberating nations marked the nature of the Jewish catastrophe. Never in Jewish history was the loneliness and orphaned character of the Jewish people so cruelly confirmed nor the consequences of Jewish homelessness so clearly defined.

After describing the cruel methods whereby millions of Jewish men, women and children had been murdered, Dr. Gruenbaum said that Jews without discrimination had been the first and most numerous victims of the war. He spoke of the heroic attitude of the Jews in Poland and other countries where resistance movements had developed, notably in the ghettos of Warsaw, Bialystok and the death camps, and the development of the Jewish fighting front, separated and isolated from the war fronts, without a General Staff to direct it, a front of heroes who knew they were fighting their last battle to save the soul of their people. Their heroism was of no avail, said Dr. Gruenbaum. As of old, when defending the Walls of Jerusalem, Jewish blood sanctified the ghettos.

One consolation nourished by the Jews during these indescribable years of terror was the belief that with victory they would be rewarded and brought to Palestine. This was their messianic vision. When victory came some Jews were rescued. Great was the joy. But it soon gave way to the bitterest disappointment. Jews emerged from Concentration Camps to a brutal world in which, they were told, there was no place for them. If they returned to their countries of origin they found it impossible to recover their possessions, and the Governments were too timid to take action. Dr. Gruenbaum recalled Mr. Ernest Bevin's remark that Europe needed the Jews for their ability and talents in reconstruction. But Mr. Bevin had apparently false notions about their positions in the European continent. The Jews in Europe continue to be threatened with despair and demoralisation. They have only one consolation, namely to fight with the Yishuv in Palestine and the Zionist Organisation and indeed with the whole of the Jewish people, for their final liberation and rescue. In that fight they are no longer objects but part of the fighting army. Dr. Gruenbaum concluded with reference to the Jewish renaissance through the Zionist Movement which was a liberating process of the Jewish people, a miracle of resurrection and redemption with the revival of the Hebrew language, the modernisation of Jewish culture and literature and the emergence of the Jew as a fighter and builder, free, proud and independent, rid of his inferiority complex and slavishness, who with courage and faith in his own powers was able to fight the hostile forces of man and nature, daring to build a new world setting an example to the old.

DR. WEIZMANN ELECTED CONGRESS PRESIDENT.

Following Mr. Gruenbaum's address, the Rev. J.K. Goldbloom, reporting on behalf of the Actions Committee, proposed the name of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, as the President of the 22nd Zionist Congress. This was put to the vote, and 191 were for Dr. Weizmann and 48 against. The result when announced was greeted with prolonged applause. The representative of the Revisionist Party then mounted the rostrum and declared that his Party had voted against Dr. Weizmann, not on personal grounds but because he symbolised the political line which had brought the Jewish people to disaster. At a time when we were entering a new phase of resistance, his party did not believe that Dr. Weizmann could continue as the head of the Movement.

Following him, a representative of the Mizrahi made a statement to the effect that his Party had abstained from voting. Dr. Weizmann was greeted with sustained applause when he rose to thank the delegates for having elected him, and pointed out that he had not sought the honour.

Congress Presidium Elected.

Rev. Goldbloom proposed the following for membership of the Presidium:-

Rev. J.K. Goldbloom	General Zionists
Rabbi Mordechai Nurok	Mizrachi
Rabbi Elimelech Neufeld	Mizrachi
Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver	General Zionists
Dr. Moshe Sneh	General Zionists
Rabbi Dr. L. Rabinowitz	Revisionist
Mr. David Remez	Ichud Olami
Dr. Schechtman	Revisionist
Mr. Josef Sprinzak	Ichud Olami

Congress assented almost unanimously and the representative of Hashomer Hazair then declared that they had voted against inclusion of the Revisionists in the Executive whom they considered were represented at the Congress unlawfully. Revisionists had spent their time in trying to break the Movement and undermine its authority. A representative of Na'ama L'Achduth Avodah on behalf of his Party "we did not vote en bloc for this Presidium on the grounds that there is no place for Revisionists in a democratic Movement. Their re-entry, moreover, had not been confirmed by the Executive."

The Rev. J.K. Goldbloom made a powerful plea for unity and tolerance saying that the eyes of the whole world and especially those of our brethren in the camps are upon this Conference. He concluded, amidst applause, "Let us work together as brothers and sisters and go forward to the achievements of the Jewish State."

Congress Court and Election Reports.

Dr. Sami Gronemann, veteran head of the Congress Court, presented his report on behalf of the Court, and alluded to the difficulties experienced in these elections which covered more than sixty countries. He referred with some emotion to the fact that he had been the President of the Congress for 25 years, and that this would probably be his last report. But he was in the knowledge that he had always tried to conduct the affairs of the Court with complete objectivity.

Rabbi Gold recalled that Nordan, who did not belong to religious Judaism when once invited to the opening of a Synagogue in Madrid, had declared that so long as Jewry could say the "Shema Israel" no people in the world could uproot them. Nordan had realized then the significance of religious Judaism, or, as it was later called the "armour of Judaism".

Rabbi Gold went on to describe the character of the various Jewish communities which had been destroyed, communities in cities like Vilna - the "Jerusalem of Lithuania" - Cracow and Warsaw, which provided not only the religious source of world Jewry but also the source of Jewish wisdom and culture. Rabbi Gold observed that the Temple of Jerusalem had its Gate of Shushan as a reminder of the miraculous rescue of the Jews of Shushan. It will be appropriate now to create a series of Gates in Jerusalem to remind us of Cracow, Vilna and Warsaw.

Rabbi Wolf concluded by reminding the audience of the previous night's Yom Kippur mood, adding that after Yom Kippur the Succah was built. In the same way, said Rabbi Gold, the Jews must now turn to the building up of Palestine in our own days, and achieve a total redemption.

This completed the afternoon Session.

-----  
22nd World Zionist Congress: Fifth Session.

The Fifth Session of Congress opened at 8.30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 10th December, with an address by Mr. David Ben-Gurion, Chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. The full text appears as an appendix to this issue of the Congress Bulletin.

~~Before beginning his address, Mr. Ben Gurion read out a telegram from Jerusalem~~ When Mr. Ben Gurion reached the section of his speech dealing with the Movement of Jews to Europe, he read a telegram which had been received from Jerusalem stating that a refugee ship carrying 800 persons was wrecked in a storm near Rhodes. When, continuing the telegram, he added that 833 persons were missing, the entire assembly rose and stood in silence for two minutes.

-----  
Before the Session closed, the Chairman announced that the Congress would not resume until 4.30 p.m. the next day, to enable the Party caucuses to meet during the morning.



TWENTY SECOND ZIONIST CONGRESS

Basle, December 12, 1946

A D D R E S S

by

Mr. Moshe Shertok

Head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency for Palestine

May I begin by paying a tribute to the Chairman of this meeting who stands before us on this platform as a symbol of an heroic epic enacted on the stage of the great European drama. We have heard a great deal during the opening sessions of this Congress about the catastrophe which befell our people in Europe during the war. We have not heard enough, but we all know that that terrible darkness which descended upon and enveloped masses of Jews was pierced with the torches of Jewish resistance of which our chairman tonight was one of the bravest and noblest carriers. That epic will remain forever a source of pride and courage to us and to the coming generations of the Jewish people. That we in Palestine could not rush to their help, could not reinforce their ranks was one of the most mortifying experiences to us during that tragic period. We tried hard, desperately hard, to obtain facilities for sending fairly early in the day a contingent of Jewish fighters from Palestine into Poland in order to stimulate resistance, in order to help, in order to lead. This was denied to us. Our urgent insistent proposals in this regard were repeatedly turned down. Late in the day, we renewed that attempt with regard to Hungary and although eventually we managed to secure authority at the highest level for the sending of a very small and modest contingent into Hungary with that object in view, official obstructions defeated that initiative and nothing materialised.

We had been taught in the very hard school of our Palestinian experience never to disparage even a limited achievement when a more ambitious one proves impracticable. We managed eventually to send from Palestine singly, or in small groups, into the various Balkan countries and some of the countries of Central Europe, three dozen young men and women who were dropped by parachute behind enemy lines and established contact with the Jewish communities, who appeared before them as emissaries of Jewish Palestine. Each one of them became a focus of hope, a centre for the mobilisation of national energies for struggle and survival. They were the only Jews of the many hundreds of thousands of Jewish fighters on all the fronts of the last war to whom it was given to penetrate deep into enemy territory as agents of rescue and liberation of their fellow Jews. Seven of them fell at the hands of the enemy.

A mission on a much larger scale for the rescue and liberation of European Jews was carried out by our soldiers, but they could operate only in the liberated areas.

All this, fellow delegates, has a direct bearing on one of the subjects which engaged the attention of Congress during this debate, the subject of what is political activity, what are the effective forms of political struggle.

The voluntary enlistment movement of Palestine Jews into the British Army, in Jewish units, was not merely a military effort. It was a political movement. It aimed high; it achieved much. It was a movement to which the Yishuv gave of the very best of its manhood and womanhood. It was the greatest manifestation achieved by us during the war of that measure of de facto independence which we have so far succeeded in building up. It gave to the Yishuv the virtual status of a belligerent ally, a record which no callous ingratitude or malicious forgetfulness can efface from the scrolls of history. It made a high name for the young Palestinian Jew and Jewess, among the many nations with whom they fought shoulder to shoulder. It put them on the map as the sons and daughters of a new national entity which arose in the Middle East in the inter-war period, who as workers and fighters are superior to many others and second to none. It gave pride and comfort to the Jews throughout the world. Members of this movement were the only Jews, among the myriads of Jewish fighters on all fronts to whom it was given to meet the enemy in open battle under a Jewish flag. That was when a sector of the Italian front was assigned to the Jewish Brigade group. And wherever the Jewish soldiers went, there went a message of hope and courage to Jews emerging from concentration camps and hiding places. So it was in North Africa, throughout the campaign in the Libyan Desert and the Libyan towns. So it was in Italy since the first landing until the final overthrow of the enemy. The mission was at first carried out by the scattered Jewish units; subsequently by the Jewish Brigade.

When the Jewish flag was unfurled for the first time over that sector of the front on the senio River, it was said, "Let this flag be a beacon of light to Jews in all corners of Europe calling them to efforts of Aliyah and Haapala". What was meant as a symbol, as a slogan, became the literal truth. A great trek set in over the European continent. Masses of Jews took to the roads of Europe. They all aimed towards that one spot on the map of the European battlefields where the Jewish flag beckoned to them. That great migration of Jews from East to West, from North to South, converging upon Italy and the American Zone in Germany and gravitating towards the southern shores of Europe, would undoubtedly have broken out anyhow. Jews were driven by despair. Jews were drawn by the only hope which they saw before them. But the presence of the Jewish Brigade in Europe, the activity of the Palestinian Jewish soldiers throughout the continent gave to that great migration its drive and cohesion. To those who had no choice but stagnate in the camps it gave a new spirit of self-confidence and self-reliance.

That movement of Jews across Europe stands out today as the mightiest demonstration of Jewish post-war homelessness in Europe, and of the urge towards Palestine. It is today perhaps the strongest element in the dynamics of the Zionist political struggle. It is a revolutionary change in European Jewish conditions, wrought by peaceful means; a change in the realities of the situation confronting the world as regards the Jewish problem. It brought to expression in a most telling manner our independent national will and our capacity to translate that will into action.

It was said here during the debate that it was vital not to confine our political effort to mere diplomacy, but reinforce it by mass political activity. That is so, but I submit that it is even more important not to rest content with mere words, whether they be spoken by single persons in private or publicly and en masse, but translate the words into deeds wherever possible and whenever expedient. Such translation of our feelings and desires into action during and after the war have been the Giyus in Palestine, the Bricha and Haapela since the war, the breaking of new ground in our work of settlement, the manifestation of the spirit of non-submission to the present policy by the Yishuv. Without all these new facts which we have created there would have been no anvil on which to bring down the political hammer with full force. The hammer would have remained in the air or, if brought down too violently, would have fallen down.

But, fellow delegates, having said so much in praise of deeds, let me also say something in defence of the spoken word. Political struggle certainly does not mean keeping quiet. Sometimes you talk indirectly to your adversary from public platforms, through the press; sometimes you have to talk to him directly. Sometimes direct talking becomes an imperative necessity, lest a decisive chance of a concentrated political effort is missed. For instance, in my conviction such a focal point which made it necessary to talk, and talk directly, was the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee. When leaders of the movement appear on this platform to testify that they were against our appearing before that Committee, it is rather interesting and would certainly be most useful to know whether they are still of that opinion. It was said here that that Committee was a mere manoeuvre. Granted. But just because it was a manoeuvre, was it not essential to try and thwart it? It was said here that we went to the Committee, but the British Government refused to implement its recommendations. So what? Suppose we hadn't gone, would there have been a greater readiness to grant us at one go the 100,000 certificates? Having appeared before the Committee and made our case, hasn't our capacity for the continuation of the attack grown stronger? Consider the array of weapons which were placed in our hands by the Committee's recommendations, passed unanimously by all the 12 members, British and American: the recommendation for an immediate grant of 100,000 permits, to be distributed as quickly as possible; their conclusion that a mass exodus of Jews from Europe, of hundreds of thousands, is unavoidable; their conclusion, stated quite squarely, that Palestine is the only country which could take these people and the only one to which they want to go; the conclusion that the Land Law of 1940 must go; the conclusion that even after the admission of the 100,000, Jewish immigration must never be subject to Arab consent or even Arab acquiescence; the reaffirmation of certain principles of the Mandate and of its whole basis, namely that Palestine is not a country where the British Government can reign supreme without any regard to its international obligations. A very formidable amount of effort was put into the preparation of our case and an appearance before the Committee in Washington, in London, throughout Europe and finally in Jerusalem. That effort was not in vain. It yielded a return. It by no means gave us all we wanted. Nevertheless, it gave us a great deal.

My friend Tabenkin argued here that it is inconceivable that we should take part in any negotiations so long as the White Paper stood. But Tabenkin and his friends were against our appearing

before the Anglo-American Committee. It is interesting to know whether they still stick to that position. Did our appearance before the Committee strengthen or weaken the White Paper policy? I submit that it resulted in enormous undermining of the moral and political authority of the White Paper of 1939.

Mr. Neumann said we went to the 1939 Conference and got the White Paper of 1939. Again, so what? May I suggest that our movement would have had a most uneasy conscience; it would have been very sorely tried, it would have had to go through most painful heart-searchings, had it not gone to the Conference of 1939 and had it been afterwards faced with that pernicious document as the basis for future British policy in Palestine. I submit that the Executive of those days would have had a very difficult task to explain why it had foregone making one supreme last minute effort by going to the conference in order to avert that policy or at least to try and mitigate it. I submit that it would have been most unwise for us to supply the government with a purely gratuitous excuse for ushering in that policy by reference to the fact that the Jews themselves had let their case go by default. Has our capacity to oppose and to fight the White Paper Policy been in any way impaired by our having gone to the 1939 Conference? Not in the slightest. Mr. Neumann, if I understood him correctly, was careful not to draw final conclusions as to whether we should or should not go to the London Conference. So will I refrain from drawing definite conclusions. It is certainly not for me to do that before the Political Commission has met and considered the question more fully than is possible to consider it at a plenary session of Congress. But I would like to say one thing. If we do go, it will be to us a new opportunity of putting up a fight for our future. We will not be presiding over the liquidation of Zionism. I may have no authority for making such a statement, but I am expressing my confident hope that whoever is elected at this Congress and if it is decided to go - whether by Congress itself or by the Executive, in case it is left to the Executive to take that decision - will not be presiding over the liquidation of Zionism. Whoever goes will go to proclaim and defend our rights, and in the rather probably event of a negative result, that appearance of ours in conference with the British Government and parallel to the negotiations with the Arabs, will serve to prepare the Jewish people for the next stage of our struggle.

Whether we go or not, our programme, the programme of the Zionist movement, remains unchanged. We stand on our full claims. But let there be no mistake about it. By merely saying that we have not solved the problem by one jot. Because the question before us is not that of enunciating a formula or proclaiming an attitude; it is our responsibility to do the utmost in order to achieve results. Our aim must be maximum independence for a maximum constructive effectiveness; maximum independence must mean real power; maximum effectiveness for our constructive effort should not be taken merely as a relative term; it is something quite definite. That in itself precludes completely the discussion of the Morrison Plan. We don't know what the outcome will be. As a Zionist movement which was founded in the dark days of Ottoman rule in Palestine, which has survived Ottoman domination, which has gone through all the trials and tribulations of the Mandatory regime, which is now ready for any new ordeal that may be awaiting it, we are firmly resolved to carry on under any conditions in



Palestine. If we have worked under the corruption and obscurantism of Ottoman sultans, we shall certainly go on working under British oppression. But we cannot rest content with such a philosophical attitude. We must brace every effort to break through. We may fail, but it is our responsibility to try, and try the utmost.

Consider the position. Take immigration. Some friends would have us go back or, rather, insist that the Mandatory Government should go back to the status quo ante 1938. Now you can perhaps muster pressure and strength in order to achieve some one-time change in the position, but how it is proposed to generate in the unwilling hearts of the Mandatory Government a continuous and active will to carry the burden which they refuse to carry is beyond my comprehension. Is it conceivable that simply by pointing a pistol, you can force a government continuously to do something which they are determined not to do? Take development. Formally, we have today Palestine undivided and undiminished. But is it actually so? From the point of view of facilities for our colonising effort, you all know the position. The law hems us in in a tiny part of Palestine. Of course, we have managed to bore many a hole in the land law of 1940. We have managed, in the teeth of the law, to take over land, to buy land, acquire land, call it what you will. We have managed to put up settlements in the very heart of the prohibited zone. The map of Palestine today, as regards Jewish settlements, is today totally different from what it was when the land law was passed. It presents an entirely different picture and has belied the expectations of the government that the White Paper of 1939 would crystallise as for all time.

Nevertheless, there is a very serious question: How long can we go on that way? And whether we cannot imagine an arrangement whereby we would be able to go on much quicker and on a much broader basis than the way we are trying to carry on today. Take our latest achievement in that field, the establishment overnight of eleven new settlements in the Negeb - in that northern belt of the Negeb, mind you, which, if we are informed correctly, is under the Morrison Scheme to be included in the Arab Zone; because it is only the southern triangle of the Negeb, which is almost completely barren, that goes to the British, supposedly as a would-be military base; so in that northern belt of the Negeb, which is a region of great promise for irrigation and intensive settlement, we have succeeded in setting up that dozen settlements.

It is incorrect to say and I am sorry Chezen made that mistake here yesterday, that we were sadly remiss as regards that colonising effort; that we had quite unjustifiably delayed it for a whole year simply because we were absorbed in high politics, and our energies were too much taken up with the formulation of high-sounding phraseology. That is not the case. It is true that the announcement of the Morrison Scheme was a very powerful stimulant to our daring. Danger always breeds courage, but the fundamental fact is that until we found water in that part of the country, it would have meant merely that one might term a political occupation of those areas with very slender prospects of real settlement and proper agricultural development. Now in the course of last year we bored for and found water in areas lying to the north of that region. Having succeeded in that and having also taken our agricultural experiments one stage further, we felt more sure of ourselves in embarking upon the next stage. Even so, it is a very daring adventure upon which we sent the groups of very young men and women, boys and girls aged 19 and 20, and we have carried it through. Now we hope to carry out a regional irrigation scheme. We hope to be able to give water also to Arabs

in that region. We hope to be able to demonstrate that the land law is not only unrealisable, but that it stands condemned by any progressive economic standard as a piece of reactionary, retrograde legislation.

All this we have managed to do and we hope to continue along that road. But can there be a certainty that we shall be able to go on until all the opportunities that ought to be ours have been exhausted? What about more ambitious irrigation schemes? Mind you, we have not yet heard the last word even about that modest local scheme - whether we shall actually be allowed to carry it into effect; but supposing we are, what about the greater irrigation schemes which we have put forward as such powerful arguments in our political campaigns, for which we have made so much publicity, and rightly, too, because they demonstrated the capacity of Palestine to absorb very large numbers of people, millions of people, and raise the whole country to a much higher level of development and prosperity? Can there be any doubt that so long as the present British regime continues, all those schemes will stay relegated to the files?

Take the question of our economic development generally. The war has quickened the process of our coming of age, so to speak, in the economic sense. We are much more mature today economically than we were in the pre-war period. But it was exactly in the same period in which we achieved our economic maturity that we were subjected to a most far-reaching system of governmental controls. Now we and the government of Palestine are more often than not at cross purposes on fundamental economic problems. There is no unity of will. There is no unity of purpose. There are instruments in the hands of the government which we cannot use and which the government refuses to use in our interests. So it is in regard to the Arab boycott. So it is in regard to the terrific problem of the high cost of living which is a very serious brake upon the absorption of immigrants. We are powerless to solve this problem in the only way which it can be solved, in a way which is contributory to Jewish immigration and settlement. Measures which the government is proposing we cannot accept. Measures which we urge are unacceptable to the government. So we are in a state of deadlock. Things are not moving and we are paying the price.

Take the grave problem of our defence. Can we divest ourselves of direct and final responsibility for our own defence? Can we entrust that to anyone else? The countries around us, not merely the population around us in Palestine, but the neighbouring countries outside Palestine are armed and are being armed. Who is to care for the Jews except the Jews themselves? Whose is the final, residuary responsibility? And what does it mean to bear that responsibility? Again that responsibility must be translated into action. It calls for a series of direct, practical measures. Now are those measures in harmony with the existing regime, or, for that matter, with any governmental regime which is not of our making? They are not and cannot be. What results is a permanent conflict, a conflict which cannot be resolved within the present political framework. It leads to a continuous strain. It is replete with danger. It results in one crisis after another. It creates an untenable position both for the government and for ourselves.

Can we rely that this untenable position, this complete lack of stability, will somehow survive the worst ?

Take our international position, both on the great scene of world affairs and within that corner to which we are confined in the Middle East. It has already been said so many times, there are seven countries around us which have achieved their independence, some of them with populations smaller and much more backward than ours selves. Five of them are already members of UN. The memberships of the others are in the offing. Now let it not be said that Palestine as a country is not represented; that is to say, that neither the Jews nor the Arabs of Palestine are represented. For all practical intents and purposes, the Arabs of Palestine have their representatives in UN because the voice that speaks for them in UN whether it be the voice of Egypt, or Saudi Arabia, or Iraq, or the Lebanon, or Syria, or tomorrow of Trans-Jordan or the Yemen, is an Arab voice. The Palestinian Arabs are but a fragment of that great race. The political unit which the Arab race constitutes has already five seats in UN. We have none. Now, our question is bound to appear before UN sooner or later. Who is to speak for us ? Can we rely on the sympathy of disinterested friends ? Can we rely on the game of politics played behind the scenes that it should lead some powers to help us not Meshavat Mordekhai but Misin'at Haman ?

And what about our direct relations with that Arab world ? The conclusion is the same. What we have around us is a system of states. Their opposition to our claim to statehood is today very strong, but the very strength of the opposition is evidence that to them it is not a mere dream or phantasy of ours. It would not have been so strong had they not felt in their heart of hearts that this is something very serious and quite practicable; that unless they watch us very carefully we might pull it off. It is because they feel they are convinced that this is a very real claim and a very imminent issue that they are mobilising their forces in opposition to such an extent. It means that once the claim has been satisfied, the fact will be accepted.

For we have not come to Palestine to run away from our neighbours. We are not interested in shutting ourselves off. We came to stay and to be integrated in the structure of that part of the world. We definitely belong to it. We are prepared to identify ourselves with it. But only on one condition- as equals. Integration, if there is equality; identification, if there is equality; and equality means statehood.

Now for how long must we continue the argument against the panacea of Bi-Nationalism. It isn't merely that Bi-Nationalism is impracticable. By-Nationalism throws the whole problem completely out of focus. It is a solution completely incongruous with the problem. Because the problem before us is not how to compose the differences between two static units inhabiting the same country. It is not the problem which faced Lord Curzon on his mission to Canada in the 60's of the last century. It is not the problem that faced the cantons of Switzerland. Palestine is not a static country. The crux of the matter is Jewish immigration, the connection of the country with a people scattered throughout the world. In the first and last, it is not the problem of Palestine, but the problem of the Jewish people. Bi-Nationalism

may be an answer to the problem of Palestine as a country, if that was all that we had to solve. Bi-Nationalism offers no solution at all to the problem of the Jewish people as a people scattered throughout the world without a country of its own and without a place in the family of nations. It completely shifts the basis of discussion into a sphere which is utterly unreal and irrelevant to the purpose that we have in mind.

But apart from that, is it practicable? Is it practical politics in our generation? One may well envisage a state of things in which Jews and Arabs live amicably together and co-operate in solving the problems of their common State. Today, it is a dream. It is just Bi-Nationalism that would today lead to the policy of divide and impera in Palestine: as there is no common basis between the two communities, on which a unitary state structure could be erected, inevitably the power of decision will have to remain in the hands of the third party. Therefore, Bi-Nationalism, if adopted, will merely serve as a new cloak to disguise direct British rule.

The tragic example which Chazan has here adduced proves the contrary of his thesis.

Next consider the inexorable facts of Palestine's demography, of the problem of population and of its natural increase. Incidentally, may I say that the question of stimulating the natural increase of the Yishuv is one which should engage the attention of this Congress, and that that attention should find its expression in a financial appropriation which would enable us to embark on a large number of births in Palestine. Anyhow, this is a fundamental political problem which cannot be ignored.

