

T  
24

THE S I S

on

Z I O N I S M   A S   A   S O L U T I O N   O F   T H E   J E W I S H   P R O B L E M

P R E S E N T E D   B Y

S T E L L A   F A R H I

I N   P A R T I A L   F U L F I L M E N T

O F   T H E   R E Q U I R E M E N T S

F O R   T H E   D E G R E E

O F

M A S T E R   O F   A R T S

American University of Beirut  
June 1944

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. On "The Jewish problem.

- ABRAHAM ISTRAEL.- JEWISH LIFE IN THE MIDDLE-AGES  
London 1932
- AHAD-HAAM.- SEE CTED ESSAYS  
Philadelphia 1936
- ARIE GABRIEL.-HISTOIRE JUIVE  
Paris 1923
- BELLOC HILAIRE.- THE JEWS  
New York 1922
- BOROCHOV BER.-NATIONALISM AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE  
New York 1937
- COHEN ISRAEL.- JEWISH LIFE IN MODERN TIMES  
New York 1914
- DEUTSCH GOTTHARD.- FOUR EPOCHS OF JEWISH HISTORY  
New York 1906
- DUBNOV S.M.- JEWISH HISTORY  
AN ESSAY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY  
Philadelphia 1927
- GOLDING LOUIS.-THE JEWISH PROBLEM  
Harmondsworth 1939
- GRAETZ H.-HISTORY OF THE JEWS (6 volumes)  
Philadelphia 1895
- HARRIS MAURICE.-MODERN JEWISH HISTORY  
New York 1928
- HELLER OTTO.-LA FIN DU JUDAISME  
Paris
- HESS MOSES.- ROME AND JERUSALEM  
New York 1918
- JOSEPH BERNARD.- NATIONALITY  
London 1923
- MC CALL.-PATRIOTISM OF THE AMERICAN JEW  
New York 1924
- MARK M.-LE PEUPLE JUIF A LA POURSUITE D'UN EQUILIBRE ECONOMIQUE  
Genève 1936
- MATHEWS BASIL.-THE JEW AND THE WORLD FERMENT

- NAMIER L.B. - THE JEWS  
Jerusalem 1942
- NORDAU MAX.-LES JUIFS ET LE JUDAISME AU 19EME SIECLE  
Paris 1913
- PARKES J.W./-THE JEW IN THE MEDIEVAL COMMUNITY  
London 1938
- PARKES J.W.-THE JEWISH PROBLEM IN THE MODERN WORLD  
London 1939
- PEARLSON GUSTAV.-TWELVE CENTURIES OF PERSECUTION  
Hull 1927
- PINSKER' -SELF-EMANCIPATION  
London 1891
- RENNAP.-ANTISEMITISM AND THE JEWISH QUESTION  
London 1942
- ROTH CECIL.-THE JEWISH CONTRIBUTION TO CIVILIZATION  
London 1938
- RUPPIN ARTHUR.-THE JEWS OF TO-DAY  
London 1913
- SAMUEL MAURICE.- THE GREAT HATRED  
London 1943
- SIVER A.-THE DEMOCRATIC IMPULSE IN JEWISH HISTORY  
New York 1928
- SIMON LEON.-STUDIES IN JEWISH NATIONALISM  
London 1920
- THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA .
- WEISS-ROSMARIN T.-HIGHLIGHTS OF JEWISH HISTORY  
New York 1941
- ZANGWILL ISRAEL.-THE VOICE OF JERUSALEM

## II. On ZIONISM

AHAD-HAAM.--ESSAYS ON ZIONISM AND JUDAISM  
London 1932

ANTONIUS GEORGE.--THE ARAB AWAKENING  
London 1938

ASHBEE.--A PALESTINE NOTEBOOK  
New York 1923

BEIN.--THEODORE GERTZL.--  
Philadelphia 1941

BENTWITCH NORMAN.--ENGLAND IN PALESTINE  
London 1932

BUCHMIL Y.--PROBLEMES DE LA RENAISSANCE JUIVE  
Jerusalem 1936

COHEN ISRAEL.--THE PROGRESS OF ZIONISM  
London 1943

FEINBERG.--SOME PROBLEMS OF THE PALESTINE MANDATE  
Tel-Aviv 1943

GOODMAN PAUL.--THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME  
London 1942

HERTZL THEODORE.--L'ETAT JUIF  
Paris 1926

HAYMSON ALBERT.--PALESTINE, THE REBIRTH OF AN ANCIENT PEOPLE  
New York 1917

KALLEN HORACE.--ZIONISM AND WORLD POLITICS  
London 1921

KANN.--THE MANDATORY GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE  
The Hague 1930

MACHOVER.--JEWISH STATE OR GHETTO  
London 1937

NORDAU MAX.--LE SIONISME  
Paris

NORDAU MAX.--THE JEWISH RETURN TO PALESTINE  
London 1920

PALESTINE REPORT ON IMMIGRATION LAND SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT  
(HOPE SIMPSON REPORT) London 1930

PALESTINE ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT  
(PEEL REPORT) London 1937



SIDEBOTHAM H. - BRITISH POLICY AND THE PALESTINE MANDATE  
London 1939

SIMON LEON. - THE ELEMENTS OF ZIONISM  
London 1934

SNUTS. - A GREAT HISTORIC VOW  
London 1934

SOKOLOV NAHUM. - HISTORY OF ZIONISM  
London 1919

SOSKIN S. - PROBLEMES SIONISTES VUE DE GENEVE  
Paris 1930

STEINLEONARD. - ZIONISM.  
London 1926

STOYANOVSKY. - THE MANDATE FOR PALESTINE  
London 1928

SYRKIN N. - ESSAYS ON SOCIALIST ZIONISM  
New York

THE WHITE PAPER OF 1939  
London

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.-	1
<b>PART ONE      THE JEWISH PROBLEM</b> <hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/>	
Chapter 1.- The riddle	11
Chapter 2.- The modern scene	27
a. Antisemitism. The facts	27
b. Antisemitism. The causes	36
Chapter 3.- The Jews	62
<b>PART TWO</b> <hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/> <b>ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION</b>	
Chapter 4.- The Jewish Middle-Ages	82
Chapter 5.- The modern times.	108
a. Emancipation	109
b. Assimilation	126
c. The communist solution	135
<b>PART THREE      ZIONISM</b> <hr style="width: 50%; margin-left: 0;"/>	
Chapter 6.- The growth of Jewish nationalism	139
a. up to 1896	140
b. From 1896 onwards	153
c. Territorialism	159
d. Spiritual justification of Zionism	166
Chapter 7. Zionism internationally recognised	177
a. The Balfour declaration	179
b. The McMahon pledge	191
c. The mandate	204
d. British mandatory policy	218
Chapter 8.- Workability of Zionism	238
a. The economic possibilities of Palestine	238
b. The Arab problem	246
CONCLUSION.-	266

2

This book is dedicated  
to the Jewish people  
to whom the world owes  
the old and new Testaments,  
and much else  
in the realms of beauty and knowledge,  
a debt  
that has been ill-repaid. "

Duff Cooper ("David")

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

---

Still another inquiry into the field of the Jewish problem. Is there anymore to say about the question ? Prominent historians of all nations have studied it through the ages from all points of view possible. They have given hundreds of interpretations as to its nature and its permanence. All methods were made use of : From the strictest Rankian objectivism to the most subjective analysis, with the whole scale of mitigated attitudes in between, none was omitted.

As, from different diagnoses, the most different suggestions were liable to follow, one was not surprised to find a great variety of solutions proposed for the radical cure of this running sore of history. Unfortunately, none of them proved to be wholly efficient. The authors of the plans were perhaps technically right. The treatment they prescribed followed logically from their evaluation of the pathological factor. But circumstances were against them . Like the physid an who claimed that his operation would have had a happy issue , had not the patient died before the end, those unsuccessful politicians would argue that they were the victims of unexpected events.

This lesson should not be wasted. If, in exceptional cases, historians have made history, we should not forget that in ninety-nine

per cent of the cases, they have only recorded it.

Now, having made that clear, we come back to our first point : Can a study of the Jewish question still bring any new interest to the student of history ? The answer is yes, without any doubt. To begin with, there is always an interest to see for ourself what we have always been accustomed to see through other people's eyes, however authorised they might be. Secondly, one should not feel overawed in treading on a way opened by famous pioneers. As the poet said :

" Ah me! My words but demonstrate the poor  
Rude soul of me thus daring to discourse,  
But the great cause will justify my speech,  
And put to silence all who dare suppose  
My boldness will offend. " (1)

On the other hand, it is wrong to conceive History as only a selection of the great historians' works. On the contrary, it is, like all great monuments, the sum of all the efforts which have contributed, however slightly, to shape the building. The masons bring the great stones. But it takes dozens of obscure workers to set the monument, to cement it, to do a thousand things without which the coming of the next stone would be very much delayed.

Besides, when the first-hand documents concerning a problem are unavailable, one has to study the question through the works of the great historians. In that way, one is in a suitable position to compare and combine the results attained by different authors more easily than would have been achieved by the authors themselves, the probability being that a student would harmonize more conveniently the works of two scientists than any one of them would do separately.

What made me chose the Jewish problem among so many others is, first of all, my personal interest in it. One cannot bear

(1) Cervantes , quoted by Gustave Pearlson, " Twelve centuries of persecution," Hull, 1927, p.3

the fact that, one hundred and fifty years after the proclamation of the Rights of Man, at this very moment, people of the same faith and longings are being despised, hated, pillaged, tortured and massacred with every species of horrors that barbarism could find, without asking one's self with anguish : WHY ? What led the Jews to such a miserable state ? What led their enemies to take such unhuman and horrid steps ? One gets an intense craving for an understanding of the case, for a knowledge of the historical facts from which the problem originated, in search of a glimmer of light which would eventually show the way out of it. If the attempt remains altogether fruitless, the student will have at least the consolation of having brought the tiny assistance he could extend to his people in distress, and to have satisfied his own conscience in seeking historical truth.

Criticisms could be made concerning the opportuneness of tackling such a vexed question of contemporary history. The answer is : On the one hand, that this will be an edifying test of the student's impartiality and truth-seeking spirit; On the other hand, that there are psychological moments in history when such research is not only allowed, but even urged upon the students of history. After all, one cannot completely disentangle the study of a human problem from unacademic contingencies. We are presently witnessing a world-war, the end of which is drawing near. When the dreadful clouds will have disappeared, statesmen will sit at a round table and try to find a suitable cure to the aching sores of humanity.

What can be more desirable then, for a student of History or Political Science, than to go and seek into the past for the roots of the problems presently at stake ? It is not by learning the

clauses of a peace-treaty that he will satisfy his want of understanding. Only by a patient and methodical study of historical evolution will he fully grasp the significance and appropriation of the measures to be taken.

The Jewish problem is one of the numerous problems clamouring for a solution. Nothing will therefore prove more timely to the student than to seek the truth about its origin and evolution.

Now, considering objectively the Jewish problem with the purpose of placing it in history, one is struck by the particular position it holds. It is, on the one hand, a part of the history of the Jewish people; and on the other, it is connected with universal history through all its phases.

What makes it stand out all the more is the uniqueness of the history of the Jewish people. Now, what is Jewish history? What are its range and contents? What message does it bring to the world? Finally, what place does the Jewish problem occupy in it, all these are questions which face us at the beginning of our inquiry.

