



## The Abba Hillel Silver Digital Collection

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

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

Series 7: Personal Miscellaneous, 1908-1989, undated.

Sub-series A: Biographical, 1908-1981.

---

Reel  
211

Box  
79

Folder  
5

Autobiography/memoirs, Book 3, 1963?.

### BOOK THREE

1. THE BATTLEFIELDS OF ISRAEL. COUNT BERNADOTTE.
2. SHOULD THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT DISBAND?
3. DISAGREEMENTS WITH PRIME MINISTER BEN-GURION.
4. AN UNPLEASANT INTERLUDE -- MY RESIGNATION FROM CHAIRMANSHIP  
OF AMERICAN SECTION OF THE JEWISH AGENCY.
5. MY RECEPTION IN ISRAEL - 1951. A VISIT TO SOUTH AFRICA.
6. THE ZIONIST CONGRESS OF 1951.
7. AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS WITH GENERAL EISENHOWER.
8. REPRESENTATION IN WASHINGTON.
9. ARMS FOR ISRAEL.
10. SUEZ AND THE SINAI CAMPAIGN.
11. THE AMERICAN SCENE AND WORLD PROBLEMS.
12. SEVENTY YEARS OLD.
13. EPILOGUE.

- 1 -

The State of Israel was now established but it was fighting for its very life. It should be remembered that what was finally achieved was achieved through bitter struggle on the battlefields of Palestine far more than on the political battlefields of Flushing Meadows and Lake Success. The United Nations was unable or unwilling to implement its resolution of November, 1947. The Jews of Palestine had to implement it with their blood and sacrifices. The moral strengthening which the United Nations resolution gave us was of enormous importance, as was the assistance which it gave us later during the armistice negotiations. It is clear, however, that there would have been no armistice in the fighting in Palestine which lasted for nearly a year if the Jews had not fought and decisively defeated the invading armies.

The final validating seal upon the political victories which were won, was set by the remarkable military victories of the greatly out-numbered and poorly equipped fighting forces of the Israeli themselves -- the Tz'va Haganah Le-Yisrael. Without their victories, our political victories would have been in vain; without our victories their military victories would probably also have been in vain. It is the people of Israel themselves, aided by the political assistance which they received from their fellow-Jews throughout the world, who established the State of Israel.

In the months which followed the proclamation of the State, there was severe fighting in Palestine. Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon invaded the country and Israeli forces clashed with them. The United Nations Security Council did nothing to defend the new state under attack but issued several cease-fire orders. It set up the office of a United Nations Mediator for Palestine to promote a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine. Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden was appointed Mediator. The boundaries of Israel were not firmly determined and attempts were made as part of the effort to achieve a peaceful adjustment to alter the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution.

A very dangerous political moment for the new-born State of Israel followed the publication of Count Bernadotte's report in September, 1948. The plan which Count Bernadotte prepared assigned the Negev, two-thirds of the territory of the State of Israel, to the Arab State and placed the city of Jerusalem under United Nations control. The American government gave its unqualified approval to this plan. A determined effort was made by the representatives of our government and those of Great Britain to rush through an approval of this plan in the General Assembly of the United Nations which was then meeting in Paris, hoping to capitalize on the public indignation which the tragic assassination of Count Bernadotte had aroused. This was a reversal on the part of our government almost as serious as that



of March 19th when it called for the scuttling of the Partition plan and proffered a temporary trusteeship in its stead. It was necessary for the American Zionist Emergency Council to get into action again in order to persuade our government to abandon the position which it had taken. This was not at all easy. As so often in the past, our government, both the Executive Branch and the State Department, suddenly became completely non-communicative on the subject. In the name of the Emergency Council, I sent on September 23, 1948, the following telegram to President Truman:

"We have relied on the loyalty of the American government to the United Nations Partition Resolution of last November, on your personal commitment and devotion to this policy and on the platform pledge of the Democratic Party to support the State of Israel within its fixed boundaries and we have accordingly been profoundly shocked by Secretary Marshall's unqualified endorsement of the recommendations of Count Bernadotte which would reduce the area of the State of Israel by two-third leaving it a miniature state incapable of large-scale settlement of refugees. The citizens of Israel who reluctantly accepted the partition of Palestine last November and who have since successfully defended the borders of their new state with their blood are now being asked to accept another partition of their small state. This penalizes Israel for having accepted partition and rewards the Arabs for having attempted by force of arms to upset the United Nations recommendation. We appeal to you to prevent the imposition of such iniquitous

terms on Israel and to stand by the pledged word of your administration and of the American government which accepted without reservation the November 29th decision and which my May 14th gave de facto recognition to the new State of Israel. "

Both political parties were persuaded to include planks in their 1948 platforms approving the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries which had been set forth in the United Nations resolution.

The Republican National Convention, on June 23rd, 1948, adopted the following plank:

"We welcome Israel into the family of nations and take pride in the fact that the Republican party was the first to call for the establishment of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth. The vacillation of the Democratic Administration on this question has undermined the prestige of the United Nations. Subject to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, we pledge to Israel full recognition, with its boundaries as sanctioned by the United Nations, and aid in developing its economy. "

The Democratic National Convention, on July 14th, adopted this plank:

"We pledge full recognition to the State of Israel. . . . We approve the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29 and consider that modifications thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel. We look forward to the admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations.

"We pledge appropriate aid to the State of Israel in developing its economy and resources. We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the State of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the United Nations to the extent that it may prevent any such revision. We continue to support, within the framework of the United Nations, the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places in Palestine. "

After much arduous labor we succeeded, on the eve of the national elections, in obtaining a clear statement from both the political candidates in opposition to the Bernadotte plan and in favor of the territorial integrity of Israel. President Truman stated that he would not agree to any change of the United Nations November, 1947 decision that would not be acceptable to the State of Israel.

The Bernadotte plan was rejected by both the Arabs and the Israeli. The Negev was finally secured by the Israeli fighting forces.

## BOOK II

### Chapter DD, page 1 Insert

A dramatic episode at one of the sessions revealed an open rift between the President of the World Zionist Organization and the Chairman of its Executive. A speech by Dr. Weizmann at the conclusion of the general debate was taken as an expression of his disbelief in the possibility of attaining the objective of a Jewish State. Ben Gurion strode angrily to the platform and declared that in making his statement, Dr. Weizmann did not speak for the Jewish People.

### Chapter DD, page 3 Insert

In contemplating the possibility that the issue might be presented to the United Nations I had thought of addressing ourselves not only to the Western democracies, but also to Moscow. I had intimated as much publicly and was roundly attacked in a part of the Jewish press for entertaining such a thought. Subsequent events proved me right.

### Chapter FF, page 14 Insert

In subsequent proceedings the Soviet Delegation turned out to be firm and consistent supporters of the case for a Jewish State. No doubt they had their own motives but we had every reason to appreciate their help and steadfastness throughout the proceedings.

### Chapter HH, page 32 Insert

There had been prolonged debate and a good deal of tension on the question of accepting or rejecting the last-minute proposal of the State Department



# INSERTS

## BOOK II

Chapter AA - page 3  
Chapter AA - page 3

HP

~~Insert as 2nd paragraph:~~ In the brief period of his association with the Emergency Council, Dr. Neumann initiated a number of significant activities including the organization of two highly important bodies: the American Palestine Committee and the Christian Council on Palestine. He engaged in diplomatic activity in Washington and also established the Commission on Palestine Surveys to make an engineering study of the Lowdermilk plan for a "Jordan Valley Authority." But he was acutely aware that Zionist public relations and political efforts were not being carried forward with the required scope, intensity and effectiveness. Deeply concerned over the grave inadequacies and the frustrating conditions prevailing in the Emergency Council, Dr. Neumann issued a public warning and resigned in February, 1943. His resignation helped to pave the way for a reappraisal and reorganization.

Chapter CC - page 14

RP Shortly thereafter a group of loyal adherents organized themselves as the American Zionist Policy Committee to bring about my return to the leadership of the Council and to fight for a program "in which timidity, appeasement and backstairs 'diplomacy' would have no place." This fighting committee was headed by Abraham Goodman, a veteran Zionist, as chairman. Dr. Neumann was its guiding spirit and chief spokesman on public platforms. Shapiro and Manson were joined by two other staff members of the Emergency Council, Abraham Tuvim and Harry Steinberg. Together they assumed full executive direction of the work of the Zionist Policy Committee and its nationwide campaign of information on the vital issues involved in the controversy.

"We must, in every way, support the Yishuv in its struggle against the attempt of the Mandatory Government to liquidate the Jewish National Home. By maximum financial and moral support, we must strengthen the Yishuv's power of resistance. The Yishuv must, in the last analysis, decide for itself the form and the timing of its resistance to British lawlessness in Palestine. But, whatever their decision -- we will stand by them. We must insure, regardless of cost, continued Jewish immigration into Palestine. "



terms, that is, to re-engage Mr. Montor. Dr. Neumann and I then resigned from the Executive of the Jewish Agency.

Most active in this unpleasant affair were the Poale Zion and their principles, the Mapai in Israel, and officials in the government of Israel.

It goes without saying that, upon my resignation, Dr. Nahum Goldmann was elected Chairman of the American Section of the Jewish Agency...

I continued as Chairman of the Zionist Emergency Council until September 1949, when I was asked to be relieved.

I had held that position for six years--the most crucial years of our Movement.

I attended the corner-stone laying ceremony of the agricultural school in Migdal Ashkelon which was established in my honor. Present at this gala occasion were Druses, including their Sheik, who had come all the way from Western Galilee to attend this function. This school has since expanded into many buildings and a beautiful campus and is known as Kfar Silver.

At a largely attended press conference, at the Press Club in Tel-Aviv, I was closely questioned about many things, especially about my resignation from the Zionist Executive concerning which there had been much commentary in the public press, a good deal from unfriendly sources. I told them quite frankly: "I did not resign, I was removed. As a result of unjustified intervention, I found myself in a situation where I could not effectively continue as Chairman of the American Section of the Jewish Agency. I was removed from my position by the tactics of those persons who now criticize me for my withdrawal. It was clear that they did not want me to continue in leadership. Why, then, are they complaining now?"

I returned to the United States and soon thereafter on June 24th, I left for South Africa to inaugurate the Fiftieth Anniversary celebration of the Jewish National Fund. The Jewish National Fund has always been the demilitarized zone in the camp of the Zionists, transcending all conflict and party strife. It was a successful tour.

the affairs of the other, but that both should work in friendly cooperation. I had resigned from the World Zionist Executive because of unwarranted interference from Jerusalem. In no instance had I attempted to dictate to, or interfere in the affairs of the Government of Israel.

I left before the Congress was over.

The political tussles and rivalries within the Movement were now too much for me. The State was established and I could not see the purpose of continually wrangling with fellow Zionists. I could find more helpful ways of serving the new state.

Thereafter, I declined every elective office in the Movement though I continued to be active in behalf of Israel. My interest in the Z. O. A., of course, never flagged. I attended its conventions and whenever consulted, I gave the organization whatever counsel I could.

I continued to address Zionist gatherings throughout the country. I participated in the campaigns of the United Jewish Appeal--and since 1956, I have served as the Chairman of the Board of Bonds for Israel, traveling extensively in its behalf. I served on the boards of the Hebrew University and the Technion and took an active part in its fund-raising efforts in the United States. Whatever was constructive in the life of the State remained close to my heart. I was available to the Embassy of Israel in Washington which, on numerous occasions, requested me to carry out some specific mission.

sentiments of the McCarran-Walters Immigration Bill. Both McCarran and Walters who had sponsored the Bill were Democrats and he did not know why he should be saddled with the responsibility for that Bill. He spoke of the deep interest which he took in the problem of the Jews in the concentration camps shortly after the invasion of Germany, of his visits to those camps, the manner in which he was welcomed by the Jews and the provisions which he made for their care.

our institutions of law, equality and justice. May it be given unto us to walk always in the dignity of free men, secure in our rights and faithful in the obligations of our prized citizenship.

"Make us all of one heart, O God, so that together as one people we may move forward unafraid to the tasks and challenges of the inscrutable years which lie ahead. Amen."

A few days later I received the following letter from President

Eisenhower:

January 28, 1953

"Dear Rabbi Silver:

I want to take this opportunity to tell you that I am particularly grateful for the important contribution you made to the Inauguration ceremonies. In the years ahead the ceremony and your part in it will be a source of real and constant strength to me. I am deeply appreciative.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER



an encouragement to violate its orders. Economic sanctions were applied to Israel which had not yet been ordered by the United Nations--while such sanctions had for several years not been applied by the United States in the case of Egypt or any other Arab state which had time and again defied the Security Council.

Jewish representatives called on Secretary Dulles and expressed the feelings of the American Jewish community on the withholding of economic aid to Israel. I telephoned Secretary Dulles several times about the matter. On October 25th I telegraphed Mr. Dulles and expressed the hope that he would do all that he could to correct the unfortunate impression which had been created by the announcement of the withholding of financial aid which, in my judgment, was a mistake from every point of view.

On Monday evening, October 26th, Secretary Dulles telephoned me from Washington. He said that he had been misunderstood at an earlier press conference; that he would like to discuss the entire matter with me and invited me to lunch with him at the State Department on October 28th.

At this luncheon we discussed the issue of the grant-in-aid and all the other issues which were up before the Security Council relative to Israel. I went into the matter in great detail--the hydro-electric plant, the matter of Kibya, the attitude of the State Department generally towards Israel since the new administration came into office and the importance of closer cooperation and a friendlier attitude.

by the President, myself and my associates, in the course of which we have also considered very carefully the views of Israel, as ably presented by their Ambassador here and also in Israel. I greatly hope that this move will open the way to the genuine peace in the area, which I know Israel wants and which I know is also the desire of the United States.

Knowing of your great interest in this matter, I am letting you know a bit in advance this background to our thinking and I hope that what we are doing will commend itself to you.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

/s/ John Foster Dulles

P.S. If, as I anticipate, you get this letter prior to my making my statement, please keep its contents confidential.

/s/ JFD

To this letter I replied on September 2, 1955:

At the Madison Square Garden Meeting, I stated:

"In a way what has happened in recent weeks -- the opening of the Eastern Mediterranean to Soviet penetration -- is the result of our Government's mistaken Middle Eastern policy. We warned against it time and again but our objections were written off as coming from special pleaders. We did not see things, we were told, from the American point of view.

"But quite definitely we saw it from the American point of view, and the people who were responsible for the handling of the Near East interests of our Government in the State Department have been proven wrong clear

I planned a visit to Israel in March, 1956. In view of the tense situation, I thought that a letter which I would bring from President Eisenhower to the President of Israel would be reassuring. Accordingly, I requested such a letter from the President. His letter to President Itzhak Ben-Zvi reads:

March 15, 1956

"My dear Mr. Ben Zvi:

"Through my friend, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, who is about to visit Israel, I should like to take the opportunity to convey my personal greetings on the occasion of the celebration of Passover, your historic festival, and on the eve of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

"I have followed with admiration the progress and development of your country. The American people wish your young state peace and prosperity.

"Permit me to assure you that the American Government, earnestly and in the friendliest of spirit, is exploring every avenue to bring about a satisfactory, peaceful solution of the problem which confronts Israel and its neighbors.

"We shall all need patience, mutual confidence and good-will to help us along the way.

Sincerely,

/s/ Dwight D. Eisenhower"

I presented it to President Ben-Zvi in his modest cabin at Sodom on the Dead Sea where he was spending the Passover holidays with the men in the potash works.