Finally, take the problem of the international regime in which we live. I have very little to add on this score to what was so brilliantly stressed by my friend Nahum Goldman. I told him that in coming to address you after him I felt as if I was trying to light a candle in a floodlit room. I would just say this. The whole conception of the formal dependence of one country upon another is disappearing from the political map of the world. Dependent countries are either completely absorbed into the territory and state structure of their stronger neighbours or their formal connection with the stronger party is severed and some other arrangement is substituted.

Apart from that, in our own experience throughout the evolution of British policy in Palestine, the outstanding feature is a gradual and inexorable shifting of the emphasis from our rights regarding the future to the hard facts of the actual position; that is to say, from the recognition of our historical claim to Palestine or the acceptance of the Zionist vision as a starting point of policy, to the realities of the situation. It is a trend to assimilate our unique position to the general uniform pattern of world conditions.

If you go through the series of successive White Papers and legislative measures enacted in Palestine, you will clearly see this trend. Now unless we manage in this eleventh hour to put ourselves upon the foundations of reality, to place our political



structure on the basis of facts and rights rooted in facts which we can proceed to exercise straightaway, and bring within that structure the maximum that can be brought in as far as margins of future expansion are concerned, territorial and economic, we may be heading for a real disaster of liquidation. For let there be no mistake - there is a very real and determined attempt to liquidate Zionism.

I submit that these considerations go to the very core of the matter and that they outweigh certain arguments logically cogent, legally unanswerable, dialectically most ingenious, which have been put forward here with a view to indicting the Executive of a political inconsistency.

When men are imbued with an unholy impatience to achieve results, to avert a disaster, to open the way for a large-scale effort of rescue and rehabilitation by the achievement of Statehood, they may be forgiven an apparent inconsistency. They would have had a much more serious charge to meet if they had failed in their duty to try and try and try again in order to attain the utmost.

I hope I will not be committing an indiscretion if I say that from my talks in Jerusalem, during the stay there of the Anglo-American Committee, with my friend Mr. Neumann I gained the impression that he himself was fully alive to the weight and gravity of these considerations and that he was ready to draw certain practical conclusions from those basic premises.

Naturally, none of us can guarantee that even this much is easily or at all achievable, now or within the immediate future. If nothing of the sort is achieved which would constitute an indispensable minimum, our struggle will go on. But try we must. Remember, the movement has a conscience and that there are deeper conceptions of responsibility vis-à-vis the future than those expressed today which lie hidden in the movement's heart, which will one day come out and demand an answer and formulate quite a different indictment. Let us try and meet not only the day of judgment as it stands today, but that future day of judgment. Let us not miss any conceivable chance. Let us leave no stone unturned. Let us close no avenue in advance.

I said if there is no minimum satisfaction of our claims, our struggle will go on. I do not propose to go here into details as to what that struggle should comprise. But I must make clear, in view of the fact that the subject has been raised by others, what I consider lies outside its permissible scope. I will try and say it briefly, but as clearly as I can. And in so doing I am giving my personal opinion for what it is worth.

The Yishuv and the Zionist movement cannot and will not tolerate being misrepresented in the eyes of the world as a murderous, bloodthirsty monster, or as a body of men and women ready to harbour without protest or opposition such a monster in their midst. They cannot and will not tolerate that groups of Jews who have cut themselves off from the framework of national discipline should let their doctrinaire fanaticism and perverted political reasoning determine a disastrous course of events affect the fate of the entire people.

We listened yesterday to an extraordinary declaration made by Mr. Grossman which had a bearing on this subject. To me it was a signal act of self-abnegation on his part. He identified himself with certain groups in Palestine. But the members of these groups are by no means ready to identify themselves with him. They are not prepared to accept his authority or leadership. They keep their own counsel. Naturally, they will cash in on the compliments paid to them yesterday from this platform. Yet they will give nothing in return. Speaking quite calmly and I hope dispassionately I should like to say, again in my own name for what it is worth, that Mr. Grossman and his friends will not be able to square that attitude with the continued membership of the World Zionist Organisation.

They have two alternative courses open to them within the World Organisation, none other. The one is to exert their influence, as far as it goes, in order to try and prevail upon these people to re-enter the national fold, submit to national discipline and accept all the far-reaching limitations as well as enjoy all the privileges which this involves: the other is to disavow them completely. In my conviction, there is no third course open to Mr. Grossman and his colleagues within the World Zionist Organisation. If there is a third course, it is to quit.

Mr. Grossman made a further statement yesterday which, if I understood him correctly, sounded like a threat. I hope I misunderstood him. Anyhow, that was the impression created and he cannot object if I react accordingly. Mr. Grossman should beware of playing with fire. He would be well advised to keep off that subject at least in public discussion because if, God forbid, that fire does break out, it is not those whom Mr. Grossman regards as his opponents who will be the first to be consumed.

The line followed by those groups is not merely morally disastrous, it is politically senseless. The whole point of our struggle in Palestine, whatever form it may assume under national direction, is to demonstrate the unity of the Yishuv and of the whole movement behind it. That is the only compelling force which the manifestation of our determination to resist, of our refusal to submit, can hope to possess. But here the opposite effect is achieved. It is a demonstration of the complete isolation of those groups, of the dissociation of the Yishuv from their course of action. Their tactics, therefore, defeat their own purpose. And let me sound a warning. There is an inevitable logic in the development of certain trends. From external and indiscriminate terrorism, the development leads to an internal and discriminate terrorism. We have had instances of it in Palestine recently. And we had the same kind of development in the camp of our neighbours in Palestine in former years: From indiscriminate terrorism against us they eventually passed to internal terrorism directed against definite persons. Let all clearheaded Jews and Zionists who are determined to oppose the present official policy to the bitter end, see clearly where the present course of the dissident terrorist groups is liable to lead us. Let us all put our heads together and our hands together in order to avert that disaster.

This calamitous phase of the situation cannot detract our attention from the main object in view of opposing the present régime. We are all - I hope, all - extremely anxious to avoid a conflict, have always been. But it does not depend upon us. For the time being the British

Government persists in the disastrous blunder which they committed in 1939, and one blunder leads to another. One such blunder by way of "averah goreret averah" was the Latrun Chapter.

Somebody told me, I did not myself hear the words, that one of the speakers here said that the release of some of us from Latrun had come as an act of grace on the part of the British Government. I should like to say that as sure as I stand here before you tonight, it is my conviction and the conviction of my friends with whom I shared that honourable position of being a detainee in the heart of Palestine, that our release came as a triumph of the unity and firmness of the Yishuv, of the Zionist movement and of the entire Jewish people.

I wish somebody else had said it, but, anyhow, I consider it my political duty to say it. Unless one adopts the philosophy that it is a "mitzvah" not to be released, except by an army of liberation which can by force cut through the barbed wire enclosures, short of that I do not think that there could be a more honourable release. It was, in fact, a most honourable release. Why? Because it came as a result of the government having come to the conclusion that it had failed in the object which it set itself when it put us behind barbed wire. Having come to that conclusion, they still tried to gain something on the transaction and to hedge the release with all sorts of conditions. Those conditions were rejected by the Executive in London, and we were released unconditionally. In that attempt, too, the government failed. The release did not, of course, improve our general position. We have not advanced one jot from where we were before. On the contrary, new setbacks were experienced in the meantime. It was during our stay in Latrun that the new practice of deporting Jews from Palestine, shipload after shipload, was initiated and it still continues. But as far as that imprisonment or detention was concerned, we emerged from the ordeal strengthened, and we can face the task of our future political struggle with heads raised high. It was not a trial of strength in the usual sense of the term, but it was certainly a trial of the strength of character, and in that trial we did not fail.

The question is, what of the future. Will courage, wisdom and justice prevail or are we in for a second round of political struggle after the present relative lull. If we are in for the second round, quite obviously it will not be a matter for the Yishuv alone. Our struggle is a manysided affair and a joint responsibility of the Yishuv and the Diaspora. Not only the Zionist movement, the entire Jewish people must play their part. It should be Zionist policy to mobilise all its energies. We are now embarking on a new political course - the quest for a new political basis for our work. The change has not come of our own accord - it has been forced on us. The quest has become necessary through the crumbling up of the political framework within which we worked and struggled and progressed in the inter-war period. It was the framework of the British Mandate. The war has merely delayed the crisis. It first came in 1939, but we had not yet felt its full impact when the war supervened and overshadowed it. With the conclusion of the war, the crisis broke on us with its full force. The maps by which we steered our Zionist vessel until then, are now obsolete. The Mandatory regime is a thing of the past. We have emerged from it into an unknown future. We start now on a voyage through an uncharted sea.


Meanwhile the storm is raging. One's heart prays for a firm and resourceful lead, for a clear vision, for internal unity. Is it too much to hope that our dire need for a country and a State of our own, the courage and devotion of our youth, the strength which we already possess in Palestine, the determination and sublime bravery of our maspilim, the unity of our people rallied to the banner of Zion - is it too much to hope that all these will carry us through ?

---





After the Congress we must <sup>again</sup> take the  
initiative to bring this (partition) plan  
to the Brit Govt.

If this is a question of facts  
Ask more to WRTIS - Why not  
ask for Trans  - (Revision  
applied).

Against any ~~two~~ resolutions which will  
bind the Executive. - We can have an  
"elastic" resolution - which will come out  
either for or against partition.

4m



# קונגרס

## Congregation

Basle

No. 4

13-12-46

### World Zionist Congress: Eighth Session

The eighth session of the World Zionist Congress was presided over by Rabbi Dr. L. Rabinowitz. Telegrams were read from Belgium, Sweden, Poland, Argentine, Brazil, Lins/Austria and from the World Union for the Hebrew Language.

Dr. Felix Rosenbluth addresses Congress

Presenting the point of view of Aliyan Unasana, Dr. Felix Rosenbluth said his party stood for progress and democracy, large-scale and uninterrupted immigration and international support for our constructive enterprises and challenged the arbitrary resort to violence. Dr. Rosenbluth said that orientation and a policy of self-sufficiency was a demagogic slogan, good for mass meetings, but empty and futile. We could not orient ourselves to Uno, Russia or America and only England remained. We required her protection surrounded as we were by Arab neighbours with whom an understanding was remote. Activism had damaged our chance of England's support: we must further Aliyah by all means, but we must keep away from activism. Comparison of our movement with Irish liberation was false. People forget that the Irish struggle lasted for hundreds of years. The outside world cannot be expected to appreciate shades of differences between various forms of violence and the result of the teaching of activism was that the young people of the Yishuv themselves could not distinguish between its various forms. In Palestine the consequences were visible and the British Government stubbornly refuses to yield on immigration until law and order have been established. The Army had been given extraordinary power, the Jewish Agency Executive members arrested and its offices occupied. Did we have to invite these defeats? How could the Executive risk staking everything on one card? Even assuming that the hazardous experiment of activism had been justified in the past, then the experiment had failed and the time had come to give it up.

### MR. I. TABENKIN

Mr. I. Tabenkin, speaking on behalf of his party, Siye l'Ahduth Avodah, said that the Zionist Congress was called upon by the Jewish people to fulfil a historic task in the struggle for Jewish survival. He did not remember any Congress at which the reality of Palestine was evident so little as at this Congress. Not in terms of delegates, but the living reality has not found expression in the Congress. Nor had the living reality of European Jewry made its presence felt. As a representative from Palestine and as a Chelutz, he felt he must tell the Congress that it is its obligation to take part in the struggle before us. The Congress itself must be a phase of the struggle, it cannot be a substitute for it. This is a conflict between the British Mandatory Power and the Jewish people and in the forefront stands the "Masgil".

It is the battle of the whole Jewish people against whom war has been declared.

Immigration is not merely a part of Zionism. It has become the only possibility for our continued existence. The closing of the gates of Palestine is a threat to the whole Jewish people, it means that a third of the population of Palestine is menaced with the fate which has always confronted our people, to be condemned to a permanent minority status. We should remember that a state cannot be secured at a Round Table, moreover this table is not round, it is sharp and angular.

There are some who would have us believe that the policy of intimidation upon which the Government had embarked was provoked by terrorism. It is not so. Long before they had begun to hunt the refugees and to search for arms. We should not permit this policy of intimidation to cow us; we have memories of a greater intimidation, that of Treblinka and Auschwitz, and the fear of homelessness inspires us with greater dread. - a dread which becomes overwhelming at a time when a Third World War is being freely discussed. And it is perhaps this conflict on the horizon which is the real reason that Palestine has become an armed camp. Unless we can bring 200,000 Jews a year to Palestine, the peril will be greater than the intimidation of Latrun and Refia and Cyprus.

The Zionist Organisation must become a great instrument of Jewish unity which will be able to stand firm against the power that rules in Palestine. But it cannot co-operate with the Government of the White Paper. Though it may have been loyal in the past, it can no longer owe allegiance to a Government that is in itself founded on an illegal document, the White Paper of 1939. Mr. Tabenkin went on to say "We understand Ben Gurion's defence of Dr. Goldman, we understand Goldie Myerson's loyalty to the Executive, but Dr. Goldman when he goes to talk to Governments does not represent the Executive alone, he speaks in the name of the whole Jewish people.

What happened since we adopted the Biltmore Resolution? Was it a change of heart by the British Government or was it the 29th June which caused the change of formula from "Palestine as a Jewish State" to "Jewish and Arab States in Palestine"? And if repression continues, shall we retreat to the Morrison Plan and even further? The opponents of partition are told that the Executive must be free to take a line in an emergency. If so, what is the point of our being on the Political Commission? Eretz Israel is indivisible. Should we create puppet Jewish and Arab States. With Britain in the saddle it will lead to even graver friction between Jews and Arabs and there is no future unless we find the way of living with our neighbours.

#### DELEGATE FROM GERMAN CAMP ADDRESSES CONGRESS

There was a dramatic moment at Congress when the representative from Germany, Mr. Traeger, rose to speak. He said that 98% of the people in the Camps wanted to go to Palestine. They remembered that peoples amongst whom they had lived for centuries had joined in Jewish extermination. Even now they were living amongst those who had taken part in the massacres. He pleaded that the 25,000 children in Europe who were left should be allowed to go to the place where they can grow up and become decent citizens. He praised the emissaries from Palestine. Palestine was the only hope. All other ways would lead to degeneration and decay.

MR. SHRAGAI'S ADDRESS

Mr. Shragai (Mizrachi) opened his address by declaring, "The sole solution we suggest is a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine. And such a decision, if accepted by Congress, must not be merely a pious wish, but a decision binding on the Executive. They must work to persuade public opinion in England and America, and seek to convince the Governments of these countries. In particular must the Yishuv in Palestine be convinced. And the Executive should not be allowed to act against such a decision."

Mr. Shragai went on to say that the second resolution this Congress should accept was that under present conditions, the Executive should not participate in the London Conference. Should a new situation arise in which the basic demands of our movement could be discussed, the Jewish Agency could then consider whether it could serve as a basis for participation in the Conference. It was clear that since the Mandate and up to now, England had done everything to impede the development of Palestine and to create difficulties. After these difficulties had been created, England had used them as an excuse to do nothing to further the development of Jewish Palestine. Hitherto we had been unsuccessful in moving the Government from this position. When we came with a compromise in order to reach agreement with the Arabs and in order to obtain increased immigration, the Government did everything to nullify such a compromise. The compromise of partition has been rejected by England. The moral of that was that by compromising we would not convince the British Government. Such a step only showed England that we were prepared to renounce our rights. Therefore, it should be our axiom that we should demand the whole of Palestine as a Jewish State.

Mr. Shragai added that it should be clear to us by now that by political negotiations alone we should not achieve anything. Therefore our policy had to be accompanied by: (a) continuous immigration under all conditions and by all means; (b) a wide network of settlements in all parts of Palestine; (c) the accompaniment of these two conditions by a permanent struggle of the Yishuv. This would show that the Jews were ready to fight for the development of the whole of Palestine as a Jewish State.

"But," Mr. Shragai declared, "I stress very strongly that we are against the 'Porshim' organisations. (This is a reference to the terrorist organisations in Palestine, described by the Yishuv as outlaws) Using two armies and two general staffs to fight a battle can never succeed, and the battle can never be won. There is also danger of civil war."

"I am also against their acts of terrorism," Mr. Shragai continued. "When we say that we are against the acts of the British Government, we also say that we are against the plundering and slaughter of people who have no influence whatsoever on these acts. We are against the murdering of simple soldiers in the streets of Tel Aviv. This does not mean that we should not have an army of our own to conduct our war as we think it should be conducted."

"We also say that as long as England insists upon the Morrison Plan we cannot participate in discussions with her. There are already two sides ranged against us, the English and the Arabs. I consider it therefore preferable not to participate in such a Conference, so that England would not be able to say that the Jews had participated in the negotiations, and her decision is the result of that participation. And if we did not participate, we had two tasks (a) immigration, settlement, security, struggle. (b) Political work in all countries, and particularly in England and the United States. Such work should not be confined to one party. We had to deal both with capitalists and socialists.



Mr. Shragai expressed the view that Jewry in the whole of Europe was in great danger of assimilation. Assimilation everywhere reared its ugly head. And the danger existed even in Palestine. Because if there was not the observance of the Jewish Torah and its Commandments, the Jews did not know what distinguished them from other people. In America public opinion had been aroused by the fact that on the 29th June the Shabbat had been desecrated by the British. How could we demand from the non-Jews observance of the sanctity of the Sabbath when our own leaders had not done so? "Therefore," concluded Mr. Shragai, "I sum up: our task must be Aliyah, Hityashvut, struggle, Zionist education and the fulfilment of the Torah."

### 22nd Zionist Congress: Ninth Session.

#### ADDRESS BY MRS. JUDITH EPSTEIN

The ninth session of Congress opened at 4.30 p.m. on Thursday 12th December, 1946, with an address by Mrs. Judith Epstein, President of Hadassah. Mrs. Epstein began by saying that the political debate so far had been, for her, somewhat unreal, for there were such very large areas of agreement, that the area of disagreement seemed to be artificially stimulated. On the large area of agreement, everybody believed with his whole heart and soul in the great undertaking, the miracle of the upbuilding of Palestine. No one who had followed the development of that little land and had seen what had been done when the passion and the will to live and create had been applied to a land that had been a desert, could fail to believe in this great undertaking.

Hadassah, the speaker continued, was perhaps more fortunate than other groups in that it had a small but very definite and direct tie with that upbuilding programme through the living contact with Youth Aliyah, through the health care of immigrants, through its social service help in the new Palestine. Hadassah shared with all who had spoken and who would speak an understanding of the great importance of the Palestine upbuilding programme.

Hadassah understood, too, what resistance in Palestine meant. It was the symbol that the Yishuv had attained that kind of maturity on which nationhood was built. As with the American Revolution, when no orders were too great to be placed against the necessity of winning freedom, so in Palestine; there was no one who had any understanding of the tremendous impulses which lead men to seek freedom and independence and self-respect, who did not understand what resistance in Palestine means. "It sometimes", said Mrs. Epstein, "and we face this with sad knowledge, means bloodshed, destruction and loss of life. We have gone into Palestine to build and not to destroy. And it is a matter of deep tragedy that the magnificent efforts, the will to create of our youth should have to be diverted to what is a matter of urgent and moral necessity."

But, Mrs. Epstein went on, so long as our young people undertook these tasks, knowing that they were ugly and hard, but necessary, then we could face it. But when it became something that was gladly approached, then it was bad. That was our attitude toward resistance. We understood as a magnificent symbol uncertificated immigration, whereby boats came into the Harbour bringing the men, women and the children who were determined that nothing should stop them from entering a land which they regarded as home. There was only one definition of a home, and that was a place which one could enter at will. But having said that, Mrs. Epstein continued, stirred as one was by these

indications of the will to live and by these signs of nationhood, one had to say that these magnificent assets were no programme for the solution of the Jewish problem. What Congress had to seek was an international, political programme which would make by law something which was a fact, a Jewish nation and a Jewish State.

Turning to the question of the continuance of the Mandate, Mrs. Epstein said that speaking for Hadassah "to speak of continuing efforts to secure the implementation of the Mandate is to lull oneself from taking the kind of action that is necessary to solve the problem now".

Mrs. Epstein described the frustrations suffered by the Jewish Agency in their struggle to secure the full implementation of the Mandate. A Royal Commission had said that the Mandate was unworkable. To imagine that one could breathe new life into the Mandate that would wipe away all the bitterness and ugliness and bring in a new ideal relationship was to indulge in a false dream which would lead us nowhere. "Therefore we say that we must end now find the way to establish that independence which will give us that right to create that economic absorptive capacity, to create the conditions for bringing our Jews into Palestine in our own ships and under conditions which will tell them that they are coming home. We need that status that will give us the self-respect that all peoples need", declared Mrs. Epstein.

Turning to political activity in America, Mrs. Epstein said that without seeking to exaggerate Zionist advances in America on the political front, it would be wrong to minimise what had been done. America not only participated in the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee; America was still in the picture. Due to the efforts of American Zionist Emergency Council and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the Morrison-Grady Plan had been rejected by the United States Government. That was no small accomplishment, and the speaker hoped that much fuller co-operation could be secured from America. It was of advantage to America and to American interests that there be a stable, highly developed industrialised Jewish State in the Middle East. For America wanted peace. War was wrought by the terrible underprivileged of this world. There could be no peace when there are people who starve. An industrialised Jewish State that would be a demonstration centre for the whole Middle East would inevitably raise the level of living of all peoples, said Mrs. Epstein. And American Jewry had a very special contribution to make, over and above the contribution in resources, money and political support. America possessed those economic skills which had made her the arsenal of democracy in war and the leading industrial nation of this world. This economic skill and technical ingenuity had to be placed at the disposal of Jewish Palestine.

Turning, in conclusion, to the immediate political programme, Mrs. Epstein said that it was foolhardy to speak and think as though we had now at this point our destiny completely in our own hands. She did not underestimate for one moment the strength of the Yishuv, of the determination of the European Jewry to break through and find a home, of that indestructible will of the Jewish people the tyrants had been unable to break. That was our great and noble asset. Without it we would have no hope. But on the other hand it was

foolhardy not to understand that we were part of a whole world complex, a disturbed world in turmoil, where the tug for power involved and enmeshed us. We needed a Jewish State in order to save our Jewish people. "We must have a Jewish State: and if I quote the words of Ben Gurion, 'In our life time', I translate them to mean 'Now'," said Mrs. Epstein. "In order to accomplish that purpose", the speaker concluded, "one thing has to be kept before us. If you think as I think that the solution of the problem is Jewish Statehood, that is the core; that is the principle which must not be deserted, which must not be left, which must not be compromised. Flexibility and compromise in other directions which will leave untouched the essential needs of the Jewish people and the movement, Jewish nationhood, and Jewish statehood, those we can face with unanimity and courage. I hope that this Congress which faces a problem of desperate crisis will be able to keep before it that essential need. And I hope that in that amity and friendship and love that bind us all together, we can decide how best to accomplish that purpose".

#### Mr. Beal Locker addresses Congress

Mr. Locker began by referring to the speech made by Mr. Meir Grossman, which he characterized as aggressive in tone, not the speech of one who came back a repentant sinner. His friends, Locker said, in whose name he spoke, left the Zionist Organisation nine years ago. He, Mr. Grossman, had said nothing about their achievements during that time. Mr. Grossman only confirmed that which Mr. Eren had said from this platform about the new Zionist Organisation. Mr. Grossman spoke with a voice of warning. "Mr. Grossman," went on Mr. Locker,

"I warn you: yesterday you threatened us with internal terror. We shall not allow you to frighten us by your terrorist threats." Mr. Locker then dwelt on Dr. Silver's speech, and that of Mr. Neumann, and said, "I am the last to underestimate the importance of American Zionism. I readily agree that America, after all that has happened in Europe, has a great role to play in Jewish life and in the Zionist Movement, and that her responsibilities have grown in view of the political development which brought America into the problem of the Middle East and Palestine, but in Dr. Silver's speech one very important element was missing which America has still to show, - concern for the growth of Zionism, a growth that should not only be in breadth but also in depth. And when one talks about taking upon oneself the leadership of the movement, one should ponder as to whether one is properly chosen to do so. To this we have to give considerable thought and consideration." Mr. Locker asserted that Congress does not reflect in the number of American shekel holders commensurate with the size of American Jewry. A million shekelim were sold in America, but how many of the shekel holders went to the polls? Of the five million Jews in America, less went to the polls than in the case of the Jews in Palestine.

Referring to the speech of Mr. Shragai, Mr. Locker remarked: "Mr. Shragai, I am afraid, did not express an original idea when he contended that one of the causes of our political defeat had been that the Executive had concerned itself only with enlightenment in the Labour Party circles, and had neglected other parties. He asked who prevented them from talking to others. Did those who criticised us for this alleged default try themselves to contact Conservatives, Liberal and Religious circles? They did not. They were not able to do so. The truth is that the London Executive tried with all the means at its disposal to reach the circles of non-Labour people too. I myself approached Conservatives and Liberals more than once, and my friend Brodetsky, and certainly Dr. Weizmann and others had done so.

"And now let us come to the main subject which is being discussed," said Mr. Locker. "That which emerged in Paris had been given many names. There has been talk of panic, defeatism and intimidation. I have even heard the word Vichy. But the only factor that led us to adopt the Paris policy was the terrifying picture of the situation of Jews in Eastern European countries who are on their way from Poland to Germany, who are in camps, and on ships. It was our overwhelming feeling of gigantic responsibility which rests on the Zionist Movement which moved us. In Paris there were those who favoured partition and those who opposed it. The decision taken in Paris was almost unanimous. That doesn't mean at all that these decisions prevent us from seeking a final solution now. I don't know how Mr. Chazam has reached such a conclusion. I have not the feeling that we can wait any longer."

