



## 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 V: Writings, 1909-1963, undated.

---

Reel  
182

Box  
67

Folder  
709

World Zionist Congress, 1947.



had remarked that Europe needed the Jews for their ability and talents in reconstruction, but Mr. Bevin apparently had false notions about their position in the European continent. The Jews in Europe continue to be threatened with despair and demoralisation. They had 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. Mr. Gruenbaum concluded on a note of Jewish renaissance through the Zionist Movement which was a liberating process of the Jewish people, a miracle of resuscitation and redemption, 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 PRESIDENT OF CONGRESS.

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. In the voting, 191 were for Dr. Weizmann and 48 against. The result was greeted with prolonged applause. The representative of the Revisionist Party made a declaration 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.

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 President.

#### CONGRESS PRESIDUM.

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

Rev. J. K. Goldbloom, General Zionists;  
Rabbi Mordechai Nurok, Mizrahi;  
Rabbi Elimelech Neufeld, Mizrahi;  
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, but the representative of Hashomer Hatzair declared that they had voted against inclusion in the Presidium of the Revisionists, whom they regarded as unlawfully represented at Congress. Revisionists had spent their time in trying to break the Movement and undermine its authority. A representative of Achduth Avodah, on behalf of his Party, stated that his group did not vote *en bloc* for this Presidium on the ground that there was no place for Revisionists in a democratic Movement. Their re-entry, moreover, had not been confirmed by the Executive, on the ground that they still adhered to another organisation.

The Rev. J. K. Goldbloom made a plea for unity and tolerance.

#### CONGRESS COURT AND ELECTION REPORTS.

DR. SAMI GRONEMANN, 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 proud in the knowledge that he had always tried to conduct the affairs of the Court with complete objectivity.

DR. LEO LAUTERBACH reported on the results of the Congress Elections, and said that altogether, in 65 countries, two million one hundred thousand shekalim had been sold, including three hundred thousand in Palestine, six hundred and sixteen thousand in Europe, one million and eleven thousand in the United States and Canada, seventy-seven thousand in South Africa, eighty-six thousand in the rest of Africa, seventeen thousand in Asia, and eight thousand in Australia and New Zealand. Elections were held in 24 countries. In the others, agreement had been reached between the Parties. Congress Court had cancelled the elections in Colombia and Bolivia. In Italy the elections of four of the delegates had been cancelled and eight confirmed, without the right to vote.

This concluded the morning session on Tuesday, December 10th.

#### FOURTH SESSION: DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER.

The Fourth Session of Congress opened on Tuesday afternoon, December 10th, with an address by RABBI DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER.

When the story of American Jewry during the Second World War is fully told, Dr. Silver said, it will be found to be one of high lights and deep shadows. Many fine and noble things were done. Many sad mistakes were made. Great opportunities were missed. The errors were those of the mind, not of the heart. It will also be found that the masses were far ahead of their leaders. Their instinctive judgment was sounder. Their demand and readiness for action more forthright and determined. The war matured American Jewry. It brought it very close to the orbit of Jewish life and to the heart of the Jewish problem. Just as America became central to the world's political and economic life, and the decisive factor in the winning of the war, so American Jewry became central and indispensable to the total life of world Jewry. American Jewry was quick to grasp the new situation as well as the new challenge which confronted it, and to the best of its ability it tried hard to see to it that a great hour should not find it a small people. They were well acquainted with the record of the material contributions which American Jews made through private and public agencies to help the stricken Jews of Europe. As the true knowledge of the conditions came to be understood, the response of the Jews of America became increasingly more generous. It is difficult to estimate what the total public and private aid amounted to. During this year alone, through the major, though by no means exclusive, agency, the United Jewish Appeal, more than \$100,000,000 will be raised. This creditable record is due to the fact that the Jews of America keenly felt the impact of the appalling tragedy which had overtaken their people, and reacted to the obligations of Jewish solidarity.

One of the secrets of our survival is that there never was any isolationism amongst our people when disaster swept upon any segment of our people anywhere. The bond of Jewish unity was again tested during these years of wrath and was found strong and durable among the Jews of America, as among the Jews throughout the world. But there was another factor. There were, in many instances, close family ties which bound together the Jews of America with those who were living and dying in the several hells of Europe. Deep called unto deep—and the hearts of men living in the security and freedom of a blessed land went out to brother and sister, father and mother, kith and kin, who lived in the shadow of death, languished in concentration camps or walked the dolorous roads which led to death in the gas chambers or other human slaughter pens. Myriads of personal anxieties and tragedies deepened and intensified the compassionate efforts of American Jews to sustain and to rescue the Jews of Europe. A valuable by-product of the numerous campaigns which were held in our country year after year, has been the education which was given to our people in the real status of Jewish life in the world to-day, and in the problems of Jewish survival. The American Jew is better informed to-day and more alert as a Jew than ever before. He is also better organised. These campaigns made necessary the organisation of Jews in every community and of all classes and elements of Jewry. In each community new leaders have come to the front, many of them young, energetic and forward-looking, who are proud to be associated with a vital Jewish service and who derive deep spiritual satisfaction from their new and chosen association with the life of their people. American Jewry also tried to assist in the rescue of European Jewry, and in their escape from the certain doom which threatened them. This called, of course, for governmental action. Unfortunately, in this regard they had very little success. The contribution of America to the solution of the greatest single humanitarian problem in modern history, that of rescuing millions of men, women and children from mass extermination, is not one which fills us with any measure of pride. It consisted mainly in sending representatives to a do-nothing conference on refugees; in belatedly appointing a committee on refugees of its own, whose accomplishments were insignificant; in sending away from its shores a shipload of helpless human beings who were to find their ultimate doom in the death holes of Eastern Europe; and in the setting up, on the eve of a national election, an American detention camp for 1,000 refugees at Oswego. The whole world, and not only America, remained blind to the ruin and outrage of our people, which is beyond words, beyond tears, beyond all utterable woe. Spiritual palsy attacked the world, and our mouldering age found all



sorts of excuses for doing nothing. There were transportation difficulties. There were immigration laws. There was a war on. Nowhere was there any appreciable exertion to rise above the quiddities of technicalities and the barriers of routine. And so millions of our precious sons and daughters perished who might otherwise have been alive to-day. The United States is not without its full share of blame for this terrible failure. Our country did not open its doors wide to rescue the trapped men, women and children. It did not offer even temporary asylum to them in numbers commensurate with the enormity of the tragedy. "I believe that much of the failure to achieve results, on the part of the American Jewish organisations which concerned themselves with this problem, was due to their lack of co-ordination, their working at cross purposes, their tardiness, and the political involvements of some of their leaders which kept them from exposing forcibly the do-nothing policy of the Government."

In consequence of the Second World War and the Hitlerian threat to Jewish existence, American Jewry resolved to organise itself on a representative national scale for effective action. The story of the organisation and convocation of the American Jewish Conference was well known to them. All classes and sections and all parties in that democratically elected American Jewish Conference were represented. They served clear and decisive notice that American Jews were determined to choose their own spokesmen to make their true convictions heard. It was heartening to behold the overwhelming interest of these democratically elected representatives of American Jewry in Palestine and in Zionism. What transpired was not an artificially manipulated pro-Palestine demonstration. It was the gratifying product of Zionist education among the Jews of America which was carried on over a period of years. They had not laboured in vain. A scientific poll on Palestine, which was taken at a later date among American Jews, pointed to the same result. American Jewry was overwhelmingly in sympathy with the aims of Zionism. An attempt was made by a very small minority at this Conference to reduce the issue of Palestine to one of immigration and to prevent the Conference from making a clear declaration on the Jewish commonwealth. They failed. The Conference issued a forthright and vigorous declaration on the Jewish commonwealth. The enemies of Zionism grasped the full significance of this action of the American Jewish Conference when they finally resolved to break away from the Conference and to discredit it over the issue of the Jewish commonwealth. It is now being rumoured about that these same enemies of the Jewish commonwealth resolution at the Conference, who were so bitter over its enactment that they seceded from the Conference and projected one of the most violent controversies on the American Jewish scene, have now been won over to the idea of partition—to a little Jewish commonwealth. "I wish here to sound a word of caution and warning."

ingly in sympathy with the aims of Zionism. An attempt was made by a very small minority at this Conference to reduce the issue of Palestine to one of immigration and to prevent the Conference from making a clear declaration on the Jewish commonwealth. They failed. The Conference issued a forthright and vigorous declaration on the Jewish commonwealth. The enemies of Zionism grasped the full significance of this action of the American Jewish Conference when they finally resolved to break away from the Conference and to discredit it over the issue of the Jewish commonwealth. It is now being rumoured about that these same enemies of the Jewish commonwealth resolution at the Conference, who were so bitter over its enactment that they seceded from the Conference and projected one of the most violent controversies on the American Jewish scene, have now been won over to the idea of partition—to a little Jewish commonwealth. "I wish here to sound a word of caution and warning. No one is more welcome in our ranks than the convert and repentant sinner. This is in keeping with an ancient Jewish tradition. We should make sure, however, that they are indeed repentant and converted before we entrust them with any responsible rôle in any negotiation which may involve the fate and destiny of the Jewish National Home." The matter which agitated American Zionists most in the last few years was the proper attitude to take towards their Government's handling of the Palestine issue. "Some of us felt that our Government was dilatory in pressing for our rights to which the American Government and the American people stood committed. Others were unwilling to embarrass the Administration or to embarrass themselves with the Administration. This issue in our own ranks was bound, sooner or later, to come to a head, and it did. After a period of sharp controversy and public debate, the issue was decided in favour of those who believed in a frank, forthright and resolute approach to our Government and in the mobilisation of American public opinion, Jewish and non-Jewish, for a determined representation to our Government that it must rest content with promises and more statements, but that it must act. The attitude of the American Government towards our cause through the years, in all fairness, might be characterised as one of mere benevolent neutrality. Our Government was at all times kindly disposed, but it persisted in doing nothing about it. By 1942 the subject of Zionism had become taboo in Washington. The word had gone through Washington that for the duration of the war the subject of Zionism should be avoided."

Dr. Silver continued: This became the official line. But Zionist leaders preferred to remain blindly unaware of it. The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain had actually come to the point of issuing an

official request for the cessation of all discussions of the Palestine question. Fortunately, this was averted through energetic intervention. It was clear that a change had to be forced in this attitude in Washington if our case was ever to have a chance. Our demands had to be placed on the agenda of the political thought and concern, not only of the United States but the world. On the eve of the White Paper deadline (March 31st, 1944) President Roosevelt authorised a statement to the effect that 'the American Government had never given its approval to the White Paper of 1939.' This statement of the President of the United States broke a long and, to the Jews of Europe, a dreadfully costly silence. Nearly five years had elapsed since the issuance of the White Paper and all through that time our Government had not registered a single official objection. Meanwhile, millions of our people perished. Unfortunately, even this declaration of the President was not followed up by any representation to the British Government, and, as if to indicate that the President's statement did not imply any new departure on the part of our Government in its policy towards Palestine, the heads of the Arab countries were informed by our State Department, with the approval of the President, that no decision on Palestine would be reached without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews. Such assurances were not at all called for, nor were they at all in the spirit of the Anglo-American Convention. It was not until three years later that this position of the American Government was modified to the extent that the admission of 100,000 Jews which President Truman requested did not involve any change in the basic policy of the United States touching Palestine, and, therefore, did not call for consultation with the Arabs. On October 15th, 1944, on the eve of our national elections, President Roosevelt sent to the Convention of the Zionist Organisation of America a message in which he expressed satisfaction that, 'in accordance with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the Four Freedoms, the Democratic Party at its July Convention this year included the following plank in its platform: "We favour the opening of Palestine for unrestricted immigration and colonisation and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as possible. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim, and if re-elected I shall help to bring about its realisation.' But this admirable statement, too, was not followed up by any action. In fact, the events which followed proved greatly disturbing."

Throughout the Roosevelt Administration, the United States Government was determined to take no action

of the Four Freedoms, the Democratic Party at its July Convention this year included the following plank in its platform:

"We favour the opening of Palestine for unrestricted immigration and colonisation and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as possible. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim, and if re-elected I shall help to bring about its realisation." But this admirable statement, too, was not followed up by any action. In fact, the events which followed proved greatly disturbing."