To begin with, Jewish history is that of a historical people; It has long been implicitly agreed upon that there is a difference based upon sociological development and dynamism, which differentiates historical from unhistorical peoples. The former are the ones which have, by a painful and constant effort, passed through almost all the stages of modern civilization; the ones which have been conscious of their history and of their progressing mental productivity through it, whereas the latter are the peoples which have been unproductive, unconsciously stagnant since their appearance on



earth, as some barbarous African clans. As Weber says in the introduction of his "Allgemeine Weltgeschichte": "Only those nations and states belong to history which display self-conscious activity; which evince an inner spiritual life by diversified manifestations, and combine into an organic whole what they receive from without, and what they themselves originate." (1)

It is obvious that the Jewish people belongs to this category. S.M. Dubnov, the Russian historian whose "Essay in the philosophy of history" is devoted to Jewish history, divides the nations of the higher type into three chronological groups: "First, the most ancient civilised peoples of the Orient, such as the Chinese, the Hindoos, the Egyptians, the Chaldeans; Second, the ancient or classic peoples of the Occident, the Greek and the Romans; Third, the modern peoples, the civilised nations of Europe and America of the present day." (1)

Coming to find a place for the Jewish people in this classification, the author feels most embarrassed. For the Jews may claim to fit into any one of the mentioned categories; they are certainly one of the "most ancient peoples", being the contemporaries of the Egyptians and the Chaldeans. They stood with them in the early days of civilisation and, moreover, spread monotheism which surpassed in spiritual maturity all the ideologies of the time.

The Jews are recognised as being one of the three classical peoples which gave to modern society the elements of its moral, artistic, and judicial life. Finally, they might be counted

(1) in Dubnov, "Jewish history", Philadelphia, 1927, p.5

among the most distinguished nations of the present age on account of their substantial share in the progress of thought, and more especially of science.

How are we going to classify them, then? On account of its activity which has not ceased to develop ever since the beginning of history, Dubnov deems it suitable to call the Jewish people "the historical nation of all times". It therefore appears that Jewish history is unique in its duration, being that of the only people which has survived its contemporaries of the ancient times and still displays, thirty-five centuries after the beginning of its history, most striking signs of vitality.

Jewish history is also unique as regards its contents. In the end of its first half, up to 70 A D, it is the struggle of a people against an uninterrupted wave of conquerors, not an altogether unsuccessful struggle, since, during the whole period, the Jews managed to keep their own culture and to live under their own laws. At first sight, there is nothing very particular in that, and many other nations have passed through this same phase. But, on second thoughts, one finds in this early record of events not only that of a political society, but also that of a spiritual one. The national development of the Hebrews went along religious lines, and with it developed the idea of the election of the Jewish people, (1) that idea which has to a certainly great extent achieved its promise in giving to the world its elementary ethical principles.

So the belief of being the chosen people, together with the teachings of the prophets, contributed "to enoble every heart by moral aspirations, to indoctrinate every individual with an unequivocal

(1) "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation".  
Exodus, XIX, (6)

theory of life, to inspire every member of the nation with lofty ideals",<sup>(1)</sup> and thus prepared to make homelessness easier.

Thus spiritual activity became an integral part of Jewish life, so much so that when the Temple was destroyed and the wanderings began, it remained the only tie which kept the Jewish people self-conscious and alive. The second half of Jewish history owes therefore its aloofness to the fact that it was the only history "stripped of every active political element." It does not record wars, battles, or high deeds of princes. It is a spiritual record, the slow but fertile cultural development of an intellectual people, the addition of innumerable strivings in the domain of moral, religious and social life. Recent critics have attacked certain historians of the past centuries on the ground that they devoted all their efforts to the political development of society, whereas they left the cultural and social side which are the kernel of history, untouched. "History without these ( inner, spiritual elements) is a shell without a kernel" said Macaulay.

In applying this statement to the second half of Jewish history, from 70 A D up to now, we observe that the latter is a cultural history, stripped of most of the external events which load up other histories. "To think and to suffer" was the Jewish watchword in the diaspora. The mental potentiality of the Jews continually displayed itself, in the huge productions of the Talmudists, in the religious philosophy which followed, in the flourishing Judeo-Spanish literature, in mysticism and the Kabbala, to quote only a few of them.

In brief, from the point of view of duration as well as from the point of view of content, Jewish history presents a very distinctive chapter of universal history.

(1) Dubnov, op cit p.16

There remains a third and momentous point which is the significance of Jewish history. We will consider it from two points of view, the national, and the universal.

What does Jewish history mean to a twentieth-century Jew? If he is an orthodox Jew, he will have felt already the greatness of it in the Holy Scriptures. But if he is a little far from the Jewish tradition, he may be unmoved by its early beginnings. Still, a long time will not elapse before he will take the tragic wanderings of his people at heart. Of course, the reader will object that this is sentimentalism and, therefore, must be excluded from a historical survey. But what is nationalism when stripped of its emotional connotations?

Historical consciousness in most of the cases awakens conscious nationalism, and, where it fails to do so, it intensifies the vague and scarcely realized feeling of solidarity between the Jewish student of history and the characters of the past. "Common sorrow unites men more closely than common joy. A long chain of historical traditions is cast about us all like a strong ring.... In the course of centuries, as generation followed generation, similarity of historical fortunes produced a mass of similar impressions which have crystallized, and have thrown off the deposit that may be called the Jewish national soul." (1)

Now, and that is what will interest us here mostly, what is the significance of Jewish history for the historian, in general?

To begin with, it has, from the point of view of universal history, a great experimental value. It offers to the student an already worked out laboratory experiment. This is what I mean: We have been told time and time again that history, as a science, was not

(1) Dubnov, op cit p.28

comparable to the natural sciences, because of its inability to provide for experiments, to reduce historical facts into effects following from definite causes. After having located the causes of a historical event, the historian is indeed unable to alter or even completely suppress the play of a causal factor in order to evaluate its share in producing a given effect. Jewish history provides the student of history with such a rare possibility. It offers to his consideration twenty centuries of history "stripped of every active political element." Is not that a unique opportunity to study the part played by politics in the social life of a people, to evaluate its real contribution to the formation of nationalism? This is not a trifling experiment. It is one which has lasted twenty centuries, and might be therefore of a certain weight if inductive methods are applied to it.

Besides this pragmatic use that can be made of its material Jewish history offers another characteristic in that it is intersected in every one of its pages with universal history. The contact between them is both physical and spiritual. The Jewish people has kept a constant physical contact with the other peoples through the persecutions which ranged through all its life. It has also kept a vivid spiritual intercourse with them through the rich, reciprocated influence of the distinct cultures.

Ever since the Babylonian captivity, the Jews contributed to the development of other nations in carrying with them, as it were, the Hebrew heritage to all the areas to which they moved. This legacy inspired the foreign peoples, and the Jews, in turn, found new sources of speculation in the Gentile culture. Given their dispersion the Jews were in a unique position to spread the seeds of European culture, and they did not fail to do so.

In its earlier history, the Jewish people gave to humanity the idea of a single God, inspired by the same sacred book. All the Christians of the world are acquainted with that early history. It is mostly from its heroes that they derive their great incarnations of virtue and moral strength.

Dubnov suggests that "the time is approaching in which the second half of Jewish history will be to the noblest part of thinking humanity what its first half has long been to believing humanity, a source of sublime, moral truths." "In this sense", does he conclude, "Jewish history in its entirety is the pledge of the spiritual union between the Jews and the rest of the nations." (1)

PART ONE:           THE  
                                  JEWISH  
  PROBLEM

"The great misunderstood  
of history."

Zangwill

CHAPTER ONE

THE RIDDLE.

" The Christian world has alternately hated and idealised the Jew, it has never understood him," says Milton Steinberg in his study of " The making of the modern Jew." The Middle-Ages, in its bewilderment, built around him a myth, that of the " wandering Jew ", which symbolised his survival against all the rules of logic. To-day, there is no such myth, which does not imply that there is no mystery.

After centuries of persecution, the Jew has survived, He has, furthermore entered into gentile society and taken part into its various activities, so that the non-Jewish world cannot help recognising his existence. But the twentieth-century hardly understands his survival any more than did the Dark Ages. As, however, the modern age does not go in for Bables, the Gentile world has taken the Jew for granted. But, at the same time , it has relegated his existence to the realm of unanswerable questions and has therefore thrown away all possibilities of understanding him.

As a matter of face, the modern Jew himself is seldom more enlightened. For, if he is sentimental about his Jewishness, he will rather keep a halo of romance around it than reduce it to hard facts. And



if he is ashamed of being a Jew, he will systematically avoid the study of or reference to Jewish history. Thus, in both cases, no approach to history will be made, and no understanding of the case attempted.

The fact is really a curious one since people are generally attracted by original phenomena and puzzles of all kinds. The reason of that world-wide attitude toward Jewish history is either that the Gentile mind is uneasy in dealing with Jewish questions; or, that the Jewish survival is irritating enough by itself to make any further study about it unpleasant.

But, if the Gentile can avoid contact with Jewish history, or try to ignore it, he cannot ignore the Jews as well, some of whom he is obliged to meet everyday. He then finds out that the character of the modern Jew is no less a puzzle than his history. He makes some generalization about Jews, and he is amazed to find how great is the number of them who do not fit into the classification he has made. He thought that all Jews were learned in their own culture, and he meets many a Jew who has been brought up in the only light of his new motherland's. He thought that all Jews were greedy, and he finds many of them among the greatest philanthropists of the world. He thought that all Jews were anarchists, then, he learns that some are at the head of organised governments. Imagine his confusion then.

His perplexity is even greater when he tries to make clear how the Jews behave to their own group. Let us pause for a while and review the different pictures of them he has the opportunity to see. To begin with, that of the orthodox Jew. He can see him on a Sabbath or a Holy Day, with his best suit on, going to the Synagogue, where he will spend the best part of the day reading Hebrew prayers. On his way back,

he will walk home, as riding is forbidden on such a day. He will not carry the slightest thing in his pockets, as recommended by a religious prescription. At home, he will eat food prepared the day before strictly according to rabbinic rules. And he will spend the rest of the day together with his wife and children, reading with genuine delight parts of the Scriptures related to the festivity of the day.

Side by side with this conservative, loyal Jew, lives a family of assimilationists. On that same Saturday, every one of them will attend to his business in the City. At noon they will have lunch in a fashionable restaurant with their Gentile friends. They will ride, they will play cards, find a hundred ways of enjoying themselves without bothering to stop for a moment and ask themselves whether they could act otherwise. They deem that the conservative Jew is an anachronism, a vestige of antiquity, and that one ought to live according to one's own time.