Prior to my return to the States, President Ben-Zvi gave me a letter to President Eisenhower:

During my visit to Israel in 1956, I also attended the dedication ceremonies of Kfar Silver on March 29th. On that occasion the Druse Sheik who had been present at the corner-stone laying in 1951, presented me with his abayah and cane and with his initialed watch as a token of friendship. Prime Minister Ben-Gurion was present, and actually startled me and the audience by addressing me as "the greatest American Zionist leader since Henrietta Szold"...

The meeting with President Eisenhower, which I had requested took place on April 26, 1956. Secretary Dulles was present. We spent about an hour together. Our main topic of conversation was the apprehension of our people due to the menacing arms situation.

Throughout the discussion I presented my arguments for permitting Israel to purchase a certain amount of defensive weapons--to restore the military balance--to act as a deterrent to prevent aggression--and to encourage the other Western powers to do likewise.

The arguments made by Dulles and the President hinged around the one central thought of theirs--that the United States is interested in bringing about a permanent peace settlement in that part of the world and that the



The problems of Israel were not the only ones which absorbed my interest. The American scene presented grave problems of its own.

In the Fall of 1957, the struggle over the desegregation of our schools, which had been ordered by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1955, reached one of its deplorable climaxes in the Little Rock episode when Governor Faubus of the State of Arkansas called out the National Guard to bar the admission of nine Negro students from entering Central High School. There were to be other such forceful resistances to the Court decision later on by the Governors of the States of Mississippi and Alabama, leading to violence and bloodshed.



I always confronted my people with this simple question: "How do you, yourselves, stand, for example, on the question of allowing a Negro family to settle in your neighborhood?" It is quite easy to love humanity in the abstract, but how about your next-door neighbor, who is not of your color or creed? When you talk of brotherhood, do you include everybody or only your own kind? How inclusive are you in your human sympathies? How much of snobbishness and status-seeking is left in your own make-up? If you are sincere in your devotion to human brotherhood, begin with yourselves! And then work with other men of good-will to make your voice heard in the councils of your community and your government. You must speak up and not be afraid. The greatest threat to the moral integrity of a man, especially of a man in comfortable circumstances, is his unwillingness to take sides in a controversial issue. Why should he invite criticism? Why should he not rather remain at ease in Zion? But this attitude of caution and complacency which is so common to men and to leaders of men is the besetting sin of our society, and in these revolutionary days it is a dangerous attitude.

I am not sure that the movement of passive resistance on the part of the American Negro to obtain his rights will succeed. Conditions in the United States are not identical with those which prevailed in Ghandi's India. But if it fails and the struggle enters other and far less desirable phases, the fault will not be with the Negro, who will never again accept conditions as they are, but with the white man who stubbornly denied him these elementary human rights and with the white man who preferred to remain detached and uninvolved in the struggle.

We owe it to ourselves to abandon these prejudices because as long as they are with us, we remain civilized barbarians. We owe it to our faith because it summons us all to equality before God. We owe it to our gracious land--a land of noble heritage and tradition, which, until recently, was the hope and pride of free men. We must not continue to defile its image in the sight of the world. America is our beloved home and we can make it a happy and beloved home for all our people.

Those who oppose freedom for all men ultimately forfeit their own.

In the year that I came to Cleveland, 1917, the Communist Revolution took place in Russia. Throughout the succeeding years of struggle between what has come to be known as the East and the West, I had to define my own position toward Communism in its manifold manifestations. No religious leader could or would wish to by-pass this major challenge of the twentieth century. The pulpit would have relegated itself to irrelevancy in the modern world if it had failed to give men guidance on this powerful new phenomenon which was shaking the very foundations of our society. Religion could not ignore it--for it was attacking all religion. Democracy and liberalism could not ignore it, for it was destroying them both wherever it could. It would have been a simple matter to engage in wholesale condemnation and so find oneself praised and applauded. But there were factors in the Communist revolution which the religious leader was obligated to consider, and spiritual elements which he could not ignore. As between the East and the West it was not altogether a case of black or white--the perfectly good system against the utterly evil one.

In 1917, when Bolshevism first swept into power in Russia, I delivered a sermon at The Temple on "<sup>u</sup>Bolshevism--How to Meet It". My central thought was "Kill Bolshevism with justice, kill it with love". That was very naive, quite as naive as were the teachings of the founders of our faith when they confronted the evils of their own day. Since then I have visited Russia three times, in 1926, 1935 and 1961. I have spoken often in and out of my pulpit on what our attitude towards the Soviet Union should be.

I am convinced that we must learn to live on the same globe with the Soviet people and they with us. The Russians have adopted a way of life which is theirs. I would not choose it for myself or for America. It has stark and basic defects

study our adversary--at times even to learn from him--than to abuse him. We should go about our national business without emotional tautness, certainly without self-righteousness, in the full knowledge that while the worst can happen, in all likelihood it will not; doing what we feel we ought to do at the behest of our own national traditions and principles, helping where we can, seeking no political compensation in return, craving no praise and deterred by no threats, looking first to the soundness and justice of our own economy and the well-being of our people. No one will rob us of our chosen way of life, nor will time rust our spiritual treasures, if we cherish them lovingly.

Back in 1952 I wrote a letter to President-elect Eisenhower just before his inauguration.

December 26, 1952

"On the eve of the New Year, I should like to send you the greetings of the season and to wish you a year of health and well being. May the coming year be one of blessed new beginnings, under your inspired leadership, for our beloved country and for mankind.

"I read with deep interest of the overtures which have been made for diplomatic talks between you and Premier Stalin, and of the unwillingness of the Premier to discuss with you ways of ending the Cold War and easing world tension. I am confident that you will wish to give the most thoughtful consideration to such a proposal.

"Before the election you electrified the American people by stating that you were personally going to Korea to get a first-hand view of the situation there. Overwhelmingly the American people approved. I believe that they will similarly approve a decision on your part to get a first-hand view, in personal conference with the head of the Soviet Union, of the world situation which has deteriorated in recent years so dangerously, and to explore all avenues for improvement and for averting a world disaster. Such a conference may be--I do not say will be--the key which will open a new door of hope and promise for that peace and stability for which mankind has been so prayerfully yearning.

"You have been the great architect of our victory in war. I feel that destiny has summoned you to be the great architect of world peace. You were not afraid to take calculated risks to win victory in war. I am sure that you will not be afraid to take calculated risks to win victory for peace. Our friends throughout the world will be heartened in this dark hour of mounting confusion and despair, by a manifestation of forthright and courageous statesmanship on the part of the new President of the United States who, forever mindful of the need for making the free world secure,



nevertheless prepared to negotiate, in confidence and fulness of heart, for the settlement of those differences with the Soviet Union which will end conflict and which will enable both groups of peoples to live in peace in the same world.

"With warmest regards, I remain

Most cordially yours,

/s/ ABBA HILLEL SILVER"

I received a reply from President-elect Eisenhower on January 29,  
1953:

"Thank you for your thoughtful letter of December 26th.

"I greatly appreciate your comments and assure you that they will receive careful consideration. As you know, I am vitally interested in doing everything possible to achieve enduring peace throughout the world."

Unfortunately very little was achieved in this direction during the ensuing years. The major effort which was made to end the Cold War and which to culminate in the Paris Summit Conference of 1960 ended, as is well known, in the tragic fiasco of the U2. President Kennedy's administration promised a fresh start in reducing communist-free world tension but was soon bogged down in the abortive of Cuba

Fortunately in 1963 new winds began to blow. The thaw set in. The United States and the Soviet Union after years of fruitless negotiations signed a limited nuclear test ban treaty--a first step to check the suicidal arms race. The United States also began to trade more freely with the communist bloc. This may be the forerunner of other contracts which may lead to better understanding and trust and to the lessening of tensions.

I also early favored our recognition of Red China. It would have been easier then than it is today and might have changed the entire course of subsequent events.

I was opposed to our military intervention in Korea. In my address entitled, "A Letter to Mr. Truman", which I delivered in the Temple pulpit on December 17, 1950 and which was reprinted in the Congressional Record, I stated my reasons.



On Sunday evening, July 14th, a Testimonial Dinner was given in my honor on the occasion of my seventieth birthday by the Zionist Organization of America in association with the World Confederation of General Zionists and the Liberal Party of Israel at the Sheraton Tel-Aviv Hotel.

David Ben-Gurion attended this function and spoke. His words coming from one with whom I had so often in the past crossed swords moved me deeply. He said:

that the State of Israel is the collective creation of the entire Jewish people, not only of the people now living, but of the Jewish people in all generations. And I assume that Abba Hillel Silver realizes as I do that this creation has not yet been completed, and that we still have a long road ahead, long and difficult, strewn with obstacles and danger before we can complete our work"...

In my response, I thanked Mr. Ben-Gurion for his gracious tribute.

I also told the assembled guests

Like a golden thread, the Zionist ideal has run through the pattern of my life. From my early, formative years, and throughout my professional career of nearly half a century as a Rabbi, my life has been one with the Zionist Movement. I occupied many high offices. I attended innumerable conventions, conferences and congresses. I campaigned in a hundred cities and addressed a thousand gatherings. I fought many battles and emerged often bloody but always unbowed. I was clobbered by many people who have honored me by their presence here this evening--and I clobbered them in turn. Irritations and frustrations there were plenty. I have made many friends and some enemies in the course of my Zionist career. But never did the glory of the Zionist ideal fail to sustain me, never did its glow fade from my heart. I was privileged to witness with my own eyes the consummation of our people's millennial dream, and to share in the great drama of its realization--what richer guerdon can one ask for?

## EPILOGUE

- 1 -

Ever since the establishment of the State of Israel, I have frequently been asked, "What should be the future relationship between the Jews of America and the State of Israel?"

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

Israel will come again to be the non-political center of world Jewry. Pilgrims will go there as of old--and not merely the pious. There will be a free flow of manifold communications, of mutual stimulation, of give and take. Israel will again come to exercise a unifying and sustaining influence in Jewish life everywhere.

We shall remain one people, one historic community, as of old. But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States will be citizens of the United States, and similarly with Jews in other lands.

They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have

always done. But they will retain a special attachment to the land of Israel which will in no way interfere with their duties and obligations as citizens of their respective countries.

It was Voltaire who once said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands--his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally non-political, it may be applied to the Jew and Israel. Israel will be the Sabbath in the life of our people when, according to a beautiful tradition, an additional soul is vouchsafed unto man.

Does the re-establishment of the State of Israel represent the consummation of Israel's hope? No.



The State of Israel is today a great and glorious fact. But greater than the State of Israel is the people of Israel, and greater than the people of Israel is the immortal vision and hope which sustained our people through the long centuries, which made of it a covenanted people, pledged to the ideal of Malchut Shamayim, the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

The establishment of the State of Israel is not the final act in the drama of Israel. Our people is moving on, the Ark of the Covenant is moving on, in greater freedom now and in greater confidence along the broad highways of the world, to Achrit Hayamim, to the end of days, prefigured by our seers, "When they shall not hurt, nor destroy in all my holy mountain, and the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea."

The profound meaning of Jewish history lies not in nationalism but in Judaism. The destiny of our people is linked with the progressive establishment of the good society on earth, in accordance with the ethical and spiritual principles of our prophetic religion. The Jewish community inside and outside of Israel has today, as in the past, the mandate and the privilege of carrying on this work.

The establishment of the State of Israel has in no way diminished this primary and continuing obligation of Jewish life. What has been tragically abnormal in Jewish experience through the centuries--national homelessness--has now been rectified. Upon surer foundations the world Jewish community of tomorrow will be able to build a more affirmative religious cultural life, and perhaps recapture its revolutionary religious leadership in the world which twice in the past remolded civilization.

The establishment of the State of Israel was an act of historic necessity for our people, but it does not represent the consummation of Jewish destiny. Our destiny is linked up with the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. Our ancient prophets preached this during the first and second commonwealths. Our prophets of tomorrow will preach it during the third commonwealth. Our people were the first in olden days to proclaim the unity of God and the unity

of mankind. We, their descendants, must be among the first in the battle for this spiritual vision of human life. We must inspire our youth with the mighty accents of their historic faith so that they will join with all men of good will in the courageous attack upon all that disfigures life and keeps man from his divine patrimony-- upon poverty, upon the economic insecurity of the masses, upon corruption and social privilege, upon the war machine and chauvinism, upon race arrogance and exploitation.

Translated into concrete terms, it means replenishing the spiritual and religious reservoirs of Jewish life--the synagogue, the religious school, the academies, the centers of Jewish learning and scholarship. For years now the Jewish communities of the world, other than those, of course, which were destroyed or ravaged by war and persecution, had to give priority to relief, physical rescue and the reconstruction of the State of Israel. Much of this work will have to continue into an unpredictable future. Certainly there still remains the urgent and compelling need for taking care of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who are seeking new homes.

But even while this work is going on, and certainly as the urgency and pressure of that work diminishes, as we hope it will with the years, our energies and our resources should increasingly be poured into the permanent and positive spiritual and cultural institutions and enterprises of Judaism. We must begin to think again in terms of the total picture of Jewish life. Millions of Jews will live

in Israel in the days to come; millions more will live outside of Israel. It is the religion of Judaism which will unite them, not any political bonds. Judaism in the past kept our people together as one religious fellowship although they were politically disparate. For the sake of Jews everywhere for the enrichment of their lives, for their effective contribution to the progress of the countries in which they are citizens, and for hastening the day of the Kingdom, it is imperative that we begin to pour again our creative thinking, our substance and our energies into the institutions of Jewish religious life.

For nearly half a century I have worked as a Rabbi with the American Jewish Community. What do I think about the future of this great community, and of the tasks which lie ahead?

"No one can foretell a people's future...no one can know whose hand will draw the threads of the future on the loom of time or what the pattern will be. Fifty years ago no one could have foreseen the practical disappearance of European Jewry. One hundred years ago no one could have foretold that in the U.S. there would arise the largest Jewish community in history. At best we can project our hopes on the basis of our present knowledge and draw reasonable inferences from perceptible trends. If one were to ask



It was about this time that a decision was reached by the Zionist bodies to invite me to become Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Zionist Emergency Council. I accepted the invitation and for six years I occupied this key position in American Zionism.

Both political parties were persuaded to include planks in their 1948 platforms approving the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries which had been set forth in the United Nations resolution.

The Republican National Convention, on June 23, 1948, adopted the following plank:

"We welcome Israel into the family of nations and take pride in the fact that the Republican party was the first to call for the establishment of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth. The vacillation of the Democratic Administration on this question has undermined the prestige of the United Nations. Subject to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, we pledge to Israel full recognition, with its boundaries as sanctioned by the United Nations, and aid in developing its economy."

The Democratic National Convention, on July 14th, adopted this plank:

"We pledge full recognition to the State of Israel. . . . We approve the claims of the State of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29 and consider that modifications thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the State of Israel. We look forward to the admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations. We pledge appropriate aid to the State of Israel in developing its economy and resources. We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the State of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the United Nations, to the extent that it may prevent any such revision. We continue to support, within the framework of the United Nations, the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places in Palestine."

Harold P. Manson, as Director of Information, was very active in organizing support for the resolutions. After much arduous labor we succeeded, on the eve of the national elections, in obtaining a clear statement from both the political candidates in opposition to the Bernadotte plan and in favor of the territorial integrity of Israel. President Truman stated that he would not agree to any change of the United Nations November, 1947 decision that would not be acceptable to the State of Israel.

