



The Abba Hillel Silver Digital Collection

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 7: Personal Miscellaneous, 1908-1989, undated.

Sub-series A: Biographical, 1908-1981.

Reel
211

Box
79

Folder
1

Autobiography/memoirs, Book 1, 1963?.

On Sunday, January 24, 1943, my Temple celebrated my twenty-fifth year as its Rabbi. The guest-speaker on that occasion was Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the World Zionist Organization. In the course of his address, he said:

"I do believe that Rabbi Silver is destined to perform things which will transcend the framework of even a great community like yours, and very often, I confess it to you, I had it in mind to exercise the authority and power which was given to me by my constituents in drafting away Rabbi Silver, at least for a short time, and loading upon him the great and difficult tasks of service to the national ideal at this very critical time."

It was not long before the draft came and I responded to that summons. The next ten years proved to be the most exciting and rewarding years of my life.

My Zionist career, as it were, began many years before -- in 1904, to be exact. I was then a lad of eleven. At the suggestion of my father, I organized, together with my brother Maxwell, the first junior Zionist Club in the United States. We named it the "Dr. Herzl Zion Club", after the illustrious founder of political Zionism who died that year.

When Dr. Herzl died, my father, who loved Zion with a passionate love, said to us with tears in his eyes, "A prince and a leader has this day fallen in Israel". A few days later he took us to a great memorial service which was held in one of the large synagogues on the Lower East Side of New York, where men and women wept bitterly as if for a lost son. They wept for an uncrowned king, who, in a few brief years, had kindled the hopes of a homeless people and, by the magic of his personality, had stirred their Messianic dreams of

national restoration, and died a poor, broken and tired man at the age of forty-four.

The Club conducted its meetings, which were at first held in the narrow quarters of our home, in Hebrew. Father supervised our programs and corrected our Hebrew. My beloved mother, proud and happy with what we were doing, looked after us lovingly and, from time to time, added her culinary art to our intellectual repasts. ~~Mother was a rare and valiant spirit, alert, energetic, competent. She shared with father all the tasks and responsibilities of maintaining a home and raising a family -- and these were at times not easy. Her children remember, in boundless gratitude, her loving care, her stout heart and her deep piety.~~

Our programs consisted of discussions in Jewish history and literature, debates, recitations, and lectures by adults who were invited to address us. We arranged for open meetings to which the public was invited. Before long we edited and published a little magazine of our own in Hebrew.

The most attractive feature of our program were the annual productions of a Hebrew play which we presented in one of the large theatres on the East Side which we rented. Abraham Goldfaden, the father of the Yiddish theatre, interested himself in our club and wrote his first and only Hebrew play, "David in War" for us. He also composed the music and personally trained us in the acting.

Members of the club visited the numerous societies and "Landsmannschaften" with which the East Side abounded in those days, addressed their meetings and sold tickets. We filled the People's Theatre on the Bowery to capacity and the play was a success. It was the first Hebrew production anywhere in the United States and it created quite a stir.

Other productions were to follow. A colleague of mine recently sent me a review of the play, "Moses", which the club produced in 1909. The review appeared in the magazine "Theatre". In a pleasant and light vein it praised the young amateurs for their acting and notably my performance of "Moses" which, it said, would have done credit to a professional actor.

In reply, I wrote: "As you see, it has been a Long Day's Journey into the Limelight... I acted the part of "Moses" in 1909. Fifty years later I wrote a book about "Moses and the Original Torah". But I am afraid that in spite of ^{the} ~~my~~ histrionic ^{of 1877 cost} talents and my scholarly ^{in 1877 cost} research, "Moses" still dwells in the thick darkness which he entered on his way up ^{to} Sinai..."

The Dr. Herzl ² Zion Club was responsible for the founding of the Zionist Youth Movement in the United States which soon developed under the name of "Young Judea". An impressive number of active Zionist and communal workers and leaders, educators and Rabbis, received their early training in ~~this~~ ^{our} club.

The seven years between 1904 and 1911, the year when I left for Cincinnati to enter the Hebrew Union College, to study for the Rabbinate, were quickening and developing years for me. The vital ^{and} culturally ^{stimulating} ~~rich~~ environment of the East Side of those years, alive and turbulent with ideological controversy, bubbling over with the ferment of old world ideas in ^{their} new world bottles, the opportunities for manifold expression which the club afforded, were all that a young man could ask for in the formative years of his life. The mind and spirit were ~~stimulated~~ ^{guided}. ^{There} The bread was not always abundant, ~~in our home,~~ but the fullness of life was there, comradeship and challenge and beckoning horizons. We enjoyed a rare freedom of movement and scope within ^{traditions of Judaism} a discipline which was accepted by us as a matter of course. We were, as it were, on our own in a world where to be on one's own meant, as a prior condition, loyalty to a ^{revealed} given way of life.

Among my unforgettable memories of those years were the lectures of the Rev. Zvi Hirsch Masliansky which I attended regularly every Friday evening in the Educational Alliance. Masliansky was the most popular preacher-lecturer

on the East Side in those days. Thousands flocked to hear him. He would enrapture his audience by his eloquence and wit, by the vivid portrayal of the life which ^{the} immigrant listeners had left behind them in the old world, its spiritual grandeur, ^{as well as} its physical poverty and its tyrannies and repressions. They would sit spell-bound as he spoke to them of the New World, its hopes and promises, ^{and here} and of the many problems and frustrations which confronted them and of the frictions which were developing between parents and children. His impassioned words would reach heights of poetic fervor and grandeur when he spoke of the people of Israel, and of its destiny and the hope of national restoration in Palestine.

I sat every Friday evening ^{in the wings} behind the back-drop of the stage of the Educational Alliance -- Rev. Masliansky was fond of me and had invited me to sit there -- and I listened to the captivating flow of his eloquence. After these many years I can still taste the ^{sweet} honey of his words.

In the Fall of 1911, I left for Cincinnati. I decided to study for the Rabbinate. My brother, Maxwell, too, had made a similar decision and had left the year before. In ^{joining a Reform congregation} so doing we were following a family tradition. My father was an ordained Rabbi and so was his father before him. He had studied at the famous Yeshiva of Slabotka in Lithuania. But he never occupied a Rabbinic post either in the Old World or the New. He earned his living in New York as a teacher of Hebrew. Though himself Orthodox, he raised no objection to our enrolling in a Reform seminary. He belonged to the "enlightened" wing of Orthodoxy. He was at home in several languages -- Russian, German, Lithuanian -- and wrote a beautiful Hebrew. When, years later, he settled in Palestine (now Israel) he published two volumes of

A

Biblical commentaries, "Chashukei Kesef" (Filigrees of Silver) which critics have praised as a fine blending of Rabbinic and scientific scholarship.

My ^a decision to enter the Hebrew Union College was not the result of ^{any} clear ideological choice. Because of my love for the home of my childhood and the religious way of life of my parents, I had then and still have a warm affection for Orthodox Judaism, but I felt no strong intellectual commitment to it, either as to its practice or doctrine. I and my young friends were reaching out, quite unconsciously, for ~~the~~ ^a more liberal type of Judaism. I was aware, of course, of the anti-Zionist tradition of Reform Judaism but before me were the examples of eminent men like Gustav Gottheil, who though a Rabbi of ^{the} a leading Reform Temple, was also Vice-president ^{in New York} of the Federation of American Zionists; and ^{of} ~~of~~ ^{Jacob L. Margolis, a graduate} of the Hebrew Union College -- and a one-time instructor there -- who was Secretary of the Federation of American Zionists and at the same time Rabbi of a Reform Temple. That was true also of Dr. Stephen S. Wise, who headed a liberal congregation in New York and was a leader in Zionism. One really never knows what motivates ^{decisions} some of the basic designs of one's life, but looking over the years I am inclined to believe that the decision which I made was a wise ^{one.} decision.

I spent four years at the Hebrew Union College and at the University of Cincinnati. My days there were very pleasant. The members of the College Faculty were masters ⁱⁿ of their ^{respective} fields, some of them world-renowned. They revealed to me ^{the} ^{depths} of genuine Jewish learning and each in his own way influenced me, some by their remarkable scholarship, others by the example of their lives, still others by the genuine warmth of their personality. No attempts were made to indoctrinate the students. The sharp controversy which had raged at the College a few years prior to my entrance over the issue of Zionism, and which had resulted in the

A

resignation of two of its professors, had apparently subsided, and while the College still reflected the prevailing anti-Zionist position of Reform Judaism, it was no longer militant about it. A student could preach a pro-Zionist sermon in the College Chapel if he so desired, and some of us did, *and* he was not disciplined for it.

At the University, I edited a literary magazine called "The Scribe". At the College, I founded and edited "The Hebrew Union College Monthly". One of my classmates at the College was Solomon B. Freehof, a brilliant student, who years later taught at the College, became Rabbi of the Reform Temple of Pittsburgh and is now head of the World Union for Progressive Judaism. We became close friends and through the years we cooperated in many causes. We were practically of the same age, and we were delighted to attend each other's sixtieth and seventieth anniversary celebrations in our respective communities.

also
During my first year in Cincinnati, I helped to organize a Hebrew-speaking society, the "Ivriah". We held public meetings and organized courses for the study of modern Hebrew.

My early love for the Hebrew language was, of course, a by-product of my early training and my home environment. But in later years I came to understand how vital the cultivation of Hebrew really was for the preservation of Jewish life.

No Jewish community ever contributed culturally or scholastically to Jewish life which did not foster the Hebrew language and literature. No Jewish community ever survived for long which ignored Hebrew.

Our people frequently employed other language media for religious-

I was ordained in 1915 and I was called to my first pulpit in Wheeling, West Virginia. The community was relatively old, as ^{Jewish} communities in the Ohio Valley go, and was thoroughly Americanized. Almost everyone belonged to the Temple and attendance at worship on Friday evenings was relatively better than that of their descendants in later times. Their loyalty to Judaism was greater than their knowledge of it. Religious education in the Sunday School was rudimentary with untrained volunteer teachers and inadequate religious text-books. But much of the life of the community centered in the Temple.

I served as Rabbi in Wheeling for two years, during which time I learned much about the nature and problems of a small Jewish community in the Middle West, which in many ways differed from those of the older and larger communities in the East. Jewish life here was far more peripheral, much less rich than the ^{more} intensive Jewish life which I knew in the East. As a Rabbi, I came close to people whom, ^{perhaps} for the first time, I saw as individual human beings in the setting of their every-day lives -- not merely as ^a group abstraction, ~~in some ideological~~ ~~pro-or-con~~ arrangement. I found great warmth and helpfulness among these people and to this day I cherish ~~my~~ pleasant memories of them. Some years later I returned to Wheeling to marry ~~my wife~~, Virginia Horkheimer, and a ~~shining~~ presence came into my life which has graced and guided it ever since.

I was called to the pulpit of The Temple in Cleveland in 1917 and I have remained there ever since. Cleveland had a Jewish population of ^{some} 80,000. ⁽²⁾ Already in those years the Temple was an important and influential congregation in the United States. My predecessor, Rabbi Moses J. Gries, was a man of

great dedication and of high personal integrity, but ultra-radical in his interpretation of Judaism. In later years I was to re-introduce many elements of ritual and ceremony which he had discarded -- the Friday evening and Saturday morning services to supplement the Sunday morning lecture-service, as well as the teaching of Hebrew in the Sunday School and on week-day afternoons. Rabbi Gries was anti-Zionist and so presumably were also the majority of the members of the Temple. But my "reforms" and my Zionism, which soon made themselves manifest, did not encounter any marked resistance. Perhaps my youth and the reception which the entire community gave to my preaching, helped me. The Temple always allowed me a free pulpit. Occasionally I found myself under the necessity of advocating a social, economical or political cause which was unpopular or distasteful to some or to many in the congregation, but no effort was ever made to restrain me.

A minister is, of course, never entirely free in his profession. No one working in and through an institution is entirely free. One cannot expect to have the perfect freedom and independence, say, of a prophet, and still be the endowed and accredited spokesman of an organized group. In a minister of small integrity, this makes for a measure of insincerity. But in most cases it serves to increase the minister's patience without decreasing his courage or his dedication.

B

When in later years I had to absent myself for long periods of time in connection with my Zionist activities throughout the country, or over-seas, the Temple people were extremely patient with me.

I had the support of fine lay leadership. The officers of the Temple, especially the men who occupied the office of President during the years of my ministry, Benjamin Lowenstein, Eugene E. Wolf, Sidney N. Weitz, A.M. Luntz and Bertram Krohngold, were of inestimable help to me. I enjoyed and valued their friendship. On my seventieth birthday I told my congregation it has been good to grow old among people whom one loved...

Our two sons, Daniel Jeremy and Raphael David, were born in Cleveland. Daniel Jeremy is now Rabbi of the Temple. Raphael David, a graduate of Harvard Business School, is active in the business world. Both have brought joy to our home -- they, their wives and their children.

Cleveland has been a good city to work in. The cosmopolitan character of its people endowed it with a commendable spaciousness. Intolerance of any sort found it difficult to take permanent root. Cleveland has a strong liberal tradition dating back to the days of Tom Johnson. Neither reaction nor radicalism made much headway in Cleveland. The city is carried along by a sound, confident and steady-going liberalism.

For ^{only} one brief spell following the World War, during the notorious era of the Palmer Red hysteria, Cleveland went hay-wire with the rest of

B

the country and the infamous May-day riots of 1919 took place. But the community soon sobered up and recovered its balance.

The sense of civic unity in Cleveland is evidenced in its Community Chest. I attended the very first Community Fund Campaign in 1918 and I have remained close to the Fund ever since. I was privileged to open many of its Campaign meetings. The Community Fund, the first to be organized in the United States, was a civic achievement of more than local significance. It was a pioneering effort, experimental in the extreme, but it succeeded, and it carved a highway for the community idea in philanthropic giving for the entire nation.

Cleveland is a tolerant city in a religious sense. The various religious groups in the community carry on their activities in amity and frequently in cooperation. There have been very few instances of bigotry and sectarian hostility. I have been a member for more than forty years of a group of clergymen of various denominations called the "Alathians". We meet monthly in each other's homes. A paper is read by one of the members on a subject of his own choosing of common interest to our profession and ministry. It is then discussed freely and fully. Following which we sit down to a fellowship dinner. No publicity is ever given to these meetings and no resolutions are ever adopted. But it has served as a valuable clearing-house for ideas, and a vehicle for better understanding and good-will in the religious community of Cleveland.

I came to the Temple during the First World War. Before long our own country was at war. Temple boys left for the war, some never to return. War activities engrossed our days and the war mood completely engulfed us all. I threw myself heartily into "the war to end all wars". I attended many patriotic _____

- ~~6~~ -

rallies and spoke in many parts of the country in behalf of Liberty Bonds. In the summer of 1918 I went over-seas for the United States Committee on Public Information and at the request of the French High Commission. I visited the Front, the Army camps, hospitals and the installations of the Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A., the Jewish Welfare Board and the Salvation Army. My assignment was to see what provisions were made for the care of our troops over-seas.

In France I met many distinguished Frenchmen -- Albert Thomas, Maurice Barres, Joseph Reinach, Emile Boutroux and others and learned their views on the future peace, on Franco-American cooperation and on Russia, where the Bolshevik Revolution had but recently overthrown the Kerenski government and had pulled Russia out of the war. I return^{ed} home to tell the story of what I saw. My report was seemingly not all that the super-patriots ~~expected~~ expected, for thereafter and until the end of the war a member of the Secret Service attended every one of my Sunday morning ~~services~~ ^{lectures}. At the close of the war I was decorated by the French government, "Officier de l'Instruction Publique".

I was disillusioned with the Peace Treaty which followed the war. I spoke out against it: "The treaty of peace as we have it cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called a peace treaty. There is no promise of peace in it. It has many of the earmarks of the Peace of Vienna of 1815 and the Treaty of 1871. It is *impunito* to a degree and vindictive in a frightful measure.

B

~~- 5 -~~

The spirit of vae victus (~~woe to the vanquished~~) is written large ⁱⁿ on it. One looks in vain for that spacious generosity, that spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation, that healing sympathy which one was led to anticipate from the words of our leaders and spokesmen." (See "In Time of Harvest", Macmillan Company, 1963. p. 30.)

I was persuaded that the League of Nations which President Wilson was urging upon the Allied nations and with so much idealism ^{with} such cogent logic would be endangered by the harsh terms of the Peace Treaty which was being imposed upon the defeated nations. I had previously been a strong advocate of a League of Nations and had ^{spoken} in many cities in favor of ~~such a league~~, but when I returned from Europe in 1920, after the Treaty of Versailles had been published, I was convinced that "it was not a treaty of peace but a treaty of war and that any league organized to perpetrate such a treaty is organized for war". (See The Cleveland News, Oct. 19, 1920.) In an address before the Cleveland City Club, speaking on "Europe Revisited", I declared: "What one carries back with him from Europe is a confirmed feeling of the almost absolute futility of war. The gains which the world can credit itself with as a result of the war do not justify the sacrifices. European governments have learned practically nothing from the war." (The Cleveland Press, Oct. 16, 1920.)

I was shocked and dismayed by the wave of intolerance, witch-hunting and anti-Red hysteria which swept over our country after the war. Those were the days of the Red Scare and the ~~Pekin~~ ^{Pekin} raids. Cleveland ^{was} in the grip of ^{his} hysteria. On May 1, 1919, a parade of socialists and sympathetic ~~Reds~~ ^{Reds} was broken up in a bloody riot. The next day two socialist ^{centers} were attacked by mobs, ransacked and their occupants beaten up.

Free speech was muzzled in our city. Under the auspices of the City Club, the one liberal body in Cleveland which had kept faith with true Americanism, I addressed open-air meetings in the Cleveland Public Square and elsewhere in the city. I called upon ~~my~~^{our} fellow-citizens to return to democratic sanity and ^{to} safe-guard the traditional values of our free American society. I helped to organize a group of Cleveland men ^{blacklisted to} for law, order and free speech.

In 1927, the National Society of Scabbard and Blade, the Reserve Officers Training Corps, ^{the} Key Men of America, and similar organizations issued a Black List of fifty-six "dangerous un-American personages who were working to undermine the government by their communistic tendencies". It was a distinguished list. It contained such names as Miss Jane Adams, Senator William E. Borah, Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Professor John Dewey, ^{and} Sherwood Eddy. I was honored by being included in this Black List. Later on I was to be blacklisted also by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I was not troubled by this blacklisting but I was troubled by the growing intolerance ^{in the nation} among our people as evidenced by the ^{growing} increasing number of these self-constituted so-called patriotic bodies which were growing up like weeds on the American soil. Anyone who was a known liberal, an enemy of child-labor, a defender of the rights of the Negro, an advocate of the World Court, a pacifist, ^{in Arizona} one who favored the recognition of Russia, was automatically blacklisted.

^{On April 29, 1928}
I delivered an address at the Temple on the subject of Patriotism and Black Lists in which I said:

B

" One may be a member of the D. A. R. , or of the Reserve Officers' Training corps and still not be a patriot. The blacklisting activities of these bodies are not of great moment. ~~The American people have simply laughed them out of court.~~ They are indicative, however, of the means and agencies which are being employed by interested groups in an effort to thwart the cause of peace and to discredit those who are advocating it. They are indicative, too, of an attitude on the part of some persons to regard patriotism and American loyalty as private monopolies. Whatever opinions they form touching governmental policies, international relations, national defense or immigration laws become, ² because of the peculiar custodial relation which ~~these~~ ^{they} people have assumed towards America, the only authoritative ⁱⁿ American opinion. All contrary opinions are straightway branded as unpatriotic and un-American.

" The war gave the professional ^{'patriot'} 'profiteer' his great opportunity and he ~~has~~ strutted across the face of our land pompous, self-important, armed with usurped authority to pursue and destroy anyone whose speech and conduct ~~did~~ ^{did} not conform to his canon of patriotism. It was ⁱⁿ an ugly period in American history. These organizations are now attempting to continue ~~their~~ disreputable war psychosis into a peace time Palmerism, through the medium of the urbane and genteel blacklist.

" What is patriotism? It is not a mysterious esoteric science whose recondite meaning is revealed only to the elite and the initiated. It is nothing more or less than that which is implied in the simple phrase 'love of country'. The man who is devoted to the best interests of his country, who seeks its well-being and works for its prosperity, is a patriot.

B

~~"Patriotism does not at all mean that a citizen must endorse every policy of his government or believe in the infallible wisdom of the State Department or the War Department or even of the President of the United States. A citizen may believe his government to be totally and completely in the wrong at times and still be a patriot."~~

The dominant Mood of reaction also reflected itself in labor-management relationships. Cleveland was then, as it is today, an important industrial community. An organized attempt was made ^{at that time} to crush labor unionism. Strikes and lock-outs were the order of the day. At the close of the war there was severe unemployment in the city and this situation was seized upon to undermine the organized labor movement. A leader in the campaign was the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce whose president was the war-time Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker. In protest I resigned from the Chamber of Commerce. The correspondence between Mr. Baker and myself was given wide publicity in the local press. Labor leaders assured me that it greatly strengthened their position.

In September, 1930, I found myself again involved in a labor-management dispute in which justice was on the side of labor. The Hotel managers of Cleveland broke a seventeen-year old agreement with the Cooks', Waitresses' and Waiters' Union and ^{the latter had to resort to} forced them ^{into} a strike to protect their right of collective bargaining.

The action was clearly part of a united effort instigated and directed by powerful interests who were fast obtaining a strangle-hold on Cleveland to destroy ^U Unionism in a period of intense economic depression.

13

~~SECRET~~

I issued ^{at the time} a public statement in which I said among other things:

"Altogether indefensible is the intransigent attitude which these hotels have taken in refusing all forms of arbitration. In international conflicts men have agreed to designate that nation as the aggressor which refuses to arbitrate. The Unions are willing to arbitrate. The hotels are not. The public should bear this fact in mind in deciding which party is the aggressor in this conflict and which is entitled to sympathy and cooperation.

"Only those who believe in the class struggle refuse to arbitrate. Men who believe in the possibility of American capital and labor cooperating amicably for their mutual benefit are neither uncompromising nor dogmatic."

Years later, in 1958, the issue of the Union Shop was again revived.

A "Right to Work" Constitutional Amendment was presented to the voters of the State of Ohio. On that occasion I issued the following statement which was widely largely used by the Ohio Federation of Labor to defeat the Amendment:

"Every man in a free society should have the right to work. But every man, once he finds employment, also has the moral duty to join an organization of fellow-workers which achieves for him, through its organized efforts, the favorable conditions he enjoys in his employment and affords him protection for the future. Everyone is morally obligated to share in the responsibilities if they wish to avail themselves of the rewards of collective effort. The theoretic "Right to Work" which no one questions is qualified by man's moral responsibility to assume the obligations which assure him the very things which he seeks in his employment.

~~III~~

✓ B

"It has been my conviction for many years that no free society and no free economy can long endure in the modern world without a strong organization of its working people. A strong labor movement not only protects workers against exploitation but, at the same time, will save capitalism and free enterprise from those very abuses which ultimately destroy it."

The ^aAmendment was decisively defeated.

(Here follows letter, thanks from Cleveland to I.L. - C. O.)

CU11

Shortly after I came to Cleveland, Great Britain issued on November 2, 1917, the famous Balfour Declaration. Regardless of the variety of interpretations which were later placed upon this Declaration, and regardless of the subterfuges which its vague phraseology afforded in time to those who sought evasion and the whittling down of the meaning of a National Home for the Jewish people, whose establishment in Palestine His Majesty's Government viewed with favor and undertook to facilitate, at the time of its issuance the Declaration electrified the Jewish world. It was hailed as an historic breakthrough for which the homeless centuries had waited so long. We were elated and we celebrated. Thereafter, our Zionist activities took on an air of confidence and assurance. A world power -- Great Britain -- had considered and justified our claim and committed itself to help in the realization of our cause. Those were the halcyon days of our Movement. And when in 1919 President Wilson announced that the United States Government and people concurred with the policy that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish Commonwealth, our future course seemed assured. This, unfortunately, was not to be. Three decades of hard struggle, frustrations, endless commissions, sharp internal controversies, violence and war were to precede the final proclamation of the establishment of the State of Israel in May, 1948.

In this dramatic struggle, which was unparalleled in Jewish history, I was caught up.

In 1919, I made my first visit to Palestine. It was before the days of the British Mandate. I saw the country as it emerged from the war and learned firsthand concerning what had to be done by way of land acquisition, irrigation, of forestation and sanitation, in order to prepare the land for mass immigration. Upon my return to the United States, I toured many cities in behalf of the Palestine Reconstruction Fund.

In July, 1920, I attended the World Zionist Conference in London. It was the first meeting of World Zionists since before the war. The war was now over. The Allies had triumphed and the promises of the Balfour Declaration loomed large and hopeful in the deliberations of this conference. The Supreme Council of the Peace Conference had met in San Remo a few months prior and had resolved that Palestine should be allotted to Great Britain as ^a mandatory. Sir Herbert Samuel was already in Palestine as High Commissioner.