Throughout the Roosevelt Administration, the United States Government was determined to take no action whatsoever and to make no representations whatsoever to the British Government either to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration, or to live up to the other obligations which it had assumed under the mandate. On strategic occasions statements were issued to assure the Jews of America that the Government of the United States was heartily in sympathy with their aspirations. The action of President Truman in connection with the 100,000 refugees was a welcome turning point, not in American policy on Palestine, to be sure, but in the sustained policy of the former Administration to do absolutely nothing to help Jews get into Palestine. The President made his request on purely humanitarian grounds. Nevertheless, this marked a real step forward in the direction of intervening actively in the Palestine situation. But the hand of the new Chief Executive also soon faltered. Instead of pressing vigorously and with the authority and prestige of the Government of the United States upon Mr. Attlee to accede to his request, he accepted a refusal and yielded to a counter-proposal for a Joint Committee of Inquiry, which was a palpable delaying device and an excuse for inaction. "You may recall that I urged that our Movement should ignore this Committee of Inquiry and should not appear before it, especially since Mr. Bevin had made it clear that the real purpose of the committee was to liquidate the Zionist movement. Nevertheless, the World Zionist Executive decided to co-operate with the committee and the American Zionist Emergency Council made a full and, I believe, a very creditable presentation of our case before this committee." When President Truman made public the report of this committee on April 30th of this year, he stated: "I am very happy that the request which I made for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine has been unanimously endorsed by the Committee of Inquiry."



The transfer of these unfortunate people should now be accomplished with the greatest dispatch. . . . In addition to these immediate objectives, the report deals with many other questions of long-range political policies and questions of International law which require careful study, and which I will take under advisement." This was a sound and statesmanlike position to take. Unfortunately, here again the hand of the Chief Executive faltered. The President failed to follow through and our State Department announced that no immediate action would be taken on behalf of these refugees without first acting on all the other recommendations of the report. Our State Department went through the motions of inviting Arab and Jewish representatives to present their views on the recommendations of the Committee, as if these views were not already fully known. After considerable delay a Cabinet Committee on Palestine, consisting of the Secretaries of State, of War and of the Treasury was appointed to assist the President in the early consideration of the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. After another delay, American technical experts were sent to London to meet with British experts and to discuss the logistics involved in the transfer of the 100,000. Finally, the Cabinet Committee dispatched to London its three deputy members to meet with the British; not to get the 100,000 Jews moving into Palestine, but to work out the implementation of all the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry. The results of the labours of these deputy members was the well-known Grady-Morrison plan, which, I am sure, is fresh in your minds. What the report recommended was not a plan for implementing the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry, but an utterly new and radically different substitute plan. On the advice of Secretary of State Byrnes, President Truman was prepared to approve this report for the American Government. The decisive rôle which the American Zionists played in having this scheme rejected by the American Government is well known. With reference to the ultimate solution for Palestine, the President took note of the Agency's proposal. It was his belief that a solution along these lines would commend the support of public opinion in the United States. However, the President did not commit the United States to the Agency's proposals, but indicated that the Government is prepared to give its support to a compromise as between the partition scheme of the Agency and the Grady-Morrison plan. President Roosevelt, you will recall, went much further in this regard than President Truman. He stated that the American people give their support to the establishment of Palestine (that is to say, the whole of Palestine) as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and if re-elected he would help to bring about its realisation. Up to his return from the recent Paris Conference late in October, Secretary of State Byrnes did not concern himself much with the Palestine problem, for reasons best known to himself.

rejected by the American Government is well known. With reference to the ultimate solution for Palestine, the President took note of the Agency's proposal. It was his belief that a solution along these lines would commend the support of public opinion in the United States. However, the President did not commit the United States to the Agency's proposals, but indicated that the Government is prepared to give its support to a compromise as between the partition scheme of the Agency and the Grady-Morrison plan. President Roosevelt, you will recall, went much further in this regard than President Truman. He stated that the American people give their support to the establishment of Palestine (that is to say, the whole of Palestine) as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and if re-elected he would help to bring about its realisation. Up to his return from the recent Paris Conference late in October, Secretary of State Byrnes did not concern himself much with the Palestine problem, for reasons best known to himself. Within recent weeks there have been clear indications that he has taken active charge of the matter. He understands the full gravity and urgency of the problem. He has been personally conferring with Mr. Bevin on the subject. It is too early to say how firm and persistent he will be in pressing for Jewish rights in Palestine and for a just and early solution. Here is where, my friends, the road ends at the moment. It remains to be seen whither it will lead from here on."

Summarising the activities of American Jewry with reference to Palestine during and since the war, Dr. Silver said that "in the fields of organisation, education and propaganda, and material support, it did well. It carried on an effective job of public relations. It brought the message of Zionism to Christian and Jew alike. It enrolled leading Christian Americans, both of the laity and the clergy, in our cause. It won the co-operation of nearly all the members of the Congress of the United States. More than 40 State Legislatures in our Union, which represent approximately 85 per cent. of the population in the United States, adopted resolutions in our behalf. Organised American labour came solidly to our support. A scientific poll, taken among the American people registered an overwhelming sympathy for our objectives. American Jewry is solidly behind our movement. The American-Jewish Press and especially the Yiddish Press have been valiant champions. The American rabbinate, orthodox, conservative and reform alike, and in our country we do not investigate the theologic credentials of those who wish to serve our cause, have been strong spokesmen of our movement, and much of our effective leadership has come from their ranks. There has been a growing awareness of Zionism among the Jewish youth of America, the speaker continued. Many of them have been aroused and

stirred by the events of recent years. Not only the tragedy of world Jewry, but the magnificent struggle of the Yishuv has appealed to the imagination of American Jewish youth. The fact of an embattled Israel fighting heroically for its rights against tremendous odds is drawing our young people closer to us in bonds of pride and solidarity. It is our hope that we shall be able to develop a large movement of Chalu-tziut among the young Jews of America and that we shall be able in the years to come to provide Palestine not only with financial support and political undergirding, but also with fine human material."

There existed a small, well-financed and highly vociferous group of anti-Zionists, Dr. Silver proceeded, which created frequent embarrassments. Their size and importance, however, was not overestimated by the American Government. American Zionists also succeeded in impressing upon their Government the fact that the Palestine issue was not a peripheral one, but that it must become one of the major objectives of American foreign policy, to which it must devote as much of its thought and energy as it does to other important political problems in other parts of the world. Palestine was a major international political problem to which far-sighted statesmen have pointed time and again as containing disastrous explosive possibilities for the peace of the world. The United States Government, not only because of its Palestine commitments, but also because of the dominant rôle which it now played in international affairs, must treat this problem not as something incidental to its diplomatic activities, to which it gives a passing thought only when prodded by an unhappy electorate. American Zionists and their friends throughout the country have, he believed, convinced their Government that the interest of the American people in this subject was deep, earnest and persistent, and that its demands will not be satisfied until action took the place of pronouncements and promises. They believed, Dr. Silver concluded, that the U.S. Government was now moving in the right direction. The future was very uncertain. "We shall not be discouraged nor deterred. We are not going into the battle empty-handed. We know our strength, our faith, our resolute purposes. We have learned not to yield to wishful thinking and pleasant illusions. We have forged a strong movement. We have a loyal and disciplined army of followers ready to give of themselves, of their substance and of their loyalty and devotion to the cause of a free Israel in a free land of Israel. This great testing hour of Jewish destiny will not find American Jewry wanting."

#### THE ARMOUR OF JUDAISM.

RABBI WOLF GOLD, addressing Congress on the destruction of the religious and spiritual institutions in Europe, recalled that Nordau, who did not belong to religious Judaism, when once invited to the opening of a Synagogue in Madrid, had de-

believed, Dr. Silver concluded, that the U.S. Government was now moving in the right direction. The future was very uncertain. "We shall not be discouraged nor deterred. We are not going into the battle empty-handed. We know our strength, our faith, our resolute purposes. We have learned not to yield to wishful thinking and pleasant illusions. We have forged a strong movement. We have a loyal and disciplined army of followers ready to give of themselves, of their substance and of their loyalty and devotion to the cause of a free Israel in a free land of Israel. This great testing hour of Jewish destiny will not find American Jewry wanting."

#### THE ARMOUR OF JUDAISM.

RABBI WOLF GOLD, addressing Congress on the destruction of the religious and spiritual institutions in Europe, recalled that Nordau, 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. Nordau had realised then the significance of religious Judaism, or, as it was later called, the "armour of Judaism."

Rabbi Gold gave a comprehensive review and description of 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. 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, he added.

Rabbi Gold concluded by reminding the audience of the Yom Kippur mood on the previous evening, 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.

#### FIFTH SESSION: BEN GURION'S SPEECH.

The Fifth Session of Congress opened on Tuesday evening, December 10, with an address by MR. DAVID BEN GURION, Chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

#### MR. BEN GURION ON FUTURE POLICY.

The President of the Zionist Organisation, Mr. Ben Gurion said, reviewed the events of seven years of war which were marked by slaughter and betrayal. It was the story of Jewish experience as a people since the last Zionist Congress in 1939. He could not add to the vivid picture drawn by Dr. Weizmann. He would endeavour to concentrate entirely on the



46-7

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER BEFORE THE CONGRESS OF THE WORLD ZIONIST  
ORGANIZATION AT BASLE, SWITZERLAND, DECEMBER 12, 1946

16

At this late hour I do not wish to engage in a full-length discussion of the political problem which confronts us. I should like to say just a word or two on the subject of tactics. Dr. Goldmann in a lengthy and persuasive address a few days ago dismissed the subject of tactics in one sentence while devoting the rest of his lengthy address to principles, political evaluations, theories and speculations. I want to limit myself to the question of tactics.

Regardless of what your objective is, however sound and just, if you are inept in your strategy, you will be defeated. In diplomatic as in physical warfare, battles are frequently won or lost by good or bad strategy. Often larger and better equipped armies are defeated by skillful generalship and inspired strategy.

Mr. Lipsky began his address yesterday afternoon by saying that the entire matter in Paris on the part of the Executive began as an issue of tactics and maneuvers. It is on that basis that its action should accordingly be evaluated. Mr. Greenberg, in his address yesterday, rather poo-pooed the idea of tactics. He furthermore compared those Zionists who maintain that we should insist upon our full and just rights in Palestine to oriental merchants who customarily ask four or five times the real value of the article which they have to sell, in the hope of finally obtaining what they really expect to get. I, for one, was somewhat shocked by this analogy. I am wondering whether Mr. Greenberg really believes that the Zionist movement, which up to three months ago, and for many years prior to that, was demanding, on the basis of our legal and historic rights, the establishment of the Jewish State in the whole of Palestine, which, since 1922, had already been reduced to a third of the Palestine contemplated by the Balfour Declaration, I wonder whether he really believes that our movement was asking four or five times what it was actually entitled to, and was merely engaged in the shabby bartering of an oriental merchant. Mr. Greenberg does not believe in tactics. I noted, however, that he concluded his forceful address, in which



he championed partition as the sole salvation of our movement by advising the Congress not to pass any resolution on partition and not to give any instructions to the Executive - and, to be sure, for tactical reasons.

I am not an expert on tactics, but in common with all of you, I understand that diplomacy is an art from which tactics cannot be divorced. And so, taking Mr. Lipsky at his word that what took place in Paris was an issue of tactics and maneuvers, I ask myself why did the Executive take the action which it did. It was argued that the action was taken in order to defeat the Grady-Morrison proposals. In my address before this Congress last Tuesday, I stated what I believed was common knowledge, that the Grady Plan was rejected by the American Government some days before the Executive took action in Paris and before its emissary arrived in Washington. Mr. Ben-Curion in his address challenged my statement. A day or two later Dr. Goldmann corroborated my statement. I think that the fact stands that the action of the Agency in Paris was not needed to defeat the Grady Plan.