The Bernadotte plan was rejected by both the Arabs and the Israeli. The Negev was finally secured by the Israeli fighting forces.



for peace and for international cooperation? I believe that in all these major trends, our age has given welcome evidence of great determination and considerable progress. It is moving purposefully in the right direction -- the abolition of war, the reduction of poverty, and the elimination of racial inequality. These are the three major trends of our century, and they are the major trends both in the East and the West, in the Communist as well as in the non-Communist world. What is tearing these worlds apart is a difference not of ideology or objective, but of method...

In the days to come there will be new horizons to challenge the adventuresome spirit of man. In science and industry, in invention and discovery, in the arts and the humanities, progress will be unlimited. We are far from having reached the ultimate stage in the evolution of mankind. The twentieth century is building a better and ampler world for man, and the twenty-first century will advance and improve upon it. There will be more of the good things of life for everyone. A society will emerge, I believe, which will be free from the dark heritage of the past, the age-old curse of poverty, misery and exploitation, of inequality, racialism, and intolerance.

And I believe, too, that it will be a great age for American Jewry if the catastrophe of war does not shatter its security and life. As a minority we are helpless against the ravages of hate and demagoguery, which war and economic depressions unleash.



But given peace and economic stability, the American Jewish community will move forward and develop. It will expand its cultural and religious life and institutions, and will make worthy contributions to the total life of America. The last three hundred years are warrant for it. Our beginnings were humble -- as were the beginnings of all peoples who came to these shores. Steadily through the years, and more rapidly in the last three-quarters of a century, our numbers increased and we shared eagerly and gratefully in the growing and evolving life of America. Our people became in outlook, in confidence, in hopefulness, true children of the New World,

- 2A -

As an American, a Jew and a Rabbi, I have been active for many years in support of the struggle of the Negro in the United States for equality before the law, for equal opportunity to earn a livelihood, for unsegregated schools, and for the same manner of respect which is the due of every citizen in a free society.

My position has been that the task confronting us is not a simple one and the strength of no one is equal to its complexity. It is not easy to make straight what has been crooked for so long and to make right a wrong which has been tolerated for so long, but I have been mindful of the admonition of our sages that ours is not the duty to complete the task but neither are we free to desist from it.

This applies to individuals, to nations, to generations.

But we must begin with ourselves. This is what I have stressed on all occasions. It is vital, as a first step, to outlaw by legislative action public practices which are discriminatory. Whatever conditions can be reached and corrected by law, should be done. But there are vast areas of human relationship which cannot be reached by law -- the inner disposition and attitudes of men. Here is where the individual must challenge himself. We must thoroughly house-clean our own minds and souls of racial prejudices and of attitudes which are unworthy of mature people. We must grow up to our full human stature. We must check on our own personal conduct before we point an accusing finger at our neighbor.

I always confronted my people with this simple question: "How do you, yourselves, stand, for example, on the question of allowing a Negro family to settle in your neighborhood?" It is quite easy to love humanity in the abstract, but how about your next-door neighbor, who is not of your color or creed? When you talk of brotherhood, do you include everybody or only your own kind? How inclusive are you in your human sympathies? How much of snobbishness and status-seeking is left in your own make-up? If you are sincere in your devotion to human brotherhood, begin with yourselves! And then work with other men of good-will to make your voice heard in the councils of your community and your government. You must speak up and not be afraid. The greatest threat to the moral integrity of a man, especially of a man in comfortable circumstances, is his unwillingness to take sides in a controversial issue. Why should he invite criticism? Why should he not rather remain at ease in Zion? But this attitude of caution and complacency which is so common to men and to leaders of men is the besetting sin of our society, and in these revolutionary days it is a dangerous attitude.

I am not sure that the movement of passive resistance on the part of the American Negro to obtain his rights will succeed. Conditions in the United States are not identical with those which prevailed in Gandhi's India. But if it fails and the struggle enters other and far less desirable phases, the fault will be not with the Negro, who will never again accept conditions as they are, but with the white man who preferred to remain detached and uninvolved in the struggle.

We owe it to ourselves to abandon these prejudices because as long as they are with us, we remain civilized barbarians. We owe it to our faith because it summons us all to equality before God. We owe it to our gracious land -- a land of noble heritage and tradition, which, until recently, was the hope and pride of free men. We must not continue to defile its image in the sight of the world. America is our beloved home and we can make it a happy and beloved home for all our people.

Those who resist freedom for all men ultimately forfeit their own.

With the establishment of the State and the fulfillment of the Zionist ideal, the question soon arose as to the future of the Zionist Emergency Council. Should it disband? Should the whole Zionist Movement wind up? And what <sup>should</sup> ~~shall~~ be the <sup>future</sup> ~~relationship~~ between the Jews of <sup>Am</sup> ~~Am~~erica and the State of Israel?

To this last question I addressed myself when I spoke before the Fiftieth Biennial Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations held in Boston, November 14-17, 1948.

"If history is any guide, the Jews of today who will continue to live in other lands will, by and large, maintain the same attitude towards the State of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic relationship towards that land. They will materially help <sup>it</sup> to absorb as many Jews as will wish to go there or may have to go there. They will help to build up its cultural, scientific, and spiritual institutions, as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere can be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews, as a people, can accomplish on their own.

Israel will come to be again the non-political center of world Jewry. Pilgrims will go there as of old -- and not merely the pious. There will be a free flow of manifold communications, of mutual stimulation, of give and take. Israel will again come to exercise a unifying and sustaining influence in Jewish



It need not duplicate their activities, but it can stimulate, guide and coordinate them. It took us many hard years of struggle to establish the ascendance of our ideas in the Jewish communities of this country. Let us not lose it now by default."

Not all Zionists agreed with this point of view. Foremost among those who adopted an opposite view-point was Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. He felt that now that the State was established, there was no longer any need for a strong Zionist Movement. The Zionist Movement was the necessary scaffolding for the building of the State. Now that the State was built, the scaffolding was no longer needed. A Zionist is one who settles in Israel. All others may be friends of Israel but should not regard themselves as Zionists. This position, he maintained consistently and vocally through the years and in the capacity of Prime Minister of the State, did much, quite unintentionally, I <sup>am</sup> ~~am~~ sure, to undermine the World Zionist Movement. ~~After a time, his own party refused to go along with him on the position which he took,~~

(Quote Resolution)

When Mr. Ben-Gurion visited the United States in April, 1951, to launch the campaign for Bonds for Israel, he studiously avoided reference to Zionism and the Zionist Movement and on the eve of his departure, he addressed a Zionist meeting in New York in which he told the Zionists that they cannot speak for American Jewry as a whole, that there are non-Zionists who do not want the Zionist Movement to stand "as a wall between them and Israel", and that the Zionists should confine themselves in their work to education and Aliyah.

Thus, there existed, <sup>a</sup>~~therefore~~, sharp divergences~~;~~ in our points-of-view about the future role of the Zionist Movement. But there were also other more down-to-earth party considerations which led to ~~sharp~~ conflicts between Mr. Ben-Gurion and me.

Ben Gurion's party, the Mapai, wanted to control the government and determine its future political and economic policies, as indeed it has done ever since the establishment of the State. The Mapai's economic platform was socialistic, although not radical or inflexible. Through the years it has known how to make the necessary adjustments to conditions as they arose and it has invited and stimulated private investments and enterprises in the country.

But from the beginning it looked upon the party of the General Zionists in Israel as a most serious rival and competitor. The General Zionists' party

The General Party in Israel was a merger of two groups, one slightly to the left of the other, which agreed to unite in 1946.

I was a General Zionist and because of the prominence of the position which I occupied, I came to be regarded as an asset to the General Zionist Party in Israel, and correspondingly a threat to the political position of the Mapai. Had the Z.O.A. membership <sup>been</sup> largely ~~been~~ laborite instead of ~~predominately~~ "liberal centrist", all the difficulties and ~~disputes~~ <sup>disputes</sup> which were to follow would not have arisen.

Not long after the State was established, elections were held for a national ~~Constituent~~ <sup>Constituent</sup> assembly (The ~~Knesset~~ <sup>Knesset</sup>) and as the date set for the election, January 25, 1949, approached, electioneering began in earnest and rapidly gained in intensity. The General Zionists in Israel quite naturally pointed to the political achievements of their friends in the United States. The Mapai, quite as naturally, found it necessary to disparage them... And so politics bedeviled our relationship, ~~and~~ Ben-Gurion, as the official leader of the Mapai, and I, as the unofficial leader of General Zionism in America, thus drifted into discord and misunderstandings. Politically, in theory and method, we were not far apart. We were both known as maximalists, activists, and -- stubborn. I admired the very dynamic and courageous leadership which <sup>Ben Gurion</sup> ~~he~~ gave our Movement during the critical years of the founding of the state. In the hour of decision he remained firm. He did not waver in his convictions and he did not under-rate the determination of the Yishuv to fight for its national redemption. But he was

recriminations began to abate in 1952, when the General Zionists joined the government coalition in Israel, and especially after the election of President Eisenhower in the fall of 1952. This removed from the arsenal of criticism the argument which had frequently been employed against me that I was persona non grata at the White House....

In the ~~days~~<sup>eyes</sup> of the politically oriented <sup>American</sup> Zionists, a leader's position depended on whether he was persona grata at the White House. When President Truman was elected in 1948, my stock slumped. When Dwight Eisenhower was elected President in 1952, my stock rose again. Actually, my Zionist achievements under the Eisenhower administration, such as they were, were far less substantial than under the Truman administration, though personally my contacts with the Eisenhower administration were far more frequent and pleasant. Important national policies and decisions are simply not arrived at the "personality" way.... Furthermore, the attitude of the State Department under John Foster Dulles continued to be quite as uncertain toward Israel as it had been under Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes or Marshall. At times it seemed to be definitely following a policy of Arab appeasement.

I sensed the cooling off towards me on the part of the friends of the Mapai in the United States -- the Poale Zion -- as early as 1946, when elections for the World Zionist Congress of that year were held. The Poale Zion had backed me up solidly right along and its spokesmen had praised and defended me. But



2 'A'

M. A.

After prolonged and fruitless debate on what was regarded as ultimate aims, on the differences between "Jews in Exile" and "Jews in the Diaspora", ~~and as to~~ whether all Jews the world over should, <sup>and whether there was any future for Jewish life in the Diaspora</sup> would, or ~~not~~ <sup>could</sup> come to Israel, the so-called Jerusalem Program was finally shelved.

There was also considerable heated discussion as to the future relationship <sup>between</sup> ~~of~~ the Zionist Movement and the State of Israel. Here charges were hurled, especially by members of the Mapai that certain American Zionists (meaning me) had not yet reconciled themselves to the fact that there is <sup>in</sup> ~~no~~ actual existence ~~of~~ a sovereign State of Israel and <sup>who</sup> ~~we~~ were trying to interfere and to dictate to it. My position, of course, which I <sup>had</sup> ~~often~~ stated, was that neither should interfere in the affairs of the other, but that both should work in friendly cooperation. I had resigned from the World Zionist Executive because of unwarranted interference from Jerusalem. In no instance had I attempted to dictate to or interfere in the affairs of the Government of Israel.



men

The Congress Court denied them any seats  
at the Congress although the Court itself did not  
follow the election procedure and penalized  
the other parties <sup>in general</sup> by cutting down the numbers  
of their delegates....

The Zionist Congress, which met in August, 1951, was a dishevelled and untidy affair. It had been repeatedly postponed. It was the first time that Congress met since the establishment of the State. One might have expected an exalted mood of achievement to dominate it and that it would devote itself to outlining a program of action for the future of the Movement. Instead of which, the bitter inter-party strife which had attended the elections for the Constituent Assembly (Knesset) in Israel in 1950, were reflected in the Congress where the largest single delegation was from Israel. Likewise, the sharp friction which had developed during the preceding three years between the Mapai group in Israel and the Zionist Organization of America <sup>and my resignation were</sup> ~~was~~ also in evidence. The Mizrachi and the General Zionists of Israel <sup>boycotted</sup> ~~had at first refrained from voting for delegates to the Congress~~ <sup>elections</sup> altogether, because of irregularities in the electoral list, over

The acrid general debate with which the Congress opened soon reflected the party cleavages and the clash of personalities. The <sup>American</sup> General Zionists, who were greatly out-numbered <sup>because of</sup> ~~because of the votes which had been allotted to them, and~~ the strong Mapai-Hadassah ~~and~~ Poale Zion alignment became the target of attack, especially the Zionist Organization of America -- and more especially, myself.

Golda Meyerson (now Mair), speaking for the Mapai, delivered an especially <sup>partisan and</sup> vitriolic attack upon me -- which <sup>outraged almost the entire press</sup> ~~was so bad that even the labor~~ paper, "Davar", apologized for it. <sup>in Israel. Her arguments were,</sup> as the main, those which Mr. Ben-Gurion, <sup>had</sup> ~~employed when~~ he addressed American Zionists in New York, in April of that year.

(over)

The ~~missary~~ sent to  
Mrs. Halpern was sent by the Executive to Florida  
to ~~see~~ convey this compromise agreement to Mr.  
Morgenthau. Mr. Montor accompanied her on  
this mission,....

It was none of the business of the Jewish Agency <sup>I maintained</sup> to designate the chairman of the campaign of the U. J. A. This was the function of the United Palestine Appeal. These three then proceeded to cable Jerusalem urging a special session of the entire Executive in New York City. The above three <sup>also</sup> ~~went~~ <sup>also went</sup> without authorization and without notifying the Chairman, to Mr. Morgenthau and requested him to resume the chairmanship of the campaign for the coming year.

The Jerusalem Executive of the Jewish Agency came to the United States and after lengthy discussions, a compromise resolution was worked out under which there would be three directors, one representing the Joint Distribution Committee, another the United Palestine Appeal and a third who would be designated by Mr. Morgenthau. This would have made Mr. Montor one of the three directors. As a prior condition to his re-employment, however, he would be required to sign a letter of retraction of the charges which he had made and would refrain in the future from any and all controversial political activity related to Zionist funds and to any Zionist organization. The Committee of Contributors would discontinue all <sup>its</sup> activities and would dissolve immediately.

<sup>Over</sup> Mr. Morgenthau rejected the Agency's compromise proposal and demanded that Mr. Montor be given sole authority to run the United Jewish Appeal. The Executive then asked me to see Mr. Morgenthau personally in Florida in an effort to get him to agree to the compromise which had been worked out by the Executive. Mr. Morgenthau could not see me. Whereupon the Executive of the Agency reversed itself and yielded to Mr. Morgenthau's

Instead of planning the future activities of the Movement, the Congress became badly entangled in an ideological squabble over what came to be known as "the Jerusalem Program". The Israeli delegates, led by the Mapai, insisted that a rigid formula be accepted by the Movement to the effect that Zionism means the personal commitment of every Zionist to settle in Israel -- the Ben Gurion formula. ~~(Quote)~~.

This immediately was challenged by ~~the~~ delegates from America <sup>and other countries.</sup>. They resisted the attempt to foist such a formula on the Movement. I, myself, took ~~violent~~ <sup>strong</sup> exception to it. ~~(Quote)~~.

Of course, we all agreed that there was ~~a~~ need for immigration -- especially from the Western countries -- but to make this obligatory on every Zionist was to announce to the world that Zionists everywhere are not integrated citizens of their countries, that Israel is summoning them to renounce their citizenship.

add "A"  
I left before the Congress was over. ~~It was the last Congress that I~~  
~~attended.~~

The political tussles and rivalries within the Movement were now too much for me. The State was now established and I could not see the purpose of continually wrangling with Zionists. I could find more helpful ways of serving the new state.

Thereafter, I declined every elective office in the Movement. My interest in the Z. O. A., of course, never flagged. I attended its conventions and whenever consulted, I gave the organization whatever counsel I could.