I recall the great Zionist demonstration which was held in Albert Hall on July 12th to celebrate the acceptance by Great Britain of the mandate for Palestine. Ten thousand people packed the hall and thousands who sought admission were unable to get in. The giants of our Movement were on the platform -- Weitzmann, Nordau, Sokolow, Ussishkin. So were Balfour, Lord Robert Cecil, Col. Wedgewood and Major Ormsby-Gore. Lord Rothschild presided. The speakers were all enthusiastically greeted. Their speeches were frequently interrupted by loud applause, cheers and cries of "Hear, hear!" Each speaker had a notable message and all their messages were infused with

high hopes for the Jewish National Home, whose career had now begun. It was a stirring and unforgettable occasion for everyone and especially for me. I was the youngest man on the platform and I spoke for the American Zionist Delegation. This was my first address to an audience outside the United States. The response of the audience delighted me. The "Jewish Chronicle" of London referred to my address as "a magnificent effort magnificently accomplished. It was the work of a master of oratory, a man who has the ability of controlling vast audiences by the power of his tongue, by his dramatic capacity deftly employed so that his art seemed but natural. And soon after he had brought his audience spell-bound, the meeting closed to the strains of a magnificent organ". (The Jewish Chronicle, July 16, 1920)

All this, of course, fed not only my vanity but my confidence and morale.

It was at this London Conference of 1920 that the Keren Hayesod (The Palestine Foundation Fund) was established and this led to the first serious controversy in Zionist ranks in which I was to take part. There had been, of course, other controversies in the pre-war days of our Movement and there would be many more in the days to come. Our ^{movement} household was to resound, from time to time, with the clash of arms, with partisan slogans and battle-cries, with voices each claiming to have the one sure and only answer to what should be done. But the relentless realities of life and the force of unforeseen and unpredictable world events modulated and often muted some of the dogmatic predictions and assertions of this man or that party. Frequently our Movement

had to charter its course in very stormy seas. It had to adjust its course from time to time to shifting tides, weather and winds. No one unalterable chart was adequate for all occasions. Our Movement seemed to have a logic of its own and when the situation required, it did not hesitate to make the necessary adjustments, however drastic they may have been. No one chart and no one navigator finally brought our ship safely into port.

The controversial issue at this Conference was over the nature of the Palestine Foundation Fund which was established. Dr. Weitzmann and his colleagues on the Zionist Executive favored the immediate raising of an all-inclusive fund of twenty-five million pounds, to be secured within one year, through ~~a Tithe~~ an extraordinary offering of capital and income similar to the Tithe which would be contributed by the Jewish people, part of it to be devoted to the acquisition of land, to immigration, education and other social services and the major part to investments in permanent national institutions as economic undertakings within the country. The Fund, in other words, would undertake all activities necessary for the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home.

Justice Louis D. Brandeis and most of his colleagues from the United States were opposed to the commingling of funds. They insisted on the separation of investments and donations. The Keren Hayesod should be devoted exclusively to social services in Palestine and its organizational and political activities. Monies for economic undertakings in Palestine should be raised from private investors. The economic planning and development of the country should be vested in the hands of a small body of experts. Justice Brandeis also favored a more or less decentralized World Zionist Movement.

Justice Brandeis maintained that Dr. Weizmann had been in agreement with him right along. At his request, and in order to bring some new forces into the work, he had seen and persuaded some leading personalities in British Jewry to assume direct responsibility for the economic development of Palestine within the Zionist Movement -- Sir Alfred Mond, James de Rothschild and Waley-Cohen. These three, together with Weizmann, Sokolow, Flexner and himself were to constitute the small executive. But overnight, Weizmann, Brandeis charged, changed his mind. The plan which was agreed upon was wrecked. Brandeis felt shocked and let down and he never forgave Weizmann.

The clash between these two men was due not only to a sharp difference on how to do the upbuilding work in Palestine. It was due also to a conflict of personalities. Dr. Weizmann, as Isaiah Berlin described him years later, "was not too tolerant of other leaders... he believed in his own judgment, he was bold and independent, and at times deeply disdainful... he found it difficult to share the direction of affairs with others". (Chaim Weizmann, Athenaeum, 1963, pg. 41) Dr. Weizmann shared the weakness of other great men. He was intolerant of greatness at his side. Others besides Brandeis -- Herzl, Wolfsohn, Nordau and Sokolow, had also felt the abrasive exclusiveness in leadership of this brilliant man, who was otherwise so amiable to friends and co-workers.

Justice Brandeis, too, was hard and inflexible once he had reached a conclusion. He was not given to any detours on the road to his objective. Weizmann found Brandeis -- as he later described him -- "a Puritan, upright,

c

austere, of a scrupulous and implacable logic. These qualities sometimes made him hard to work with" (Chaim Weizmann", "Trial and Error". 1950, p. 248) Brandeis, a relative new/come^r to the Movement, was not sufficiently sensitive to the honored position which some of the older leaders whom he wished to displace occupied in the Movement -- men like Ussishkin, ^{bb}Rupin, Jabotinsky. He was less than circumspect in his treatment of them. He failed to see that the Movement, after all, had not been organized, directed and inspired through the years by financiers and economists. A change was now called for, but not a purge.

Brandeis was also handicapped by the exalted judicial position which he occupied in the United States. When asked at one of the meetings of the American delegation in London ~~at which he presented his plan~~, whether as one of the seven in the small executive which he proposed he was prepared personally to assume a leading part in the conduct of Zionist affairs -- he replied that it would be a mistake for him to resign from the Bench with a view of taking up exclusively this work. If he resigned, men would say "that a man cannot be a Zionist and a good citizen of his country because there was Brandeis, who was supposed to be one of the most American of Americans, who left his Court and his country at a time when, what many will believe to be, its greatest need. This would impair our Movement with Jews and non-Jews..."

Brandeis, ^rhimself, ^rthus restricted himself to a purely consultative position, something which he deprecated in the case of the others who were to be in the small executive committee. He wanted to lead the Movement by remote control. This was the weakness of his position which finally defeated him.

The differences were somehow patched up at the London Conference. The Keren Hayesod was proclaimed.

But the controversy was by no means over. The Zionist Organization of America, under the leadership of its President, Judge Julian W. Mack, a man of impeccable integrity and loftiest motives, refused to go along with the launching of the Keren Hayesod in the United States. He wanted clarification on the issues which were not settled at the London Conference. He was a staunch advocate of the Brandeis line.

Dissention soon developed within the ranks of the American Zionists, ~~themselves~~. At a meeting of the National Executive Committee, held on September 29, 1920, a resolution "to approve the proceedings of the American delegation at the London Conference under the wise and competent leadership of the Honorary President (Brandeis) encountered considerable opposition. No vote was taken at this meeting. In the meantime, it was thought expedient that someone should approach Justice Brandeis and fully inform him concerning the criticism which had been voiced at the meeting.

I was delegated to see Justice Brandeis. I saw him at his modest apartment in Stoneleigh Court in Washington on October 12th. I submitted a lengthy memorandum of our conversation to the Executive, after Justice Brandeis had approved of its accuracy.

C

He denied categorically that he had any intention of breaking with the World Zionist Organization. The so-called Brandeis plan which he presented to the leaders of the London Conference was his only in detail. It was Weizmann's as well.

After my conversation with the Justice, I was inclined to think that there was much more of misunderstanding concerning all that had transpired than was at first apparent, and that much of the conflict of opinion ^{was} ~~is~~ due to it. The Justice apparently could not present certain important facts to the delegates at the time, nor could he explain in full the reasons for the position which he was at times compelled to take. Some of the delegation were accordingly led to certain conclusions, based on ignorance of the facts and on misunderstanding.

I concluded that the differences between Weizmann and Brandeis could have been compromised. I was never taken in by the loose talk which went the rounds about the fundamental ideological conflict which existed between ^{their} two concepts of Zionism -- between that of Eastern European Jews which Dr. Weizmann represented and that of Western European Jews which Justice Brandeis represented -- the so-called irreconcilable struggle between Washington and Pinsk. Weizmann's protagonists at the time, especially Louis Lipsky, made much of it and Dr. Weizmann, himself, dwelled on it at the time and later on in his "Trial and Error". It is true that Dr. Weizmann

appealed more effectively to the Jews of Eastern Europe and to their descendants in the United States. He spoke their language and understood their psychology much better than the "Westerner", Brandeis.

Brandeis was a sound political Zionist. His position was that now that the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate were established facts, the major energies of the Movement should be directed towards the economic development of the country in order to prepare it as rapidly as possible for a maximum Jewish immigration. He believed further that the Jewish people should be asked not only to make donations for vital and necessary activities, such as immigration, education and health, which ~~could~~^{would} yield no financial returns, but that they should invest capital in the country and that these investments should be treated as investments and not as donations and their operation should be directed by an ^{independent} board of experienced economists and financiers.

Before Dr. Weizmann arrived in the United States, in April, 1921, to launch the Keren Hayesod, the Executive of the Zionist Organization of America approved of a memorandum which was to be submitted to him upon arrival. It set out the viewpoint of the Executive and was to serve as a basis for conference and discussions with Dr. Weizmann, looking towards agreement. Dr. Weizmann chose to regard this memorandum as an ultimatum.

A public reception and meeting was arranged in his honor and those who accompanied him -- Professor Albert Einstein and M. M. Ussishkin -- by the Zionist Organization of America at the Metropolitan Opera House on the afternoon

of April 10th. A General Committee, representative of all elements of the Jewish community, was organized. Judge Mack invited me to represent the Zionist Organization of America on that occasion. I accepted the invitation and spoke at what was a tremendously enthusiastic gathering, addressed also by Judge Mack, Judge Herbert Lehman and Louis Marshall.

During the ensuing week, a number of conferences were held between Judge Mack and Dr. Weizmann and their colleagues. With good will, common ground could have been reached. In fact, Dr. Weizmann finally agreed that until the next Zionist Congress, the Keren Hayesod in the United States should be exclusively a donation fund. The draft of an agreement had actually been drawn up, but the next morning Dr. Weizmann rejected it and proceeded to issue a manifesto announcing the establishment of a Keren Hayesod Bureau in the United States. Dr. Weizmann maintained that the final draft virtually involved the control of the Keren Hayesod by the Zionist Organization of America and the actual recognition of the Zionist Organization of America as a body, coordinate with, or even superior to the World Zionist Organization.

The fat was in the fire and at the Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, it burst into flames. The convention was held in ~~my city of~~ Cleveland in June of that year and it was a very stormy gathering, indeed. Present at the convention, though not participating in its deliberations, was Dr. Weizmann, accompanied by his friends, Professor Albert Einstein, Ussishkin, Mossinson, and others. Dr. Weizmann's enormous prestige and ~~those~~^{that} of his friends from

abroad undoubtedly influenced the deliberations. Brandeis was not present. The majority of the delegates, led by Louis Lipsky, Emanuel Neumann, Morris Rothenberg and Bernard A. Rosenblatt, were on Weizmann's side. The leaders of the Brandeis-Mack group at the Convention were Felix Frankfurter, Stephen S. Wise, Nathan Straus, Robert Szold and Sol Rosenbloom. Judge Mack called for a vote of confidence, approving of the position which he and his administration had taken. The vote went against him. Whereupon he and seven of the eight officers of the Administration and most of the members of the Executive resigned.

I was among those who resigned -- reluctantly. Forced to take sides, I sided with the Administration. I believed that the Zionist Movement in the United States which had done so much to save the Yishuv in Palestine and preserve the integrity of the Movement during the war and had played a significant role in the securing of the Balfour Declaration and the San Remo decision and which would be called upon to raise most of the funds for the Keren Hayesod in the future should have a major voice in how these funds should be administered, at least until the time of the next World Zionist Congress. This was not an unreasonable demand. Before many years were to pass, Dr. Weizmann would make far greater concessions to non-Zionists in the matter of the control of funds raised in the United States for Palestine. I further felt that odious misrepresentations had been made and irresponsible propaganda methods had been resorted to to undermine the authority of the American Zionist leadership.

The rift in American Zionism did not do the Movement any good. Fortunately, it did not last very long. Time and again in the many years of my association with the Movement, I observed its leaders, men of strong conviction and temperament, in the moment of sharp controversy act as if they would never speak to each other again or were about to quit the Movement. But the cause which they served always mastered them in the end and whipped them back into line. They were soon reconciled, if only temporarily, to resume some controversy on ^{some} other issues the next time.

Not long after the Cleveland split, when many harsh words had been spoken and serious charges made, the principal participants in the fray -- Mack, Wise and Lipsky, met on the same platform at the National Conference on Palestine in Boston in November, 1926, which was called to consider an enlarged Jewish Agency. Dr. Wise in an impressive speech declared: "The role of Disraeli in Britain is the role of Weizmann in Israel, and we, your fellow Zionists, bid you God-speed and say to you we will stand with you and will labor at your side." Dr. Weizmann in an equally eloquent speech affectionately addressed Dr. Wise as my "old comrade, collaborator, co-worker, and, if I may use the term, old war-horse".

And so it was with all of us. We feuded but we never hated. Our boiling point was not very high, and our freezing point was not very low, but always we were driven into united action at the behest of the urgent needs of our common cause.

The so-called "Brandeis Group" which, of course, did not resign from the Zionist Organization, met in Pittsburgh on July 3-4 to plan its course of action. It resolved not to organize itself as an opposition faction within the Zionist Organization of America, but to proceed forthwith to initiate specific economic activities in Palestine. It organized itself into a Palestine Development Council and a Central Committee of Palestine Development Leagues which would raise the funds and secure stock subscriptions for the corporations which would be founded by the Council.

At this Pittsburgh Conference, I made an appeal for subscriptions towards the first project to be launched by the Council -- a Palestine Cooperative Company to extend loans to credit unions and to cooperative consumers and producer societies in Palestine. A sum close to a quarter of a million dollars was raised.

Other projects were to follow -- a Building Loan Association and assistance in the financing of the Rutenberg Project for the creating of Hydro-Electric power in Palestine. As President of the Central Committee of the Palestine Development Leagues, I toured many cities in the United States, as far as the Pacific Coast during the months of August and September of 1922, in the interest of the Rutenberg project. The response was fairly good. I organized a number of Leagues in some of the principle cities of the United States and addressed numerous meetings. I succeeded in interesting the Central Conference of American Rabbis in the work of the Council. This was its first direct identification with any Palestine activity.

But the movement of the so-called "Brandeis Group" never really got off the ground. Lacking an adequate organizational apparatus and an adequate propaganda machine, it failed to get widespread support. From the very beginning I had urged that an effective organization of paid workers and organizers should be set up as a basis for volunteer work, if we intended to reach a large number of subscribers for our projects. I was dubious about our success with the few rich people upon whose support much of our hope was based. By the end of 1922, I was convinced that the program of Justice Brandeis for the raising of funds was doomed to failure and with it, I feared, would come the ultimate dissolution of the Palestine Development Council. Accordingly, in December of that year I sent in my resignation.

The Keren Hayesod likewise was not as successful as its advocates had hoped. It was soon clear that if effective work for Palestine were to be done on the American scene, a union of forces was imperative.

Peace overtures commenced practically the day after the close of the Cleveland Convention. People, prominent in all walks of life, friends of Palestine, contacted one or the other side and urged reconciliation. Zionists soon began to demand unity. In November, 1921, Sokolow, Professor Warburg, Vladimar Jabotinsky came to the United States on a mission for the Keren Hayesod in the course of which they sought to heal the breach. The Zionist Convention in Philadelphia, in June, 1922, the first since Cleveland, was dominated by a desire to find a peace formula.

In 1924, I joined the forces of the Keren Hayesod. I was greeted by a huge rally in Carnegie Hall in New York City.

That same year I attended the Convention of the Zionist Organization of America meeting in Pittsburgh and was asked to serve as Vice-President of the Organization.

The following year, Dr. Wise and Judge Mack also lent their help to the Keren Hayesod. The Keren Hayesod was now merged with the Jewish National Fund and other Palestine causes, to form the United Palestine Appeal.

This was my first experience in the rough and tumble game of politics and I learned much. Every one who was engaged in this bitter controversy was unquestionably a good Zionist, working for the good of the cause -- but this did not preclude the all-too human weaknesses of ambition, rivalry and picque from entering into the situation. I saw how men rationalized their prejudices, and how truth was often rendered helpless by a sustained and skillful propaganda of misrepresentation. I saw how strong men stood up under attack and how others looked smaller even in their triumphs.

In 1924 we moved into our new Temple in University Circle. It is a beautiful structure of a modified Byzantine ~~type~~^{style}. It has been described as "a building which is not only architecturally satisfying, but which expresses in itself the deeply religious spirit and the essential unity of the Jewish faith". (The Architectural Forum, Nov. 1925). It was built before the vogue developed to build functional synagogue structures.

I have always had strong reservations on the ~~new-design~~ trends in contemporary church architecture. The church has lived with many types of architecture in many parts of the world, types which it created, borrowed or embellished. The test of an effective church style is neither its antiquity nor its modernity. Any building which is conducive to prayer and meditation, which fosters in man a mood of humble quietude and reverence, and which gives him sanctuary from the clamor of the market place and the drabness of the commonplace is, from the point of view of the mission of the church and synagogue, good architecture.

It may be old in design or it may be new, or it may be a blending of the two -- it matters not, provided the spirit of man finds shelter in it and is moved by its beauty and harmony and the memories which it arouses to dwell on the mystery of life and the eternal ways of God.

A church design which is merely untraditional, which deliberately startles by its feats of novelty, which embodies abstractions in constant need of commentary, or which attempts to make the religious edifice "functional" in the mechanical sense of the term, aligning it with the nigh universal trend toward functionalism in our industrial society, misses,

D

I am afraid, the very unique and redemptive contribution which a house of worship can make to the beset and troubled spirit of modern man when it turns to the courts of the Lord in quest of peace and spiritual security.

When a man enters a church or synagogue to pray or to be instructed in the word of God, he should be moved to exclaim not "How modern! How functional! How sensationally different!" but, "This is none other than a house of God and this is a gate to heaven".

In 1959 we added additional facilities to our Temple and we acquired additional land to build a parking area and also a small park. We were determined to remain where we were, and not ^{to} move to the suburbs where many of our members were moving. I regarded the flight of churches and synagogues to the suburbs as a mistake. We have had no occasion to regret our decision. Our membership through the years has increased, and the University Circle, where we are now located, with its numerous cultural and social activities is fast developing into ^{the} most impressive cultural center ^{in the} ~~United States~~ ^{world}.

Here I have worked these forty years. In spite of my many extra-mural and out-of-town activities, and the many demands which were made upon me by national and international causes, I tried not to neglect my Temple work. I was in my pulpit most every week-end and preached most every Sunday. I taught my Confirmation classes regularly, conducted classes for adults, supervised the general activities of the Temple and attended to the pastoral duties of my office. I did not visit people as often as I might have for I did not

have the time for it, but I did not wholly neglect that part of my ministry either -- and my associates in the Temple supplemented my work. I never regarded the purely pastoral phase of a Rabbi's work as of primary importance. In the tradition of the Rabbi, it never loomed large, though in the eyes of many members modern congregations it is all-important. ^{Historically,} The Rabbi was primarily the teacher, not the pastor.

I would prepare my sermons very carefully, writing them out in full and then memorizing them. I seldom spoke extemporaneously. I was reverent of the spoken word. I feared that the inspiration of the moment may be late in coming. Only in recent years, ^{and} on occasions which called for scrupulous care in wording did I resort to a manuscript.

As a rule, my sermons never exceeded thirty to forty minutes. Beyond that, both preacher and congregation reach a point of no return. . . . But capsule sermons to satisfy the quick-lunch taste of modern Temple-goers never appealed to me. They are usually devoid of ^{intellectual} nutriment and free of ^{spiritual} calories. . .

One of the subjects which I stressed most often in the pulpit and ~~outside~~ on various platforms was the importance of Jewish education. I recall that in the keynote address which I delivered at the Golden Jubilee Convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1923 in Carnegie Hall, I stated:

"In deference to ourselves let us be frank. Our religious schools are inadequate. Their curricula are rudimentary and faulty. The time allotted to the religious education of our children is all too short. We cannot transmit a

heritage of three thousand years, the learning and wisdom of thirty centuries, the history, religion, ethics and literature of a people, all in the one or two hours a week during the few years of the child's school life. We Rabbis frankly confess our inability to cope with this problem. You Jewish laymen must look to it. It is you who must take the initiative in this tremendously urgent work. For remember that our religious schools must do much more than impart some elementary historical information and some religious guidance. The school along with the home and the Synagogue must inculcate the essential mental and spiritual qualities of our people, the collective soul and mind, as it were, of our race, the Jewish attitude and the Jewish point of view, the passion of the prophet, the piety of the Psalmist, the dream of the poet, the faith of the martyr, the high hope and sacrificial valor and the morale which make for victory."

My deep concern with Jewish education led me to organize the Bureau of Jewish Education in Cleveland in 1924, with the aid of the Federation of Jewish Charities and with the cooperation of the other rabbis of the city. A survey had revealed the startling fact that 14,000 Jewish children of school age, out of 21,000 in our community, were receiving no religious training whatsoever, either in Religious Schools, Hebrew Schools or through private instruction. The Bureau applied itself to the establishment of schools in all parts of the city, to the support of the existing educational institutions which were not ~~the~~ entirely self-supporting and to the training of Religious School and Hebrew School teachers.

I was elected President of the Bureau and actively served in that capacity for seven years. The Bureau has served well through the years and

^R Elsewhere I indicated what I regarded as the function of the religious leader in modern society. ^{↳ What was it that} As a Rabbi, what did I specifically ^{taught} teach my people about Judaism? I was never enamoured of ^{found,} systematic theology, though, of course, I had studied theology, not only as part of my training in preparation for my ordination, but subsequently to discover what new ideas and insights have been added. I found ^{little new} none in the writings of the renowned theologians of our day or of the generations which preceded them. They all said the same things in different ways with different emphasis. Some were more obscure than others, some more ponderous than others, but all ended up with the same few simple truths which are the essence of all the religions of the Western World, truths which the ancient seers and prophets of our religion had stated with greater clarity, conviction and eloquence. ^{To In preaching Judaism} Furthermore, I never extolled one type of Judaism over another. I never criticized Orthodox Judaism, nor deprecated Conservative Judaism, nor extolled Reform Judaism. I was never an "Orthodox" Reform Jew. These distinctions interested me very little.

In fact, I was rather critical of Reform Judaism ^{though I was a Reform} in which ministry I ^{Rabbi; perhaps because I was a Reform Rabbi.} served. I believed that the pioneer reformers and their disciples ~~after~~ were too zealous to "modernize" Judaism, and too self-conscious about modernity. There was too much emphasis in their thought and speech upon "reform", "change", "progress", too little upon "rebirth", "return", tracing back to God". Nothing is so shallow and ephemeral as modernity. The very word suggests a mode, a fashion, an ^a improved and passing version which has its practical utility, to be sure, but which must not be confused with that which is of the essence and of the eternal. They were too eager to accommodate,

to facilitate, and, strange as it may seem, to conform -- not to tradition, of course, but to the most recent thought and practice of their day -- the tradition of recency. They were sufficiently intellectual in their critique, but religious reformation is achieved only by mystics who are concerned not with the recency of their doctrines, but with the immediacy of their religious experience.

Great spiritual movements break not only with the past, but with the present as well. They never attempt to "modernize" religion but to restore it to its timeless spiritual essence, to its enduring distinctiveness through all times and ages, to that which like the flowing current moves and changes and yet remains the same. Quite consciously they are movements of "return" to marvelous and decisive beginnings so as to recapture an ageless truth. They never set out to adjust men to their social, political or economic environment. They aim to tear them free from their environment. They demand of them surrender, self-denial, renunciation of worldly comforts and interests, and they offer them the compensations of spiritual blessings. The greatest religions were those which made the greatest demands upon their followers and which called for the most rigorous disciplines.

For all their loyalty, learning and high-mindedness, many of the leaders of our movement over-estimated the importance of their ritual reforms. It was not long before it became clear that people could refrain from praying from an ~~expurgated and abridged~~ prayer book quite as consistently as from an unabridged one, that a Jew could fail to observe a one-day holiday quite as

readily as a two-day one, and that even services of great dignity and beauty could fail to impress and attract if the disposition to worship is not there. It must be clear by now that the omission from the prayer book of the prayer for the restoration of Zion did not appease the ^{unfriendly} gentile opposition, and did not succeed in making more secure the position of the Jew in the German Fatherland. It must also be clear by now that the Jew who spoke a perfect German could be disliked as vehemently as he who spoke a perfect or imperfect Yiddish. Those who were finally driven out of Germany were Jews who had become perfectly adjusted and perfectly modernized. This is not to suggest that many of the reforms were unnecessary. But looking at them from the perspective of history, which reformers frequently sacrifice for an apocalypse, they appear far less consequential than they seemed at first.