Why was the action then taken? Dr. Goldmann stated that as a result of the rejection of the Grady Plan, a political vacuum was created, and unless the Agency came forward with some new and concrete proposal, the United States Government was in danger of washing its hands of the entire Palestine matter. What actually happened was that after the Agency's proposals were submitted to the officials in Washington, the United States Government did to all intents wash its hands of the entire matter. You will recall the statement which the President issued on August 16th just before he left for his summer's vacation. He stated that "this Government has not prepared any plan of its own for the solution of the Palestine problem". It was his sincere hope, as a result of the proposed conversations between the British Government and Jewish and Arab representatives that a fair solution to the problem of Palestine can be found..... "It is clear that no settlement of the Palestine problem can be achieved which will be fully satisfactory to all parties concerned." He hoped that immigration opportunities would also be found in other countries since "the solution of the



Palestine question will not in itself solve the broader problems of the hundreds of thousands of Displaced Persons in Europe". And that was that! The Jewish press in America at the time wondered whether the President and the United States Government had not actually washed their hands of the whole Palestine question.

Thus, the action in Paris did not take place in a political vacuum and did not keep the United States Government from trying to wash its hands of the Palestine question.

Fortunately for us, we were approaching a national election in the United States, and it was opportune for us to remind and to persuade our Government that it should not and could not wash its hands of the Palestine issue. It was as a result of a sustained political pressure that President Truman issued on October 4th his other statement in which he reassured us that the American Government was still very much concerned with the problem, was still insisting upon the 100,000 refugee certificates, and that he would be prepared to approve not actually the Agency's proposals, but some compromise proposal as between that of the Agency and the Grady-Morrison Plan.

It was the considered judgment of those of us close to the scene in America that after the rejection of the Grady Plan by our Government, the next move was definitely not ours, but that of the British Government. It has been said that we could not wait. But we are waiting. Waiting politically does not mean sitting still and doing nothing, but continuing the pressure on all fronts in all ways, and not permitting the crisis to be resolved until it is properly and justly resolved.

But assuming that our Executive was right in its decision, was it tactically sound to proclaim to the world that what we will accept is partition? Why, that is the surest way not to get it! As soon as we announced partition as our solution, it became the Jewish solution, and therefore, unavailable as a compromise solution.



Every eloquent speech made at this Congress in favor of partition is a nail driven into its coffin. There were many ways open to our Executive to learn whether such a solution would be favorably regarded. It required no formal action on the part of our Executive which was bound to become known within twenty-four hours. It required no flying emissary to Washington. There existed adequate channels both in London and Washington through which proper soundings could quietly have been made.

We sensed the danger in Washington, and when Dr. Goldmann arrived, the representatives of all the Zionist parties in America organized in the Emergency Council, met with him. The subject was thoroughly canvassed. We all agreed, Dr. Goldmann concurring, that it could not have been the intent of the Agency to propose partition, and that no such proposals would be made to American officials. Unfortunately, this was not carried out. At this Congress an official declaration was made by the Executive assuming collective responsibility for the mission of Dr. Goldmann, and for the manner in which it was carried out. It is passing strange to me why some of the members of the Executive who were present in Paris have since, time and again, in written and in spoken words, stated that the Agency emissary was never authorized to propose partition in its name. How can they then at this Congress make such a collective declaration?

The failure to adopt proper tactics in carrying out the proposals of the Executive led to the following unfortunate consequences:

1. The whole world became aware that the Zionist movement had been forced to make a disastrous retreat which could only be attributed to the fact that it knew itself to be hopelessly weak. The Zionist movement was now prepared to settle for half of Palestine. It was a tragic display of weakness which in the modern world does not evoke pity, but contempt. It was believed, I am sure, and so stated in the official communication of Dr. Weizmann to the Colonial Secretary that the offer of the Agency represented a supreme sacrifice. It was expected that this extraordinary sacrifice



would evoke a corresponding spirit of generous give-and-take on the part of Great Britain. Unfortunately, this is not the kind of world in which we live. This is not the spiritual climate of our age. If sacrifices could move the hearts of Governments today, the leaking hulks which are transporting our storm-tossed refugees would not be turned away with their cargo of human misery from the shores of Palestine to detention camps in Cyprus. The sacrifices of 6,000,000 of our people did not move the British Government to deviate by an iota from its illegal and immoral action which shut the one real haven of refuge against their possible rescue. Those who favored the partition proposal undoubtedly believed that the proposal was so reasonable and so moderate that it would be quickly snatched up by the Government of Great Britain, not to speak of the United States -- as a way out of the log-jam which had developed and as a way of putting an end to a rapidly deteriorating situation in Palestine. But their belief, I am afraid, was not based on a realistic appraisal, but on honest but wishful thinking.

2. The maneuver of the Agency in proposing partition immediately branded the classic Zionist program -- the one which we affirmed and reaffirmed time and again, and which has not yet been altered by a Congress -- as extreme, and the champion of it as extremists and irresponsible fanatics. I do not recall a single instance in modern times where a great movement permitted itself, knowingly and deliberately, to be pushed by its own voluntary actions into such a calamitous position.

I was the Chairman of the Political Commission at the London Conference a little over a year ago. I hoped to draft the political resolution which stated that Palestine "undivided and undiminished" must be constituted as a Jewish State in accordance with the original purpose of the Balfour Declaration -- I and my colleagues, who remained loyal to this official program of the Zionist movement, which was, after all, only a restatement of similar declarations adopted time and again by the official bodies of our movement, suddenly found ourselves after the Paris Conference under the suspicion of being wild-eyed, irresponsible extremists, and frowned upon by the Jewish Agency itself.



There was still another loss sustained as a result of this unfortunate maneuver. Our entire Zionist propaganda was thrown into a cocked hat. You cannot go to Washington today and talk to any public official about the total Zionist program without being laughed out of court. Have not the newspapers informed them day after day that there is no longer any total Zionist program, and that the Jewish Agency was prepared to settle for half of its program or less?

Now, all these severe losses might be justified in the eyes of the protagonists of partition, at least, if the maneuver had succeeded in getting Great Britain to accept partition as a basis for discussion at the London Conference. Great Britain has not accepted. Every effort in the past few months on the part, both of friends and foes of partition to get Great Britain to accept the Agency proposal as a basis failed. Nor did the United States accept the idea of the Agency's proposal, nor did it succeed in persuading Great Britain to accept it as a basis of negotiations.

If, therefore, what took place in Paris was a matter of tactics and maneuver, it failed, and it is well that we acknowledge the failure. Older and more experienced Governments than ours frequently make serious mistakes. No one is infallible. But, let us not attempt to persuade people that a costly and unsuccessful maneuver was in reality a great victory for our movement, and let us soberly draw the consequences.

Because the Executive had made a public offer of partition, it had to insist, in self-defence and in order to protect the movement, upon an absolute condition, a sine qua non. It could not attend the London Conference unless its proposal of partition was accepted as the basis for discussion. Had the Executive not hastened to make any partition proposals to Great Britain and the United States, it could have considered the question of going or not going to the Conference on its merits, whether more could be gained by going than by staying away. If it had decided to go to the Conference, it would undoubtedly have presented to it the full Zionist program, even



as the Arabs intend to present theirs. Perhaps out of the Conference deliberations some satisfactory compromise solution would evolve. But this was no longer possible as soon as the Agency proposals became public, because these proposals represented our absolute "irreducible minimum" beyond which the movement could not go. How can you go to a Conference to negotiate on an "irreducible minimum"? One is expected to be reasonable and to make concessions at a Conference for the sake of arriving at a mutually satisfactory solution. The Agency was no longer in any position to make concessions. It had already made its maximum concessions! Therefore, it was no longer free to enter the London Conference without the protection of a prior commitment on the part of Great Britain that partition would be the basis of discussion. This was not obtained. When I see members of the Executive who, up to a week ago, proclaimed from the roof-tops that we simply cannot and will not go to the Conference unless this indispensable condition is accepted, now come before this Congress and with all sorts of skillful arguments attempt to persuade the Congress to attend the Conference anyhow, without any condition, I see in it a grave and frightening omen that they are preparing the movement for another disastrous retreat.

What faces the Congress now is, in my judgment, also largely a matter of tactics. I am personally persuaded that more can be gained by not going to the Conference than by going. Our refusal to go has already wrested one concession from Great Britain - not a very vital one, to be sure, but still a concession. The London Conference was called together so that Great Britain could discuss with the Jews and Arabs the implementation of the Grady-Morrison Plan. That, in the words of Herbert Morrison in the House of Commons on July 31st, was to be the basis for negotiations, the plan recommended by the expert delegations. "I should make clear," he said, "that we mean to go ahead with discussion with Arabs and Jews of a constitutional scheme on these lines." But Mr. Bevin's letter of December 3rd to Secretary of State Byrnes stated that "His Majesty's Government do not regard themselves as committed



in advance to their own proposals". I have reason to believe that this concession was the result of Great Britain's eagerness to have us come to the Conference. The reasons for their eagerness are best known to themselves. We may have our own opinions, but it is clear from all indications, public and private, that His Majesty's Government are very anxious to have the Jews attend the London Conference. I feel that we should not go until the condition of the Jewish Agency is met. It will serve notice on Great Britain that we have finally reached the limits of any possible concessions which can be forced from us, that it cannot have its way with us all the time. A 100,000 certificates? No! The Anglo-American Committee report? No! A moderate increase in the number of refugees permitted into Palestine? No! And on the final great gesture of sacrifice which we made to surrender half of Palestine in order to be master in our own house in the other half. Again, no! And now we are expected to go to another Conference, convoked by this same Government, so callous and so willful - for what purpose? Again to be told no? How long can we follow this line of retreat and abnegation without tearing the heart out of our movement?

Does any champion of partition in this Congress believe for a moment that Great Britain does not know all the arguments in favor of partition, that it requires another conference to give our spokesmen the opportunity officially to bring forward these arguments again? The present leaders of the British Government have heard each and every argument that was made here on the floor of the Congress in behalf of partition, and many more. They were not persuaded. Does any one believe that they will be persuaded at a formal public conference? Public conferences never succeed unless preliminary agreements are reached in prior informal conversations. No such agreements have been reached.

To those who insist that we must go to the Conference and who expect some good to come out of it, I would suggest that they should not go on the basis of the negotiations which have been carried on in the last four months. To permit the impression



that partition still represents the full program of the Zionist movement to remain unchallenged by this Congress would be fatal to any success which they hope to derive from attending the Conference. That is why I have suggested that this Congress, in some unmistakable and effective manner, should indicate to the world that it disassociates the movement from the disastrous diplomacy of the last few months which is leading us inevitably to Grady-Morrison.

It is important for this Congress to bring our movement back to its main highway. It has wandered far afield. The Congress should put an end to this lamentable chapter. There are no partition proposals before us other than those which our Executive made and which have not been accepted. They no longer exist for us. If we go to any conference, it should be on the basis of our full Zionist program. It is this program that our representatives should be obligated to advocate and to urge, even as our spokesmen did at the hearings of the Anglo-American Committee. Any contrary proposals which might be made should be transmitted to the Actions Committee which should, however, not be confronted with tentative commitments by the Executive on partition subject to its ratification. They should be free to listen to all proposals, inquire into them, hear all about them, and then transmit them to our supreme bodies. They should not be given carte blanche. It is all-important, furthermore, that the same people who have been so persuasively arguing with the Congress that there is no hope for us anywhere or in any other solution but partition, should not be our spokesmen at such a conference. I am afraid that the same arguments which they presented here in defense of partition - namely, that the Mandate is unworkable, UNO is hopeless, the plight of our refugees is becoming more desperate day by day, and the situation in Palestine more explosive - will, I am afraid, persuade themselves to go beyond partition to some modified Grady-Morrison proposal. Why not? The logic is the same, and the Grady-Morrison proposals do not permanently exclude the possibility of a Jewish State - at least, so it is said. I am very much afraid that in another few months these same people would be coming to an Actions Committee meeting



with an equally skillful array of arguments to persuade the Zionist movement that the Grady-Morrison Plan, under another name, is the sole salvation of Israel!

I conclude. This Congress should reaffirm in clear and unmistakable language the London resolution of 1945, calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in an "undivided and undiminished" Palestine. Let us state that the partition proposals which were made and which were not accepted, no longer exist. There are no partition proposals before the Zionist movement today. It is along the line of our historic claims and legal rights to the whole of Palestine that we shall continue our struggle. When counter-proposals will be made to us at any time by governments, which we will find truly reasonable and which will meet our fundamental needs and satisfy our national aspirations and our sense of justice, our movement will be prepared, I am sure, to give them serious consideration. But, such proposals have definitely not been made to us by anyone. Sound and just proposals are bound to be made to us sooner or later if we do not lose our nerve or our perspective.