There existed in the United States a core of opposition to the leadership of Dr. Neumann and to myself, ever since I took over <sup>responsibility for</sup> ~~the leadership of~~ our political work in the United States in 1943. In an earlier chapter I referred to this opposition in connection with the episode of the Palestine Resolutions in the Congress of the United States. When this opposition was defeated, it did not disappear. It simmered through the years, and now, as a result of the action which <sup>was taken</sup> ~~took place~~ at the General Council in Jerusalem, it gathered itself -- as the Committee for Progressive Zionism -- for another attack. This time the attack was aimed directly at the administration of Dr. Neumann, but indirectly against me.

The General Zionist Party in Israel had, early in 1948, split. A group which called itself "Progressive" seceded from the General Zionist Party and set itself up as an independent Party. From that moment on, those who did not follow this group of secessionists were branded as reactionaries. One needed a microscope to distinguish the precise differences between the "Progressive" Party and the General Zionist Party. A few years later, they were to unite again into one ~~party~~ and their competing subtle ideologies were forgotten.

During my visit to Israel in 1948, I <sup>cautioned against</sup> ~~deplored~~ this split in the ranks of the General Zionists and called on the Progressives to return. At that time I did not support one group as against the other, and urged their re-unification. My advice was not taken. In the 1949 national elections, they presented two separate lists. When a coalition government was formed following the elections, the Progressives entered the coalition, the General Zionists did not.

~~The letters~~  
These are the letters which we exchanged.

October 14, 1952

General Dwight D. Eisenhower  
President's House  
Columbia University  
New York, New York

My dear General:

It is with keen interest that I have followed your campaign throughout the nation and your forthright discussion of the issues which confront the American people.

I was at the Republican Convention in Chicago, and was greatly pleased, because of my close association with the cause, at the inclusion in the Party platform of a clause on the State of Israel, which reads

"The Republican Party has consistently advocated a national home for the Jewish people since a Republican Congress declared its support of that objective thirty years ago. In providing a sanctuary for Jewish people rendered homeless by persecution, the State of Israel appeals to our deepest humanitarian instincts. We shall continue our friendly interest in this constructive and inspiring undertaking. We shall put our influence at the service of peace between Israel and the Arab states and we shall cooperate to bring economic and social stability to that area."

I do not recall that you have had an occasion during your campaign fully to define in public your personal views on this subject which is so vital to the peace and progress of the Middle East and to the defense of our free world. I know that many of your friends and admirers would be eager and grateful for such a statement.

With all good wishes, I remain

Very cordially yours,

Signed/ Abba Hillel Silver

"The statements on Israel which have been issued by both candidates for the Presidency of the United States served to strengthen the conviction that the friendship between America and Israel will become even closer and stronger in the months and years to come. Our country's support for Israel has always been bi-partisan in character and the declarations which were made during the past week by General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson have provided a striking evidence that this bi-partisan policy will be continued in the future. There is clearly no difference of opinion between the Republican and Democratic Parties on the question of friendship and assistance for Israel."

General Eisenhower was elected President. On November 18th, he wrote me a letter in which he said: "I deeply appreciate your fine support during the recent campaign and I look forward to seeing you again soon." Governor Dewey wrote: "You made a wonderful contribution to this tremendous result and I know it must give you the deepest personal gratification." John Foster Dulles wrote on November 26th: "You have always been a good friend who has stood by me in hours of trouble."

On December 11th I received a letter from Senator Stiles Bridges stating that the President-elect, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has requested

PP

- 1 -

At a meeting of                      <sup>in</sup> on January ~~22~~, 1951, Ambassador Eban asked me to come down to Washington. He laid before me the ~~question~~ <sup>matter</sup> of ~~the~~ "grant-in-aid" by the American government and solicited my help in connection with the introduction of ~~the~~ <sup>a</sup> bill in Congress. I saw Senator Taft in his office. I discussed with him American grant-in-aid for Israel. He said that he would be very happy to help, that he would be prepared to sponsor such a bill on a non-partisan basis. A week later I received a letter from Ambassador Eban in which he stated: "I was greatly heartened to hear the outcome of your visit here last week. I am convinced that this has taken us  
I  
a very long stride forward and ask you to accept this expression of warmest appreciation."

Early in February, I received the first draft of the bill and I suggested certain changes in it. The second draft was then submitted to me. On February 28th I spoke with Senator Taft by long distance ~~in Washington~~. He informed me that he was meeting the next day with Senator Douglas to agree on the final wording. In June Ambassador Eban telephoned me again requesting that I come to Washington again in connection with the Grand-in-aid Bill. I did. ~~He~~ <sup>They</sup> requested me to see Senator Taft that morning. The Senator indicated that he would continue to press for his resolution as an authorization resolution when the President's Omnibus Bill for military and civilian aid came up before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Note: Find out what was the fate of this Grand-in-aid Bill.

add 1<sup>st</sup> A



/A'

Israel received grant-in-aid from the United States -- fourteen million dollars in 1951, eighty-four million dollars in 1952, and varying amounts thereafter until ,



to address myself is, can we think hopefully of the next century as Jews, as Americans, as members of the human family -- for they are all inter-related. I believe that we can. I believe that we have every right to do so, though we cannot be dogmatic about it; for progress is neither guaranteed nor automatic; nor can we ignore the fact that time and again the unforeseen and unpredictable in history have upset all man's careful calculations.

" I believe that the age in which we live is a great age and that we are moving towards an even greater age. I believe that our present age is one of the greatest in human history. We are too near our times properly to appraise them. One requires distance in order to see great objects in their proper perspective. We ourselves are too much involved in the turmoil and the conflicts of our day to see objectively the amazing new pattern of life which is emerging.

"Many people are quick to describe our age as materialistic, as lacking in idealism, in aim and purpose, an age of breakdown and disintegration."

"In characterizing our age as great, I am thinking in terms of social progress and welfare, in terms of human advancement and civilization. More is being done in our day for the improvement of the conditions of the common man, for the raising of his standard of living, his health, his education, and for his protection against the disabilities of sickness, unemployment and old age, than in any generation, than any five generations in the past. Never were more determined efforts made to bring about a fairer sharing of the wealth that is produced and a better way of life for all.

"Never have the submerged races and peoples of the earth risen as they have risen in our day to demand and to achieve, as they have to a large measure achieved, freedom and self-determination. ~~Within the last eight years one-fourth of the earth's population -- more than five hundred million non-self-governing people -- have obtained their political freedom.~~ Imperialism and colonialism are in their death-throes. Backward peoples are pressing forward into the light of a new day, and the exploitation of the dark races of the earth is rapidly drawing to a close.

"What we are witnessing in our day, if we have eyes not only to see things, but also to see into the heart of things, is not social disintegration, but a radical new reintegration of humanity, a profound change in the social evolution of man, a change not free, of course, from dangers -- for there is no progress without danger -- but one of boundless and immeasurable potentialities.

"I do not wish to overdraw the picture. I am not suggesting that our age is approaching idyllic perfection, or that the millenium is just around the corner.

"The important thing to consider is not whether we are on the eve of the millenium, but whether the major trends of our age are in the direction of the hoped-for good society, or away from it. Is our age trying to eradicate poverty and illiteracy and to raise the standard of living of people, regardless of race or color or creed? Is it trying to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of peoples to national freedom and independence? Is it trying to organize the world

- 2 -

The meeting with the President took place on April 26, 1956.

Secretary Dulles was present. We spent about an hour together. Our main topic of conversation was the apprehension of our people due to the menacing arms retraction:

"

August 24, 1955

My dear Rabbi Silver:

I am planning to make a statement in New York on Friday at 5:30 p. m. dealing with the Israel Arab problem and suggesting possible bases for bringing about a genuine peace in the area. In this statement, I indicate that the President is prepared to recommend a substantial contribution to such a settlement, namely:

1. Subscription to an international loan to enable Israel to discharge its obligation to the refugees which in turn will help them to get resettled;
2. United States contribution to water projects which will develop more arable land which will aid in resettlement;
3. Good offices, if desired, to assist in making the frontier adjustments needed to convert the present armistice lines into permanent boundary lines;
4. United States participation in an international treaty guarantee, preferably sponsored by the United Nations, of the resultant boundary lines.

I feel that if this program were carried through, there would be no great difficulty in settling the remaining problems such as the question of transit through the Suez Canal, and determining the status of Jerusalem.

Probably the principal obstacle in the way of solution is the boundary matter, where the Egyptians seek a substantial part of the Negeb so as to have common boundaries with Jordan and Saudi Arabia, but where the Israelis also want continuous access to the port of Aqaba. I feel, however, that these conflicting claims can be reconciled, and indeed that some reconciliation is in the long run inevitable. This statement comes out of very long and careful thought given the matter



-5-  
- 8 -

But apart from its own merits, the very announcement of such contemplated action on the part of our government would help to convince the Arabs that they have nothing to gain in persisting in their present attitude and that it would be more advantageous to all concerned to accept those benefits which would flow from negotiated agreements on all outstanding issues.

I am very eager to be helpful in urging reasonableness and a spirit of give-and-take on the part of those who may be influenced by my voice in Israel. Of one thing, however, I am quite certain -- prior to negotiations, Israel will not make concessions with respect to the unresolved issues.

I will watch with keen interest the reaction of the Arab governments to your statement.

With warmest regards, and hoping that you will have a pleasant and restful vacation, of which I am sure you stand greatly in need, I remain

Most cordially yours,

ABBA HILLEL SILVER

As if in reply to Secretary Dulles' friendly proposals to bring about peace, the Egyptian government, on September 27, 1955, obtained huge shipments of arms <sup>planes, bombers and submarines</sup> from Czechoslovakia of such magnitude <sup>as</sup> to create a dangerous imbalance in the Near East, ~~and~~ seriously threatening the security of Israel. There were, of course, ~~serious~~ <sup>to this</sup> repercussions in Israel and in the Jewish world. On November 9, President Eisenhower appealed to the Soviet Union to stop the arms race in the Middle East and declared that the United States would consider the request for arms which were needed for legitimate self-defense. On November 16th, Israel formally applied to

C  
O  
P  
Y

~~Letter sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower  
The White House  
Washington, D. C. by Izhak Ben-Zvi, President of the  
State of Israel.~~

- Date 2.

Dear Mr. President,

I thank you for the warm personal greetings which you sent me through our good friend Dr. Silver on the occasion of the Passover Festival and on the eve of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of our State. I am deeply grateful for this expression of your friendship for Israel and your kind words of appreciation of its progress and development. The people who dwell in Zion and the whole House of Israel will always remember your historic role as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during the Second World War and the inspired efforts you made in succouring the surviving remnants of the Jewish people. We trust that the deep human sympathy you then evinced for a suffering people will stand us in good stead in our present difficult position.

I am writing you this letter at a grave moment in the life of our young State. It came into being as a result of an effort of economic, social and spiritual reconstruction which goes back three generations. Its emergence received the support of an overwhelming majority of the United Nations, who were resolved that the Jewish people should be given the security of a free national life in the ancient land of their fathers and not again be exposed to the dangers



The position of our government on the Sinai-Suez action was wrong-headed in the extreme as subsequent developments showed. It alienated its strongest Western allies, England and France, and weakened their position and influence in the Arab world without improving its own. Far from preventing the Soviet Union from becoming an influential factor in the Middle East, it actually enabled it to become a serious competitive power in a part of the world where it had heretofore exercised little influence. And it contributed nothing toward the pacification of that area or its stability.

But it was of utmost importance to make sure that Israel would not be made the scape-goat in this internal crisis which had suddenly flared up, and <sup>which</sup> dangerously divided the free nations of the Western world.

The long and involved story of what followed the presentation of the <sup>for</sup> issue by the American government to the General Assembly on November first, need not be <sup>rehearsed here</sup> ~~repeated~~. Israel was not covetous of the territory which it had conquered in the Sinai Peninsula but was determined to make sure that in the future its right of transit through the Suez Canal <sup>would</sup> ~~could~~ be safeguarded, <sup>as well as</sup> ~~and~~ unobstructed transit from the port of Elath through the Gulf of Aqaba, and that Egypt would be forbidden to maintain ~~Red~~ <sup>Ar</sup>ab bases in Sinai. <sup>Israel's</sup> ~~its~~ compliance with the United Nations resolution <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ withdraw all forces behind the armistice line of 1949 was, therefore, slow and contingent upon obtaining the above assurances which were not <sup>all</sup> ~~not~~ forthcoming.

- 1 -

In 1956, my book, "Where Judaism Differed", was published. It was *and dwell on the great insights Judaism has to offer* an inquiry into the distinctiveness of Judaism. *I referred to it as* It was well received and in a short time six printings of it were issued. A Hebrew translation of the book appeared in Israel in 1961.

In 1961, my book, "Moses and the Original Torah", was published. *It, too, dwell on what I regarded as the original Torah* It, too, was issued by the Macmillan Company. The subject of this study *add to Part I* was the original Torah of Moses to which the prophets of later times frequently referred, where it is to be found, and how it fared in pre-exilic times among the two peoples of Northern Israel and Southern Judah. Because of its radical approach, it aroused considerable controversy, both in traditional circles and among students of Higher Biblical criticism. *P. 47*

Having been relieved of political office and its exacting demands and preoccupations, I found more time for books and study, and I was grateful for it.

In the Fall of 1957, the struggle over the desegregation of our schools, which had been ordered by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1955, reached one of its deplorable climaxes in the Little Rock episode when Governor Faubus of the State of Arkansas called out the National Guard to bar the admission of *nine* ~~more~~ Negro students from entering Central High School. There were to be other such forceful resistances to the Court decision later on by the Governor *of* the States of Mississippi and Alabama, leading to violence and bloodshed.

In my response I said in part:

"I have attended many memorable gatherings in my life, some of them arranged in my honor, but the remembrance of this evening which is attended by so many friends, from America and Israel, graced by the presence of so many eminent men in public life, by His Excellency, the Ambassador of the United States, by the former Prime Minister of Israel, who has given his name to an heroic age <sup>in our history</sup> which will forever be known as the Age of David Ben-Gurion, by the Chairman of the Jewish Agency, members of the Keneset and the heads of so many cultural and educational institutions in Israel, will remain with me for as long as I live.

I am deeply honored that presiding on this occasion is Dr. Emanuel Neumann, the friend of my youth, who worked side by side with me through the years, giving our Movement superb leadership, guidance and the wealth of his heart and mind.

I find that I have so much to be grateful for as I look back over the years. I have received gifts richer than I deserve. Providence favored me with wonderful parents to whom a book was even more precious than a loaf of bread, whose quiet courage, piety, and idealism were both sun and shield to me throughout my days. Later in life, I was again the recipient of the blessing of a beloved wife, children and grandchildren, ~~and~~ I was privileged to live in a free and gracious land. ~~It is no achievement to get to be seventy. You live long enough and, before you know it, you are seventy!~~

in its plenitude it is still unfulfilled. The State of Israel is today a great and glorious fact. It will be even greater and more glorious tomorrow. But greater than the State of Israel is the people of Israel, and greater than the people of Israel is the immortal vision and hope which sustained our people through the long centuries, which made of it a covenanted people, pledged to the ideal of Malchut Shamayim, the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

Zionism, as the pledge of affirmative Jewish living in the spirit of our deathless prophetic tradition, can help us all, both in Israel and in the Diaspora, to work together for the coming of the next great age, the distant, the ultimate age, the Messianic Age, when justice, ~~and~~ peace and freedom will be established on earth, when "<sup>e</sup>Each man will live under his vine and under his fig tree with none to make him afraid".