Consider still another type of Jew, the social climber. This one's dearest wish is to make the Gentiles mix with him and forget that he is a Jew. He will reject the dogmas and practises of his religion, he will change his name, move from the Jewish quarter, do anything that will make people believe that he is a mere Britisher, or American, whatever it may be, without any further degrading characteristic. He will boast of knowing perfectly the history of the country of his adoption, will prove a humble admirer of its progress and culture. He will be more enthusiastic than the most ardent patriots, and, as a matter of fact, will display a zeal so exaggerated that it will reveal deliberateness. What will be the result of those constant efforts? He will be despised by his own people, suspected, mocked or disdainfully pitied by the Gentiles. "Thus is formed a class of Jews who do not want to be what they are and cannot be anything else." (1)

(1) M Steinberg, 'The making of the modern Jew', London, 1934, p.6

To complete this picture, one has to say a word of the chauvinistic Jew. This one is not ashamed of being a Jew and he does not fail in proclaiming it to whom it may and may not concern. Has he heard the word "Jew" uttered in a conversation, he bursts in, and defends most dramatically the rights of his people, sometimes when they have not even been attacked. He is so sickly-conscious of his Jewishness that he simply has got to refer to it any time he speaks. If he is typical of his class, he will look with utter contempt at the assimilationists or the social climbers and will gladly agree to give them up to the Gentiles.

Such is the baffling picture liable to be found whenever a Gentile attempts an incursion in the Jewish domain. Yet, another surprise awaits him when he steps into the realm of Jewish ideology. There, he finds the group, as a whole, as a huge debating society. The most varied opinions are held about what is called "the Jewish problem", and many an elaborated solution urged as the only remedy to it. The world is often led to think that there are only two attitudes possible toward the Jewish question: The assimilationist, and the Zionist ones. The average Gentile, and somehow the average Jew, would be both surprised at the number of other existing groups, and by those, I mean sections of the Jewish population united by thoroughly elaborated ideologies, organized in order to work out definite programs, the aim of which is the solution of the Jewish question.

The adepts of Reform or Liberal Judaism, for instance, tend to modernize the Jewish cult by suppressing many old rites and customs. Furthermore, they state that their Judaism is entirely a matter of religious belief, given that they belong to the country in which they live by their culture, longings, and social affiliation. Their credo

can be summarised in two statements: " Judaism is a progressive religion. Being a Jew is being only the member of a religious community, and no longer the member of a nation."

Opposed to the Liberals are the Modern Orthodox Jews. Their orthodoxy is not superstitious like that of the Middle-Ages. It is conscious and deliberate. If Judaism is to survive at all, it is by its strict and voluntary maintenance of all its precepts. One who believes in it must close deliberately the door on all doubts and needs no further justification. At this price only will the Jewish people survive as such.

Between these diametrically opposed philosophies stands a third one known as " conservatism ". This one is adopted by people who cannot deliberately shut their minds to questions, and who feel the need to adapt their rites to the pressure of circumstances. They want to keep as much of the traditions as possible, but at the same time, agree to certain indispensable reforms.

Most recently, another doctrine has developed, that of " Reconstruction ", which seems to have a most promising future. It is based on the following axioms: Were assimilation possible, it should be rejected, Judaism possessing enough inherent value to justify its preservation. What is only needed is a rethinking of the dogmas and their interpretation. Proceeding from these premisses, the " reconstructivists " analyze the elements of Judaism. From that analysis they derive that Judaism is by no means only a religion; it is a civilization. The reconstruction is very important and implies significant consequences. If Judaism is a civilization, then the use of its language gains a new vitality. On the other hand, the founding of a centre for its culture becomes necessary; thus full support is given to the nationalists.

Much more could be said about this and other ideologies. My aim here is not to draw a detailed picture of contemporary Judaism.

though I had to sketch it for the sake of understanding the world's attitude toward the Jewish question. I still have to speak however, of the most important section, the one which gathers the greater part of the Jewish population, I mean, that of the average Jew.

Most Jews are not informed of the various theories and programmes that the most learned among them have established. Their knowledge of history and religion is made of third rate information, of half-truths and so forth. They are neither orthodox, nor completely indifferent to religion. They observe some prescriptions, and not others, and are not well aware why. They would like to make friends with the Gentiles, and yet feel themselves at home only among other Jews. Above all, there are moments when they wonder what that is all about! Why do they have to justify themselves, why are they cross-examined by anyone who feels the right to do so? "The average Jew is then a pathetically confused person who stands midway between ultimate states and knows not which way to turn." (1) He leaves the theories to the rabbis and tries to solve his own troubles piecemeal without pretension at finding a solution to his people's troubles. He finds pain enough in solving his own, when he solves them.

Such is therefore the baffling picture that the Gentile has before him when he attempts to understand what he hastily calls the mystery of Jewish survival or that of the Jewish character. All the facts he has observed seem to him the ill-fitting parts of a jigsaw-puzzle. For, after a superficial enquiry, the picture of Jewish society and beliefs seem even less understandable than before. It is only by a patient and systematic study of the Jewish past that he will find the key to the enigma. For, if the Jew is an anomaly, he is no miracle. Every trait of his character, every longing he has, every theory he builds can be explained by reference to history.

(1) M. Steinberg, op cit p.9



The first point that I wanted to stress however, is the strange indifference of the world to the understanding of the Jewish people. The modern Christian is totally ignorant of the Jews. He may have some vague notions of the Jews before or at the beginning of the Christian era. But he does not know how they lived through the centuries which separated the Biblical Jews from the twentieth-century. Furthermore, he has no exact information whatever about the problems of their present situation. And when he tries to learn something about the question, he does it in a superficial, hasty way, which leaves him less able to deal with the case than before. He thinks nevertheless that he has acquired sufficient knowledge and draws from the few observations he has made faulty conclusions as far from reality as the medieval myth.

Having analysed some apparently puzzling aspects of the Jewish scene and having observed the very inadequate approach which has been made toward it, both of which being indispensable preliminaries to the study of the question, let us now ask ourselves the following question: Why is there a Jewish problem in the present world? Which reasons are traditional and which are characteristic of the twentieth-century?

The reasons which have made the Jewish position peculiar in the modern world were brilliantly analysed by Dr Leo Pinsker in his well-known pamphlet on "Self-emancipation" (1882). He states that what makes the Jews despised in the world more than any other people can be reduced to three main reasons:

The first is psychological. Some day may happen when mankind will live in peace and brotherhood, when all men will feel equals and will love each other regardless of nationality, race, or faith. This blessed day has not yet come and shows, unfortunately, no sign of drawing near. We still live, above all, in a world of nations. Those nations

The first point that I wanted to stress however, is the strange indifference of the world to the understanding of the Jewish people. The modern Christian is totally ignorant of the Jews. He may have some vague notions of the Jews before or at the beginning of the Christian era. But he does not know how they lived through the centuries which separated the Biblical Jews from the twentieth-century. Furthermore, he has no exact information whatever about the problems of their present situation. And when he tries to learn something about the question, he does it in a superficial, hasty way, which leaves him less able to deal with the case than before. He thinks nevertheless that he has acquired sufficient knowledge and draws from the few observations he has made faulty conclusions as far from reality as the medieval myth.

Having analysed some apparently puzzling aspects of the Jewish scene and having observed the very inadequate approach which has been made toward it, both of which being indispensable preliminaries to the study of the question, let us now ask ourselves the following question: Why is there a Jewish problem in the present world? Which reasons are traditional and which are characteristic of the twentieth-century?

The reasons which have made the Jewish position peculiar in the modern world were brilliantly analysed by Dr Leo Pinsker in his well-known pamphlet on "Self-emancipation" (1882). He states that what makes the Jews despised in the world more than any other people can be reduced to three main reasons:

The first is psychological. Some day may happen when mankind will live in peace and brotherhood, when all men will feel equals and will love each other regardless of nationality, race, or faith. This blessed day has not yet come and shows, unfortunately, no sign of drawing near. We still live, above all, in a world of nations. Those nations



live in a state of relative peace, they respect each other to a certain extent and consider themselves equals, on the plane of nationhood at least. Only the Jewish nation is unanimously despised, and that is easily understandable. For if the Jews have once led a normal national life, they have been deprived for almost twenty centuries of one of the most important attributes of nationhood, that is, a country. True, the Jews have never ceased to live a national life as far as the domain of culture is concerned. They have produced great achievements in the development of Hebrew literature and studies.

But here lies precisely the source of the evil. "The world saw in this people the uncanny appearance of a dead man, who walks with the living. This ghostly appearance of a walking dead man, of a people without unity and organisation; without land or band; no more alive, but still walking among the living; this astonishing spectre, unparalleled in history, without a model or copy, could not but produce a peculiar and strange impression on the imagination of the nations. Since a fear of ghosts is congenital... why should its prevalence be surprising with regard to this dead, but still living nation?" (i)

This suspicion of the abnormal is a recognised biological phenomenon. There is a good deal of evidence that an unfamiliar or strange animal will be mobbed by other species. "It will be remembered how unfavourably the Man Who Could See was received in Mr Well's Country of the Blind", says Louis Golding. (ii)

It is therefore a part of the physiological heritage of man that he suspects the unknown. From suspicion to fear there is only one step and from fear to hatred another. Israel appears to the

(i) Leo Pinsker.- Self-emancipation . London 1891. p.11

(ii) Louis Golding.- The Jewish problem. Harmondsworth. 1939.p.16

nations as a disembodied ghost, the fear of which has been transmitted from one generation to another for two thousand years, so much so that this fear has become an ineradicable disease. The nations of to-day may regard individual Jews with kindness, they keep a deep animosity against the people as a whole.

The second line of argument which is responsible of the existence of a Jewish question is political in character. It is a proved fact that nations do not like strangers. The Jewish citizens, however old may be their settlement in a country, are always considered as strangers. Moreover, they are always considered by the state and the non-Jewish population as poor relations. And why? For the reason that people behave differently to a well-to-do stranger and to a homeless pauper. The Gentile does not grasp the fact that the Jew is entitled to enjoy all the advantages he himself enjoys. Neither does the Jew. When his disabilities are removed, he does not feel that the state owes him equal citizenship, no. He is grateful, because he knows that the Gentiles are treating him out of goodness of heart, and doing something they could have helped, had it not been for their charitable disposition.

What is the situation of the Jew in the countries where he is the happiest? He has been recently granted full rights of citizenship. "But the mere fact that the granting of equal rights is an act of generosity, and not a duty based on the real equality of the two parties, robs the boon of its moral value, and makes it merely a piece of legislative machinery. The giver can never forget that he is the giver, nor the receiver that he is the receiver." (1) The fact that Jews have been reproached time and time again with not being grateful

(1) Ahad-Haam.- Selected Essays.- London 1922. p.66

enough to their benefactors is another sign of the underestimation of the Jews by their Gentile fellow-citizens. The Jews are thus endowed with an inferiority complex which makes them grateful for the mere fact that no mention is made of their Jewishness. That is therefore another of the important sides of the abnormality of the Jewish situation in the political world.

The third cause responsible for the existence of the Jewish question, following Pinsker's classification, pertains to economics. In the actual state of economic life, competition is peaceful but not quite free. The state differentiates to a certain extent between natives and strangers in giving often priority to its own citizens. That is one of the primary motives of colonization. Discrimination occurs the more so as the stranger is poor and homeless. Israel appears as an undesirable, and serious competitor who is tolerated as long as there is prosperity in the country. But let the slightest symptoms of a crisis be seen, he is immediately thrown over the border, or hand-tied in a small corner from where he will not be able to move for a long while. The wealthy foreigner, however undesirable he may be, will not be openly shown animosity, for the sake of avoiding a precedent. The case of the Jew is different. No one will rise to protect him and threaten the country in question with reprisal.