In the meantime, we must in every way support the Yishuv in its struggle against the attempt of the Mandatory Government to liquidate the National Jewish Home. By maximum financial and moral support, we must strengthen the Yishuv's power of resistance. The Yishuv must, in the last analysis, decide for itself the form and the timing of its resistance to British lawlessness in Palestine. But whatever their decision, we will stand by them. We must make, regardless of cost, continued Jewish immigration into Palestine. We must carry on in every part of the world, and especially the United States, an intensified campaign of education to inform the world of the organized conspiracy of the present British Government to nullify our rights in Palestine. Finally, we must stand full square on the proposition that Zionism is not an immigration or a refugee movement, but a movement to establish the Jewish State for a Jewish nation in the land of Israel. The classic textbook of Zionism is not how to find a home for 100,000 Jewish refugees. The classic textbook of our movement is the "Jewish State".





# הקונגרס היהודי

## Congregation

Basle

No. 9

19-12-46

World Zionist Congress: 17th Session (contd.)

Address by Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

At this late hour I do not wish to engage in a full-length discussion of the political problem which confronts us. I should like to say just a word or two on the subject of tactics. Dr. Goldmann in a lengthy and persuasive address a few days ago dismissed the subject of tactics in one sentence while devoting the rest of his lengthy address to principles, political evaluations, theories and speculations. I want to limit myself to the question of tactics.

Regardless of what your objectives are, however sound and just, if you are inept in your strategy you will be defeated. In diplomatic as in physical warfare, battles are frequently won or lost by good or bad strategy. Often larger and better equipped armies are defeated by skilful generalship and inspired strategy.

Mr. Lipsky began his address yesterday afternoon by saying that the entire matter in Paris on the part of the Executive began as an issue of tactics and manoeuvres. It is on that basis that its action should accordingly be evaluated. Mr. Greenberg in his address yesterday rather poo-pooed the idea of tactics. He furthermore compared those Zionists who maintain that we should insist upon our full and just rights in Palestine to oriental merchants who customarily ask four or five times the real value of the article which they have to sell, in the hope of finally obtaining what they really expect to get. I, for one, was somewhat shocked by this analogy. I am wondering whether Mr. Greenberg really believes that the Zionist movement, which up to three months ago, and for many years prior to that, was demanding, on the basis of our legal and historic rights, the establishment of the Jewish State in the whole of Palestine, which, since 1922, had already been reduced to a third of the Palestine contemplated by the Balfour Declaration, I wonder whether he really believes that our movement was asking four or five times what it was actually entitled to, and was merely engaged in the shabby bartering of an oriental merchant. Mr. Greenberg does not believe in tactics. I noted, however, that he concluded his forceful address in which he championed partition as the sole salvation of our movement by advising the Congress not to pass any resolution on partition and not to give any instructions to the Executive and, to be sure, for tactical reasons.

I am not an expert on tactics, but in common with all of you, I understand that diplomacy is an art from which tactics cannot be divorced. And so, taking Mr. Lipsky at his word that what took place in Paris was an issue of tactics and manoeuvres, I ask myself why did the Executive take the action which it did. It was argued that the action was taken in order to defeat the Grady-Morrison proposals. In my address before this Congress last Tuesday, I stated what I believed was common knowledge, that the Grady Plan was rejected by the American Government some days before the Executive took action in Paris and before its emissary arrived in Washington. Mr. Ben Curion in his address challenged my statement. A day or two later Dr. Goldmann corroborated my statement. I think that the fact stands that the action of the Agency in Paris was not needed to defeat the Grady Plan.



Why was the action then taken ? Dr. Goldmann stated that, as a result of the rejection of the Grady Plan, a political vacuum was created and unless the Agency came forward with some new and concrete proposal, the United States Government was in danger of washing its hands of the entire Palestine matter. What actually happened was that after the Agency's proposals were submitted to the officials in Washington, the United States Government did to all intents wash its hands of the entire matter. You will recall the statement which the President issued on August 16th just before he left for his summer's vacation. He stated that "this Government has not prepared any plan of its own for the solution of the Palestine problem." It was his sincere hope that as a result of the proposed conversations between the British Government and Jewish and Arab representatives a fair solution to the problem of Palestine can be found... "It is clear that no settlement of the Palestine problem can be achieved which will be fully satisfactory to all parties concerned." He hoped that immigration opportunities would also be found in other countries since "the solution of the Palestine question will not in itself solve the broader problems of the hundreds of thousands of Displaced Persons in Europe." And that was that ! The Jewish press in America at the time wondered whether the President and the United States Government had not actually washed their hands of the whole Palestine question.

Thus, the action in Paris did not take place in a political vacuum and did not keep the United States Government from trying to wash its hands of the Palestine question.

Fortunately for us we were approaching a national election in the United States and it was opportune for us to remind and to persuade our Government that it should not and could not wash its hands of the Palestine issue. It was as a result of a sustained political pressure that President Truman issued on October 4th his other statement in which he reassured us that the American Government was still very much concerned with the problem, was still insisting upon the 100,000 refugees certificates, and that he would be prepared to approve, not actually the Agency proposals but some compromise proposal as between that of the Agency and the Grady-Morrison Plan.

It was the considered judgment of those of us close to the scene in America, that after the rejection of the Grady Plan by our Government -- the next move was definitely not ours, but that of the British Government. It has been said that we could not wait. But, we are waiting. Waiting politically, does not mean sitting still and doing nothing, but continuing the pressure on all fronts in all ways, and not permitting the crisis to be resolved until it is properly and justly resolved.

But, assuming that our Executive was right in its decision, was it tactically sound to proclaim to the world that what we will accept is partition ? Why, that is the surest way not to get it ! As soon as we announced partition as our solution, it became the Jewish solution and therefore unavailable as a compromise solution. Every eloquent speech made at this Congress in favour of partition is a nail driven into its coffin... There were many ways open to our Executive to learn whether such a solution would be favourably regarded. It required no formal action on the part of our Executive, which was bound to become known within twenty-four hours. It required no flying emissary to Washington. There existed adequate channels both in London and Washington through which proper soundings could quietly have been made.

We sensed the danger in Washington and when Dr. Goldmann arrived the representatives of all the Zionist parties in America organised



in the Emergency Council, met with him. The subject was thoroughly canvassed. We all agreed, Dr. Goldmann concurring, that it could not have been the intent of the Agency to propose partition and that no such proposals would be made to American officials. Unfortunately, that was not carried out. At this Congress an official declaration was made by the Executive assuming collective responsibility for the mission of Dr. Goldmann, and for the manner in which it was carried out. It is passing strange to me why some of the members of the Executive who were present in Paris have since, time and again, in written and in spoken words, stated that the Agency emissary was never authorised to propose partition in its name. How then can they at this Congress make such a collective declaration?

The failure to adopt proper tactics in carrying out the proposals of the Executive led to the following unfortunate consequences:

(1) The whole world became aware that the Zionist movement had been forced to make a disastrous retreat, which could only be attributed to the fact that it knew itself to be hopelessly weak. The Zionist movement was now prepared to settle for half of Palestine. It was a tragic display of weakness which in the modern world does not evoke pity but contempt. It was believed, I am sure, and so stated in the official communication of Dr. Weizmann to the Colonial Secretary that the offer of the Agency represented a supreme sacrifice. It was expected that this extraordinary sacrifice would evoke a corresponding spirit of generous give-and-take on the part of Great Britain. Unfortunately this is not the kind of world in which we live. This is not the spiritual climate of our age. If sacrifices could move the hearts of Governments today, the leaking hulks which are transporting our storm-tossed refugees would not be turned away with their cargo of human misery from the shores of Palestine to detention camps in Cyprus. The sacrifices of 6 million of our people did not move the British Government to deviate by an iota from its illegal and immoral action which shut the one real haven of refuge against their possible rescue. Those who favoured the partition proposal undoubtedly believed that the proposal was so reasonable and so moderate that it would be quickly snatched up by the Government of Great Britain, not to speak of the United States - as a way out of the log-jam which had developed and as a way of putting an end to a rapidly deteriorating situation in Palestine. But, their belief, I am afraid, was not based on a realistic appraisal but an honest but wishful thinking.

(2) The manoeuvre of the Agency in proposing partition immediately branded the classic Zionist programme - the one which we have affirmed and reaffirmed time and again, and which has not yet been altered by a Congress - as extreme, and the champion of it as extremists and irresponsible fanatics. I do not recall a single instance in modern times where a great movement permitted itself, knowingly and deliberately, to be pushed by its own voluntary actions into such a calamitous position.

I was the Chairman of the Political Commission at the London Conference, a little over a year ago. I helped to draft the political resolution which stated that Palestine "undivided and undiminished" must be constituted as a Jewish State in accordance with the original purpose of the Balfour Declaration. I, and my colleagues, who remained loyal to this official programme of the Zionist movement, which was after all only a restatement of similar declarations adopted time and again by the official bodies of our movement, suddenly found ourselves after the Paris Conference under the suspicion of being wild-eyed,



irresponsible extremists and frowned upon by the Jewish Agency itself.

There was still another loss sustained as a result of this unfortunate manoeuvre. Our entire Zionist propaganda was thrown into a cocked hat. You cannot go to Washington today and talk to any public official about the total Zionist programme without being laughed out of court. Have not the newspapers informed them day after day, that there is no longer any total Zionist programme, and that the Jewish Agency was prepared to settle for half of its programme or less.

Now, all these severe losses might be justified in the eyes of the protagonists of partition, at least, if the manoeuvre had succeeded in getting Great Britain to accept partition as a basis for discussion at the London Conference. Great Britain has not accepted. Every effort in the past few months on the part, ~~both of friends and foes~~, of partition to get Great Britain to accept the Agency proposal as a basis, failed. Nor did the United States accept the idea of the Agency proposal, nor did it succeed in persuading Great Britain to accept it as a basis of negotiations.

If, therefore, what took place in Paris was a matter of tactics and manoeuvre, it failed, and it is well that we acknowledge the failure. Older and more experienced Governments than ours frequently make serious mistakes. No one is infallible. But, let us not attempt to persuade people that a costly and unsuccessful manoeuvre, was in reality a great victory for our movement and let us soberly draw the consequences.

Because the Executive had made a public offer of partition, it had to insist in self-defence and in order to protect the movement, upon an absolute condition, a sine qua non. It could not attend the London Conference unless its proposal of partition was accepted as the basis for discussion. Had the Executive not hastened to make any partition proposals to Great Britain and the United States, it could have considered the question of going or not going to the Conference on its merits - whether more could be gained by going than by staying away. If it had decided to go to the Conference, it would undoubtedly have presented to it the full Zionist programme, even as the Arabs intend to present theirs. Perhaps out of the Conference deliberations some satisfactory compromise solution would evolve. But this was no longer possible as soon as the Agency proposals became public, because these proposals represented our absolute "Irreducible minimum" beyond which the movement could not go. How can you go to a Conference to negotiate on an "irreducible minimum"?

One is expected to be reasonable and to make concessions at a Conference for the sake of arriving at a mutually satisfactory solution. The Agency was no longer in any position to make concessions. It had already made its maximum concessions. Therefore, it was no longer free to enter the London Conference without the protection of a prior commitment on the part of Great Britain that partition would be the basis of discussion. This was not obtained. When I see members of the Executive, who up to a week ago proclaimed from the roof-tops that we simply cannot and will not go to the Conference unless this indispensable condition is accepted, now come before this Congress and with all sorts of skilful arguments attempt to persuade the Congress to attend the Conference anyhow, without any condition, I see in it a grave and frightening omen that they are preparing the movement for another disastrous retreat.