The establishment of the State of Israel is not the final act in the <sup>d</sup>Drama of the people of Israel. Our people is moving on, the ~~A~~rk of the ~~C~~ovenant is moving on, in greater freedom now and in greater confidence along the broad highways of the world, to Achrit Hayamim, to the End of <sup>y</sup>Days, prefigured by our seers, "<sup>w</sup>When they shall not hurt, nor destroy in all ~~th~~ey holy mountain, and the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea."



And so at seventy, dear frients, my days of apprenticeship are about over. At seventy, the emotional chemistry of a man is such that his boiling-point is somewhat higher and his freezing-point somewhat lower. Otherwise, he need not lose his zest for the glorious adventure of life, or cease to be the willing captive of an imperishable dream, even though he now knows that you cannot take heaven by storm.

At the end of each of the twenty-four books of our holy Bible, one word is printed in large type - <sup>'Chazak'</sup> "Be strong!" That, you will agree with me, is excellent advice for any man as he concludes one volume and turns to the next one in his book of life.

The very first thing that the good Lord said to Abraham, who was destined to become the founder of our faith, and the ancestor of our race, was: "Keep on going". Abraham was seventy years old when he received that divine command. He was not told exactly where he should go -- simply, "Move on to the land which I will show you". I suppose that this is a good command to follow at any stage of one's life. In trust and faith to keep on going, confident that the true way will be shown by Him who is the light of the world. And this, my friends is exactly what I intend to do.



of mankind. We, their descendants, must be among the first ~~today~~ in the battle for this spiritual vision of human life. We must inspire our <sup>youth</sup> ~~people~~ with the mighty accents of their historic faith to join with all men of good will in the courageous attack upon all that disfigures life today and keeps man from his divine patrimony -- upon poverty, upon the economic insecurity of the masses, upon corruption and social privilege, upon the war machine and chauvinism, upon race arrogance and exploitation.

Translated into concrete terms, it means replenishing the spiritual and religious reservoirs of Jewish life -- the synagogue, the religious school, the academies, the centers of Jewish learning and scholarship. For years now the Jewish communities of the world, other than those, of course, which were destroyed or ravaged by war and persecution, had to give priority to ~~works of~~ relief, physical rescue and the reconstruction of the State of Israel. Much of this work will have to continue into an unpredictable future. Certainly there still remains the urgent and compelling need for taking care of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who are seeking <sup>new</sup> ~~a~~ home ~~in Israel~~.

But even while this work is going on, and certainly as the urgency and pressure of that work diminishes, as we hope it will with the years, ~~increasingly~~ <sup>increasingly</sup> our energies and our resources should be poured into the permanent and positive spiritual and cultural institutions and enterprises of Judaism. We must ~~begin~~ to think again in terms of the total picture of Jewish life. ~~both geographically and historically~~. Millions of Jews will live

in Israel in the days to come; millions more will live outside of Israel.

It is the religion of Judaism which will united them, not any political bonds.

Judaism <sup>in the past</sup> kept our people inside and outside of Palestine together as one religious fellowship ~~in the past~~ although they were politically ~~unrelated~~ <sup>distinct</sup>.

For the sake of ~~the~~ Jews <sup>everywhere</sup> ~~the world over~~, for the enrichment of their ~~own~~ lives, ~~and~~ for their effective contribution to the progress of the countries in which they are citizens, and for hastening the day of the King dom, it is imperative that we begin to pour again our creative thinking, our substance and our energies into the institutions of Jewish religious life.

The ~~five million~~ Jews of the United States ow<sup>e</sup> it to themselves, to their children and to this great and beloved country of which they are proud and loyal citizens to make Judaism as beautiful, meaningful and dynamic as possible in their lives and in the total life of America, ~~democracy~~.

With the establishment of the State and the fulfillment of the Zionist ideal, the question soon arose as to the future of the Zionist Emergency Council. Should it disband? Should the whole Zionist Movement wind up? And what <sup>should</sup> ~~shall~~ be the <sup>future</sup> ~~relationship~~ between the Jews of <sup>Amer</sup> ~~Amer~~ica and the State of Israel?

To this last question I addressed myself when I spoke before the Fiftieth Biennial Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations held in Boston, November 14-17, 1948.

"If history is any guide, the Jews of today who will continue to live in other lands will, by and large, maintain the same attitude towards the State of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic relationship towards that land. They will materially help <sup>it</sup> ~~to~~ absorb as many Jews as will wish to go there or may have to go there. They will help to build up its cultural, scientific, and spiritual institutions, as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere can be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews, as a people, can accomplish on their own.

Israel will come to be again the non-political center of world Jewry. Pilgrims will go there as of old -- and not merely the pious. There will be a free flow of manifold communications, of mutual stimulation, of give and take. Israel will again come to exercise a unifying and sustaining influence in Jewish

It need not duplicate their activities, but it can stimulate, guide and coordinate them. It took us many hard years of struggle to establish the ascendance of our ideas in the Jewish communities of this country. Let us not lose it now by default."

Not all Zionists agreed with this point of view. Foremost among those who adopted an opposite view-point was Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. He felt that now that the State was established, there was no longer any need for a strong Zionist Movement. The Zionist Movement was the necessary scaffolding for the building of the State. Now that the State was built, the scaffolding was no longer needed. A Zionist is one who settles in Israel. All others may be friends of Israel but should not regard themselves as Zionists. This position, he maintained consistently and vocally through the years and in the capacity of Prime Minister of the State, did much, quite unintentionally, I <sup>am</sup> sure, to undermine the World Zionist Movement. After a time, his own party refused to go along with him on the position which he took.

(Quote Resolution)

When Mr. Ben-Gurion visited the United States in April, 1951, to launch the campaign for Bonds for Israel, he studiously avoided reference to Zionism and the Zionist Movement and on the eve of his departure, he addressed a Zionist meeting in New York in which he told the Zionists that they cannot speak for American Jewry as a whole, that there are non-Zionists who do not want the Zionist Movement to stand "as a wall between them and Israel", and that the Zionists should confine themselves in their work to education and Aliyah.



Thus, there existed, <sup>a</sup>~~therefore~~, sharp divergences<sup>1</sup> in our points-of-view about the future role of the Zionist Movement. But there were also other more down-to-earth party considerations which led to ~~sharp~~ conflicts between Mr. Ben-Gurion and me.

Ben Gurion's party, the Mapai, wanted to control the government and determine its future political and economic policies, as indeed it has done ever since the establishment of the State. The Mapai's economic platform was socialistic, although not radical or inflexible. Through the years it has known how to make the necessary adjustments to conditions as they arose and it has invited and stimulated private investments and enterprises in the country.

But from the beginning it looked upon the party of the General Zionists in Israel as a most serious rival and competitor. The General Zionists' party



The General Party in Israel was a merger of two groups, one slightly to the left of the other, which agreed to unite in 1946.

I was a General Zionist and because of the prominence of the position which I occupied, I came to be regarded as an asset to the General Zionist Party in Israel, and correspondingly a threat to the political position of the Mapai. Had the Z. O. A. membership <sup>been</sup> largely ~~been~~ laborite instead of ~~predominately~~ "liberal centrist", all the difficulties and ~~disputes~~ which were to follow would not have arisen.

Not long after the State was established, elections were held for a national ~~Constituent~~ assembly (The ~~Knesset~~) and as the date set for the election, January 25, 1949, approached, electioneering began in earnest and rapidly gained in intensity. The General Zionists in Israel quite naturally pointed to the political achievements of their friends in the United States. The Mapai, quite as naturally, found it necessary to disparage them... And so politics bedeviled our relationship, and Ben-Gurion, as the official leader of the Mapai, and I, as the unofficial leader of General Zionism in America, thus drifted into discord and misunderstandings. Politically, in theory and method, we were not far apart. We were both known as maximalists, activists, and -- stubborn. I admired the very dynamic and courageous leadership which <sup>Ben Gurion</sup> ~~he~~ gave our Movement during the critical years of the founding of the state. In the hour of decision he remained firm. He did not waver in his convictions and he did not under-rate the determination of the Yishuv to fight for its national redemption. But he was

recriminations began to abate in 1952, when the General Zionists joined the government coalition in Israel, and especially after the election of President Eisenhower in the fall of 1952. This removed from the arsenal of criticism the argument which had frequently been employed against me that I was persona non grata at the White House....

In the <sup>over</sup>days of the politically oriented <sup>American</sup> Zionists, a leader's position depended on whether he was persona grata at the White House. When President Truman was elected in 1948, my stock slumped. When Dwight Eisenhower was elected President in 1952, my stock rose again. Actually, my Zionist achievements under the Eisenhower administration, such as they were, were far less substantial than under the Truman administration, though personally my contacts with the Eisenhower administration were far more frequent and pleasant. Important national policies and decisions are simply not arrived at the "personality" way.... Furthermore, the attitude of the State Department under John Foster Dulles continued to be quite as uncertain toward Israel as it had been under Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes or Marshall. At times it seemed to be definitely following a policy of Arab appeasement.

I sensed the cooling off towards me on the part of the friends of the Mapai in the United States -- the Poale Zion -- as early as 1946, when elections for the World Zionist Congress of that year were held. The Poale Zion had backed me up solidly right along and its spokesmen had praised and defended me. But

There existed in the United States a core of opposition to the leadership of Dr. Neumann and to myself, ever since I took over <sup>responsibility for</sup> ~~the leadership of~~ our political work in the United States in 1943. In an earlier chapter I referred to this opposition in connection with the episode of the Palestine Resolutions in the Congress of the United States. When this opposition was defeated, it did not disappear. It simmered through the years, and now, as a result of the action which <sup>was taken</sup> ~~took place~~ at the General Council in Jerusalem, it gathered itself -- as the Committee for Progressive Zionism -- for another attack. This time the attack was aimed directly at the administration of Dr. Neumann, but indirectly against me.

The General Zionist Party in Israel had, early in 1948, split. A group which called itself "Progressive" seceded from the General Zionist Party and set itself up as an independent Party. From that moment on, those who did not follow this group of secessionists were branded as reactionaries. One needed a microscope to distinguish the precise differences between the "Progressive" Party and the General Zionist Party. A few years later, they were to unite again into one ~~Party~~ and their competing subtle ideologies were forgotten.

During my visit to Israel in 1948, I <sup>cautioned against</sup> ~~deplored~~ this split in the ranks of the General Zionists and called on the Progressives to return. At that time I did not support one group as against the other, and urged their re-unification. My advice was not taken. In the 1949 national elections, they presented two separate lists. When a coalition government was formed following the elections, the Progressives entered the coalition, the General Zionists did not.



It was none of the business of the Jewish Agency to designate the chairman of the campaign of the U. J. A. This was the function of the United Palestine Appeal. These three then proceeded to cable Jerusalem urging a special session of the entire Executive in New York City. The above three <sup>also</sup> ~~went~~ <sup>also went</sup> without authorization and without notifying the Chairman, to Mr. Morgenthau and requested him to resume the chairmanship of the campaign for the coming year.

The Jerusalem Executive of the Jewish Agency came to the United States and after lengthy discussions, a compromise resolution was worked out under which there would be three directors, one representing the Joint Distribution Committee, another the United Palestine Appeal and a third who would be designated by Mr. Morgenthau. This would have made Mr. Montor one of the three directors. As a prior condition to his re-employment, however, he would be required to sign a letter of retraction of the charges which he had made and would refrain in the future from any and all controversial political activity related to Zionist funds and to any Zionist organization. The Committee of Contributors would discontinue all ~~its~~ activities and would dissolve immediately.

Mr. Morgenthau rejected the Agency's compromise proposal and demanded that Mr. Montor be given sole authority to run the United Jewish Appeal. The Executive then asked me to see Mr. Morgenthau personally in Florida in an effort to get him to agree to the compromise which had been worked out by the Executive. Mr. Morgenthau could not see me. Whereupon the Executive of the Agency reversed itself and yielded to Mr. Morgenthau's

The Zionist Congress, which met in August, 1951, was a dishevelled and untidy affair. It had been repeatedly postponed. It was the first time that Congress met since the establishment of the State. One might have expected an exalted mood of achievement to dominate it and that it would devote itself to outlining a program of action for the future of the Movement. Instead of which, the bitter inter-party strife which had attended the elections for the Constituent Assembly (Knesset) in Israel in 1950, were reflected in the Congress where the largest single delegation was from Israel. Likewise, the sharp friction which had developed during the preceding three years between the Mapai group in Israel and the Zionist Organization of America was also in evidence. The Mizrachi and the General Zionists of Israel had at first refrained from voting for delegates to the Congress altogether, because of irregularities in the electoral list.

The acrid general debate with which the Congress opened soon reflected the party cleavages and the clash of personalities. The General Zionists, who were greatly out-numbered because of the votes which had been allotted to them, and the strong Mapai-Hadassah and Poale Zion alignment became the target of attack, especially the Zionist Organization of America -- and more especially, myself.

Golda Meyerson (now Mair), speaking for the Mapai, delivered an especially vitriolic attack upon me -- which was so bad that even the labor paper, "Davar", apologized for it.



Instead of planning the future activities of the Movement, the Congress became badly entangled in an ideological squabble over what came to be known as "the Jerusalem Program". The Israeli delegates, led by the Mapai, insisted that a rigid formula be accepted by the Movement to the effect that Zionism means the personal commitment of every Zionist to settle in Israel -- the Ben Gurion formula. (Quote).

This immediately was challenged by the delegates from America. They resisted the attempt to foist such a formula on the Movement. I, myself, took violent exception to it. (Quote).

Of course, we all agreed that there was no need for immigration -- especially from the Western countries -- but to make this obligatory on every Zionist was to announce to the world that Zionists everywhere are not integrated citizens of their countries, that Israel is summoning them to renounce their citizenship.

I left before the Congress was over. It was the last Congress that I attended.

The political tussles and rivalries within the Movement were now too much for me. The State was now established and I could not see the purpose of continually wrangling with Zionists. I could find more helpful ways of serving the new state.

Thereafter, I declined every elective office in the Movement. My interest in the Z. O. A., of course, never flagged. I attended its conventions and whenever consulted, I gave the organization whatever counsel I could.

~~The letters~~  
These are the letters which we exchanged.

October 14, 1952

General Dwight D. Eisenhower  
President's House  
Columbia University  
New York, New York

My dear General:

It is with keen interest that I have followed your campaign throughout the nation and your forthright discussion of the issues which confront the American people.

I was at the Republican Convention in Chicago, and was greatly pleased, because of my close association with the cause, at the inclusion in the Party platform of a clause on the State of Israel, which reads

"The Republican Party has consistently advocated a national home for the Jewish people since a Republican Congress declared its support of that objective thirty years ago. In providing a sanctuary for Jewish people rendered homeless by persecution, the State of Israel appeals to our deepest humanitarian instincts. We shall continue our friendly interest in this constructive and inspiring undertaking. We shall put our influence at the service of peace between Israel and the Arab states and we shall cooperate to bring economic and social stability to that area."

I do not recall that you have had an occasion during your campaign fully to define in public your personal views on this subject which is so vital to the peace and progress of the Middle East and to the defense of our free world. I know that many of your friends and admirers would be eager and grateful for such a statement.

