



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
183

Box
68

Folder
770

The case for Zionism, 1949.

The establishment of the State of Israel last year has raised, quite properly, the question of the future of the Zionist Movement. Some have urged its prompt liquidation now that its objectives have been achieved. Anti-Zionists who have been (ideologically) confounded and generally frustrated by the triumph of Zionism have been (especially) clamorous in demanding the immediate dissolution of the Zionist Movement.

Most anti-Zionists have reconciled themselves to the new situation. They have gracefully withdrawn from a controversy which life has finally resolved. Some of them, out of a sense of fair play and (commendable) pride in Jewish achievement, have been helping (both) in the political defense and (in) the economic support of the new State.

Unfortunately, some irreconcilables among the anti-Zionists insist upon keeping their propaganda motor racing although their car is definitely and permanently stalled. They are shrewd enough to avoid a frontal attack upon the newly-established state, but they continue their attacks upon American Zionists who helped to bring it about. They repeat the well-known innuendoes of dual allegiance. They charge Zionists with constituting an unholy pressure group in American public life in behalf of a foreign state, and with fostering a spirit of Jewish nationalism among the Jews of the world. (They see a danger to themselves in a sustained interest of American Jews in the re-created State of Israel.) They would (accordingly) like to see the Jewish State isolated as far as possible from the rest of world Jewry, and an iron curtain erected between it and the great Jewish community of the United States.

The fears and wild imaginings of these perennially shell-shocked Jews and their few non-Jewish sympathizers will influence the attitude of American Jews as little in the future as in the past.

But Zionists themselves have been studying the possible implications of their epochal achievement (- and Jews generally.) The Zionist Organization of America appointed, soon after the establishment of the State of Israel, a commission to study the future program of the Zionist Movement. A report of this commission was recently made public. (Its findings are summarized in the statement; "The establishment and international recognition of the State of Israel constituted a signal achievement for

Zionism. They do not mark the fulfillment of its aims." Its (continuing) aims, according to the report, are to safeguard the integrity and independence of the State of Israel, to promote the speedy migration to Israel of Jews desirous of settling there, to assist in the organization of all Jewry for these purposes, and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity. (These were also the conclusions of the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Movement which met recently in Jerusalem.)

These conclusions are based on the realization that the political objectives of the Zionist Movement have not yet been made secure and that the economic objectives are actually only in the very early stages of attainment. One can readily understand that the Jews of the United States, for example, who did so much to establish the State of Israel and who have for many years been so deeply concerned in the plight of their homeless refugees for whom the world offered no sanctuary, would wish to continue their assistance to fellow-Jews who are now coming and who will continue to come to the blessed refuge of Israel in the tens of thousands monthly. One can readily understand also that they would resolve to remain on the alert in order to protect as far as they can that little country which is still beset with so many political dangers. No fair-minded man will impugn to these American Jews, who have demonstrated time and again in war and in peace their unfailing loyalty to their beloved country, any sinister or unpatriotic motives when they appeal to their government for helpful cooperation in these tasks (for which the American people have on all occasions demonstrated a most profound sympathy and understanding.)

Our foreign policies (no less than our domestic policies) are clearly not made in a vacuum. (In the last analysis) they must be responsive to public opinion. Americans who seek to influence the foreign policies of their government are not, because of it, to be condemned. The test is whether they are motivated by patriotism and humanity, or by selfish interests detrimental to their country.

American Zionists have always believed that the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine was in complete consonance with the highest American interests in the

Middle East. They believed that such a state would become a friendly outpost for legitimate American interests and for American ideals of democracy and freedom in that vast undeveloped and socially backward part of the world. Fundamentally, this conviction ~~added to~~ ^{coupled with} the conviction that Zionism was morally justified, ^{major} (that it represented, to quote Senator Vandenberg, "One of the greatest of all ~~national~~ ^{major} ideals in international justice — and humanity") was behind the endorsement which was given to the Zionist Movement by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson and twice by resolutions of the Congress of the United States.

When American Zionists, therefore, appealed to their government in the past to assist in the establishment of the State of Israel, or when they turned to it more recently to help the established state economically and politically, they were not working in opposition to any basic American foreign policy, but definitely for the fulfillment of such a policy.

Unfortunately, the practical implementation of this policy suffered (from time to time) at the hands of our State Department most baffling and contradictory fluctuations. Other influences were at work emanating from such "disinterested" sources as the oil interest in the Middle East, the missionary educational circles, Arab quarters, and the British Foreign Office (which frequently succeeded in deflecting American foreign policy on Palestine from its clear and steady course.)

Thus, (for example, in March 1948 after) our government (had) voted in November of the previous year with the overwhelming majority (of the members) of the United Nations for partition and the setting up of independent Jewish and Arab states, ^[Then in Mar 1948] it suddenly reversed itself and produced ^{unutterable} immeasurable chaos in the United Nations. Similarly in September of last year our government gave hasty (and unqualified) endorsement to the Bernadotte Plan which was rejected by the United Nations Assembly. This would have cut away two-thirds of the territory from the State of Israel. In both instances the protest of American Zionists and an aroused public opinion prevented these colossal political blunders which would have done irreparable hurt to the basic American policy on Palestine (and which would have aggravated further the already much bedeviled situation in the Holy Land.)

The new State of Israel will be in need of political defense for a long time to come. There is as yet no stability in Palestine. No peace treaties have been signed. The boundaries of the country have not (yet) been fixed. The status of Jerusalem has not (yet) been determined. The explosive Arab refugee problem has not (yet) been solved, and it is being exploited to the utmost by the enemies of Israel.) American Zionists must, therefore, remain organized to try to make secure what was achieved with so much effort and sacrifice. (The liquidation of organized Zionism at this time would simply play into the hands of those forces in Washington which have always been hostile to it.)