Surely in our day the need for this type of reform is over. It was over a long time ago. What is needed today is not the innovation or renovation or reformation or reconstruction of Judaism, but the conversion of the Jew to his faith. It is no longer a question of less or of more, of Reform, Conservatism or Orthodoxy, but of Godlessness, secularism and materialism which have blighted our people, along with all other peoples, but which we, because of our unique position in the world, can least of all afford. It is hopeless to try to reach the heart of our people or to serve them by reviving old slogans and battle-cries, or discarded rituals, or by confronting them with the competitive claims of Orthodoxy, Conservatism or Reform. None of these has scored any significant victory in our day, and life is now attacking them all.

D

And so, when I taught my people about Judaism, I spoke to them not of competitive denominational Judaism, but of the essentials and the eternal values of their historic faith. I spoke of an old religion, reaching across many centuries and many lands, ~~embracing many cultures~~ and reflecting the great variety of experiences of our people. Judaism, I often reminded them, is not a fixed and inveterate set of dogmas, ~~and~~ doctrines and observances, which have remained constant and inflexible through the centuries. It is not a formalized creed which consists of so many articles of faith which have received the official stamp of approval of some authorized church council.

Nor is Judaism based on some outstanding event in the history of the Jewish people, or on some extraordinary personality, although historic events, ~~and~~ great personalities, played a significant role in the development of our faith.

Rather, is it the evolving faith and the ethical thinking of a spiritually sensitive people through long centuries of time, and it is only the religious sense or the religious genius of this people which gives organic unity to the faith which we call Judaism.

Just as is the case with all other religions, so also with Judaism, there have been in it from time to time various schools of thought; the traditionalists, and the reformers, the ritualists and the pietists, the rationalists and the mystics, the priests and the prophets. At times, the views of one or the other predominated, but most often they interpenetrated and modified one another. But it is not difficult at all to discover beneath the surface of these movements

and currents the deep, steady and persistent channels which carried on throughout the ages. ~~Amidst~~ ^{Amidst} the many changes of opinion and emphasis, it is quite easy to discern the outlines of the major trends, the key ideas, ~~the enduring attitudes,~~ the unfailing and beckoning horizons of the historic faith, Judaism.

There is a royal road which stretches down the ages from Abraham and Moses to our own time. There is an unbroken highway which connects the world-view of the early patriarchs, the later prophets, the scribes, the sages and the Rabbis. Each, of course, ^{was} ~~is~~ a child of his age, but they all share a common belief and outlook which are ageless.

The great insights of Judaism are easily recognizable in all stages of its development: That God is One, ~~spiritual, Creator and Ruler of the universe,~~ indwelling in all nature, and yet transcending it, near to man in all his needs and yet beyond man's comprehension; that God can never be represented and is never incarnated; that man, while fashioned out of the earth, is nevertheless made in the spiritual image of God; that while man is bound by his physical and mental limitations, he is nevertheless boundless in his moral aspirations, and he is free to determine his own spiritual progress through his own efforts, assisted by the grace of God; that both body and soul are of God and that the whole of man -- body, mind and soul -- is sacred; that all men are equal in their essential humanity and in the sight of God; that there is but one moral law for prince and pauper, for ruler and subject, for native born and the stranger; that life is good and is a gracious gift of God; that the evil which exists in the world can be overcome, and in the overcoming of it lies the meaning and the adventure of human life, and that a ^{good} ~~golden~~ age of universal justice and brotherhood and peace awaits

the human race, to be ushered in by the efforts of the human race; that there is a reward for goodness in time and in eternity, and punishment for evil which can be averted through repentance; that man's principal concern should be with life this side of the grave since "the hidden things belong to God but the things that are revealed belong to us and our children, that we may do all the words of the law."

Some of the great religions of mankind possess one or more of these ideas; some have adopted them directly from Judaism; but Judaism has woven them all into a single and unique pattern, has integrated and correlated them into a dynamic and magnificent religious philosophy and into an ethical code which have powerfully influenced the civilization of mankind.

I would always stress the thought that while Judaism is the religion of the Jewish people, evolved by it and entrusted to it, its mission was to spread its teachings to the whole world. The message of Judaism is universal. ~~Its God is the God of the whole of mankind. The Temple is a house of prayer for all peoples.~~ Israel conceived of itself as a covenanted people, a mission-dowered people, trained through a self-imposed discipline to be, as it were, an army of the Lord, to carry this revelation of the One God and of His mandates ~~of faith and of right living~~ to all men everywhere. It was chosen not for any special favors or special privileges, but for the hard, exacting obligations of spiritual leadership which is so often a crown of thorns.

As an historic faith, infused with the life experience of the Jewish people, Judaism naturally reflects in some of its customs, symbols, ceremonies

D

and festivals, the special experiences and the special needs and hopes of the Jewish community, but the light of its spiritual and its ethical vision is intended for the whole of mankind. Judaism excluded no one from sharing in its faith because of race or of caste. In fact, no one needs to be formally admitted into its fold in order to be "saved".

This is the Judaism which I taught my people through the years -- in sermon, lecture, address or classroom instruction. This is the Judaism which I applied in interpreting the events of the day, from week to week, from year to year.

It is difficult to estimate the effectiveness of one's ministry. The minister deals in imponderables. The business-man can point to his profits, the physician to the sick whom he cured, the lawyer to the cases which he won in court, the engineer to the structures which he built. The minister can point to no such tangible achievements. He does not know whether his teaching is followed or not, or whether his preaching has any influence whatsoever.

But he will not lose heart, for it is not his duty to complete the work but neither is he free to disist from it.

In 1927, I published my book, "Messianic Speculations in Israel", from the First through the Seventeenth Centuries. The nucleus of the book was the doctorate thesis which I had presented to the faculty of the Hebrew Union College in 1925, which I enlarged and completely revised for publication. It was well received in the scholarly world. In 1958, a paper-back

edition of the book was published by the Beacon Press. I added a brief preface which carried the story of Messianic Speculations in Israel up to the time of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

The Messianic motif in Jewish history has always intrigued me. The Messianic hope sustained the Jewish people through centuries of darkness, homelessness and persecution. In its prophetic expression, as the beckoning vision of a redeemed humanity, it continues to guide, inspire and sustain men of good-will everywhere.

In 1931, I published my book, "Religion in a Changing World" -- a series of essays on the place of religion in the modern world. It was exceptionally well received. It was a "best seller" among religious books in its day.

I always believed that the church should enter the arena of social and political life and urge the faithful to build the good society.

I believed that the first great service which the church, the effective arm of religion, can render the cause of social justice is to galvanize by education and inspiration the will of men so that they will seek justice and pursue it.

The church should not remain content to speak of social justice in the abstract. The church is not an academy for special social sciences. It is a dynamic agency for social reconstruction. It must enter the arena of life and do valiant battle for its sanctities.

The church cannot, of course, align itself with a propaganda for one specific economic system as against another. It must not involve itself in economic dogmatism. To do so would be to suffer a severe loss in spiritual prestige and authority. The church would be compelled either to champion an existing order in spite of its sundry and inevitable flaws, or a new order, which might fail even to approximate the virtues claimed for it. The church is not concerned with systems, but with the safeguarding of principles which each age must be challenged to work into such a system as will best meet its requirements. Whether it be capitalism, socialism or communism, there are basic principles of justice at stake in each, and the church must under all conditions remain free to defend these ideals for which no system holds adequate guarantees.

E

~~2~~ ✓

~~Whether it be capitalism, socialism or communism, there are basic principles of social justice at stake in each, and the church must under all conditions remain free to defend these ideals for which no system holds adequate guarantees.~~

There are problems in modern society of vast social import, reaching to the very heart of our civilization and affecting the whole structure of society, concerning which the church must speak, and in no uncertain terms. Conditions of palpable and vast wrong persist, throughout the world, which thwart the rich promise of human life, consign millions to degradation and defeat, and fill the habitations of men with anguish and sorrow. Greed and lust and oppression devastate life. Untold millions are starved by poverty and physically and spiritually drained by exploitation. Millions of children are broken upon the wheels of industry. The burdens of our economic order lie heavily upon the shoulders of our womanhood. Nowhere in the world today do those conditions of justice and opportunity fully obtain which would make possible the free, untrammelled unfoldment of personality, the harmonious development of all of God's children according to their capacities.

In the face of these conditions the church cannot, dare not, remain silent. It must cry aloud. It must lift up its voice like a trumpet to declare unto the people their transgressions. Else its vision is a lying vision and its ritual an abomination. It is true that the church has ^{frequently} ~~always~~ cared for the victims of social injustice. It fed the poor, clothed the naked, sheltered the homeless, healed the sick, ~~sustained~~ and ~~comforted the denied and the dispossessed of the earth.~~ Nearly all the agencies of mercy in the world are the creations and wards of the churches. The church was indeed a compassionate mother. But it must now do more. It must not wait until the

flotsam and jetsam of social wreckage come drifting to its doors. It must anticipate disaster. It must labor for a social reconstruction which will afford all men a better chance of security.

The church must summon its adherents to a close scrutiny of social ills. It must stimulate research and inquiry into their possible remedies. It must place the social responsibility for ameliorating these conditions squarely upon the shoulders of its devotees. It must demand the application of their best intelligence and highest motives to this task. It must arouse and disturb them ~~with the desperate challenge:~~ "Ye are your brothers' keepers," and drive them on to ever new experimentations in perfecting this stewardship. It must voice the maximum idealism of life, calling for a condition of society in which man will at all times be primary, and the satisfaction of his legitimate needs superior to profit or the accumulation of wealth, in which rewards will be commensurate with service, ~~and in which none shall partake of social goods who does not contribute to the social weal.~~ It must organize the religious consciousness of the world and the mighty hosts of the faithful for strategic action at decisive moments.

Above all, it must be the refuge and sanctuary of absolute integrity. It must be the home of uncompromising loyalty to social ideals. The church must be feared and revered for its dauntless proclamation of truth. It must rise above the state, not in the sense of endeavoring to master it, or to control its political fortunes, but in the sense of freeing itself from an alignment which carries with it ^{an unqualified} ~~the~~ endorsement of all the political programs and policies of the state. It dare not be the lackey of the state. It must rise above the prevalent economic system, not in

the sense of seeking, in doctrinaire fashion, to substitute another system for it, but in the sense of emancipating itself from an alliance which might compel it to play the role of defender and apologist. The church has often been intrigued into casting the mantle of its sanctity over the corruptions of an unjust society. The church must be free, fearless and autonomous. It must be the guide, the critic, the censor of state and society. It must never be the tool of propaganda or the channel for reaction.

This conception of mine as to the role of organized religion in modern society guided me through the years both in my pulpit utterances and in my active participation in ~~the many~~ ^{the} social movements of the day.

^{Thus} Especially in the dark days of the economic depression, when so many of our fellow-citizens were jobless and their families in dire want, I spoke up time and time again on the social menace of unemployment.

By 1927 the unemployment situation had become very serious in Cleveland, as indeed it had become ~~so~~ all over the country. I urged upon the City of Cleveland immediate large-scale construction jobs as a means of bringing ~~immediate~~ relief to the unemployed and adequate local, state and federal relief.

It was at this time that I began my campaign for unemployment insurance which was to continue for almost a decade until the State of Ohio adopted it.

^{As a people we had overlooked, we} ~~We~~ had overlooked the social menace of unemployment. Periodic unemployment ~~makes for irregular habits, shiftlessness,~~ destroys morale, and undermines a laborer's pride and self-respect. It discourages those who see their small savings, which they had through careful economy set aside for the education of their children or for the purchase of a home slowly eaten up by the lean weeks and months of unemployment. As their savings vanish, their pride too, and their ambitions vanish. Unemployment disrupts families, ~~so~~ ^{for} many a man finds the burden of caring for a family too heavy to bear when he is unable to find work.

Unemployment was forcing thousands to the doors of charitable institutions and nothing is more degrading and desolating. ~~For the family of a self-respecting workingman to be compelled to ask charity is to drain the last bitter dregs of the cup of life.~~ This social pauperization of the manhood and womanhood of our land is a blot on the honor of ~~this~~ the fairest and richest country in the world.

~~47~~ 61. 6/

E

The fear of joblessness is ~~dreadfully demoralizing~~. It robs a man of that sense of security and stability upon which alone permanent character values can be built. Unemployment is also hurtful to industry and business. ~~A workingman cannot be loyal to an industry which may at any moment, at the slightest fluctuation in the market, throw him out upon want and misery.~~ It also interferes seriously with industrial efficiency and organization.

Unemployment, I was convinced, ^{was} ~~is~~ not an insoluble problem. Periodic fluctuations of prosperity and depression ^{was} ~~are~~ not inevitable. The business cycle, ^{could} ~~can be~~, to a large extent, ^{be} controlled. If the same amount of intelligent research and ~~inventive~~ ingenuity which has gone into technical improvement and the production end of American industry had gone into the problem of the regularization of production, the stabilization of markets, and the control of credits, the dread ghost of the business cycle would have been laid long ago.

~~Above all~~, I urged that a law should be passed establishing compulsory unemployment insurance for all workingmen. Every workingman is entitled to be protected against involuntary unemployment, just as he is entitled to be protected against the disability of sickness and old age. Unemployment insurance is a legitimate charge against industry the same as accident insurance or fire insurance. ~~The~~ An insurance plan should be so drafted and ~~the~~ premiums should be so graded as to put financial pressure upon the employer to ^{regularize} steady employment within his industry.

The first concern of a country should be its laboring population. The security of a country rests upon a contented working class. Rich and prosperous America can not afford to subject millions to recurrent periods of unemployment and want and to drive thousands to beggary and alms taking.

- 48 - 3.71

E

The Consumers League of Ohio had since ~~1928~~ been studying the problem of unemployment which was beginning to assume serious proportions. I urged upon it ^{in 1928} ~~that year~~ the wisdom of concentrating on unemployment insurance as a means of solving the relief problem which was caused by unemployment. "I should like to see a great movement started in this country on the part of those who are alert to the situation, for unemployment insurance." In April, 1930, the League appointed a committee to ~~make a~~ study ~~of~~ unemployment insurance with the idea of framing legislation on the subject. The committee consisted of economists, representatives of labor and industry, social workers, and civic and religious leaders. It met in the Parlor of my Temple on Friday evenings for a period of six months. It studied intensively every phase of unemployment insurance and the insurance plans which had been adopted ⁱⁿ ~~by~~ other countries.

As an outgrowth of this study, it was decided to sponsor a bill for unemployment insurance in the Ohio Legislature. A public meeting of citizens was ~~then~~ called on December 15, 1930, to receive the draft of the proposed bill for consideration and action. At this meeting, the Cleveland Committee for Unemployment Insurance was officially organized and I was elected Chairman. The meeting ~~meeting~~ voted to authorize the Chairman to appoint committees to secure the endorsement of other organizations throughout the State, to interview members of the Ohio Legislature, to organize a Speakers Bureau and to do whatever else was necessary to further the movement.

Our Bill was introduced in the Ohio State Legislature in January, 1931. It was known as the Reynolds-Keifer Bill. Hearings on the Bill were held in Columbus and I appeared before the Legislature on February 17th.

Prior to my appearance, the Executive Director of the State Council of Retail Merchants circularized the membership of the Council with the warning: "When the eloquent Rabbi Silver appears in Columbus before legislative committees, with packed galleries, pleading for such a cause, LOOK OUT!"

At these hearings I said:

"You have listened this evening to the proponents who came from the ranks of business-men, laboring men, social workers, teachers, economic experts. I should like to have you hear a word from another profession, the profession of the ministry. I believe that I voice, in a measure, its sentiments on this subject. We are all devoting ourselves to the task of translating some of the basic moral ideals of our religions into concrete human institutions, just laws and a better way of life for all our people.

"I have been amazed in recent years as I became progressively more and more aware of this problem, of the relative indifference of the American public to the whole problem of unemployment until it becomes as acute as it has in recent months. We assume that unemployment is inherent in our industrial system and can offer only emergency relief. We have overlooked

E

the social menace of unemployment. . . It has been said that irregular employment makes for irregular character, makes for a break-up of personality. Social workers tell us of the disruption which results when the head of the family fails to provide for the needs of the family. He cannot endure the silent rebuke of wife and children. Unemployment is forcing tens of thousands of self-respecting working-men to the humiliation of begging at the doors for charity.

"This Bill will not solve the problem of unemployment but it will solve some of its evils. It substitutes for our unplanned anti-social relief a dignified American method of relief. This Bill is an insurance measure and not a 'dole'. It is the very antithesis of the dole. . . The beneficiary pays for the protection which he receives and the amount is clearly fixed. The plan is actuarilly sound.

" It places no additional burden on the people of the State of Ohio, for we are already spending millions in taking care of the unemployed in an inefficient, haphazard sort of way. . . Why should not the great State of Ohio take the first step in the right direction which will immediately be followed by other states ?

"Insurance will help our state when it most needs help -- during periods of economic depression.

"The mind of the American working-man today is very restive. During the next decade we will have to pay for the undernourishment of these years, for the partial starvation to which we are subjecting our children. How long will the American working-man tolerate a system which compels him to use up his savings periodically? Russia is a challenge to our whole system, which seems to acknowledge that unemployment and misery are inherent in our

10 E

capitalistic system. You do not believe it, nor do I.

"This Bill is sound, this Bill is practical, ^{it is conservative,} It has taken into account all the experiences of ^{other countries} Germany and England. ~~Why shouldn't the great State of Ohio take the first step which will immediately be followed by other industrial states?~~

"I voice the ^{earnest} sentiment of men and women who work in the field of religion, who are close to men and women in their ^{great} needs."

There were those who spoke against the bill, representatives of industry and business.

Both the Ohio Chamber of Commerce and the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce worked for its defeat.

The Bill was killed in the Senate on March 12th, and in the House on March 26th. However, as a result of the great interest ^{which was} aroused in unemployment insurance by the introduction of the Bill and due to the manifold activities of our committee ^{throughout the State} the Ohio Legislature on April 9, 1931, ^{acted} cited favorably upon the recommendation of Governor White for the appointment of a Commission "to investigate the practicability and the advisability of setting up unemployment reserves or insurance funds to provide against the risk of unemployment, and to recommend what form of legislation, if any, may be wise or suitable to Ohio as a separate State and which may seem to offer the best preventive remedy to avoid future distress and suffering, such as is being undergone by our citizens who are unable to find work through no fault of their own".

-52- 11/ E

Governor White appointed this Commission in November, 1931. It consisted of ten members with Senator J. A. Reynolds of Cleveland as Chairman and Elizabeth S. Magee, as Secretary. The Commission included a prominent industrialist, the Secretary of the Ohio State Federation of Labor, the Master of the Ohio Grange, the Secretary of ~~one of the~~ ^{Springfield} Chambers of Commerce ~~of Ohio~~, two professors of Economics -- one from Antioch and the other from Ohio State University, the Director of Information Bureau on Women's Work, an attorney from Cleveland, later to become United States Senator, the National Secretary of B'nai B'rith, and myself.

This Commission worked for a year and made a thorough study of the ~~whole~~ field of unemployment insurance, and on October 26, 1932 it presented its conclusions, together with ~~a~~ ^{the} draft of a bill for an Unemployment Insurance Law. The Commission had held many public hearings throughout the state in order to get a better picture of the distress from unemployment and of the problems and methods of public and private relief and to hear the views of citizens on unemployment insurance.

The Commission found that "unemployment insurance is not only desirable and practical but that the state cannot safely face the employment insecurity of the future without preparing for it by a compulsory system of insurance".

The report, as might be expected, was not unanimous. Two members, representing the employers and the Ohio Grange dissented: "Instead of a substitute for charity", they wrote to the Governor, "the proposed Bill presents an additional form of charity which may easily induce idleness, discourage thrift and leave a large part of the present charity load as a public charge while

- 53 - 12 ✓

the cost of compulsory unemployment insurance must eventually be borne by labor, the tax-payer or the consuming public".

Later on, the representative of the employers on the Commission, a Cleveland manufacturer, ^{J.} C. F. Lincoln, in addressing the Associated Industries of Cleveland, charged that the three Jewish members of the Commission (Dr. I. M. Rubinow, Professor William M. Leiserson and ~~me~~ ^(S.F.)) were the authors responsible for the Unemployment Insurance Bill, and ~~he~~ ^{he} went on to say that all three were foreign-born, "their background was a tradition of a land of pogroms, exile and serfdom, also one of despotism, persecution, misery and immemorial hatred". He questioned whether "these sponsors of the Bill had absorbed the American spirit of initiative, of individual responsibility, and self-reliance sufficiently to be trusted with the handling of major social and political problems of the country".

The Ohio Chamber of Commerce, in a brochure which analyzed the Commission's report expressed "its resentment at the impudent challenge hurled at us by foreign propagandists". It asked, "When were Christian charity, family love, neighborly kindness and human brotherhood scientific ?". It further stated that "this attempt to foist upon the United States foreign ideals, foreign practices during this trying period is indefensible and disloyal".

The Unemployment Insurance Bill of the Commission was introduced into the Ohio Legislature in 1933. It was known as the Harrison-Keifer Bill. The Bill became nationally known as the Ohio Plan and served as a model for unemployment insurance bills in many states in the Union.

~~5~~ 13 E

This Bill passed the House but was killed in the Senate.

Organized labor at first ~~approved~~ ^{approved} unemployment insurance but by 1932, a complete reversal of attitude took place in the part of the American Federation of Labor. Thereafter, unemployment insurance had ^{organized labor} as one of its staunchest friends in the State, organized labor.

In 1934, I went to Washington and appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House to advocate the passing of the Wagner-Lewis Bill for Unemployment Insurance .

In June, 1934, I called a conference in Columbus to plan the drafting and presentation of a third unemployment insurance ^{Bill} Bill.

In 1935, a third ^{Bill} Bill was introduced, known as the ^{Boyd-Hunter B.A} Bill, which, like the preceding ^{Bill} Bill, embodied the recommendation of the Ohio Commission on Unemployment Insurance. This Bill passed the House but was killed in the Senate.

Finally, in December 1936, at a special session of the Legislature, a Unemployment Insurance Bill was passed by the State of Ohio which, in the main, followed the provisions of the original Commission Bill. Thus, seven years of unflagging labor and devotion to a cause were finally crowned with success.

Through the years before its enactment into law, the Ohio Plan was discussed in many states of the Union and stimulated action in many of them. It was, in a way, the forerunner of unemployment insurance in the United States.

Early in 1954, I was invited by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to testify on Bill S-692 which had been introduced the previous year -- a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin and ancestry.

I intended to attend the hearings
~~was set for the hearings~~ on January 19th but *because they were* postponed to March.

did I ~~could~~ not attend in person and *so* I sent a statement *which was requested* to be incorporated

in the record of the hearings. In this statement I declared:

"We have prided ourselves on our doctrine of "free enterprise".

How much free enterprise is there for an American citizen of dark color -- or of minority religions -- if his advancement is restricted, or made impossible by his race or creed? Is it not fair to say that individual enterprise can only be made truly free when every man's achievement is limited only by his own ability and merit?....

"What cannot be measured is the unmeasurable hope and sense of status that the mere passage of such legislation brings to millions of our fellow Americans....

"A second potential boon of FEPC is the strengthening of our unity as a people. It is of the essence of Americanism that we are unafraid of frank controversy on all manner of social, economic and political questions. But there is a type of controversy that is fruitless and destructive -- the controversy that pits race against race and religion against religion in matters of earning a livelihood. The real

-2-15

E

issues and problems confronting us are so grave that we dare not squander our strength on such internecine disputes. In the last analysis there are only two ways to answer the increasingly articulate demand for full rights by racial and minority groups: there is the way of segregation and oppression and there is the way of equality of opportunity. The first is a direction which leads to Conflict and violence. The second leads to harmony and a united people. It is my belief that FEP legislation represents a significant step in this second, constructive direction.

"The third major basis for urging enactment of the legislation before you is the contribution which it can make to strengthen our political and moral leadership on the international scene. I had occasion recently to express my belief that the coming age will be a great age for America. I stated:

"The next hundred years is likely to be known as the American Century, in the same sense as the 19th century was The Century of Great Britain. Destiny has singled out our beloved country, the foremost democracy on earth, to give leadership to the world and to lead mankind out of the grave, social, political and economic predicaments in which it finds itself. I believe that American leadership will prove itself equal to the challenge, if it will take counsel of faith and not of fear, and if it will be guided by the prophetic insights and the wide perspectives of the Founding Fathers of this Republic."

The war and the Bolshevik Revolution had brought misery and suffering upon the Jews of Russia.

The American Joint Distribution Committee had been conducting campaigns to raise funds to help these victims of war and persecution not only in Russia but in Eastern Europe and in many other lands. The Joint Distribution Committee enjoyed splendid lay-leadership and a competent and dedicated staff. Its services over-seas won the commendation and confidence of American Jewry.

In 1925, the leaders of the J. D. C. became interested in a project of large-scale Jewish colonization in Southern Russia and in the Crimea. The father of the plan was Dr. Joseph A. Rosen. He urged colonization as the most expedient form of reconstruction work for the J. D. C., to undertake. Jewish mass colonization in Russia, he maintained, was feasible, and the political and economic conditions there favored such colonization.