You may well ask us what assurance have you that we shall achieve a Jewish State? Such an assurance does not exist. But the question is not one of speculation but sober judgment as to whether the time has come to exert pressure on a world burdened with grave problems, and whether we should exploit this great urgency of ours in order to arouse the conscience of the world, so that we may at least secure the beginning of the final solution to our problems. I cannot understand why those who argue that this is no time for a final solution have such peculiar confidence in the present situation. Are the motives that drove England in 1939 to the White Paper any weaker? Has the Arabic opposition to Jewish immigration weakened? Is the fact that there are at present seven organised Arabic states united in a league designed to make opposition to Jewish immigration weaker?"

Turning to Mr. Chazam, Mr. Locker said, "He (Mr. Chazam) spoke not so much about the Mandate but about an international trusteeship of England, America and Russia. I don't know how much confidence he has in America, but as far as Russia is concerned, do we really know that Russia is with us. For a brief period we had some kind of illusion that there, in Russia, a certain change had taken place. In February 1945, the World Congress of the Trade Unions adopted the resolution of a Jewish State. The Russian delegates not only voted for that resolution, but actively helped to secure the resolution. But since then certain things have happened, and if on this matter a certain policy is being crystallised on Palestine, it is for the time being against us and not for us. This question is connected with influences and ambitions in the Middle East, and the struggle between England and Russia. This is not just a mere speculation. The Labour Government is first and foremost interested in one thing - the maintenance of the Empire, and I can't understand why we should aim at a rule of three Mandatory Powers instead of one power, after we have seen the fine results of such a combination in the conquered countries of Europe. We could be promised the moon, but would the promise be kept? It is a single historical act which will ensure us the minimum which we so sorely need at the present time. That minimum is worth great sacrifices. Some speak of a bi-national State. I cannot follow this line, but I do not believe this idea is founded on historic experience. It exists in no country. Even in Switzerland the majority rules in Parliament, and the minority vote has no political effect."

Mr. Locker then referred to Mr. Tabenkin's speech and said, "Mr. Tabenkin singled out Dr. Goldman for criticism, but he is wrong. Dr. Goldman acted on behalf of us all: on behalf of all those who participated in the Paris Conference. Rabbi Fishman yesterday repeated what he said in Paris: 'I love Palestine, I love the Jewish people very much, but if there should be a conflict between these two loves, then it is to the Jewish people that I should give preference, and I must make the sacrifice.' In Paris we said that we are ready to consider a plan for creating in Palestine a Jewish State in an adequate area of the country. We said a viable state and added in an adequate area of Palestine. We shall not agree to any kind of partition. The keys of the country will have to be in our hands; immigration, development, land, and above all the possibility to bring in our brothers and sisters who must be rescued."



DR. NAHUM GOLDMAN ADDRESSES CONGRESS

Dr. Nahum Goldman opened his address by observing that many critics in the political debate had sought to define a certain line in Zionism as "Goldmanism". Such a line did not exist. All that he had done in his political activities in Washington had been done with the general agreement of the leading institutions of the Zionist movement. The Actions Committee (Zionist General Council) could stop every move of his which he undertook. He had taken no action which had not been based on the condition that Congress could ratify or reject at its will. Much had been said about an agreement which had been signed on the question of partition. But no agreement had been made at all. Even if the other side would have been ready to sign such an agreement, we should have replied that our signature could come only through Congress, after its members had approved it. "To my mind", Dr. Goldman continued, "no Executive should receive authority to sign an agreement on our behalf, the contents of which we do not know. But one must not forbid the Executive to conduct negotiations if it considers them necessary." But the whole discussion, the speaker added, was somewhat empty, for it concerned a matter that did not exist.

Dr. Nahum Goldman then drew a picture of the circumstances in which the Executive, with the agreement of all but one member, had empowered him to go to Washington. "Noone", he said, "liked to discuss a Jewish State in a part of Palestine. But there were times of grave responsibility when one had to assume the burden. There were times when it was the duty to give an answer to the Jewish tragedy. Mr. I. Chazan was of the opinion that the disaster of Zionism consisted in its desire to obtain a Jewish State by means of a shortcut. But Mr. Chazan might have told us how he visualised our future development. If circumstances prevailed at present which gave us the possibility of receiving 100,000 Jews each year, and of continuing with the upbuilding of the country for the next ten or twenty years on this basis, then we could certainly have renounced the demand for a Jewish State. But the British Government believed that it could not at present realise the Mandate, which should lead to a Jewish State in Palestine. The Biltmore idea was a good one. And it was opportune. He, himself, had been among the six or seven people who had had a part in that programme. But it had been built on the hope that after the war, a different world would emerge, and that our just claims would be carried out. "Now", said Dr. Goldman, "the war is over. And it is clear that England is not ready to help. Not only is partition not granted; even immigration is refused. President Truman demanded more than once that 100,000 Jews should be allowed to enter Palestine. Later, an Enquiry Commission was sent which had unanimously recommended the immigration of 100,000 Jews. But the English disregarded all this. Our friends in the British Cabinet, not to speak of our enemies, argue that they would not fight for this immigration, for it would only mean the continuation of Arab opposition; it would mean a new conflict over another 100,000 after the first 100,000 certificates are granted. There is no final solution to this project. "Therefore", Dr. Goldman went on, "when a new hope appeared, even though there was no guarantee that this hope would materialise in a final solution, with heavy hearts we began the negotiations".

Dr. Goldman went on to say that there had been much talk of expressed and unexpressed opinions, about so-called other orientations

and about trusteeships. But he, Dr. Goldman, knew by personal experience when he was active at the League of Nations in Geneva, what it meant to do political work on an international scale. The troubles at the League of Nations were nothing compared to the situation which would confront us at UNO over trusteeships. At the League of Nations, who was with us, he asked. In the majority of cases, they were the small nations, peoples who were not interested in power politics. Now we were faced with the task of declaring to 50 nations that what was good for other nations might not necessarily be good for Palestine and for Zionism. For Palestine was a special case. And if we had to deal with UNO, it meant ~~convinced~~ trying to influence each member nation and educate them on the special nature of our problem to secure their support. Dr. Goldman then passed on to the question of terror. We Jews, he declared did not take sufficient account of the consequences of the situation should terrorism continue. There was a time when a certain conception had been built on an illusion of England's moral attitude. Reality had shown that this was a fatal error. England reacts in an uncertain manner to terrorism. Should the situation in Palestine continue, with ships turned away and conditions in the country much as they were at present, one could not say that England would not "dare" to take certain action. And it would be an illusion to rely on the morality of England or on the support of America to check that action.

"A change must come", said Dr. Goldman, "even if it has to be by a 'shortcut'. It is true that England has not yet given her consent to partition. But one cannot say that England has rejected this proposal. We therefore felt duty-bound in a period of political vacuum, to make the political attempt to break the deadlock. It is not true that the Morrison Plan was produced only after that, and only because we accepted the decision to discuss partition. The Morrison plan was produced before that step. American public opinion had a share in that plan. What we have achieved through our negotiations is that America has not withdrawn herself entirely from the problem of Palestine. Rumours were current that the American Cabinet - if one can speak of a Cabinet in America - had already decided to withdraw from the whole matter: and even in this small achievement lies a certain political success."

Dr. Goldman concluded by stressing that partition meant compromise. If they rejected this compromise, we were at liberty to make our claims. So long as there was still some hope of conducting negotiations, with the British Government, we should try it. "The Morrison Plan", said Dr. Goldman, "we shall not accept. Should the British Government reject all this, then we shall have to bring the matter to the United Nations. But in any case, our policy must be so devised as to be in a position to give a realistic reply to the demands of the Jewish people in our generation".

Dr. Goldman's address concluded the ninth session which was presided over by Mr. Meir Yaari.

The Tenth session of Congress, presided over by Miss Zivia Lubetkin, and addressed by Mr. Moshe Shertok, opened at 9 p.m. on Thursday 12th December, 1946. A full report will appear in our next issue of Congress Bulletin.

## CONGRESS NOTICES

### WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE WIZO

The 11th World Conference of the Wizo will open on Sunday evening, the 15th December in the Kaufmannischer Verein, Aeschengraben 15, Basel, at 7.45 p.m. The first session will be devoted to a memorial address in memory of the Jewish women who perished in Europe and greetings from a member in the D.P. camps. Later in the evening there will be addresses by Mrs. Rebecca D. Sieff and the Hon. Mrs. Edwin Samuel.

### YOUTH ORGANISATIONS

The date for the gathering for representatives of Zionist Youth Organizations has been advanced to Sunday the 15th December. Representatives and observers should note that the Sunday session will commence at 6.0 p.m. in the office of the Youth Department and will continue during the following day.

### HEBREW WORLD UNION

A Conference of the Hebrew World Union will take place on Monday, 16th December at 8.0 p.m. in the Grill Room of the Mustermesse Restaurant. All delegates to the Conference, and guests, are invited.

### KEREN HAYESOD AND KEREN KAYEMETH EXHIBITIONS

The Exhibitions of the Keren Hayesod and Keren Kayemeth which will be on view at the Baseler Halle (opposite the Mustermesse) will be opened at the same time at 11.30 a.m. on December 14th (Saturday). Delegates, guests and journalists are cordially invited.

### DR. STEPHEN WISE TO ADDRESS LOCAL COMMUNITY

On Wednesday, 18th December at 8.15 p.m. in the Bernoullianum, Basel, Rabbi Dr. Stephen Wise will address the Basel Israelitische Gemeinde on the subject of 'American Jewish Life.' Delegates, guests and journalists are invited to be present.

### HEBREW OPERA COMPANY ARRANGES CONCERT FOR DELEGATES

Under the auspices of the Committee for Hebrew Opera in Palestine, there will be a special concert by Mme. Edis de Philippe on Wednesday, 18th December in the Hubersaal of the Casino, Basel. All delegates and guests are invited.

### WORLD CONFERENCE OF JEWISH JOURNALISTS

A preliminary conference to discuss details of the setting up of a World Union of Jewish Journalists will be opened on Tuesday evening. Announcement as to time and place will be made later in this bulletin.



# קונגרס הציוני העולמי

## Congregation

Basle

No. 5

12-12-46

World Zionist Congress: Tenth Session

### ZIVIA LUBETKIN PRESIDES AT CONGRESS

When the Chairman of the Tenth Session of the World Zionist Congress took her seat she was greeted with prolonged applause. The gathering was expressing its tribute to this heroic young woman who had been a leader of the Jewish Resistance movement in Poland in the epic period of the Warsaw uprising.

### DELEGATE TO FIRST ZIONIST CONGRESS ADDRESSES ASSEMBLY

Dr. M. Ebner who was a delegate to the First Zionist Congress recalling the First Zionist Congress at Basle 50 years ago said he was one of the few surviving delegates of that historic gathering. Dr. Ebner acclaimed the decision of the Jewish National Fund to plant a Basle Forest, saying that we were a people that did not forget our friends. "Fifty years ago," said Dr. Ebner, "we were a people without a language and without a country. Now the Hebrew language lives in Eretz Israel and the land is coming to life again through Jewish toil and Jewish skill. We shall always remember the City of Basle with deep gratitude and affection and we extend to its people our best wishes.

### MR. M. SHERTOK'S POLITICAL ADDRESS

Mr. Moshe Shertok whose Political Address was delivered in English, opened with a warm tribute, in Hebrew, to Zivia Lubetkin who presided at the Session and to the heroic generation which she symbolised. The full text of Mr. Shertok's speech appears in the supplement.

### DISTURBANCE DURING POALE-ZION INTERPELLATION

After Mr. Shertok's speech, Mr. Louis Segal, American Poale-Zion delegate, mounted the rostrum to make an interpellation on behalf of the Ihud Olami. He asked whether the Revisionist Party had fulfilled the conditions of membership of the World Zionist Organisation as a legally constituted party by abolishing its own separate "New Zionist Organisation". He went on to ask whether, if this Organisation had not been dissolved, its members had left it before joining the Zionist Organisation and asserted that the continuation of a separate organisation by the Revisionists as a parallel organisation disturbed the unity of the Zionist movement and harmed its activities. He urged that it be stopped. He put forward as a demand of the Ihud Olami that the Revisionist delegates should make a statement on this matter from the tribune of the Congress.



Mr. Segal went on to allege that the Revisionists had made a separate approach to UNO in America asking that the Palestine question should be placed on the UNO agenda, and this action was contrary to the Constitution of the World Zionist Organisation. It was designed to undermine the authority of the World Zionist Organisation and showed that the Revisionists intended to continue a separate policy and were not prepared to accept Zionist discipline. Mr. Segal referred to the activities of the Bergson Group in America, which has done so much harm to the Zionist Organisation in which, he alleged, the Revisionist Party in America was playing an important part. He added that the same tendencies were noticeable in Mr. Grossman's speech, in which he (Mr. Grossman) had gone as far as to threaten terror against the authoritative bodies of the Jewish people. This provoked an uproar in the hall, Revisionist delegates protesting against what they described as a malicious lie and slander. For some time Mr. Segal was prevented from continuing his statement, Revisionist Delegates, accusing the Presidium of permitting the interpellation without having examined its contents and demanding the adjournment of the session for a meeting of the Presidium to consider the matter. Zivia Lubetkin, the Chairman formally called on Mr. David Rencz to take over the Chair. Mr. Rencz declared amidst uproar from both sides that the Congress Constitution permitted every party to make an interpellation without censorship; but requested Mr. Segal to eliminate the passage objected to until such time as the Presidium could consider the matter. This evoked a counter-objection from delegates who declared their opposition to the deletion of the passage as the result of the unparliamentary demonstration of a section of the Congress. The Chairman's suggestion, however, finally accepted, the assembly called a vote and Mr. Segal continued with his statement.

## 22nd Zionist Congress: Eleventh Session

The eleventh session of Congress, presided over by Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, opened on Friday morning, the 13th December, 1946, at 10 a.m.

Dr. Horlitz read telegrams of greetings from the following organisations: the Tel-Aviv Chamber of Commerce, the Union of Bessarabian Jews in Palestine, the Lodz Union, refugees in Rome, the Palestine Swiss Chamber of Commerce in Lausanne, the Zionist Federations of South Africa, Helsinki, Stockholm, Australia, Vienna, Rio de Janeiro, Ecuador, Cuba, the Executive of the Palestine Yizrazi, Budapest Yizrazi, Hechalutz of Roumania, the Union of Yemenites in Palestine.

### GENERAL DEBATE CONTINUES.

Rabbi Dr. Sh. Aron, Chief Rabbi of Roumania, gave a vivid picture of the position of the Jewish survivors in the world. He said "The blood shed by the Hitler scourge cannot even cry out from the ground for these martyrs were not even given a Jewish burial. They were burned, and gassed, and no trace of them has remained." Rabbi Shafren said that he was striving to find a new spirit in mankind, but he had failed. He went on to give facts about the condition of Jews in Roumania and about their efforts to reach Erez Israel. There are today, he said, 116 Jewish communities in Roumania, with kindergartens, elementary schools, and 15 secondary schools. Even in the dark days of the massacres they did not cease their cultural life; indeed, it was at that very time that the Hebrew school "Tarbut" was established. Our aim must always be Zion, unity and the Jewish State.

Mr. Gedalia Bublik, the American Mizrahi leader, recalled the discussions of partition at the Zionist Congress of 1937 when the Mizrahi representatives were opposed to that solution. At this Congress, said Mr. Bublik, the question of partition is not on the agenda, yet there is endless discussion on the subject. The theme appears to be what will happen if a proposal of partition is made? Both Dr. Goldman and Mr. Shertok have admitted that the proposal for partition in Paris came from us, but they said nothing of the harm which this had done, namely, that by these tactics we had renounced our legal right to the whole of Palestine. Britain has argued that the Mandate cannot be carried out; we had denied it. The moment we agree to accept only a part of Palestine we subscribe to the English contention that the Mandate is unworkable. Further, Mr. Bublik argued, the new proposals are half-way between the Jewish Agency's plan and the Morrison plan. In any event, they have no connection with the Mandate. Dr. Goldman also admitted that the abandonment of the Morrison Plan came about without the help of the Jewish Agency. And although our Gentile friends in America support us, we must insist that Britain shall carry out her undertakings in full. We based our demands throughout on the Biltmore Programme, we said that it was the demand of the whole Jewish people. Our non-Jewish friends believed us; now they are convinced that this was not so. We have, in fact, agreed to abrogate the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate. Partition has not given us the smallest part of Palestine. The only thing that it has accomplished so far has been the division and disintegration of our own circles. Zionist leaders should not have taken this course. Their duty was to declare for the Mandate, and only the Mandate. The chapter of partition is but an indication of what will happen if leadership remains in the same hands. Mr. Bublik opposed participation in the London Conference, saying that we shall have a British-Arab front against us. Dr. Weizmann himself had asserted that we could only go to the London Conference on the basis of the Jewish State. Mr. Bublik contended that we could only go to the Conference if appropriate proposals were forthcoming. We could not do so otherwise and we should declare that we turn once again to the Mandate, to a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine.

Dr. A. Altman (Revisionist) dwelt on a series of facts which he insisted called for vital decisions. Speaking of the attacks on the Revisionists at the previous day's session, he said that instead of recognising that a new force had been added to Congress, attacks had been launched against them. Revisionism was a fact, and it was pure demagoguery to invoke one or other paragraph of the constitution against it. Dr. Altman criticised Aliyah Hadashah for using a letter of Dr. Weizmann for defeatist purposes. He considered Dr. Goldman's speech, too, as a piece of defeatism, and asked why all those people did not have the courage to declare openly that they were in favour of partition. Policy must be open, not defeatist. Dr. Altman argued against the contentions of Hashomer Hatzair that the Biltmore Programme had caused the crisis. The real reason was that individuals and parties believed in such nonsense as an agreement with the British or with the Arabs. The speaker then outlined the two alternatives facing the Zionist movement: either the Revisionist line of a liberated people in the whole of Palestine, or annihilation. Had the right course been followed from the outset we should already have had a Jewish State by now and no international machinations would have availed. It is up to us to take the matters into our own hands. The decisive factor in Palestine are the British, and as long as they remain so, no agreement with the Arabs is possible. There was no Arab hegemony in the Near East, and our quarrel was not with the Arabs but with the British. The speaker then warned the parties of the Histadruth that t

they had the least chances to reach an agreement with the Arabs. "Arabs" were synonymous with capitalists and Kings, and these elements feared a Jewish State less than they did Bolshevism. This was the main, if not the only, reason why they were against us. Britain would give us nothing unless she stood to benefit from our strength. The only realistic policy would be firm demand for the whole of Palestine. Dr. Altman then discussed the question of terror. He said that nobody had succeeded in destroying the terrorist groups, and asked his opponents why their people blew up police stations and bridges. Was that in order? And if that was not considered ethical, then what was it? Words alone would not remove facts. They should declare that they were not in a position to stop terrorism and the British should be made to understand that the remedy was in their hands and lay only in the fulfilment of our demands. "I do not assert", Dr. Altman declared, "that force alone can secure our objective. Our strength is an atom bomb created by the Jewish catastrophe, and this bomb should be used. Victory is with those who believe in it."

Mr. H. Riffin (Hashomer Hatzair) declared that the task of Congress was to protest against the policy of Britain in Palestine. He did not believe that the British Cabinet's acts represented the last word of Socialism. We could not wait until recognition came from outside, we had to carry on with our work, defending it if necessary by force, even physical force. But to protect ourselves we must first break Fascism in Palestine. Turning to the Revisionist benches the speaker declared that the Revisionists must before everything respect Zionist leadership: it was not only Britain, but the Revisionists also who refused to acknowledge Zionist authority. The very presence of Revisionists at this Congress was illegal. Zionism was a democratic movement and capable of ejecting the Zionist Fascist Revisionist movement. "We want no Revisionism", Mr. Riffin exclaimed. "Our fight with Britain must be clean". The speaker went on to say that the dispute with Britain was still going on; refugees were still being sent away from the shores of Palestine; Jewish constructive effort was being sabotaged. His party could not accept Dr. Goldman's statement that they were ready not only for partition but also to grant strategic bases to Britain; they were not willing to see Palestine turned into a military basis serving British Imperialism. They demanded a joint trusteeship of Britain, America and of the greatest Power in which they had faith, namely Soviet Russia. The speaker went on to criticise the Biltmore Programme which, he said, caused confusion in the minds of Jewish youth. Dr. Goldman had argued against Hashomer Hatzair who described the Executive's policy as one aiming at a "shortcut" solution, but who could say that that policy was not calculated to lead to disaster. Partition was strategic and political folly. How could Jerusalem, the Dead Sea, the very heart of Palestine, be given up? Agreement between Jews and Arabs must come about because circumstances demanded it. We must insist on, and defend, the integrity of Palestine.

#### Professor Brodetsky's Address

Professor Selig Brodetsky, Member of the Executive, dealt with the attempt that had been made to prove that British Jews lacked a firm line in respect of Palestine. He declared that such was not the case. The attitude of British Jews towards Palestine was the same as that of all other Jews. The truth of the matter was that all had a share of the blame for conditions in Palestine today. What the British did in Palestine was one thing, and what was being done on the roads leading to Palestine was another. Naturally the British should feel ashamed of what was being done in Palestine in their name: the time would come when British children would feel shame at the acts committed by the British Navy of Admiral Nelson. Professor Brodetsky then spoke of the urgent necessity that the Jews shall become a people with an autonomous state of its own.



He was under the impression that even those who opposed the Executive's proposals would accept it once its full programme was realised. The problems which they faced were twofold: would they be able to continue their work in cooperation with England, and did Britain intend to bring about a change in Palestine. The speaker was not convinced that Palestine constituted the strategic key position of the British Empire; quite new plans had emerged recently. He did not believe in cooperation with Britain at present and thought that the matter should be brought before the whole world. The discussion whether partition proposals should come from us or from the British was futile. Congress was not called upon to decide about steps to be taken. Its task was only to indicate the general lines and to choose people enjoying its confidence. But the future of Palestine should be the subject of discussion; otherwise it would not be clear who was responsible for our struggle. Psychologically we were not ready to wage real war. It was interesting that the forces supporting the Zionist leadership came from Palestine, and there must be no quarrel between Palestine and the Diaspora. Our struggle must be concentrated on immigration, and for this our budgets must make proper provision.

Turning to the dissident groups, Professor Brodetsky said that they must not conduct a policy of their own but should submit to national discipline. Terrorism not only endangered the Yishuv but caused Britain and the world to turn against us. He called on Congress vigorously to condemn terrorism in Palestine. Speaking as a British Jew, he declared that the British Government had no real understanding of the Yishuv's needs. This fact was openly stated by Jews in Britain. Was there another Jewish community anywhere which had fought its own government for over twenty five years? Their task had been much more difficult than that of American Jews for whom it was easy to come out against England.

British Zionism, Professor Brodetsky went on, had fulfilled Herzl's injunction by winning over the Kehillot (communities). As President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, he had to fight hard against assimilation, and only a short while before Congress opened the assimilationists had again been defeated.

The protest march of British Jews to Trafalgar Square in London on July 6th, 1946, was an event unique in the history of British Jewry. The only similar occurrence had been in 1933, when they had marched in protest against persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany.

Professor Brodetsky then gave some facts of political enlightenment work carried on in the British Parliament and among the various parties. As far as Palestine was concerned, he contended, there was no difference between Labour Conservatives or Liberals.

In conclusion, the speaker declared himself to be opposed to the demand for the proclamation of a Jewish Government, which would not be given asylum in any country. Mr. Neuman had suggested that the Zionist Central Office should be removed from England, but surely the centre should be where the struggle is being waged.

#### Dr. Sneh's Address.

Dr. Moshe Sneh, Member of the Executive, analysed the debate up that point and stated that one aspect had not been touched upon, namely, the fact that Britain was not really seeking a solution for the Palestine problem. It was wrong to assume that Britain had not yet made up her mind about us- she had done so, and her decision had gone against us.



Actually, this had become obvious in 1939; it was only wishful thinking on our part which made the policy appear merely as a matter of temporary expediency. The war was over, yet the treachery went on. They had always clung to hope; there was, they had said, another England, the England of Labour. Now Labour was in, and the results was that anti-Zionism had assumed an ideological foundation. Zionist leaders refused to believe the evidence of their eyes; they went on avowing that the position must change. But the position did not change. The same Britain which in 1917 undertook to build up Erez Israel was in 1946 busy trying to destroy it. It was true that Britain attempted to hide this decision under the mask of an agreement. The truth of the matter was that, in her political plans in the Middle East, there was no room for the Jews.

Dealing with the London Conference. Dr. Sneh said that negotiations had a meaning only where there was a common basis but Britain and ourselves started from different premises. The Jews demanded independence, the British refused to grant it. Britain's intentions were quite obvious, and there was no reason to change their decisions. He thought that the Agency should not take part in the London Conference. Professor Brodetsky had said that Congress should not discuss the question of participation and should confine itself to electing an Executive who would decide whether to go or not; what he obviously meant was that they should participate. Then why not say so?