As far as the economic problems of Israel are concerned, their solution has in a sense only just begun. Zionist aims at the in-gathering of all Jews who wish to go to the State of Israel or who must go there. Their numbers will reach into the millions. It will take years to achieve this goal. It will require a consistent, sustained and costly effort on the part of the Jews of the world to make this possible. (There is) no body in American Jewry (that) is better equipped to perform this historic task than the Zionists who so magnificently helped in the completion of the first task - the creation of the State. (A strong organization with a solid core of tried and experienced Zionists augmented by all such who, as friends of Israel, are ready to join in the work, is essential in order to sustain a long-range program of cooperation on the part of American Jews in the economic upbuilding of Israel, and to insure that in the coming years, when the Israeli honeymoon period will be over, the needs of Israel will not be pushed aside.)

What basically will be the relationship of the Jews of the United States to the new State of Israel? Here history may offer some guidance. It should be borne in mind that the majority of the Jews of the world will, in the days to come, continue to live outside of the State of Israel. (Assuming that Israel will, in the course of time, come to contain three or four million Jews, the majority of the Jewish people will nevertheless still reside outside its borders.)

See middle of Pg 7
Readers Digest copy -5-

This was the case also during the Second Commonwealth. There was a considerable dispersion of the Jewish people in the six centuries before the Common Era which extended from the borders of Persia in the East to Spain in the West, and from Ethiopia to the Black Sea. It has been estimated that in the closing centuries of the Second Commonwealth about 2½ million Jews lived in Palestine and about 5½ million lived outside. This dispersion was not always the result of expulsions. Jews emigrated from Palestine (for reasons of trade and commerce, because of economic opportunities elsewhere, and perhaps also) because of crowded conditions in the homeland.

What was the relationship of these Jews who lived outside of Palestine to the Jewish State? They owed no political allegiance to the Jewish State, and the Jewish State exercised no political control over them. The famous Jewish philosopher, Philo, who lived in Egypt during the ^[2000 years ago] first century of the Common Era, writes:

No one country can contain the whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness; on which account they frequent all the most prosperous and fertile countries of Europe and Asia, (whether islands or continents,) looking indeed upon the holy city as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the most high God, but accounting those regions (which have been occupied by their fathers and grandfathers and great grandfathers and still more remote ancestors,) in which they have been born and brought up, as their country.

The country in which they lived was their country. The existence of the Jewish State did not diminish by one iota their loyalty to the countries in which they lived and in which they and their children were born. There was no dual allegiance. Dual allegiance was never a fact in Jewish experience. Jews make good citizens. This is the testament of history. (Jews have ever been mindful of the admonition of the Prophet Jeremiah. "Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray to God for it, for in its peace shall ye have peace.")

The Jews who lived outside of Palestine in those days looked upon Palestine as the non-political spiritual center of world Jewry. It was to them the Holy Land. Palestine was their ancestral home and the center of Jewish religious worship. They made frequent pilgrimages to it. (It was a revered custom among them to contribute annually a half shekel towards the maintenance of its religious institutions. Even after the destruction of the Temple, they continued to recognize the authority of the spiritual leaders of Palestine and to send their self-imposed tax for the support of its schools and its scholars.)

If history is any guide, the Jews of today will, by and large, maintain the same attitude towards the State of Israel as their forefathers did. ^{their} There will be a most sympathetic spiritual relationship towards it. They will help it to absorb as many Jews as will wish to go there or may have to go there. They will support its cultural, scientific and religious institutions as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere will be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews as a people can accomplish on their own. (Pilgrims will go there as of old - and not merely the pious. There will be a free flow of manifold communications, of mutual stimulation, of give and take.)

But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States will be citizens of the United States, and similarly with Jews in other lands. They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries, and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have always done. (Their friendly feelings toward the land of Israel will in no way interfere with their duties and obligations as citizens of their respective countries and with their fullest participation in the social, political and cultural life of these countries.)

It was ^{Voltaire} ~~Thomas Jefferson~~ who said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands - his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally non-political, this may be applied to the Jews of the world and to the State of Israel. In this connection it may be well to recall the words of the late Justice Louis B. Brandeis: "Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties

are objectionable only if they are inconsistent..... Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so."

As far as the future of Judaism is concerned, the re-establishment of the State of Israel represents the fulfillment of only one of its tenets. It does not represent the fulfillment of the eternal spiritual mandates of prophetic Judaism. (Zionism was never a surrogate for Judaism.) Zionism sought to normalize the status of the Jewish people in the world, to give it what other peoples possess and what the Jewish people once possessed - a national center and an internationally recognized status in the family of nations.

But the profound meaning of Jewish history lies not in a re-established state, but in Judaism. The destiny of our people is linked up with the progressive establishment of the Kingdom of God, of the good society on earth, in accordance with the ethical and spiritual teachings of our prophets and seers. The mandates and privileges of a covenanted mission remain valid for the Jews in the future as in the past, and for Jews outside of Israel as well as inside - to battle for the spiritual vision of human life and to join with men of goodwill everywhere, for the removal of all barriers which bar the way of man to his divine patrimony.

The establishment of the State of Israel has contributed a large measure of dignity and confidence to Jewish life, and therefore, has brightened the prospects for a spiritual renaissance among our people. That which has been tragically abnormal in Jewish experience through the long, weary centuries - national homelessness - has now been providentially normalized. Upon surer foundations the world Jewish community of tomorrow, inside and outside of Israel, will be able to build a more affirmative religious life and re-capture perhaps that revolutionary religious leadership which twice in the past molded the civilization of mankind.

The Case for Zionism

By

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver



The establishment of the State of Israel last year has raised, quite properly, the question of the future of the Zionist Movement. Some have urged its prompt liquidation now that its objectives have been achieved. Anti-Zionists who have been confounded and frustrated by the triumph of Zionism have been clamorous in demanding the immediate dissolution of the Zionist Movement.