This colonization project had aroused much interest among American Jews, but also considerable opposition -- especially among the Zionist forces who feared that it would be a severe competition to the colonization work in which the Movement was presently engaged in in Palestine. They were bringing thousands of Jewish refugees into the country as part of their program to build the Jewish National Home.

F

The J. D. C. planned a campaign to raise fifteen million dollars. The first nine million dollars would be set aside for three years colonization work in Russia. A National Conference was held in Philadelphia in September of that year, which was attended by hundreds of delegates from all parts of the country. Many leaders of American Jewry were present.

Zionist leaders also attended this Conference and expressed their fears and misgivings about colonization undertakings in Russia. "What about Jewish colonization in Palestine?", they asked. "Why should not the two campaigns be combined?" "Wherein is the wisdom of dealing with the Soviet Union which the United States has not yet recognized?"

Logically, of course, the two campaigns should have been merged. They both aimed at the re-settlement of Jews -- the one in the Crimea, the other in Palestine. However, the leaders of American Jewry were not yet ready for such a merger. It would take five more years -- the creation in Zurich of an enlarged Jewish Agency for Palestine, and the bloody riots in Palestine in 1929 -- to bring about the formation of an Allied Jewish Campaign for the combined work of the J. D. C. in the Diaspora, and the Zionist Organization in Palestine.

At the Philadelphia Conference, a compromise resolution was finally agreed upon. A paragraph was included in the Resolution which stated that: "The Conference regards it as self-evident that American Jewry, whenever called upon, is prepared generously to support the work of Jewish re-settlement in Palestine. It is persuaded that through the Jewish Agency

F

and other instrumentalities, the Jews of America will always give adequately and generously of their strength and substance to the performance of this great historic task."

David A. Brown of Detroit, a most dynamic campaigner, who had earlier successful campaigns to his credit, was appointed National Chairman.

The controversy over Russian colonization, however, was not to end there.

Prior to the Philadelphia Conference, I had written to Mr. Brown of my opposition to the so-called Crimean project. He replied that he hoped that my final judgment would be based upon facts as presented and not upon any prejudices which may come through my feeling for the Zionist cause:

"You are so vital to not only Cleveland and Ohio but to the balance of the country that I ask you again to withhold your judgment until all the facts are presented to you." To this letter I replied:

COPY

34

F

September sixteenth
1925

Mr. David A. Brown,
United Jewish Campaign,
512 Pershing Square Bldg.,
New York City.

// My dear Mr. Brown,

// I have read your kind letter of September tenth and regret that my opposition to the so-called Crimean project hurt you. I would not do that for the world, but you realize I am sure, that in matters such as these, involving fundamental outlooks, men must follow their own light.

// I am surprised that you assumed that my opposition to Russian colonization was due entirely to my Zionism. That is not the fact. I was instrumental in a measure in keeping the "Crimean" resolution off the floor of the Vienna Conference, because I did not regard it as a Zionist issue.

// I read Dr. Rosen's report, even as I read everything which he wrote heretofore and everything which you wrote. I am still of the opinion that mass colonization in Russia is a stupendous blunder. I am confident that five or ten years will prove me right. I need not go into the reasons for the position which I take. I assume that many of them were stated at the Philadelphia Conference. I am of the opinion that should present conditions in Russia improve, the Jew will not stay on the farm. Should they grow worse, he will be wiped off the farm.

// It is naive to assume that the settlement of a few thousand families upon the soil and the expenditure of a few millions of American dollars will reconstruct Jewish life in Russia -- as the grandiose publicity of the J. D. C. announced. The reconstruction of Russian Jewish life is contingent upon the reconstruction of Bolshevist Russia through the revision of its economic policies. This will come to pass sooner or later.

// The resolution which was adopted at the Philadelphia Conference is in the nature of a compromise. I am perfectly willing to abide by those decisions, although there seems to be room for various and opposing interpretations of these resolutions. If Mr. Rosenwald's position is to become the official interpretation of this resolution -- that the first nine million dollars raised must go for Russian colonization, and if Russian colonization will continue to be featured as the outstanding object of this campaign, many of us will find ourselves embarrassed when it comes to the task of assisting in raising the funds.

"I cannot free myself from the thought that for the price of a few thousand acres of confiscated land, Soviet Russia has purchased the finest propaganda machine in America. Marshall's address at the Philadelphia Conference was but one of the many apologies for Soviet Russia which the spokesmen of the J. D. C. will be compelled to make in order to justify their colonization project. I note that an attempt was even made at the Conference to stifle all criticism of Soviet Russia -- a government which has proscribed the teaching of our religion and which is directly responsible for the godlessness and the appalling ignorance concerning our faith and our ideals of half the Jewish youth of Russia today.

"However, in the face of what has been hailed as "the harmony resolution" of the Conference, I shall, for the time being at least, remain silent.

"There is in all this, of course, my dear Mr. Brown, not a scintilla of criticism of you or of the sincerity and honesty of your position. We just see things differently. Time alone will prove which of us is right."

Not long after the Philadelphia Conference, David Brown sent out letters inviting a number of outstanding Jews in the United States to join a National Committee for the Campaign. In this letter he quoted the full text of the Resolution which had been adopted in Philadelphia but omitted the paragraph about the support for Palestine which was the very basis of the compromise.

When I received the invitation to join the National Committee, I wrote to Mr. Brown ~~the following~~, stating that "I feel that until such times as it becomes apparent what you and your friends will do in a practical way this year for colonization in Palestine, I must refrain from participating in any campaign for Russian colonization."

F

My letter, in which I declined to serve as a National Chairman of the Campaign was evidently brought to the attention of Louis Marshall, who so vigorously championed Russian colonization at the Conference. Mr. Marshall was the outstanding Jewish layman of his day. His authentic leadership was acknowledged by American Jewry. He was a vigorous champion of Jewish rights and was in sympathy with every constructive movement in Jewish life. He was a friend of Palestine and, within a few years, he was to become the prime non-Zionist mover in the formation of an enlarged Jewish Agency for Palestine which was consummated in Zurich in 1929. Mr. Marshall wrote me the following letter:

C
O
P
Y

GUGGENHEIMER, UNTERMYER & MARSHALL
120 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

October 24, 1925

Dear Rabbi Silver:

" Yours of the 15th instant to Mr. David A. Brown has been brought to my attention. It is because of the very high esteem in which I hold you that I am persuaded that your letter is the outcome of a misunderstanding.

" If you had been present at the Philadelphia Conference, I am sure that you would not have declined to become a member of the National Committee of the United Jewish campaign. It was there pointed out, as is the fact, that in May last the Joint Distribution Committee, together with the American Jewish Relief Committee, the Central Relief Committee and the Peoples Relief Committee, recognizing that conditions in Eastern Europe were such as to necessitate a continuance of the assistance which we had rendered during the past ten years, concluded that it was the duty of American Jewry to contribute during the next three years \$15,000,000 to that end. It was never the purpose of these committees to concentrate on agricultural work in Russia -- in fact it was intended that the greater part of the funds collected would go for other purposes, as, for instance, the creation of Kassar, to supply capital to small tradesmen, to assist artisans, to continue child-care, refugee, sanitation and cultural work in various parts of Eastern Europe, and to some extent to continue the health work which we had begun in Palestine. There was no possible question as to the crying need which existed and continues to exist. We were admonished that this was the fact not only by our own representatives, but by the many organizations whose representatives had come to the United States to collect funds for various of these objects, thus creating untold embarrassment among the Jews of this country, who were called upon to contribute to organizations of which they knew nothing. Among the responsible men who had come to this country for such a purpose was Rabbi M. Eisenstadt, formerly of Petrograd, who was explicit in his insistence on the importance of all of these humanitarian obligations.

" The conference at Philadelphia was called to further the campaign to raise these funds. There were those who opposed the assistance of the Jews in any part of the world except Palestine, and the fear was expressed that if the United Jewish Campaign was launched, it might interfere with the plans of those who were seeking to raise funds for Palestine. The matter was fully discussed. Speaking with

- 8 -
10-13
F

authority, I stated, and now repeat, that although this campaign was intended to take care of the Jews of Eastern Europe, those connected with the Joint Distribution Committee had in the past shown their recognition of the needs of Palestine by distributing over \$7,000,000 of our funds for Palestine, at a time when scarcely a dollar came from any other source, that we had contributed to Keren Hayesod, and that many of us had cooperated with Dr. Weizmann in seeking to secure increased contributions for that organization, that we participated in the effort to induce non-Zionists to cooperate with the Zionists in connection with the Jewish Agency, whose principal function, I conceive to be to help in the raising of funds for Palestine, and that we likewise were engaged in seeking capital for the Palestine Economic Corporation. I then stated, with the sanction of my associates, that at the proper time we would do all in our power to help the cause of Palestine and to assist in the effort to raise adequate funds, for its needs. There was and is no dissent from that point of view among my associates. Later in the session a committee was appointed to prepare the resolutions to which you have referred. They speak for themselves. Nobody connected with the United Jewish Campaign is desirous of modifying those resolutions to the extent of a hair's breadth.

" The fact that Mr. Brown, in his letter of invitation, did not quote these resolutions in full and omitted the paragraph concerning Palestine, is entirely beside the question. He had previously given extensive publicity to these resolutions. The letter which he was writing related to the United Jewish Campaign. The clause in the resolution regarding Palestine had no materiality in respect to that campaign. Nobody ever intended, except to the extent to which I have referred that any part of the funds raised in the campaign was to be pledged for Palestine. It was understood that that would be an entirely separate and independent campaign.

" You say in your letter: "American Jewry has now waited for action in behalf of Palestine -- not merely expressions of good will." I am at a loss to understand what more can be done than has been done so far as the United Jewish Campaign is concerned. What was desired at Philadelphia was an expression of good will. That was given without mental reservations. I am confident that the purpose expressed will be carried out, unless we are prevented from doing so.

" You refer to our campaign as one "for Russian colonization." That phrase was used merely for the sake of brevity. Everybody knew what was meant. It was, to help the Jews who desired to engage in agriculture in Russia on lands set apart for that purpose, to have the opportunity to do so so far as we could supply funds for that purpose within the limits of our appropriation for that object, and so far as consistent with our obligations to other humanitarian and constructive purposes in Eastern Europe.

- 9 - ~~SECRET~~
- 1 -

" Though we have rarely met, I am confident that I have read you aright when I express the belief that you do not fail to recognize the needs of our co-religionists in Eastern Europe and the duty that we owe to them, and that you would be the last man in the world to say that, in view of our interest in Palestine, we can shirk our obligation to the 8,000,000 unfortunate Jews in Eastern Europe. As I have had occasion to say recently, this entire matter is one of psychology. The Jews of the United States are able and willing to help where assistance is needed. There are enough warm hearts and willing hands to help the Jews of Eastern Europe and the development of Palestine. If we go before the people with ranks divided, hesitant and doubtful, and indicating a lack of confidence in our ability to help in both directions, it will not take the people long to appreciate that fact, and there may be disappointment all around. But if we go forward, not pessimistically, but with real optimism, and show the public that we believe what we say and that we are acting in accordance with our belief, American Jewry will not fail us in either direction. Ten years ago, when we began our war relief activities, nobody would have hazarded the prophecy that the Jews of the United States would respond as they have, not only to this relief work, but to Palestine, to our various communal charities, to our educational and cultural needs, and to the erection of magnificent structures costing millions of dollars. A fine sense of responsibility has been created, and there are thousands who today find joy in giving, who formerly were indifferent because they had not realized the great moral principle which has been brought into life by the throb of human sympathy and by the spur of necessity.

" I most earnestly hope, dear Rabbi Silver, that you will reconsider your decision.

Very cordially yours,

(Signed) Louis Marshall

~~Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver
1845 East 106th Street
Cleveland, Ohio~~

In reply to Mr. Marshall, I wrote:

C
O
P
Y

— 10 —

October Twenty-ninth
1925

Mr. Louis Marshall,
Guggenheim, Untermeyer & Marshall,
120 Broadway, New York City.

My dear Mr. Marshall,

Permit me to acknowledge the receipt of your kind letter of October twenty-fourth. I appreciate very much the spirit which prompted your communication. I am fully aware of the earnestness with which you have applied yourself to the forthcoming campaign of the J. D. C. - quite in keeping with your tradition of Jewish service and leadership -- and I realize that the differences of opinion which have arisen are a source of great concern to you.

I need not assure you, my dear Mr. Marshall, that I am as vitally interested in relief measures in behalf of our brothers in Eastern Europe today as I have been in the last ten years, and that I should be as eager to serve now as I was through all the earlier campaigns of the J. D. C. I have just returned from a rather extensive tour of Eastern Europe. I visited Poland, Roumania, Lithuania, Hungary and Austria. I know now more vividly than ever before what a life-saving and soul-saving benefactor the American J. D. C. has been to our people in those lands, and how desparately in need they still are of our continued help and support.

Had the projected campaign of the J. D. C. been limited to a continuation of this work, not a dissenting voice, I am sure, would have been raised in American Israel. However, for months prior to the Philadelphia Conference, a misguided publicity bureau inundated the American press with rash and pompous talk about salvaging Russian Jewry through a vast program of colonization. All other services which the J. D. C. could render Jews in Eastern Europe were completely eclipsed by this new-found panacea.

You state in your letter -- "It was never the purpose of the Committee to concentrate on agricultural work in Russia -- in fact it was intended that the greater part of the funds collected would go for other purposes". I am pleased to think that this is now the fixed policy of the J. D. C., but I am at a loss to know why greater publicity was not given to the fact heretofore, or why a budget indicating in a general way the degree of support which would be given to Russian colonization and to other enterprises have not yet been announced.

I need not restate here my position on the subject of colonization in Russia. Mr. Brown has probably sent you a copy of my letter of September sixteenth.

~~Mr. Louis Marshall~~

~~14~~
- 2 -

F

— 11 —

I wrote him then, that it was my humble opinion that mass colonization in Russia was a stupendous blunder. Should conditions in Russia improve, the Jew will not stay on the farm. Should they grow worse, he will not be permitted to remain on the farm. It is naive to assume that the settlement of a few thousand families on the soil and the expenditure of a few millions of American dollars will reconstruct Jewish life in Russia, as the grandiose publicity of the J. D. C. announced. The reconstruction of Russian Jewish life is contingent upon the reconstruction of Bolshevist Russia through a revision of its economic policy. This will come to pass sooner or later.

^ However, I stated to Mr. Brown that in view of the Philadelphia Resolution (which refused to make Russian colonization the central motive of the Conference, and which at the same time recognized the upbuilding of Palestine as a direct and immediate challenge to American Jewry) that I was content to remain silent and to refrain from actively opposing the colonization project in Russia so as not to limit the other relief agencies which will be helped by this campaign. Mr. Brown has now scrapped the Philadelphia agreement by omitting the paragraph on Palestine, which alone made that agreement possible. By this act he served notice that in the forthcoming campaign Palestine will be completely ignored. It is not even to be mentioned.

^ What then is to become of Palestine?

^ You state in your letter that "at the proper time we will do all in our power to help the cause of Palestine and to assist in the effort to raise adequate funds for its needs". But in all frankness, my dear Mr. Marshall, when is this proper time to be? Does not the great emergency which has arisen in Palestine, due to the unprecedented immigration of thousands of Eastern European Jews into that country, make this the proper time? Close on to one thousand Jews are coming into Palestine weekly. Do you not think that Palestine colonization is entitled to at least that measure of real support -- not good-will and resolutions and gestures -- but real support, that Russian colonization is about to receive?

^ In deference to our common cause ought we not to face the realities of the situation frankly? The men who are at present at the head of the J. D. C. are the very men upon whom, as the result of the many months of conference and negotiation, we have counted upon to launch this year an effective campaign for Palestine. It is clear that the J. D. C. drive will absorb the major efforts of these men for perhaps two or three years and no campaign in behalf of Palestine has been launched or is even contemplated. What then is to become of Palestine?

^ Is it not then incumbent upon those of us who are impressed with the urgent needs of Palestine today to concentrate our effort on Palestine at a time when, seemingly, the most influential men in American Jewry are devoting themselves exclusively to Near East Relief and Russian Colonization?

Very sincerely yours,

The Crimean project, as is well known, petered out before very long.

Under the date of July 12, 1926, Mr. Walter Duranty, Special Correspondent to "The New York Times", quoted a statement issued by Michael Kalenin, President of the Union of Soviet Republic, in which he ~~gives~~ ^{gave} fifteen reasons which actuated the Government in settling the Jews in Russia on the land. Among the reasons given are:

"Jewish communists living among the Jewish population feel strongly that they should be settled on the land in Russia rather than become "the tools for capitalist exploitation in Palestine. The Soviet Government shares this view."

This, of course, was confirmation of our contention that the Crimean scheme was being used by Russian communists as a counter-foil to Palestine.

On July 14th, before my departure for London to attend the meeting of the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization, I issued the following statement:

"What is tremendously significant is the official acknowledgment on the part of the Soviet Government that the Crimean colonization project was launched by the Russian Bolshevists as a counterfoil to Palestine and indirectly also as a move against Great Britain.

" The Zionist Organization has for a long time been in possession of evidence concerning the ulterior motives actuating the Bolshevist protagonists of Russia of the colonization scheme, but has consistently refrained from making use of its findings so as not to hurt the important and necessary relief campaigns which were launched through the United States in behalf of the Jews of Eastern Europe. In spite of the implied antagonism to Palestine in the colonization project, the Zionists have actively cooperated in the relief campaigns throughout the country, but they have at all times regarded with misgiving this headlong movement fraught with so much uncertainty and danger.

" We have never questioned the sincerity of the leaders of the American Joint Distribution Committee, but we hope that they will be impressed by the startling disclosures contained in Kalenin's statement, and that they will be cautious in embarking further upon any extension of their colonization program.

"The Kalenin statement bears out the prediction that the settlement of Jews in Crimea would create a menacing anti-Jewish movement among the Crimean peasants. That such a hostile movement has already taken on serious proportions is indicated by the fact that Kalenin himself found it necessary to counteract it by an official appeal to the people of Crimea.

"One is disturbed, too, by the fact that according to the statement of Kalenin, the land placed at the disposal of Jewish settlers in Crimea is of an inferior quality, such as the Russian peasants could not use and such as will require the investment of millions of dollars on the part of American Jews before it can be made available for cultivation."

The Soviet Government originally intended to use the Crimean colonizations "as a base for a territorial center of the Jewish nation in the Soviet Union. According to the plan of the economist, Lanin, one of the leaders of the Komzet, more than two hundred thousand Jews were to be settled within several years in the middle section of Crimea. However, in 1928, the Soviet Executive Council decided to establish a Jewish agricultural settlement in Biro-Bidjan, and this put an end to all large-scaled plans for Jewish colonization in Crimea". (Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 3, pg. 292).

As is well known, the Biro-Bidjan project likewise petered out. American Jewish philanthropists had become excited about this project too, which was planned by the Soviet Union as a Jewish autonomous region in the Far Eastern provinces, not far from Manchukuo, on the Amur River.

This was also to be the fate of the colonization project in the Dominican Republic in 1939. Tens of thousands of Jewish refugees were to be colonized there. Agreements were entered into between a group

F

of Jewish philanthropists in the United States and the government of Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo. The first thirty-two settlers arrived in May, 1940. By the end of that year, some two hundred and ten persons had been settled, and that was it!.... The Second World War practically put a stop to the transportation of Jewish refugees to the Dominican Republic and when the war was over, nobody seemed to care very much about the project altogether.

Under the terms of the Mandate, provision was made for a Jewish Agency which was to act in an advisory and cooperative capacity to the mandatory government. The World Zionist Organization was recognized as this agency, but it was to take steps to secure the cooperation of all Jews who were willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Dr. Weizmann was eager to enlarge this agency so as to include non-Zionists. His object was, of course, to involve the wealthier Jews of the United States and of other countries who did not wish to work through the Zionist Organization, in the economic development of Palestine and to tap additional resources for the Movement.

To this end, he persuaded a group of prominent American Jewish leaders -- Louis Marshall, Cyrus Adler, Horace Stern and Herbert H. Lehman, to call a "Non-partisan Conference to Consider Palestine Problems", on February 17, 1924, at the Astor Hotel in the City of New York.

The week prior to this, Dr. Weizmann wrote to me:

"I suppose that the official invitation to the Conference on the 17th will have reached you by now and I do hope that it will be possible for you to be with us on that day. I wonder whether it will be possible for you to come to New York a day earlier so that we could have a few hours to consider matters which may arise before or during the Conference. We should also like to have a talk with you on the position of the Movement generally. We were prevented from having a private talk in Cleveland and I should very much like to make up for the loss."

I could not attend the Conference. Dr. Weitzmann was evidently pleased with the results ^{of the Conference.} A few days ^{later} ~~after the Conference~~, he wrote me:

"You will no doubt have read the short reports about the Conference which we all think was a signal success. The "New Palestine" of this week will have a full account of the proceedings and I am sure you will be as pleased as I am. We were not asked to give up anything of our principles or our intentions. It was a most harmonious meeting."

And Investment Corporation for the economic development of Palestine was voted at this Conference which was formerly merged with the Palestine Economic Corporation established by the Brandeis-Mack group.

I wrote to Dr. Weitzmann that I, too, was very pleased with the results of the Conference. "I think a very fine beginning has been made. The trick is to keep those people on the job, working."

The trick unfortunately, did not come off.

I favored the extension of the Jewish Agency right along, although quite a number of the Brandeis-Mack group, as well as other ^{Zionists}, strongly opposed it. At the Zionist Congress which convened in Zurich in 1929, the main issue was the ratification of the ^{en}larged Jewish Agency proposal. I spoke in favor of it. In my address I stated:

"An act of historic moment is about to be consummated. It will not be a precipitate act. Rarely has a matter been considered so long, so carefully and so earnestly by our organization. The whole Zionist world has for six years

G

participated in a prolonged and searching discussion of this subject, in the press, on the rostrum, at conventions and at congresses. Everything that could have been said, has been said. And now you are about to act, and I hope decisively. And a new era will begin.

I rise to speak for the American Zionists who will vote for the extended Jewish Agency. We of America are anxious, as I am sure you are, that the step which we are about to take shall eventuate in the good which we expect it to yield. America has, of course, been central in the entire project of the extended agency. The idea of extending the agency gained headway among the Zionists of the world chiefly, though not exclusively, because of the hope that it will tap new ^{resources and new power for the Jewish people} veins of strength, new resources of ~~men~~ economically prosperous Jews of America. My acquaintance with all the elements of the Jewish people in America justifies my belief that this hope will, in large measure, be realized, provided we who are here and they who will be here will bring to the new alliance a full measure of mutual confidence, a willingness to learn to understand each other and a desire to bridge gulfs and not to widen them.

the whole
will
stand
and!

I have followed with the closest attention the deliberations of this body on the subject of the agency. I have been keenly aware of the doubts and fears which have agitated many of our delegates and which were expressed here in the midst of great strain and tension. I have profoundly sympathized with all of them and personally shared some of them. Anyone who is at all sensitive to the quality of high jealous loyalty which a great ideal evokes among its devotees will readily understand that men who have through many wearying years struggled sacrificially

for the ideal of Zionism could not have approached the radically new departure which is involved in the proposed enlarged agency without great hesitancy and trepidation. No one would question the motives of those men who sought by every honorable means to safeguard the integrity of their ideal, to buttress it with constitutional guarantees and to build bulwarks and defenses around it. This has been done -- and I believe wisely done.

But, my friends, the greater task still remains. How to establish the required mood, the necessary psychological atmosphere, the favourable state of mind, in order that our new cooperative enterprise shall thrive. This has not yet been achieved, and the unavoidably² self-centered deliberations of the past few days have not contributed to this desired end. Not having the light of past experiences to guide us in this new venture, we were in the dark and in the dark it is not difficult to conjure up all sorts of ghosts and apparitions. These are still with us. It must be clear to all of us that upon the broken seas of suspicion and mistrust the craft which we have now launched, so heavily freighted with our precious cargo, cannot navigate. It will never reach port. Unless we bring to our new alliance a warm confidence, a vital eagerness and a self-assurance which does not take counsel of fear, this new alliance will prove a tragic futility. It will not enkindle the imagination of our people. It will not attract those whom we hope to attract and it will not release those new energies which we are anticipating.

G

Perhaps only time will dispell these doubts, but a beginning must even now be made. Within a very few days our new allies will come here from all parts of the world. Let us remember that they are coming not as enemies or competitors, but as friends. They come to share with us a common historic undertaking, to bear their share of a common burden, to assume with us a corporate national responsibility. They do not come to subvert or to destroy. In candour and good faith they are coming to help us build the Jewish homeland. Many of them have rendered and are rendering great and distinguished service to our people in other fields -- political, economic, cultural, religious and humanitarian. Many of them have earned by the merit of their lives the universal esteem and confidence of all groups in our population, Zionist and Non-Zionist, native or foreign born, orthodox or reform, labour or capital. They represent the best and worthiest in our communal life.