Dr. Sneh remarked that Mr. Byrnes had no influence upon Mr. Bevin; the former was now only saying what the latter had said before. Even the U.S.A. had been unable to change Britain's attitude, what sense would there be in participating in the London Conference? "I beg of you, friends", Dr. Sneh exclaimed, "do not go to London. We know the results in advance: The decision will go against us". Congress must declare that none of them would have a share in carrying out those decisions. Dr. Weizmann had written to Mr. Hall that they would not take part in the Conference unless it were made clear that its aim was to be the establishment of a Jewish State. Let them, therefore, stick to Dr. Weizmann's letter and not humiliate themselves. Let the Basle Congress of 1946 renew the programme of the Basle Congress of 1897 - Palestine as a Jewish State.

Referring to Britain's attitude towards them and their plan for a compromise, Dr. Sneh said "It is for this Congress to decide - this way or the other. Orientation towards Britain must come to an end. The British Empire no longer offers us support, we must look elsewhere. As a progressive Movement of liberation, we should be in a position to find support in other countries provided we are ready to act, politically in Palestine and in the Diaspora, that means, if we are ready to resist. We shall be neither more nor less anti-British than they are anti-Zionists. England conducts a war against our misfortune, against our pioneer endeavours in Palestine; we shall defend ourselves with that misfortune, with those pioneer endeavours."

Dr. Sneh admitted that resistance was a shocking thing to Chalutzic Zionism, but it had to be done. He did not believe that Zionism could be realised by the good old methods. They had to be just both in their aims and their means. The Resistance Movement was no party matter, it was the concern of the central directing body.

-----

The judgment on the 4000 uncertificated immigrants on board the "Kneses Israel" had disillusioned the Yishuv about British justice; there was a twofold reaction - a three minutes' silence, and terroristic acts. Both these methods were wrong. The only proper reaction must be the continuation of immigration despite all obstacles. True resistance was the establishment overnight of eleven new settlements despite the Nazi-like land regulations. If they could not resist, they must perforce accept what was offered to them, and to that they would never agree. Thus the choice lay between resistance or surrender. Palestine's new generation, young survivors of Maidanek and Ausschwitz, would never surrender; they would rather be destroyed by resistance than by surrender. True, the specter of Massada loomed on the horizon when resistance was discussed, by the fate of Massada's defenders was a certainty if no resistance were attempted; on the other hand, if they did resist, there was a chance of victory.

In conclusion, Dr. Sneh said that real Zionist and Jewish activity was vital. The whole of Jewry was now deeply concerned with our work. There were 200,000 Jews in the camps who were ready for anything. They should not underestimate the strength of American Jewry. Their strength was founded upon that readiness. United with all sections of our people they would emerge victorious.

Meier Grossman replies to Louis Segal.

Mr. Grossman (Revisionist) in a personal statement, said: "In the interpolation of Mr. Louis Segal, views and expressions were attributed to me which had not even passed through my mind - I had no reason to withdraw anything that I had said because what was not properly understood was immediately corrected." Mr. Grossman quoted one or two passages from his speech to indicate that when he had spoken of the dangers confronting those who were not prepared to accept the decisions of the Congress when these decisions were in conflict with the idea of a Jewish State, he did not mean any individual or particular group in Palestine but the general resistance movement. He believed, therefore, that all these groups should be under one national authority. "I have not threatened," said Mr. Grossman, "only warned against undesirable results."

Dr. Goldmann's Statement on Press Report.

At the end of the Session Dr. Goldmann made a statement concerning the accusation against him made by Mr. Rittin to the effect that he (Dr. Goldmann) had categorically declared himself to be ready to offer military bases in the Jewish State to Britain. Dr. Goldmann asserted that he had in fact said that the question of the bases would have to be dealt with by the United Nations. At the time he had not denied the reports which had appeared in the Press because they had reached him late, and because he considered them irrelevant to the present issues. Those entitled to know details of the conversations between himself and the British representatives, were fully and accurately informed about them.

-----

[December 16, 1946]



# קונגרס העם היהודי

## Congregation

Basle

No. 6

16-12-45

### World Zionist Congress: Twelfth Session

The Twelfth Session of the World Zionist Congress opened on Saturday evening, 14th December, at 6.15. Mr. Joseph Sprinsek presided. Dr. G. Herlitz read telegrams of greeting to the Congress which had arrived from every part of the world.

#### SPEECH OF MR. I. GRUENBAUM, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE

Mr. Gruenbaum began by saying that just as the Seventh Zionist Congress specially emphasised the identity of our renaissance movement with the practical work in Palestine, so the 22. Zionist Congress will go down in history of Zionism as the Congress which marked the way for the realisation of the Zionist Movement. For some years the process of Zionist realisation has increased to a quicker tempo, an expression of Jewish need and the result of the catastrophe which overtook the Jewish centres in Europe. This was not of our seeking. Our endeavour was always that Palestine should be built up in conditions of peace and security and not under the pressure of catastrophe. But our fate willed otherwise. The Zionist movement had therefore to turn towards elements whose attitude towards the Balfour Declaration and our upbuilding in Palestine had previously been indifferent.

Mr. Gruenbaum went on to analyse the factors which induced Great Britain to accept the Mandate. As was well known, he said, from the very beginning, various circles in Britain, especially military ones, were hostile to the idea of creating a Jewish National Home in Palestine. Only during the brief period of Lloyd George was this matter taken seriously. Very soon there began the era of whittling down the promise and hindering the development of the Jewish National Home. The tempo slowed down. Britain did everything to retard our progress. Every minor Arab disturbance was an excuse for the British to retreat still further from their undertakings and to produce still more limitations upon our activity. Still, we managed to continue successfully and despite all obstacles the Yishuv continued to grow until it reached 600,000. Should we have gone in for conflict with and resistance against the British, we should not even have reached this result. It is true that 1939 was a turning point in the British attitude towards us. Britain came to the conclusion that the Jews were serious in their intention of rebuilding their land, that Jews were returning to Palestine because it had become a vital necessity to them, and they decided to place even more obstacles in our path. These new impediments nearly vitiated the Mandate completely. Then the Royal Commission visited Palestine and produced a new proposal. But with the outbreak of the war the plan came to nought. Instead, we got the White Paper which condemned the Yishuv to remain a permanent minority. It is our task to destroy this policy. We have to force Britain to adopt a new policy, one which will give us satisfaction. Our task is to consider plans for the years 1947 and 1948 which will enable us to change this policy. These are the problems that should be on the agenda

and not long-term policy. It is not the first time in Zionist history that we try to settle our problems for all times in one sweep. And we have learned as the result of 60 years' experience in connection with this gigantic task that we still cannot tell how long the process of upbuilding will have to continue, a process the lynchpin of which is the question of immigration. We should lay down as a principle that anything which retards the tempo of mass immigration is harmful and anything which advances mass immigration is to our advantage.

Mr. Gruenbaum went on to compare our struggle with that of other countries and said that had we been in the position of Ireland, for example, we might have permitted ourselves the use of other means than those we have employed hitherto. We should not forget, however, that Ireland was not faced with the problem of immigration. The millions of Irishmen cannot be driven out of their land. It is not difficult to declare that we mean to continue immigration under all circumstances, but we have to be clear in our own minds as to what forcing these barriers really means. Naturally, immigration of uncertified persons is a weapon in our struggle, but this can be no substitute for real mass immigration.

Turning to the decisions of the Executive in Paris, Mr. Gruenbaum said that on the basis of these decisions a proposal was put before the British Government. Now we are retreating from these proposals. Will the result of this not be that confidence in us will be shaken and they will ask: is it possible to conduct negotiations with these people. It is perfectly true that Congress is sovereign and has the power to overrule the decisions of the Executive. On more than one occasion the Executive informed the Government that the proposals were subject to the approval of Congress. But if the Chairman of the Executive declares that the proposal no longer stands and that we are now waiting for a new proposal by the Government, how will it be possible to negotiate with such an Executive which produces a proposal in August and cancels it in December.

Mr. Gruenbaum then dealt with the phases that were necessary in our development. Our full demand must be for a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine. This aim cannot, however, be reached by any shortcut. Though the fundamental demand must remain the basis of our policy, we must recognize that from time to time certain temporary deviations are inevitable. No person who is honest with himself could say that anyone who is prepared to accept the limitation of the boundaries of Palestine which we are unable to fix is a traitor. The Liberation movements of other countries have also passed through various phases. When Greece only had the Peloponnes, no one would have thought that they would one day stand before the gates of Constantinople. And who would have dreamed in the nineteenth century that they would reach Salonika. The same thing happened with Roumania, Bulgaria and Italy and now with Ireland. Though Ireland has not extended its independence to the North, the Irish ideal has, nevertheless, remained intact.

Referring to Jewish History, he asked: Did the Jews in the epic Maccabean period possess the whole of Palestine? Shechem, for example, was outside the boundaries of the Jewish State. The question, therefore, arises whether it is true that if you agree to accept part of Palestine, you renounce the rest. It is vain to contend that if we accept only a part we weaken our aims and have renounced a part of Palestine. There was a time when we were afraid to invoke the magic word "Jewish State" although no one thought of anything else and nobody believed that we had ever given up the idea. In the same way nobody will imagine that



the establishment of a Jewish State in part of Palestine means the renunciation of a State in the whole of Palestine. The problem before us now is negotiation or resistance. No one really believes that we are in a position to reject negotiations, that Britain will impose us to agree to its proposals. Even our dissidents do not believe this. Our struggle with Britain can only be by way of compelling her to conduct negotiations and this is the right moment, because Britain has perforce to bring some proposals concerning Palestine before the United Nations. The Mandate System is finished. The agreement of 1922 under which Britain received the Mandate must be changed. The question is what will replace the Mandate and secure our rights in Palestine.

Mr. Gruenbaum did not agree with the opinion of the Haskomer Hatzair speaker whomaintained that we can wait. He would have been right had there not been a second world war and if the Mandate System had not changed. It is not we who had brought the change about. The world had changed. The late Menachem Ussishkin had written a memorandum in whichhe formulated our demands from Britain as follows:- "You British have as your first task the safeguarding of the integrity of Palestine and the creation of conditions to enable us to become a majority. Then you can quit." But Britain did not agree. A new great Power has arisen in Europe - Russia. Who knows whether we should have secured the Mandate in 1917 and in 1922 if Russia had then been a great power. True, the Revisionists maintain that the focal point in the relationship of the nations is fear of Russia and we should do everything possible to convince Britain that in a decisive moment, we should be with her because of the fear of communism which looms everywhere. Should we conduct our policy on this premise, it would mean humiliation. We cannot become the tool of anyone. We must remain independent both in our work and our struggle.

The question of going to the London Conference was, in the opinion of Mr. Gruenbaum, a tactical one. It could only be considered on its merits. He believed that conditions now were more favourable to us now than six months ago. The British Government could if it wished suppress terrorism by completely destroying the Yishuv but the Government has not yet followed the line which the Military authorities would have counselled. There are many reasons why Britain prefers to negotiate with us. There is the urgent necessity to produce some sort of an agreement, conditions in Palestine - our attempt to force the gates, and I do not know whether Britain will be as ready to negotiate, once terror has been suppressed as she is now. People ask how it is conceivable to enter into negotiations as long as our demands are unfulfilled. There are two schools of thought in this respect. The first that the demand for a Jewish State should be the basis for the negotiations and the second that aim should be a Jewish State. Mr. Gruenbaum understood neither of these schools. The basis of these negotiations would be that we had produced our plan whilst the British had produced the Morrison plan - the aim would mean that Britain would be asked to agree to our proposals a priori in which case there can be no negotiations nor discussion of the details. Nobody would accept such conditions in advance, except as terms of surrender after defeat in battle. It would have been thoroughly unpolitic to send such a communication, it would have been no more than a figure of speech.

Mr. Gruenbaum asserted that he was one of those who opposed our appearing before the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry. He was then in Paris and this was what he wrote to his colleagues of the Executive: "If the Committee comes to a favourable conclusion, it will not be carried out. If not, why should we appear?" Now, however, the situation had changed. Now we negotiate with the Government on a subject which commands the support of the United States. Should we refuse to go, the Government of the United States would refuse to have anything further to do with us. The attitude of the British will remain the same; the siege will go on, repression will continue which will only provoke further resistance and counter-repression by the Government. The vicious circle will have no end. Dare we hazard the risk? Ben Gurion once said that the British would not dare to shoot against us; they are not Poles or Rumanians. Even Dr. Snoh when he speaks of resistance does not believe that Britain would resort to violent methods as a revenge. It is not my conviction. I do not believe that England has decided to liquidate us. If on June 29th events appeared to indicate this, there has since been a change. Certainly we must offer resistance, otherwise we should be showing defeat and demoralisation but the leadership of resistance must take into account not only sentiment but stark reality. Resistance must be organised, planned and concentrated around the point which is likely to evoke sympathy for us, namely immigration. If our ships are transferred to Cyprus it is a defeat in which lies victory. And if they transfer uncertificated immigrants not to Cyprus but to Tripoli and if there will be two hundred thousand Jewish refugees in the American Zone and 100,000 in Tripolitania and other British-controlled areas, the pressure of these 100,000 will be greater than that of the 200,000 in the American Zone.

Mr. Gruenbaum went on to speak of the eleven new settlements which Dr. Snoh had mentioned. He considered that this too was an act of resistance but had the Palestine Government taken steps against this action, who knows what might have happened. The question is, can we in our present position do things which will provoke repressive measures and we shall have to speak of this in the Political Committee.

Concluding his address, Mr. Gruenbaum said, we must regard this moment as one of severe crisis in the Zionist Movement. We must use every opportunity to strengthen our position in Palestine and work through accomplishments and not only hopes. The Government of the United States is ready to help us and, as he had said, our struggle must be in those fields which will evoke the maximum sympathy in the world. As the number of Jews in Palestine grows, the pressure on Britain will grow too. It matters not whether the pressure will come from Palestine itself or from outside. Were we able to bring 200,000 Jews into British possessions and even if they were in concentration camps, it would be useful, it would be better than leaving these Jews in the American Zone of Germany, and these are the lines that we shall propose in the Political Committee.

Mr. Gruenbaum recalled that when he was in the Latrun Camp he read a book about the Byzantine period in the history of Palestine. During that period there were four rebellions in Palestine. And what was the result? At the time of Bar Kochbah there were two million Jews in Palestine and after the rebellion only two hundred thousand remained. When the Arabs occupied Palestine the Jews were an insignificant minority and the attitude towards them was contemptuous. We have reached the stage where the number of Jews has, despite all obstacles, grown to 600,000. We must safeguard that which we possess and our struggle, whether physical or mental, must be directed to one end only - increasing and adding to the number of Jews in Palestine.

JEWISH ADVISOR TO AMERICAN ZONE ADDRESSES CONGRESS

Speaking after Mr. I. Gruenbaum, Rabbi Phillip Bernstein, Jewish advisor in the American Zone of Germany reported on the Displaced Persons in Germany and Austria. He said that there were 192,000 D.P.s in the American Zone. This constituted the second largest Jewish community in Europe, second only to Roumania. They were the largest single group of D.P.s: of this group, 162,000 were in Germany and 30,000 in Austria. Together with those in the British Zones and in Italy there are altogether a quarter million D.P.s. The figure is no longer 100,000. The big movement from Poland which once reached the scale of 1,000 per day had ended. They were now only trickling in at the rate of 3,000 a month. Rabbi Bernstein paid tribute to the U.S.A. Government and the U.S. Army's attitude towards refugees and said that the borders had been kept open despite pressure. No persecuted Jew had been denied admittance and this policy was continuing. He also praised the UNNRA and the Jewish Agency officials for their unselfish devotion to duty. He stressed the vitality of these Jews. Amongst the 100,000 who had come during the last few months were those who had returned to Poland from Russia, having escaped the German occupation. These were now in family groups and there were now 23,000 children. These latest arrivals included people who were used to hard work and who were willing to work. There was no defeatism amongst them and the old wounds were beginning to heal. No single suicide had occurred except one in a particularly bleak camp and there was no lessening of intensive Jewish life. One third of the total number and over half of the employable people were now working. Conditions were too abnormal to provide work for all, but most of them were eager to take up an occupation. Stressing the danger, Rabbi Bernstein said if certain forces (not American, he added) who wished to reduce the standards of the American Zone to the level of the British Zone under the economic unification plan were successful, D.P.s would be seriously affected. Other British proposals which had been mooted were to force Jews to work for the German economy and place them under the jurisdiction of German courts. These proposals were being discussed at the highest level and he urged Congress to act on the shameful report which had been published in the United States which was a vile slander on the Jewish D.P.s and proposed to reduce expenditure on them. He pleaded for action to maintain the status of the Jewish D.P.s. He pointed out the danger of demoralisation if the present condition continued. There had already been a deterioration but a struggle was going on to prevent it and there was a race between deterioration and normalisation. Rabbi Bernstein concluded by saying that the hope of Zion would sustain these tragic survivors. We have little time and we may even have to make concessions if these Jews are to be saved.

DR. BERNARD JOSEPH ADDRESSES CONGRESS

Dr. Bernard Joseph began by recalling that he had been sad to spend Balfour Declaration Day in Latrun in the Vale of Ajalon made famous in Jewish history by Joshua's injunction to the moon to stand still. His sadness lay not in that he was a detainee. It was his conviction that the detention was part of a deliberate policy to undermine the authority of the Jewish Agency, in an attempt to soften up and weaken the Yishuv by searches and mass arrests. Notwithstanding



all this, those who thought the Jewish spirit would be broken or even waver by operation Agatha, have learned their error and must realise it was a colossal blunder and a regrettable setback to Anglo-Jewish relations. Dr. Joseph went on to speak on his reflections in the camp on the joy with which the Balfour Declaration was received and his deep regret that men who had striven for Anglo-Jewish co-operation had been detained and the pledge in the Balfour Declaration thus betrayed. But, went on Dr. Joseph, this disappointment does not justify the despairing remarks made that the Zionist situation was one of bankruptcy as a direct result of the Weizmann policy. He felt that we had cause to be proud of our great achievements - a Yishuv of 600,000 souls, with Tel Aviv, a great city built by Jewish hands, a fine harbour at Haifa, a flourishing industry and over 300 agricultural settlements blazing a new trail in social justice and human relations. He felt it was wrong to belittle our achievements in order to make a dubious point in a political debate.

Dr. Joseph then went on to discuss the present impasse and the policy required to meet the situation. Speaking of the Hashomer Hatzair programme of a bi-national state, Dr. Joseph said they themselves knew the weakness of their case, because the Arabs would not agree for obvious reasons. The Arabs being the majority would not be content with equal sharing of governmental authority with the Jews. And in a bi-national state the Arabs would ensure that the Jews remain a permanent minority.

Dr. Joseph continued by dealing with the assertion that we should force the British to carry out the Mandate according to its true import. He felt that there was a great difference between attempting to compel the British to carry out the Mandate and insistence on the creation of a Jewish State. For the latter, unlike the former, did not depend on the British alone. He believed that with sacrifice and perseverance this could be achieved without British aid, even despite their objection. Dr. Joseph rejected the thesis that the Biltmore Programme was a political error, he felt that we had the same right to national independence as all other nations. He had been amongst those who favoured the Peel Partition Plan. But by 1941 the situation had altered and the need had become overwhelming. He still considered that Congress should adhere to the Biltmore Programme. He knew of Dr. Goldman's mission to the U.S.A. and the Executive accepted responsibility for it. But since the British had not adopted the suggestion, we were entitled to stand on our basic demands. Dealing with the Hashomer Hatzair's characterisation of Biltmore as an illusion, Dr. Joseph said it was an illusion to those who could not see, to others it was a ray of hope and of faith which had kept up the spirits of the refugees in the D.P. Camps.

Dr. Joseph said that some believe that we would not get a Jewish State in the whole of Palestine and that our only hope was a decent partition. He felt we should cross that bridge when we came to it, but that at this moment the Executive's hands should not be tied by any prohibitive resolution barring them from negotiating freely. Those who said that if we adhere to Biltmore and do not positively propose partition we may lose U.S.A. support were wrong. He did not believe that the U.S.A. was so naive as to fail to understand the implications of our position.

As to the contention that the British will not consider a state in part of Palestine unless it is suggested by us, he felt that if



the British were ready to agree they would find no difficulty in conveying the information to us. He felt that partition would not affect the Jewish people's historic rights to the whole of Palestine and would only be a compromise agreed to reluctantly as a matter of Realpolitik. It was in this spirit that we should contemplate the possibility of agreeing to a Government proposed partition plan.

Dealing with the question of our going to the London Conference, Dr. Joseph felt that this was a matter for the Political Commission to decide but our experience with the Anglo-American Committee did not lend encouragement to that course. It was then a case of heads we win, tails we lose, since the Committee was only entitled to make recommendations and H.M. Government might accept if they were against us and reject if they were for us. This forecast had come true when Mr. Attlee pounced on a reference to Haganah as an excuse for withholding the 100,000 certificates. Whatever may have been the value of their positive recommendations, we should not overlook that the Committee had also produced the negative finding that Palestine could never be a Jewish State.

Many of those who have misgivings about participating in the Conference, might be disposed to do so if it were really a Conference between the Jews, H.M.G. and the Palestine Arabs. But unfortunately it was not. Nevertheless it might still be wiser to give the intentions of the Government the benefit of the doubt, but Dr. Joseph could not work up any enthusiasm nor was he optimistic as to the outcome.

Dr. Joseph then expressed his gratification not only that delegates both from Palestine and the D.P. Camps had urged more Halutzith, but even Mrs. Epstein and Dr. Silver had made the plea. He, Dr. Joseph, had pleaded for Halutzith when he last visited the United States, and when he proposed to Junior Hadassah that they should start preparing their members for life in Palestine, it was greeted with amazement. It is a matter for real joy that they finally embarked on that course and 150 of their members are now preparing for Aliyah. Was it too much, he asked that at least 5% of the 5 million Jews of America should come to help and build. The Jews of America and other Galuth lands need Palestine as much as Palestine needs some of them.

Speaking of the address of his colleague, Dr. Sneh, Dr. Joseph said that he, Dr. Sneh, had painted a gloomy picture and was already writing England off. Whilst Dr. Joseph agreed that Britain's present policy was anti-Zionist, he was not prepared to say that all was lost in that quarter. He would remind Dr. Sneh that Government decisions are not final but were subject to change. There had been various periods of fluctuations and finally Sir Harold MacMichael had said that not more than 75,000 would be admitted, but after that 1,500 immigrants per month had been admitted. They had decided to send refugees to Cyprus, then they had brought some back, so that the present anti-Zionist policy was also capable of change. He said this not to raise false hopes, but to indicate that we should not abandon even the faintest hope before taking so serious a decision. He was not prepared to give England a full discharge from its obligations, no matter how much they had depreciated in value. The right of the Jewish people to a free national life was more important than its friendship with Britain.

Dealing with the proposed policy of resistance and Dr. Sneh's assertion that we should find a way out of our difficulties if we were active and would become a political factor, Dr. Joseph said that there was no difference of opinion between Dr. Sneh and himself on this subject. He did not, however, agree to the possible implication behind his words. It was his view that the whole subject of resistance should not be discussed from the platform. Though numerous delegates had declared themselves for resistance almost every one understood it differently. He considered that Congress could only decide in principle on this matter and the Executive should be entrusted with the authority to decide on the form which it should take.

He felt, however, that the issue was not between peace-loving and creative persons and those who believed in activism per se. Even those who believed in readiness for resistance would prefer peaceful development. But they could not be a party to false optimism or leave the solution of the Jewish problem to the Messiah. Moreover, just as it was right to be cautious and reluctant to abandon parliamentary methods it would be wrong to surrender to undue fear of possible consequences of resistance. If it became necessary to resist in order to prevent Zionist efforts being paralysed, and in order to make possible the progressive upbuilding of the land then we should refuse to yield and should enter into such a struggle as may be necessary to achieve Jewish independence.

Dr. Joseph went on to say he had not intended referring to terrorism in Palestine, but since all his colleagues had done so he felt he must do likewise. He believed that in the struggle for liberation we must be prepared to make every sacrifice and to take such action as may be found proper and helpful. But just because he held this view he condemned unreservedly and with all his heart and might the terrorist acts of the Etzel and Stern groups. He shared Dr. Sneh's views on the objection to terrorism. He asked Congress to remember one of the basic documents in Jewish life, the Commandment "Thou Shalt Not Kill" it referred not only to Jews. Murder was murder whoever was the victim and we should not abandon the moral basis of Jewish life. Civilised society recognised two exceptions to the moral rule, the death penalty imposed by a Court of Law and when a nation was at war. But war could only be decided by a nation, not by any group, however patriotic they might be. Such acts were murder and introduced anarchy into national life.

Dr. Joseph went on to say that having mentioned terrorism he felt compelled to deal with another subject, that of the police state in Palestine. Liberty of the subject was ignored and the rule of law had disappeared. Citizens could be and were arbitrarily arrested and detained for years without trial and without redress. Habeas corpus was a fiction since the Government had rendered them ineffective by promulgating regulations which had that effect. The entire community lived in fear of repression and plunder and military tribunals had largely replaced the civil courts. Dr. Joseph felt we must warn Great Britain that this cannot go on. Government had the right to maintain its authority, but even that must be done lawfully. There could be no respect for law administered by a government which itself disregarded the rule of law and treated the whole community as if it were criminals. Police State regulations and methods must be abolished or they would be resisted.

In conclusion, Dr. Joseph said that the way before us was difficult and we carried a heavy responsibility towards our people and towards our country. He urged Congress to be deeply conscious of its duty and to take its decisions carefully and clearly, so that we might go forward together, united in the fulfilment of our solemn task - to find ways and means to open the gates of Palestine to the masses of Jews eager to enter - to continue redeeming our soil and rebuilding its waste places and to achieve the only solution of the Jewish problem: National independence in a Jewish State "speedily and in our days".