But most anti-Zionists have reconciled themselves to the new situation. They have gracefully withdrawn from a controversy which life has finally resolved. Some of them, out of a sense of fair play and pride in Jewish achievement, have been helping in the political defense and the economic support of the new State.

Unfortunately, some irreconcilables among the anti-Zionists insist upon keeping their propaganda motor racing although their car is definitely and permanently stalled. They are shrewd enough to avoid a frontal attack upon the newly established State, but they continue their attacks upon American Zionists who helped to bring it about. They repeat the well-known innuendoes of dual allegiance. They charge Zionists with constituting an unholy pressure group in American public life in behalf of a foreign state, and with fostering a spirit of Jewish nationalism among the Jews of the world. They would like to see the Jewish State isolated as far as possible from the rest of world Jewry, and an iron curtain erected between it and the great Jewish community of the United States.

The fears and wild imaginings of these perennially shell-shocked Jews and their few non-Jewish sympathizers will influence the attitude of American Jews as little in the future as in the past.

But Zionists themselves have been studying the possible implications of their epochal achievement. The Zionist Organization of America appointed, soon after the establishment of the State of Israel, a commission to study the future program of the Zionist Movement. A report of this commission was recently made public. Zionism's

continuing aims, according to the report, are to safeguard the integrity and independence of the State of Israel, to promote the speedy migration to Israel of Jews desirous of settling there, to assist in the organization of all Jewry for these purposes, and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity.

These conclusions are based on the realization that the political objectives of the Zionist Movement have not yet been made secure and that the economic objectives are actually only in the early stages of attainment. One can readily understand that the Jews of the United States, for example, who did so much to establish the State of Israel and who have for many years been so deeply concerned in the plight of their homeless refugees for whom the world offered no sanctuary, would wish to continue their assistance to fellow-Jews who are now coming to the blessed refuge of Israel in the tens of thousands monthly. One can readily understand also that they would resolve to remain on the alert in order to protect as far as they can that little country which is still beset with so many political dangers. No fair-minded man will impugn to these American Jews, who have demonstrated time and again in war and in peace their unfailing loyalty to their beloved country, any sinister or unpatriotic motives when they appeal to their government for helpful cooperation in these tasks.

Our foreign policies are clearly not made in a vacuum. They must be responsive to public opinion. Americans who seek to influence the foreign policies of their government are not, because of it, to be condemned. The test is whether they are motivated by patriotism and humanity, or by selfish interests detrimental to their country.

American Zionists have always believed that the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine was in complete consonance with the highest American interests in the Middle East. They believed that such a state would become a friendly outpost for legitimate American interests and for American ideals of democracy and freedom in that

vast undeveloped and socially backward part of the world. Fundamentally, this conviction, coupled with the conviction that Zionism was morally justified, was behind the endorsement which has been given to the Zionist Movement by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson and twice by resolutions of the Congress of the United States.

When American Zionists, therefore, appealed to the Government in the past to assist in the establishment of the State of Israel, or when they turned to it more recently to help the established state economically and politically, they were not working in opposition to any basic American foreign policy, but definitely for the fulfillment of such a policy.

Unfortunately, the practical implementation of this policy suffered most baffling and contradictory fluctuations at the hands of our State Department. Other influences were at work emanating from such "disinterested" sources as the oil interests in the Middle East, the missionary educational circles, Arab quarters and the British Foreign Office, which frequently succeeded in deflecting American foreign policy on Palestine from its clear and steady course.

Thus, our Government voted in November 1947 with the overwhelming majority of the United Nations for partition and the setting up of independent Jewish and Arab states; then in March 1948 it suddenly reversed itself and produced unutterable chaos in the U.N. Similarly in September of last year our Government gave hasty endorsement to the Bernadotte Plan, which was rejected by the U.N. Assembly. This would have cut away two-thirds of the territory from the State of Israel. In both instances the protest of American Zionists and an aroused public opinion prevented these colossal political blunders which would have done irreparable hurt to the basic American policy on Palestine.

The new State of Israel will be in need of political defense for a long time to come. There is as yet no stability in Palestine. No peace treaties have been signed. The boundaries of the country have not been fixed. The status of Jerusalem has not

been determined. The explosive Arab refugee problem has not been solved. American Zionists must, therefore, remain organized to try to make secure what was achieved with so much effort and sacrifice.

As far as the economic problems of Israel are concerned, their solution has in a sense only just begun. Zionism aims at the in-gathering of all Jews who wish to go to the State of Israel or who must go there. Their numbers will reach into the millions. It will take years to achieve this goal. It will require a sustained and costly effort on the part of the Jews of the world to make this possible. No group in American Jewry is better equipped to perform this historic task than the Zionists who so magnificently helped in the completion of the first task - the creation of the State. ~~A strong organization with a solid core of tried and experienced Zionists augmented by all such who, as friends of Israel, are ready to join in the work, is essential in order to sustain a long-range program.~~

What basically will be the relationship of the Jews of the United States to the new State of Israel? Here history may offer some guidance. It should be borne in mind that the majority of the Jews of the world will, in the days to come, continue to live outside of the State of Israel.

This was the case also during the six centuries ^{beginning some 2700 years ago.} ~~before the Common Era during which period a Jewish State existed in Palestine.~~ Jews were dispersed over the whole area from the borders of Persia in the East to Spain in the West and from Ethiopia to the Black Sea. It has been estimated that during the latter part of that era about two and a half million Jews lived in Palestine and about five and a half million lived outside. This dispersion was not always the result of expulsions. Jews emigrated from Palestine ~~for economic reasons~~ and because of crowded conditions in the homeland.

