



## Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

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

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

Series VII: Personal Miscellaneous, 1908-1989, undated.

Sub-series A: Biographical, 1908-1981.

---

Reel  
211

Box  
79

Folder  
1a

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~~ <sup>my histrionic talents</sup> and my <sup>in 20 years</sup> scholarly research, "Moses" still dwells in the thick darkness which he entered on his way up <sup>to</sup> Sinai...."

The Dr. Herzl <sup>Zion</sup> 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~~ 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 <sup>and stimulating</sup> culturally ~~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 <sup>their</sup> 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 <sup>guided</sup> stimulated. <sup>There is</sup> 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 <sup>transcending</sup> 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 <sup>revealed</sup> 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 <sup>the</sup> immigrant listeners had left behind them in the old world, its spiritual grandeur, <sup>as well as</sup> 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 <sup>and promises</sup> 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 <sup>at the</sup> 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 <sup>sweet</sup> 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 <sup>involving a Rabbinate career</sup> 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

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

My <sup>2</sup>decision to enter the Hebrew Union College was not the result of <sup>any</sup> 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 <sup>the</sup> a leading Reform Temple, <sup>in New York</sup> was also Vice-president of the Federation of American Zionists; and <sup>of</sup> Joseph L. Harkness, 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 <sup>decisions</sup> 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 <sup>one</sup> ~~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 <sup>in</sup> of their <sup>respective</sup> fields, some of them world-renowned. They revealed to me <sup>quality and</sup> 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. <sup>It</sup> 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 <sup>Jewish</sup> 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 <sup>more</sup> intensive Jewish life which I knew in the East. As a Rabbi, I came close to people whom, <sup>perhaps</sup> for the first time, I saw as individual human beings in the setting of their every-day lives -- not merely as <sup>a</sup> 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 <sup>some</sup> 20,000. (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 Krchngold, 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 <sup>only</sup> one brief spell following the World War, during the notorious era of the Palmer Red hysteria, Cleveland went hay-wire with the rest of

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 \_\_\_\_\_



- ~~for~~ -

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<sup>ed</sup> home to tell the story of what I saw. My report was seemingly not all that the super-patriots ~~expected~~ for thereafter and until the end of the war a member of the Secret Service attended every one of my Sunday morning <sup>lectures</sup> ~~services~~. 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 ~~unforgotten~~ <sup>unforgotten</sup> to a degree and vindictive in a frightful measure.

B

The spirit of vae victus ~~{wee-to-the vanquished}~~ is written large <sup>up</sup> 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 <sup>with</sup> 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 <sup>spoken</sup> 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 ~~Police~~ <sup>to</sup> raids. Cleveland <sup>was</sup> in the grip of <sup>his</sup> hysteria. On May 1, 1919, a parade of socialists and sympathetic ~~Reds~~ <sup>to</sup> was broken up in a bloody riot. The next day two socialist <sup>to</sup> 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~~<sup>our</sup> fellow-citizens to return to democratic sanity and <sup>to</sup> safe-guard the traditional values of our free American society. I helped to organize a group of Cleveland men <sup>blacklisted to</sup> for law, order and free speech.

In 1927, the National Society of Scabbard and Blade, the Reserve Officers Training Corps, <sup>the</sup> 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, <sup>and</sup> 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 <sup>in the nation</sup> among our people as evidenced by the <sup>growing</sup> 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, <sup>or anyone</sup> ~~one~~ who favored the recognition of Russia, was automatically blacklisted.

<sup>On April 29, 1928</sup>  
I delivered an address at the Temple on the subject of Patriotism and Black Lists in which I said:

" 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, <sup>2</sup> because of the peculiar custodial relation which <sup>they</sup> ~~these~~ people have assumed towards America, the only authoritative <sup>in</sup> American opinion. All contrary opinions are straightway branded as unpatriotic and un-American.

" The war gave the professional '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 <sup>did</sup> ~~did not~~ not conform to his canon of patriotism. It ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> 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 ~~works~~ <sup>seeks</sup> 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 <sup>at that time</sup> 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 <sup>the latter had to resort to</sup> ~~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 <sup>U</sup> Unionism in a period of intense economic depression.



~~of the time~~  
I issued 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.

~~SECRET~~

✓ 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 <sup>an</sup>Amendment was decisively defeated.

(Here follows letter, thanks from  
Cleveland A. F. L. - C. O.)



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 first<sup>h</sup>hand 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 <sup>a</sup> 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 household was to rescind, 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 ~~an~~ 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 newcomer 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, Rubin, 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, ~~of~~ himself, thus restricted himself to a purely consultative position, something which he deprecated in the case of the others who were to be on 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 <sup>was</sup> ~~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 <sup>their</sup> ~~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 <sup>would</sup> ~~could~~ 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 <sup>independent</sup> ~~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~~<sup>that</sup> 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 <sup>some</sup> 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, Vladimir 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 <sup>style</sup> ~~type~~. 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,

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 <sup>to</sup> 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 <sup>a</sup> the most impressive cultural center <sup>in the</sup> ~~United States~~ <sup>world</sup>.