#### DR. SNEH'S SPEECH

The version of Dr. Snéh's speech which appeared in Bulletin No. 5 of the 13th December was condensed from the original. A full and verbatim report of the speech will appear in the next Hebrew issue.

#### NOTICE OF CONCERT

On Wednesday, the 18th December, at 8.30 p.m. there will be a concert arranged by the Folksopera of Tel Aviv. Madame Edis de Philippe, the well-known soprano who recently appeared with such success in Palestine will be amongst the artists. The Concert will take place at

STADTCASINO HANS HUBER-SAAL

and delegates and guests are invited.

#### EXHIBITION OF NATIONAL FUNDS

Last Saturday morning, the exhibitions of the Keren Hayesod and the Jewish National Fund (Keren Kayemeth) were opened in the Basler Hall. Hundreds of delegates and visitors attended the opening ceremony which was addressed by Mr. Leib Jaffe, Mr. L. Herrmann and Mr. M. Haezrahi. The exhibition contains a fine range of photographs depicting types of settlers and scenes from the settlements. There is a fine display of diagrams and pictures showing the development of Palestine and the work of the Funds. The exhibition of the Keren Hayesod was arranged by Dr. A. Vallisch and that of the Keren Kayemeth by Dr. M. Rczner.

# CONGRESS ITEMS

Totals of Shekalim sold for the 22nd Zionist Congress according to countries.

Country	Total	Country	Total
Eretz Israel	300,754	America	
Europe		United States	956,250
Austria	30,000	Canada	54,813
Belgium	9,612	Argentina	39,400
Bulgaria	14,050	Bolivia	1,974
Denmark	900	Brazil	14,500
Norway	279	Chile	3,933
England	66,776	Colombia	4,528
Finland	256	Mexico	7,500
France	32,852	Uruguay	11,340
Germany	112,370	Barbados	39
Greece	3,088	Cuba	1,500
Holland	2,718	Ecuador	786
Hungary	95,616	Salvador	104
Italy	16,901	Marianas	170
Poland	110,000	Venezuela	463
Portugal	350	Costa Rica	285
Roumania	91,922	Guatemala	100
Slovakia	19,403	Nicaragua	110
Sweden	6,477	Panama	315
Switzerland	5,140	Paraguay	430
Transylvania	23,038	Peru	764
France (Alsace)	3,526	Trinidad	153
Yugoslavia	100	Curacao	100
Asia		Australia	8,286
China (Shanghai)	5,600		
China (Tientsin)	1,500		
India	1,685		
Iran	4,536		
Syria	250		
Aden	2,432		
Other Countries	1,240		
Africa			
Algiers	6,100		
Egypt	7,341		
Morocco	11,362		
South Africa	46,600		
Tripoli	1,963		
Tunis	13,296		
Eritrea	180		
Tangier	600		
Tanganyika	100		

## SUMMARY

Eretz Israel	300,764
Europe	626,615
Asia	17,243
Africa	86,691
America	1,099,570
Australia	8,286

2,139,559

## CONGRESS NOTICES

The festive re-union of the Keren Hayesod will take place on Monday 16th December, 1946 in the Casino Saal at 8.30 p.m.

The World Conference of Jewish Journalists will be opened on Tuesday 17th December, 1946 in the Press Room of the Conference at 9.30 a.m. All Jewish journalists, whatever their language, are welcome.





# קונגרס Congregation

18-12-46

WORLD ZIONIST CONGRESS: Fifteenth Session

The fifteenth session of Congress was opened on Sunday evening, December 15th, Mr. L. Gurfinkel presiding. Dr. Herlitz read a number of announcements and messages of greeting.

## Rabbi Hameir's Address

Rabbi S. Hameir (Mizrachi) reviewed the position of the Jews in Europe a year and a half after the termination of the war. They still had no place where to lay their heads, the survivors of the Hitler horror were still held in concentration camps, and those of them who risked their lives in tiny craft on the high seas in an endeavour to reach Palestine were turned away from its shores; if they resisted, British military did not hesitate in deploying against them all the paraphernalia of force. This state of affairs gave the Yishuv no rest, and for the sake of its conscience it must come out against it in strength. The leaders and the highest authorities of the Yishuv stood on watch over every refugee ship and prevented the Yishuv from passing on to deeds. But, the speaker declared, it was essential to say to the Palestine Administration and the British Government: Stop chasing the refugee ships, let the refugees disembark in Palestine and come to rest in their homeland, do not drive the Yishuv to desperation. Otherwise its leaders will be unable to check a possible conflagration of revolt in Palestine because of the deportations, and who knows where that might stop?

The speaker then surveyed the achievements of the Knesseth Israel in Palestine - the Jewish municipalities and communities, and the Assefath Hanivharim, the Elected Assembly of the Yishuv, and expressed the views that the Jews of Palestine were ready and fitted to administer a state of their own. They saw no reason why they should be ruled by a foreign administration. The Yishuv would not allow itself to be prevented from building up its independent state without interference, from conducting its own immigration policy - unless this frustration ceased in the immediate future it would break its chains. Nor would the 500,000 Jews held behind barbed wire await their liberation in patience. The Yishuv could not view with equanimity Great Britain's lack of fairness in awarding independence to Trans-Jordan and Syria. Only the Yishuv in its national home is not given recognition by Britain as an independent nation in a Jewish state.

Rabbi Hameir warned the Zionist Organisation also that the patience of the Yishuv and of the Jews who were knocking in vain at the gates of Palestine would not hold for ever. He pointed out that although the world was to blame for the Jewish tragedy,

the Jews themselves were not free from blame. They had lost their Torah and had become a nation divided into parties, each of which pretended to have discovered a new Torah of its own. The speaker called on Congress to declare that the Jewish people held its Torah and tradition as the only true foundation for its life in its own state. The Jewish Sabbath must be kept inviolate. He concluded by voicing the wish that before the next Congress meets a Jewish State in Palestine founded on Jewish tradition may have been established.

Dr. Fritz Bernstein.

Dr. Fritz Bernstein (General Zionists) said that there was a difference of opinion about the reasons for the present impasse. Some blamed it on the Zionist leadership which they charged with being vacillating and short-sighted and with having had an unwarranted confidence in British intentions. Others blamed Britain alone for having let them down.

The speaker saw in British policy since 1936 a determination to crystallise the Yishuv at about one third of the population of Palestine, and to prevent the Jews from becoming a majority. The Arab League policy was being exploited for that purpose. The policy had found a crude expression in the 1939 White Paper, and now in the "administrative partition" of the Morrison plan, which paid the price of limited immigration in a small area and retained for Britain a brokerage fee of 40% of Palestine. If they accepted that it would mean the end of Zionism in their time. Resistance to it, on the other hand, implied a great deal of harm and damage to themselves without assurance of success.

Many Zionists, Dr. Bernstein went on, clung to the hope of partition as a way out, but Dr. Goldmann had admitted that it would be little short of a miracle if they got the kind of partition they wanted. As yet there was no sign that they would be offered it. By going to the London Conference they would simply be bolstering up the legend of a Jewish-Arab conflict in which Britain was an almost helpless arbiter. If Britain was genuinely willing to offer them something more acceptable than the Morrison plan there were other channels through which this intention could be communicated. Until that happened they had no option but to continue with their struggle, but the ways and means for struggle should be very carefully devised so as to minimise the damage to themselves.

Rabbi J. Rabinowitz

Rabbi Rabinowitz (Revisionist) declared that the British Government had no intention whatsoever of giving the Jews a partition state in Palestine. To accept the invitation to the London Conference would be tantamount to accepting an invitation to their own funeral.

The speaker criticised Mr. Ben-Gurion's political address which, he thought, disclosed the utter bankruptcy of the Zionist

Organisation, and charged that the leadership had failed to proclaim the Jewish State as the final aim of the movement from the very beginning. Now that they did at long last ask for the State, they did so in timid and halting terms and made it appear as though they would never have asked for it if the Mandate had been carried out in full. The leadership was being inexorably pressed by life into the very positions which they disliked - they had been against illegal immigration, against mass evacuation from Europe, against resistance. All of these had come, and now the logic of events would force them into establishing a provisional government as the only thing that would save Zionism. That provisional government must be established in order to prepare the way for the Jewish State. That was his party's view, and experience had shown that what Revisionists thought to-day, the rest of the movement would think to-morrow, only to-morrow would be too late.

Rabbi Rabinowitz pointed out that already they had immigration, settlement and an armed defence force in defiance of government law; they could not have it both ways. Aliya Hadasha thought that whatever government decreed they had to fulfil; the other alternative was to declare that the Mandatory Government was in Palestine illegally and to break relations with it. The leadership had done so, but only to a limited extent; they had not gone far enough.

Speaking of resistance, Rabbi Rabinowitz reminded Congress that they were about to celebrate the Feast of the Maccabees. They could not celebrate that festival and call resistance immoral in one and the same breath. Those who had opposed resistance on the ground of Jewish ethics and tradition were illogical. The Syrian Government at the time of the Maccabees was a hundred times more legal than the present Mandatory Government in Palestine. Jewish tradition said that it was better to be persecuted than to persecute, but when 6,000,000 had been sacrificed it was time to recall that other tradition which demanded resistance against the would-be slayer. They must realise that the British Government was out to kill Zionism and to liquidate it.

In the political field, the speaker asserted, they had come to a dead end. The Mandate was finished, cooperation with England was at an end, Britain was illegally in Palestine. The only logical conclusion was that it was essential to set about the establishment of a provisional government.

Mr. M. Regalsky.

Mr. Regalsky (Argentina) expressed astonishment at the lack of reality in the addresses of delegates who lived in closest contact with the facts of the Jewish position; such indulgence in political abstractions might have been more comprehensible coming from representatives of South America who kept in touch with events only through hearsay.

The speaker identified himself with the point of view expounded by Dr. Goldmann and Mr. Gruenbaum. He awaited with great interest the words of the prodigal Revisionists, but they

-----

had only one new thing to say: the need for a provisional government. That sounded very fine, but they failed to explain why such a government should be stronger than the Executive. Mr. Regalsky wanted to know where the seat of the provisional government would be and suggested that perhaps the Revisionists would care to consider Dublin. He asked, however, whether this government in Dublin would strengthen the movement more than an Executive with its seat in Palestine and with offices in London and Washington. He failed to understand how such political absurdities could be proffered at so critical a time.

Listening to the attacks on the Executive, Mr. Regalsky continued, one might have thought that a political crime had been committed in Paris. Now that Mr. Neumann had spoken one must pay tribute to the work of American Zionists. Everyone warmly welcomed Mr. Truman's letter and the message issued on the eve of Yom Kippur. But how many more such messages were likely to be issued? There had been elections in America at that time, but there would be no more in the next two years. Also, there was the question of oil in Saudi Arabia in which Washington was said to be greatly interested. Did they have the right to engage in political adventures and run such risks?

He had been deeply shaken by Dr. Sneh's address. Assuming that Dr. Sneh's forecast were to be unfortunately realised, could they throw away the last chance of an understanding by refusing to attend the London Conference? Could they, as the only organised force of the Jewish people, take the responsibility of a final break? Something might be gained by attending the Conference after all. He knew of no forces, nor did Dr. Sneh point to any, which would stand behind them and secure for them another opportunity. They had no right to run such risks. Dr. Herzl had taught them that the fulfilment of a dream called for a realistic policy. Russia had signed the treaty of Brest-Litovsk because it needed a breathing space. Mr. Regalsky, speaking on behalf of the Zionists of all South America, called on Congress to become conscious of its historic responsibility and not to throw away the slightest opportunity of salvation.

Mr. Werfel.

Mr. I. Werfel (Hapoel Hamizrachi) said he was one of those who believed that there was a power over the earth which directed events. He believed there would be two stages, firstly preparation and then immigration of tens and hundreds of thousands, so that our life in Palestine may be firmly entrenched until the independent state was achieved. This would be the natural and consequent way. This is no shortcut. Speaking against the reductions of the boundaries of Palestine, Mr. Werfel said those who were against were those who were increasing the boundaries by their deeds. Those who were against partition were those who were going on to the land in the Negev, who were surrounding Jerusalem with a network of settlements. We had reached a new stage in our work - the youth was ready for sacrifices and they must be kept pure from the evil atmosphere that now pervaded the world. Mr. Werfel appealed to workers and employers: Keep the Sabbath. He urged that the spirit of unity manifested at Givat Chaim and Birish should be maintained.



World Zionist Congress: Sixteenth Session

The Sixteenth Session of the World Zionist Congress opened on Monday morning, December 16th at 10 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mrs. Judith Epstein.

Mr. A. Lulu (Ichud Olami)

Speaking in the name of nearly a million Jews, Sephardim, Yemenites and Eastern Jews, spread from Tangier to Bombay, Mr. Lulu emphasised that Zionist work in these countries cannot be openly conducted. Nevertheless the yearning for Palestine is very strong. Since the war Chalutzism has begun in these lands and they are destined to play a great part in the building of Palestine. The speaker urged that chalutzig emissaries should be sent in large numbers. Mr. Lulu painted a tragic picture of the spiritual and moral degradation and the physical oppression of these communities, in places like Persia and Tashkent forced to live as Marranos. They were subject to hunger and disease and unless there was a large exodus we might face the same catastrophe as we have seen in Europe. Sephardim and Ashkenasim shared a common fate in the European crematorium. Speaking of our struggle, Mr. Lulu felt that we must keep our flag pure and unsullied, but he did not agree with Dr. Rosenblueth that we had to confine ourselves to protests only. Our demonstration of strength had won us new respect from the Arabs. There were 150,000 Oriental Jews in Palestine, half of them organised in Histadruth and most of them workers. Four villages have been established this year and thousands more are waiting for the opportunity of settling in Palestine with the least possible delay.

Dr. A. Mibashan (General Zionists)

Dr. A. Mibashan, speaking as a delegate for Uruguay, brought greetings from the Argentine, the second-largest Jewish community in America, as well as from Central, South and Latin America. He said that the Jews of Latin-America were 95% Zionist. As witness the results for the funds, hundreds of thousands of pounds having been collected. Last year they gave £350,000 for the Keren Hayesod alone. It was characteristic that the telegraphic greeting from the Sephardic Community of Buenos Ayres began with the words: "We are sending £5,000 for the Keren Hayesod and £1,000 for the Keren Kayemeth".

Dr. Mibashan, speaking of their work amongst non-Jews through the Pro-Palestine Committee said this was real resistance, and resulted in creating a certain atmosphere for the Mandatory Power in every country. Five days after June 29th there had been a protest meeting of 35,000 Jews in Buenos Ayres and the Police had helped in its conduct. Despite the protest of the protest of the British Embassy.

They had reprinted Morrison's speech against the White Paper in 1939 and distributed it throughout Latin-America. The speaker thought this should be printed in millions of copies and distributed throughout the world. It would help to prove the injustice of the British Government's present act.

Dr. Mibasham said we must conduct negotiations, but we dare not give up the weapons which we possessed in the rousing of public opinion all over the world. For Britain was extremely sensitive at the present time. Dr. Mibasham was in favour of the strengthening of the Executive from Left to Right on one condition that the members of the Right who believe in a Provisional Government should recognise the Jewish Agency as our Government.

Dr. Mibasham concluded by recalling Churchill's words to the effect that he believed that one day we should see a Jewish State on both sides of the Jordan with millions of Jews.

Rabbi J. Gelman (Mizrachi)

Rabbi Gelman said we were now entering the end of the fifty year period of Zionism. During that time the Mizrachi had survived for three fundamentals. The unity of the people, the unity of the land and ~~Juor~~ the unity of Judaism. This conception was indivisible. We have often heard from this platform that Zionism is not bound to religion. This has never been the ultimate programme of the Zionist movement. The Mizrachi had always believed in the synthesis of Judaism and Zionism and the time had come for us to take account of our attitude to the religious values of the Jewish people. We ask for deeds as well as words. The speaker said he had visited Palestine twice this year and did not wish to question the devotion and self-sacrifice of the people of the settlements, but he had found Kibbutzim which did not believe that either Rosh Hashanah or Yom Kippur were Yomim Tovim. The speaker asked how it was possible to continue in this way. How can we secure the Jewish future by these methods. He believed it was a political danger. To the need for rescue, immigration and defence he would add rescue of Judaism, continuation of Judaism and defence of Judaism.

Dr. Israel Goldstein (General Zionists)

Dr. Goldstein dealt with some of the criticism which had been levelled against American Zionism. The fact that they were not fully steeped in Jewish culture should not debar them from Zionist leadership. There was a growing interest amongst the youth in going to Palestine as Chalutzim, as students, and as people with technical skill. This movement was not comparable in numbers to that from Europe, because it was actuated by idealistic preference and not by necessity. There were growing efforts to interest American Jewish business men in Palestine. The American contribution to the national funds did not need stressing. It was especially satisfactory to note the large number of new recruits to American Zionism from the native-born. Generally speaking, there was reassuring evidence of the growth and strength of American Zionism.

Its most significant role just now was in the political struggle. More than one Zionist crisis in recent years had been averted by its influence. The most recent case was the Morrison plan. There was a British attempt to minimise this influence as in the pre-election pressure, but this failed to take account of the fact that elections were annual events in America and the influence

and the influence of a large pressure group was continuous. It was important however that the credentials of American Zionist spokesmen before their Government should not be confused by direct representations from the Jewish Agency. The size and freedom of American Jewry, and its ability to criticise the Mandatory freely, should be utilised to the full in assigning leadership and responsibility.

Dr. Goldstein was of the opinion that in the last resort physical resistance was not against the spirit of Jewish tradition, and would be understood by Americans from their own history. The public had to be enlightened to distinguish between disciplined self-defence and anarchic terrorism.

He was against going to the London Conference, as he feared that our representatives would be pressed into retreating even further than the partition offer already made. The same pessimistic argument now used in favour of the partition compromise would be used in favour of further compromise. After three months of informal discussion, we had received not a single encouraging sign. Even if we had to reject Mr. Byrnes' appeal the American Government would not wash its hands of Palestine as long as it interested five million citizens. The least the British Government could have done to show good intentions towards us was to lift the blockade against refugees. The indications were that Britain had already made up its mind, and we would merely be helping to stage-manage a mock conference at our expense. We should fight as best we can relying on the Yishuv, the World Zionist Movement, the driving force of Jewish homelessness and the friendly interest of the American Government. But we need a vigorous collective leadership to maintain our morale in the struggle.

Rabbi J. Berman (Mizrachi)

The speaker asserted that the upbuilding of Palestine must be conducted on the principles of the Torah and Jewish tradition. Only thus will we become strong and show the world the way. When a delegation of English clergymen visits our Kibbutzim and finds not a vestige of a Jewish God or a Jewish way of life, they go back, hostile to our demands and show an anxiety to ensure that British soldiers do not visit the Kibbutzim. Could the world expect such a Palestine to create something new in the world. We must strengthen our values. Let us not underestimate the strength of Jewish faith. The Jewish way and the Jewish faith are the way to victory.

Judge Morris Rothenberg (General Zionists)

Judge Rothenberg, President of the Jewish National Fund of America, emphasised the restrictive land laws of 1940 about which too little had been heard of the Congress. Immigration into Palestine without access to the land was meaningless, and would frustrate that portion of the Mandate which aimed at encouraging close settlement of Jews on the land. That was why the Anglo-American Committee had urged abolition of the land restrictions. The extension of J.N.F. holdings was a political as much as an economic need. It was regrettable that after all our work only 6.5% of Western Palestine was Jewish and only about half of this was national land. Larger immigration required expansion of the J.N.F. land programme. It was

intolerable that even the Palestinian war veterans were unable to settle in most of Western Palestine.

He appealed to Congress to lay stress on the land restrictions in its condemnation of British policy.

Mrs. Rabinowitz (Mizrachi)

Speaking on behalf of the Mizrachi and Junior Mizrachi Women, Mrs. Rabinowitz insisted on a demand for the whole of Western Palestine, as Eretz Israel was a totality and as such indivisible. If we went to London at all, it should only be to argue this case and not to compromise. Britain had no intention of giving us the Jewish State, large or small. We should persuade them that their greatest asset in the Middle East would be a Jewish State.

The only real political activity open to us now was to press on with constructive work - Aliyah, settlement, Chalutzit and Haganah. All the D.P. Camps in Europe should be turned into Hesheharah centres. A great part of official political activity should be centered in America.

World Zionist Congress: Seventeenth Session

The Seventeenth Session of the World Zionist Congress started at 4 p.m. on Monday afternoon, December 16, at 4 p.m. with P. H. Mr. Chaim Greenberg in the chair.

Dr. Adolph Berman (Siyah l'Achdut Avodah)

Dr. Berman said that as well as speaking for his party he spoke for 100,000 Polish Jews, the vast majority of whom identified themselves with the struggle for freedom of the Jewish people, and the land of the Jewish future, Palestine. Polish Jews could no longer give financial aid, but they would give what was even more important, manpower, the builders and the fighters.

It was not true to say that Kielce was the only impetus to emigration to Palestine. There were two deeper reasons. On the one hand the immense graveyard upon which they lived and on the other a mighty urge to end for all time the homelessness of the Jewish people. The national spirit of the Jews of Poland was encouraged by the noble attitude of the People's Government in Poland whose programme was threefold: political and economic equality, right to free emigration and support for Jewish aspirations in Palestine. Expressing dissatisfaction with the Political Debate, the speaker said he had hoped that the Congress would become a powerful demonstration of resistance and national mobilisation for the struggle. What was happening in Palestine was not only the concern of the Yishuv, it was deciding the fate of the whole Jewish people. Therefore he believed it was essential to set up a broad common front to protect Jewish rights ranging from the Agudah to Jewish Communists. The present struggle must be regarded as a continuation of the heroic uprising in the ghettos.



We must anticipate a long and difficult struggle. The British Empire is out to destroy us. We are not against the British Government or the British worker, but against British Imperialism in its Labour form we must declare a holy national war. Jewish labour in Palestine is too radical for British Imperialism. It is a thorn in the side of Imperialist plans for the Third World War. Let us declare categorically that Jewish labour in Palestine will not permit its country to become a strategic military base and a springboard for the attack on the Soviet Union. For this reason the new orientation to America is an illusion and a deception. This would mean at this time, an orientation towards ultra-capitalist American Imperialism which will ultimately turn against the progressive elements of the Yishuv. Therefore he recommended a third alternative, alignment with the socially progressive forces of the Soviet Union. He demanded that from <sup>this</sup> Tribune a mighty greeting should be sent to all those people who are struggling as we were against forces of imperialism. We should stretch out a hand to the Arab masses, straining under the yoke of their exploiters, not as foes but as friends, united in a common effort for freedom. He was against defeatism and evil compromise, against Zionist complacency and or Socialist self-satisfaction. He called upon the movement to repudiate the irresponsible Revisionist adventurers who once aimed at uniting us with the Fascist Mussolini in order to fulfil their dream of breaking the Histadruth, destroying labour positions and enslaving the Jewish working masses.

Rabbi Herschkovitz (General Zionists)

Rabbi Herschkovitz, speaking in the name of the remnant of the Jewish people, especially those left in Hungary, expressed his thanks to the Jews of all countries and especially the Jews of Palestine for their material and moral support from the time of their great suffering until this day. He also thanked the Red Army which had rescued the remnant of Hungarian Jewry. The delegate recalled that 50 years ago Hungarian Jewry did not send a single delegate to the Zionist Congress being unwilling to participate in the movement. Today there were 13 delegates and a new spirit had arisen in Hungarian Jewry, the spirit of Hibat Zion. In the Jewish schools of Hungary 3,000 children were learning Hebrew. The Jewish youth was training itself in Fachsherah camps and was turning towards Aliyah and Chelutzuth. The Hungarian who once symbolised assimilation were anxious today to identify themselves with the Jewish people. Hungarian Jewry does not wish to see distinctions made between Hungarian Jewry, Polish, Rumanian, American or other Jewries. We were the children of one people working to a common end. The Hungarian Government is making genuine attempts to diminish anti-Semitism, but the hatred of the Jews is great. We have only one solution, to rebuild Eretz Israel. The link between the remnant of Jewry and Eretz Israel is Aliyah. The speaker concluded by saying that every state is trying to halt Jewish immigration - only one state could make it possible, the Jewish State.

Mr. I. Yishayahu (Ichud Olami)

The delegate said it would have been well for Congress to discuss the position of the Jews in Eastern countries. It might have broadened their political horizon. He especially mentioned the most tragic of these communities, the Yemen which for centuries had drunk the cup of bitterness to the full and whose position had worsened in the last few years.

Perhaps these Jews may survive the burden of oppression from the Arabs. There was, however, the additional burden of hunger and disease without any medical alleviation and death was taking its toll. They had also to cope with the law which permitted the kidnapping and forcible conversion of Jewish orphans. Against these two scourges the Jews of Yemen see only one way out - the way to Palestine. For these reasons they were streaming in their thousands towards Palestine - towards Aden which they see as the gateway to Palestine. The delegate painted a tragic picture of the plight of the refugees and emigrants in Aden and said that the burning question was that of certificates. The Jews in Yemen know well that there are no certificates: they know of the great suffering of those who are already in Aden, nevertheless they still come in the hope that Aliyah may be possible. Attempts have been made to prevent more from coming until those already there are assured of certificates, but to no avail. It seems that their suffering has reached breaking point.