Let us take an instance in contemporary history. "We recently heard the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Colonel Beck, announcing in Geneva and in his own country, and in England, in numerous interviews that there are a million Jews too many in Poland ..... Why exactly a million JEWS ? They are citizens of Poland , they have been connected with the fate and destinies of Poland for well-nigh

a thousand years.....They are out to make their contribution to Poland, good, bad, or indifferent, like everybody else. Why should THEY be singled out as being a million too many ?" (1) Why? Because a vague of unemployment came and strengthened the living Polish antisemitism. Though the Polish Jews could not have been charged with being millionaires, or forestalling the jobs in the country ! They were the most miserable of all their fellow-Jews.

Here are, therefore, above-mentioned, three sides of the Jewish question: the psychological, the political, and the economic. All of them confirm though from different standpoints, the abnormality of the Jewish situation. The argument has been reduced to a single catchword : ~~we~~ We speak of a Jewish problem because the Jews are " a minority everywhere, and a majority nowhere."

The Jews are a religious, a national, and an ethnic minority. Anyhow, they are always different from others, at least in one way. They are not the only minority, will someone object! No, of course, there are minorities everywhere, though not two or threefold. Yet the Jews are the more easily identifiable. They have sometimes characteristic features, they have traditions and folk-ways of their own. On the other hand, there are always some of them who are newcomers, and therefore easily recognisable by their foreign accent. They are also a vocational minority, according to some theoreticians. They are gathered around a few definite occupations. So, they are in more than a way a conspicuous minority!

Yet , their fate is different from that of all other minorities. Consider for a moment the position of the Scots in the British Empire. It is in more than one way similar to that of the Jews.

(1) DrH/ Weizmann.- The Jewish people and Palestine .Tel-Aviv,1936. p12

The Scots have an ethnic and religious background of their own. Exaggerated appreciation of money and excess of intellectualism are charges made against both Scots and Jews. The percentage of Scotsmen in the civil Service, politics, journalism, and banking is extremely high. In brief, the Englishman meets the Scot wherever he goes. Still, he does not reproach him with having invaded England, taken the jobs of the Britishers, or cherishing a secret allegiance to Scotland, his mother-country, that is, not to any serious extent. There is no such thing as a Scottish problem !

Similarly, the Protestants are a minority in France. They want, as well as the Jews, to preserve their identity. They are not accused of exclusionism, at least not to the same extent as the Jews. They are not accused of being foreigners, and no catholic whatever will dream of expulsing them from France. There might be a French Protestant problem, as has been explicitly shown by the Dreyfus case, still France remains the motherland of the French Protestants, and they remain her gallant sons. The case is different with the Jew. No matter when he came, he will remain the traditional stranger. At best, a liberal government will tolerate him, but one should never forget that the people who are tolerated are the people who are not liked, toleration meaning bearing with indulgence. The Jews are therefore tolerated when they are lucky. And it is because they realize the tragic instability of their situation that at every festival, at every Holy Day, in the Synagogue and outside it, the representatives of the Jewish population express, on behalf of their brethren, their eternal gratitude to the generous people who does not throw them out of the country, who is ready to tolerate them. " We have sunk so deeply, writes Pinker,...that...when an idle looker-on shoups to uson our way: Poor devils of Jews, you are

truly to be pitied, we are profoundly moved...and when a Jew is said to do honour to his people, we are foolish enough to be proud of it."(i)

There have been minority problems which have been solved. The Huguenot minority in England in the eighteenth-century, for instance. Their problem disappeared because they disappeared themselves. The Jews have refused to surrender their identity. They consider that Judaism has sufficient inherent value to justify its preservation. That is why their problem still exists, urging more than it ever did.

Apart from this will to live which is after all common to all national minorities now-a-days, the Jews have another disability. They are nowhere a majority, they are nowhere hosts, they are always guests. In fact, they have, as Louis Golding puts it, "all the disadvantages of a minority without any of its advantages." They are a religious, a national, an ethnic minority, and in spite of all that there is no state in God's wide world which will raise its voice to defend them. Add to that that they are easily identifiable, and you will have a faithful picture of their situation. "It has been said that the part played in English economic life by the Quakers is out of all proportions to their numbers, writes Golding....If that is so, few persons are aware of it, for the Quaker names are Barclay, Bevan, Hanbury Richardson...No one, as he walked... would pay much attention to such names... If, instead of such names he read Cohen, Levy, Rosenberg, his reactions, I fear, would be more emphatic." (ii)

What is the result of this easy identifiability? Wherever he goes, the Jew is noticed, at work, in the street, in social life.

(i) Pinsker.- op cit - p.24  
 (ii) The Jewish problem.- op cit . p.22



And what, if anything goes wrong ? It is the conspicuous witness who is the first suspected. All the dissatisfied point to him. Unable to detect the causes of their troubles and to accuse the really responsible people, the mob shouts: Down with the Jew! And not only the mob, unfortunately, but also the so-called elite who reacts in the same, though more sophisticated way. It is rightly that the Jews have been called the scapegoat of history!

Following this series of tragic abnormalities, one should not be surprised at the strange behaviour of the nations to the Jews. "If Jewish history be but one long anomaly, wrote Milton Steinberg, then the world's attitude toward it must be another."(1) Indeed, the nations have displayed toward the Jews the most prejudiced attitude, and here I refer to all the nations of the world, included those which pretend to be untainted by the virus of an isemitism.

When a Jew does something valuable, he is credited with it, at least in liberal countries. But let him beware of making a slip. He will be seriously warned, and his Jewishness immediately reminded to him as a primary charge from which he has not yet acquitted himself.

When an individual Jew proves to be a genius, a social benefactor, or a great thinker, the Jewish community as a whole does not get credit for it. This Jew is considered then as an ordinary citizen, like any other Gentile. But let a criminal, a thief, or a traitor be a Jew, then the crime stains the whole community. "Imagine a few men to have committed some grave crime in London,... and the entire English people throughout the world wherever scattered and however upright their lives, are held responsible; tens of millions of its members have never seen or even heard of the few evil members of the nation, but they are guilty with them. A dispassionate and unbiassed mind would instantly



taboo such a ridiculous action as foolish and unjust, yet this was the chief phase of the Jewish question in the Middle-Ages." (i) And it is still so in the twentieth-century. When a Jewish boy of seventeen killed a German official in Paris, not very long ago, six hundred thousand Jews suffered from the reprisals. The Jewish community of Germany had to pay £ 80,000,000 as an indemnity. And there are still people who argue that the twentieth-century is not comparable to the Middle-Ages, as far as humanitarian feelings are concerned !

"Many of us are happy to acknowledge the eminently fair treatment which we and our work have received in this country. England) Still in every one of us there is, deep down, the consciousness that we cannot afford to slip: a fall for us is harder and more irretrievable than for a non-Jew." (ii) One has only to notice the anxious look on the face of every Jew, when a crime of any kind happens to be committed, to be convinced of Professor Namier's sincerity.

The Jew does not enjoy, though granted, freedom of thought, especially in politics. "If a socialist, he is suspect of Bolchevism; if a Conservative, he is a bloated capitalist". (ii) The trouble with him, or is it with the world, is that he has always got to justify himself. He is continually cross-examined, his actions more often than not malevolently interpreted. He is even asked why his people wants to survive as a nation. Do the English, the Germans, the French, The Dutch, or the Chinese have to explain why they want to live as a nation ? It would sound ridiculous. So, why do the Jews have still to do so ?

These are, therefore, the different aspect of the Jewish riddle as can be seen in the first half of the twentieth-century.

(i) Gustave Pearlson.- Twelve centuries of persecution. Hull 1927, p.76  
(ii) L.B. Namier.- The Jews. Jerusalem 1942. p.4

We have noticed, to begin with, the lack of comprehension the the world displayed toward it. Then, we have reviewed the different sides of the problem, the psychological, the political, the economic, and the social. We have observed all through the survey that a strange and persistent animosity was felt by the Gentile world against the Jews. We are now proceeding to study more comprehensively this "Judeophobia" and evaluate its development and strength in the modern scene.

" Pretexts change but the hatred remains. The Jews are not hated because they have evil qualities; evil qualities are sought for in them because they are hated. "

Max Nordau

## CHAPTER TWO.-

The modern scene.

### A. Antisemitism.- The facts.-

It is 1944 and the Jewish people is writing a chapter in letters of blood in the history of the world. I do not allude here to the thousands of Jewish soldiers who are fighting and falling gallantly in the armies of the various belligerents. No, those are not to be pitied any more than the multitude who are dying everyday on both sides of the battlefields. I refer only to the millions of men, women and children whose lives have been taken with all the refinements of cruelty that could be found, on account of their blood parentage; to the whole communities who are being persecuted, starved, or shot every day because of a single and unforgivable crime: that of pertaining to the Jewish people. And, which is worse, I refer to those crimes which are intentionally perpetrated, those which, apart from being homicides, have the further qualification of being the fruits of a twentieth-century ideology.

Nothing is baser than "atrocitiy mongering" for its own sake and I do not wish to draw a tragic picture of the Jewish situation in order to arouse the pity of the reader. I only wish to stress that the horrors alluded to are not in any way exaggerated by sentiment and will be backed by official figures in due time. People are too often inclined to believe that this cannot be true, that the Jews in Germany, in Poland, in Austria and many other parts of Europe are really unhappy but not miserable to the extent pictured. Most unfortunately, news and witnesses confirm to us every day the truth of antisemitic crimes.

Even when realising the extent of the anti-Jewish measures taken during the last decade, the observer tends to remain indifferent by pushing the facts away from him, into the domain of history. Massacres have always taken place, is the argument generally put forward. Once it was the Christians', another time the Jews. It thus happens that the present victims are the Jews. This is part of a cyclical phenomenon. It is nothing to be moved about.

We will deal later with antisemitism as a cyclical phenomenon, and see if such a view can be held on good ground. In the meantime, I would like to emphasize the difference between the present persecutions and those to which they are compared. To begin with, one often hears the following argument: The early Christians were pitilessly massacred by their contemporaries. Even the Lord died victim of his beliefs. It is only fair that Jews should now die victims of intolerance.

I will not deal here with the value of the fanatical argument of revenge, which does not need any answer, nor with the religious accusation at the origin of the anti-Jewish hatred which will be dealt with separately in this chapter. I wish only to recall that the Roman

massacre of the Christians took place two thousand years ago; and that since then, religion, ethics, and philosophy were supposed to make the modern individual more human. How can one seek collective security and trust in disarmament, how can one speak of world-citizenship, when persecutions, the crudest application of the principle of force, are indulged in every day on helpless minorities ?

" On the great masses of humanity, modern ideas and inventions have had little spiritual effect. The man who drives a motor-car is as much a creature of ignorant prejudices and superstitions as his ancestor who guided an oxcart. It is natural, then, that so far as the half-literate are concerned the folk hatreds of the ages should survive into the twentieth-century. The disappointment is not with the masses, it is with the educated classes."(1) In fact, intelligent, cultured, intellectual men have taken the lead in the present Jew-bating. Their education has not helped to eradicate prejudice from their hearts; on the contrary, it has rationalised it and made of it a pseudo-scientific theory.