Please remember that those who are vehemently opposed to us will not wish to enter the new compact. They will avoid it. For we have nothing to offer them but heavy burdens and hard work. Those who are coming are men who love their people, who are vitally concerned about its survival, and who see in Palestine not another opportunity for the exercise of their philanthropic impulses -- opportunities which are not wanting them elsewhere -- but the altogether unique and challenging opportunity to assist in the realization of vast historic purpose -- the physical and cultural upbuilding of our homeland. Perhaps unconsciously they too have now been caught up by the mighty rhythm of our peoples forward march. Perhaps they too have now

been stirred by the cadence of the life-song of our people's resurrection. They wish the great experiment ^{which is} without historic precedent ~~is~~ of the ingathering of a world — dispersed people -- their people -- to succeed. They wish to share in the pride of its success.

They are not avowedly Zionists, to be sure. They are not imbued with our ideology. They have lived in a world different and removed from that in which many of us have lived. On the other hand, it is clear even to the casual observer, that they are groping for a new ideology, a new intellectual adjustment, a new way of Jewish living. The old slogans no longer satisfy them. Perhaps it is this unsatisfied hunger which is propelling them to Palestine and to us. Perhaps in seeking Palestine, they are seeking their own lost identity. Perhaps in finding Palestine, they will find themselves.

If we meet them in complete sympathy and trust, relying on time, experience and the magic alchemy of Palestine to win them over to our doctrine, even as they have now been won over to our work, then we will live to bless this day and this act. If, on the other hand, we shall confront them as an armed camp, bristling with prejudgments and suspicions, set as it were for a conflict of wills and purposes, with minds shut in, dour and prickly, we shall destroy even more than we are now attempting to build.

We, the American Zionists, regard the action which will be taken tonight as evidence not of weakness but of vigour. It is to us evidence of the virile pliability of a living organism, of a movement which has not permitted itself to become rigid and inflexible. We have made a new adjustment, which entails no break. This is the way of life and progress.

Let us face the new era in hopefulness. Let us have faith in ourselves, in the all-conquering power of our ideal and in the transforming power of Palestine. Let those who are now coming work with us in a Union *§acrée*, a *Brith Kadosh*. Let them work with us in Palestine. Let the spirit of that land enter into their blood. Let them come in contact with all that the indefeasible spirit of our people has builded there, our settlements and our colonies, our schools and our university, our speech and our culture, our Palestinian manhood and womanhood and youth, and we have no doubt but what Palestine will persuade them and exalt them. "

I was later present in Zurich when the enlarged Jewish Agency was finally constituted amidst much ceremony and rejoicing. It was the second high point in Dr. Weitzmann's diplomatic career, the first being the Balfour Declaration. He had worked for it hard for almost a decade. It involved ~~the~~ a radical re-organization ^{of} the Zionist Movement. This was strongly resisted in many quarters. As I indicated, Zionists were asked to relinquish their sole control over Zionist activities ^{and Zionist funds} in Palestine. Inordinate hopes were fixed upon the consummation of the enlarged Jewish Agency, but when it was consummated, the high waters began to recede quickly. With the sudden death of Louis Marshall, and later of Lord Melchett, disintegration set in. The anticipation of large financial support which the "notables" would provide, never materialized. Neither Dr. Weitzmann nor Justice Brandeis ever succeeded in moving the "big givers" to large-scale generosity. Actually,

G

less money was collected by the Keren Hayesod during the decade following the creation of the Enlarged Jewish Agency than in the decade preceding it. A contributing factor to this sorry record was undoubtedly the disastrous economic depression which set in in the United States and in other parts of the world in 1929.

It would take another World War, Hitler, and the threatened extermination of European Jewry to open the flood-gates of Jewish generosity, and here, again, principally of the masses of our people and of the middle classes.

This major effort of Dr. Weizmann, unsuccessful though it proved, was, however, not a total loss. The direct results were disappointing but there were some valuable by-products in terms of propaganda and increased prestige for the Movement. One is left wondering, however, whether these by-products justified the years of labor, struggle and controversy which had been invested in this enterprise.

In 1932, I was given a sabbatical year, leave-of-absence, by my congregation. I spent it abroad in Berlin, Paris, Prague, Rome, Geneva and in Palestine. For the first time I came face-to-face with Fascism and Nazism in their native homes. The Fascist regime in Italy was then celebrating the tenth anniversary of Mussolini's March on Rome. While I was in Berlin in January, 19³3, the Nazis took over the government of Germany. I also attended the sessions of the League of Nations in Geneva and was present when the critical debate on Manchuria took place.

Everybody knew that the Sino-Japanese conflict over Manchuria had brought the League to the first searching test of its career. Heretofore, the League had intervened more or less successfully in conflicts where only smaller nations were involved. Now one of the Big Five was vitally involved. The League must now reveal its true character. Was it really a competent international organization to ensure peace, ~~which was~~ resolved to enforce the principles and agreements of the pact upon all the signatories alike without fear of favor, or was it merely a creature of the great powers who would allow it freedom of speech and action only when their own private interests were not jeopardized? What will the League do in this critical juncture? All possible excuses for delay had now been exhausted. It was now more than a year since China had appealed to the League against Japan's invasion of Manchuria. It was almost a year now since Japan, at the League's intercession, had agreed to an immediate cessation of

~~the League's intercession~~

hostilities and to the withdrawal of her troops. Following that solemn pledge, Japan had proceeded to ignore it and to do as she pleased. The League had invoked no sanctions against Japan but had resorted to the well-known device of appointing a fact-finding Commission. The Lytton Commission was appointed, and after months of close investigation, its report was finally submitted to the Council of the League. The report, remarkable for its thoroughness and unbiased judgment, found Japan's aggression in Manchuria unwarranted by any consideration of self-defense and furthermore declared that the new state of Manchukuo, which Japanese bayonets had carved out of China was nothing more than a Japanese puppet state.

The Assembly was now meeting to make the final disposition of the case. The hour of decision had arrived.

Many delegates took part in the momentous debate. Dr. Yen spoke for China. Matsuoka spoke for Japan. There were those who spoke for the smaller nations -- for Ireland, Czecho-Slovakia, Sweden, Spain. These all spoke in defense of China and against Japan. If Japan were allowed to go unchecked and the League in this emergency were to be found powerless in checking the aggression of a great power, then their own security from aggression was gone and the League was a broken reed to lean on.

Everyone now waited to hear the spokesman of the Great Powers. Paul Boncour arose to speak for France. One never realized how pliant and flexible a language French can be in the hands of one who wished to

~~zigzag~~, dodge and wriggle round a moral issue. Paul Boncour's speech was so finely spun, so dexterous and so meaningless that men declared it to be diplomacy at its very best. He was followed by Sir John Simon, speaking for Great Britain. Sir John was also at his barrister's best. He could see both sides of the case. On the one hand, etc., but on the other hand, etc., Therefore, one must not proceed with undue haste.

And so Great Britain, too, would not take sides. It was all over then. The great drama of Geneva had petered out into a sour comedy. One knew now that the League would do nothing in the Manchurian situation. What took place that day in Geneva was the beginning of the end of the League of Nations.

From Geneva I went to Rome and there I had an interview with the Duce. Premier Mussolini was, at that time, riding high. He was celebrating triumphantly the tenth anniversary of Fascism in Italy, which he established. Within another ten years, his battered and riddled body would be hanging face down from a lamp-post in Milan, his empire gone, his country in total collapse. But on the day that I saw him in the Pallazo Venezia in Rome, he looked and acted as if he were the favorite of the gods. In our conversation he prescribed not only for Italy, but for the United States as well. He thought that a central master mind and central economic planning and control were necessary in a country like America.

He prided himself on the religious tolerance which existed in his country and declared that there was no anti-Semitism in Italy. Here Jews occupied positions of high importance. He expressed the thought that the increase in anti-Semitism in Europe in recent years was a result of economic dislocations and said that he thought it would wane with the return of normal times.

It would not be long before Mussolini would join the Axis and would abandon his religious tolerance and accept the racism of the Nazis and their shameful anti-Jewish program.

I arrived in Berlin on January 22, 1933, at the beginning of what turned out to be the most exciting fortnight in the political history of Germany. I found the city on edge. The Nazis were staging one of their quasi-military demonstrations.

Three days later, in spite of bitter cold weather, fifty thousand communists staged a counter-demonstration. "Berlin is ours", they cried.

On the following Sunday, a hundred thousand Social Democrats with bands playing and banners flying marched into the great Lustgarten Square shouting, "Berlin bleibt rot (Berlin remains Red)".

In the meantime, the political pot was boiling and spilling over. Von Schleicher's brief regime of less than two months as Chancellor seemed to be coming to an end.

On January 28th he resigned. Forty-eight hours of terrific suspense now followed. Who would succeed von Schleicher?

Hindenburg now called upon the former Chancellor, Franz von Papen to negotiate with the political party leaders for the formation of a new Cabinet "within the framework of the Constitution and in agreement with the Reichstag". Who would be the new Chancellor? Would it be Hitler? -- Hitler, the firebrand, the agitator, who had promised his followers that heads would roll in the dust once he came into power. But Hindenburg had twice refused him the Chancellorship.

And then suddenly with the force and speed of a thunderbolt came the announcement that a new Cabinet had been formed and that Hitler was made Chancellor. Berlin was stunned. The Nazis were delirious with joy. Their long-hoped-for day of triumph had finally come.

Almost immediately, the Nazi newspaper appeared with screaming headlines: "Chancellor Hitler!" "German Berlin!" "Hang the flags out". A huge torchlight procession was held in the evening. Thousands upon thousands of Hitler shock-troops and Steel Helmets carrying torches marched shouting "Heil Hitler" and singing "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles". Past the President's Palace they marched where the erst-while insignificant Army Corporal, now Chancellor of the German Reich, ~~Hitler~~, received their homage.

H

I stood on the curb and watched the procession.

I knew, of course, what the rise of Hitler to power would mean to the Jews of Germany but I under-estimated the depth of depravity of the man and his regime. I thought at the time that it was possible, and perhaps likely, that the Nazi leaders, now shouldered with political responsibility, would be sobered by these responsibilities and would not attempt to carry out their fantastic schemes against the Jewish citizens of Germany. I was beguiled by the thought, as were so many German Jews at the time, that "one does not eat his soup as hot as it is cooked".

The German Jews with whom I spoke soon after the rise of Hitler to power, were concerned, of course, but were not greatly frightened. They were preparing themselves for the storm which they knew was coming but which, they were confident, would sooner or later blow over.

This, unfortunately, was not to be.

When I returned to the United States five months later, the Nazis had already shown what their tactics were. Upon my arrival, in an interview with the press, I said: "The Jews of Germany are being sacrificed to a racial Moloch, the like of which the world has never seen. The Jews are doomed to be helots or aliens in Germany unless they obtained a legal status as a minority nationality within the state. The Jew is on the rack in Germany. Nazi atrocities are unlike ~~T~~zarist atrocities. They are deadlier.

They are calculated to strangle a community of six hundred thousand souls by encompassing it on all sides with increasingly tighter economic and educational barriers. They are being forced from public life, from the professions, from the arts, from the schools and universities. They are being hampered at every turn in their economic freedom. ~~Z~~zarist Russia made pogroms on the Jews and found it necessary at least to apologize. Nazi Germany is engaged in the meanest dry pogrom known in history and shamelessly brags about it. The military spirit is again rampant in Germany. It is being fostered by the press, the platform, the theatre, the movies, even by the pulpit which has become a lackey of the state. The youth of Germany is being indoctrinated with the same Valhalla complex of military grandeur and imperial destiny which led to 1914. Germany must not be permitted to re-arm. Nazism is a clenched fist raised against the world and an armed Nazism cannot be trusted to preserve the peace of the world. Germany's plea at the disarmament conference for equality is a plea to re-arm and a menace to the world."

Soon after my return I began to work actively in campaigns for the relief of German Jewry. It was at that time, too, that I helped to organize the economic boycott against the Nazis.

After I left Berlin, I went to Prague. Ever since the First World War, I had entertained the hope of some day visiting the ~~New~~^{the} ~~Republic~~^{Republic} of Czecho-Slovakia, and particularly its President, Tomas G. Masaryk.

I had long been an admirer of this wise and courageous leader who towered majestically over all the political leaders and statesmen of Europe. I was very eager to learn what this man, the most authentic exponent of democratic ideals in the modern world, had to say in these confused and turbulent times.

I was received by the Grand Old Man of Europe in the audience chamber of the Hradcany Castle. He came in tall, erect, impressive. His eighty-three years had not bent his back, dimmed his eye nor abated his intellectual vigor. Very informally, but very earnestly, he spoke about many things for nearly an hour -- politics, religion, the blind gropings of our age for a new order of things, and on all matters the President proved to be a keen and incisive commentator who spoke as one having the authority of great knowledge and vast experience.

Around his democratic country which he, himself, had fashioned out of the chaos of war-shattered empires, now surged the raging waters of Fascism and Nazism. His land lay in the path of the political tornadoes. Everywhere about him, the democratic order was at hand-grips with dictatorships, and desperate experiments in absolutism.

"What do you, Mr. President, think of the future of democracy?", directly and without circumlocution I asked him. We were holding our interview a few days after Hitler's rise to power in Germany. His answer came, without a moment's hesitation, clear and decisive, "Democracy is

passing through a crisis but crisis does not mean defeat. Democracy is safe. Mankind has known monarchical and all forms of autocratic government in countless ages. It has experienced democracy only for a very short time. In a sense, democracy is only just coming to be. Mankind has nothing to put in its place. All dictatorial experiments are impressive but ephemeral. It has been tried before. Democracy, however, needs a great moral content today. We have^e been exploiting it exclusively for capitalistic individualism and business purposes."

"What is really at the bottom of the world's great moral confusion? What is really wrong with our age?", I asked him. He replied, "The world is morally ill. The World War was not the cause of this moral illness, but only a tragic symptom of it. The world has come to worship the machine and force, which is an expression of the machine. The things which the machine creates are looked upon as the highest values of life, and men and nations have rushed into headlong pursuits after them. Human aspirations are all too frequently only the desire to possess some kind of machine, or some machine-made toy. The world needs a new mind and a new devotion to spiritual values bound up with a realistic program of social progress."

Here President Masaryk launched into a criticism of the churches for having failed in their spiritual mission throughout the world. This failure, he held, was one of the causes of our spiritual chaos. The churches today are bureaucratic and institutionalized. They do not go out into the

highways and by-ways of life to reach and mold the personal lives of men. They have their institutions and their functionaries in every town and hamlet in the land. In many countries they have control of the education of the young, yet they fail to inspire the rising generation with enthusiasm for the moral and spiritual essentials of civilization.

There was something of the ancient prophet about this man who, in spite of the burden of more than four-score years, was still battling as fearlessly and as confidently for what he regarded as the basis and indispensable ideals of humanity as he did in the years of his youth and his early manhood.

I was greatly stirred by the faith and the steady vision of this man. The years which were to follow would not vindicate his hope that democracy was safe in the world. His own beloved country would, after a second World War, fall into a ruthless communist dictatorship such as he could never have envisioned, and this dictatorship would engulf a third of the globe. But perhaps Professor Masaryk's outlook had wider perspectives. Perhaps he was thinking in larger epochs when he said that democracy was passing through a crisis. That crisis is still going on and the final outcome is not yet in sight.

The American League for the Defense of Jewish Rights was organized in May, 1933, to fight the Nazi regime by means of a boycott. Its President was Samuel Untermyer. I was the Chairman of the Administrative Committee. When it was incorporated in November, 1933, as a membership corporation, under the laws of the State of New York, "to champion human rights... to combat religious and racial discrimination and oppression...." its name was changed to "The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights", and its officers were Samuel Untermyer, President; myself, along with James G. Gerard, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Arthur S. Tompkins and Col. Theodore Roosevelt as Vice-Presidents. A Notable group of Americans from all walks of life constituted its Board of Directors.

The Boycott was widely endorsed as civilization's only weapon against Hitlerism, short of war. Organized labor, the liberal forces of the United States, and outstanding religious leaders in the nation advocated it. There was ~~also~~ considerable opposition to an official boycott, even on the part of organized Jewish bodies, such as the B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and others. Opinions differed sharply as to its practicability and its repercussions. The large Jewishly-controlled department stores in New York City were far more reluctant to cooperate with the boycott movement than the non-Jewish stores.

While some friends of the boycott movement undoubtedly entertained the hope that it would contribute to the fall of Hitler, the greater number looked upon it as an effective weapon of protest, as a means of expressing

the ^{horror} disgust and abhorrence of the American people of the Nazi persecution ~~of~~
~~the Jewish people~~ and the shameless Nazi propgaganda which was beginning
to infiltrate ~~our~~ ^{our} cities.

I addressed many meetings in behalf of the boycott movement. ^{such meetings} Two stand
out in my memory -- one in December, 1933, in the Chicago Stadium ^{which was} attended
by some fifteen thousand people ^{in meeting} which was addressed by Dr. Paul Hutchinson,
and Dr. Carles Clayton Morrison of the "Christian Century", Dr. John Haynes
^{Holmes} ~~Holmes~~ of the Community Church of New York, Col. Raymond Robins, Solomon
O. Levinson, and others. At this meeting, a resolution was unanimously adopted
"to join in the condemnation of the inhuman conduct of the Nazi government and
to aid and cooperate to remove this vital ~~men~~ menace to liberty and civilization;
and to pledge ourselves to refrain from buying or dealing in any and all German
materials, goods and products, and to refuse to patronize or ride in German owned
or controlled steamships or other means of transportation until the stigma and
curse of Naziism were weeded out of the German government".

In addressing this Boycott rally in Chicago, I stated:

" Just why are we so aroused, so deeply stirred? Just why are we so
passionately indignant at ^{what} ~~that~~ which has happened and is happening in Germany?
After all, we are not unaccustomed to persecution. Many pages of our history
are red with the blood of Jewish martyrs ^{and} ~~and~~. What makes this latest chapter
in the story of the age-old persecution of Israel so much more horrible and
dreadful? Why are we rallying to fight against this thing as men fight against
death and the plague? There are other countries in the world today where the
Jews do not as yet enjoy full equality, ~~political or economic~~. There are other

lands in which our brethren suffer disabilities of one kind or another.

What is the difference between them and Germany?

The difference is a very vital one. In those countries especially of Eastern Europe where our people do not, as yet, possess a full measure of equality, they are hopeful of achieving it. They have come out of the Dark Ages practically rightless but by dint of effort and struggle over many generations they have achieved a measure of it. They are hopeful that they will achieve more. There is, therefore, in their situation an upward climb, a constant ascent which gives hopefulness and confidence to their struggles and their sacrifices.

But, in Germany, the process has been completely reversed. In Germany there has been a throwback; that which was already achieved through blood and struggle has been again wrested away. In Germany our people through many generations of struggle had reached a position of freedom. They succeeded in winning equality and they have used it worthily. From the days of Moses Mendelssohn to the days of Albert Einstein, they contributed to Germany's cultural, political, social and economic life in fullest measure. In every department of human endeavor, the Jews gave to Germany and through Germany to the world, men of genius, in science, art, literature, in the things of the mind and the spirit-- pathfinders, pioneers, men who wrote the classic text books of the new sciences.

What, therefore, has happened in Germany concerns us not merely insofar as 600,000 men, women and children of our people are being trodden under the ruthless heel of tyranny because the security, well-being and rights of.

J

If Hitler succeeds (and there isn't the slightest doubt in my mind that he will not succeed), if Hitler succeeds in establishing himself and in using that great nation of 65,000,000 ~~of~~ people as a base for his anti-Semitic campaigns throughout the world, then ~~we~~ Jews are facing an era of dread, uncertainty and conflict ^{all over} ~~in the whole~~ world. It is because we ~~we~~ want to avert that calamity that we are determined to crush Hitlerism at the outset. I don't want this great land of ours, which has been our hope and our dream as it has been the hope and dream of mankind, this land which is built not upon one race but upon a hundred races, this nation into which all peoples have poured their ~~life~~ blood and their dreams -- I don't want this nation which ~~has~~ ^{was} ~~been~~ founded on the principle of the ²inalienable right¹ of all men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, I don't want this land to be sullied, to be dirtied by Naziism and Hitlerism.¹¹

second

The ~~several~~ meeting: which I recall was the Testimonial Dinner which was tendered to William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, early in 1934. Mr. Green had given outstanding leadership to the boycott movement in the United States. He saw early~~ly~~ and clearly the dangerous Nazi assault on organized Labor. Under his guidance, the American Federation of Labor decided by unanimous vote that the American Federation of Labor join with other public-spirited organizations in officially adopting a boycott against German-made goods and services until the German government recognizes the right of the working people of Germany to organize into bona fide independent trade unions of their own choosing, and until Germany ceases its offensive ~~prohibitory~~ policy of persecution of ^{the} Jewish people.

At this testimonial dinner I said among other things:

"The same bloody hand which laid waste the Jewish community also destroyed all the agencies and institutions of mutual help and protection which organized labor had established in Germany over a period of many years, outlawed its unions, scattered its forces, imprisoned its leaders, confiscated its funds and reduced the working men to a condition of feudal vassalage.

"This, of course, was the prime objective of the Nazi movement. That is why it was so heavily financed by the big industrialists, bankers and manufacturers of Germany. The bogey ~~and the bogey~~ of Communism which the skillful Nazi agitators raised was a ruse and a camouflage. The German Republic was never seriously threatened by Communism. It was the rising power of organized labor and the clear trend towards socialization of industry which the hard-pressed and frightened magnates of Germany were passionately eager to check and which they succeeded in checking. At least for the time being. . . . For no such victory can long endure at this late day. Those purblind industrial rulers of Germany who have succeeded in destroying the only free institutions whereby the progress of the people could have been assured through peaceful ways of evolution have laid up for themselves a bloody day of reckoning.

"It is a commonplace of Jewish history that the reactionary forces of a country which are aligned against the Jew are also aligned against the working classes. The fortunes of our people throughout the world have ^{always} been linked up ~~always~~ with the progress of freedom and political and economic liberalism. Wherever these ideals flourished, the position of our people was satisfactory.

—Wherever they were suppressed, its position became insecure and frequently desperate. Similarly the fortunes of labor are linked up with the progress of these great social ideals. Those who attack them attack also the security and rights of labor. It is, therefore, no accident of history that Naziism, which is the implacable foe of the Jewish people, is also the implacable foe of organized labor.

" Every reactionary movement has used the Jew as the pivot in the fulcrum for dislodging liberal and progressive ideas and institutions. The enemies of the Third Republic in France stigmatized it as Jewish. Czarist Russia pogromized the Jew because it claimed that he was responsible for the revolutionary movements which were undermining the regime. Hitler attempts to eradicate democracy by declaring that it is fundamentally Jewish and not Germanic...

" Fascism is a deliberate and conscious effort to restore mankind to that system of ideas and social organization which prevailed in the days before the French Revolution. If it triumphs in the world, it will also restore our people to the status which it occupied in pre-Revolutionary days -- political and economic rightlessness and defenselessness. Instead of free men intrenched in inalienable human rights, we shall become members of a disfavored minority group in an hierarchic system of feudal vassalage -- exactly the position which we occupied in the Middle Ages. It was the doctrines of the French Revolution -- Liberty, Equality, Fraternity -- which opened for us the doors of opportunity in Europe and which made the ~~Nineteenth~~ Nineteenth Century for the Jews of Western Europe the Golden Age of their history. Fascism will again shut these doors against us. It has already shut them in Germany. Lacking the basis of economic

J

idealism, Fascism must find some other social ideal as its basis. It can find it only in an intensified nationalism or racism. Strong nationalism and racism always spell strong anti-Semitism. They are intolerant of all minority groups.

"The Jewish people is, therefore, fighting in self-defense against this rising tide of political reaction, national chauvinism and racial intolerance. But other groups, too, must wage a similar defensive war against this self-same menace, particularly trade unions which are the first to succumb whenever Fascism triumphs. It is, therefore, most logical that in the attack upon Hitlerism and Fascism, organized labor should form one unified front with the hosts of Israel against the common foe. For every anti-Semite is, under the skin, an enemy of freedom and of the working class."

When Samuel Untermyer resigned because of age from the presidency of the Anti-Nazi League, he requested that I succeed him. I could not, because of my many Zionist commitments. Untermyer, a brilliant lawyer and law partner of Louis Marshall, came late to action[✓] service in the Jewish field, but thereafter worked with great energy and effectiveness in many important undertakings.

Mr. Untermyer represented Mr. Bernstein of the Jewish Tribune, in his libel suit against Henry Ford for the ~~letters~~^{letter's} and attacks on him and on Jews, generally. He forced Mr. Ford to apologize to Mr. Bernstein.

J

Mr. Untermeyer was for some years Vice-President of the American Jewish Congress and President of the Palestine Foundation Fund (Keren Hayesod).