What was the relationship of these Jews who lived outside of Palestine to the Jewish State? They ~~never~~ owed no political allegiance to the Jewish State and the Jewish State exercised no political control over them. The famous Jewish philosopher, Philo, who lived in Egypt 2000 years ago, writes:

No one country can contain the whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness; on which account they frequent all the countries of Europe and Asia, looking indeed upon the holy city as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the most high God, but accounting those regions in which they have been born and brought up as their country.

The country in which they lived was their country. The existence of the Jewish State did not diminish by one iota their loyalty to the countries in which they lived and in which they and their children were born. There was no dual allegiance. Dual allegiance was never a fact in Jewish experience. Jews make good citizens. This is the testament of history.

The Jews who lived outside of Palestine in those days looked upon Palestine as the non-political spiritual center of world Jewry. It was to them the Holy Land. Palestine was their ancestral home and the center of Jewish religious worship. They made frequent pilgrimages to it. ~~It was a revered custom among them to contribute annually a half shekel towards the maintenance of their religious institutions, and this continued even after the destruction of the Temple.~~

If history is any guide, the Jews of today will, by and large, maintain the same attitude toward the State of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic spiritual relationship toward it. They will help it to absorb as many Jews as wish to go there or may have to go there. They will support its cultural, scientific and religious institutions as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere will be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews as a people can accomplish on their own.

But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States and similarly with Jews in other lands. They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have always done.

It was Voltaire who said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands -- his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally non-political, this may be applied to the Jews of the world and to the State of Israel. In this connection it may be well to recall the words of the late Justice Louis B. Brandeis: "Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so."

As far as the future of Judaism is concerned, the re-establishment of the State of Israel represents the fulfillment of only one of its tenets. It does not represent the fulfillment of the eternal spiritual mandates of prophetic Judaism. Zionism sought to normalize the status of the Jewish people in the world, to give it what other peoples possess and what the Jewish people once possessed -- a national center and an internationally recognized status in the family of nations.

But the profound meaning of Jewish history lies not in a re-established State, but in Judaism. The destiny of our people is linked with the progressive establishment of the Kingdom of God, of the good society on earth, in accordance with the ethical and spiritual teachings of our prophets and seers. The mandates and privileges of a covenanted mission remain valid for the Jews in the future as in the past, and for Jews outside of Israel as well as inside; to battle for the spiritual vision of human life and to join with men of good will everywhere for the removal of all barriers which bar the way of man to his divine patrimony.

The establishment of the State of Israel has contributed a large measure of dignity and confidence to Jewish life, and therefore has brightened the prospects for a spiritual renaissance among our people. That which has been tragically abnormal in Jewish experience through the long, weary centuries -- national homelessness -- has now been providentially normalized. Upon surer foundations the world Jewish community of

tomorrow, inside and outside of Israel, will be able to build a more affirmative religious life and recapture perhaps that revolutionary religious leadership which twice in the past molded the civilization of mankind.



the globe is one world, and that therefore Federal Government should be a world government. It is true that the Atlantic world is one world. Western Europe and the United States are as parent and child. We are bound by ties of blood, religion, political institutions. Even much of our language is common. But there is a vast gulf between west and east, even apart from current differences.

Let us mark one inescapable truth. Free peoples can never, never, permanently unite their armed forces with the armed forces of unfree peoples, because there would always be the danger that the free peoples would be outvoted in such a government and the very international armed forces which they had created to defend them would be turned against them by some world dictator. The free peoples can make agreements with the nonfree nations, yes, for the joint use of armed forces against an aggressor, for all nonfree peoples do not stand for aggression. But they can form a permanent union only with nations which have established democratic control.

The eminent British historian, Lord Acton, said:

"The pursuit of a remote and ideal object which captivates the imagination by its splendor and the reason by its simplicity, evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just."

World government is remote and ideal—it captivates the imagination by its claim to end all wars and remove the threat of the atom bomb. It captivates the reason by its simplicity—one law to be enforced all over the one world. But it is not rational or possible at this time.

On the other hand Atlantic union is not remote—it is the immediate step which can be taken. It is not ideal; it faces the fact that we do not actually have one world, but at least two worlds and probably more. But it is a rational, possible end. It is the next step toward the ideal. It is confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just.

In traveling our road to Atlantic union we shall have to resolve many antagonistic claims—the claims of rival nations and rival ideologies within the free world.

It is pleasant to escape into the dream world of planning a world government now, an attempt to mix the water of freedom with the oil of tyranny, but it is only a diversion from the real task at hand, which is to organize freedom. When freedom is organized it will be safe and powerful, and in a position to work effectively with such of the unfree as will join in a compact against aggression.

We can have a true world government only after the free nations, by federation, have given freedom such prestige—prestige such as it had in the nineteenth century—that freedom and democracy can again resume their march around the globe, and one nation after another, as each qualifies by firmly establishing the practice of democracy, can obtain admittance to the great union. In the meantime we shall have to depend on the United Nations as the only world-wide organization, for whatever it will be able to do. It will be able to do more when there is functioning within it a great union of the free.

As realists, we must recognize that there is not only a division between the free world and the Communist world, but that the free world itself is divided by conflicting beliefs—if socialism, in the welfare state of varying degrees, and in individualism and private initiative.

How can we resolve those conflicting views? Here I cannot speak as a member of the Atlantic Union Committee but express only my own views. There are various economic forms—self-employment, the partnership, the cooperative, the corporation, government

ownership. Let these various forms exist side by side, in competition with each other. Let us make no final decision as to how much of one of these we shall have. If a government operation is not satisfactory, let us not hesitate to sell it to a private operator.