Massacres have been carried out in the Middle-Ages by the mob, by ignorant, superstitious, irresponsible individuals. They were not officially recognised by the Church who nevertheless was the most irascible enemy of the Jews. Nowadays, they are led by cold-blooded, utterly conscious theorists, and they are part of a thoroughly elaborated ideology.

Nor is present-day antisemitism comparable to the worst Jewish persecution of the past, I mean, the Inquisition. For, the Spanish Jews had an alternative. They could give up their religion. The measures of expulsion were taken only against professing Jews. It was repeatedly

(1) M. Steinberg. op cit , p.225

emphasized that there would be no discriminations against those who would willingly accept conversion. And the promise was kept. The Middle Ages objected to the identity of the Jew, to his strange tongue, to his rites and customs. But as soon as he got himself merged into the Christian environment, the animosity subsided. Modern antisemitism takes the opposite attitude. The Jews are not asked to assimilate any more. On the contrary, they are accused to have poisoned society by infiltration. They are not persecuted because of their religious affiliations but because of their inferior ethnic identity. No matter if a Jew was converted two or three generations ago, if his descendants have been faithful Christians ever since, if they have given up all contact with Jews, their blood is still defiled by the Jewish parentage. Aryan society rejects them.

And where does it reject them? Is there any country in the world which agrees to give them refuge? All the doors are closed before them. At previous times, they could always find some haven or another. In 1290, when they were expelled from England, France accepted them on her soil. In 1306, they could still flee to Germany and central Europe. From Germany, they could escape to Poland; from Russia to the New World. Now they can go nowhere. As some writer put it, "the world seems now to be divided between countries where Jews cannot live, and countries where Jews must not enter." (1)

That is the tragic fate of a few millions of Jewish people. Over half a million Christians of Jewish origin are under the same ban. What will to-morrow bring for them? Here are scores of young people who were Germans and Polish as any German or any Pole. They were in no way different from other young men and women who are allo-



wed to live and be happy as they like. Still, elementary rights are refused to them. What is more poignant than their situation is that of their parents who, after having accepted the sacrifice of assimilation for the sake of their children's happiness. have lived to see "no thoroughfare for Jews written on every vocation for which they had been prepared."(i)

Of course those dreadful anti-Jewish measures are presently applied in Germany and occupied Europe only. But the irritability towards the Jew is felt almost everywhere. Prejudice, added to an overflowing German propaganda has made all the nations Jew-conscious. As Israel Cohen puts it: "Antisemitism dogs the footsteps of the Jew in every land , in free republics as in despotic monarchies; it has no respect for rank or class and makes no distinction between the religious and the non-religious Jew; it assails the Jewish politician and author equally with the Jewish artisan and pedlar; it finds ever new objects of accusation."(ii)

It has even raised its head in England where it has not manifested its existence for a long time. Even England, "the land of the free", has been attacked by the virus of antisemitism. The sickness has not spread as violently as elsewhere because , after all, there are only 350.000 Jews in England for over 40.000.000 inhabitants. Still, animosity against the Jews become little by little intensified. Sir Oswald Mosley 's "British Union of Fascists" was founded a few years before the present war. It was the first English political party in history which held Jew-baiting among the important points of its program. While Mosley officially refuted the antisemitic character of

i) Basil Mathews.- The Jew and the world ferment. London, 1935 p.118  
 ii) Jewish life in modern times. New York, 1914 p.315



his party, the B.U.F.'s organ, "Blackshirt", wrote the following:  
 " In the light of recent events, we state deliberately that the Jews are striving to involve Britain in war....the Jews have now organised a racial minority within the State to conduct a furious agitation with all the forces of their great money power which can have no effect except to drag this country towards war with Germany." (i)

Still, the fascist movement did not grow into a mass movement. But the middle-class was largely susceptible to its antisemitic propaganda. The shopkeepers, the small traders could easily be convinced that what hampered their business were Jewish trusts or Jewish financiers. And when the B.U.F. disclosed openly its anti-Jewish attitude, publicity was done more easily to it. Already in 1934, the "New Statesman" was writing: " Let no one....say that anti-semitism is not dangerous in England. Sir Oswald's anti-Semitic passages were wildly, madly, cheered from all parts of the hall ( Albert Hall). People rose in their seats and yelled delight when he accused the Jews of blackmailing the Press and destroying England..." (ii)

Besides, the "Anglo-German" fellowship", an organisation which viewed with sympathy the doctrines of the German government, and therefore its antisemitic position, was founded with such distinguished members as British peers, heads of big businesses, managers of banks and insurance companies. Thus, before the war broke out, there were in England some, if only few, organised centers of antisemitic propaganda. After September 1939, and especially after September 1940, the anti-Jewish seeds sown before the war began to germinate. With the necessary war-restrictions, discomfort grew. Deficient

(i) Blackshirt, nov. 4th 1933, quoted by Rennap in "antisemitism and the Jewish question.- London 1942. p.103

(ii) Rennap, op cit p.104

shelter accommodations sometimes created unavoidable friction. The evacuation of strategic areas and the overcrowding which followed were favourable conditions for the old prejudice to burst out. Add to that the sight of refugees who spoke with a strong German accent, and who, on top of it, looked like Germans more than anything else, and you will have a hardly exaggerated picture of to-day's British Jew-consciousness. I wonder if this observation in a recent number of the "Jewish Chronicle" was too pessimistic. It read: "There appears to exist a large degree of sympathy with Hitler in his anti-semitic outlook among people who otherwise ardently support the war against Germany." (1)

My intention is not to exaggerate. I believe that, in spite of the whole propaganda, British outlook towards the Jews is not, on the whole, one of strongly marked antipathy. I have insisted on the anti-semitic publicity made in England in order to stress that, even in the most liberal countries, antisemitism is living. It was necessary in a short survey of antisemitism, to emphasize the universal character of that phenomenon, a character which is generally disregarded.

While we are in the domain of the great democracies, let us say a word of the situation in the U.S.A. There, the number of Jews is much greater, amounting to 4,000,000. On the other hand, a great part of them is composed of new settlers, Russians who have escaped from the tsarist pogroms in 1880 and 1903, Germans who have managed to get immigration permits in the early thirties of the century. Consequently, the U.S.A. is slightly more Jew-conscious than is Great-Britain. Moreover, German propaganda has had a freer play there than in the United Kingdom. All these factors combined have made a small

(1) Rennap, op cit , p.113

wave of antisemitism rise. Henry Ford was one of the leaders of that movement up to 1927 when he was sued for libel and had to retract all the fallacious rumours he had been spreading.

Meanwhile, Charles Coughlin, who was later called "America's Radio Priest", was becoming the American Jew-baiter "par excellence." By his very persuasive sermons, he succeeded in gathering around him a great number of admirers who formed the "Radio league of the little flower", a so-called non-political organisation, which indulged in antisemitic propaganda very frequently. Father Coughlin began to publish "The protocols of the elders of Zion", this forgery of the 19th century that pretended to warn the world against an international Jewish danger. Radio propaganda and cheap literature contributed to predispose the average American against the "foreigner", and to close the doors before him. Mrs E. Morton, in her book, "I am a woman and a Jew", tells of the serious difficulties she had in looking for a job in the U.S.A., when the employers knew that she was a Jewess; she tells of the homes which were closed to her and her husband because she came from a Jewish stock.

On the other hand, it would be interesting to note the somewhat close connection which exists in America between isolationists and antisemites. The former played the anti-Jewish card as a last chance of keeping the U.S.A. out of the war. When Germany attacked the Soviet Union, and the U.S.A. promised the U.S.S.R. its assistance, partly as a consequence of Ambassador Davies' "Mission to Moscow", the isolationists alleged that it was the Jewish financiers who were dragging the U.S.A. into the conflict. Lindberg's speeches are typical of that tendency. The "New York Herald Tribune", commenting on "Lindberg's virtually unconcealed appeal to anti-semitism" wrote :

" Evidence that their leaders ( the isolationists' ) are deliberately taking up this despicable, disruptive and profoundly inhuman and un-American weapon is too strong to be denied." (1)

However, one would create a false impression if one did not add that, on the whole, the U.S.A. remains one of the few liberal countries still friendly to the Jews.

What about France, is one inclined to ask? France being now virtually occupied, she is displaying the same policy as that of the German ruler. About the Dreyfus affair and the strong antisemitism it revealed in France, we will speak a little later.

To sum up what has been said above, these pictures of twentieth-century Jewry unanimously confirm that the removal of Jewish disabilities has not necessarily implied the acceptance of the Jew as an ordinary citizen in modern society. Antisemitism, displayed, as it were, in the various countries, has, whatever its causes and its intensity, shown the main reluctance of the nations to welcome their Jewish minorities.

(1) Rennap, op cit, p.99

B. ANTISEMITISM.- The causes.

The next step that we have to take now is therefore to analyse the main tendencies of Antisemitism in general, and determine the nature of the causes which gave birth to it.

The most prominent factor which provoked anti-Jewish hatred, and chronologically the first, was the religious accusation. Since its very early days, and through its Holy Scriptures, the Church propagated among the worshippers the idea that the Jews had killed the (Lord). This accusation was of a momentous value in the Dark and Middle Ages. It remains up to now one of the main causes of antisemitism, though not the only one. It is generally thought that in a century in which religious belief has considerably weakened, the religious basis of antisemitism does not exist any longer, or exists only among certain orthodox circles. That is an erroneous statement. The religious indoctrination is at the root of almost every gentile's antisemitism.

The greatest category of people for whom the accusation of deicide holds true is obviously the majority of the orthodox Christians. Since they faithfully believe in the Gospels, they necessarily hold the Jews responsible for the Crucifixion. Now, as it has been judiciously observed, the Jew has no right to ask the believing Gentile to question the veracity of the Scriptures. What he can do, nevertheless, is to ask him to be consistent with the Christian belief in human brotherhood and remember the last words of Christ: "Father forgive them, for they do not know what they do." A true Christian cannot at the same time believe in universal fraternity and yet look at the Jews, as a whole, with hatred or contempt. Prominent members of the clergy have realised that want of logic in the behaviour

of a considerable Christian minority and have sought to make it up. However, this attitude remains very likely to be found.

Another channel through which the religious influence has largely contributed in creating an antisemitic prejudice is children's education. "The Jews are the only group, says Louis Golding, (and the only group, above all, with which the ordinary person is likely to come into contact) who are singled out adversely, for censure and for obloquy, in the education and training of the ordinary child....All too often it is taught in school, it is repeated in conversation, it is proclaimed from the Pulpit, it is reiterated in readings from the Gospel, it is echoed in literature, that Jesus Christ was killed by "the Jews", that is, that "the Jews" were responsible for the greatest of all crimes in history."(i)

Now the Sunday-school teacher is not very much liable to tell the child that serious doubts are being raised about the historic truth of the Jewish crime. He will not tell him that the men who were suspected and who were in power at that time were a small minority of Romanised Jews thoroughly unrepresentative of their contemporaries. He will not stress the fact, above all, that the alleged offence, if it was done at all, took place twenty centuries ago. No hint of these truths will ever be given to the child who will consequently believe in the Jewish sin with all the candour and faith of childhood, and will not be led to differentiate between his little Jewish playmates and the contemporaries of Pilate.