What faces the Congress now is, in my judgment, also largely a matter of tactics. I am personally persuaded that more can be gained



by not going to the Conference than by going. Our refusal to go has already wrested one concession from Great Britain - not a very vital one, to be sure, but still a concession. The London Conference was called together so that Great Britain could discuss with the Jews and Arabs the implementation of the Grady-Morrison Plan. That, in the words of Herbert Morrison in the House of Commons on July 31st, was to be the basis for negotiations, the plan recommended by the expert delegations. "I should make clear", he said, "that we mean to go ahead with discussion with Arabs and Jews of a constitutional scheme on these lines". But Mr. Bevin's letter of December 3rd to Secretary of State Byrnes stated that "His Majesty's Government do not regard themselves as committed in advance to their own proposals". I have reason to believe that this concession was the result of Great Britain's eagerness to have us come to the conference. The reasons for their eagerness are best known to themselves. We may have our own opinions, but it is clear from all indications, public and private, that His Majesty's Government are very anxious to have the Jews attend the London Conference. I feel that we should not count on the condition of the Jewish Agency is met. It will serve notice on Great Britain that we have finally reached the limits of any possible concessions which can be forced from us, that it cannot have its way with us all the time. - A 100,000 certificates? - No! The Anglo-American Committee report? - No! A moderate increase in the number of refugees permitted into Palestine? - No! And on the final great gesture of sacrifice which we made to surrender half of Palestine in order to be master in our own house in the other half. - Again no! And now we are expected to go to another Conference, convoked by this same Government, so callous and so wilful - for what purpose? - Again to be told, no? How long can we follow this line of retreat and abnegation without tearing the heart out of our movement?

Does any champion of partition in this Congress believe for a moment that Great Britain does not know all the arguments in favour of partition, that it requires another Conference to give our spokesmen the opportunity officially to bring forward these arguments again? The present leaders of the British Government have heard each and every argument that was made here on the floor of the Congress on behalf of partition, and many more. They were not persuaded. Does any one believe that they will be persuaded at a formal public conference? Public conferences never succeed unless preliminary agreements are reached in prior informal conversations. No such agreements have been reached. To those who insist that we must go to the Conference and who expect some good to come out of it, I would suggest that they should not go on the basis of the negotiations which have been carried on in the last four months. To permit the impression that partition still represents the full programme of the Zionist movement to remain unchallenged by this Congress would be fatal to any success which they hope to derive from attending the Conference. That is why I have suggested that this Congress, in some unmistakable and effective manner, should indicate to the world that it disassociates the movement from the disastrous diplomacy of the last few months which is leading us inevitably to Grady-Morrison.

It is important for this Congress to bring our movement back to its main high-way. It has wandered far afield. The Congress should put an end to this lamentable chapter. There are no partition proposals before us other than those which our Executive made and which have not been accepted. They no longer exist for us. If we go to any conference it should be on the basis of our full Zionist programme. It is this programme that our representatives should be obligated to



advocate and to urge even as our spokesmen did at the hearings of the Anglo-American Committee. Any contrary proposals which might be made should be transmitted to the Actions Committee which should, however, not be confronted with tentative commitments by the Executive on partition subject to its ratification. They should be free to listen to all proposals, inquire into them, hear all about them, and then transmit them to our supreme bodies. They should not be given carte blanche. It is all important, furthermore that the same people who have been so persuasively arguing with the Congress that there is no hope for us, anywhere or in any other solution but partition, should not be our spokesmen at such a Conference. I am afraid that the same arguments which they presented here in defence of partition, namely that the Mandate is unworkable, UNO is hopeless, the plight of our refugees is becoming more desperate day by day, and the situation in Palestine more explosive, will, I am afraid, persuade themselves to go beyond partition to some modified Grady-Morrison proposal. Why not? The logic is the same, and the Grady-Morrison proposals do not permanently exclude the possibility of a Jewish State - at least as so it is said. I am very much afraid that in another few months these same people would be coming to an Actions Committee meeting with an equally skilful array of arguments to persuade the Zionist movement that the Grady-Morrison Plan, under another name, is the sole salvation of Israel! ..

I conclude. This Congress should reaffirm in clear and unmistakable language the London resolution of 1945, calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in an "undivided and undiminished" Palestine. Let it state that the partition proposals which were made and which were not accepted, no longer exist. There are no partition proposals before the Zionist movement today. It is along the line of our historic claims and legal rights to the whole of Palestine that we shall continue our struggle. When counter-proposals will be made to us at any time by Governments, which we will find truly reasonable and which will meet our fundamental needs and satisfy our national aspirations and our sense of justice, our movement will be prepared, I am sure, to give them serious consideration. But, such proposals have definitely not been made to us by anyone. Sound and just proposals are bound to be made to us sooner or later if we do not lose our nerve or our perspective.

In the meantime, we must in every way support the Yishuv in its struggle against the attempt of the Mandatory Government to liquidate the National Jewish home. By maximum financial and moral support, we must strengthen the Yishuv's power of resistance. The Yishuv must, in the last analysis, decide for itself the form and the timing of its resistance to British lawlessness in Palestine. But, whatever their decision - we will stand by them. We must make, regardless of cost, continued Jewish immigration into Palestine. We must carry on in every part of the world and especially the United States, an intensified campaign of education to inform the world of the organised conspiracy of the present British Government to nullify our rights in Palestine. Finally we must stand full square on the proposition that Zionism is not an immigration or a refugee movement, but a movement to re-establish the Jewish State for a Jewish nation in the land of Israel. The classic textbook of Zionism is not how to find a home for 100,000 Jewish refugees. The classic textbook of our movement is the "Jewish State".



Address by

Rabbi Dr. Stephen Wise

I speak not to a party. I do not purport to speak for a party. I do not speak to an audience, however large, I speak to the Zionist Congress. I speak to the Jewish people irrespective of party. I want to say to you today that excepting for the almost unmeasured terms of criticism of Dr. Goldmann and Louis Lipsky, nothing has been said by any of the representatives of American Zionism about American Zionism that went before. The American Zionist Emergency Council. No mention has been made indeed of all that went before, of all those great know Americans who brought to us, twenty-five, thirty, forty years ago inspiration, illumination and heartening..

I begin with the name of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who after all has paid 11 or 12 visits to America within the last thirty years, who spent nearly three years after a tragedy that befell him and his family in the United States and by his personality and the weight of his authority, as a scientist and no less as Zionist, won much from the President of the United States of those days and from the Under-Secretary of State, but it was not Weizmann alone who did great things before. There was an American Zionist Emergency Committee. I name other great friends who came to us and made American Zionism. Shmaryahu Levin, Nachum Sokolov, Menahem Ussishkin, Jabotinsky, Bialik and among them living friends and leaders, David Ben Gurion, and I want to say a word seeing that no one else has been either just or generous enough to say it, there have been Americans before two years ago or three who made a great contribution to American Zionism and to world Zionism - to name them makes praise unnecessary, Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Reverend Hirsh Meslansky, Henrietta Szold, Professor Guttenheim, Judge Julius W. Mack and thus far I have named only those who are no longer with us. But I must name living men even though one of them has ventured to disagree with what seems to be the present dogmatic line of the Zionist Organisation of America; namely, Dr. Harry Friedenwald, Louis Lipsky who might be celebrating his 70th birthday in the midst of his family, but instead of that is here - that veteran who has given much to the service of the Zionist cause, and I add two representative names and I am done - three names - Judge Rothenberg, Robert Szold, and that despite all that is alleged and all that is implied that extraordinarily gifted and brilliantly effective figure of the Zionist cause, Nachum Goldman.

Dear Friends, after a week what I have said might have sounded a little tiresome, but justice one must pursue even when it is easier to forget. Let us not bandy about words and terms and slogans. Retreat, retreat, retreat, popular convenience, and never again Massada. Fellow Zionists, a nation can survive one Massada, but it cannot live and flourish on Massadas. Something has been alleged as against the speaker about inconsistency or rather consistency which a great American said is the hobgoblin of little minds. It was proven by the Chairman of the Executive of the American Zionist Emergency Council, who in 1939 was as far removed at the Zionist Congress of that year from resistance and unlimited immigration as I today am far from resistance to the ideal of a Jewish State.

I do not favour a Jewish State either with pleasure, not even with resignation, to require any man, how Demosthenic his eloquence to say I favour an indiminished and undivided Jewish State. Do you



imagine that Goldman is less of a Zionist. No. No, then the men who presume publicly to misjudge and misinterpret him.

I wish to say a word about the change that has come over the scene since August when Dr. Weizmann with your concurrence wrote that letter. Do you not know what has happened. Whether the heads of the Zionist, American-Zionist Emergency Council admit it or not, American public opinion has been won not by certain types of pressure. The President of the United States even though he committed the crime of omitting to mention the 100,000 about whom he has constantly, repeatedly, almost tiresomely, spoken, the President has been won, public opinion has been won, and whether some of my fellow Americans are interested or not, liberal public opinion has been won for the ideal of a Jewish State in Palestine.

I want you to know something of American history. You are a little apt to be misled. Talk about the American revolution and the defeat of the British. England was defeated by a handful of Americans. True. But Americans were there in the 13 colonies alone and the British Army was 3,000 miles away and it took three months to send an Army of 20 or 30,000 to the United States of America. Today England has 100,000 or more soldiers in Palestine and can send another Army by air within a few days. Moreover even though we choose to forget about them, there are nearly twice as many Arabs as Jews in Eretz Israel.

We were told tonight and we were told before that the Grady Plan was rejected before. Goldmann was not an emissary but a member of the Jewish Agency and deputised unanimously to go to Washington. He was not a hired emissary. He was a trusted member of the Agency group. Well, we know there was no vacuum. We know for we helped to bring it about, and you know it. Cablegram after cablegram was sent by Ben Gurion and Goldman and myself to the President in order to bring up the rejection of the Grady-Morrison Plan, and I want to say something more. Only one or two things. I ask why have we changed our position? I tried to make an answer. I tell you now, men and women, you will have reason to remember my words, as eloquent and halting and stumbling as it is, not to go to the Conference in London is to affront the public opinion of the world which we cannot afford to do. Not to go to the Conference is to alienate the Government of the United States; not to go to the Conference is needlessly to irritate and affront the British Government. Nor, Mr. Chairman, is it the wisest thing in the world, and as an American and Zionist I wish to offer my protest to belittle what the United States Government has done and I believe will do - support of the American public which political unwisdom has done enough and more than enough to alienate in recent months. I wish to lay down the thesis that I as an American Jew and Zionist may continue to have faith in the United States of America and still be a loyal Zionist. And incidentally, may I observe whether some of us like it or not: we cannot rearrange presidential elections and presidential terms. President Truman will remain President of the United States until early January 1949. That is a fact not to be forgotten. Ladies and Gentlemen, I close with one appeal to you. Having an Aliyah policy as we have, what of the DPs and their camps. These dispossessed and displaced persons who have come out of the concentration camps, are they to be forgotten? Are they to be ignored? Are they to be left outside of instead of being brought into the Aliyah because it sounds well to make a distinction as against refugees, and finally, I wish to ask, Ladies and Gentlemen, I should probably never again have the privilege of meeting with you and I have good reasons for saying that, I ask you does going to London commit us to the acceptance of any decision which the London Conference may reach. Of course, we will say in



advance the White Paper must be cancelled as the very basis of discussion in the London Conference. Of course, we reject the Morrison Plan and do not be afraid no Zionist will ever accept the Morrison-Grady Plan or anything like it. It is an unfair and unjust assumption to assume that because some of us favour a Jewish State in less than all of Palestine that therefore we may be brought to the shame of accepting the Morrison plan. We reject a bi-national State which would mean not an Arab-Jewish State, but an Arab State dominating the Jewish population in that State. Finally, I cannot help saying to you, we fared very badly in London. I know it. I was there. I suffered heartbreak with the rest of you. The White Paper came out of the 1939 Conference. We would never have assented to it, but alas, within a few months came war and then our business was not to fight Mr. Chamberlain or Lord Halifax, but Hitler, our enemy who destroyed six million and two hundred thousand of us. There is no war today. If we are denied a Jewish State in Palestine, we will meet together and we will act together on behalf of Eretz Israel. What I have said to you tonight after that incomparably eloquent address, what I have said to you tonight is not defeatism. It is not bankruptcy. It is not despair. It is realism, it is wisdom, it is faith. Faith that much can be done with little. Paraphrasing the words of Winston Churchill, that out of a lesser part of Palestine, we can make a great, living, free Jewish State in Palestine. I as one of the few surviving friends and disciples of Herzl say to you in my last word: I am not pleading for another Uganda. I am pleading for a Jewish State. Trust your leadership. Trust the men who have not failed you. They know they have not failed you. They have not been the leaders of lawless violence. They have been wise and statesmanlike leaders. I hate the word bankruptcy. We have a Jewish State in Eretz Israel in all but name today. We have a great people. We shall have a greater people. I appeal to you, I urge you as my last word and I say it without equivocation without compromise and without fear: you can, if you choose, tear me from this desk and I say to you, we must go to the London Conference and through the London Conference lay the Foundations of a Jewish State in Palestine. To do other, to do less, is to repudiate Jewish history, is to deny the hopes, the tears, the prayers of the Jewish People, and that we will not do.