On their way they pass through territories inhabited by savage tribes given to robbery and murder. Being neither Yemenites nor subjects of Aden they are helpless and considered outside the law. Many perish on the way. They were receiving help from the Joint on the initiative of the Jewish Agency, but much more could be done. One pound can save a Jewish life. During the last few years 6,000 Jews from the Yemen have arrived in Palestine and had been settled at a cost of only 1/2 million pounds. Between all the new arrivals 2,000 Yemenite Jews served in the forces. And Jews from the Yemen can be found in every chalutzig undertaking in Palestine. It is only right they should be considered as equal in national help and rescue. The world was prone to consider the problem of refugees as being that of European Jewry only. But there were 45,000 Jews in the Yemen and who know how many more amongst the tribes in the interior. Only last year an emissary brought news of a Jewish tribe in Khaban, cut off for centuries from Jewish life and living like the neighbouring bedouins. He concluded by saying that in common with all other Jews the Jews of Yemen were beating at the gates of Palestine and would not rest until the gates were wide open.

Mr. A. Goldstein (General Zionists)

The speaker said he appeared not as a representative of any party but as a man in the street, unacquainted with hairsplitting ideologies, but weighed down with Jewish sorrow.

No one could gainsay the achievements of the Executive. But his impression was that they had no clear line and sought only a mandate to be allowed to continue in the same way as before. It is almost impossible to secure information as to what really happened in Paris. Members of the Executive visiting America had given diverse reports on what transpired. Dr. Weizmann was full of status quo, Ben Gurion repudiates partition and calls for return to Biltmore: Ben Gurion says the imminence of the Morrison-Grady plan was the reason for the Paris decision whereas Goldman says the reason was the deadlock in negotiations. Can they not agree as to what the reason was? Dr. Goldman says this is the first time that the U.S. Government has supported Jewish proposals. But American delegates who had worked to secure Government influence, are not so optimistic.

The truth is that this is not the first time that the American Government had offered real support. At one time they were ready even to the point of using their army to make a real contribution. But Britain side-tracked this intention. What is the use, therefore, of deluding oneself about achievements which do not exist. The speaker detected a new tone in the discussion on whether or not one should go to the London Conference - there was even a suggestion that we should go unconditionally.

Dr. I. Schwarzbart (General Zionist)

Dr. Schwarzbart said it was significant that he followed the representative of Polish Jewry. He, Dr. Schwarzbart, represented Polish Jewry during the war and as such he joins in paying tribute to the great efforts of Polish Jewry and to their hopes for the restoration of a free and democratic life. We had not only to overcome the negative attitude of Great Britain, but the pronounced indifference of Soviet Russia. For in our struggle to enlist United Nations' support we could not count upon the Soviet Union. In 1946 the Jewish Communist Party had published a credo which contained opposition to the Jewish State and free immigration, and which declared that they stood for immigration only under joint Arab-Jewish control. This should not be overlooked. We are accused of being tied in the wake of Soviet power politics. It should be made clear from this platform that we are not tied to any Power, we are the expression of the positive tendencies in Jewish life.

Quoting Dr. Weizmann's letter, setting out the terms upon which we should go to the London Conference, Dr. Schwarzbart said there was no reason to change this Executive Decision. If the Executive had not succeeded in their efforts to change the basis of the Conference since September what chance have we now if we go to the London Conference.

He was one of those who in 1937 voted for partition, but today none of the three possibilities independence on both sides of the Jordan, a Jewish State on one side or partition was realisable and the discussion was purely theoretical. The time for decision has not come and the way out would be a repetition of the formula of 1937 by which the Executive was in power to negotiate. The real task of the Congress was to deal with the creation of a United front for the Jewish people. The fact that other Jewish organisations did not accept the invitation without the Jewish Agency has made a deep impression upon the Government.

Mr. M. Gnessier (Revisionist)

M. Gnessier, Revisionist delegate for North Africa, began by saying that at the moment the eyes of the refugees in Europe were turned in desperation to the Congress for help and the proud and dignified resistance of Palestine places its hopes upon us to secure that which is ours. He addressed himself to the Congress to make his modest contribution. Jewry in France and Africa represented the second great concentration of Jews. North African Zionism had developed out of their suffering in the war and had found in Revisionism the integral doctrine of Herzl, and the example of

Jabotinsky. French North Africa and the Zionism to be found there had assumed a great importance as it was an integral part of France, not the France of Vichy, but that generous France which had subscribed through its great son Cambon to the Balfour Declaration. North African Zionism was also important because it was a country with an Arab majority and he affirmed from the platform that friendship between Jew and Arab could be established. The problem could be solved if Great Britain would scrupulously respect the terms of the Mandate. He believed that unity could be established among the Jewish people. Our force would be irresistible.

Mr. E. Liebenstein (Ichud Olami)

The speaker felt that the Congress had been conducted in the style of a mass meeting and there was little moral encouragement to take back to Palestine. Our main obstacle was the attitude of the British government. As to the Arabs they were hopelessly divided. Were it a question of Jews and Arabs a way out would be possible. It was strange that during discussions on the Jewish State there were possibilities of contact with Arabs whereas when the State was not being discussed disturbances broke out. He believed British opposition was due not so much to British imperialism but that they were afraid of the political, industrial and technical strength of the Jews in Palestine. And the Morrison Plan was more convenient for the British than any other Zionist demand. The Morrison plan aimed at unlimited British rule and the interruption of Jewish immigration and colonisation. It would fail and the British will have to find another solution.

The lines of our struggle would be complicated, but partition was dangerous and should only be undertaken if there is no other way out. It is doubtful whether the partition proposal was timely. It was a technical error. And he did not accept the view that President Truman had suddenly become enamoured of the plan. They will either offer us a Jewish State within the framework of the Morrison plan or accept the Goldman plan without a Jewish State. No such compromise could be accepted. Many believe that important British circles are willing to agree to a viable Jewish State, but he quoted a "Times" article which denies that the Jewish State could solve the Jewish problem. Congress should not decide against going to the London Conference, for if there is hope of success a last attempt should be made. Let them not be able to say that if we had gone we might have avoided sacrifices and suffering. The decision might be left to the Executive but with three conditions (1) that it be a Jewish State in Palestine undivided, (2) continuation of work during the period of negotiations and (3) unity in defence organisation. Finally, he said, we were approaching a decision and we should not underestimate the small things nor be deterred by the large ones.

Captain Baker (Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi)

The speaker brought greetings from the Mizrachi in Poland and from the Jewish communities there. He disagreed with Dr. Berman's estimate of conditions in that country and said that we needed one orientation towards our own traditions.



Polish Jewry did not ask for sympathy, it wished to take its own part in the struggle for freedom of our people. But resistance could only be conducted on a organized basis. The speaker told of the thrill of pride which passed through Polish Jewry when they heard of the new religious settlements in Palestine, but it hurt them when they heard that there were settlements conducted on an irreligious basis. When he insisted on traditional observance in the central organisations of Poland he was asked whether things were better in Palestine.

Mr. Jochanan Hachohen (General Zionists)

Mr. Cohen said Congress should make up its mind to concentrate on the redemption of Israel and the creation of an independent Jewish Palestine. The only discussion can be on ways and means. The Biltmore resolution was the result of a natural process based on three factors, The British retreat from the Mandate, the World War which opened new horizons for Jewish demands and the crystallisation of the Jewish vital forces. The Biltmore programme was not the final aim of our movement. Had we been able to continue under the Mandate we should not have proclaimed Biltmore. He opposed the contention of Hashomer Hatzair that we had to find a new ally. The world had had disappointing results from the great powers. We had been bitterly disappointed in the new Government in England and which had now declared war against Jewish achievements in Palestine. The speaker expressed his astonishment at Dr. Goldman's words. He did not believe that by shortcuts we could achieve anything. There should be an end to the policy of accepting decisions in advance.

Mr. M. Solomon (Mizrachi)

The speaker brought greetings from the surviving Jews of Hungary. He said that not enough was known of the wonderful work of the Jewish "underground" which achieved great things with the help of the Swiss Government. The whole of Hungarian Jewry was deeply grateful to the Swiss Government. Tens of thousands of Jews were saved. The speaker paid tribute to the Joint and said that today there were 140,000 Jews of whom over 120,000 were maintained by the Joint. Though the country was under a democratic Government, public opinion was poisoned. The Zionist question was one of life and death for them. He asked Congress to find a solution for the problem of Hungarian Jewry. The speaker hoped that Hungarian Jews would still play an important roll in the great work before the Zionist movement.

MONDAY NIGHT SPEECHES

At the close of the political debate which is reported above, important speeches were delivered by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Mr. David Ben Gurion, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Stephen Wise.

These will appear in full in the next issue of the Bulletin.

DECISION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE CHAIRMEN AND  
VICE-CHAIRMEN OF THE VARIOUS COMMISSIONS.

---

<u>COMMITTEE</u>	<u>CHAIRMEN</u>	<u>VICE-CHAIRMEN</u>
Standing Committee	Ichud	General Zionist
Political Committee	General Zionist	Ichud Olami
Immigration, Hachsharah, Hachalah	General Zionist) Ichud Olami	Mizrachi
Budget	Mizrachi	(Ichud Olami (Achdut Avodah
Agricultural	Ichud Olami	Hashomer Hapair
Labour	Achdut Avodah	Revisionist
Youth	Hashomer Hapair	General Zionist
Urban Colonisation	General Zionist	Mizrachi
Organisation) Propaganda )	Ichud Olami	General Zionist
Education, Culture	Mizrachi	Revisionist
Diaspora	Revisionist	Ichud Olami

Mr. Zalman Rubishev was elected Chairman of the Standing Committee.

Mr. Daniel Frisch Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee.

---

MARITIME DAY AT BASLE.

The gathering of friends and supporters of the Palestine Maritime League held yesterday took a novel form. Two parties one in the morning and the other in the afternoon embarked on a Rhine steamer and the meeting was held whilst the ship sailed along the Rhine, with the participation of representatives of a number of countries. At the mast of the ship, the flag of the League with the Hebrew Name Chevel Yami Leisrael flew and attracted the attention of passers by.

Mr. S. Tolkowsky, M.B.E., the Chairman of the League who presided, said that Jews had had an unbroken connection with the sea throughout the centuries. The crowning achievement in Maritime activity was the establishment of the National shipping company "ZIM", the first step in the creation of a Jewish Merchant Navy. Their first ship, the "Kolmah" of 3,000 tons would shortly be in commission. It would carry about 300 passengers and a Jewish crew. Messrs. J. Frischman, J. Schrier, and M. Rivlin, members of the committee, reported on the activities of the League in Palestine and abroad, describing the Fishing Research Station of Haifa, the building of training boats, the Haifa Nautical School, the Sailors Home, and other ramifications of the League. Palestine has 25,000 members, and the budget of League in 1946 was 50,000 pounds, derived solely from membership fees and contributions.

Professor Brodetsky, Itschak Gruenbaum, Abba Khushi, and I. Shragai addressed the gathering, stressing the importance of maritime development, and the role of the League. Rabbi Professor Abraham brought greetings from the branch in South Africa, of which he is President, and Mr. Maurice Rosette, a member of the British Committee spoke. Advocate Golub of Italy and J. Ratner of Germany described the Maritime training of refugees at Fano and Degendorf. Mr. Lerner brought greetings from the newly established branch in Roumania.

---

CONGRESS NOTICES.

Children and Youth Aliyah will hold a meeting on Sunday, 22nd December, in the late afternoon. Particulars with regard to time and place will be announced within the next days. For information, please enquire at the Youth Aliyah Office, Congress Building, Mustermesse.

VISIT THE EXHIBITION.

The exhibition "20 years' Record of Jewish Industrial Development in Palestine", which is held in the Basler Halle (opposite the Congress Building) attracts a large number of visitors every day. The Congress delegates, the guests and the local visitors show a great interest towards the different branches of this exhibition, and they receive a detailed answer to their questions from the management. In order to give the visitors an opportunity to get acquainted with the various items of special interest to them in the different branches of industry, the management is ready to arrange special conducted tours in different languages, according to request. All those interested are requested to apply in this matter to the Department of Trade and Industry of the Jewish Agency, in the Congress Building.

\* \* \* \* \*



# קונגרס הציוני

## Congression

Basle

No. 11

22-12-46

### 22ND ZIONIST CONGRESS: CONCLUSION OF NINETEENTH SESSION.

Following the addresses of Dr. Granovsky and Mr. Leib Jaffe at the Nineteenth Session (published in Congress Bulletin No. 10), the Chairman, the Rev. J.K. Goldbloom expressed appreciation to all engaged in national fund-raising work. Our emissaries had accomplished much in the last twenty years, he said, in mobilising the resources of the Jewish people for the upbuilding of our homeland.

The Chairman then called upon Sir Leon Simon, one of the oldest English Zionists, and at present chairman of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Sir Leon Simon said that he had been a Zionist for 45 years, and had participated in many Zionist Congresses. But this was the first time he had had the honour to appear on the tribune of Congress. He brought greetings from the Institution which was closely connected with the Zionist movement and with our national renaissance. Sir Leon talked of the progress at the University which today had 150 Readers and Lecturers, and a thousand students. Most of the students were Palestinians; but there were a number from other countries, including the United States of America. All branches of learning were represented at the University faculties. Up to now, there was no Faculty of Medicine, owing to a lack of teaching personnel. But now this difficulty was about to be remedied, and a department was about to be set up which would train the doctors which the Yishuv will need.

During its existence, the University had had to fend for itself. There was no University in the world which did not receive an income from various sources, as, for example, interest on legacies, or Government subsidies. The Hebrew University could count on nothing of this kind. With great difficulty, it was compelled to secure donations from the public spirited in America, Britain and other countries.

But this could not continue, said Sir Leon. The University would be compelled to continue its collections, but the time had come when the Zionist movement and the Jewish Agency would have to come to the help of the University.

The budget of the University now amounted to £400,000. And when the Medical Faculty would open, this would be considerably increased. It would amount to between £500,000 and £600,000. The Zionist organisation, said Sir Leon, had to contribute at least £100,000 annually to the budget of the University. This was a modest demand, and Sir Leon hoped that the delegates to the Congress without distinction of party would support it and help the Hebrew University to fulfil its important tasks in the coming years.



22nd World Zionist Congress: Twentieth Session

The Twentieth Session of Congress opened on Thursday 19th December, 1946 at 8 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. L. Gurfinkel. Dr. E. Schmorak, member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency, delivered an address which will appear as a special supplement in one of the coming issues of the Congress Bulletin.

Dr. Schmorak was followed by Mr. A. Harzfeld, who opened by declaring that we all considered two factors as the very source of Zionism: Immigration and land settlement. Everything else was linked to these two fundamentals. Yet these two factors were not widely discussed at this Congress. Mr. Harzfeld dwelt particularly on the two events that had occurred in the two months before Congress had opened; the 'going up' in the Negev; the establishment there of the eleven settlements in two days; and the arrival of a ship with 4,000 immigrants. Yet we have heard very little about these two events, which were not only a symbol of our strength and prospects, but were also a legacy for the future.

Mr. Harzfeld went on to describe our concrete achievements during the war years. In the 7-year period since the last Congress, 63 new settlements were created on Keren Kayemeth land with the help of the Keren Hayesod. A description giving details of this work and of the people who had carried it out would add a rich chapter to our history. "I think", he said, "we can have a slight break and enjoy the luxury of thanking all those who have helped us to bring this miraculous work to fruition."

The eleven settlements which were set up in two days have been erected quite differently from earlier "watchtower" settlements, Mr. Harzfeld went on. The reason for the enthusiasm and the extraordinary joy with which the news had been greeted was, first, that we had established aid centres for our settlements in the south: Gevulot, Bet Eshel and Asluz. These were three points quite a distance from each other and all were cut off from the rest of Palestine. They were a small group of people, living under very great hardships. "I spent a night in Beerot Itzhak, the Hapoel Hamizrachi settlement near Gaza," said Mr. Harzfeld, "and I have seen how the Chaverim were brought to the new settlements. I watched the faces of the older settlers when they thanked the newcomers, saying 'we are no longer alone and isolated'!"

Those people who had to visit Ruhama were compelled to walk for long stretches, and sometimes to spend a night in the desert on the way. Suddenly Ruhama had been enriched with two new neighbouring settlements. The same was true of Beth Eshel and other places. All our positions in the south were actually established during the war and we now felt happier and more comfortable. The arrival of this new strength had also increased our sense of security.

The creation of these new settlements, Mr. Harzfeld continued, was the first concrete manifestation that we had begun to consider the Negev as a serious practical settlement area. But this was only a beginning. We had only two or three prefabricated huts at each settlement centre, and they could not yet be regarded as built-up inhabited regions in the desert. Such regions were as yet only discernible in our mind's eye. The problem of water suddenly emerged

with grim acuteness in this desert of the Negev. Only today, the speaker added, had word been received that a water pipe line had been laid from Nir Chaim and Gvar Am running to Mizpeh Hayam. Two or three years ago, none had believed that these centres would be able to supply water. Today it was clear to all that the plan that had earlier been undertaken had been fully justified.

Mr. Harzfeld hoped that there would be no reproach at the fact that no other settlement news had been heard following the announcement of the celebrated 'Negev Eleven'. The fact is that other settlements had been established in Palestine in the last few weeks. But after this great news of the Negev with the simultaneous creation of eleven the establishment of one or two seemed unnewsworthy by comparison.

The speaker went on to outline a settlement plan whereby 25 to 30 new settlements could be established fairly soon - a third of them in the Negev. This was not easy. But what had already been achieved had also not been easy. The 17 new settlements which had been created in the year 5707 together with the water supply programme in the Negev had cost £17,000. Courage was needed in no small degree to embark on such an expenditure. Mr. Chazan had asked why this had not been done a year ago. The question was perfectly proper. But the fact was that we had now reached such a dangerous pass that the danger had alone been responsible for our undertaking these ventures in the Negev even though we had been without the necessary funds. It was danger which had prompted us to afford a luxury we could not otherwise have permitted ourselves. Mr. Harzfeld went on to say that the cost of the 30 new projected settlements would be one and a half million pounds. And he was convinced that, difficult though it might be, we should secure these funds.

Turning to the question of shipping, Mr. Harzfeld said that when he had heard that one of our ships had arrived bringing in 4,000 people, he had been considerably moved. And he had asked himself at the time, if we could manage to bring in 4,000, why not a ship with 5,000 or even 10,000, and to bring in our 100,000 immigrants in a year? This would also be in accordance with the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry which had been unanimous on the subject of the 100,000. But this too was linked to financial considerations. The cost per person was £40 to £50. So that 4 or 5 million pounds would be required to bring in the 100,000. Our American friends had discussed today a budget of fifteen million pounds. When such a stage had been reached, it was not unreasonable to think of another four millions, said Mr. Harzfeld.

We talked of struggle. But what were we struggling for? We are struggling for the conquest of the soil. If we talked of establishing thirty new settlements, we should think of doing it now. In six months' time we should be preparing for the next stage. Every day we lost was a crime against our future. And the same was true of immigration. Those who brought the ship with four thousand must not rest. There was no time for a halt in this work.

In conclusion, Mr. Harzfeld said that our penetration of stretches of land which some had suggested should be prohibited to us, did in fact vitiate the plans of our enemies designed to obstruct our development. "Let us penetrate further and further into these areas", he said, "and let us bring in more and more Jews, so that the question of 100,000 will no longer be a world topic of conversation but a reality."

Mr. Intriligator (Hapoel Hamizrachi) asked Congress not to forget when speaking of new settlements the position of the existing settlements which were facing special difficulties since the end of the war. During the war, loans had been easy to secure. Now the banks were much tighter. The settlements were nevertheless faced with the task of taking in new immigrants, and while none could refuse to make sacrifices to this end, he thought the Executive should understand the difficulties of the younger settlements and be prepared to help them. Only then would they be able to play their part in this vital work.

Dr. Shostak (Revisionist) said that it seemed to him that in economic policy our institutions were unwittingly helping the White Paper policy, and tacitly accepted every edict sometimes with protest and sometimes even without. The Yishuv contributed 80% of the budget of the country and of this 90% went to support Arabs. Our institutions had compromised on the boycott which was not only a danger to us, but a menace to our plans for the development of the Middle East.

In the matter of demobilised soldiers, we had acquiesced in bearing the whole burden and in housing the administration had succeeded in obstructing the housing possibilities of the country. All this had happened with scarcely a protest. There was an internal political struggle as well as an external one. The institutions were dominated by one party and this was hindering our development and was a danger to the future of the Yishuv.

Dr. A. Katznelson (Ichud), Director of Health of the Vaad Leumi, complained that the question of practical and constructive work had not aroused sufficient interest at this Congress. There had been much talk of political activism, and not enough of economic activism. It was in this that the Executive could show most results.

Few remembered the financial conditions under which this Executive had assumed its duties. "Thirteen years ago", said Dr. Katznelson, "I was in negotiation with the Executive on the question of Education when this field was taken over by the Vaad Leumi. The Executive agreed to contribute £40,000 annually to education. It had then been unable to hand this sum over in cash. It was compelled to give bills, which no bank would discount. It was with great difficulty that we persuaded a group of bankers to advance this sum to the Vaad Leumi. That is how the finances of the Executive stood thirteen years ago. Today the financial Commission deals with a budget of fifteen million pounds, whereas the total budget of the Palestine Administration is about 20 millions. All this has happened in a period when Palestine was torn by four years of Arab disturbance, and six years of war. In these years, the Yishuv has grown and has become an important factor in every economic sphere."

Dr. Katznelson went on to say that the division of functions between the Jewish Agency and the Vaad Leumi had become a real problem. Both institutions recognised that the Yishuv had to take over social services, such as education, health and social work, and this had in fact been done. In the last year the combined budget of these three services had reached five million pounds, and only ten per cent had come from outside sources. The Palestine

Government had contributed only 1/2 million or 10 per cent towards this five million - and it had done that only after a struggle. The Revisionists had an easy remedy for our difficulties in this sphere. They suggested handing over our schools and hospitals to the Government. We did not propose to try this, said the speaker.

One institution alone, Kupat Cholim, which cared for the health of a quarter of a million workers, with a budget of two million pounds, was conducted without any outside help, Dr. Katznelson continued. Thus the wish of Kaplan that Palestine institutions should become a self-supporting was being realised.

But the Yishuv was not content to confine itself to its own institutions. It had played its part through the National Funds, on a scale worthy of comparison with the largest countries. In the last few years, the Yishuv contributed in the three funds £1,600,000 and if the Yishuv received a subsidy from the Agency and asked for more, it was only a small part of what they themselves had been giving.

Explaining the legal position of the Vaad Leumi, Dr. Katznelson said it had no power to tax the Jewish population. This was only within the competence of municipalities, Local Councils, and Communities. Without funds of its own, the Vaad Leumi's position was difficult and it meant that the Jewish Agency had to a certain extent to continue to bear their financial responsibilities.

Dr. Katznelson then outlined the future plans: the Yishuv had contributed 175,000 pounds last year to education. This would have to be increased, for the education budget was affected more than any other by the increased cost of living. Further spheres were the encouragement of Hebrew among the new immigrants and special attention to the physical education of the youth after years of neglect, a vital matter if we were to prepare our youth for work and defence. There was also the problem of child welfare, mothercraft and the need for a family endowment fund to help large families and to help increase the birth rate in Palestine. Everything which this Congress would do to help Palestine's institutions was indissolubly bound up with the progress of Zionism, said Dr. Katznelson, in conclusion. Helping the Yishuv to stand on its own feet is sound Zionist policy, and this policy must be supported and understood by this Congress."

Dr. Katznelson was followed by Mr. N. Bader (Hashomer Hatzair) who declared that the single shaft of light that had penetrated our darkness in the last grim years had been our achievements in Palestine. It was only fair to pay just tribute to Mr. Kaplan for the one positive asset we possess. But here our criticism began. Mr. Kaplan had gone in too much for the consolidation of our finances. After such a war, after the vast need to rescue our brethren and develop the Yishuv, after such an expansion which had demanded colossal investments, after such a period . . . the Jewish Agency should have borrowed more, and should have increased its indebtedness still further. If this was not so, one of two things had happened: either the Jewish Agency had not fully exploited all the available possibilities, or it had not itself borne the burden of immigrant absorption, but transferred that burden to the shoulders of the settlements. The fact is that both things had happened, that opportunities had been missed and not enough advantage had been taken of all the development prospects.



Mr. Beder went on to say that the Chalutzik section of the Yishuv was bearing a disproportionate share of the general burden as a result of this false economic policy to consolidate the finances of the Jewish Agency. Mr. Kaplan's words are themselves the best indictment of the exaggerated consolidation policy he was pursuing. It may have been alright thirteen years ago. It was a mistake during the war and it was a mistake today, at this moment of our struggle. The speaker added that he could not avoid the conclusion that the illusion of a State had influenced this possibility. Fifty years ago, Herzl had said 'Things create conditions' and this was just as true today.

Dr. S. Moses (Aliyah Chadashah) paid tribute to Mr. Kaplan for his work during a difficult period and underlined the question of an Economic Bureau which Mr. Kaplan had demanded. We hoped that Congress would act upon this proposal which had been accepted in principle by more than one Congress. Heading this bureau should be a non-party man, in a permanent appointment which could not be subject to termination without a three fourths majority of the Actions Committee.