If we think that a private operation would serve the public better under public ownership, do not hesitate to buy it, paying a fair price without confiscation. Meanwhile let us increase the amount of individual private property. Let us have more property owners. Let us have more profit-sharing, more ownership of corporation stocks by workers. Let's make the workers owners, even as the owners become workers. Let's encourage more people to build their own security by an increase of private savings, made secure by laws that enforce common honesty. Thus we would remove some of these economic conflicts from the field of ideology and handle them on the basis of practical experience.

The individual asks what can I do to advance Atlantic Union? Every individual can help promote unity within the free world by helping, in his own life, to resolve some of the economic conflicts that now divide us. He can promote the program by speaking, or by correspondence, as John W. Apperson has done so effectively. Hardly a week passes that some influential person in Washington or New York or London does not get a letter from John, intelligently stirring his interest in Atlantic Union. Or one can do what Mrs. Fred Howard did, spend part of her vacation time promoting Atlantic Union in the place where she was staying.

To every individual there will occur something he can do.

The Case for Zionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "The Case for Zionism," written by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, and published in the September 1949 issue of the Readers' Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

II. THE CASE FOR ZIONISM

(By Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver)

(Dr. Abba Hillel Silver has served since 1917 as rabbi of the Temple in Cleveland, Ohio. For many years a leading Zionist spokesman, he represented the Jewish Agency for Palestine during the United Nations' deliberations over partition of the Holy Land. He was chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council and president of the Zionist Organization of America.)

The establishment of the state of Israel last year has raised, quite properly, the question of the future of the Zionist movement. Some have urged its prompt liquidation now that its objectives have been achieved. Anti-Zionists who have been confounded and frustrated by the triumph of Zionism have been clamorous in demanding the immediate dissolution of the Zionist movement.

But most anti-Zionists have reconciled themselves to the new situation. They have gracefully withdrawn from a controversy which life has finally resolved. Some of

them, out of a sense of fair play and pride in Jewish achievement, have been helping in the political defense and the economic support of the new state.

Unfortunately, some irreconcilables among the anti-Zionists insist upon keeping their propaganda motor racing although their car is definitely and permanently stalled. They are shrewd enough to avoid a frontal attack upon the newly established state, but they continue their attacks upon American Zionists who helped to bring it about. They repeat the well-known innuendoes of dual allegiance. They charge Zionists with constituting an unholy pressure group in American public life in behalf of a foreign state, and with fostering a spirit of Jewish nationalism among the Jews of the world. They would like to see the Jewish state isolated as far as possible from the rest of world Jewry, and an iron curtain erected between it and the great Jewish community of the United States.

The fears and wild imaginings of these perennially shellshocked Jews and their few non-Jewish sympathizers will influence the attitude of American Jews as little in the future as in the past.

But Zionists themselves have been studying the possible implications of their epochal achievement. The Zionist Organization of America appointed, soon after the establishment of the State of Israel, a commission to study the future program of the Zionist movement. A report of this commission was recently made public. Zionism's continuing aims, according to the report, are to safeguard the integrity and independence of the State of Israel, to promote the speedy migration to Israel of Jews desirous of settling there, to assist in the organization of all Jewry for these purposes, and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity.

These conclusions are based on the realization that the political objectives of the Zionist movement have not yet been made secure and that the economic objectives are actually only in the early stages of attainment. One can readily understand that the Jews of the United States, for example, who did so much to establish the State of Israel and who have for many years been so deeply concerned in the plight of their homeless refugees for whom the world offered no sanctuary, would wish to continue their assistance to fellow Jews who are now coming to the blessed refuge of Israel in the tens of thousands monthly. One can readily understand also that they would resolve to remain on the alert in order to protect as far as they can that little country which is still beset with so many political dangers. No fair-minded man will impute to these American Jews, who have demonstrated time and again in war and in peace their unfailing loyalty to their beloved country, any sinister or unpatriotic motives when they appeal to their Government for helpful cooperation in these tasks.

Our foreign policies are clearly not made in a vacuum. They must be responsive to public opinion. Americans who seek to influence the foreign policies of their Government are not, because of it, to be condemned. The test is whether they are motivated by patriotism and humanity or by selfish interests detrimental to their country.

American Zionists have always believed that the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine was in complete consonance with the highest American interests in the Middle East. They believed that such a state would become a friendly outpost for legitimate American interests and for American ideals of democracy and freedom in that vast undeveloped and socially backward part of the world. Fundamentally, this conviction, coupled with the conviction that Zionism was morally justified, was behind the endorsement which has been

given to the Zionist movement by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson and twice by resolutions of the Congress of the United States.

When American Zionists, therefore, appealed to the Government in the past to assist in the establishment of the state of Israel, or when they turned to it more recently to help the established state economically and politically, they were not working in opposition to any basic American foreign policy, but definitely for the fulfillment of such a policy.

Unfortunately, the practical implementation of this policy suffered most baffling and contradictory fluctuations at the hands of our State Department. Other influences were at work emanating from such "disinterested" sources as the oil interests in the Middle East, the missionary educational circles, Arab quarters and the British Foreign Office, which frequently succeeded in deflecting American foreign policy on Palestine from its clear and steady course.

Thus, our Government voted in November 1947 with the overwhelming majority of the United Nations for partition and the setting up of independent Jewish and Arab states; then in March 1948 it suddenly reversed itself and produced unutterable chaos in the United Nations. Similarly in September of last year our Government gave hasty endorsement to the Bernadotte plan, which was rejected by the United Nations Assembly. This would have cut away two-thirds of the territory from the state of Israel. In both instances the protest of American Zionists and an aroused public opinion prevented these colossal political blunders which would have done irreparable hurt to the basic American policy on Palestine.

The new state of Israel will be in need of political defense for a long time to come. There is as yet no stability in Palestine. No peace treaties have been signed. The boundaries of the country have not been fixed. The status of Jerusalem has not been determined. The explosive Arab refugee problem has not been solved. American Zionists must, therefore, remain organized to try to make secure what was achieved with so much effort and sacrifice.