At the age of seven or eight, the child is "an antisemite in embryo."(ii) When he grows up, he may become a sceptic, or a free thinker. He may reject all the religious convictions which were implanted in him. But the antisemitic prejudice will not die out. It



will be transformed into another prejudice, more fitting into the contemporary scene. The Jew will become for him, either an anarchist or a labour-sweater, or a cunning usurer. He will remain an individual towards whom hatred or contempt is felt, for one reason or another.

It is not here the place to attempt a refutation of the alleged crime which has caused to the Jews, throughout all history, innumerable sufferings. It is nevertheless necessary to point out the definitely sceptical attitude taken by the scholars who have sought to find out if the Christian accusation could stand the test of historical criticism, scholars among whom was the late Prof. Guignevvert, lecturer on the history of Christianity at the Sorbonne. To some, this scientific inquiry, made in a truth-seeking spirit, would be found heretical. For those who would still believe in the Jewish culpability, I would quote the words of Renan, who himself held such a belief for good. He writes : " Selon nos idées modernes, il n'y a nulle transmission de démerite moral du père au fils; chacun ne doit compte à la justice divine que de ce qu'il a fait. Tout juif, par conséquent, qui souffre encore aujourd'hui pour le meurtre de Jésus, a droit de se plaindre.....

.....Hélas, il faudra plus de dix-huit cents ans pour que le sang qu'il va verser (le Christ) porte ses fruits. En son nom, durant des siècles, on infligera des tortures et la mort à des penseurs aussi nobles que lui. Aujourd'hui encore, dans des pays qui se disent chrétiens, des pénalités sont prononcées pour des délits religieux.....Si, au lieu de poursuivre les Juifs d'une haine aveugle, le christianisme eût aboli le régime qui tua son fondateur, " ( l'intolérance, à laquelle il est fait plus haut allusion, )



"combien il eût été plus conséquent, combien il eût mieux mérité du genre humain!" (1)

We have therefore seen how, whether they believe or not in the religious accusation, the majority of the Gentiles are prejudiced against the Jew since their early childhood, and we have referred to the transformation of the prejudice into a different one, owing to changes in the contemporary scene. Now, the main leading factor of our time, in peace and even more in war-time, the typical factor of the present philosophical outlook, is economic. Therefore, it is not surprising that one of the main aspects of modern antisemitism be economic.

We live under a regime of competitive economy. Every one of us, in order to make a living, has to compete against his neighbours. And if, as is here the case, one feels towards some of one's neighbours either jealousy or hostility, one finds one's self wronged by an unfair competition. That is what often happens between Gentiles and Jews. The former believe that they live in a world of their own, and that they should be favoured as compared with their Jewish fellow-citizens.

This animosity already exists in time of prosperity. We will see in a later chapter how the natural talents of the Jews were developed and how they were perfected through the long life struggle they had to lead for survival; how they became clever because the cleverless Jews had no alternative to death and persecution. Intelligence develops along the lines of want, says modern psychology. The case of the Jews is typical of the rule.

Vie de

Paris

p.238

(1) Ernest Renan.- Jésus.

Thus, the Jews developed ability in making a living. The average citizen thinks there is something unfair about that. One often hears him complaining: "Of course, I don't dislike Jews....But, you know...They are awfully clever and get on..The majority is well off and don't seem to work hard."(i) or "They always make it their business to get ahead and they pop up from nowhere. They start with nothing and end up rich." (ii) This is a kind of observation one very often hears.

When this unsympathetic attitude is observed in a period of economic prosperity, what if a crisis happens ! The latent prejudice which lays in the Gentile's heart becomes conscious and even violent. Every job held by a Jew is a job the unemployed Gentile could hold. The greengrocer around the corner is convinced that were it not for his competitor Cohen, he would have more customers. He would not dream reasoning in the same way about his fellow-Gentiles. But a feeling he has that the Jew is where he is "on sufferance and not by right", to reverse Mr Churchill's phrase, leads him to find the Jewish competition "unfair".

What would be the situation under a regime of non-competitive economy, and , as a matter of fact, what is the situation in the USSR? Where there is neither individual stimulus nor individual chances of profit, this animosity against the Jew should be non-existent in the economic field. Whatever one thinks of the economic and political regime now in force in Soviet Russia, one must concede that collectivism is bound, by its very theories , to bring the complete eradication of antisemitism. Whether it has been successful or not

(i) Quoted by Rennap, op cit. p. 101  
(ii) " " " " p.97

till now cannot very easily be determined. What is nevertheless to be kept in mind is that Russia is to-day "the only state which has developed a theory and a programme calculated to deal with anti-semitism." (1) We will deal with the trial in Birobidjian when examining the attempted solutions of the Jewish problem.

We have, up to now attempted to explain antisemitism by religious and economic causes. We have purposely left for the end the study of racism, as being the most recent cause of antisemitism, and the one which offers the most elaborated theory aiming at it.

Here is, in a few words, the essential of racist philosophy. Human beings have different physiological characteristics according to the race to which they belong. Races are classified along a hierarchical scale, according to the sum total of their physical and cultural characteristics. At the top of the scale stands the Aryan race, only, and at the bottom, the semitic race. The people of the Western democracies are of an inferior strata because of their mixed origin. The Italians are mentioned as a non-Aryan, negroid people. The Japanese who, owing to an unfortunate slip of the pen, were, up to the building of the Berlin-Tokio axis, considered as "yellow monkeys", are to-day duly recognised as "yellow Aryans."

As regards the Jews, they possess all the characteristics of an inferior people, physically, as well as mentally. They are incapable of straight reasoning, they are vicious and dishonest, and have a natural inclination to betray their benefactors. Not only are they incapable of coping with the higher forms of civilization, but

they are a constant threat to it. They are a danger to any society in which they are tolerated. They pervert and defile all the activities in which they take part.

A single attitude has to be adopted towards them, and this is extermination. It is repeatedly emphasized in German speeches and broadcastings that unless the Jews are wiped out from the face of the earth, war, international conflicts, crises, and, indeed, all the evils of modern civilization will never disappear.

The racial theory, as elementary summarised above, was not a creation of the year 1933. It is much older than that. To Christian Lassen, Professor at Bonn, (1800-1876) and Ernest Renan, the French writer and historian (1823-1892), belongs the fatherhood of the doctrine. Although Renan, in the preface to his history of the Semitic languages, warned the reader against an anti-semitic interpretation of his book, it was he who provided the modern antisemite with his pseudo-rational weapons.

(By the way, it is suitable to note that the term antisemitism which has afterwards come to mean all shades of Jew-hatred, is used by the exponents of the racial theory as the hatred of the "semitic race". The term should have been, indeed, confined to the racial meaning, since its connotation is none but ethnological.)

Thus Renan threw the first elements of the inferiority of the Semites. "The Semites have never had any comprehension of civilization in the sense in which WE understand the word; they were at no time public-spirited.....not progressive....They lacked personal courage;.. Their moral ideal was different from OURS...They were selfish, chiefly negative, and altogether "une race incomplète".(1)

(1) The Jewish Encyclopedia, new edition, 1925, on "Antisemitism". Vol I, p.642

"This spoken of a race that has inundated the liberal and plastic arts, science and philosophy, in a degree out of all proportion to its numbers".(1) Among whom are Isaiah, Moses, Henry Heine, Karl Marx , Ricardo, Lombroso, Freud, Einstein, Bergson, Spinoza, Mendelsohn and others.

After Renan, Gobineau and Houston Chamberlain contributed to the rationalization of the racial classification, until Alfred Rosenberg ultimately gave it its present form. Hitler did not invent the racial theory, nor did he introduce antisemitism in Germany. He merely exploited both and, one must concede, in a very masterful way, for the benefit of the Nazi stay in power.

One cannot attempt a survey of modern racism without dwelling on its cradle, Nazi Germany. For, the racial ideas, though not newly-invented, are, as far as their propagation in the whole world is concerned, "Made in Germany". So, Hitler used the antisemitic weapon as a means of raising the moral of the German people. He came to power at a moment when Germany was in a miserable situation from all points of view. The Germans had lost the war 1914-1918 . They had been considered by the whole world as war-guilty. They had borne military occupation after the defeat. They had been humiliated by the loss of their colonies. They had to pay huge reparations. Internationally, they were despised. The German morale was hopelessly wrecked. Add to that the economic crisis of 1921 and the deflation , and you will have an almost complete picture of the German situation before 1933.

In 1933, Hitler comes to power. He reminds the Germans that they are a superior race. He tells them of their noble past, and of

(1)G.Pearlson, op cit, p.292

of the great future which lies before them. And, as some kind of explanation is needed to justify their present misery, Hitler says: It is the Jews.

If Germany lost the war, it is because it was betrayed by the German Jews. If the Republic failed, it was because some of its members were Jews. Those inferior human beings who carried a germ of destruction wherever they went, had planned to ruin the Fatherland. After the collapse of 1921, some Germans were ruined, others made colossal fortunes. There were Jews in both groups. But Hitler drew public attention towards the latter only. The Jews had organised the economic crisis in the purpose of wrecking Germany, and making a personal profit out of her distress.

That is the type of speech which Hitler gave to the German people. It is not at all surprising that he was eagerly listened to, and the slowly the morale began to show signs of recovery. The reason of Hitler's success is that he identified his political movement with the age-old characteristics of the German people. In "the house that Hitler built", Roberts shows how Hitler revived the idea of the Nordic Volk, mainly based on two elements: blood and soil; how his antisemitic propaganda was based on the sociology of taboo of savaged tribes; how he exploited the natural pride of the Germans in forbidding mixed marriages and exterminating all the members of the racially-inferior semitic minority.

This is not surprising at all. What is astounding is the extraordinary reaction of the world to such teachings. The theory vivified the ambition and Don-Quichotism inborn in every man, and, in spite of its obvious inconsistency, proved surprisingly popular. It



did not matter that no scientific argument was laid at its basis. It did not matter that so many mixings had occurred among ethnological groups throughout history that no true race could be defined now. (As a matter of fact, the Aryan type has been derisively described "as blond as Hitler, as slim as Goering, as tall as Goebels") It has not mattered to the nations that all of them were held as inferior to the Aryan race (particularly to the Arabs, for whom all the inferior qualifications of the Jews apply ! ) citizens of all countries have enthusiastically upheld the racial theory, and sympathetically agreed to this rationalised antisemitism.

With those people who walk in the German path in spite of common sense, there is nothing worth arguing, except that one could quote the famous challenge of Anatole France : " If these people are so wicked, then why rob them? Give them back the God and the civilization you have stolen from them ! " (i)

In spite of all the attempts at rationalising it, antisemitism remains a prejudice, whatever cause it seems to follow logically from. And, as all prejudices, it very seldom dies out. One has often the opportunity to meet the " some-of-my-best-friends-are-Jews- but " type of antisemite. He proclaims that he has nothing against some Jews, and then he immediately tries to justify a certain animosity that he nevertheless feels towards the group as a whole. "Whatever virtue the Jew has is stigmatised as a vice, whatever failing he has- the product of centuries of oppression- is exaggerated as a crime...On the one hand, the Jews are too rich and live luxuriously, and/on the other... they are too poor and lower the standard of li-

fe in their adopted country... on the one hand, they are too clever, and will capture the entire state if they are not restrained... on the other,... they are illiterate and must be denied the right of asylum." (i)

The attitude of the prejudiced Gentile towards the Jew is typically illustrated by this Talmudic fable/ A Roman emperor came to pass near a Jew who did not salute him. He ordered his execution because of irreverence. The following day he met a Jew who did salute him. He ordered his execution because of familiarity.