Shortly before his death in 1940, he made a request that I should officiate at his funeral. When he passed away I traveled to New York and conducted the funeral services at his home in Yonkers.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, the organized body of American Reform Rabbis, was founded in 1889. Its founder was Isaac M. Wise, one of the leading Reform Rabbis of his day. He also founded the Hebrew Union College for the training of Rabbis. He, as well as his colleagues of those early days, were strongly anti-nationalist or anti-Zionist and they set the tone for American Reform Judaism for the next two generations.

In fact, their confreres in Germany, where Reform Judaism originated in the early nineteenth century, had already set the tone. They confidently proclaimed that Germany was their Fatherland -- a rather one-sided proclamation. They needed no other homeland. The early Reformers were riding the high tide of nineteenth century liberalism, but they failed to note the dangerous shoals of nineteenth century nationalism, the trends towards the centralizing state, and the threat to the Jewish minority of the fast deploying class struggle of their day. Especially dangerous was this oversight in a land like Germany, which was only just then recovering, after two centuries, from the physical and spiritual devastations of wars of religion, among a people periodically swayed by waves of hysterical religiosity, hysterical metaphysics and hysterical politics, whose foremost religious leader in the sixteenth century could indulge in an anti-Semitism which was matched only by the anti-Semitism of the foremost political leader of Germany in the twentieth century.

These reformers were thinking of progress as most men of their day did, in terms of a steady advance, an unbroken march forward, rather than in terms of a succession of cyclical movements, which, over and again, come again and which result only in a slight net advance for mankind. There were ample warnings all around them, portents which less romantic eyes did appraise more realistically -- signs of an irreconcilable opposition, an indurate racial, cultural, economic and religious hostility which had not and would not accept the humanistic and democratic synthesis which a revolutionary middle-class capitalism had popularized in the nineteenth century, and which was destined sooner or later to disintegrate.

Dr. Isaac M. Wise entertained this same premature confidence that mankind was rapidly approaching the era of a universal faith and a universal republic. He declared in 1875:

"Before our very eyes, the world moves onward into the golden age of redeemed humanity and the fraternal union of nations, as our prophets thousands of years ago have predicted. We are fast approaching the universal democratic republic with civil and religious liberty, cemented by the world's advanced intelligence. This century settles old accounts. It is progressive." The following year he declared: "The Jews do not think of going back to Palestine among Beduins and sandy deserts, and the nations in power do not want them to go there. No European country today would give permission to the Jews to emigrate with their wealth or even without it...It is all dream and fantasy. The world goes not backward, its march is onward, and this will expunge the old race prejudices as well as the religious superstitions of the races...."

And so, when Dr. Wise and his colleagues came to formulate a Declaration of Principles for Reform Judaism, as they did in 1885 in Pittsburgh, they stated:

"We recognize, in the modern era of universal culture of heart and intellect, the approaching of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the kingdom of truth, justice, and peace among all men. We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish State."

When the Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917. the Central Conference of American Rabbis went on record at its Convention in 1918: "We do not subscribe to the phrase in the Declaration which says: 'Palestine is to be a National Homeland for the Jewish people.'. We are opposed to the idea that Palestine should be considered the Homeland of the Jews... The ideal of the Jew is not the establishment of a Jewish State -- nor the reassertion of Jewish nationality which has long been outgrown "

The Central Conference of American Rabbis always favored the *physical* rehabilitation of Palestine for such Jews as may desire to go there and even urged upon Jews the duty to contribute to the reconstruction of the country but it remained obdurately opposed to Zionism and to the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland.

K

But the sentiment of many of its members, especially of the younger generation, moved steadily away from this doctrinaire^{LA} position. Life was forcing them to a new orientation. The exponents of the classical, anti-Zionist position in the Conference were soon fighting a rear-guard action. The showdown came in 1935, at the Chicago Convention. It was now fifty years since the Pittsburgh Platform had been adopted. The Conference arranged for a re-evaluation of that Platform, more particularly of its position on Zionism.

Dr. Samuel Schulman of Temple Emanuel, New York, and I were invited to present our contrasting views. I had, from time to time, been honored by my colleagues by being invited to deliver a sermon or read a paper at their conventions on some subject related to Judaism. On all such occasions, I urged a new attitude on the part of ~~the~~ Reform Judaism toward Zionism. In this climactic discussion in 1935, I was also invited to present the Zionist viewpoint. This turned out to be the last major debate on the floor of the Conference on the subject of Reform Judaism and Zionism.

Dr. Schulman, in a very scholarly paper, in the main defended the Pittsburgh pronouncement on Zionism, although he was far less dogmatic than he himself had been in 1918 at the Convention following the issuance of the Balfour Declaration. After all, much had happened in the intervening years....

Dr. Schulman acknowledged that the strength of what he called the nationalist party, consisted in the fact that it had emphasized the importance of Israel by calling it a nation. Indirectly, it had strengthened the backbone of Jewish consciousness, although it braced it artificially.... Its weakness was



K

that while it wants to strengthen the backbone of Jewish consciousness, it has assimilated away the Jewish soul by making Israel a "goy" like other "goyim", a nation like other nations.

He called for unity and not for bitter controversy among Jews over this issue.... "Let us work together, we the religionists and those who differ with us.... Not to stand aloof is our aim, but recognizing the value of Palestine for hundreds of thousands of our brethren in Israel, let us help increase the settlement, at the same time let us bravely uphold the truth that Israel is not a "goy" like other "goyim". It always was, it is now and if it is to live at all, will always be a ;witness to God." (C. C. A. R. Year Book, 1935, p. 309 ff).

Thirteen years later, on the eve of the proclamation of the State of Israel, when Israel did become a "goy" like other "goyim", Dr. Schulman wrote me: "I feel the need of saying to you that I hail the courageous assertion of the Jews of Palestine, with pride in their spirit, and I invoke God's blessing upon their efforts. May God bless the new State.... May He give victory to the valiant defenders of their country and may peace come soon.... I congratulate you upon the dignity and brilliance with which you have represented the cause before the United Nations."

In my paper I took issue with the accepted thesis that the Jewish people was nothing more than a religious community and that its mission to humanity precluded the idea of national restoration.

The ideal of the mission of Israel, I maintained, is not a denial, a revision or a substitution for any other concept heretofore held basic in Jewish thought, but only a supplement, an addition, another bulwark for national security. It does not supplant nationalism. It re-enforces it. It does not look upon the dispersion as a blessing. It confronts it as a tragic fact which, however, must not be permitted to endanger the survival of Israel. It does not assume that the Jew must remain in exile in order that Yahweh may become the God of all the nations. It does not proclaim that Israel is no longer a nation but only a religious community, whose sole raison d'être is the conversion of the Gentiles. The prophecies of Second Isaiah ring with the recurrent refrain of Israel's approaching restoration to Palestine. When the prophets speak of Restoration they are not thinking of "the colonization of Palestine as a philanthropic effort deserving of general support" (a concession made to Palestine even by anti-Zionist Reform Rabbis), but of the rebuilding of the political life and home of the Jewish nation.

Zion rebuilt and Israel ingathered are the passionate themes of the prophets following the exile, and they did not regard them as being in any way irreconcilable with the hope of converting the whole world to Yahweh.

Any one who attempts to exploit the historic Mission Idea of Israel as an argument against Jewish nationalism or against the rebuilding of Palestine or in justification of the Galut is guilty of gross distortion of an idea which is very clearly and unambiguously defined in its original sources. The prophets did not believe that the Jews should continue to live in exile, nor that they should welcome the Dispersion as a blessing for the sake of their mission.

Nation, race, land, language were always vital and indispensable concepts in Jewish life, indissolubly associated of course with religion. It was never a case of one or the other. They were all one, organically united. There were times when one or the other had to be stressed. Whenever one of these factors of survival was threatened, the strong instinct of the people rallied to its defense. Hence in our history we find eras of accentuation of one or another of these several concepts and eras of attenuation. But never was any one of them abandoned -- until the time of the Reform Rabbis of Germany which is, of course, a very recent and seemingly a rapidly vanishing phenomenon.

A Messianic hope not bound up with the restoration of Israel to Palestine is simply not found in Jewish religious literature anywhere from the time of the Second Isaiah to our own day. National restoration was the very heart of the Messianic ideal from its very inception. To substitute for this national ideal an anti-national, nebulous Messianic Age, on the plea of religious evolution, is to be guilty not of revision but of distortion. It is both new and counterfeit.

It is idle, of course, to talk of our people as no longer a nation but a religious community, in the face of the fact that millions of Jews are today recognized by the law of nations as national minorities in Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, millions more as a distinct nationality in Soviet Russia, where an autonomous Jewish region is actually being built, and hundreds of thousands in Palestine where a Jewish homeland is being created under the terms of a mandate of the League of Nations which recognizes not only the national existence of the Jewish people but its historic claim to a national home. It is not only idle today to repeat the "religious-community" shibboleth of the early Reformers but also quite fantastic.

The Jewish people produced the Jewish religion, but people and religion are not synonymous terms. The Jewish religion -- and I use the term in its customary sense, for I do not believe that a clever neology -- the use of a word in a new and unsanctioned sense -- is equivalent to a new theology -- is a colossal and world-revolutionizing concourse of spiritual ideas unfolding itself in the life of a people of a particular character and temperament, but the Jewish religion does not exhaust the full content of the Jewish people.

It was Judah Halevi who declared: "If there had been no Jews there would have been no Torah, and the Jews did not derive their high estate from Moses, but Moses derived his high estate from the Jews."

Jewish life possessed in its great epochs a classic balance, and the aim of religious leaders today should be to restore it. Many tributaries flow into the historic channel of Jewish life. In recent years some zealous and mostly uninformed partisans have attempted to reduce Jewish life to what is only a fraction of itself -- to race or nationalism or folkways or theologic abstractions. Quite unconsciously they are all falsifying Jewish life. It is a mark of decadence in the diaspora that so many of our people have lost the sense of the classic harmony in Jewish life and are attempting to substitute a part for the whole.

It is the total program of Jewish life and destiny which the religious leaders of our people should stress today -- the religious and moral values, the universal concepts, the mandate of mission, as well as the Jewish people itself and all its national aspirations. Thus the strength and security of our life will

K

be retrieved, and, whether in Palestine or in the diaspora, we shall move forward unafraid upon the road of our destiny."

The discussion of my paper ²proved so ^{absorbing} ~~intriguing~~ that at one o'clock in the morning the Conference which was meeting in a club in the suburbs of Chicago, decided not to adjourn ^{to} ~~the~~ session but to return to the headquarters hotel in the city, and there to resume the discussion. This was done and it was not until the early hours of the morning that the session finally adjourned.

It was at this Conference that the traditional opposition of the Central Conference of American Rabbis to Zionism was finally officially abandoned. It was replaced by a position of benevolent neutrality. It left the acceptance or rejection of the Zionist program to the determination of the individual members of the Conference themselves, and it further resolved that the Conference would continue to cooperate in the up-building of Palestine.

Two years later, when a new set of guiding principles for Reform Judaism, the so-called Columbus Platform, was adopted to replace the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885, it declared:

"In the rehabilitation of Palestine, the land hallowed by memories and hopes, we behold the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a haven of refuge for the oppressed, but also a center of Jewish culture and spiritual life."

In February, 1942, I was invited to deliver the sermon at the convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis which met that year in Cincinnati. The time and the city were chosen to coincide with the Centenary ^C~~Celebration~~ of the founding of the congregation which bears the name of Isaac Mayer Wise,

and whose pulpit Dr. Wise occupied for many years. Commenting on this convention, the "Reconstructionist"^a magazine of reform within Conservative Judaism stated that "The Convention of American Rabbis which took place recently demonstrates again and quite forcefully the happy capacity of Reform Judaism for self-examination, self-criticism and fresh adjustment. . . . The Conference sermon preached by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver from the pulpit occupied for many years by Isaac Mayer Wise, set the theme for the convention. The sermon was a moving experience, and a penetrating critique of Reform Judaism. . . . Additional proof of the central importance of Zionism, logically a spiritual concept synonymous with Judaism, in contemporary Reform Jewish thinking, was the bold and vigorous plea of Dr. Silver for Jewish nationalism and for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, a plea which he coupled in his sermon with one for greater consecration to God, Torah, and Israel and which was enthusiastically received by the vast majority of the Conference members."

It was at this Conference that a resolution endorsing a Jewish army for Palestinian Jewry was adopted over the bitter opposition of the "old guard". The resolution read: "The Central Conference of American Rabbis adds its voice to the demand that the Jewish population of Palestine be given the privilege of establishing a military force which will fight under its own banner on the side of the democracies under allied command, to defend its own land and the Near East to the end that the victory of democracies may be hastened everywhere."

K

The "old guard" was so outraged at the adoption of this resolution, that it called a conference and organized what subsequently became the Council of American Judaism, a notorious anti-Zionist group from which the Rabbinic constituency steadily withdrew, leaving it almost entirely in the hands of super-patriotic laymen whose chief interest was not Judaism but anti-Zionism.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in the critical years of the last quarter of a century, during which time the battle for the establishment of the State of Israel was waged, and its foundations were laid, maintained a positive, constructive and most helpful attitude. Many of its members were leading champions in the struggle.

L

Jewish "intellectuals" have always been a problem to the Jewish people. As a rule they are supercilious fringe-Jews, victims of a conscious or unconscious escapism. They entertain neither love nor reverence for their people's heritage. They have cut their moorings and are adrift.

The term "intelligentsia", like the terms "proletariat" and "peasant", is really ^{not} applicable ~~not~~ to the structure of American society. They belong, or belonged, to the social stratifications of the Old World. When men speak of the Jewish "intellectuals" in the United States, they have in mind, presumably, Jewish authors, jouranalists, artists, philosophers, professors, etc., not necessarily all the educated, college-bred Jewish men and women of whom there are legion in our country.

of

Quite a number of this small group/alienated "intellectuals" -- if and when they treat Jews and Judaism in their literary productions -- do so slightly, disparagingly and at times with acid and scorn. Some of them do so out of ignorance. But a goodly number of them hail from old-fashioned Jewish homes and from a distinctly Jewish environment where they received orthodox Jewish training. But they have removed themselves from positive Jewish life because they believe that there are sweeter pastures elsewhere -- higher rewards, both social and monetary. To belong to a distinguishable and, at times, disfavored minority group is too difficult a burden to bear. It is only after these intellectuals become disillusioned, when they discover that the rewards which they anticipated are not forthcoming, that some of them return to the welcoming fold of Israel, a bit saddened and embittered and a bit over-zealous....

From time to time these intellectuals are polled by some enterprising ^{magazine} periodical as to their attitude towards ^{the} Jew and Judaism and the results are, of course, largely negative. These findings are then interpreted to mean that there is a sharp trend among all educated Jews in the United States away from Judaism and the Jewish people, and toward non-religion and assimilation.

Back in 1926, the Menorah Journal presented several such intellectuals in a survey of the Jewish cultural and religious scene in the United States. One was Professor Horace M. Kallen, another was Elliot E. Cohen, managing editor of the Menorah Journal and in later years editor of Commentary, and the third was Henry Hurwitz, the founder and editor of the Menorah Journal.

These three "did a job" on American Judaism, the American rabbi and the Jewish theological schools in the United States. Their composite portrait of American Jewish life was one of utter inadequacy, and worthlessness. There was but one hope for American Israel and that was ~~to be found~~ in an adequately financed and endowed Menorah movement. . . .

Especially free-wheeling and gross was the essay of Elliot E. Cohen, whose particular [^]bête noire was the American rabbi, but whose distaste for Judaism generally was no less notorious. Among the rare pearls of wisdom with which his article was adorned were:

The Elders of Zion myth is a by no means distant cousin of the Jewish mission myth.

The little respect our culture receives is that paid to a people who stumbled (sic!) on some spiritual ideas capable of being incorporated, in a greatly improved form of course, in the culture of the West.

Lacking wisdom, our leaders take refuge in speech. Good Watsonian behaviorists, they discover the springs of thought in the voice box.

Speeches and sermons are born of the air and destined to vanish with the breath that gave them birth.

But they [the rabbis] are guilty certainly of a too weak acquiescence in the degradation of the rabbinical function to that of a spokesman -- i.e. mouthpiece, of the ignorance, ambitions and fears of the influential Jewish laity.

Mr. Hurwitz requested me to write a rejoinder to these articles. "Let me repeat again most sincerely and urgently, my invitation to you to write an article for the Menorah Journal, as soon as may be, to present the situation as you see it in answer to Kallen's and Cohen's articles. . . . You will be doing the Journal a very great service -- I believe you will be doing the cause of Judaism in America a great service -- if you will present your analysis of the situation, your description of what the rabbinate and the synagogue have so far had to build up in this country, and what your ^{beliefs} ~~rabbis~~ their future service should be. May I count on you for this?" I finally ^{to write such an article.} consented. My article, "Why Do the Heathen Rage", was accepted by the Menorah Journal. Galley proofs were submitted to me which I corrected and returned. The article was announced for publication in the Journal, ~~and at~~ ~~a public meeting in Cleveland~~, Mr. Hurwitz made an announcement ^d ~~of~~ the forthcoming publication of my article as an indication of the broadmindedness and fairness of the Menorah Journal.

On the eve of my departure for Europe in July of that year, I was informed by Mr. Hurwitz that the article would not be published.

I immediately turned over the article to the Jewish Tribune of New York, which published it in four ^{weekly} installments, beginning with the issue of July 23, 1926.

Mr. Hurwitz attempted to justify the suppression of my article in a letter which he sent to the Jewish Tribune upon my return from Europe. I read his letter and replied to it in the Tribune of August 20th.

"Upon my return from London today I read the letter which Henry Hurwitz wrote to you in explanation of the suppression of my article which had been requested and accepted by 'The Menorah Journal'."

Mr. Hurwitz states in his letter that I made two unacceptable conditions to its publication, one, that it should be printed in full, without change, and two, that no answer to it should appear in the same issue of the Journal.

This is correct. One will readily understand why these conditions were made when one remembers that two of the three authors whose papers I discussed are respectively the editor and the managing editor of the Menorah Journal. When I requested that no answer should be made in the same issue, I asked for my article the same privilege which the articles of Dr. Kallen, Mr. Cohen, and Mr. Hurwitz enjoyed. The editor indicated in a note which accompanied the galley proofs that a reply to it would appear in the following issue of the Journal, to which, of course, I raised absolutely no objections.

Mr. Hurwitz was free to reject my conditions. He did not reject them; rather he accepted them with alacrity and in writing.

Mr. Hurwitz refers to the title of my article, "Why Do the Heathen Rage" (a Biblical phrase, by the way) as "the elegant nomenclature of Rabbi Silver." Here again Mr. Hurwitz's memory seems to fail him. I submitted two titles for his consideration, the other being, "A Rabbi Makes Reply," and Mr. Hurwitz, himself, selected the former.

There is a subtle suggestion contained in Mr. Hurwitz's letter that my article did not fully measure up to the established standard of thought

and expression of the Menorah Journal. Of that the reader must judge. I am, however, again compelled to refresh Mr. Harwitz's memory. Upon receipt of my article, he wrote that he was glad to get it "and glad even after reading it." This was in April. Four or five weeks later, during which time the editor undoubtedly had sufficient time to acquaint himself with the palpable deficiencies of the article, he sent me the galley proofs. Shortly thereafter, at a public meeting, he announced its forthcoming publication. In June, then, the article still measured up to the exacting standards of the Menorah Journal. In July it failed utterly. . . .

One must be a dour fellow indeed not to chuckle at the literary vagaries of this distinguished editor.

Thirteen years after I penned my critique of the Menorah Journal, Rabbi Milton Steynberg, of the noted Rabbi of the Park Avenue Synagogue of New York, felt constrained to write a similar critique of the Commentary Magazine, a monthly journal of Jewish life, letters, and opinion, sponsored by the American Jewish Committee. Its editor at that time was the same Elliot E. Cohen, who brought to his new post the same aversion to Judaism and Rabbis, and the same predilection for secularist themes and writers. Only this time he ^{proposed} literary confessions which had a touch here and there of the pornographic. . . .

"I doubt," wrote Rabbi Steynberg, "whether either the ^e editors or the inner communications ^{at} Committee representation of the American Jewish Committee are aware of the extent and bitterness of the hostility they have awakened in broad sectors of American Jewry, especially among informed and committed Jews. . . . My complaint is against the spirit which animates it as disclosed in these ^{three} circumstances, that the magazine has

studiously ignored some of the most significant elements in Jewish life; that it has consistently given distorted presentation to certain others, no less *crucial*; and, finally, that all too frequently it takes on an air of condescension and *superbiousness* towards matters Jewish, including historic Jewish sanctities, and of *insensitiveness* towards Jewish sanctities."

The Menorah Journal lacked a positive Jewish program and content. It made much of Jewish "culture" and catered to the Jewish intellectual, but the culture was secularist in character, avoiding any positive identification with Judaism as a religion. Nor was it Hebraic in character or outright in its "nationalist" identification. It was neither Zionist nor anti-Zionist. Towards the end it became the mouthpiece of the American Council for Judaism. . . . "Culture, with us," to quote Emerson, "ends in headache." . . ."

The Journal ceased being a monthly quite early. It became a bi-monthly, then a quarterly, and finally a semi-annual periodical. The Menorah movement, of which I was at first a member of its Board of Governors and had assisted it financially from time to time, likewise began to disintegrate quite early. It is not possible to launch a vital movement of Jewish renaissance in the Diaspora which is purely secular in character. In my rejoinder, "Why Do the Heathen Rage," I commented on this fact:

Religion was the sole reason why the Jew persisted in maintaining his identity in the world. I have searched high and low in Jewish literature to discover evidences that the Jew struggled to remain a Jew amidst adverse circumstances in order that he might develop, to quote Mr. Hurwitz in his article, "Watchman, What of the Day?", a great "synagogue architecture, mural paintings and frescoes, and sculpture in wood and brass, works in silver, gold and other metals . . . and the old signboards of Polish Jewry." I find nowhere that the Jew objected to intermarriage with other peoples (a practice which would of course have destroyed him) on the ground that the resultant racial admixture would produce less gifted musicians or scientists or writers. There was but one reason throughout the ages: "Lest he will turn away thy son from following Me, that they may serve other gods." ~~The Jew persisted in racial uniqueness in order to preserve the~~

The Jew persisted in racial uniqueness in order to preserve the integrity of his faith. Loyalty to the faith spelled loyalty to the race. When the American Jew will abandon his faith he will swiftly and surely assimilate. He will intermarry with the peoples about him, and he will destroy himself racially, and no quantum of Jewish music and Jewish art or books on Jewish literature and philosophy will be potent enough to save him. The anti-religious Jew will be the first to go, as he always has been. The religiously indifferent Jews will linger on by sheer force of inertia until ~~but~~ ^{the} relentless assimilative forces will scatter and overwhelm them too. The secular nationalist will endure until such time as his ideology derived from the segregated and compact Jewish community life of eastern Europe is dissipated by the dissolving influences of American life. Even the strong appeal which Palestine is making today to many of our people will not prove sufficient to command their loyalty in the days to come. The establishment of a strong Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine will not accomplish the miracle of preservation for the American Jew. The existence of a great German Fatherland has not kept the Germans in the United States from assimilating. The Jew in the United States will not long remain either a Yiddishist or a Hebraist, in the technical sense in which the proponents of cultural pluralism understand the terms. Only the religious Jew who will continue steadfast to his faith will conserve and carry on the culture and the traditions of Israel. The rest will disappear, as they always have, as they inevitably must. In other words, Judaism, far from being "a small part of the total fullness of the life of the Jewish people which I am accustomed to call Hebraism" (Horace M. Kallen, in Can Judaism Survive in the United States?) is in reality its very heart and life blood.

Following the large-scale Arab riots of 1936 in Palestine, a Royal Commission was appointed by the British Government under the chairmanship of Earl Peel, "to ascertain the underlying causes of the disturbances, to inquire into the manner in which the Mandate for Palestine is being implemented in relation to our obligations as Mandatory toward the Arabs and the Jews respectively; and to ascertain whether upon a proper construction of the terms of the Mandate, either the Arabs or the Jews have any legitimate grievances upon account of the way in which the Mandate has been, or is being implemented; and if the Commission is satisfied that any such grievances are well-founded, to make recommendations for their removal and for the prevention of their recurrence".

The Commission submitted its report in July, 1937. It was comprehensive, ~~fair~~ and sympathetic. It proposed the termination of the Mandate and the division of Palestine into three parts - a Jewish State, an Arab State, and a British Mandated Territory, which would include Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Nazareth with a corridor from Jerusalem to the coast, and an enclave near Aqaba (as well as, temporarily, Tiberias, Acre, and Haifa). The area of the new Jewish State would be equal to about one-fifth of Palestine west of the Jordan. It recommended partition "as the only method we are able to propose for dealing with the root of the problem". On the principle of "Half a loaf is better than no bread", it ~~thought~~ ^{regards} the solution sound and just. Without working out the scheme of partition in full detail, it made the above general recommendations on the territorial division of the country.

M

At the Fortieth Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, which met shortly after the issuance of the Royal Commission report, in New York City, the proposed scheme of partition was the chief subject of discussion.