Speaking of budget policy, Mr. Moses thought that two changes should be made: changes in organisation and in the budget itself. A more intensive and active participation was needed on the part of the competent bodies of the Zionist Organisation in financial activities, and especially in the practical carrying out of the budget. It would be in the interests of the Finance Department of the Jewish Agency to work in conjunction with a special budget sub-committee which the Smaller Actions Committee should set up. As regards the budget itself, the Jewish Agency had not taken into consideration the different sections of the Yishuv. In the last seven years only four per cent of the general colonisation budget had been allotted to middle-class colonisation. It was imperative that this percentage be substantially increased. Dr. Moses also demanded larger support for RASSCO, which concerned itself with middle-class settlement and increased subsidies for industry as well as for shipping and fishing. In this sphere, the pioneering elements represented in the shipping companies had been given no support by our national institutions. The speaker demanded that the budget should be altered to take into consideration the vitally urgent needs of these elements which had so far been treated as step-children.

Mr. Shmuel Dayan (Ichud) said that now, after twenty five years of our work and achievement, the Revisionist delegate came along and asked us to hand over everything to them - and they would lead us to greater gains than the Zionist Organisation had been able to effect! We could not ignore and Zionist history could not deny that throughout this whole period, they, the Revisionists, stood outside, and did everything they could to hinder and destroy. This was their achievement. And therefore our people will hand no task over to them. Mr. Dayan went on to speak of the tremendous accomplishments which had been effected in the last twenty five years despite the difficulties and grim struggles. He spoke especially of the Emek, which had just celebrated its twenty-fifth birthday. But, said the speaker, we could not be self-satisfied. We stood before the blank wall of the White Paper, before a road which was blocked. We had to consolidate our settlements in every part of the country and develop everything capable of development. This was our real task in the years between Congresses.

Mr. Dayan concluded with the demand that fifty per cent of the Zionist budget should be allotted to agricultural settlement and colonisation.

Mr. Shutzberg (Hashomer Hatza ir) also observed that too little attention had been paid to colonisation. And this was symptomatic of the trend of thought in our movement which no longer put work and development in the forefront of its programme. He went on to describe the great advances which had been made in agricultural technique and specialist skill in Palestine. Speaking of the effect of the war on the settlements, Mr. Shutzberg said that their position was grave. Mr. Kaplan had not explained why this was so, but he, the speaker, said that the reason was the new settlements should not be created unless a new colonisation budget had been set up at the same time. In addition to providing the land and the water, they needed to be adequately financed. The limitations of the Executive budget were known. But the speaker was not convinced that their restrictions should have been so rigid in face of the difficulties of the settlements. "I believe", said Mr. Shutzberg in conclusion, "that we are on the eve of a great Aliyah. And if we want to see these new immigrants coming on to the land, we must do everything possible to enable the settlements to undertake this great task."

Mr. Kalmer (Hapoel Mahizrachi) dealt in his speech with the condition in town and village. This question he said had not been given its proper place in Mr. Kaplan's address. Speaking of the Jewish workers in the orange grove, Mr. Kalmer said that the Jewish Agency had not given them sufficient attention. There was a considerable difference between the wage levels in rural orange groves and in the towns. And it was necessary to give constructive help if Jewish labour was to be attracted to the groves. There was also the problem of housing for this type of worker, and account should be taken of this in the handling of the housing budget.

This concluded the Twentieth Session.

#### Death of Mr. Jacob Fishman

We regret to announce the sudden death in Basle on Friday night, 20th December, of Mr. Jacob Fishman, Editor of the New York Jewish Morning Journal. He was 69. Mr. Fishman had come here as a member of the United States delegation to Congress, and was a valued member of the Political Commission. He had been active in Congress work up to the very moment of his death.

One of the best loved figures in Jewish life, Mr. Fishman had a long and distinguished record of prominent Zionist leadership. A writer and journalist of distinction, he was one of the great Yiddish editors of his generation.

The funeral will take place on Monday 23rd December, 1946.

World Zionist Congress: Eighteenth Session

Mr. Eliezer Kaplan's Address  
(continued)

/// The first part of Mr. Kaplan's address on Tuesday December 17th was published in Congress Bulletin No. 10. Here is the second part. The speech, translated from the Yiddish, is reproduced in full. ///

-----

An additional factor stimulating the development of the agricultural settlements were the new immigrants. The settlements were the absorbing ground for Youth Aliyah, as well as for adult immigrants. On the 1st October of this year, the country absorbed 4,376 young people and 1,000 adults in the settlements. In lean times, the acceptance of these immigrants placed a heavy burden on the settlements. There is a moral obligation on the Jewish Agency and the Keren Hayesod to concern themselves about this absorption. I have already mentioned the large sums whose allocation for agricultural settlement and colonisation was agreed upon for the year 5707 - £1,450,000 for creating new settlements and for developing the existing ones. Today, out of 238 of the aforementioned settlements, there are 148 under the supervision of the Colonisation Department of the Jewish Agency and dependent on its budget. Consequently the resources which we have available for extended development are small, sometimes ludicrously small, in relation to needs. Under pressure of necessity, the settlements have sought other ways out; they have raised loans on the private market. During the war, when money was plentiful, loans were freely offered. And short-term loans were taken for building houses, for planting, for extending water supplies, etc. despite the high cost of investment during the war. As long as the standard of living rose with the cost of living, as long as there was prosperity, the wheels turned smoothly. But already during the last year and a half, conditions have begun to turn to the disadvantage of the agricultural settlements. Many are experiencing a severe financial strain. And the problem of restoring the soundness and economic health of many of their estates is pressing. Conversion occupies a permanent place in the plans which the Agricultural Department of the Jewish Agency and the concerned parties have prepared. There are, however, other questions, some far-reaching. How are we, for example, to finance our settlements in the years ahead? No problem can be fundamentally solved by loans. We can, of course, demand that the proportion of the Keren Hayesod devoted to agricultural development shall be increased. This, however, means competition with other important fields which stand in equal need - Aliyah, security, political and other work. We sought to establish a whole range of undertakings which could assume the burden of financing a part of the colonisation budget. We have tried to mobilise resources on the private market. But experience has shown that they can help only when the basic budget of colonisation has been covered.

Sooner or later, whether it wants to or not, the Zionist movement will have to face the question of national planning and a national budget. I have mentioned the Keren Kayemeth and Keren Hayesod. These two departments are not sacrosanct. Up to the first world war, the Keren Kayemeth bore the whole burden of colonisation. In the first years after the founding of the Keren Hayesod, the Keren Kayemeth continued to carry out its task of providing water supply. Only in 1929 did Congress decide - when the income of the Keren Kayemeth was substantially lower than that of the Keren Hayesod - to free the Keren Kayemeth from this burden. And the Keren Hayesod took over the provision of water supply. We must at all times be free to consider the methods of our work, taking into consideration only one thing: how best can we build up our land?

I have devoted much time and space to financial questions. I should like to repeat here what I have said many times in Palestine, that the financial problem is not the only one which confronts us. We are faced with a whole series of economic and technical problems. But in the financial sphere, I consider it my duty to record that all the comparatively well established settlements now regularly meet their financial obligations to the Keren Hayesod. Moreover, there were hundreds of settlements, especially Moshavim, who considered it their duty to repay their loans long before they were due. Moshavim, for example, like Nahalal, Kfar Yehoshua, Kfar Vitkin, El Yashiv and others. These loans were not due for repayment for a number of years - and they were originally lent at a small interest rate of two to four percent. The settlements considered it, however, a matter of honour to repay the loans at the earliest opportunity, so as to ease the burden of the Jewish Agency and enable it to extend its colonisation projects. This is the major part of the explanation of the large sum by which our assets were increased during the war. In the report which is before you, you will also note the great strides made in agricultural technology both in quality and in quantity.

Let me say a few words about the settlements in the Negev. My friends, we have talked about the Negev for a long time. As long as 27 years ago, Dr. Weizmann carried about with him the plan for securing a million dunams in the Negev. 25 years ago we established a small experimental station at Bئر Sheva. We soon liquidated it, however, and the Negev remained beyond the scope of our endeavours. The new stimulus to the Negev came from the late Joshua Hankin and from Moshe Smilensky. This was a considerable achievement. On their own initiative they penetrated the Negev and conquered substantial stretches. About three years ago, to some extent on the initiative of the Keren Kayemeth, we established the experimental settlements "outposts" as we called them.

These were courageous experiments, and they paved the way for the colonisation of the Negev on a much larger scale. As you know, we established 11 new settlements in the Negev a few months ago. They are founded on the assumption that we shall either bring water from a distance, or try to conserve the rain water on the spot. Or we may bring water from settlements 60 to 80 kilometres North West of Beer Sheva or from places on the coast. This settlement project will cost us £600,000 in the first stage of which £350,000 will have to go for provision of water. We aim to establish another seven settlements in the Negev and we shall then apply ourselves completely



to the problem of water, so as to ensure a basic minimum of 40 cubic metres per hour for each settlement.

I do not believe it necessary for me to stress the significance of this project. There are in this region millions of dunams, inhabited by only a few tens of thousands of Bedouins. The Government has done little for their development. Our presence there can transform the entire area. We want the Arabs to benefit from our development, and we hope that it will open new horizons for us. I can definitely state that for the time being relations are good between us and our neighbours in the Negev.

The young people whom we have sent there come from all groups and classes. It is indeed a gathering of the exiles, Sabras, Youth Aliyah trainees, new immigrants, often no older than 18 or 19. Theirs will be a hard life - a life of pioneering. Their task is the task of turning this wilderness into a garden. One of the young pioneers told me an amusing story. "Do you know," he asked me, "what is considered in the Negev a rich soup? One which contains a lot of water." Water there is indeed the rarest commodity. A cubic metre of water costs us between £1 and £1.10.0.

But already in the last few months the landscape has undergone a change. I had a wonderful feeling on my last visit finding that I could travel safely between one settlement and the other. I felt myself again among my own. Palestine is a small country. But in this small country you can experience every kind of climate and every kind of soil. And each has its own great possibilities, which can be exploited by those permeated with a love of the soil and of creative work - those who see their task as one of life and death. Our greatest possession is Palestine and its human material - our youth - which is ready to do all to create and struggle.

All these plans are really part of a much greater plan to utilise in the most rational way every part of Jewish soil in Palestine. On surface irrigation, our Experimental Station in Rehovot has carried out an accurate analysis on every sample of Jewish soil. It has examined the possibilities which irrigation, reparation, new farming methods, new experiments, new plant strains, and new seeds will open up. The Experimental Station considers, after careful analysis, that in the valleys alone, some 12,000 new farming families can be settled. They have worked out a plan for settling 6,000 families in the coming two or three years and thus consolidate 3,000 existing economic units. At present price levels, this will require a sum of £9,000,000. This together with the plans for the new settlements will almost double the number of our settlements in the country. This demands not only money and a suitable approach but more Jews for Palestine to become settlers and consumers. Aliyah is the driving force of our life and work in Palestine.

I want to mention one other sphere of activity, the settlement of our demobilised ex-servicemen and their rehabilitation into civilian life. This serious problem first confronted us a year ago. I made mention of it at the London Conference. The truth is that this problem is causing us great concern. In other

countries it is primarily the responsibility of the Governments. In Palestine, the Government accepts certain obligations, but the main responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Yishuv, upon our shoulders; it begins with the first contact after demobilisation and goes on until they have been finally rehabilitated.

In dealing with this question we have worked in close co-operation with other bodies; in housing we worked with the municipalities and banks to set up reconstruction loans. The campaign for Mobilisation having helped us to secure substantial resources.

I am not going to say that the problem has been solved. This year a proposal has been worked out which envisages the investment of about a million and a half pounds and the Jewish Agency will participate to the extent of 60%. It is my belief that we have not treated the soldiers who represented the Jewish people, worse than any other nation in the world. Out of twenty thousand soldiers there remain only about a thousand who still need rehabilitation. The problem that still remains to be solved is that of housing. To sum up, the Yishuv and the Zionist movement, have withstood the test under conditions which are known to all of you. They tackled it with dignity and with a full sense of their obligations to the demobilised soldiers.

En passant I should like to indicate our successes in the sphere of fishery. Here our efforts before the war had not succeeded, but during the war fishery became one of the most important activities in many of the settlements and has now become one of the most important sources of food for the Yishuv. Deep-sea fishing has reached the stage in which it is self-supporting. It opens new prospects, namely to establish a series of fishing settlements on the shores of the sea. Deep-sea fishing is, moreover, essential to education in seamanship. In order to help and to stimulate seafaring, we decided, two years ago, to create a national seafaring company known by the name "Zim". The subscribed capital up to now amounts to £250,000. "Zim" together with an English shipping company, founded a daughter company. I hope that the first passenger ship of the new company "Kedmah" will be launched shortly and will ply between Europe and Palestine in the coming few months. This company is at present conducting negotiations for acquiring a second ship. Whilst on the subject of transport, I shall only briefly touch upon our work in the field of motorised transport and mention the attempts which have been made to ensure that Jews shall take their rightful place in civil aviation. A company has been set up known as "Aviron".

I believe that as a result of negotiations with various bodies we shall succeed in building up an insurance company. This, too has its significance.

As time is short I shall not dwell on other economic problems. But I have a few words to say on the question of building. As with other countries, Palestine, too, is faced with building difficulties. Building activities in Palestine have been considerably reduced since the Arab disturbances. We have ten years to catch up. A short while ago our Economic Research Institute carried out an investigation on urban housing conditions. The results have shown an average of 3.29 persons to a room. There are even grimmer cases of overcrowding - cases of six to eight persons living in a single room. The Yishuv in Palestine at present is in need of a hundred

thousand new rooms..

And the problem of building is closely linked not only to the needs of the existing Yishuv but also to the problem of immigration. To some extent the solution of this question is dependent on a vast mass aliyah.

We have achieved much, despite the difficulties, as the appropriate commissions will show. But great though these achievements have been, they have not kept pace with need. The difficulties have been tremendous. Scarcity of materials and shortage of labour have sent up building costs in Palestine. The building index today stands at 400 as compared with the pre-war index of 100. There was a slight easing recently in the building materials situation. Some of our Canadian friends helped us to procure Canadian timber at international prices. This incidentally is an example of how many friends in the various countries could help us by arranging for us the import of the necessary building and other materials. Unfortunately the scarcity of labour is increasing. We have done something to help alleviate the housing problem by importing prefabricated houses, especially of wood. And we are trying to train skilled labourers. But the process of training should really begin in the countries of the galuth.

Building demands huge means. We have recently experienced considerable difficulty in securing long-term mortgages in Palestine. Indeed the scarcity of such mortgages and of long-term credits for agriculture and industry are among our principal financial worries. But even if credits are obtainable for building they will cover only a small part of the costs. A living unit consists of one room, a kitchen and accessories. This we give to a family of three to four people and costs in Palestine about £600. The first mortgage which might be obtainable is £200 to £250. Many of the inhabitants, particularly the new immigrants, do not possess the necessary means. My view is that every immigrant needs on an average £100 of public funds for housing alone. Government experts consider that this figure is an underestimate. But even this is difficult to provide, even within the framework of an enlarged budget.

I should like to put the following proposal before Congress: that we should establish two holding companies, the initial capital of each company to be two and a half million pounds; that the Jewish Agency should participate in these companies to the extent of 25% by acquiring ordinary shares. We shall have to appeal to our friends all over the world to take up preference shares. I am prepared to suggest to the Jewish Agency that it should guarantee a certain minimum dividend for the preference shares during the transitory period - say a period of ten years. Thus we shall succeed with the available sum of £600,000 for housing purposes in securing an actual amount of about two and a half million pounds. The company will take the form of a 'holding company'. Its activities should not be confined to building alone, but it should also assist in setting up local Building Societies in Palestine in co-operation with municipalities and public bodies. We have conducted negotiations with the large Moshavot, advising them to build a thousand houses, and we are prepared to participate with a sum of £125,000 to £175,000 partly in shares and partly in the form of a second mortgage. We have also conducted negotiations with the municipality of Tel Aviv for the erection of a thousand houses. Each million pounds will give us the possibility of building about six thousand housing units. We shall

build them in such a way that in the course of time we should be able to convert them into two-room dwellings.

The second company which I would like to see established should take the form of a general development company and its task should be: to enable us to participate in the enlargement of the Industrial Fund and credit, in the various irrigation companies, and in the carrying through of special projects aiming at the development of certain areas of the land. I should like to formulate this somewhat differently: to direct immigration to those parts of the country, the development of which is of special importance to us. To some extent we can already do this by means of our housing activities but in many cases this is not sufficient. We have to create in these new districts new sources of livelihood. We have already made a humble beginning in two places. In conjunction with the Keren Kayemeth and other companies we have established a company for the development of Tiboria. Our share in it amounts to £100,000 which is 15% to 20% of the whole. We have also established a similar company for the development of Safed. This task of distributing the population is one of the most important problems which will face us in the near future when we will have to penetrate new areas. We may have the opportunity in the commissions to deal with a concrete plan. We need the help of the Jewish world. The Jewish Agency, the national funds, <sup>can</sup> at times take the initiative, at times be a partner, at times take the risk or apply other forms of help. But it is necessary to attract greater capital.

In general the line of our work is a line of co-operation with various groups and with various companies. Though we aim at a central administration, we endeavour to guard ourselves against the creation of a stiff bureaucratic central apparatus. Our method enables us to attract various forces, both in Palestine and abroad. By these means new avenues are opened to our friends abroad to invest money in Palestine. I do not by this intend to weaken the work which has been carried out by our American and African friends. Still less do I wish to belittle the importance of direct investments if friends from other countries want to create undertakings in Palestine. We shall demand for the upbuilding of Palestine huge means and huge efforts from many quarters. We shall have to exploit not only one but many ways which will lead us towards an increase in the tempo of our upbuilding activities.

Both needs and possibilities are tremendous. In Palestine we stripped down to the bare minimum the most important demands placed before us by various departments, and here is the figure we reached: we need fifty million pounds. This sum is almost the budget of a small state. We are in fact building a state but under very difficult conditions and without the normal means of statehood. In the commission I shall give detailed explanations of our budget proposals. What I want to say at this stage is that not everything depends on the Executive, nor even on the World Zionist movement. What these bodies can and must do is to bring in the help of the whole of the Jewish people. This depends first and foremost on our friends in the United States.

This budget in its general outline was proposed to the "Atlantic City" Conference. The three institutions, U.P.A., A.J.D.C. and National Refugee Service together suggested a budget of two hundred and fifteen million dollars. Of this about eighty



five million goes to the U.P.A. American Jewry's fundraising quota of this total was resolved at one hundred and seventy million dollars. And only a few minutes before I came to this session I received a telegram from our friend Henry <sup>W.</sup> Montor that our New York communal workers decided to make the City of New York responsible for sixty-five of the one hundred and seventy million dollars.

Gigantic efforts will be required from this platform I appeal to my American friends to live up to the great responsibilities at a moment which is fraught with great dangers but which also has great possibilities. They will have to do their utmost to carry out the U.P.A. campaign this year. This campaign must come before all other fund-raising campaigns. And I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to those friends of the United States who had the courage last year to propose a campaign aiming at a hundred million dollars and to carry it out successfully, and who have this year set themselves a far higher target. I must make clear that the scale of our work will in the first place be dependent on the success of this campaign and on the work in the United States. Other countries will have to co-operate.

In conclusion let me say this. The 'Atlantic City' decision has not only a financial significance. It is of great moral and political importance: it gives encouragement to the remnant of our people in the Diaspora and to us in Palestine. This is an obligation which American Jewry has undertaken, not only by words but also by deeds.

The figures which I have given here are related only to the present scale of immigration into Palestine, to the present position and to the present task. With the considerable increase of immigration we shall be faced with new tasks. We have approached this problem in the light of the investigation of the Anglo-American experts. Thus we have produced detailed plans to absorb a hundred thousand Jews in a comparatively short time. We were ready - in the hope that international financial aid and the necessary facilities for transport and material would be available to enable us to assume the responsibility of integrating into Palestine ten thousand Jews per month. We have given a written declaration to that effect. We have also declared how the people will - in accordance with our plans - be integrated, how many of them will settle on the land and how many will remain in the cities, and what their main professions will be and the amount of money this will have to cost. The cost of integrating one person into Palestine's economy amounts at present to between £600 and £700. This amount is three times higher compared with the pre-war figure. As the present immigration is composed of people without means of their own, we thought that this time we shall obtain about half of the resources from sources of national colonising character and the other half from private commercial sources or by means of accumulation of capital. We therefore said that in order to integrate the hundred thousand Jews a sum of about thirty to thirty-five million pounds will be necessary, in short about three hundred to three hundred and fifty pounds per person. Only a little while ago at the conference at Atlantic City I again reviewed the accounts and came to the conclusion that for each group of ten thousand people, whether children or adults, we shall need the sum of about three and a quarter million pounds. The British experts were not unanimous about the figures. They doubted our ability to

absorb ten thousand Jews per month. In their view we could only reckon on four to five thousand per month. They also considered that the cost would be much higher. In their view the cost of absorbing a hundred thousand people would amount to one hundred and five million pounds. Finally, they arrived at the compromise proposal by the Americans which was between our estimate of thirty-five million and theirs of one hundred and five million. They agreed upon a compromise at seventy million pounds. The principle fact remains however that the 'thing' is possible; this they did not deny. This is the result of years of experiment during the war - years during which we had often to withstand severe political and economic storms. This is the sum total of all the political and economic plans and suggestions which we made during the last few years. I am not sure whether it is known that the Executive three years ago established a special planning commission. We tried to draw a whole series of people into that work. Planning work in Palestine was to some degree parallel with the work of our funds in the United States.

At this stage I should particularly like to stress the important research work carried out by Mr. Robert Nathan, Mr. Gass and Mr. Kramer. The results of their investigations were published in a special book which contains important research material on the economic potentialities of Palestine in the next ten years. In research in the sphere of 'water' in which a whole series of engineers participated, three people distinguished themselves: Lowdermilk, Savage and Hays. They have outlined a plan in connection with the irrigation of Palestine and the supply of power. In Palestine we have conducted a whole series of parallel investigations, part of which we later placed at the disposal of the Anglo-American Commission. We tried to explain the ways and means that could be employed to make possible the integration of a million Jews in Palestine. All this material together with the evidence which was given to the Commission will be published.

Naturally, vast resources will be required. But, as I have already had the opportunity of explaining to the Commission, I believe that if the political opportunities are given to us and if we organise internally we can produce the resources both from Jewish and non-Jewish sources.

In the past year we made various attempts to mobilise non-Jewish financial resources. Our negotiations with banking institutions were interrupted for political reasons and as the result of the political situation in Palestine and in Zionist generally. These negotiations were only suspended but have not broken down. And if the political situation changes we shall resume them again with an excellent chance of success. The question of an internal loan has been discussed at some length, but up to now all negotiations have been abortive. We also made a demand for reparations, and reimbursements for the colossal capital of which we were robbed and the Jewish property for which the legal heirs cannot be found. Unfortunately, I cannot state that we met with success in this connection. It is true that small, very small, beginnings have been made. In Paris recently at the Five Power Conference it was decided that 2 2 million dollars of reparations should be allocated to help the victims of Hitler. This help should be given to them through the Jewish Agency and the Joint. To this the heirless wealth should have been added. Unfortunately this was not the case up to now. And again this was due to a large extent to our political

difficulties. Other beginnings were made. But the work has been hard and the road long. Nevertheless I believe that in spite of it all we can achieve considerable success. I am less worried about the problem of financing our great plans than I am about our transition period. Should the political situation, sooner or later, change in our favour, through work and building reach our goal, and then the centre of gravity will again lie in our midst, in our ability to build and to create, to organise in an economic manner. The result of what we have created up to now gives us great hope. However, the scale of our work has so increased that it demands new organisation and a new approach. It demands the maximum exploitation of our work, initiative and skill. Science will have to play an increasing role in the development of the country and in the solution of the Jewish misery. What is demanded of us is unity, faith and devotion, courage and discipline. Behind us lies the indescribable Jewish need, before us the great hope to become a free and independent people. And with the strength of faith, work, initiative and science, we shall be victorious.



TWENTY - SECOND ZIONIST CONGRESS.

I. Members of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President.  
David Ben-Gurion, Chairman.

MEMBERS:

Professor S. Brodetsky  
Eliahu Dobkin  
Rabbi J.L. Fischman  
Rabbi Wolf Gold  
Dr. Nahum Golansa  
Itzhak Gruenbaum  
Dr. Bernard Joseph  
Elieser Kaplan  
Louis Lipsky  
Berl Locker  
Moshe Shapira  
Dr. Emil Schmorak  
Moshe Shertok  
Dr. Abba H. Silver  
Dr. Moshe Sneh  
Dr. Stephen Wise.