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. <sup>Historically,</sup> 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 <sup>intellectual</sup> nutriment and free of <sup>spiritual</sup> calories...

One of the subjects which I stressed most often in the pulpit and ~~outside~~ <sup>on various platforms</sup> 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. 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 ~~then~~ 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



<sup>R</sup> Elsewhere I indicated what I regarded as the function of the religious leader in modern society. <sup>What was it that</sup> As a Rabbi, <sup>taught</sup> what did I specifically ~~teach~~ my people about Judaism? I was never enamoured of <sup>found,</sup> 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 <sup>little new</sup> 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. <sup>To In preaching Judaism</sup> 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 <sup>though I was a Reform</sup> in which ministry I <sup>Rabbi; perhaps because I was a Reform Rabbi.</sup> served. I believed that the pioneer reformers and their disciples ~~after them~~ 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 <sup>is</sup> 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 <sup>substantially</sup> 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.

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 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, <sup>was</sup> ~~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 <sup>spiritual</sup> ~~golden~~ age of universal justice and brotherhood and peace awaits



D

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

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 his 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 docterate thesis which I had presented to the faculty of the Hebrew Union Colleg: in 1925, which I enlarged and completely revised for publication. It was well received in the scholarly world. In 1958, a paper-back

D

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

~~22~~ ✓

~~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 wheel of industry. The burdens of our economic order lie heavily upon the shoulders of our womanhood. Nowhere in the world today do these 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 <sup>frequently</sup> ~~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

change 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 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~~ <sup>the</sup> social movements of the day.

~~Especially~~ <sup>thus</sup> 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.

~~We~~ <sup>As a people we</sup> 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, ~~for~~ <sup>for many</sup> 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.

Mr. L.

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, <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ not an insoluble problem. Periodic fluctuations of prosperity and depression <sup>was</sup> ~~are~~ not inevitable. The business cycle, <sup>could</sup> ~~can be~~, to a large extent, <sup>be</sup> ~~is~~ 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~~ <sup>An</sup> insurance plan should be so drafted and ~~the~~ premiums should be so graded as to put financial pressure upon the employer to <sup>regularize</sup> 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.

- 3.71

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 <sup>in 1928</sup> ~~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 <sup>in</sup> ~~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

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 actuarially 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

6/10 E

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

"This Bill is sound, this Bill is practical, <sup>it</sup> is conservative, <sup>It</sup> has taken into account all the experiences of <sup>the countries</sup> 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 <sup>earnest</sup> sentiment of men and women who work in the field of religion, who are close to men and women in <sup>great</sup> their 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 <sup>which was</sup> aroused in unemployment insurance

by the introduction of the Bill and due to the manifold activities of our committee <sup>throughout the State</sup> the Ohio Legislature on April 9, 1931, <sup>acted</sup> 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".

7/11  
-52/-  
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 <sup>Springfield</sup> 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 <sup>the</sup> 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

- 58 - 12/ E

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, <sup>J.</sup> 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~~ <sup>(S.F.)</sup>) were the authors responsible for the Unemployment Insurance Bill, and ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> 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.



13 E

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

Organized labor at first ~~approved~~ <sup>disapproved</sup> unemployment insurance but by 1932, a complete reversal of attitude took place on the part of the American Federation of Labor. Thereafter, unemployment insurance had <sup>organized labor</sup> 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.

In 1935, a third <sup>Bill</sup> was introduced, known as the <sup>Boyd-Hunter B.A.</sup> Bill, which, like the preceding <sup>Bill</sup>, 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* ~~was postponed to March~~. *I did not* I could not attend in person and ~~so~~ *which was requested* I sent a statement 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.

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



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:

C  
O  
P  
Y

344

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 Bolshevik 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."

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

34  
- 7 -

F

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 -      ~~46-13~~      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.

" 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.

- 3 -

~~Mr. Louis Marshall~~

- 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 Bolshevik 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~~<sup>gave</sup> 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.



F

" 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

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 <sup>of the Conference.</sup> A few days <sup>later</sup> 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 <sup>Zionists</sup>, strongly opposed it. At the Zionist Congress which convened in Zurich in 1925, the main issue was the ratification of the <sup>enlarged</sup> 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



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 <sup>resources</sup> ~~veins~~ of strength, new resources of men <sup>and money</sup> ~~of~~ 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.

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 unavoidably<sup>2</sup> 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.

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 <sup>which is</sup> without historic precedent ~~in~~ 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 *ḥacrée*, 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 <sup>in</sup> 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 in Palestine. <sup>and Zionist funds</sup> Inordinate hopes were fixed upon ~~the~~ 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.