As far as the economic problems of Israel are concerned, their solution has in a sense only just begun. Zionism aims at the ingathering of all Jews who wish to go to the state of Israel or who must go there. Their numbers will reach into the millions. It will take years to achieve this goal. It will require a sustained and costly effort on the part of the Jews of the world to make this possible. No group in American Jewry is better equipped to perform this historic task than the Zionists, who so magnificently helped in the completion of the first task—the creation of the state. A strong organization with a solid core of tried and experienced Zionists, augmented by all who, as friends of Israel, are ready to join in the work, is essential in order to sustain a long-range program.

What basically will be the relationship of the Jews of the United States to the new state of Israel? Here history may offer some guidance. It should be borne in mind that the majority of the Jews of the world will, in the days to come, continue to live outside of the state of Israel.

This was the case also during the six centuries before the Common Era, during which period a Jewish State existed in Palestine. Jews were dispersed over the whole area from the borders of Persia in the east to Spain in the west and from Ethiopia to the Black Sea. It has been estimated that during the latter part of that era about 2,500,000 Jews lived in Palestine and about 5,500,000 lived outside. This dispersion was not always the result of expulsions. Jews emigrated from Palestine for economic reasons and because of crowded conditions in the homeland.

What was the relationship of these Jews who lived outside of Palestine to the Jewish State? They owed no political allegiance to the Jewish State and the Jewish State exercised no political control over them. The famous Jewish philosopher, Philo, who lived in Egypt 2,000 years ago, wrote:

"No one country can contain the whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness; on which account they frequent all the countries of Europe and Asia, looking indeed upon the Holy City as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the most high God, but accounting those regions in which they have been born and brought up as their country.

The country in which they lived was their country. The existence of the Jewish State did not diminish by one iota their loyalty to the countries in which they lived and in which they and their children were born. There was no dual allegiance. Dual allegiance was never a fact in Jewish experience. Jews make good citizens. This is the testament of history.

The Jews who lived outside of Palestine in those days looked upon Palestine as the nonpolitical spiritual center of world Jewry. It was to them the Holy Land. Palestine was their ancestral home and the center of Jewish religious worship. They made frequent pilgrimages to it.

If history is any guide, the Jews of today will, by and large, maintain the same attitude toward the state of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic spiritual relationship toward it. They will help it to absorb as many Jews as wish to go there or may have to go there. They will support its cultural, scientific, and religious institutions as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere will be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews as a people can accomplish on their own.

But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States will be citizens of the United States, and similarly with Jews in other lands. They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries, and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have always done.

It was Voltaire who said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands—his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally nonpolitical, this may be applied to the Jews of the world and to the state of Israel. In this connection it may be well to recall the words of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so."

As far as the future of Judaism is concerned, the reestablishment of the state of Israel represents the fulfillment of only one of its tenets. It does not represent the fulfillment of the eternal spiritual mandates of prophetic Judaism. Zionism sought to normalize the status of the Jewish people in the world, to give it what other peoples possess and what the Jewish people once possessed—a national center and an internationally recognized status in the family of nations.

But the profound meaning of Jewish history lies not in a reestablished state but in Judaism. The destiny of our people is linked with the progressive establishment of the Kingdom of God, of the good society on earth, in accordance with the ethical and spiritual teachings of our prophets and seers. The mandates and privileges of a covenanted

mission remain valid for the Jews in the future as in the past, and for Jews outside of Israel as well as inside: To battle for the spiritual vision of human life and to join with men of good will everywhere for the removal of all barriers which bar the way of man to his divine patrimony.

The establishment of the state of Israel has contributed a large measure of dignity and confidence to Jewish life, and therefore has brightened the prospects for a spiritual renaissance among our people. That which has been tragically abnormal in Jewish experience through the long, weary centuries—national homelessness—has now been provisionally normalized. Upon surer foundations the world Jewish community of tomorrow, inside and outside of Israel, will be able to build a more affirmative religious life and recapture perhaps that revolutionary religious leadership which twice in the past molded the civilization of mankind.

Is Bankruptcy Our Goal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31 (legislative day of
Thursday, June 2), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article I have written entitled "Is Bankruptcy Our Goal?" which appears in the September issue of the Country Gentleman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS BANKRUPTCY OUR GOAL?

IF YOU BORROWED AND BORROWED UNTIL THAT \$5,000 MORTGAGE AGAINST YOUR FARM GREW TO \$65,000, YOU HAVE MARCHED THE SAME FINANCIAL ROAD AS UNCLE SAM

(By HARRY FLOOD BYRD, United States Senator from Virginia)

The average man on the farm or in the city has a family, and he has his nose to the grindstone. In trying to maintain and improve the circumstances of his family, he usually has debts. Often he contracts debts as a means of getting ahead—borrowing, then paying off. Many a farmer has started like that, as I did myself. In this way much of a man's sweat goes to the payment of debt, or payment of interest until he can pay the debt. Therefore I want to talk about the mortgages on American farms.

I see two kinds of mortgages on a farm. One the farmer signed in the bank, and he may, if he is able and lucky, pay it off. The other he will always pay interest against. It is national debt, a mortgage that has climbed like a jet plane, and in 1949 it amounts to \$1,740 for each American man, woman, and child. Thus, if your family numbers five, you have a mortgage of \$8,700 in addition to any other mortgage which you personally signed and blotted.