Alexander Archer  
15-5 Ave.  
N.Y.C.

Dr. Silver Reporting in New York on the World Zionist Congress.

# Are We to Go to London?

By DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

Excerpts of address during political debate at World Zionist Congress

Because the Executive had made a public offer of partition, it had to insist in self-defense and in order to protect the movement, upon an absolute condition, a sine qua non. It could not attend the London Conference unless its proposal of partition was accepted as the basis for discussion.

Had the Executive not hastened to make any partition proposals to Great Britain and the United States, it could have considered the question of going or not going to the Conference on its merits—whether more could be gained by going than by staying away. If it had decided to go to the Conference, it would undoubtedly have presented to it the full Zionist program, even as the Arabs intend to present theirs. Perhaps out of the Conference deliberations, some satisfactory compromise solution would evolve. But this was no longer possible as soon as the Agency proposals became public, because these proposals represented our absolute "irreducible minimum" beyond which the movement could not go. How can you go to a Conference to negotiate on an "irreducible minimum"?

One is expected to be reasonable and to make concessions at a Conference for the sake of arriving at a mutually satisfactory solution. The Agency was no longer in any position to make concessions. It had already made its maximum concessions! Therefore, it was no longer free to enter the London Conference without the protection of a prior commitment on the part of Great Britain that partition would be the basis of discussion. This was not obtained. When I see members of the Executive, who up to a week ago proclaimed from the roof-tops that we simply cannot and will not go to the Conference unless this indispensable condition is accepted, now come before this Congress and with all sorts of skillful arguments attempt to persuade the Congress to attend the Conference anyhow, without any condition, I see in it a grave and frightening omen that they are preparing the movement for another disastrous retreat.

What faces the Congress now is, in my judgment, also largely a matter of tactics. I am personally persuaded that more can be gained by not going to the Conference

B'nai Zion  
1-47  
46-9



than by going. Our refusal to go has already wrested one concession from Great Britain—not a very vital one, to be sure, but still a concession. The London Conference was called so that Great Britain could discuss with the Jews and Arabs the implementation of the Grady-Morrison Plan. That, in the words of Herbert Morrison in the House of Commons on July 31, was to be the basis for negotiations, the plan recommended by the expert delegations.

But Mr. Bevin's letter of December 3 to Secretary of State Byrnes stated that "His Majesty's Government do not regard themselves as committed in advance to their own proposals." I have reason to believe that this concession was the result of Great Britain's eagerness to have us come to the Conference. The reasons for their eagerness are best known to themselves. We may have our own opinions, but it is clear from all indications, public and private, that His Majesty's Government are very anxious to have the Jews attend the London Conference.

I feel that we should not go until the condition of the Jewish Agency is met. It will serve notice on Great Britain that we have finally reached the limits of any possible concessions which can be formed from us, that it cannot have its way with us all the time. A 100,000 certificates?—No! The Anglo-American Committee report?—No! A moderate increase in the number of refugees permitted into Palestine?—No! And on the final great gesture of sacrifice which we made to surrender half of Palestine in order to be master in our own house in the other half.—Again no! And now we are expected to go to another Conference, convoked by this same Government, so callous and so willful—for what purpose?—Again to be told, no? How long can we follow this line of retreat and abnegation without tearing the heart out of our movement?

Does any champion of partition in this Congress believe for a moment that Great Britain does not know all the arguments in favor of partition, that it requires another conference to give our spokesmen the opportunity officially to bring forward these arguments again? The present leaders of the British Government have heard each and every argument that was made here on the floor of the Congress on behalf of partition, and many more. They were not persuaded. Does any one believe that they will be persuaded at a formal public conference? Public conferences never succeed unless preliminary agreements are reached in prior informal conversations. No such agreements have been reached.

To those who insist that we must go to the Conference and who expect some good to come out of it, I would suggest that they should not go on the basis of the negotiations which have been carried on in the last four months. To permit the impression that partition still represents the full program of the Zionist movement to remain unchallenged by this Congress would be fatal to any success which they hope to derive from attending the Conference. That is why I have suggested that this Congress, in some unmistakable and effective manner,

should indicate to the world that it disassociates the movement from the disastrous diplomacy of the last few months which is leading us inevitably to Grady-Morrison.

It is important for this Congress to bring our movement back to its main highway. It has wandered far afield. The Congress should put an end to this lamentable chapter. There are no partition proposals before us other than those which our Executive made and which have not been accepted. They no longer exist for us. If we go to any conference, it should be on the basis of our full Zionist program. It is this program that our representatives should be obligated to advocate and to urge even as our spokesmen did at the hearings of the Anglo-American Committee.

Any contrary proposals which might be made should be transmitted to the Actions Committee which should, however, not be confronted with tentative commitments by the Executive on partition subject to its ratification. They should be free to listen to all proposals, inquire into them, hear all about them, and then transmit them to our supreme bodies. They should not be given carte blanche.

It is all important, furthermore, that the same people who have been so persuasively arguing with the Congress that there is no hope for us, anywhere or in any other solution but partition, should not be our spokesmen at such a Conference. I am afraid that the same arguments which they presented here in defense of partition, namely that the Mandate is unworkable, the UN is hopeless, the plight of our refugees is becoming more desperate day by day, and the situation in Palestine more explosive, will, I am afraid, persuade themselves to go beyond partition to some modified Grady-Morrison proposal. Why not? The logic is the same, and the Grady-Morrison proposals do not permanently exclude the possibility of a Jewish State—at least so it is said. I am very much afraid that in another few months these same people would be coming to an Actions Committee meeting with an equally skillful array of arguments to persuade the Zionist movement that the Grady-Morrison Plan, under another name, is the sole salvation of Israel!

This Congress should reaffirm in clear and unmistakable language the London resolution of 1945, calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in an "undivided and undiminished" Palestine. Let us state that the partition proposals which were made and which were not accepted, no longer exist. There are no partition proposals before the Zionist movement today. It is along the line of our historic claims and legal rights to the whole of Palestine that we shall continue our struggle. When counter-proposals will be made to us at any time by governments, which we will find truly reasonable and which will meet our fundamental needs and satisfy our national aspirations and our sense of justice, our movement will be prepared, I am sure, to give them serious consideration. But, such proposals have definitely not been made to us by anyone. Sound and just proposals are bound to be made to us sooner or later if we do not lose our nerve or our perspective.



# דאס קלאסישע בוך פון אונזער באוועגונג

רעדע פון ד"ר א.ה. סילווער

## ייִדנשטאט

1-3-4 Die jidische schtete

עס נעמט דאן דאס וואָרט ד"ר אבא הלל סימאנער, וועלכער זאָגט: אין דער אַצט־יקער שפּעטער שטח וויל איך זיך טישט אַרײַנגלײַכן אין אַ גאַנצן וויכוח איבער דעם פּאָליטישן פּראָב-לעם, וואָס שטייט פאַר אונז איך וויל דאָ זאָגן אייניקע ווערטער אין דער פּראָגע פון טאַקטיק. מיט עטלעכע טעג צוריק, האָט ד"ר גאַלדמאַן געלעזט די טאַקטיק פּראָגע מיט אַזוי אַז און געוואָרענע זיינע אַנדערע ווערטער פּרינג-ציפּן, פּאָליטישע אַפּשאַצונגען און ספּעקולאַציעס. איך וויל מיך באַגרענעצן אויף דער פּראָגע פון טאַקטיק. אייער ציל קאָן זיין, וואָס ער זאָל נישט זיין, און מעג ער זיין ווי ווייט מעג-לעך גערעכט און געוונט — אויב אָבסערװירט וועט זיין שוואַך אין סטראַטעגיע, וועט איר ליידיג אַ טפּלה. אין דיפּלאַמאַטישע מלחמות פונקט ווי אין פיזישע, זענען אָפט נצחונות אָדער מפלואות אָפּהענגיק דערפון, אויב די סטראַטעגיע איז געווען גוט אָדער שלעכט. אָפט ווערט אַ גרעסערע אין בעסער אויסגעשטאַטער טע אַרמיי באַזיגט דורך אַ שוואַכערן קעגנער, וועלכער האָט אָבער אַ פינאַקערן גענעראַל. שטאַב און אַ בעסערע סטראַטעגיע. ה' ליפּסקי האָט געכטן אָנגעהויבן זיין רעדע און געזאָגט, אז דער גאַנצער ענין פון דער עקזעקוטיווע אין אַזוי האָט אָנגעפאַנגען אלס אַן ענין פון טאַק-טיק און מאַטעריאַל. ה' גרינבערג האָט אין זיין רעדע געשפּאַט אַבער „טאַקטיק“. ער האָט וואַגט פאַרגלייכט די ציוניסטן, וואָס פּאָדערן צו שטיין אויף אונזערע פּוילע רעכט אין אַרץ-שטאַל, צו יענעם אַריענטאַלישן סיחור, וואָס באַשטימט אַ 4 אָדער 5 פּאַכיקן פּרייז, ווי עס איז דער אַמתער ווערט פון זיין סחורה, כדי ער זאָל לבסוף באַקומען דעם פּרייז, וועלכן ער וויל אַן דער ווירקלעכקייט. איך פּערזענלעך האָב געווען אין דעם דאָזיקן פאַרגלייך אַ פאַר-שוועכונג.

איך בין נישט קיין טאַקטיק ספּעציאַליסט, אָבער צוגלייך מיט אייך אלעמען פאַרשטיי איך, אז דיפּלאַמאַטיע איז אַ קונסט פאַרבונדן מיט טאַקטיק. און אזוי האָב איך אויך פאַר-שטאַנען די ווערטער פון ה' ליפּסקי, אז אלץ וואָס איז פאַרעקומען אין אַזוי, איז געווען אַ פּראָגע פון טאַקטיק און מאַטעריאַל. אויב אזוי — פּרעג איך זיך, נאָכוואָס האָט די עקזעקוטיווע דאָס אלץ געמאַכט? מען האָט דאָ גע-זאָגט, אז דאָס איז געווען אַ גוימאָדערקייט כדי מבשיל צו זיין דעם גריידי מאָריסאָן פּלאַן.

שטימט מיט מיין דאָזיקער הערקלערונג. אַ טאָג צוויי נאָכדעם איז געקומען ד"ר גאַלדמאַן און האָט טען דערקלערונג באַשטעטיקט. איך גלויב יאָ אַז אַזוי אַ פאַקט, אז די אַרבעט פון דער אַגענציע אין אַזוי איז נישט געווען נויטיק כדי מבשיל צו זיין דעם גריידי פּלאַן. אויב אזוי, טאָ נאָך וואָס איז די דאָזיקע אַק-ציע אונטערגענומען געוואָרן? ד"ר גאַלדמאַן (המשך אויף זייט 2).

אין אַ רעדע פאַרן קאָנגרעס דעם פּאָדעם דינ-טאָג האָב איך פּעסענטעטעלט דאָס, וואָס איז לויט מיין איבערצייגונג געווען אַלגעמיין באַקאַנט, אז דער גריידי פּלאַן איז אָפּגעוואָרפן געוואָרן דורך דער אַמעריקאַנער רעגירונג איי-ניקע טעג איידער די עקזעקוטיווע אין אַזוי איז צוגעטראָטן צום דאָזיקן ענין און איידער איר שלוח איז געקומען קיין וואַשינגטאָן. ה' בן גוריון אין זיין רעדע האָט נישט אייבע-ר-ה' ליפּסקי





אונזער גרעסטע אויפגאבע איז פארצוועצן די אייניקייט, וואָס האָט געהערשט אין דער ציוניסטישער אָרגאַניזאַציע אויפן לעצטן קאָנ- גרעס. אויך אין באַצוג צו די פּאָליטישע צילן און אונזערע פּאָליטישע האַפּענונגען. דער בילטד מאָר פראַגראַם האָט אין משך פון די מלחמה יאָרן אין נאָך זיי פאַרדייניקט אַרום זיך דעם גרעסטן טייל פון דער ציוניסטישער באַוועגונג אין יידישן פּאָלט. עס איז אַ פאַקט, אַז נאָר אַ קליינער טייל פון דער ציוניסטישער אָרגאַניזאַ- ציע און פון יידישן פּאָלט איז געווען קעגן דעם בילטמאָר פראַגראַם, און איך זע נישט קיין שום סיבה פאַרוואָס מען זאָל דעם דאָזיקן פראַגראַם נישט ווידער באַשטעטיקן.