The antisemites who pretend to follow rational, elaborated doctrines are not sincere with themselves. They do not want to confess that they are led by feelings. Those feelings can be traced back in history, but that by no means alter their emotional nature! Certain lies are propagated, and by dint of repetition are mistaken for truths. Here is what Hitler writes himself: " The very enormity of a lie contributes to its success... The masses of the people easily succumb to it, as they cannot believe it possible that anyone should have the shameless audacity to invent such things... Even if the clearest proof of its falsehood is forthcoming, something of the lie will nevertheless stick." (ii)

Let us examine some of "the lies which have nevertheless stuck" , let us review the main charges in which consist the Gentile justifications of antisemitism as exposed now-a-days.

The main objection, among many others, made to the Jew now-a-days, is that of " Dual nationality." Whatever efforts have been made for the promotion of cosmopolitanism, our contemporaries

(i) I Cohen, op cit p.291

(ii) Mein Kampf, quoted by L Golding, op cit, p.115

are still far from feeling themselves "world-citizens". They are still very nationally-minded. They look at the Jew with suspicion given that he owes allegiance to the Jewish people as well as to the country of his birth. The argument seems, at first sight, a well-founded attack of political scientists. But when examined by the unbiased student of history, with reference to the Mosaic law, and to the Jewish records in the various countries of the world, it loses all its validity.

In fact, the Jewish religion, which requests from every Jew faithfulness to his own people, requests from him as well loyalty to the country where he lives. Here are a few passages from the Jewish Holy books where such a commandment can be found :

Jeremiah says: " Seek the welfare of the city whither I have banished you, and pray on its behalf unto the Lord; for in its welfare shall ye fare well." (1) In the book of Samuel, in that of Ecclesiastes, in the Proverbs, are recommendations to serve the country and the King. The punishment of death is to be applied in case of disrespect to God, but to the King as well.

In the Talmud, which was written at a time when Jews were already scattered in the Diaspora, recommendations of patriotism are met with every now and then: " Rabbi Samuel laid down the principle: 2 The law of the country is the law"... Rabbi Jose also states: " The laws of the country, even if wrong, must be obeyed."..... Honor to rulers is commanded, as rebellion against government is decried, and all acts for the public welfare are lauded... One is allowed to break the Sabbath to defend one's country... The whole trend of Talmudic thought on this subject is indicated in such pas-

(1) Jeremiah. XXIV (2)

sages as : " Let the interests of the place in which you dwell be you own."... and, " Pray for the happiness of the King, to the end that anarchy be not established." " (i)

The argument of the antisemites is not that the Jew is not a patriot. Worse than that, it states that by his very allegiance to the Jewish people, the Jew cannot be a patriot. We have seen by a short reference to the Bible and the Talmud the invalidity of such a statement. On the contrary, is a good Jew only he who obeys the precepts of the law. and therefore " prays for the welfare of the kingdom." The Israelite who does not follow this precept is a disloyal citizen, and a disloyal Jew as well. In his " Ethics of Judaism" , Moritz Lazarus epitomizes the emphasis laid on good citizenship by the Jewish religious leaders: " Judaism commands the conscientious observance of the laws of the state, respect for and obedience to the government. It therefore forbids rebellion against governmental ordinances and evasion of the law. Judaism commands the promotion of the welfare of one's fellow men, the service of individuals and communities in accordance with one's ability." (ii)

Some will yet argue that the objection is not made to the religion of the Jews, but to their Jewish nationality. That is perfectly right. But, on the one hand, the Jewish nationalist is not, by definition, anti-religious. He may still follow the Biblical precepts. Moreover, Jewish nationalism has been so intimately connected with religion throughout history that it cannot be separated from it.

On the other hand, the nationalist by no means fails his

(i) Quoted by the Jewish Encyclopedia, on Patriotism. Vol IX p 562

country in helping the foundation of a Jewish national home. As long as he is ready to serve his country, as long as he takes part in its economic, political and cultural life, as long as he goes to war when that country is to be defended, there is nothing in his Judaism which hinders his patriotism any more than his fellow-citizens'.

It is very interesting to note, with respect to this point, the observations made by Dr Bernard Joseph, a prominent political scientist as well as a distinguished Zionist leader, in his book on "Nationality." The world is no more composed of nation-states, says Dr Joseph. Several nationalities are liable to be found in the same state. The existence of such a question as Dual nationality comes from the confusion which exists between loyalty to the state, and loyalty to the nation. There is no ground "for supposing that in a multi-national state there is occasion for conflict between national and state loyalty. A proper apprehension of the fundamental distinction between the conception of nationality and state will make it clear that although both are in a sense interconnected, they are actually quite independent of each other and do not in any way come into conflict. The one concerns itself with the political manifestations of the group life, the other with the relationship between the individuals of the group in their personal life, their culture, origins and traditions. Being loyal to one's nationality implies the recognition of one's historical past, and one's affinities, which is a state of the mind that does not call for any action; being loyal to one's state implies the active par-

participation in the conduct of the affairs of the state and in assuring it freedom from outside interference. These material things are of like concern to all the citizens of the state of whatever nationality for they assure the possibility of leading a peaceful life within an organised community." (i)

Further, he writes: "Perhaps the best illustration of the proper relationship between nationality and the state is that afforded by the attitude of the Jewish nationality to the state. Scattered throughout the countries of the world the Jews retain their own nationality, adhere to their national traditions and culture, and organize their own communal life in accordance with Jewish custom and tradition. At the same time, they take part in the governmental functions in the different states in which they reside and are loyal citizens of those states. Their conception of nationality divorces it completely from the state." (ii)

Even when this question has been put in the true light, objection is made on the ground that a state is stronger when its inhabitants form a single nationality. At first sight, the objection seems well-founded. On second thoughts, it is not as convincing. That is what Lord Acton thought of it: "The presence of different nations under the same sovereignty, he writes, is similar in its effects to the independence of the Church in the state. It provides against the servility which flourishes under the shadow of a single authority. by balancing interests and multiplying associations. It promotes independence by forming definite groups of public opinion

(i) Dr Bernard Joseph.- Nationality. London, 1929. p.327  
(ii) do p.330



and by affording a great source and centre of political sentiments... The co-existence of several nations under the same state is a test, as well as the best security of its freedom. It indicates a state of greater advancement than the national unity which is the ideal of modern Liberalism. The combination of different nations in one state is as necessary a condition of civilised life as the combination of men in society." (1)

Therefore, the whole argument against the Jew's dual nationality does not hold true. To Dr Joseph's observations, I would add that even if the Jew feels himself a member of the "nation" in which he lives (by antithesis to the "state"), his situation is not hampered by his Jewish nationality, given that his two loyalties request from him distinct duties. What if the two come to a clash? There is no rule for that case. Each individual acts according to the emotion he is most subject to.

The charge made against the Jew is composed of two parts: The Jew cannot be a loyal citizen in the country of his birth; secondly, the Jew has not been a loyal citizen. Emphasis has been laid on purpose on the refutation of the first part of the statement because it seemed essential as basis of the discussion, and because of the interest the argumentation offered.

About the past record of the Jew, one has only to run over a history book to get acquainted with its nature: An American roll signed by a long series of prominent names, led by Woodrow Wilson, former President Taft, William Bryan and Cardinal O'Connell

(1) Lord Acton.- History of liberty.p.289

read as follows : " The loyalty and patriotism of our fellow citizens of the Jewish faith is equal to that of any part of our people, and requires no defence at our hands. From the foundation of this Republic down to the World War, men and women of Jewish ancestry and faith have taken an honorable part in building up this great nation and maintaining its prestige and honor among the nations of the world." (i) Theodore Roosevelt wrote : " From the day of the founding of the Republic, we have had no struggle, military or civil, in which there have not been citizens of Jewish faith who played an eminent part for the honor and credit of the nation." (ii)

In his "Essai de politique et de littérature", Prevost-Paradol writes: " Ce large et irrévocable bienfait de la Révolution Française a eu cet heureux résultat qu'il n'y a guère parmi nous de meilleurs citoyens, d'hommes plus attachés aux principes de notre droit civil, plus dévoués au pays que la plupart des enfants d'Israël." (iii)

There are innumerable such testimonies given by outstanding political authorities, of all nations and all times. However nothing is more tedious than such an enumeration. The Jew does not boast of his loyalty to his country. But, as Theodore Hertzl said :

"Nous avons partout loyalement essayé d'entrer dans les collectivités nationales qui nous environnent... On ne l'admet pas. En vain sommes-nous de sincères patriotes, voire même, dans différents endroits, d'exubérants patriotes; en vain faisons-nous les mêmes sacrifices en argent et en sang que nos compitoyens; en vain nous effor-

(i) quoted by Mac Call, op cit.- p.260

(ii) do p.118

(iii) quoted by J Kaplan. Témoignages sur Israël dans la Littérature

câns-nous de relever la gloire de nos patries respectives... Dans ces patries où nous habitons déjà depuis des siècles, nous sommes décriés comme des étrangers. " (i) That is why we are urged to open the old records and lay down the evidences of our good behaviour!

Kallen says very rightly : " There has rarely been a time when the truth about the Jews was so needful as an antidote to prejudice regarding the Jews among both Jews and Gentiles." (ii) The prejudice is so well-spread that, indeed, one can find such Jews who confess that it is well-founded!

Apart from this challenge on loyalty, many are the charges which have been laid against the Jews. I will not dwell on those any longer, because they almost entirely repose on bias, and against bias, no argument can prevail. The Jews are said to be ~~me~~ ~~ach~~ ~~ists~~, isolationists, middle men, usurers, social-climbers, vile people, and above all, united in a great Internationale which aim is the mastery of the world! The Jews have spent their life refuting like arguments. Anyway, what appears from a short survey of Jewish history is on the one hand, that the Jew is what the world has made him; and on the other, that the Jew is tired of being everywhere and always regarded as a problem. He seeks a normalisation of life which would give him ~~qu~~ ~~ett~~ and liberty. " There should be one place in the world, in God's wide world", according to Dr Weizman's expression, where the Jew could live his own life, without making it up or having to justify himself. Perhaps he would not achieve great deeds; for this is not the point. He would only try to be happy in his own way; that mostly what he yearns after.

(i) L'état juif.- Paris 1926 p.50

(ii) Zionism and world politics.- London- 1921 p.VIII

It would be suitable now to bring the argument to a head. We have attempted above to make a classical analysis of antisemitism, and we appreciated the part played in it by prejudice, and that played by envy or morbid nationalism. For this essay to be a real survey, we ought to say a word about the new interpretations which have been lately made of anti-Jewish hatred.

To begin with, there is Maurice Samuel's philosophical interpretation of Antisemitism in his book "The great hatred", of which Thomas Mann said: "A valuable weapon for everyone concerned with defending the foundations of our western, Christian morality." Samuel develops in his book a single idea, mainly, which is the following: Antisemitism, whatever forms it may take, in whatever country it is displayed, is, either consciously or not, the hatred of the non-force Judeo-Christian idea. The followers of the force-philosophy, or at least a small minority of their leaders, have realised the danger of the non-force Jewish ideology. This ideology is, as a matter of fact, Christian as well. But, as they cannot oppose Christianity to the extent they have opposed Judaism, (though they have openly opposed Christianity as well), and as the Jews were the inspirers of the philosophy themselves, they are the ones who are attacked.