General Council Members:

Dr. Mayer Ebner	H. Farbstein
Josef Baratz	Abraham Bialopolski
Mordechai Bentov	Jakob Chazan
Shmuel Dayan	Miss Ada Fischman
Hayim Greenberg	Abraham Harxfeld
S. Adler Rudel ( replacing Dr.J.Hellmann )	Israel Idelson
Meir Jaari	Marc Jarblum
Dr. M. Cotik ( replacing S. Kaplan )	Israel Meroninski
Mrs. Golda Meyerson	Melech Neustadt
Elieser Prai	David Remez
Anselm Reiss	Salman Rubaschow
Dr. Abraham Silberschein	Josef Ruzicki
Levy Szkolnik	Ischak Tabenkin
Mrs. Rachel Katznelson ( replacing J.Uri )	David Wertheim
Aharon Zisling	Baruch Zuckerman
Dr. M. Kramer ( replacing L. Brandt )	Elihu L. Stone ( replacing Dr.B.Brickner )
Rev. J.K. Goldbleom	Eara Shapiro ( replacing Dr.S.Goldman )
Dr. Israel Goldstein	Mrs. S. W. Halprin
Moshe Kolodny	Rabbi Irving Miller
Lazar Ettingen	Dr. Jehuda Ohrenstein
S. Zuchowitsky	Dr. Josef Rufeisen
Mrs. Albert P. Schoelman	Dr. Oskar Gruenbaum
Dr. J. Schwarzbart	Dr. Abraham Stupp
Dr. Chaim Loewenstein ( replacing J.Suprensky )	Dr. J. Burg
Rabbi E.M. Neufeld ( replacing Rabbi M.Berlin )	Abraham Kestenbaum ( replacing Yeldore Epstein )
Leon Gellmann	A. Bornstein ( replacing Rabbi L. Gold )
Jacob Grynberg	Rabbi M. Nurcock
S.Z. Shragai	Zerach Wahhaftig
Dr. Abraham Weiss	Meir Grossmann
J. Machover	Zerubavel
M. Erem	Chaim Schurex ( replacing the late Berl Katznelson )
Dr. Abraham Katznelson ( Vaad Leumi )	Rabbi Moshe Meiri ( Vaad Leumi )
( replacing J. Ben Zvi )	( replacing E. Berligné )



Dr. Georg Halpern (J.C.T.)  
 Dr. Arthur Hantke (K.H.)  
 Dr. Moshe Smoira (Court of Honour)

Dr. Abraham Gromovsky (K.K.L.)  
 Sanny Gromman (Congress Court)  
 Felix Rosenbluth (Congress Attorney)

## II. REPRESENTATIVES IN ADVISORY CAPACITY

Dr. Carlo Viterbo (Italy)  
 Rafael Cantoni (Italy)  
 Itzhak Freilich (Italy)  
 Chaim Lazar (Italy)  
 Mihaly Salamon (Hungary)

Leo Garfunkel (Italy)  
 Nilsen Reznik (Italy)  
 Itzhak Widokla (Italy)  
 Michael Glass (Italy)  
 Walter Vogel (Czechoslovakia)

## III. ELECTED MEMBERS.

Rabbi Israel Abrahams	S.Africa (Gen.Z.)	Abraham Abrahams	Argentina (Rev.)
Gideon Abramovitz	Germany (Rev.)	Ischak Ben Aharon	Bretz Israel (Achd.Av.)
Dr. Arish Altman	Bretz Israel (Rev.)	Jacob van Amerongen	Holland (Ich.)
Mrs. Julian Ansell	USA. (Gen.Z.)	Herman Auslaender	CSR. (Mizr.)
Moshe Averbuch	Rumania (Ich.)	Mendham Bader	E.I. (Hash. Haz.)
Josef Bankover	E.I. (Achd.Av.)	Moshe Baram	E.I. (Ich.)
Israel Barzilai	W.E.L. (Hash. Haz.)	Harry Batshaw	Canada (Gen. Z.)
Sol. P. Benamy	U.S.A. (Gen.Z.)	Aron Beker J.	Poland. (Mizr.)
F. Beniori	U.S.A. (Achd.Av.)	Mina Juliet N. Benjamin	Canada (Gen.Z.)
Dr. Leopold Beretvas	Tunis (Achd.Av.)	K. Berger	Canada (Ich.)
Samuel Berke	USA. (Ich.)	Rabbi Elieser Berlinger	Finland (Mizr.)
Adolf Berman	Poland (Achd.Av.)	Rabbi Jacob Berman	W.E.L. (Mizr.)
Marcel Bernfeld	France (Gen.Z.)	F. Bernstein	E.I. (Gen.Z.)
Moshe Bernstein	Germany (Rev.)	Mrs. R. Bessin	Canada (Mizr.)
Charles Bick	U.S.A. (Mizr.)	Oskar Biedermann	Hungary (Gen.Z.)
Bezalel Biezynski	W.E.L. (Mizr.)	Mrs. Bessie Blaufarb	USA. (Ich.)
Maurice Blaustein	Brazil (Gen. Z.)	Miss Rose Bloom	USA. (Gen.Z.)
Rabbi Aaron Blum	Uruguay (Mizr.)	Mauricius Blumenthal	Rumania (Gen. Z.)
Jedidiah Blumenthal	S. Africa (Ich.)	J.M. Bobrowe	Canada (Ich.)
Zvi Bonfeld	E.I. (Rev.)	A.J. Boraditsky	Canada (Mizr.)
Irving Boxenbaum	USA. (Ich.)	Dr. Josef Brandes	Belgium (Ich.)
David Breslau	USA. (Ich.)	Daniel Brick	Sweden (Ich.)
Rabbi Samuel Brod	USA. (Mizr.)	Prof. N. Brunschvig	Tunis (Rev.)
Gedalia Bublick	USA. (Mizr.)	Dr. David Bukepan	E.I. (Rev.)
S. Burstein	USA. (Ich.)	Paul Celanaro	Marocco (Indep.)
Rubin Cederbaum	Poland (Hash. Haz.)	Chaim Chmowitz	Germany (Mizr.)
Jaacov Chazan	Argentina (do.)	Miss Frieda Chesir	USA. (do.)
Maxwell Cohen	USA. (Gen. Z.)	Rabbi Ouzife Cohen	Tunis (Mizr.)
Prosper Cohen	Morocco (Indep.)	Sol Cohen	USA. (Gen.Z.)
Rabbi Samuel Cooper	USA. (Gen. Z.)	Leon Crestohl	Canada (Gen. Z.)
Ischak Cukierman	Canada (Ich.)	Dr. H. Cynowitz	India (Gen. Z.)
Dr. Josef Damm	Uruguay (Rev.)	Mrs. Lorraine Danzig	USA. (Mizr.)
Hillel Danzig	Hungary (Ich.)	Dr. Bela Dones	Hungary (Ich.)
Moses Dickstein	Canada (Ich.)	Benjamin J. Doft	USA. (Gen. Z.)
Israel Dunsky	S.Africa (Gen.Z.)	Dr. Marc Dwarzecki	France (Ich.)
Jaacov Eftor	WEL (Ich.)	Dr. Desider Ehrenfeld	CSR. (Mizr.)
I. Ehrlich	E.I. (Mizr.)	Jechezkel Effie	Germany (Achd.Av.)
B. Eisenstadt	E.I. (Ich.)	Emmanuel Ellenhagen	Rumania (Ich.)
Dr. A. K. Epstein	Peru-Paraguay (Gen.Z.)	Elishu Epstein	USA. (Ich.)
Mrs. Moses P. Epstein	USA. (Gen. Z.)	Mrs. Shoolam Ettinger	USA. (Gen. Z.)
Louis A. Falk	USA. (Gen. Z.)	Rabbi Dr. S. Federbusch	USA. (Mizr.)
Zeev Feinstein	E.I. (Ich.)	Cipora Feldman	Poland (Ich.)
Rabbi Leon Feuer	USA. (Gen. Z.)	J. Finkelstein	Argentina (Achd.Av.)
Mendel N. Fisher	USA. (Gen. Z.)	Jacob Fishman	USA. (Gen.Z.)
Dr. Herbert Foerder	E.I. (Al.Had.)	Jeno Frankl	Hungary (Mizr.)

Max Freilich	Australia	(Gen.Z.)	Daniel Frisch	USA	(Gen.Z.)
Rafi Friedl	CSR	(Hash.Hatz.)	Benjamin Friedman	USA.	(Ich.)
Major Wm. R. Friedman	USA.	(Rev.)	Rabbi Simon Fuka	East France	(Mizr.)
Zelda Funk	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Moshe Furmansky	USA.	(Hash.Hatz.)
Israel Galili	E.I.	(Achd.Av.)	Mina Gelerstein	Chile	(do.)
Bernard Gering	S.Africa	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Bertha W. Gershunoff	Argentina	(Gen.Z.)
Dr. Edouard Ghanassia	Algiers	(Rev.)	Pinchas Gingold	USA.	(Ich.)
Joseph Ginsberg	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Elliott F. Glesberg	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Zaharia Gluska	E.I.	(Indep.)	P.L. Goldman	USA.	(Achd.Av.)
Morris Goldovsky	USA.	(Ich.)	Moshe Goldsmith	USA.	(Ich.)
Abraham Goldstein	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Dr. Alexander Goldstein	CSR.	(Ich.)
Mrs. Bert Goldstein	USA.	(Ich.)	Mrs. B. J. Goldstein	USA.	(Mizr.)
Dr. Israel Goldstein	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Ischak Goldstein	E.I.	(Gen.Z.)
Schmuel Goldwein	Sweden	(Ich.)	Mrs. Molly Golub	USA.	(Mizr.)
Abraham Goodman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Jack Goodman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
J. R. Goodman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Israel Gorfinkel	E.I.	(Ich.)
Isaac Gotlieb	New Zealand	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Benjamin Gottesman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Meir Grabowski	E.I.	(Ich.)	Sealom Grajek	Poland	(Indep.)
Mrs. David B. Greenberg	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Harry Greenberg	USA.	(Ich.)
J. M. Greenberg	England	(Rev.)	Mrs. Mary Greenberg	USA.	(Ich.)
Joseph W. Greenleaf	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	M. Gringorten	Canada	(Rev.)
Miss Chaja Grossman	Poland	(Hash.Hatz.)	Meir Grossman	Belgium	(Rev.)
Sandor Grossmann	Hungary	(do.)	Alexander Gurvitch	China(Tientsin)	(Rev.)
David Hacohen	E.I.	(Ich.)	Max Hagler	USA.	(Mizr.)
Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Sara Halprin	E.I.	(Ich.)
Mrs. Joseph Hammerman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Isaac Hamlin	USA.	(Ich.)
Arjeh Handler	England	(Mizr.)	N. Harpas	E.I.	(Ich.)
Meir Hartman	WEL	(Gen.Z.)	Miss Judith Hassler	China(Shanghai)	(Rev.)
I. Hecht	E.I.	(Mizr.)	Dr. Jacob Hellman	Brazil	(Ich.)
Oskar Hedler	Germany	(Indep.)	Z. Hering	Germany	(Ich.)
Emerio Zvi Herman	Iran	(Gen.Z.)	Dr. Fabian Herskovic	Hungary	(Gen.Z.)
Herman Hollander	USA.	(Mizr.)	Joseph Hollender	France	(Ich.)
Filip Huppert	Transylvania	(Ich.)	Meir Jaari	E.I.	(Hash.Hatz.)
Nathan Jackson	England	(Ich.)	Norman M. Jacobs	England	(Gen.Z.)
Joseph Jambor	E. I.	(Hash.Hatz.)	Barnett Janner	England	(Gen.Z.)
Mrs. Beba Jacobsen	E. I.	(Ich.)	Leon Ilutowicz	China(Shanghai)	(do.)
David Intriligator	E. I.	(Mizr.)	Mrs. David L. Isaacs	USA.	(Ich.)
A. Krechmar Isreeli	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Israel Jeffreykin	Uruguay	(Ich.)
Israel Jeshayahu	E.I.	(Ich.)	Dr. Shimon Junickman	E.I.	(Rev.)
Dr. A. S. Juris	Brazil	(Ich.)	Ischak Ischaki	E.I.	(Achd. Av.)
Chaim Kahan	Germany	(Ich.)	Elgar Kanner	Rumania	(Rev.)
Rabbi J. Kaplan	France	(Mizr.)	J. Kargman	E.I.	(Ich.)
Mordechai Katz	Germany	(Rev.)	Samuel L. Katz	USA.	(Rev.)
Mrs. Louis Kaufman	USA.	(Ich.)	Istvan David Kemeny	Hungary	(Hash.Hatz.)
Aba Khoushi	E.I.	(Ich.)	J. King	Mexico	(Rev.)
Rabbi Max Kirshblum	USA.	(Mizr.)	Joseph Kleiman	Roumania	(Rev.)
Dr. Hans Klee	Switzerland	(Gen.Z.)	Dr. Stephen Klinger	WEL	(Rev.)
Jochanan Kohn(Lances)	Poland	(Gen.Z.)	Zvi Kolitz	Brazil	(Rev.)
J. Korn	E.I.	(Ich.)	J. Kosoy	E.I.	(Ich.)
M. Kostrynski	Argentina	(Ich.)	F. Kozlowsky	E. I.	(Ich.)
Mendel Kozower	Poland	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Oljah Kosneczoj	E.I.	(Ich.)
Mrs. Siegf. Krausarsky	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Oskar Krausnansky	CSR	(Gen.Z.)
Miklos Krausz	Hungary	(Mizr.)	Dr. M. Kronsberger	E.I.	(Al.Chad.)
Ch. Kriepin	E.I.	(Ich.)	Ischak Kubowitaki	Belgium	(Gen.Z.)
A. Leon Kucowitski	USA.	(Ich.)	J. Lamm	E.I.	(Al.Chad.)
K. Lendau	Mexico	(Ich.)	Mrs. Chana Lendau	E.I.	(Achd.Av.)
Dr. Georg Landauer	E.I.	(Al.Chad.)	Mrs. Ann Lebow	USA.	(Ich.)
Judge S. Leibovitz	USA.	(Ich.)	Janen Leibu	Roumania	(Rev.)
Israel Leiwandman	Roumania	(Mizr.)	Dr. S. Lewenberg	England	(Ich.)
Judge Louis E. Levinthal	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Zvi Levin	France	(Ich.)
Mrs. Eleanore Levinson	USA.	(Ich.)	Joseph Lewitan	Mexico	(Indep.)

Leib Levite	E.I.	(Achd.Av.)	E. Liebenstein	E.I.	(Ich.)
Adolph Lieblich	USA.	(Rev.)	Morris Lifschitz	USA.	(Mizr.)
Louis Lipsky	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	David Liwazyc	E.I.	(Achd.Av.)
Dr. Th. Loewenstein	Roumania	(Yeh.)	E. Loulou	E.I.	(Ich.)
Mrs. Jeanette Leibel	Lourie USA.	(Gen.Z.)	P. Lubianiker	E.I.	(Ich.)
J. Lufban	E.I.	(Ich.)	Mrs. Z. Lubetkin	E.I.	(Achd.Av.)
Miss Ruth Ludwin	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Aron Luxemburg	France	(Gen.Z.)
K. Luzinsky	E.I.	(Ich.)	Joshua M. Machover	Australia	(Indep.)
Mauritius Mahler	Transylvania	(Ich.)	Emanuel J. Margolis	Bulgaria	(Ich.)
Dr. Samuel Margoshes	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	B. Margulies	England	(Mizr.)
Mortimer May	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	S. Meirou	E.I.	(Ich.)
Abraham Melamed	Germany	(Mizr.)	Dr. Markus Melchior	Denmark-Norway	(Mizr.)
David Meller	Poland	(Gen.Z.)	Dr. Abraham Mibashan	Uruguay	(Gen.Z.)
Rabbi Irving Miller	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Asher Moissis	Greece	(Gen.Z.)
Khanbaba Mirzahi	Iran	(Gen.Z.)	Siegfried Moses	E.I.	(Al.Chad.)
David Moskovitz	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	P. Naftali	E.I.	(Ich.)
Arjeh Nahir	E.I.	(Hash.Hatz.)	Dr. Umberto Nahon	Tripoli	(Gen.Z.)
Emilie Najjar	Egypt	(Ich.)	Andre Narboni	Algiers	(Indep.)
Erich Neilhans	Germany	(Mizr.)	M. Zemirsky	E.I.	(Ich.)
Fred Nettler	England	(Gen.Z.)	Emanuel Neumann	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Dr. Zvi Neuman	USA.	(Mizr.)	Isaac Niedermayer	Roumania	(Hash.Hatz.)
Dr. Fugues Nogrady	Hungary	(Hash.Hatz.)	Mrs. Rega Warasawiak	Chrenstein, E.I.	(do.)
Mrs. Lucy Oppenheim	USA.	(Ich.)	Marco D. Ovadia	Bulgaria	(Gen.Z.)
Josef Passi	Bulgaria	(Hash.Hatz.)	Mrs. Ernest M. Peiser	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Dr. A. Pekelis	CSA.	(Ich.)	Mrs. Nathan D. Perlman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Louis Pincus	S. Africa	(Ich.)	J. Pines	Switzerland	(Mizr.)
Aaron Z. Prope	USA.	(Rev.)	Samuel Rabinovich	Argentina	(Gen.Z.)
Dvora Rabinovitz	USA.	(Mizr.)	Rabbi Louis Isaac Rabinowitz	S. Afr.	(Rev.)
Nahum Nir (rafalkes)	E.I.	(Achd.Av.)	Mrs. A. Raginsky	Canada	(Gen.Z.)
Mrs. C. Joseph Recht	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Abraham A. Reiselheim	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Marco Regalsky	Argentina	(Ich.)	Carol Reiter	Transylvania	(Gen.Z.)
Elsig Remba	E.I.	(Rev.)	Zimel Resnick	USA.	(Ich.)
Tovia Resnikoff	Mexico	(Gen.Z.)	Charles Ress	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Jacob Riftin	E.I.	(Hash.Hatz.)	Dr. El. Rimalt	E.I.	(Gen.Z.)
Tibor Rosenbaum	Hungary	(Mizr.)	Rabbi J.S. Rosenberg	USA.	(Mizr.)
Judge Bernard Roserblatt	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Dr. Herzl Rosenblum	E.I.	(Rev.)
Mrs. Samuel J. Rosensohn	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	David Rosenthal	Germany	(Hist. Achida.)
Salvador Rudolph M. Rosenthal	USA.	(General Z.)	Mordechai Rosman	Germany	(Hash.Hatz.)
Mrs. Alfred Rossi	Tunis	(Rev.)	Edward Rostal	Poland	(Gen.Z.)
Dr. Siegfried Roth	Hungary	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Dvora Rothbard	USA.	(Ich.)
Judge Morris Rothenberg	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Dr. Israel Rothenberg	Roumania	(Hash.Hatz.)
Rene Roubache	Algiers	(Ich.)	Szymon Rosenberg	Poland	(Achd. Av.)
Hans Rubin	E.I.	(Hash.Hatz.)	Dr. Jacob Rubin	E.I.	(Rev.)
Dr. Josef Sack	Poland	(Indep.)	Mrs. Louis Samuels	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
J.S. Jehuda Schewermann	Roumania	(Gen.Z.)	Joseph Sarlin	E.I.	(Gen.Z.)
S. Schacool	Egypt	(Hash.Hatz.)	Dr. Joseph Schechtman	USA.	(Rev.)
Josef Schofman	E.I.	(Rev.)	Mrs. A. P. Schoolman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
R. Schreibman	E.I.	(Ich.)	Jekob Schutzberg	Poland	(Hash.Hatz.)
Hersch Schwartzberg	Germany	(Ich.)	Judge Jacob Schyolsky	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Louis Segal	USA.	(Ich.)	Rabbi Zev Segal	USA.	(Indep.)
Zvi Segal	Germany	(Indep.)	Hillel Seidel	Poland	(Gen.Z.)
Mrs. Lewis Serate	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Perry Sewel	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
E. Shapiro	E.I.	(Ich.)	Ezra Shapirc	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Dr. Dawid S. Sheke	USA.	(Rev.)	Charles B. Sherman	Canada	(Achd.Av.)
Abraham Shlonsky	E.I.	(Hash.Hatz.)	Elihu Shomroni	E.I.	(Ich.)
Eliexer Shostak	E.I.	(Rev.)	Mrs. Herman Shulman	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Solim Silberfarb	Roumania	(Mizr.)	Mrs. Rebecca D. Sieff	England	(Gen.Z.)
Mrs. Regina J. Silberstein	Bulgaria	(Indep.)	Dr. Abba Hillel Silver	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Edyard S. Silver	USA.	(Mizr.)	Miklos Simonovics	Hungary	(Achd. Av.)
Daniel Sirkis	E.I.	(Mizr.)	Kalman Soltanik	Germany	(Gen.Z.)
Rabbi S. Sperber	England	(Mizr.)	Joseph Sprinzak	Australia	(Ich.)

Dr. Benzion Sternberg	E.I.	(Rev.)	Joseph Sternstein	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Devey D. Stone	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Elihu D. Stone	USA.	(do.)
Theodore Strimling	USA.	(do.)	William H. Sylk	USA.	(do.)
Mrs. Marie Syrkin	USA.	(Ich.)	Robert Szold	USA.	(do.)
Mrs. Zip.F.Szold	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Mojzesz Szajnborg	Poland	(Ich.)
Pinchas Szajnmam	Poland	(Mizr.)	David Tabatchnik	Germany	(Achd. Av.)
Aron Tabecman	Roumania	(Ich.)	Leo Tager	S.Afr.	(Ich.)
Meir Talmi	E.I.	(Hash.Hatz.)	Rabbi Kasriel F. Tchorn, E.I.		(Mizr.)
David Tilsner	USA.	(Mizr.)	Maurice Timsit	Morocco	(Mizr.)
Moises Toff	Ecuador	(Gen.Z.)	Jacques Torczyner	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
David Trager	Germany	(Ich.)	Mrs. Raphael Turover	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Isidore S. Turover	USA.	(Gen.Z.)	Mrs. Abraham Tulin	USA.	(do.)
Moshe Unna	E.I.	(Mizr.)	Rabbi B.M. Uziel	E.I.	(Mizr.)
S. Wasserman	E.I.	(Mizr.)	Morris Weinberg	USA.	(Gen.Z.)
Baruch Weinstein	E.I.	(Rev.)	Dr. Zeev von Weisl	WEL.	(Rev.)
Meyer Weisgal	Venezuela-Panama etc.	(Gen.Z.)	J. Weissman	Egypt	(Gen.Z.)
Robert Weksler	USA.	(Ich.)	Benjamin West	WEL	(Ich.)
Abush Werber	WEL	(Achd. Av.)	Imchak Werfel	E.I.	(Mizr.)
Dr. Oskar Wolfsberg	E.I.	(Mizr.)	E.I. Zacks	Canada	(Gen.Z.)
Nathan Zigman	WEL	(Mizr.)	Rafael Zilber	Cuba	(Indep.)



(Names of all delegates from Austria and of some from Transylvania and Roumania will be announced at a later date.)



Announcement of the Organisation Department No.1

RESIGNATIONS OF DELEGATES

The following delegates have taken the place  
of delegates who have resigned their seats:-

Date	Delegate	representing	in the place of
12/12	Abraham Krumbein	U.S.A.	Rabbi Rudolf Rosenthal
12/12	Mrs. Rose J. Bender	"	William Sylk
15/12	Chaim Chanowitz	Germany	Erich Nelhans
16/12	Manuel Laderman	U.S.A.	Morris Lifschitz
"	Hayim Fineman	U.S.A.	Samuel Berk
17/12	Dr. Jos. Kassis	France	Aron Luxembourg
17/12	Rabbi S.B. Kapel	France	Rabbi J. Kaplan
18/12	Josoph Daleski	Gr. Africa	L.J. Rabinovitz
18/12	Jacques Lilienblum	Eastern France	Rabbi Simon Fuchs
19/12	Hermann Neumann	C.S.R.	Dr. Desider Ehrenfeld.
19/12	Josef Reich	"	Dr. A. Goldstein
19/12	Louis Beretvas	Algiers	André Narboni

## CONGRESS ITEMS

### ALL-PARTY UNION OF PARTISANS AND GHETTO FIGHTERS HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE

On Wednesday a representative group of Jewish partisans and ghetto fighters met representatives of the Press. The Chairman, a partisan from Italy, said it was a matter for regret that more partisans had not appeared on the platform of this Congress. The partisan leader, Ch. Choleofski, reported on the record of the Jewish partisans in Italy and Ch. Levin dealt with partisan activities in Austria and their aid to the Red Army in the days of liberation. Kaganovitch of Italy dealt with the plans for aiding War invalids and their rehabilitation into productive work in Palestine. He also described a project for preparing two books one a memorial volume and the other a record of the part which Jewish partisans had played in the war.

### KEREN HAYESOD RECEPTION TO JEWISH PRESS

Over a hundred journalists participated in a reception given by the directors of the Keren Hayesod at which Mr. Leib Jaffe spoke of the development of the Hebrew Press in Palestine, which he said had become a mighty factor in our struggle. Mr. Jaffe called attention to the representatives of the Jewish Press in Eastern Europe who were bravely maintaining the condition of the one great Jewish press which adorned the Jewish communities of those countries. He also thanked the Jewish press for its valuable aid to the Keren Hayesod.

Mr. Ben Tov, in the name of the Hebrew Press of Palestine, Mr. Alperin of the "Tog" in America, Mr. J. Hodess for the Jewish Press of England, Mr. R. Rubinstein, editor of the "Jiddische Stimme" which formerly appeared in Kovno, Mr. A. Cincinnati, member of the Administration of the Jewish Literary Union of Warsaw, in the name of the Jewish Press of Warsaw replied to the greetings.

### BASLE NEWSPAPER REPORTS MEETING BETWEEN DR. SCHMORAK AND SWISS CONSUL IN PALESTINE

In the Basler Zeitung, of the 18th of this month, an item appeared reporting a talk in Palestine between Dr. Emil Schmorak, Head of the Trade and Industry Department of the Jewish Agency and the Consul General for Switzerland. The Report stated that in the talk the import of Swiss goods was dealt with in connection with a boycott by Jews of British goods. Dr. Schmorak emphatically denies that his talk made any reference whatsoever to commercial relations between Palestine and Britain and that in fact no such boycott has been suggested or discussed in any quarter.

### EXHIBITION OF CARTOONS

An exhibition of portrait sketches made at this Congress by Ross is on show at the Mustermesse Restaurant.