כדי צו דערהויבן אַ יידישע מדינה אין ארץ ישראל, האָרף מען אויך גלויבן אין דעם, אַז ס'איז נויטיג צו ענטפערן דער הסכם מיט די אַראַבישע וועט קומען דאָן, ווען מיר וועלן זיין זעלבסטשטענדיק. עס וועט קומען

מיר האָבן דעם מוט צו זאָגן, אַזאָ אויף ווייני- גער ווי אונזער עקזעקוטיווע האָט פאַרזעללאָגן וועלן מיר נישט איינגיין.

אויף וויפיל מיר וועלן זיין צווישן זיך פאַר- אייניקט, וועלן מיר קאָנצענטרירן דאָס יידי- שע פּאָלט און אויך די יעניקע קערפערשאַפטן, וואָס געפינען זיך אינעם נישט אויפן קאָנגרעס. מיר וועלן דאָן דעם פאַרדייניקטן כוח קעגן וואָלכן עס האָט זיך געפונען די ענגלישע רעגיר- יונג מיט אייניקע חרשים צוריק, בעת די האָט אומזיסט געוואלט אַנדערע יידישע קערפערשאַפ- טן, וואָס זאָלן איינשטימען צו גיין צו דער אָנפערעניץ. עס זענען זינט דאָן נישט פאַרגע- וואָסן קיין שום ענדערונגען. און איך זע נישט באַוואָס מיר זאָלן אינעם יאָר גיין צו דער קאָנ- גרעניץ. מיר דאַרפן אויך ווייטער זיין גע- אייניקט ארום די דאָזיקע באַשלוסן, און די מי- גריטעט, וואָס איז געווען קעגן דעם, וועט נאָך אינעם בלייבן אַ קליינע מאַגאָריטעט אין שטח און און דער נאָכער באַוועגונג, אויך

זאָגן מיר אויך היינט. דאָס וואָס איז געשאַט געוואָרן אין ארץ ישראל און וואָס וועט נאָ געשאַפן ווערן, מוז געבויט ווערן אונטער אַ קאָנצענטראַרטלעכער לייטונג און דורך אַ פאַר- אַנטוואָרטלעכן ישוב, וואָס וועט נישט דולד קיין בינעזישע אַרומיגען ביי זיך און וואָס קאָ נישט דערלויבן, אַז אומשולדיקע מענטשן זאָלן געשאַסן ווערן אויף די גאַסן פון ירושלים און תל אביב. זאָל געוואָלט ווערן קלאָר פון דער דאָ- זיקער פּלאַטפאָרם, אַז דער ציוניסטישער קאָנ- גרעס, דער ישוב און דאָס יידישע פּאָלט פאַדער אויף די טעראָריסטישע גרופעס אויפצוהער זייערע מעשים און זיך אונטערוואַרפן דער נאָ- ציאַנטלעך דאָסציפלין. אונזער ווידערשטאַנד האָרף זיין אַ ריינער, אַ קלאָרער, אַ מאַראַלי- שער, אַ חלוצישער ווידערשטאַנד. אַרום דעם ווידערשטאַנד איז פאַראייניקט דער גאַנצער יידישער ישוב. און אויב מיר וועלן זיין פאַר- אייניקט, וועט זיך אויך די ענגלישע רעגירונג מיט אונז רעכענען, און עס וועט אוממעגלעך מאַכן די פאַרווירקלעכונג פון ווייסקובץ.

אויך האָבן היינטיקעס יאָר געווען יידן אין איראָקע און אין די לאַגערן, און אַ שוואַרץ וואָס איז די ווערטער פון עקזעקוטיוו מיטגלידען האָט זיך געהערט אַ געוויסער אומגלויבן אין די יידישע מאַסן. אָט די יידן אויף וועלכע עס זענען אַריבער צרות און גזירות אָן אַ שיעור, זענען גרייט זיך צו שטעלן אין די רייען פון אונזערע קעמפער. דער יידישער ישוב אין ארץ ישראל נויטיקט זיך אין די דאָזיקע הונדערטע טויזנטער יידן, ווייל אָן זיי דאָס אים די גע- פאַר צו בלייבן אַ מינדערהייט. די יידן אין דעם גולה נויטיקן זיך אין ארץ ישראל, ווייל זיי ווייסן, אַז נאָר ארץ ישראל וועט זיי ברענגען אַ גאָלד. אַ ברית חיים איז פאַראַן צווישן דעם ישוב און צווישן הונדערטער טויזנטער יידן אין דער גולה; דאָס איז אַ ברית צו לעבן צוזאַ- מען, צו בויען צוזאַמען און צוזאַמען צו קומן צום ציל, צו זעלבשטענדיקייט אין אונזער לאַ- גער — אַ זעלבשטענדיקייט, וואָס זאָל אונז אויף- לייען פון דער גלות חרפה און פון דער סכ- פון אַ מינדערהייט אין אַן אַראַבישן שטאַ- נד. עס דאָס אונז דער זעלבער גורל, וואָס האָט געטראָפן די יידן אין עיראַק, סיריע, אַל- נון, מצרים און אַנדערע אַראַבישע לענדער.

אויב דער קאָנגרעס וועט זיך דערהויבן דער מדרגה פון אחדות און צו דער מדרגה אַ בשותפותדיקער שפראַך; אויב דער קאָנגרעס וועט פאַרשטיין, אַז מיר מוזן זיין געאייניקט אין דער קאָנסטרוקטיווער אַרבעט, אין חתי- מות, אין העפּלעך — וועלן מיר זיין, און אַנדערע פאַקטאָרן וועלן פאַרשטיין, אַז דאָ יידישע פּאָלט איז באַרעכטיקט צו פרייהייט און זעלבשטענדיקייט, ווי יעדעס אַנדערע פּאָלט אין דער וועלט.



WRHS





# אויסגעוויילט די נייע ציוניסטישע

## שלוש-יצינג פון 22-טן ציוניסטישן קאנגרעס אי

### צוזאמענשטעל פון נייעם אקציעאנס קאמיטעט

דער 22-טער ציוניסטישער קאנגרעס האט אויף זיין שלום יצינג אויסגעוויילט א נייעם אקציעאנס קאמיטעט אין פאלגענדן צוזאמענ-שטעל:

### רעזאלוציעס פון 22

דער 22-טער ציוניסטישער קאנגרעס, וואס איז זיך צוגעפונען אין שאטן פון גרויסן חורבן, וואס איז געקומען אויפן יידישן פאלק, שפעט האפנונג און מוט פון דעם אומדערשייטערלעכן ווילן און דראגט פון דער שארית הפליטה אין אייראפע אנטוויקלן א ניי לעבן אין ארץ ישראל, פון דעם וואס פון ממשות-דיקן כוח און מאהאלישער אויטאריטעט פון ישוב אין ארץ ישראל און פון דער טריישאפט און איבערגעגעבנקייט פון די ברייטסטע יידי-שע מאסן אין דער גארער וועלט צום ציוניס-טישן ווערק.

2. די געשעענישן פון לעצטן יאר אין ארץ-ישראל און אין אייראפע און דער גרויסער וואס פון דער צאל ווילער צום דאזיקן קאנ-גרעס זאגן עדות אויף דעם אנטשלאסענעם ווילן פון יידישן פאלק אנטוויקלענען אלע זיינע כוחות צוצואוילן זיין באפרייאונג.

3. די לעצטע פון אומגליק אין אייראפע, די סכנות, וואס לויפן אויף יידישע קהילות, און מורח און אין אנדערע לענדער, נאך דער מלחמה; דער פארשריט און די אנטוויקלונג פון יידישן אויפבו ווערן אין ארץ ישראל, די זעלבסטשטענדיקייט, וואס עס האבן דערגרייכט

מוצאי שבת, העם 4 יאנואר 1947, RUE BLANCHE (Métro : Trinité)

וועט פארקומען

גרויסער

מיטן אנטויל

נצחק גרינבוים, ד

(מיטגלידער פון דער

מים בענדושאמין

עקזעקוטיוו-מיטגלידערן פון „הרסה“

ד"ר יוסף מאסיס

(רעלעטא צום ציוניסטישן קאנגרעס)

איינגאנג פריי !

### עקזעקוטיווע מיטגלידער :

9 אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן; 7 מפא"י און

4 מזרחי

בן גוריון פארזיצער פון דער עקזעקוטיווע אין ירושלים.

ד"ר א. ה. סילווער פארזיצער פון דער עק-זעקוטיווע אין וואשינגטאן.

אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן

1. ד"ר סילווער

2. פרוי ר. האלפערין

3. פראם. בראדעקי

4. ד"ר בערנשטיין

5. י. גרינבוים

6. נ. גאלדמאן

7. ד"ר י. ניומאן

8. ד"ר מ. סנה

9. מ. קאלאדי

מפא"י

1. ד. בורדוין

2. ח. גרינבערג

3. דאבקי

4. גאלדע מאירסאן

5. ב. לאקער

6. א. קאפלאן

7. מ. שערטאק

מזרחי

1. הרב גאלד

2. הרב פישמאן

3. שפירא

4. שרנאי

## האנסאלידירט און געשלאסן

פון ד"ר ישראל גאלדשטיין

אנארכיסטישן טעאָרעטיק, וועלכן ער האט נישט צוויידייטיק פארטוילט און דער נאציאנא-לער רעזיסטאנץ באוועגונג, וועלכע ער האט א פראגראם און א פארשטיינער פון ארץ-ישראל האט פארטיפט אונזער איבערצייגונג, אז דער ישוב וועט קיינמאל נישט אינגיין אויף דער ענגלישער הערשאפט אין א"י, וועל-כע ער זיך אויף כוח, צוזאגן און אונטער-זיכונג פון אלעמענארע בורגער, רעכט, דער צווייטער מיט די דעלאטאן פון די דע-פארטיסטן, האט און אנדערע יידישע געמיינ-דעם אין אייראפע האט איבערגעלאזן אן איינ-דרוק, אז די דרינגדיקע נויטווענדיקייט וועט ברענגען צו די ברייטע פון ארץ ישראל מאסן יידן, אפילו אן סערטיפיקאטן און טראץ אלע שוועריקייטן און צווינגען.

א וויכטיקן טייל אויפן קאנגרעס האט פארנעמעלט מיט זיך די אמעריקאנער דעלע-גאציע פון די אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן, וועלכע איז באשטאנען פון דער אמעריקאנער ציוניסטי-שער אהאנאליזאציע און הרסה. אין פריערדיקע יארן און אויף די פריערדיקע קאנגרעסן זענען די אמעריקאנער ציוניסטן געווען רעספאקטירט הויפטזעכלעך צוליב זייער פינאנציעלער צו-שטייערונג לטובת דעם אויפבו ווערן אין ארץ ישראל. צו דעם קאנגרעס, דאסען, זענען די אמעריקאנער ציוניסטן געקומען מיט רעאלע פאליטישע דערגרייכונגען פארזיכערנדיק די פרייזעלעכע פרא ציוניסטישע שטעלונג פון דער אמעריקאנער רעגירונג אין דער ארץ ישראל פראגע. דער פאקטאָר רעזערווירט פאר אונזער באוועגונג א באזונדערס וויכטיקן און בכבודיקן ארט אין דער אלגעמיינער ציוניסטישער אה-טאניזאציע.