With all good wishes, I remain

Very cordially yours,

Signed/ Abba Hillel Silver

"The statements on Israel which have been issued by both candidates for the Presidency of the United States served to strengthen the conviction that the friendship between America and Israel will become even closer and stronger in the months and years to come. Our country's support for Israel has always been bi-partisan in character and the declarations which were made during the past week by General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson have provided a striking evidence that this bi-partisan policy will be continued in the future. There is clearly no difference of opinion between the Republican and Democratic Parties on the question of friendship and assistance for Israel. "

General Eisenhower was elected President. On November 18th, he wrote me a letter in which he said: "I deeply appreciate your fine support during the recent campaign and I look forward to seeing you again soon. " Governor Dewey wrote: "You made a wonderful contribution to this tremendous result and I know it must give you the deepest personal gratification. " John Foster Dulles wrote on November 26th: "You have always been a good friend who has stood by me in hours of trouble. "

On December 11th I received a letter from Senator Stiles Bridges stating that the President-elect, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has requested

At a meeting of                      <sup>Jan</sup> on January 22, 1951, Ambassador Eban asked me to come down to Washington. He laid before me the question <sup>matters</sup> of the 'grant-in-aid' by the American government and solicited my help in connection with the introduction of <sup>the</sup> bill in Congress. I saw Senator Taft in his office . I discussed with him American grant-in-aid for Israel. He said that he would be very happy to help, that he would be prepared to sponsor such a bill on a non-partisan basis. A week later I received a letter from Ambassador Eban in which he stated: "I was greatly heartened to hear the outcome of your visit here last week. I am convinced that this has taken us a very long stride forward and <sup>I</sup> ask you to accept this expression of warmest appreciation."

Early in February, I received the first draft of the bill and I suggested certain changes in it. The second draft was then submitted to me. On February 28th I spoke with Senator Taft by long distance ~~in~~ Washington. He informed me that he was meeting the next day with Senator Douglas to agree on the final wording. In June Ambassador Eban telephoned me again requesting that I come to Washington again in connection with the Grand-in-aid Bill. I did. <sup>He</sup> They requested me to see Senator Taft that morning. The Senator indicated that he would continue to press for his resolution as an authorization resolution when the President's Omnibus Bill for military and civilian aid came up before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Note : Find out what was the fate of this Grand-in-aid Bill.



to address myself is, can we think hopefully of the next century as Jews, as Americans, as members of the human family -- for they are all inter-related. I believe that we can. I believe that we have every right to do so, though we cannot be dogmatic about it; for progress is neither guaranteed nor automatic; nor can we ignore the fact that time and again the unforeseen and unpredictable in history have upset all man's careful calculations.

" I believe that the age in which we live is a great age and that we are moving towards an even greater age. I believe that our present age is one of the greatest in human history. We are too near our times properly to appraise them. One requires distance in order to see great objects in their proper perspective. We ourselves are too much involved in the turmoil and the conflicts of our day to see objectively the amazing new pattern of life which is emerging.

"Many people are quick to describe our age as materialistic, as lacking in idealism, in aim and purpose, an age of breakdown and disintegration.

"In characterizing our age as great, I am thinking in terms of social progress and welfare, in terms of human advancement and civilization. More is being done in our day for the improvement of the conditions of the common man, for the raising of his standard of living, his health, his education, and for his protection against the disabilities of sickness, unemployment and old age, than in any generation, than any five generations in the past. Never were more determined efforts made to bring about a fairer sharing of the wealth that is produced and a better way of life for all.



"Never have the submerged races and peoples of the earth risen as they have risen in our day to demand and to achieve, as they have to a large measure achieved, freedom and self-determination. Within the last eight years one-fourth of the earth's population -- more than five hundred million non-self-governing people -- have obtained their political freedom. Imperialism and colonialism are in their death-throes. Backward peoples are pressing forward into the light of a new day, and the exploitation of the dark races of the earth is rapidly drawing to a close.

"What we are witnessing in our day, if we have eyes not only to see things, but also to see into the heart of things, is not social disintegration, but a radical new reintegration of humanity, a profound change in the social evolution of man, a change not free, of course, from dangers -- for there is no progress without danger -- but one of boundless and immeasurable potentialities.

"I do not wish to overdraw the picture. I am not suggesting that our age is approaching idyllic perfection, or that the millenium is just around the corner.

"The important thing to consider is not whether we are on the eve of the millenium, but whether the major trends of our age are in the direction of the hoped-for good society, or away from it. Is our age trying to eradicate poverty and illiteracy and to raise the standard of living of people, regardless of race or color or creed? Is it trying to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of peoples to national freedom and independence? Is it trying to organize the world

- 2 -  
- 3 -  
The meeting with the President took place on April 26, 1956.

Secretary Dulles was present. We spent about an hour together. Our main topic of conversation was the apprehension of our people due to the menacing arms retraction:

"

August 24, 1955

My dear Rabbi Silver:

I am planning to make a statement in New York on Friday at 5:30 p.m. dealing with the Israel Arab problem and suggesting possible bases for bringing about a genuine peace in the area. In this statement, I indicate that the President is prepared to recommend a substantial contribution to such a settlement, namely:

1. Subscription to an international loan to enable Israel to discharge its obligation to the refugees which in turn will help them to get resettled;
2. United States contribution to water projects which will develop more arable land which will aid in resettlement;
3. Good offices, if desired, to assist in making the frontier adjustments needed to convert the present armistice lines into permanent boundary lines;
4. United States participation in an international treaty guarantee, preferably sponsored by the United Nations, of the resultant boundary lines.

I feel that if this program were carried through, there would be no great difficulty in settling the remaining problems such as the question of transit through the Suez Canal, and determining the status of Jerusalem.

Probably the principal obstacle in the way of solution is the boundary matter, where the Egyptians seek a substantial part of the Negeb so as to have common boundaries with Jordan and Saudi Arabia, but where the Israelis also want continuous access to the port of Aqaba. I feel, however, that these conflicting claims can be reconciled, and indeed that some reconciliation is in the long run inevitable. This statement comes out of very long and careful thought given the matter

-5-

*Handwritten signature and initials*  
- 8 -

But apart from its own merits, the very announcement of such contemplated action on the part of our government would help to convince the Arabs that they have nothing to gain in persisting in their present attitude and that it would be more advantageous to all concerned to accept those benefits which would flow from negotiated agreements on all outstanding issues.

I am very eager to be helpful in urging reasonableness and a spirit of give-and-take on the part of those who may be influenced by my voice in Israel. Of one thing, however, I am quite certain -- prior to negotiations, Israel will not make concessions with respect to the unresolved issues.

I will watch with keen interest the reaction of the Arab governments to your statement.

With warmest regards, and hoping that you will have a pleasant and restful vacation, of which I am sure you stand greatly in need, I remain

Most cordially yours,

ABBA HILLEL SILVER

"

As if in reply to Secretary Dulles' friendly proposals to bring about peace, the Egyptian government, on September 27, 1955, obtained huge shipments of arms <sup>planes, bombs and submarines</sup> from Czechoslovakia of such magnitude <sup>as</sup> to create a dangerous imbalance in the Near East, <sup>and</sup> seriously threatening the security of Israel. There were, of course, <sup>serious</sup> repercussions <sup>to this</sup> in Israel and in the Jewish world. On November 9, President Eisenhower appealed to the Soviet Union to stop the arms race in the Middle East and declared that the United States would consider the request for arms which were needed for legitimate self-defense. On November 16th, Israel formally applied to

~~COPY~~

~~Letter sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. by Izhak Ben-Zvi, President of the  
State of Israel.~~

~~- Date 2.~~

Dear Mr. President,

I thank you for the warm personal greetings which you sent me through our good friend Dr. Silver on the occasion of the Passover Festival and on the eve of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of our State. I am deeply grateful for this expression of your friendship for Israel and your kind words of appreciation of its progress and development. The people who dwell in Zion and the whole House of Israel will always remember your historic role as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during the Second World War and the inspired efforts you made in succouring the surviving remnants of the Jewish people. We trust that the deep human sympathy you then evinced for a suffering people will stand us in good stead in our present difficult position.

I am writing you this letter at a grave moment in the life of our young State. It came into being as a result of an effort of economic, social and spiritual reconstruction which goes back three generations. Its emergence received the support of an overwhelming majority of the United Nations, who were resolved that the Jewish people should be given the security of a free national life in the ancient land of their fathers and not again be exposed to the dangers



The position of our government on the Sinai-Suez action was wrong-headed in the extreme as subsequent developments showed. It alienated its strongest Western allies, England and France, and weakened their position and influence in the Arab world without improving its own. Far from preventing the Soviet Union from becoming an influential factor in the Middle East, it actually enabled it to become a serious competitive power in a part of the world where it had heretofore exercised little influence. And it contributed nothing toward the pacification of that area or its stability.

But it was of utmost importance to make sure that Israel would not be made the scape-goat in this internal crisis which had suddenly flared up, and <sup>which</sup> dangerously divided the free nations of the Western world.

The long and involved story of what followed the presentation of the <sup>is</sup> issue by the American government to the General Assembly on November first, need not be <sup>rehearsed here</sup> ~~repeated~~. Israel was not covetous of the territory which it had conquered in the Sinai Peninsula but was determined to make sure that in the future its right of transit through the Suez Canal <sup>would</sup> ~~could~~ be safeguarded, <sup>as well as</sup> ~~and~~ unobstructed transit from the port of Elath through the Gulf of Aqaba, and that Egypt would be forbidden to maintain <sup>Fedeyeen</sup> ~~Fedeyeen~~ bases in Sinai. <sup>Israel's</sup> ~~Its~~ compliance with the United Nations resolution <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ withdraw all forces behind the armistice line of 1949 was, therefore, slow and contingent upon obtaining the above assurances which were not <sup>all</sup> ~~not~~ forthcoming.

In 1956, my book, "Where Judaism Differed", was published. It was an inquiry into the distinctiveness of Judaism. It was well received and in a short time six printings of it were issued. A Hebrew translation of the book appeared in Israel in 1961.

In 1961, my book, "Moses and the Original Torah", was published. It, too, was issued by the Macmillan Company. The subject of this study was the original Torah of Moses to which the prophets of later times frequently referred, where it is to be found, and how it fared in pre-exilic times among the two peoples of Northern Israel and Southern Judah. Because of its radical approach, it aroused considerable controversy, both in traditional circles and among students of Higher Biblical criticism.

Having been relieved of political office and its exacting demands and preoccupations, I found more time for books and study, and I was grateful for it.

In the Fall of 1957, the struggle over the desegregation of our schools, which had been ordered by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1955, reached one of its deplorable climaxes in the Little Rock episode when Governor Faubus of the State of Arkansas called out the National Guard to bar the admission of ~~more~~<sup>nine</sup> Negro students from entering Central High School. There were to be other such forceful resistances to the Court decision later on by the Governor<sup>s</sup> of the States of Mississippi and Alabama, leading to violence and bloodshed.

In my response I said in part:

"I have attended many memorable gatherings in my life, some of them arranged in my honor, but the remembrance of this evening which is attended by so many friends, from America and Israel, graced by the presence of so many eminent men in public life, by His Excellency, the Ambassador of the United States, by the former Prime Minister of Israel, who has given his name to an heroic age <sup>in our history</sup> which will forever be known as the Age of David Ben-Gurion, by the Chairman of the Jewish Agency, members of the Kenesset and the heads of so many cultural and educational institutions in Israel, will remain with me for as long as I live.

I am deeply honored that presiding on this occasion is Dr. Emanuel Neumann, the friend of my youth, who worked side by side with me through the years, giving our Movement superb leadership, guidance and the wealth of his heart and mind.

I find that I have so much to be grateful for as I look back over the years. I have received gifts richer than I deserve. Providence favored me with wonderful parents to whom a book was even more precious than a loaf of bread, whose quiet courage, piety, and idealism were both sun and shield to me throughout my days. Later in life, I was again the recipient of the blessing of a beloved wife, children and grandchildren, ~~and~~ I was privileged to live in a free and gracious land. ~~It is no achievement to get to be seventy. You live long enough and, before you know it, you are seventy!~~

in its plenitude it is still unfulfilled. The State of Israel is today a great and glorious fact. It will be even greater and more glorious tomorrow. But greater than the State of Israel is the people of Israel, and greater than the people of Israel is the immortal vision and hope which sustained our people through the long centuries, which made of it a covenanted people, pledged to the ideal of Malchut Shamayim, the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

Zionism, as the pledge of affirmative Jewish living in the spirit of our deathless prophetic tradition, can help us all, both in Israel and in the Diaspora, to work together for the coming of the next great age, the distant, the ultimate age, the Messianic Age, when justice, ~~and~~ peace and freedom will be established on earth, when "<sup>2</sup>Each man will live under his vine and under his fig tree with none to make him afraid".

The establishment of the State of Israel is not the final act in the <sup>d</sup>Drama of the people of Israel. Our people is moving on, the ~~A~~rk of the ~~C~~ovenant is moving on, in greater freedom now and in greater confidence along the broad highways of the world, to Achrit Hayamim, to the End of ~~Y~~ays, prefigured by our seers, "<sup>3</sup>When they shall not hurt, nor destroy in all ~~my~~ holy mountain, and the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea."



And so at seventy, dear friends, my days of apprenticeship are about over. At seventy, the emotional chemistry of a man is such that his boiling-point is somewhat higher and his freezing-point somewhat lower. Otherwise, he need not lose his zest for the glorious adventure of life, or cease to be the willing captive of an imperishable dream, even though he now knows that you cannot take heaven by storm.

At the end of each of the twenty-four books of our holy Bible, one word is printed in large type -- "Be strong!" That, you will agree with me, is excellent advice for any man as he concludes one volume and turns to the next one in his book of life.

The very first thing that the good Lord said to Abraham, who was destined to become the founder of our faith, and the ancestor of our race, was: "Keep on going". Abraham was seventy years old when he received that divine command. He was not told exactly where he should go -- simply, "Move on to the land which I will show you". I suppose that this is a good command to follow at any stage of one's life. In trust and faith to keep on going, confident that the true way will be shown by Him who is the light of the world. And this, my friends is exactly what I intend to do.

of mankind. We, their descendants, must be among the first today in the battle for this spiritual vision of human life. We must inspire our people with the mighty accents of their historic faith to join with all men of good will in the courageous attack upon all that disfigures life today and keeps man from his divine patrimony -- upon poverty, upon the economic insecurity of the masses, upon corruption and social privilege, upon the war machine and chauvinism, upon race arrogance and exploitation.

Translated into concrete terms, it means replenishing the spiritual and religious reservoirs of Jewish life -- the synagogue, the religious school, the academies, the centers of Jewish learning and scholarship. For years now the Jewish communities of the world, other than those, of course, which were destroyed or ravaged by war and persecution, had to give priority to works of relief, physical rescue and the reconstruction of the State of Israel. Much of this work will have to continue into an unpredictable future. Certainly there still remains the urgent and compelling need for taking care of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who are seeking a home in Israel.

But even while this work is going on, and certainly as the urgency and pressure of that work diminishes, as we hope it will with the years, increasingly our energies and our resources should be poured into the permanent and positive spiritual and cultural institutions and enterprises of Judaism. We must begin to think again in terms of the total picture of Jewish life, both geographically and historically. Millions of Jews will live

in Israel in the days to come; millions more will live outside of Israel. It is the religion of Judaism which will united them, not any political bonds. Judaism kept our people inside and outside of Palestine together as one religious fellowship in the past although they were politically unrelated. For the sake of the Jews the world over, for the enrichment of their own lives, and for their effective contribution to the progress of the countries in which they are citizens, and for hastening the day of the Kingdom, it is imperative that we begin to pour again our creative thinking, our substance and our energies into the institutions of Jewish religious life.

The ~~five million~~ Jews of the United States owe<sup>e</sup> it to themselves, to their children and to this great and beloved country of which they are proud and loyal citizens to make Judaism as beautiful, meaningful and dynamic as possible in their lives and in the total life of American ~~democracy~~.