What about the payments you make on this United States mortgage? They are hidden somewhat, but the payments come out of your pocket just as surely as you have to pay for a gallon of paint. You are paying interest on that mortgage not only when you pay your income tax but also when you buy a gallon of gasoline, a package of cigarettes, a month's rent or a sandwich, a piece of machinery, a piece of clothing—there is, I suppose, nothing we buy for which part of

Reader's Digest

SEPTEMBER 1949

ARTICLES OF LASTING INTEREST • 28th YEAR OF PUBLICATION

The Fantastic Story of the Tucker Car	Collier's	1
General Eisenhower's Favorite War Story	Ernie Pyle	7
First Things Come First		
<i>Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes</i>		10
Tower of Hope	Time	13
His Father	John Steinbeck	19
Why They Confess	Life	22
Enjoy Yourself — It Is Later Than You Think	Billy Rose	27
The Coal Queen	Atlantic Monthly	29
What Religious Experience Can Mean to You	Guideposts	35
I Climbed Gum Sun — the Gold Mountain		
<i>American Magazine</i>		38
Aviation's Incredible Dingus	Saturday Evening Post	43
Little Miffed Moppets		47
Israel's Flag Is Not Mine	Alfred M. Lilienthal	49
The Case for Zionism	Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver	54
Beware of Broken Fluorescent Lights	Laird S. Goldsborough	59
Life in These United States		62
The Treasure of Great Bear Lake	American Mercury	65
What's in the Freezer?	Harper's Magazine	69
Prison Without a Wall	Rocky Mountain Empire Magazine	73
Should Your Wife Be Fired?	American Magazine	78
How to Lick Class Struggle	Walter W. Cenerazzo	81
"Everybody Needs Beauty"	Donald Culross Peattie	86
Love That Teacher	McCall's	93
The Most Unforgettable Character I've Met		
<i>Bruce Hutchison</i>		97
Putting Human Nature to Work	Rotarian	103
Electronic Fish-Finder	Science News Letter	105
Farm Help from Abroad	Country Gentleman	111
What's the Score in Kansas City?		
<i>National Municipal Review</i>		114
The Store with No Front	Esquire	121
Conversation with a Queen	Max Eastman	124

Book Section { Nineteen Eighty-Four George Orwell 129

Spiced Tongue, 42 — Advertising *cum laude*, 72 — Laughter, the Best Medicine, 91 — It Pays to Increase Your Word Power, 109 — Quotable Quotes, 118 — Man's Best Friend, 119

tism in the world. We are witness to the opposite."

All too many Christians have supported Zionism because they felt that Jews, having been persecuted, should now have what they want — whether it is good or bad for them. Christian leaders can help us greatly. But Christian sympathy for Jews

should be measured not in terms of support for Jewish nationalism in distant Israel but in accepting us as friends, neighbors and first-class citizens of this our country. That is true liberal Christianity. And also, Mother, good Judaism, that fine old faith which you taught me as a little child.

II — THE CASE FOR ZIONISM

By Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver

THE ESTABLISHMENT of the State of Israel last year has raised, quite properly, the question of the future of the Zionist Movement. Some have urged its prompt liquidation now that its objectives have been achieved. Anti-Zionists who have been confounded and frustrated by the triumph of Zionism have been clamorous in demanding the immediate dissolution of the Zionist Movement.

But most anti-Zionists have reconciled themselves to the new situation. They have gracefully withdrawn from a controversy which life has finally resolved. Some of them, out of a sense of fair play and pride in Jewish achievement, have been helping in the political defense and the economic support of the new state.

Unfortunately, some irreconcilables among the anti-Zionists insist upon keeping their propaganda motor racing although their car is definitely and permanently stalled.

DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER has served since 1917 as rabbi of The Temple in Cleveland, Ohio. For many years a leading Zionist spokesman, he represented the Jewish Agency for Palestine during the United Nations' deliberations over partition of the Holy Land. He was chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council and president of the Zionist Organization of America.

They are shrewd enough to avoid a frontal attack upon the newly established state, but they continue their attacks upon American Zionists who helped to bring it about. They repeat the well-known innuendoes of dual allegiance. They charge Zionists with constituting an unholy pressure group in American public life in behalf of a foreign state, and with fostering a spirit of Jewish nationalism among the Jews of the world. They would like to see the Jewish State isolated as far as possible from the rest of world Jewry, and an iron curtain erected between it

and the great Jewish community of the United States.

The fears and wild imaginings of these perennially shellshocked Jews and their few non-Jewish sympathizers will influence the attitude of American Jews as little in the future as in the past.

But Zionists themselves have been studying the possible implications of their epochal achievement. The Zionist Organization of America appointed, soon after the establishment of the State of Israel, a commission to study the future program of the Zionist Movement. A report of this commission was recently made public. Zionism's continuing aims, according to the report, are to safeguard the integrity and independence of the State of Israel, to promote the speedy migration to Israel of Jews desirous of settling there, to assist in the organization of all Jewry for these purposes, and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity.

These conclusions are based on the realization that the political objectives of the Zionist Movement have not yet been made secure and that the economic objectives are actually only in the early stages of attainment. One can readily understand that the Jews of the United States, for example, who did so much to establish the State of Israel and who have for many years been so deeply concerned in the plight of their homeless refugees for whom the world offered no sanctuary,

would wish to continue their assistance to fellow Jews who are now coming to the blessed refuge of Israel in the tens of thousands monthly. One can readily understand also that they would resolve to remain on the alert in order to protect as far as they can that little country which is still beset with so many political dangers. No fair-minded man will impute to these American Jews, who have demonstrated time and again in war and in peace their unfailing loyalty to their beloved country, any sinister or unpatriotic motives when they appeal to their Government for helpful coöperation in these tasks.

Our foreign policies are clearly not made in a vacuum. They must be responsive to public opinion. Americans who seek to influence the foreign policies of their Government are not, because of it, to be condemned. The test is whether they are motivated by patriotism and humanity or by selfish interests detrimental to their country.