I vigorously opposed this partition proposal of the Royal Commission.

The "American Hebrew" of July 2, 1937, reporting my address before the Zionist Convention, wrote:

"Rabbi Silver attacked Great Britain for failing to carry out the terms of the Mandate to facilitate Jewish immigration and the close settlement of Jews on the land. Dr. Silver also criticized the British Government for failing to provide physical protection and security for Jewish settlers during the recent Arab disorders. Declaring that Great Britain undertook to build a Jewish Homeland in Palestine including both sides of the Jordan, Dr. Silver pointed out that it had failed in that pledge, cutting off from the provisions of the Mandate the whole of Transjordan, a territory twice as large as the present Palestine.

"Now, twenty years after the Balfour Declaration, an effort is being made to cut the Jewish Homeland still further to constrict its boundaries and to consign an expanding Jewish Homeland to what must be a political and economic absurdity.

"The high spiritual exaltation of our people, in 1917, inspired by the Balfour Declaration, has been, through two decades, successively dampened, and chilled, not so much by terroristic resistances on the part of certain intransigent Arab elements in Palestine, as by the failure of the Mandatory

M

Government to fulfill the obligations which it undertook under the terms of the Mandate.

"The whole record of the Administration of Palestine with reference to the upbuilding of the Jewish Homeland has been a series of failures, blunders, inaction and non-cooperation.

"Great Britain undertook, under the terms of the Mandate, to place the country (Palestine) under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home. It failed to do that.

"It undertook to 'facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions'. It has failed to do that. Far from opening the doors of Palestine wide to Jewish mass immigration, it has continually wrangled and bickered and bargained, for minimum schedules for immigrants."

The Convention of the Zionist Organization of America which preceded the World Zionist Congress called to meet in Zurich in August, emphatically rejected the partition proposal.

Added
World Zionist Congress which was held in Zurich in August, 1937
At the [^]Congress, the principal issue was the acceptance or rejection of the Royal Commission's [^]report. The debate was on whether negotiations should be undertaken with Great Britain on the basis of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The majority favored such negotiations. The minority, of which I was one, expressed firm opposition to any discussion with Great Britain [^]which ~~that~~ might consider partition, holding that the inalienable rights of the Jewish people to their historic Homeland cannot be bartered away.

I addressed the Congress on the subject and in the course of my address, I stated:

"The Report of the Royal Commission sets the fashion for illogical conclusions, and this method had been adopted by the Congress. The Report vindicated all our claims, stated that the position of the Arabs had improved greatly, that the Arab land-owners and fellaheen had profited, that the health of the population had improved, and that all this had been made possible through the growth of the Jewish population in Palestine. The conclusion should then have been a recommendation for a vigorous implementation of the Mandate. Instead, there is an unwarranted proposal to dismember the country. Similarly, Dr. Weizmann failed to draw the logical conclusions of his own declarations. He criticized the Palestine Administration, declared that the Mandate could be carried out, that the riots in Palestine could have been prevented, and that the fault was the weakness, blundering, and, in part, definite sabotage on the part of members of the Palestine Administration.

"What, then, should have been his conclusions? A demand, based upon the Report of the Royal Commission, for the removal of those responsible for existing conditions. Instead of which, he, too, recommends partition. Dr. Ruppin pointed out the insurmountable difficulties which are involved by the presence of so large an Arab minority in the proposed Jewish state and the difficulty of transferring this Arab population. What should have been his conclusion? A total rejection of the plan of partition as unsound and unworkable. Instead, he, too, agrees with the Commission's plan.

M

"What prompted these people to suggest illogical conclusions? The promise of a lasting settlement between Jews and Arabs and the hope of a large-scale Jewish immigration. On all these scores they are likely to be disappointed. Partition does not offer the promise of a lasting settlement with the Arabs. The Arabs have said that they would resist it. A terrific irredentism will be created inside and outside of Palestine. Should trouble arise, and the English Government be called in as the protector of the Arab minority, it would arrive, possibly at the same conclusions as those at which the Commission had arrived, namely, that a further partition or perhaps even a complete liquidation of the Jewish Homeland is indicated.

"Fear is not leadership; surrender is not statesmanship; dismemberment is not nation-building! When the Children of Israel found themselves with the Egyptians at their backs and the Red Sea in front, the word went forth:

'Speak unto the Children of Israel and let them go forward.' "

The Zionist Congress adopted the majority resolution which stated that the partition scheme was unacceptable, but that the Executive should ascertain the precise terms of the Government for the proposed Jewish State, and that the Executive should bring any definite scheme that might emerge before a newly elected Congress for consideration and decision.

The Permanent Mandate's Commission of the League was favorable in principle to an examination of the proposed partition scheme, but opposed to the immediate creation of two independent states.

The British government soon ^{was} ~~announced~~ that it was not committed to the Royal Commission's partition plan and that it would send out another Commission to draw up a more precise scheme. This Commission, headed by Sir John Woodhead, unanimously advised against the adoption of the partition scheme outlined by the Royal Commission on the grounds of its impracticability. The British government then ~~announced~~ that it would convene a conference of representatives of the Palestinian Arabs and of the neighboring Arab states, and of the Jewish Agency in an effort to promote an understanding between the Arabs and the Jews. This conference took place in London at St. James Palace early in 1939. The Arabs refused to sit down with the Jewish delegates, so that the conferences of the two sides were held separately. The London conference led to no agreement. When the talks were broken off, two months later the British government issued its White Paper.

All this is almost an exact preview ~~in sequence~~ of what will take place almost a decade later following the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry....

N
=

In August, 1939, I attended the twenty-first Zionist Congress in Geneva. It met under the shadow of the White Paper which had been issued by the British government the preceding May and which declared that no more than seventy-five thousand immigrants inclusive of twenty-five thousand refugees, would be admitted over the next five years, and that thereafter no further Jewish immigrations would be permitted unless the Arabs agreed. This was a complete repudiation of the obligations which Great Britain had assumed under the terms of the Mandate for the Jewish National Homeland.

The delegates to the Congress were, of course, bitter. All were united in rejecting the White Paper. Some advocated passive resistance—complete non-cooperation with the government. Others urged active resistance, ~~to the new policy which had been announced by the British government.~~ There were a few who called for armed struggle against the government.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who was the object of some violent attacks because the diplomatic failure was charged up to him—pleaded for the use of peaceful methods only in ~~combating~~ ^{combating} the White Paper. I sided with him, and defended his position on the floor of the Congress. I was soundly denounced for the position which I took. The Laborite delegates especially did not approve of my position, nor did all the members of the American delegation. Many of them favored illegal ~~interpretation.~~ ^{immigration.}

We were on the eve of a second World War. In fact, within two weeks of the opening of the Congress, the war actually broke out. The war would be conducted against the deadliest enemy of our people—the Nazis. Great Britain would be the chief adversary of the Nazis in this struggle. As Jews, we were deeply involved in the outcome of the coming struggle. If the Nazis won, not only would Palestine be lost to us, but the Jewish people would also be lost. In a Nazi dominated world there would be no room for the Jewish people or for a Jewish Palestine any more than there would be room for any free people. Great Britain would be fighting not alone for its own survival and for the survival of the free world, but also for our survival. We should, therefore, not resort

N

to measures which would gravely embarrass her in her war efforts. *this was my position*

To be sure we could not accept the White Paper. Its proposals were contrary to law and unjustifiable on moral grounds. We must, nevertheless, I argued, continue our cooperation with the Mandatory Government--in order to avert chaos in Palestine. We cannot fight the British government with violence, even if we wish ^{to} to. And we do not wish to, unless driven to desperation. A change is bound to take place. For the present we must continue our work under the brutal regime imposed upon us by a government which would not continue in office indefinitely.

In covering my address before the Zionist Congress, the "New York Times" of August 20th reported:

"In an impassioned speech frequently interrupted by hecklers, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver of Cleveland, Ohio, appealed today to the delegates attending the twenty-first session of the World Zionist Congress here to do nothing that might bring the Jews in Palestine into conflict with the British Government.

"Dr. Silver defended the political policies of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization. Conceding that Dr. Weizmann may have been 'too yielding on occasion,' Dr. Silver declared that it was not Dr. Weizmann who stood today as a discredited leader, but the British Colonial Secretary, Malcolm MacDonald. 'Dr. Weizmann is ^{closer} ~~closer~~ to us today in the hour of defeat than at any time in the past,' Dr. Silver said. 'It is Mr. MacDonald who stands as a destroyer of covenants and a breaker of mandates.'

"'I make bold to say,' Dr. Silver declared, 'that the British will not long tolerate that their government shall remain branded with the brand of betrayal.'

"He added that he was persuaded that new proposals regarding Palestine were ^{to} ~~certain~~ to emerge before long.

"That being so," Dr. Silver said, "I am constrained to propose to the delegates to this congress that they do nothing which might bring the Jewish people into conflict with the Mandatory government. We are not yet confronted with finality."...

"Dr. Silver told the conference that he was not a pacifist and that he was not obsessed with any 'appeasement' idea, but held that some day the Jews might have to pass to an attitude of resistance. He said it was a task of wise leadership to prepare for that day and store up a war chest.

"I am not unmindful of the plight of our poor refugees who are trying to get into Palestine," he went on, "but I am worried about the possibility of our making a colossal blunder at a time when circumstances do not warrant out taking such action."

"Asked by one questioner what he would do ^{about} immigration, Dr. Silver replied:

"I propose that we exert ourselves to the maximum within the limits of the White Paper. There is a possibility of bringing in tens of thousands of Jews within those limits. We have been considering in the United States a plan to bring in immediately the twenty-five thousand that the White Paper permits along with ten thousand allowed to enter this year—a total of thirty-five thousand."

Before many years would pass, I would be accused by Zionist leaders and others of being a dangerous extremist and activist. ~~As can be seen from the above,~~ In 1939, I was certainly among the most moderate. To this day I wonder whether I was wrong then...

The Congress rejected the White Paper but refused to go along with those of its delegates who advocated non-cooperation with the British Government. David Ben-Gurion succinctly formulated the official Zionist line—"To fight the White Paper as though there were no war, and to fight the war as though there were no White Paper." This, as one can readily see, was not ^{an easy} ~~a long~~ line

N

to follow:

In the war years which followed, which brought with them the early victories of the Nazis and their conquest of many countries where Jews lived in large numbers, and where the Nazis proceeded to carry into effect their policy of extermination of ^{all} ~~old~~ Jews, the position of the Jews in Europe became desperate. Many fled ^{from} their homes and many of them sought asylum in Palestine. Great Britain held vigorously to the White Paper policy and refused to admit them. Refugees attempted to enter the country "illegally". Many were deported. Others were apprehended and interned. The tragedies of the "Patria" and the "Struma" ensued. The people of Palestine were soon driven to desperation and an organized campaign of resistance to British rule in Palestine, which was made inevitable by the stubborn and inhuman policy of the government, set in which finally forced Great Britain to acknowledge defeat and to surrender the Mandate to the United Nations. I publicly approved of this resistance both of the Haganah and the Irgun and I tried to compose the bitter rivalry between them ^{the two}.

At the National Conference for Palestine, called by the United Palestine Appeal which met in Washington in January, 1938, I was elected Chairman ~~of the United Palestine Appeal~~ to succeed Dr. S. S. Wise who had served in that capacity in 1936 and 1937. The Conference was held eighteen days after the issuance of the British White Paper. A feeling of depression pervaded the Conference. Zionist hopes had received a crushing blow.

In accepting the position of chairmanship of the United Palestine Appeal at a time of such low ebb, I felt that first and foremost it was essential to raise the morale of the delegates and workers and our Zionist constituency generally. Without confidence in our ultimate victory, the work of the United Palestine Appeal would suffer enormously.

I was always confident that the inescapable logic of events would, in due time, make Palestine a Jewish State. For a shorter or a longer time this may be halted or retarded, but the re-birth of Israel as a nation in its historic home ^{was} ~~is~~ as sure to come to pass as God's word never returns empty until it has accomplished that for which it was sent.

The inescapable logic of events! When all the doors of the world would be closed to our people, then the hand of destiny will force open the door of Palestine. And that hour, I believed, was rapidly approaching.

Accordingly, I made this the central theme of my speech of acceptance:

"This is one of the rare moments in my life", I stated. "I am keenly aware that the burden involved is even greater than the honor. I am the spiritual leader of a large congregation, which, of course, has the first claim upon my time and upon my energy. Nevertheless, ~~when the summons came.~~

I ^{do} did not feel justified in declining, but I regard myself as a conscripted soldier. This is an hour of battle for Israel. We are fighting on all fronts. Never in our history have we had to fight on so many fronts at one and the same time. I shall give to this campaign during the coming year whatever energies I can command, whatever ability I can command, whatever time I can command. I shall try to be more than the nominal head of the campaign. I am assuming responsibility, and I assume, also, that you wish me to take on a full measure of authority.

"I shall try to benefit by the accumulated experiences of ours during the past years. I shall try a few new experiments, a few new ways. I shall make an effort, with your cooperation, during the coming year to capitalize on the wide-spread pro-Palestine sentiment which exists among our people everywhere. I have found that while ideologically all of our people may not be ready to commit themselves to our Zionist program, there are really few Jews in this country who are doing any thinking at all -- and most Jews have been made to think in the last few years -- who have not become Palestine-minded and Palestine-sympathizers. I shall try, as far as I can, to organize that sentiment and to capitalize upon it.

"I should like to see banished from our midst in these days the mood of defeatism, the mood of despair. No people is at its best when it is frightened. You cannot appeal to the generosity of people when you terrify them. The reaction to fright is flight and hoarding. Bring your people the kind of message

which the prophets of Israel always brought to their people in the dark night of suffering: ~~"Al tira, avdi Yaakov"~~ "Do not be afraid!" Bring them the message of the prophets: "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee, and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee. When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee."

" You can bring them that kind of a message on the basis of what we have actually achieved and builded in the desperate years since the World War. We have reason to speak to our people in confidence and in hope for the future.

" Following the World War, when more than half of our people were broken and shattered in Eastern Europe, their life disorganized, their economic resources at a vanishing point, when there took place on of the greatest migrations known in the history of our people, when so much of our energies and resources had to be devoted to the elementary work of rescue, of providing bread for the starving and shrouds for the dead -- the Jewish people, nevertheless, had the courage, the vision and the heroism to apply itself to the colossal job of re-building their Jewish national life in Palestine. With their own hands and their own resources they took a land which had been neglected, stripped, and made desolate, and in a few short years populated it, built towns and cities, schools and hospitals and a university and transformed a backward, Oriental province into the most civilized center in the Near East.



"I appeal to you to go forward as the emissaries of that faith, courage and vision which have not been dimmed in two thousand years! "

I served as Chairman of the United Palestine Appeal for six years, relinquishing the position in January, 1944, to concentrate on the work of the American Zionist Emergency Council.

A WORD ABOUT MY ~~ATTITUDE TOWARD FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT~~
~~BECAUSE THESE WERE A MATTER OF SEVERAL YEARS~~

- 1 -

Q

In 1939, the Second World War broke out. It was to mark the end and the beginning for many things in the world. It was to affect the destinies of nations, of empires, of continents. The Jewish people suffered more during this war than any other people on the face of the earth. It was the blackest period in its long and checkered history. Out of it was to emerge the State of Israel.

In ~~1941~~, Franklin D. Roosevelt was the war-time leader of our nation. In many ways I admired ~~him~~ greatly. He was the eloquent spokesman of some of the ^{higher} ~~very~~ ideals which inspired men of good-will in those searching and critical years. I had voted for him twice, but on March 31, 1941, addressing my congregation on a subject which was then widely discussed, "A Third Term for President Roosevelt?" I ^{had} stated:

"There are citizens who do not favor a third term for President Roosevelt, not because they are his foes--because they are his friends--the friends of the things he stands for. These people greatly admire him. They fully appreciate the monumental services which he has rendered this country during these last seven years... They remember that Mr. Roosevelt, in 1933, took over a bankrupt nation which had gone through the disaster of twelve years of boom and depression. He came in as the head of a people in panic, a people whose industry had been stalled, whose farms were languishing, a people prostrate not only materially, but even more so spiritually. They remember that Mr. Roosevelt succeeded in restoring their confidence and hope. He set about rebuilding what had been shaken or destroyed... They remember to this day, Mr. Roosevelt has not permitted the unemployed to starve, and has kept millions of our people from thoughts and acts of desperation. They bear in mind with gratitude the fact that he established measures of social security, security for the aged and for the unemployed..."

security for the aged and for the unemployed.

"They remember that Mr. Roosevelt endeavored to establish laws which would protect labor against exploitation, and to build up machinery for the amicable adjustment of employer and employee relationships.

"They remember that he was responsible for the enactment of laws to curb the evils of gambling on the stock exchange and the exploitation of the investing public. All these measures he attempted to achieve within the framework of the system of private enterprise. And through the enactment of these measures, he succeeded in averting a violent political and economic upheaval in our land.

"He has worked and is still working not alone for peace, but for a just peace.

"And yet, because of their very admiration for him, these friends of Mr. Roosevelt, among whom I am one, would urge him not to stand for re-election. The Third Term, my friends, is not a law, but a tradition, a tradition which reflects the political views of the American people, a custom even more powerful than a law. It is a custom which has not been violated in one hundred fifty years, and during these one hundred fifty years there have been critical times, some of them more critical than the present."

"It is particularly important in these days, when the indispensable-one-man rule is exalted in so many parts of the world at the expense of the democratic faith in laws and institutions rather than in persons, that it should not be repudiated."

After the two parties met in convention and Mr. Roosevelt was nominated by the Democratic Party for a third term, I was asked by The Cleveland Press whether I would wish to express myself on the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt or on Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, who was nominated by the Republicans.

~~SECRET~~

Q

In reply, I stated: "My conviction as to the third terms remains unchanged and so does my admiration for the *policies* and achievements of President Roosevelt. What I expressed in my March address represents a *settled* conviction. Only one consideration would have warranted a change of attitude, *if* the opposition candidate, in this case Mr. Willkie, would have been an isolationist, representing a foreign policy at sharp variance with the *sound* and courageous one which President Roosevelt has been presenting. In which case, the vital interests of civilization, now being threatened, would have outweighed any other considerations. Fortunately, Mr. Willkie has expressed himself clearly and unequivocally *in favor* of his plan of tendering maximum aid, short of war, to Great Britain."

The Republican National Committee made extensive use of my statement which was entirely proper. I was asked to become active in the campaign. I declined on the ground that it was an *unvarying* practice of mine not to participate in any political campaign.

I received a warm note from Mr. Willkie:

"Dear Rabbi Silver:

"I am most appreciative of your statement released in the Cleveland Press of Tuesday, August 6, announcing your support of my candidacy for President of the United States.

"As one of the outstanding Jewish rabbis in the country, as well as a noted liberal and leader in the Zionist movement, I am proud to have your support, and I am deeply grateful for all you are doing in my behalf.

Cordially and sincerely,

Wendell L. Willkie"

Politics aside, I really admired this man whose vision in the *worst* ^{midst} of war

reached out to the "One World", and whose deep humanity touched the hearts of men.

In 1944, when President Roosevelt ran for a fourth term, I again voted for the Republican candidate, Mr. Thomas Dewey. This was looked upon as heresy and was deeply resented by those Jews and Zionists who were completely sold on F. D. R. There were prominent Zionists, close to the Administration, who felt that my Republicanism would prove embarrassing to the Movement in Washington. My troubles in the Zionist Emergency Council in the the next few ^{years,} ~~weeks,~~ to which I will refer later on, are in the main traceable to this fact.

PRM

1.

Early in the year 1942, I received an invitation from Dr. Weizmann to visit England in behalf of the Palestine Appeal Campaign. I accepted the invitation and, travelling ^{by clipper,} by way of Bermuda and Lisbon, ~~by clipper,~~ I arrived in England on March 9th and was met by a committee headed by Dr. Weizmann in the Paddington Station. I stopped at the Dorchester Hotel and after dinner that evening I walked out into my first blackout in London. It was a weird and ghostly experience. I ^{late} stepped into the ^{underground} shelter where men, women, and children were sleeping in iron cots on three tiers while passengers were waiting for their trains.

It was a very distressing time for England. It had quite recently received staggering blows in the Far East. The wounds of Malay, Singapore, Rangoon, Java, and Burma were still fresh. Those were dark days also for our people and trying days for our Movement.

While the full extent of our people's tragedy at the hands of the Nazis was as yet ^{not} known, enough ^{the} was known of Nazi diabolic plans to exterminate European Jewry to fill us all with horror. Our Movement was impaled on the horns of a tragic dilemma. Jews everywhere were, of course, solidly behind Great Britain and her allies in the war against the Nazis, the common enemy of civilization. But our Movement was compelled to resist Great Britain in Palestine because, as the Mandatory Government, it had shut the doors of Palestine against our refugees who were desperately seeking asylum from Hitler's concentration camps and gas chambers. Palestine Jews were loyally fighting in the armies of Great Britain, but the Haganah and Irgun, each in its own way, had to resist Great Britain in Palestine in the hope of saving the hapless remnants of our people from extermination.

Those were the days of the White Paper. I arrived in London just ten days after the sinking of the "Struma"—the ship which carried seven hundred Jewish refugees. It had been turned away from the shores of Palestine and had perished in the Black Sea.

Upon my arrival, I met with the representatives of the press at the central Zionist office, 77 Great Russell Street. I spoke to them of the pressing and urgent problem of our Jewish refugees, the victims of our common enemy and of Palestine which should be open and available to them, for in Palestine the Jewish people had an internationally accredited legal status for which they had to thank Great Britain.

" The Balfour Declaration was a product of great political vision and statesmanship and emanated from the deep humanity of the fine spiritual centres of the English people; and the Jewish people would forever remain grateful to this act of statesmanship, of humanity and friendship.

"Unfortunately in the last twenty odd years, for one reason or another difficulties were placed in the way of the full implementation of the letter and the spirit of the Balfour Declaration. White Papers made the work of rehabilitation, reconstruction and actual conversion of Palestine into a homeland for the Jewish people increasingly more difficult. But they were hopeful that the same vision, the same humanity, the same friendship which the English people evidenced during the last war, would again manifest itself now and in the years to come, when it must become increasingly clear to thoughtful people, pari passu with the increased tragic position of European Jewry, that the establishment of a National Homeland for the Jewish people in their historic home was an immediate urgency.

R

" The Jewish people are asking Great Britain to treat them as friends and allies. Great Britain has no more loyal friends in the world, no more loyal friends in that part of the world which had become one of the most critical points in the far-flung battles of the United Nations in the Near East than the Jewish people. They ask of this great people not to embarrass them in the United States by such incidents as the 'Struma' affair, by sending refugees who fled from ten thousand hells in Europe to a place which they regarded as sanctuary, ~~in~~^{to} concentration camps in the Holy Land and keeping them there to languish ~~for a year or more~~. We are asking this great people to treat them in a way which is in keeping with the dignity of an ancient people; to permit the Jews of Palestine to fight for the common cause, under British command, but under the flag of the Jewish people in Palestine. "

I expected to find the war-beset and sorely troubled Jewish community of Great Britain distraught, and as far as Zionist activities were concerned, all but paralyzed. But to my great surprise, I found it unshaken in its Zionist loyalties, firm in its resolve, and generous in its response. I visited nine cities. Some of them had been recently blitzed and badly done up. The nights were made darker by the universal blackout. Besides London, I visited Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, Birmingham, New Castle, Southport, Harringate, Sheffield and Glasgow. It was a whirlwind tour. I addressed many meetings. Everywhere I received the same heartening impression and the

same warm response. I left the shores of England encouraged by what I had seen, and upon my return to the United States, I conveyed to my fellow-Jews the inspiring impressions of courage, perseverance, and loyalty which I found there.

While in London, I held several press conferences. I addressed the Palestine Parliamentary Committee in the House of Lords. I saw Mr. Neville Butler of the British Foreign Office, and Mr. Richard Law, Under-Secretary in the Foreign Office. I spent an hour with Viscount Cranborne, the British Colonial Secretary. I conveyed to them the shock which was felt by the Jews of America and by the American people generally over the recent "Struma" disaster, and the earlier episode of the "Darien", which had reached Palestine with eight hundred refugees and carried on board also the survivors of another refugee vessel, the "Salvador", which had sunk in the Sea of Marmora with the loss of over two hundred lives, and of the "Patria", which exploded in the Haifa harbor with the loss of two hundred and fifty-seven lives. On landing, the refugees on the "Darien" were all interned. I asked for the release of the internees. I pointed out ^{to} the officials, and especially to Lord Cranborne, the strong opposition in the United States to the White Paper policy which was so badly entangling Great Britain in a web of hostile acts against the helpless victims of Nazi persecutions, which I am sure, the English people themselves did not approve of. I also discussed with British officials the formation of a Jewish army in Palestine and urged the British government to give approval and to cooperate in this project. I was told that

White Paper policy might be reconsidered but not now. Even Winston Churchill would not favor any change at this time. I suggested that administrative discretion could be exercised even within the framework of the White Paper to avert a recurrence of the "Struma" tragedy. I told them that the only true friends that Great Britain had in the Near East -- friends who were actually fighting on its side -- were the Jews, and that Great Britain was sacrificing dependable friends in a critical hour to appease potential or actual enemies.