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.~~

We were five children in our family -- my oldest sister Bessie (~~Mrs. Ely Liebow~~), Pearl (~~Mrs. Jack Michaelson~~), my brother Maxwell and our youngest sister Rose (~~Mrs. Jack Matlaw~~). Pearl died young, in 1931, and though many years have since passed, I think of her often, ~~and of the sweetness and joy which she / radiated in our home,~~

Both Bess and Pearl worked and augmented the family income. Their earnings made it possible for the younger children to go to school and High School. By the time I was Bar Mitzvah (13 years old), I also contributed something to the family budget. I taught English to immigrants much older than I was, and Hebrew to children somewhat younger than myself. During the High Holy Days, I earned a few dollars singing in a Synagogue choir.



In reply, <sup>to my colleague</sup> 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</sup> histrionic <sup>of my 70s</sup> talents and my scholarly research, <sup>in later years</sup> "Moses" still dwells in the thick darkness which he entered on his way up <sup>Moset</sup> to Sinai...."

The Dr. Herzl <sup>3</sup> Zion Club was responsible for the founding of the Zionist Youth Movement in the United States which soon developed under the name of "Young Judea". An impressive number of active Zionist and communal workers and leaders, educators and Rabbis, received their early training in ~~this~~ <sup>our</sup> 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</sup> culturally <sup>stimulating</sup> ~~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 ~~stimulated~~ <sup>quickened</sup>. <sup>Thanks</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>traditional Jewish</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>reversed</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> ~~he~~ 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~~ <sup>and promises</sup> and of the many problems and ~~frustrations~~ <sup>and horizons</sup> 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>in the wings</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.~~

<sup>pursuing a Rabbinical career I was</sup> ~~In 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. <sup>In the Old World, in Neinstadt Lithuania, where I was born, he was a Shmag</sup> He earned his living in New York as a teacher of Hebrew. Though himself

Orthodox, he raised no objection to <sup>my</sup> ~~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> Judah L. Magnes, 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 ~~some of~~ <sup>decisions</sup> 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> <sup>respective</sup> of their 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>is</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



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, 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~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~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, <sup>who has</sup> ~~and a~~ <sup>shining</sup> 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>82</sup>85,000. <sup>131</sup> 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-<sup>reform</sup>~~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.

+  
add  
then  
to  
p. 48

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

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

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

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

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



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~~ expected for thereafter and until the end of the war a member of the Secret Service attended every one of my Sunday morning ~~services~~ <sup>lectures</sup>. 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 *imperialistic* to a degree and vindictive in a frightful measure.



~~- 3 -~~

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

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

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

Free speech was muzzled in our city. Under the auspices of the City Club, the one liberal body in Cleveland which had kept faith with true Americanism, I addressed open-air meetings in the Cleveland Public Square and elsewhere in the city. I called upon <sup>our</sup> ~~my~~ 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>pledged 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>on the nation's</sup> ~~among our people~~ as evidenced by the <sup>large</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>on anyone</sup> ~~one~~ who favored the recognition of Russia, was automatically blacklisted.

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

28  
*Brandeis*  
~~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 had been critical of the Brandeis position in London but*  
I concluded that the differences between Weizmann and Brandeis could ~~have~~ <sup>be</sup> compromised. I was never taken in by the ~~loose talk~~ <sup>propaganda</sup> 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



*To return to Cleveland and my ministry at the Temple.*

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 <sup>educational</sup> ~~cultural~~ and social <sup>institutions</sup> ~~activities~~ is fast developing into <sup>one of</sup> the most impressive cultural centers in the <sup>world</sup> ~~United States~~.

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 <sup>of</sup> 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 <sup>always</sup> reverent of the spoken word. I feared that the inspiration of the moment may be late in coming. Only in recent years, <sup>and</sup> on occasions which called for scrupulous care in wording did I resort to a manuscript. men

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

(iv.) In whatever I sought to accomplish  
the spoken word was my most useful tool.  
My work through life has been principally a  
work of persuasion, and I had to rely ~~on~~ <sup>upon</sup> the  
proper word, the proper argument and the proper  
mode of delivery. Whether on the pulpit, ~~on~~ <sup>at</sup> the  
platform or at congresses or conventions, it  
was through the spoken word that I could best  
represent my cause, and on it very much  
often depended.

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

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



*R In my forty-five years as Rabbi of the Temple*  
~~Elsewhere I indicated what I regarded as the function of the religious leader~~  
*What was it that I tried to teach*  
~~in modern society. As a Rabbi, 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. *To In preaching Judaism* Furthermore, I never extolled one type of Judaism over another. I never criticized Orthodox Judaism, nor deprecated Conservative Judaism, nor extolled Reform Judaism. I was never an "Orthodox" Reform Jew. These distinctions interested me very little.

*Though I was a Reform Rabbi; perhaps because I was a Reform Rabbi.*  
In fact, I was rather critical of Reform Judaism ~~in which ministry I~~ 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>a</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,

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.

*I tried to transmit to my people what are*  
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>good</sup> ~~golden~~ age of universal justice and brotherhood and peace awaits



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

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

I would always stress the thought that while Judaism is the religion of the Jewish people, evolved by it and entrusted to it, its mission was to spread its teachings to the whole world. The message of Judaism <sup>was</sup> ~~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 <sup>is</sup> so often a crown of thorns.

As an historic faith, infused with the life experience of the Jewish people, Judaism naturally reflect<sup>ed</sup> 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 need<sup>ed</sup> 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 <sup>major</sup> events of the day, from week to week, from year to year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

add from III TT. p.1.

My philosophy of Judaism as religious humanitarian  
also led me to the conviction that

~~I always believed that the church should enter the arena of social~~  
the organized religious community, as such  
and political life and ~~urge the faithful to build~~ <sup>work for the building of</sup> the good society,

I believed that the first great service which the church, <sup>and the synagogue</sup> the  
effective arm of religion, <sup>could</sup> ~~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~~ <sup>But they</sup> should not remain content to speak of social justice  
in the abstract. ~~The church is~~ <sup>They are not</sup> not an academy for ~~special~~ social sciences. <sup>They</sup>  
~~It is~~ <sup>are</sup> a dynamic agency for social reconstruction. <sup>They</sup> ~~It~~ must enter the arena  
of life and do valiant battle for its sanctities.

~~The church~~ <sup>Organized religion</sup> cannot, of course, align itself with a propaganda for  
one specific economic system as against another. It must not involve itself  
in economic dogmatism. <sup>It</sup> ~~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~~ <sup>The organized religious fellowship</sup> is not concerned with systems, but with the safe-  
guarding 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~~ <sup>organized religion, and its ministers</sup> must under all conditions remain free to defend these  
ideals for which no system holds adequate guarantees.

- add from page 10.

This <sup>conviction</sup> ~~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.

<sup>thus</sup> Especially in the dark days of the economic depression, when so many of our fellow-citizens were jobless and their families in dire want, I spoke up time and time again on the social menace of unemployment.

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

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

<sup>As a people we urged, we</sup> ~~We~~ had overlooked the social menace of unemployment. Periodic unemployment ~~makes for irregular habits, shiftlessness,~~ destroys morale, and undermines a laborer's pride and self-respect. It discourages those who see their small savings, which they had through careful economy set aside for the education of their children or for the purchase of a home slowly eaten up by the lean weeks and months of unemployment. As their savings vanish, their pride too, and their ambitions vanish. Unemployment disrupts families, ~~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.



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>were</sup> ~~are~~ not inevitable. The business cycle, <sup>could</sup> ~~can be~~, to a large extent, <sup>be</sup> 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.

-48- E. J.

The Consumers League of Ohio had since ~~1928~~ been studying the problem of unemployment which was beginning to assume serious proportions. <sup>In 1928</sup> I urged upon it ~~that year~~ <sup>in 1928</sup> 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 <sup>regularly</sup> 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



10

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

"This Bill is sound, this Bill is practical, <sup>it is</sup> conservative, <sup>it</sup> has taken into account all the experiences of <sup>other 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 their <sup>great</sup> 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".



-53- 13

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

Organized labor at first ~~approved~~ <sup>strongly opposed</sup> unemployment insurance but by 1932, a complete reversal of attitude took place in the part of the American Federation of Labor. Thereafter, unemployment insurance had <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>l</sup>Bill was introduced, known as the <sup>Boyd-Hunter B.A</sup> Bill, which, like the preceding <sup>l</sup>Bill, embodied the recommendation of the Ohio Commission on Unemployment Insurance. This Bill passed the House but was killed in the Senate.

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

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

Early in 1954, I was invited by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to testify on Bill S-692 which had been introduced the previous year -- a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin and ancestry. *I intended to attend the hearings* ~~A date~~ *was set for the hearings* on January 19th but *because they were* postponed to March, *which was requested* ~~but~~ *did* I could not attend in person and so 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

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."

"Such leadership does not derive from industrial and military *might* alone, vital as these are. It stems from faith which the world has in the integrity of our ideals and our devotion to the principles of human equality. We have heard much discussion concerning the value of the Voice of America; I am confident that with enactment of a federal FEP measure, the true voice of America will speak with an authority and persuasiveness no broadcast or series of broadcasts can hope to achieve.

"We can no longer afford the luxury of ambiguity on the subject of intergroup relations. It is far too late to speak the words "All men are created equal" and to sanction deeds of inequality. We cannot hope to win the cooperation of peoples who are today casting off the last shackles of inequality abroad if we tolerate this sort of thing at home. We can, through the enactment of FEP, help close the gap between what we profess and what we practice. "

*add for p. 18-19-20*

Ever since the ~~Communist~~ <sup>new</sup> Revolution in 1917, and throughout the <sup>Chapter</sup> succeeding years of struggle between what has come to be known as the East and the West, I had to define my own position toward Communism in its manifold manifestations. No religious leader could <sup>have</sup> or would <sup>have</sup> ~~wish~~ <sup>wish to</sup> by-pass this major challenge of the twentieth century. The pulpit would have relegated itself to irrelevancy in the modern world if it had failed to give men guidance on this powerful new phenomenon which was shaking

*IP In the year that I came to Cleveland, in 1917, the Communist Revolution ~~was~~ took place in Russia*



~~"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."~~

*From time to time I felt impelled to speak out*  
~~The dominant mood of reaction also reflected itself in labor-management relationships.~~  
*in labor-management disputes*  
Cleveland was then, as it is today, an important industrial community. An organized attempt was made ~~at the close of the war~~ *at the close of the First* 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. *add what was to*  
*p. 63*  
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 ~~forced them into a strike~~ *the latter had to resort in order* 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.

~~I issued a public statement in which I said among other things:~~  
*I publicly criticized*  
~~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.

(over)

Through the years I was called in, on  
~~several~~ occasions to arbitrate labor-management  
disputes and to settle strikes.

the very foundations of our society. Religion could not ignore it -- for it was attacking all religion. Democracy and liberalism could not ignore it, for it was destroying them both wherever it could. It would have been a simple matter to engage in wholesale condemnation and so find oneself praised and applauded in the Western world. But there were factors in the Communist revolution which the religious leader was obligated to consider, and spiritual elements which he could not ignore. As between the East and the West it was not altogether a case of black or white -- the perfectly good system against the utterly evil one.

*I recall that*  
In 1917, when Bolshevism first swept into power in Russia, I delivered a sermon at the Temple on "Bolshevism -- How to Meet It". My central thought was, "Kill Boshevism with justice, kill it with love". That was very naive, quite as naive as were the teachings of the founders of our faith when they confronted the evils of their day. Since then I have visited Russia three times, in 1926, 1935, and 1961. I have spoken often in and out of my pulpit on what our attitude towards the Soviet Union should be.

Upon my return from my last visit to the Soviet Union in July, 1961, I issued a statement to the public press in which I summarized what I had been saying through the years:

*I am convinced that*  
~~We~~ must learn to live on the same globe with the Soviet people and they with us. Neither they nor we are always in the right. The leaders of both countries must try to reduce tensions. The peoples of the world are waiting for signs of a new and inspired statesmanship both in the



study our adversary -- at times even to learn from him -- than to abuse him. We should go about our national business without emotional tautness, certainly without self-righteousness, in the full knowledge that while the worst can happen, in all likelihood it will not; doing what we feel we ought to do at the behest of our own national traditions and principles, helping where we can, seeking no political compensation in return, craving no praise and deterred by no threats, looking first to the soundness and justice of our own economy and the well-being of our people. No one will rob us of our chosen way of life, nor will time rust our spiritual treasures, if we cherish them lovingly. "

~~I was, of course, widely criticized and attacked for the position which~~  
I took. Fortunately in 1963 new winds have begun to blow. The thaw has set in. The United States and the Soviet Union, after years of fruitless negotiations, have signed a limited Test Ban Treaty -- a first step to check the suicidal ~~arms~~ race in nuclear weapons. ~~And the United States is selling wheat to the Soviet Union and also a favored nation has <sup>also</sup> begun to trade more freely with the communist bloc.~~

- 1 -

*I have urged <sup>right policy</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>friendlier</sup> attitude towards Communist Russia*  
~~I have said those things about what should be our attitude toward~~  
~~the Soviet Union~~, in spite of what I ~~know~~ <sup>learned</sup> about its attitude towards religion,  
towards Zionism and towards the Jewish people <sup>in</sup> ~~of~~ the Soviet Union:

✓The regime in Russia is hostile to religion. Its leaders boastfully avow their atheism. They do not seem to be as rapid and gross in their opposition as formerly, but everything that the government can do to eradicate it from among the people, short of completely closing down all places of public worship, is done.

✓As individuals, Jews have equal rights in the U.S.S.R., with all other citizens. It would be untrue, however, to say that all anti-Semitism has been eradicated there. This would be a Utopian assumption even for the United States. While officially, anti-Semitism is outlawed in the U.S.S.R., practice does not always keep pace with what is written in the statute books. Anti-Semitism in Russia has had a long and dark history and the October Revolution did not uproot it. Russian Jews, ~~it is reported~~, are being steadily pushed out of positions in the top governing bodies of the State and the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the higher echelons of the Red Army, the diplomatic services, and the higher brackets of academic professions and plant management.

✓I do not know how widespread this type of anti-Semitism actually is in the U.S.S.R. today. Its existence is vigorously denied by the government. But, cultural and religious discriminations directed against the Jewish nationality group, as such, is certainly being practiced. The fundamental

~~SECRET~~ 11 11

law of the U.S.S.R. grants cultural autonomy and equality to all nationality groups. They have a right to their own language, schools, press and other cultural activities. This has been one of the honorable and proud boasts of the Soviet Union. The Jewish group is recognized as a nationality. Every Jew in the Soviet Union is required to indicate on his internal passport that he is a Jew -- just as every Ukranian is required to indicate that he is a Ukranian, and every Georgian that he is a Georgian. But, unlike all the other nationality groups in the Union, and there are many, the Jewish group enjoys none of the rights of these nationalities.

"Because it is an extra-territorial community, so to speak, not centered in any one territory or region of the Union, it has been denied these rights. Those who wish or wished to enjoy such rights, it is argued by the apologists of the regime, should, or should have migrated to the autonomous Jewish region of Birobidjan in Eastern Siberia, which the Soviet established. This argument, of course, ignores the historic realities of the Jewish position in Russia. Jews, though widely scattered over the country, always constituted a separate, ethnic and cultural group in Russia which, even in the darkest days of the Tzars, were free to exercise their religion, and free to teach and develop their own Hebrew and Yiddish culture. The argument also overlooks the fiasco of Birobidjan which should have been foreseen.