American Zionists have always believed that the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine was in complete consonance with the highest American interests in the Middle East. They believed that such a state would become a friendly outpost for legitimate American interests and for American ideals of democracy and freedom in that vast undeveloped and socially backward part of the world. Fundamentally, this conviction, coupled with the conviction that Zionism was morally

justified, was behind the endorsement which has been given to the Zionist Movement by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson and twice by resolutions of the Congress of the United States.

When American Zionists, therefore, appealed to the Government in the past to assist in the establishment of the State of Israel, or when they turned to it more recently to help the established state economically and politically, they were not working in opposition to any basic American foreign policy, but definitely for the fulfillment of such a policy.

Unfortunately, the practical implementation of this policy suffered most baffling and contradictory fluctuations at the hands of our State Department. Other influences were at work emanating from such "disinterested" sources as the oil interests in the Middle East, the missionary educational circles, Arab quarters and the British Foreign Office, which frequently succeeded in deflecting American foreign policy on Palestine from its clear and steady course.

Thus, our Government voted in November 1947 with the overwhelming majority of the United Nations for partition and the setting up of independent Jewish and Arab states; then in March 1948 it suddenly reversed itself and produced unutterable chaos in the U. N. Similarly in September of last year our Government gave hasty endorse-

ment to the Bernadotte Plan, which was rejected by the U. N. Assembly. This would have cut away two thirds of the territory from the State of Israel. In both instances the protest of American Zionists and an aroused public opinion prevented these colossal political blunders which would have done irreparable hurt to the basic American policy on Palestine.

The new State of Israel will be in need of political defense for a long time to come. There is as yet no stability in Palestine. No peace treaties have been signed. The boundaries of the country have not been fixed. The status of Jerusalem has not been determined. The explosive Arab refugee problem has not been solved. American Zionists must, therefore, remain organized to try to make secure what was achieved with so much effort and sacrifice.

As far as the economic problems of Israel are concerned, their solution has in a sense only just begun. Zionism aims at the ingathering of all Jews who wish to go to the State of Israel or who must go there. Their numbers will reach into the millions. It will take years to achieve this goal. It will require a sustained and costly effort on the part of the Jews of the world to make this possible. No group in American Jewry is better equipped to perform this historic task than the Zionists, who so magnificently helped in the completion of the first task — the creation of the State. A strong or-

ganization with a solid core of tried and experienced Zionists, augmented by all who, as friends of Israel, are ready to join in the work, is essential in order to sustain a long-range program.

What basically will be the relationship of the Jews of the United States to the new State of Israel? Here history may offer some guidance. It should be borne in mind that the majority of the Jews of the world will, in the days to come, continue to live outside of the State of Israel.

This was the case also during the six centuries before the Common Era, during which period a Jewish State existed in Palestine. Jews were dispersed over the whole area from the borders of Persia in the east to Spain in the west and from Ethiopia to the Black Sea. It has been estimated that during the latter part of that era about two and a half million Jews lived in Palestine and about five and a half million lived outside. This dispersion was not always the result of expulsions. Jews emigrated from Palestine for economic reasons and because of crowded conditions in the homeland.

What was the relationship of these Jews who lived outside of Palestine to the Jewish State? They owed no political allegiance to the Jewish State and the Jewish State exercised no political control over them. The famous Jewish philosopher, Philo, who lived in Egypt 2000 years ago, wrote:

No one country can contain the

whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness; on which account they frequent all the countries of Europe and Asia, looking indeed upon the Holy City as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the most high God, but accounting those regions in which they have been born and brought up as *their country*.

The country in which they lived was *their country*. The existence of the Jewish State did not diminish by one iota their loyalty to the countries in which they lived and in which they and their children were born. There was no dual allegiance. Dual allegiance was never a fact in Jewish experience. Jews make good citizens. This is the testament of history.

The Jews who lived outside of Palestine in those days looked upon Palestine as the nonpolitical spiritual center of world Jewry. It was to them the Holy Land. Palestine was their ancestral home and the center of Jewish religious worship. They made frequent pilgrimages to it.

If history is any guide, the Jews of today will, by and large, maintain the same attitude toward the State of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic spiritual relationship toward it. They will help it to absorb as many Jews as wish to go there or may have to go there. They will support its cultural, scientific and religious institutions as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere will be

proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews as a people can accomplish on their own.

But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States will be citizens of the United States, and similarly with Jews in other lands. They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have always done.

It was Voltaire who said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands — his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally nonpolitical, this may be applied to the Jews of the world and to the State of Israel. In this connection it may be well to recall the words of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so."

As far as the future of Judaism is concerned, the re-establishment of the State of Israel represents the fulfillment of only one of its tenets. It does not represent the fulfillment of the eternal spiritual mandates of prophetic Judaism. Zionism sought to normalize the status of the Jewish people in the world, to give it what

other peoples possess and what the Jewish people once possessed — a national center and an internationally recognized status in the family of nations.

But the profound meaning of Jewish history lies not in a re-established State but in Judaism. The destiny of our people is linked with the progressive establishment of the Kingdom of God, of the good society on earth, in accordance with the ethical and spiritual teachings of our prophets and seers. The mandates and privileges of a covenanted mission remain valid for the Jews in the future as in the past, and for Jews outside of Israel as well as inside: to battle for the spiritual vision of human life and to join with men of good will everywhere for the removal of all barriers which bar the way of man to his divine patrimony.

The establishment of the State of Israel has contributed a large measure of dignity and confidence to Jewish life, and therefore has brightened the prospects for a spiritual renaissance among our people. That which has been tragically abnormal in Jewish experience through the long, weary centuries — national homelessness — has now been providentially normalized. Upon surer foundations the world Jewish community of tomorrow, inside and outside of Israel, will be able to build a more affirmative religious life and recapture perhaps that revolutionary religious leadership which twice in the past molded the civilization of mankind.