I was most cordially received, and my very frank and forthright presentation was not in any way resented. Mr. Richard Law promised to repeat faithfully what I had told him to Mr. Anthony Eden. Lord Cranborne said that he would give the matter most serious thought. It was clear to me that they were not at all happy over the measures which the White Paper policy was forcing them to take.

I do not know what good came out of these talks. But future refugee ships were not turned away, but, when seized, were taken to Mauritius^{US} and (Check!) later on to Cyprus, for the War's duration. This was a paltry relaxation, indeed, but there were no more "Struma" incidents.

While in London, I also called, in the company of Dr. Weizmann, on the Soviet Ambassador Ivan Maisky. We discussed Soviet-Jewish relations, the problem of the Jewish refugees in Russia, their transit to Palestine, and the general attitude of the Soviet Government toward the Jewish National Home.

R

I left England on March 25th for Lisbon. There I waited several days for a Clipper to carry me back home. I traveled sixteen hours to Baloma on the West Coast of Africa and then on to Natal, sleeping on the floor of the plane in the cloak-room. From Natal we flew to Belem at the mouth of the Amazon. Here we spent the night. As^{it} was the eve of Passover, I inquired whether there were any Jews in Belem. I found that there were two congregations of Jews -- one Sephardi, the other Ashkenazi. Towards evening, the Chacham and the lay head of the Sephardi congregation called and invited me to attend Passover Eve service at their synagogue, which I did. Later I was invited to have Seder with the Chacham at his home. It was a charming Seder conducted according to the Sephardi ritual. At about nine o'clock in the evening, a committee of the Ashkenazi community came to the Chacham's house and invited me to join them at their Seder. I went along, bidding farewell to my gracious host and his family. At the Ashkenazi Seder, the Haggadah was begun all over again, and the Passover meal as well...I enjoyed two Sedarim in one night.

Early next morning, we flew to Port of Spain in Trinidad. I attended Passover services there in the small synagogue, where I saw a number of American soldiers. Trinidad was an important American army base. That evening I was invited to attend a lovely Seder which was conducted by a Jewish Chaplain for the Jewish soldiers on the base. Thus, for the first time in my life, I enjoyed three Sedarim in one Passover...

R

The next day we flew to ~~P~~^{Pr}to Rico and New York. I had taken along with me a package of Matzot. When the Irish customs inspector in New York opened my suitcase and saw the Matzot, he said with a smile: "These are Jew biscuits, ain't they? Me and my missus like them too."

Two important conferences were to be held in the next two years in the United States which were to prove decisive in the history of the Zionist Movement.

An extraordinary Conference was called by the Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs in New York City, May 9-11, 1942, at the Biltmore Hotel. It was the first general conference of all the Zionist groupings in the United States since the outbreak of the war and the first important Zionist gathering since the World Zionist Congress in 1939. Dr. Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion were present.

The aims of the Conference were to bring about unity in Zionist ranks in the United States and to formulate Zionist aims in anticipation of the end of the war and the Peace Conference which was to follow. Both Dr. Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion delivered important programmatic addresses, ~~at this Conference.~~ I participated in this Conference.

The Biltmore Conference passed some important resolutions. Foremost among them was:

"The Conference urges that the gates of Palestine be opened; that the Jewish Agency be vested with control of immigration into Palestine and with the necessary authority for upbuilding the country, including the development of its unoccupied and uncultivated lands; and that Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new democratic world."

05

This so-called Biltmore program constituted, as the American Jewish Yearbook for 1942 states, "a fundamental departure from traditional Zionist policy. Heretofore official Zionism steadfastly refused to formulate the ultimate aim of the Movement, preferring instead to concentrate on the practical task of building the Jewish National Home. But the British White Paper of 1939, which interpreted the terms of the Mandate in a way that would freeze "The Jewish Community to a permanent minority status", and the war situation which would eventually bring international factors to bear upon the future of Palestine, prompted the Zionist leaders to take a firm unequivocal stand. This demand for a Jewish Commonwealth was subsequently endorsed by all major Zionist groups. . . . The Biltmore program was firmly sanctioned also by the Inner Actions Committee of the Zionist Organization in Jerusalem. In the absence of the World Zionist Congress, which met last in 1939 and may not meet again for the duration of the war, this may be regarded as the official Zionist stand on the ultimate aim of the Movement."

On August 29, 1943, the American Jewish Conference met at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. It was held in anticipation of the problems that would face the Jewish people in the post-war period in Europe and Palestine. It had been planned at a preliminary meeting of thirty-two national Jewish organizations which had been held in Pittsburgh earlier in the year and which had been convoked at the initiative of Henry Monsky, President of the B'nai B'rith, one of the truly great lay-leaders which American Jewry produced. At this meeting it had been decided to summon an American

0:9

Jewish Assembly (the name was later changed to the American Jewish Conference) which would be organized on democratic lines, to establish a common program of action in connection with post-war problems, relating to the rights and status of Jews in the post-war world, to consider and recommend action upon all matters looking to the implementation of the rights of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine and to elect a delegation to carry out the program of the American Jewish Assembly in cooperation with the duly accredited representatives of Jews throughout the world. (The American Jewish Conference, Proceedings of the First Session, 1944, p. 33).

Five hundred delegates attended the Waldorf-Astoria Conference, one hundred and twenty-five representing national organizations and three hundred and seventy-five who were elected by the communities. Elections were held in every state of the Union. At least two million two hundred and fifty thousand Jews participated directly or indirectly in the local elections of delegates to the American Jewish Conference. (Ibid 48). All shades of opinion in the American Jewish Community were represented at the Conference -- Zionists and non-Zionists, Orthodox, Conservatives and Reform Jews -- labor leaders and many who belonged to no special group. All groupings were given proportional representation on each of the Conference committees, each group designating its own representatives and each committee electing its own officers.

The ^fourth ^{pl}enary ^session of the Conference which was held on ~~Monday~~ ^{night} every August 30th was devoted to a symposium on Palestine. It

was at this session that I spoke. I was given the time allotted to the American Jewish Congress. The time of the General Zionists had been assigned to other speakers.

"My dear friends, ^{I said} the Jewish people is in danger of coming out of this war the most ravaged of peoples and the least healed and restored.

"The stark tragedy of our ravage has been abundantly told here and elsewhere -- tragic, ghastly, unredeemed. To rehearse it again is only to flagellate one's self and to gash our souls again and again. But what of the healing? What is beyond the rim of blood and tears? Frankly, to some of us, nothing. We are being comforted at the moment with the hope that the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms and victory will bring the healing of our people.

"I am afraid that we are again sacrificing cool, albeit bitter reasoning and logic to beguiling romancing in the void. We are again turning away from ^{the} history to dreams and to apocalypses which some of us amazingly enough choose to call realism and statesmanship.

"The last World War made the world safe for democracy and granted the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe not only the rights of citizenship, but even minority rights. But you remember, or have you forgotten? It brought also in its wake the most thoroughgoing, brutal and annihilationist anti-Semitism that our people has ever experienced.

"Have you already forgotten the story of the first World War? Dare you forget it? And now again, in the second World War, many Jews are hoping

to achieve through another Allied victory what an Allied victory failed to give them after the last war, what a whole century of enlightenment, liberalism and progress failed to give them -- peace and security. They are again confusing formal political equality with immunity from economic and social pressures.

"The immemorial problem of our national homelessness, which is the principal source of our millennial tragedy, remains as stark and as menacing today as it ever was. Yet some Jews are again trying to circumvent it with wishful thinking and to hide the real problem, the nettling, perplexing, inconsistent problem, crying for expression and solution, under the thick blanket of appeals to Jewish unity and Jewish affability.

"There is a tragic fact which seems to escape so many students of anti-Semitism. The story of Jewish emancipation in Europe from the day after the French Revolution to the day before the Nazi revolution is the story of political positions captured in the face of stubborn and sullen opposition, which left our emancipated minority in each country encamped within an unbeaten and unreconciled opposition, so that at the slightest provocation, as soon as things got out of order, the opposition returned to the attack and inflicted grievous wounds.

"And in our day, stirred by the political and economic struggles which have torn nations apart, this never-failing, never-reconciled opposition swept over the Jewish political and economic positions in Europe and completely demolished them. There is a stout black cord which connects the era of Fichte

5

in Germany with its feral cry of "hep, hep", and the era of Hitler with its cry of "Jude verrecke". The Damascus affair of 1840 links up with the widespread reaction after the Revolution of 1848 -- the Mortara affair of Italy; the Christian Socialist Movement in the era of Bismarck; the Tisza-Ezlar affair in Hungary; the revival of blood accusations in Bohemia; the pogroms in the 80's in Russia; La France Juive and the Dreyfus affair in France; the pogroms of 1903; the Ukrainian blood baths after the last war and the human slaughter houses of Poland in this war.

"This, my friends, is our persistent problem. This is our immediate emergency -- immediate almost to every generation of our people in almost every country. What we are confronted with today is the frightful aggravation of a situation which has continuously darkened the pages of our history since the beginning of our dispersion.

"Now, what is the solution for this persistent emergency in Jewish life? There is but one solution for that national homelessness which is the source of our millennial tragedy. There is but one solution for national homelessness. That is a national home! Not new immigration opportunities in other countries for fleeing refugees; not new colonization schemes in other parts of the world, many of which were so hopefully attempted in the last few decades, down to our very own day, and with such little success. The only solution is to normalize the political status of the Jewish people in the world by giving it a national basis in its national and historic home.

"The world finally came to acknowledge the validity of this solution. In 1917, Great Britain issued the Balfour Declaration. This Declaration was not intended to be an immigrant aid scheme, an effort to open up a new avenue for Jewish immigration. Shortly before its issuance, and for many years prior thereto, Jews in very large numbers were finding opportunities for immigration in many parts of the world, especially in the Western Hemisphere. The Balfour Declaration was a political national act designed to rebuild the national life of the Jewish people in its homeland.

"Now, is this my interpretation or that of Zionists only? Not at all. It was the universally accepted interpretation of the statesmen of the world and of those who were responsible in the first place for the issuance of this Declaration: Lloyd George, President Wilson, Jan Smuts, Winston Churchill. They were thinking in terms of a Jewish Commonwealth or, as many of them called it, the Jewish State, which was to be the natural outgrowth and evolution of the Jewish National Home.

"And how did our American Jews in those days interpret that document? When the first American Jewish Congress met in Philadelphia in 1918, a Congress in which Zionists and non-Zionists participated, as in this Conference, it elected a delegation to represent American Jewry at the Peace Conference, and the delegation was given instructions formulated as follows:

They were to cooperate with the representatives of other Jewish organizations, specifically with the World Zionist Organization, to the end that the Peace Conference might recognize the aspirations and historic claims of the Jewish people in regard to Palestine and might declare, that in accordance with the British Government's Declaration, there shall be established such political, administrative and economic conditions in Palestine as would assure, under the trusteeship of Great Britain, acting on behalf of such a League of Nations as might be formed, the development of Palestine into a Jewish Commonwealth.

"Why has there arisen among us today this mortal fear of the term "Jewish Commonwealth" which both British and American statesmen took in their stride, as it were, and which our own fellow-Jews of both camps endorsed a quarter of a century ago? Why are anti-Zionists, or non-Zionists, or neutrals determined to excise that phrase -- and I suspect, in some instances, at least, that hope?

"Why are they asking us, on the plea of unity, to surrender a basic political concept which was so much a part of the whole pattern of the Balfour Declaration? I suspect it is because they, or some of them, or most of them, have never really reconciled themselves to the fact both of the Declaration and of the Mandate. They would like to forget about them or have the world forget about them or wish them out of existence. Of course, they have no

objections to Jews going to Palestine any more than they would have any objections to Jews going to New Zealand, to Australia or any other part of the world.

It is amazing to me, I frankly confess, that Jews are moved to applaud a fellow-Jew when he consents that Jews should have the right to go to Palestine. Once having made this monumental concession that Jews have a right to go to Palestine and that that right should not be restricted, they feel justified in asking the Zionists to make a little concession of their own -- just a little concession -- namely, to surrender that for which they and their fathers hoped and prayed through the centuries and which is already in the process of fulfillment -- a Jewish Commonwealth of Palestine.

"We are told that our insistence on the Jewish Commonwealth is insistence on an ideology, and why, we are asked, should one create disunity in the ranks of American Israel over an ideology?

"In all sincerity, friends, I ask you to think along with me -- is it an ideology? Is the natural, normal instinct of a homeless people to find a home' for itself after centuries of homelessness and to lead a normal, natural existence, an ideology? Is it an ideology for an Englishmen to want an England, or for a Frenchman to want a France, a Free France, and, when exiled from it, to wish ardently to return to it?

the
"Why is it an "ideology" for/people of Israel to want the Land of Israel from which it was driven centuries ago and so lost its peace and its rest and its joy of life?

"Was it an ideology which kept alive the hope of national restoration among our people for nineteen centuries? Was it not rather the hard, cruel facts of our existence, exiles, massacres, pogroms, indignities, all the way along the black stout cord of disaster, never broken from 70 to 1943?

"We are not insisting on ideologies; we are insisting on the faithful fulfillment of obligations internationally assumed towards our people and on the honoring of covenants made with us. We ask for nothing new. It is those who tell us to surrender the demands already acknowledged in international sanctions, that are motivated by ideologies, not we. It is they who are forcing the reopening of a question which should have in all conscience been closed in 1917.

"So, my good friends, we are not concerned here with ideologies. The reconstitution of the Jewish people as a nation in its homeland is not a playful political conceit of ours, a sort of intellectual pastime calculated to satisfy some national vanity of ours. It is the cry of despair of a people driven to the wall, fighting for its very life. It is the pressing urgency of instant and current suffering and of the besetting dangers and disabilities today, and, I am afraid, also tomorrow.

"From the infested, typhus-ridden Ghetto of Warsaw, from the death-block of Nazi-occupied lands where myriads of our people are awaiting execution by the slow or the quick method, from a hundred concentration camps which befoul the map of Europe, from the pitiful ranks of our wandering hosts over the entire face of the earth, comes the cry: "Enough; there must be a final end to all this, a sure and certain end!"

"How long is the crucifixion of Israel to last? Time and again we have been stretched upon the rack for other peoples' sins. Time and again we have been made the whipping boy for blundering governments, the scape-goat for defeat in war, for misery and depression, for conflict among classes.

"How long is it to last? Are we forever to live a homeless people on the world's crumbs of sympathy, forever in need of defenders, forever doomed to thoughts of refugees and relief? Should not, I ask you fellow-Jews, ought not, the incalculable and unspeakable suffering of our people and the oceans of blood which we have shed in this war and in all the wars of the centuries; should not the myriad martyrs of our people, as well as the magnificent heroism and the vast sacrifices of our brave soldier sons who are today fighting on all the battle fronts of the world -- should not all this be compensated for finally and at long last with the reestablishment of a free Jewish Commonwealth?

"Is not this historic justice and is this world today not reaching out so desperately and so pathetically for a new world order of justice? Should we not be included in that world order of justice? Are we not deserving of it? I am for unity in Israel, but unity for what? It is strange; frequently, I am bewildered. If I agree with certain people, that's unity. If I ask them to agree with me, that is disunity.

"I am for unity in Israel, for the realization of the total program of Jewish life, relief, rescue, reconstruction, and the national restoration in Palestine. I am not for unity on a fragment of the program, for a fragment of the program is a betrayal of the rest of the program and a tragic futility

besides. We cannot truly rescue the Jews of Europe unless we have free immigration into Palestine. We cannot have free immigration into Palestine unless our political rights are recognized there. Our political rights cannot be recognized there unless our historic connection with the country is acknowledged and our right to rebuild our national home is reaffirmed. These are inseparable links in the chain. The whole chain breaks if one of the links is missing. Do not beguile yourselves. Do not let anyone beguile you with the thought that the Arabs in Palestine or the British Colonial Office, for that matter -- and the two at the moment seem to be synonymous -- will consent to a large-scale immigration into Palestine as soon as we give up our idea of a Jewish Commonwealth. They are not that naive -- they are opposed both to a Jewish Commonwealth and to Jewish immigration.

"If we surrender our national and historic claim to Palestine and rely solely on the refugee philanthropic appeal, we shall lose our case as well as do violence to the historic hopes of our people. On the basis of sheer philanthropy, of satisfying pressing immigration needs, Palestine has already done its full share for Jewish refugees. It has taken in more than one-half of the total Jewish refugees of the world, and the Palestine Arabs and their sympathizers in England and here have been quick to point out that Palestine has already done all that can be expected from a small country and far more than most of the larger countries have done. It is because Palestine is the Jewish Homeland that we ~~cannot expect~~ have the right to insist upon unrestricted immigration.

It is because of the historic connection of the Jewish people with that land that the Mandatory Government in the first place undertook to reconstitute it as a National Home and pledged itself to facilitate Jewish immigration and the close settlement of the Jews upon the land. In other words, it is on the national idea that the upbuilding of Palestine as a place of large-scale Jewish immigration has always rested and can alone continue to rest. Our right to immigration in the last analysis is predicated upon the right to build the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. They are inter-linked and inseparable.

"To ask, therefore, the Jewish people to abdicate the political positions which after centuries it finally acquired in Palestine, or, by remaining silent about them, to suggest to the world that we have abandoned them, on the vain assumption that this would lead to the opening of the doors of Palestine to large-scale Jewish immigration, is utterly fantastic. I am for unity, but here I must point out in all humility that unity of action in democratic organization depends not upon unanimity but upon the willingness of the minority to submit to the decisions of the majority.

"It is folly to expect universal agreement among five million Jews of America, or among their chosen representatives here, on all basic problems affecting Jewish life. It is folly to expect it. It is naive to anticipate it. However, this is no reason for avoiding these basic problems. This is no reason for preventing the majority from endorsing ^a the program which the minority may not be inclined to endorse. If the overwhelming majority of American Jews

believe in the upbuilding of a Jewish Commonwealth, they should have the right, through the medium of this solemn conclave, to say so and to make their demand upon the world. A strange thing has occurred here. We are asked not to relinquish our convictions but at the same time not to express them.

The minority, if it is wise, as I believe it is, and responsible, as I know it is, and responsive to the democratic process, will abide by the decision and accept the role of a loyal opposition. We are not a government and we have no authority to impose decisions, but there is a tremendous moral authority in a solemn conclave such as this of the chosen representatives of our people, and when after due deliberation it speaks in overwhelming endorsement of a certain program, its decision ought not to be lightly disregarded.

"I close with this word, my friends. The heroic Yishuv in Palestine has prayerfully appealed to us to uphold its hands. You have read it in the public press. Our Yishuv today is fighting a desperate fight against enemies stretched all the way from Jerusalem through Cairo, through newspaper offices in the city of New York. It is fighting a desperate fight against enemies who are organizing another conspiracy to strangle its further development and to extinguish the great hope of national freedom which has sustained the faith and courage of those splendid men and women who are building the Jewish commonwealth. They have appealed to us, their brothers and sisters in America,

to approve of their struggle, to defend their rights and to appeal to the political leaders and statesmen of this great, free and blessed land to help them now in this, the approaching hour of decision, with the same sympathy and the same understanding as the Presidents of the United States from Wilson down, and the Congress of the United States, helped them in the earlier years. I ask you, good friends, shall we let them down?

"Shall we pass a Palestine resolution here which will mention nothing about the historic Balfour Declaration and its clear intent and underlying purpose -- the upbuilding of the Jewish Commonwealth? Will it be perhaps our purpose to send a delegation to the peace conference with nothing more than an immigration aid plea to let Jews go to Palestine, as if Palestine were for us another Santo Domingo?

"Are we to ask merely for the right of asylum in our historic home, the right which any people may claim in any part of the world, though, unfortunately, such claims are only infrequently recognized? Is this Jewish statesmanship? Is this Jewish vision, courage, faith? Or are we to declare in this great assembly, when the proper time comes, that we stand by those who have given their tears and their blood and their sweat to build for them and for us and the future generations, at long last, after the weary centuries, a home, a National Home, a Jewish Commonwealth, where the spirit of our entire people can finally be at rest as well as the people itself?

"Are we going to take counsel here of fear of what this one or that one might say, of how our actions are likely to be misinterpreted; or are we to take counsel of our inner moral convictions, of our faith, of our history, of our achievements,

~~SECRET~~

5

Louis Lipsky, who was ^{an important} ~~a key~~ figure in the leadership of the Conference, described the effect of my address in the "Congress Weekly" of October 13, 1958:

"At this halting moment, with the Zionists greatly troubled, with the non-Zionists uncertain as to where this confusion would lead, the man destined to play that part of deus ex machina revealed himself, in the person of Abba Hillel Silver, who was the next speaker -- representing not the Zionists, but the American Jewish Congress bloc which named him as their spokesman.

"He rose from his seat in the second row on the platform. He moved somewhat clumsily and with uncertain steps in the direction of the speaker's desk. He leaned his hands on the desk and braced his shoulders. His voice rang out resonant, fresh and arrogant. He was the debater, the pleader, the rebuker. He was interested in making a case and winning it and used all the arts of the advocate who wanted to convince and win a verdict. He sought the right word to describe what he wanted to say. He was not evasive. He was not tactful. He gave a moving, penetrating analysis of the prevailing conditions of Jewish life and what Zionism meant and wanted.

"Any summary of this remarkable address would be inadequate to convey the public impression it made upon the audience that heard it. The electric excitement it created seemed to bind every syllable uttered by the speaker to the nervous system of every listener. It was indeed the climax

of a great moment. It brought back the Zionist groups to the mood of unswerving loyalty to their cause, to a refusal to bandy words and make compromises. It made the Zionist program vividly clear. It strengthened the conviction of the Zionists that they could carry the whole Jewish people with them on the wings of their faith in the great struggle in which the Jewish people were immersed."

I was made a member of the Committee on Palestine which consisted of sixty-seven members and I was elected its chairman. After a free and full discussion in five sessions of the Committee, of the three separate resolutions which were introduced, agreement was finally reached. Before the resolution was to be presented to the Conference, ^{Judge} Proskauer, supported by Jacob Blaustein of Baltimore, President and Chairman, respectively, of the American Jewish Committee, attempted to get all action postponed by introducing a motion "that the action of the Conference with respect to Palestine be deferred until a future session to be called by the Praesidium, and that meanwhile the Palestine Committee be continued in existence".

The resolution was decisively defeated.

On Wednesday evening, September 15, at the ^Plenary ^Fession of the Conference, ^{presented} the Resolution which had been adopted by the committee with only two dissenting votes, ~~to the Conference~~. The gist of the resolution was:

"The American Jewish Conference, meeting at a time when the policies of the peace are in the making, and conscious of its historic responsibility and

of its position as representative of American Jewry and spokesman for the silenced Jewish communities of Europe, calls for the loyal and faithful fulfillment of the covenant entered into between the nations of the world and the Jewish people.

"We call for the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration, and of the Mandate for Palestine whose intent and underlying purpose, based on the 'historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine', was to reconstitute Palestine as the Jewish Commonwealth.

"We demand the immediate withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of May, 1939, with its unwarranted restrictions on Jewish immigration and land settlement. The White Paper is a violation of the rights accorded to the Jewish people under the Mandate for Palestine. It was characterized by Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons as a 'breach and a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration'. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations refused to recognize its legality or its moral validity.

"The Conference demands that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and that the Jewish Agency for Palestine, recognized under the Mandate as the authorized representative of the Jewish People, be vested with authority to direct and regulate immigration into Palestine, to develop to the maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of the country, and to utilize its uncultivated and unoccupied lands for Jewish colonization and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

"The measures here urged constitute the essential prerequisites for the attainment of a Jewish majority and for the re-creation of the Jewish Commonwealth."

This Resolution which was eloquently seconded by Henry Minsky, was adopted by the overwhelming majority of the delegates with only four dissenting votes. This was followed by a long ovation and the singing of "Hatikvah". Judge Proskauer presented a "statement of dissent" on the part of the American Jewish Committee. Concluding remarks were made by Dr. Wise and myself. The audience rose and sang "The Star Spangled Banner".

I was asked to speak again at the conclusion of the last session of the Conference. I said in part: "This has been the only great assembly, the only great K'nesia (Convocation) of American Israel in the last twenty-five years...

Here was revealed the Jewish mind in all its intellectual vigor and clarity. We all experienced some very high and exalted moments at this Conference, There were solemn moments; there were also great, joyous moments in the last few days that spoke of high hope and unbroken confidence in ourselves, in our destiny.

5

"A great hour has not found us, thank God, a small people. We faced our problems with realism, with frankness and with courage. We met each other here in a fine spirit of comradeship and tolerance.

"The future is still very uncertain. Many curtains are still to be drawn aside....

"In all humility I pray to God at this great moment that when we meet again we shall meet in an hour of victory, in an hour of redemption, in an hour of peace."