צום ערשטן מאל נאך פיל יארן, נייען ארויס די אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן נאכן קאנגרעס קאנ-סאלידירט און געשלאסן אלס א פארטיי מיט א קלארן איינהייטלעכן פראגראם און ארגאני-זאציאנעלער פארם. די וועלט קאנפערענציע פון די אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן וועט זיך אין צו-קונפט אנטוויקלען און שטיין אלס די דאזיקע פארטיי איבערהאלט דער ציוניסטישער באווע-גונג, וועלכע שטעלט זיך פאר די הויפט צילן: (1) קאטעגאריזאציע פון די ברייטע נא-ציאנאלע יידישע אינטערעסן אין ארץ ישראל. (2) די אוניפיקאציע פון בילדונגס סיסטעם פון דער יידישער יוגנט אין קענאדא צו דעם איצטיקן פארטיי סיסטעם און די גלייכצארכי-טיקונג צו עליה און התחייבות פון די אלע וועל-כע שטרעבן צו בויען זייער לעבן אין ארץ דורך דער יידישער נאציאנאלער חיים. אין אלע אנ-דערע לענדער מחוץ ארץ ישראל וועט די קאנ-פערענציע פון די אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן פאר-זען איר פאליטישן קאנטינאליטעט, וועלכער שטעלט די אלגעמיינע אינטערעסן פון יידישן פאלק איבער די אינטערעסן פון פארטיי פראג-ציעס.

אלגעמיינער ציוניזם איז דער ציוניזם פון טע-אָרעטישער הערשאפט, אלס די צאָליריכע פראגע ארץ קאנגרעס פילט ער זיך אמטערסטן פאר אנטווארטלעך פאר דער אינטערנאציאנאלער פון דער באוועגונג. פאר איר נאציאנאליזם און גע-שלאסנקייט איבער אלע פארטייאישע טענדענצן און נייגונגען.

ס'איז צו באדערן וואס דער ציוניסטישער קאנגרעס האט נישט אויסגעוויילט קיין עקזע-קוטיווע און האט דאס איבערגעלאזט דעם אה-ציאנאנס קאמיטעט. דאס דארף דורכפירט ווע-רן ווי אמטערסטן. די נייע עקזעקוטיווע דארף אפשפילען די פאליטישע ליניע פון דער מא-יאדיטעט אויפן קאנגרעס אבער גלייכצייטיק דארף עס זיין ווי ווייט מעגלעך א קאאליציע-עקזעקוטיווע, וועלכע רעפרעזענטירט די גרעס-טע טייל פארטייען.

די ציוניסטישע באוועגונג שטייט פאר דעם "שוערסטן פערזאן אין זיין געשיכטע, א פער-זאך וועלכער פארעמט מאסישע קאנפליקט-ציע, מוט און ענרגיע.

זיך אין דאמאסטישע מאמענטן, האט זיך געענדיקט די שלום יצינג פונם 22טן ציו-טישן קאנגרעס. די יצינג האט געדויערט 17 שעה אן איבערדרייס (פון 9 אונט ביז 12 אוי-גער בייטאג צומארגנס) און האט אנטוועקט א ריי באדלעסן, פאליטישע און ארגאניזאציעלע, טראץ אלע פרובן צו שאפן די נייע עקזע-קוטיווע אין מען נישט געקומען צו קיין פאר-שטענדיקונג. דער קאנגרעס האט דאן באשלאסן איבערצוגעבן די אויפגאבע פון צוזאמענשטעלן די עקזעקוטיווע דעם נייעם אקציעאנס קאמיטעט וועלכער איז אויסגעוויילט געווארן אויפן קאנ-גרעס.

ד"ר ווייצמאן געזעגנט זיך

מיטן קאנגרעס

דינסטיק איבערפירט פארן ענדיקן זיך פון דער שלום יצינג איז דערשינען ד"ר ווייצמאן, וועלכער האט אין רירנדיקע ווערטער געזעגנט דעם קאנגרעס און געוואונטן ווידער אמאל זיך צו זען מיט דער ציוניסטישער משפחה אויפן קומענדיקן קאנגרעס. אלע דעלעגאטן דריקן אויס כבוד דעם גרויסן און איבערגעגעבענעם ציר-ניסט מיט אויפשטיין פון די ווערטער און מיט לאנג ריערדיקע אפלאדישעמענטן.

געשאפן די נייע עקזעקוטיווע

נאך 5 טעג פון באדאטונגען האט דער אק-ציעאנס קאמיטעט אויסגעוויילט די נייע עק-זעקוטיווע.



ניי-אויסגעוויילטער פרעזידענט פון דער וועלט-קאנפערענציע פון די אלגעמיינע ציוניסטן

דער ציוניסטישער קאנגרעס, וואס האט זיך איצט געשלאסן אין באזעל, איז געווען איינער פון די שווערסטע און פארזאמלונגלעכסטע זינט פיל יארן. ער האט אין דער ערשטער ווי-אויסגעדריקט דעם אומצוטרוי פון די יידן צו דער ענגלישער מאכט. א גרויסע צאל דעלע-גאטן, אונגעפירט דורך ד"ר ווייצמאן, האבן זיך נאך אלץ געקלאמערט אן די לעצטע פונקטן פון האפנונג, גלייכנדיק, אז די מאנהאטאר מאכט וועט קענען באפרידיקן די מינימאלסטע פא-דערנעמען פון יידישן פאלק דורכן שאפן א יידישעמאט אויף א פאסיקן שטח פון ארץ-ישראל.

די אנהענגער פון דער דאזיקער אריינשטאציע זענען געווען די "יא" וואנער אין דער פראגע פון באטייליקן זיך אין דער קאנפערענציע-פערענציע. ביי די קענאדאטיקע אלמאטענדן. דאסען א גרעסער טייל דעלעגאטן, אונגעפירט דורך ד"ר סילווער, האט געהאלטן, אז די קאנ-סעקוטיווע אנט ציוניסטישע פאליטיק פון ווייט-געגאנגענע זינט דער פראקאמירונג פון ווייט-כאך אין 1939-טן יאר, שליסט אויס יעדע מעג-לעזיקייט פון פאזיטיווע רעזולטאטן פון וועל-כער נישט איז קאנפערענץ ביי חכם איצטיקן צושטאנד.

דער ענגלישער שטודנט בלייבט דערינער נאך צו טיילוילן אין דערמיטלענדיקן, פרא ציו-ניסטישן וועלטס כדי צו בארעכטיקן דעם שריט פון ציוניסטישן אקציעאנס קאמיטעט, אין ווע-מענס הענט/עס ליגט די רעזולוציע און די דא-זיגט איינשטאנציע וועט דערקלערן, אז די אומ-שטענדיק האבן זיך געענדיקט אין אזא מאס און אן דער היסטאריע, אז די איינלאדונג צו דער קאנפערענץ קען אנטוועקען ווערן.

נישט קוקנדיק אויף דעם, וואס ד"ר ווייצ-מאנס פאליטישע שטעלונג איז דורך דעם קאנ-גרעס נישט אונטערגעשטיצט געווארן, האט אסער זיין פערזענלעכער פרעסטיזש פון דעם אבסאלוט נישט געליטן. זיין פאליטישער ווע-קען זיין פארגליכן מיט דער מלחמהשער טעטי-קייט פון ווייטמאן שערמשיק: דעם לעצטעם נאמען איז אויף אייביק איינגעקלייבט געווארן אין דער געשיכטע פון ענגלאנד, טראץ דעם וואס זיין נאך מלחמהדיקע פאליטיק איז דורכן ענגלישן פאלק אפגעווארפן געווארן. פונקט אזוי וועלן ד"ר ווייצמאנס פארדינסטן לגבי דעם ציוניזם אין ארץ ישראל אויף אייביק בלייבן אין זכרון פון יידישן פאלק. דער ציוניסטישער קאנגרעס האט דורכגע-פירט א קלארע גרענעץ ליניע צווישן דעם



(המשך פון זייט 1)

די פעלערהאפטע טאקטיק אין פאָרשטעלן די  
רקערונגען פון דער עקזעקוטיווע האָט גע-  
אַכט צו די פאָלגנדע אומגיינסטיקע רעזול-  
טן:

רעדע פון מ. קאלאדני

בוח

רעדע פון ד"ר א. ה. סילווער

אינציווישן מוחן מיר שטיצן מיט אלע מיט-  
לען דעם געראטל פון יישוב קעגן די פארזוכ-  
פון דער מאנדאט מאכט צו ליקוידירן די יידי-  
שע גאסיאנאלע חיים, עס מוז זיי געגעבן ווערן  
זייערסטע מאטעריעלע און מאדאלישע שטי-  
צע. מיר הארפן שטארקן דעם ווידערשטאנד  
כוח פון יישוב, דאס אנטבלאנט דער פארם און  
זייט פון געראטל — וועגן דעם דארף דער  
יישוב אהיין באשליסן. און זאל זיין באשלוס  
זיין ווי ער זאל זיין — מיר וועלן שטיין ביי  
זייער זינט. די עליה דארף פארענעצט ווערן  
פאר יעדן פריוו. איממענס אין דער וועלט, און  
באוועגערס אין אימעריקע, הארפן מיר פירן אן  
אנעשטערענטע רעזיערעישע טעטיקייט. מיר  
הארפן באשאפט מאכן מאכן דער וועלט וועגן אר-  
אנציוויטער קאנספיראציע פון דער בריטישער  
רעגירונג קעגן אונזערע רעכט אין ארץ ישראל.  
און לכסוף דארפן מיר נאכאן קלאר מיט  
דער גרעסטער אנטשלאסנקייט, אז ציוניזם איז  
יישט קיין באוועגונג פון שמייראציע אדער  
פליטים, נאר א באוועגונג פאר דעם אויפבוי  
פון א יידישער מדינה הארץ יידישן פאלק אין  
ארץ ישראל. דאס קלאסישע בוך פון ציוניזם  
יעדט נישט וועגן דעם. ווי אזוי צו געפינען ארט  
פאר הונדערט טויזנט פליטים. דאס קלאסישע  
בוך פון אונזער. אונגענוג איז — „די יידישע  
מדינה“

האם א נהגט צו גלייבן, אז דע דראזער  
ציתור איז געווען דער ערשטסטע פון  
דעם שטארקן ווילן, אז מיר זאלן קומען  
צו קאנפערענץ. און דער טעם פון דאזיקן  
זענען איז ווי אליין אומבעקטן באקאנט.  
אבער דאס וועגן דעם, ווי מיר ווילן.  
אלע סימנים ווייזן דארויף אז די ענגלישע  
גייט וויל זייער שטארק, אז די יידן זאלן  
פון דער קאנפערענץ באטייליקן און אידן  
זענען, אז מיר דארפן נישט מירן ביי  
אלן נישט ערפילט וועגן די באדינגונגען  
און זייערע אומגלייכע דאס וועט ענגלישע  
פון, אז מיר זענען געקומען צו דעם  
פונקט פון א מעגלעכער פשרה, וואס  
זען פון אונז איינפליסן, וואס, האט מען  
געגעבן? 100,000 יעסערטיפאקטן? — ניין.  
און וועלכע פון ענגליש אומערגלייכער  
וועט זיין. א באטייליגענעם צווייטע פון  
פאקטן פאר פליטיש? ניין. און אויף  
גרויסן לעצטן קריש, דער וויתור און  
פאט פון ארץ ישראל, כדי מיר זאלן קאנען  
באטאנענע דאס אין דער צווייטער  
— ווידער ניין! און נאך דעם אלע-  
עווארט מען פון אונז, אז מיר זאלן זיין  
נייט קאנפערענץ צוואנצענערטן דורף  
אבער דעריבער? — נאכטאג? צו דעם  
געזאמלע צו חדר דעם „ניין“? ווי  
זאגט מען זיין אויפן דאס? וועגן פון  
דייט און נישט צעטיילן דאס הארץ פון

פֿטע טאקטיק אין פֿאַרשטעלן די  
פֿון דער עקזעקוטיווע האָט גע -  
פֿאַנגנדיק אומגינגסטיקע רעזול -

עדע פון מ. קאלאדני

אֵל  
קֵד  
עֲנֵל  
עֵד  
יִי  
מִד  
אֵל  
רֵעֵי  
וִיד  
הֵל  
עֵס  
פִּין  
כֹּחֵי  
יִדֵּעֵי  
וִי  
אֵל  
הֵל  
הֵל

[illegible]

## אמנות פז"ז :

אלע יידן קומען אויפן  
סן מיטל

שבת, דעם 4 יאנואר, 20.30 אין אונט אין  
זאל "דער אינזשעניער סיוויל".