I am inclined to the belief, however, that progress in the direction of ~~granting~~ <sup>winning for</sup> the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union the same cultural and religious considerations which are accorded all other nationality and religious groups ~~is not foreclosed~~ <sup>can still be made</sup>, given ~~a friendly~~ <sup>an</sup> and insistent world Jewish ~~opinion~~ <sup>protest</sup>, but one which does not join the chorus of the old war.



trust Stalin. Stalin does not trust Truman. Hence the impasse. It is clear that only in the direction of courageous and continuous exploration of every avenue for reaching understandings, if only piece-meal, only in the direction of negotiation, earnestly sought and welcomed, lies the hope of the world. Negotiation is not appeasement. Let not the American people be persuaded into closing their minds at the sound of the word appeasement. It is today a tabu device to paralyze thought and wise diplomatic action. There should be urgent and continuous exploration of every opportunity for the coming to an understanding with the Soviet, a nation which we cannot defeat in war any more than it can defeat us....

"Our appeal to our national leadership in Washington, which we make in all good will, for we are all involved in one common destiny, is to be courageous and unafraid, not to be swayed by partisan political considerations and not to allow itself to be stampeded by war-mongers, fanatics and cranks, and by those who would push us into war for reasons which have nothing to do with love of country. There are those in our country who do not want an understanding with Russia. There are those even in high government posts who are ardently advocating a preventive war with Russia. There are those who will try to sabotage any possibility of agreement. These are our real enemies. "

I spoke, 1954, at the Princeton Alumni Dinner, Princeton, New Jersey

Barr

I was also opposed to the re-arming of Germany. On March 4, 1951,

I spoke at The Temple on "Shall We Re-arm Germany?" I said:

" At Potsdam in August, 1945, an agreement was reached between Truman, Churchill and Stalin for the complete demilitarization of Germany. They agreed that all war potentials of Germany should be destroyed -- war plants, warships, aircraft and arms -- so that Germany would never again be able to make war.



- 26 -

// Why was this decision reached by the heads of the governments of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union? These countries had just emerged from the horrors and devastations of the Second World War which Germany had inflicted on mankind -- a second world war in a single generation. They recalled that Germany had been defeated in the First World War, but that subsequently it had been permitted to re-arm, only to hurl her military might a second time against the allied nations with even greater fury and ruthlessness. Under Hitler, as under the Kaiser, the military clique of Germany, backed by its powerful industrial cartels, had made a second attempt at conquest and world domination....They failed a second time, but not, however, before they had drenched Europe with blood and slaughtered millions of people and left countless cities in ruins and nations in bottomless misery.

// At the close of the Second World War, the allied nations were determined not to make the same mistake again.....They would render it incapable of ever again launching a war. Accordingly, the heads of the three great countries which had paid such a fearful price for German belligerency, solemnly resolved to demilitarize Germany permanently.....

// That was five and a half years ago. Today the United States is leading the world in a determined effort to re-arm Germany!

// Ironically enough, the explanation which is given for this change of front is exactly the same as Hitler gave when he persuaded the allies to help him re-arm -- namely, the over-riding need to resist Communist aggression.

// The Potsdam allies have now fallen out. They fought the war side by side against a common enemy, but now they are mobilizing against each other, and are courting the favor of their erstwhile common enemy.

// Disagreements among the allies following the first World War made possible the reconstruction of Germany's military might, the emergence of Hitler, and his early diplomatic and annexationist victories. Germany knew how to play off one ally against the other and how to gain advantages from each. Hitler knew how to make his brown dictatorship tolerable and palatable to the allies by harping upon the evils and the dangers of the red dictatorship. So did Mussolini. As a result Europe was turned over as a helpless victim to the bestialities of Nazi and Fascist madmen while the democracies were paralyzed into inaction by a propaganda which said that all these things were necessary -- in order to save Europe from a worse fate -- from Communist domination. But strange to say, when the unbearable tensions and the expansionist greed of the Nazi-Fascist adventurers finally brought on the Second World War, it was found that the allied democratic nations were at war, not with Communist Russia, but with the Nazi and Fascist states, and Communist Russia, far from fighting against the democracies, was actually fighting on their side.

// History has often a strange and tragic way of repeating itself. As if doomed by some inescapable fate, as if under the compulsion of some spell or incantation, the allied nations are today retracing the same road which they took after the First World War, step by step. Spurred on by the fear of Communist Russia, real, inflated or imaginary, the democratic nations are rushing to re-arm Germany even before the Germans have asked for it, even though most Germans are still opposed to it. We are determined to thrust rearmament upon Germany.

// The United States, even more than Great Britain -- certainly more

*I know that no*  
~~NR~~ one's wisdom is adequate for the enormity and complexity  
of the political problems of our day, and no one can be absolutely  
sure of the correctness of the position which he takes on the fast-  
moving events of our day. But there are sound, moral principles  
of international relationship which have proved their enduring validity --  
and to these, in my darkness and confusion, I resolved to cling.

And I believe that our world is moving toward these same  
principles -- ~~the~~ ~~by~~ the hard way.

The First World War which entailed so much suffering and property loss, and the Bolshevik Revolution which drove the very landless & homeless, also brought untold misery and upon the Jewish people, especially in Russia and Eastern Europe. The Jews, the United States who had escaped this ravage, the war and the revolution moved swiftly to the aid of their less fortunate brothers.

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

The American Joint Distribution Committee ~~had been~~ <sup>ed</sup> 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.



COPY

384

70

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. (2)

// 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.



Zionism was making steady but slow progress in the first decade following the Balfour Declaration. The need for accelerating the pace was keenly felt and efforts were made to bring this about.

G

Under the terms of the <sup>Palestine</sup> 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> <sup>Later</sup> A few days 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 1929, the main issue was the ratification of the <sup>en</sup>larged Jewish Agency proposal. I spoke in favor of it. In my address I stated:

"An act of historic moment is about to be consummated. It will not be a precipitated 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>man-power and money - power for Palestine and the world</sup> ~~veins~~ <sup>riches</sup> of strength, new resources of ~~men~~ <sup>men</sup> - 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



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 *Ṣacrée*, a *Brith Kadosh*. Let them work with us in Palestine. Let the spirit of that land enter into their blood. Let them come in contact with all that the indefeasible spirit of our people has builded there, our settlements and our colonies, our schools and our university, our speech and our culture, our Palestinian manhood and womanhood and youth, and we have no doubt but what Palestine will persuade them and exalt them. "

I was later present in Zurich when the enlarged Jewish Agency was finally constituted amidst much ceremony and rejoicing. It was the second high point in Dr. Weitzmann's diplomatic career, the first being the Balfour Declaration. He had worked for it hard for almost a decade. ~~It involved the a radical re-organization of the Zionist Movement.~~ This was strongly resisted in many quarters. As I indicated, Zionists were asked to relinquish their ~~sole control over Zionist activities in Palestine.~~ <sup>and Zionist funds</sup> <sup>High</sup> hopes were fixed upon the consummation of the enlarged Jewish Agency, but when it was consummated, the high waters began to recede <sup>very</sup> 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,



less money was collected by the Keren Hayesod during the decade <sup>which</sup> following <sup>ed</sup> 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 <sup>still</sup> left wondering, however, whether these by-products justified the years of labor, struggle and controversy which had been invested in this enterprise.

I stood on the curb and watched the procession.

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

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

This, unfortunately, was not to be.

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

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

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

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

*With the coming of the Nazis to power the Jews <sup>J</sup> felt themselves ~~morally~~ challenged. They reacted in many ways.*

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

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

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



the <sup>horror</sup>disgust and abhorrence of the American people of the Nazi persecution ~~of~~  
~~the Jewish people~~ and the shameless Nazi propaganda which was beginning  
to infiltrate <sup>our</sup>our cities.

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

In addressing this Boycott rally in Chicago, I stated:

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

114  
—Wherever they were suppressed, its position became insecure and frequently desperate. Similarly the fortunes of labor are linked up with the progress of these great social ideals. Those who attack them attack also the security and rights of labor. It is, therefore, no accident of history that Naziism, which is the implacable foe of the Jewish people, is also the implacable foe of organized labor.

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

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

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

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

When Samuel Untermyer resigned because of age from the presidency of the Anti-Nazi League, he requested that I succeed him. I could not, because of my many Zionist commitments. Untermyer, a brilliant lawyer and law partner of Louis Marshall, came late to action<sup>12</sup> service in the Jewish field, but thereafter worked with great energy and effectiveness in many important undertakings.

Mr. Untermyer represented Mr. Bernstein of the Jewish Tribune, in his libel suit against Henry Ford for the ~~letters~~<sup>latters</sup> and attacks on him and on Jews, generally. He forced Mr. Ford to apologize to Mr. Bernstein.

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

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



My interest in Zionism led me to work among my  
Rabbinical colleagues and to urge them to bring about a  
reorientation of the Central Conference of American Rabbis  
the subject of Zionism. - 1/

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

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

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

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

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

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

The "old guard" was so outraged at the adoption of this resolution, that it called a conference <sup>which was attended by only 33 rabbis</sup> and organized what subsequently became the Council of American Judaism, a notorious anti-Zionist group from which the Rabbinic constituency steadily withdrew, leaving it almost entirely in the hands of super-patriotic laymen whose chief interest was not Judaism but anti-Zionism.

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

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

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

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



From time to time these intellectuals are polled by some enterprising <sup>magazine</sup> periodical as to their attitude <sup>2</sup> towards ~~the~~ Jew and Judaism and the results are, of course, largely negative. These findings are then interpreted to mean that there is a sharp trend among all educated Jews in the United States away from Judaism and the Jewish people, and toward non-religion and assimilation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I immediately turned over the article to the Jewish Tribune of New York, which published it in four <sup>weekly</sup> ~~installments~~, beginning with the issue of July 23, 1926.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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



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

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

N  
=

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"He added that he was persuaded that new proposals regarding Palestine were <sup>F</sup> certain to emerge before long.



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

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

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

"Asked by one questioner what he would do <sup>a</sup>bout immigration, Dr. Silver replied:

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

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

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



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

*add*

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

I also served as General Chairman of the Cleveland Jewish Welfare Fund for six years (1935-41). Cleveland, I am proud to state, now leads the entire country in its contributions to the United Jewish Appeal.

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

Shortly after the United States entered the war, when the outcome was still in doubt, I wrote in January, 1942, an article on "The Shape of Things to Come", which was widely quoted. In it I expressed my hopes and my fears on what might follow the war. I have since seen some of my hopes partially fulfilled, but many of my fears ~~have~~, unfortunately, ~~also~~ come true.

*In 1939 Franklin D. Roosevelt was the non-Farmer leader of our nation.*

"Religion which has so much at stake in this war -- in face, the whole classic Judaeo-Christian tradition is at stake -- is hoping, though it has no assurance -- that this war, coming so soon after the last, will sober the human race so that it will forsake the cynical and brutal materialism which has led it from one Golgotha to another, and will restore to respectability the eternal human ideals and the spiritual values which alone give significance to human life. Religion hopes that this war will mark the end of the persecutions of races and minorities, the exploitation of hates, the total submergence of the individual to the state and the narrow nationalism which have made international life ugly, mean and cruel. Religion is hoping that the hard tasks of peace will evoke at least some of those virtues which fighting free men evidence in war -- courage, resoluteness, self-sacrifice and unity. For we shall have need of an even higher order of spiritual fortitude, of faith and vision, after the war, if we are to conserve those values for which our country is fighting today, and for which brave men will die."

~~Franklin D. Roosevelt was the war-time leader of our nation.~~ In many ways I admired him greatly. <sup>He</sup>~~We~~ was the eloquent spokesman of some of the ~~se~~ very ideals which conspired men of good-will in those searching and critical years. I had voted for him twice, but \_\_\_\_\_

- 6 -

133

On March 31, 1940, addressing my congregation on a subject which was then widely discussed, "A Third Term for President Roosevelt?" I stated:

"There are citizens who do not favor a third term for President Roosevelt, not because they are his foes -- because they are his friends -- the friends of the things he stands for. These people greatly admire him. They fully appreciate the monumental services which he has rendered this country during these last seven years.... ~~They do not question his true American and humanitarian motives, his honest grasp of realities, and his courage to face these realities.~~ They remember, ~~and they refuse to forget~~ that Mr. Roosevelt, in 1933, took over a bankrupt nation which had gone through the disaster of twelve years of boom and depression. He came in as the head of a people in panic, a people whose industry had been stalled, whose farms were languishing, a people prostrate not only materially, but even more so spiritually. They remember that Mr. Roosevelt succeeded in restoring their confidence and hope. He set about rebuilding what had been shaken ~~and~~ <sup>or</sup> destroyed. ~~He set about caring for the millions of impoverished and unemployed who were victims of a twelve-year financial joy-ride under Republican sponsorship.~~ They remember that he tried to rally the nation around a thorough-going program of planned economic and social reconstruction, of a long-range program to meet the evils of the so-called economic cycle.

"He sought to give greater purchasing power to the people -- to the worker, to the farmer, not only ~~as~~ to raise their standard of living, but also in an effort to circumvent the evil of periodic overproduction in this ~~country which menaced our industrial stability.~~ They remember that to this day, Mr. Roosevelt has not permitted the unemployed to starve, and has kept millions of our people from thoughts and acts of desperation. They bear in mind with gratitude the fact that he established measures of social security,



security for the aged and for the unemployed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

-8-

161

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

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

I received a warm note from Mr. Willkie:

"Dear Rabbi Silver:

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

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

Cordially and sincerely,

Wendell L. Willkie"

Politics aside, I really admired this man whose vision in the *worst* <sup>*midst*</sup> of war

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

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

Early in the year 1942, I received an invitation from Dr. Weizmann to visit England in behalf of the Palestine Appeal Campaign. I accepted the invitation and, travelling <sup>by clipper</sup> by way of Bermuda and Lisbon, ~~by Clipper~~, I arrived in England on March 9th and was met by a committee headed by Dr. Weizmann in the Paddington Station. I stopped at the Dorchester Hotel and after dinner that evening I walked out into my first blackout in London. It was a weird and ghostly experience. I <sup>later</sup> stepped into the <sup>2</sup>underground shelter where men, women, and children were sleeping in iron cots on three tiers while passengers were waiting for their trains.

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

While the full extent of our people's tragedy at the hands of the Nazis was as yet <sup>6</sup>not known, enough <sup>the</sup> was known of Nazi diabolic plans to exterminate European Jewry to fill us all with horror. Our Movement was impaled on the horns of a tragic dilemma. Jews everywhere were, of course, solidly behind Great Britain and her allies in the war against the Nazis, the common enemy of civilization. But our Movement was compelled to resist Great Britain in Palestine because, as the Mandatory Government, it had shut the doors of Palestine against our refugees who were desperately seeking asylum from Hitler's concentration camps and gas chambers. Palestine Jews were loyally fighting in the armies of Great Britain, but the Haganah and Irgun, each in its own way, had to resist Great Britain in Palestine in the hope of saving the hapless remnants of our people from extermination.

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I was asked to speak again at the conclusion of the last session of the Conference. <sup>I said in part.</sup> This has been the only great assembly, the only great K'nesia (convocation) of American Israel in the last twenty-five years... Here was revealed the Jewish mind in all its intellectual vigor and clarity. We all experienced some very high and exalted moments at this Conference, and at times I could feel almost a Yom Kipur motif... There were solemn moments; there were also great, joyous moments in the last few days that spoke of high hope and unbroken confidence in ourselves, in our destiny. ~~I could not help recalling time and again that beautiful phrase of the greatest of our poets:~~

"When I think of your afflictions,  
I am moved to the deepest of lamentation;  
But when I dream of the return of your captivity,  
I am like a harp unto your songs."