There is a great deal of truth in that. The great antisemitic leaders have seldom been sincere, understanding Christians. I do not mean here that every one of them grasped his spontaneous recoil before Jewish ideology. The few who grasped that fact popularised their ill-feeling in order to make it accessible to the wide public. But the authors of the force-philosophy themselves

understood the danger. Did not the propagation of Nietzsche's philosophy correspond to a non-religious tide which soon spread over Europe ? Freud grasped the neutralising effect that the force-idea had on the Judeo-Christian philosophy, and he wrote in "Moses" that antisemitism was the hatred of Christianity.

The question arises : But why is the anti-semitic propaganda of such a cheap quality ? Samuel answers that the anti-semite who wants to annihilate the carriers of Jewish Ethics at all costs, is indeed afraid of the "Judeo-Christian training" which he has himself had in his infancy. He therefore resorts to the more disgusting publicity, in order to quieten his own conscience.

The opposition of anti-semitism to the foundation of a Jewish national Home is explained in the light of the same interpretation. For, if antisemitic leaders were once Zionists, as Hertzl foresaw they would be, they finally rejected the Zionist solution. Why ? Because the reconnection of the Jews with the Palestinian setting would give birth to another aspect of the right-philosophy. The first connection of the Israelites with Palestine gave to the world Jewish Ethics and the Mosaic Law; the second gave Christianity. What if they were connected a third time with the same land !

This interpretation is a very appealing one, and if antisemitism cannot be fully explained by this contention, at least a new light is thrown upon its analysis.

I. Rennap, in his study of "Antisemitism and the Jewish question", follows the same argumentation, though on the political plan. According to him, "antisemitism has always been the weapon of reactionary forces, and the very fact that Hitler's new order supports

itself by antisemitism organised on a scale hitherto unknown to history is a measure of its character." (i)

Samuel's contention, though, being kept on the philosophical ground, remains a more important issue for the student of history. Indeed his conclusion on the problem of antisemitism is most interesting. The problem of antisemitism is not a Jewish problem, he says. Moreover, it should not be confused with "The Jewish problem", which deals with "auto-emancipation" and the moral regeneration of the Jew. Antisemitism is a world-issue because its consequences are more important than national Jewish issues. The Jews are presently the only victims. But the harm which is done is universal. "The sin of the Jews, writes Samuel, has been the same as the sin of the Christians, namely, the fear of placing the issue on the level to which it belongs. I have met not so much with disagreement as with a horrified warning: "Beware of making us the centre of the world problem. Beware of admitting that this war is what the antisemites claim it is, namely a Jewish war"... But because of Christ the Jew, this is a Jewish war, though in the very opposite sense of what the Nazi-Fascists mean." (ii)

The attitude adopted by the Jews in fighting antisemitism is false. When they fought Coughlinism in America, they should not have attempted to refute Coughlin's "unprovable and therefore undisprovable scurrilities." (iii) They should have openly fought Coughlin as a threat to America's good health and to civilization. Because antisemitism is a sickness which vitiates human relationship, it is

(i) Rennap. op cit. p.91

(ii) Maurice Samuel.- The great hatred. London, 1943. p.125

(iii) do p.128



on that issue only that it ought to be fought. The Jew should not plead for himself but for the world's health which is at stake.

Let us note before closing, the socialist interpretation of antisemitism which has gained much ground recently. Among the materialists prevails the idea that the only cause of antisemitism is the tearing of the Jews from the producing trades, centuries ago. Jews have got accustomed to work in the finishing industries only, never in the basic ones. They have been therefore displaced in modern society by the other workers; hence the relationship of producers to parasites.

The idealists among the socialists have a more elaborated theory. According to them, antisemitism is a product of class-society. They stress the Jewish connection with money, and explain it as the characteristic method of exploitation of bourgeois society. The capitalist system promotes conflicts and dissatisfaction which are admirable conditions for antisemitism to flourish.

The trouble with these different interpretations is that they are all very exclusive. They do not admit the existence of any valid factor but the one emphasized by them. What holds good, however, is that there is a certain deal of truth in every one of them. Antisemitism is not the exclusive product of the capitalistic regime; but to the extent to which capitalism is the source of crises, it is responsible for the promotion of antisemitic feeling. "A man has hallucinations when he is hungry" confirms the fact that antisemitism is a sign of sickness. Man is more inclined to ill-feeling towards a section of humanity when he is weak, poor, or insecure.

The consequences of the differently-interpreted and widely spread antisemitism are weighty : From the international point of view, it is, as we have stressed it above, a symptom of sickness and insecurity.

On the other hand, as far as psychology is concerned, it has very much weakened the belief in the efficacy of education in rubbing out prejudice. Innumerable and reliable refutations of anti-Jewish charges have been found out, and yet antisemitism grows stronger everyday. In spite of historical vulgarisation and indeed of common sense, the twentieth-century has experienced that prejudices die hard.

As far as the Jewish world is concerned, contemporary history has proved that the emancipation of the Jew is nowhere secure. This statement has been considered exaggerated by people who avoid frequent references to the German catastrophe on the ground that it is only an accident. I do not want to engage here in a discussion on determinism, but what is history if not an interrupted series of such accidents ?

On the other hand, the spread of anti-Jewish feelings and measures have had the other corollary of strengthening Jewish consciousness. Jews, unless they are cowards, cannot help now-a-days feeling a wave of solidarity which brings them to help their fellow-Jews in distress. The reader may have observed that, during this short survey of antisemitism, reference to concrete German or Polish atrocities has been purposely omitted. Though, the writer will be allowed to relate one case, for the sake of confirming the

tragedy of a situation too often disregarded. The case I want to refer to is that of the S/S Struma.

" When life was made completely impossible for Jews in Rumania, in the autumn of 1941... the news that the "Struma", a 180-ton cattle boat, was to sail found swift currency....The Rumanian ministry of labour put obstacles in the way of the sailing. but eventually the "Struma" left Constanza on Friday, December 12th 1941.... Very soon it became clear that the engine was old .... In the Bosphorus the engine failed....and the boat was unable to make any further progress.

The boat carried 769 passengers, including 70 children under 13 and 250 women....Arrived at Istanbul, neither the crew nor the passengers were allowed to come in contact with anyone outside the boat..... The refugees soon learned that they would not be permitted to disembark so as to make their way overland to Palestine.....

The reader will have inferred what happened. The ship, turned back towards Rumania owing to the refusal of the Palestine authorities to admit those on board, blew up - by the act, it is believed, of the passengers, who preferred death to return. It may be mentioned that the concession permitting the children under 16 to enter Palestine arrived too late - after the ship had gone down." (1)

I quoted the above-mentioned case because I believe that facts should be more widely-known. It is from a lack of knowledge, or from indifference that the world has remained passive before

Since this statement was made, in 1938, the situation has only such repeated instances? The Allies have declared that the war criminals shall be tried before the courts of the citizens they have injured. Who will try the authors of Jewish persecutions? The German, or the central European tribunals? Who will pay for the victims of the Struma? They committed suicide, but were they not victims of Nazi tyranny? The question is no more one of internal politics, I am afraid. It is one of elementary humanitarianism. In the future is considerably weakened!

Timid protests were made by Liberal opinion against the mass persecutions. But the Jews have unfortunately noticed that they were far from being unanimous. Anyway they remained only protests. The victims of anti-Jewish persecutions (who are by no means the victims of the war), found in the world indifference, or even sympathy towards the tyrant. At best, they have called forth a passive wave of pity. Numerous are the individual Gentiles who raised their voices against that unjust and unhuman treatment. No official measure was taken whatever. "It is a depressing consideration that, whereas there were great public protests in England and America fifty years before, at the time of the Russian outrages, and a hundred years before, at the time of the persecutions in Syria, and whereas as long ago as 1744-5 the Governments of England and Holland and Denmark successfully protested against the maltreatment of the Jews by the Empress Maria Theresa, from 1933 onwards no more redoubtable official voice was heard than the timorous murmurings of a few religious bodies." (1)

(1) I. Golding, op cit.

" Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar;

If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever."

Jeremiah XXXII, 35

### CHAPTER THREE

#### THE JEWS.

What are the Jews ? Believers in a same faith, members of a distinct nation, or sons of an alldof race ? Religion, nation or race have called forth lengthy discussions concerning the Jewish group. It has been indisputably stated that Judaism was a religion. Further more it has been admitted that the Jews were ethnically distinct. We do not mean by that that they are a racial entity by themselves. That is doubtful. They are considered distinct because of their pertaining to the Semitic race, that being true to the extent to which the genral classification of mankind into unmixed races is right.

The point which has been the most vexed one during the last centuries and which has remained, up to now, the subject of fiery discussions among Gentiles and Jews alike is that of Jewish nationality. Are the Jews of to-day still members of a Jewish nation, or are they not ? Some argue that the Jews were a nation up to the conquest of the Jewish state by the armies of Titus, but that that have ceased to be one ever since. Some

others maintain that the Jewish nation has never ceased to exist and shows more and more signs of vitality every day. On the other hand, a noticeable section of the Jewish population is striving to prove that Judaism is nothing more than a set of religious dogmas and practises, being convinced that, in so doing, they will succeed in throwing down the anti-Jewish charge of dual allegiance. However, one fact is certain : The existence of a Jewish nation, whatever may be said for or against it, remains unaffected by views of its desirability. One must beware of arguments dictated by emotion rather than by historical facts. The fact that certain prominent Jews have refused to acknowledge their membership in the Jewish nation is too often taken as a proof of the non-existence of the said nation. Such arguments are no more valid than any other subjective considerations. Though the study of nationality is connected with that of subjective longings, the personal appreciation of certain individuals cannot be of a decisive weight in the conclusion of the discussion. Only by an unbiased and methodical study of the early origins of the Jewish nationality, by an analysis of its various elements and their appearance throughout the ages can we attain a decisive conclusion about the state of that nationality now-a-days.

This discussion is not only an interesting theoretical argument. It is decisive in the understanding of the Jewish problem and therefore of its solution. Whether the Jewish problem is one of a homeless nation or not will prove a vital



item in the later justification of Zionism, and, so far, of Territorialism as well. A study of the existence of the Jewish nation is, consequently, an indispensable preliminary to a comprehensive judgment of Zionism, as to all the other solutions proposed as final cures of the Jewish question.

Let us go back to the origins of the Jewish nation. We are not going to try and prove that the Jewish nation existed once. No one denies it. What we are going to do is to show by a study of the origins and early evolution of the Jewish nation that nationality was never conceived as a distinct element in early Jewish history but that it was intimately mingled with the concept of Judaism as a religion and that throughout all history, it was never separated from it. That will not bring to us an academic satisfaction only. If the existence of a Jewish nation was implied in the Jewish religion at the time of the Prophets, it must still be so implied now-a-days, since the religious dogmas of the twentieth-century Jew are hardly different from those of his Biblical ancestors.

In the early development of society, each tribe worshipped a God of its own. The tribal deity was one of the elements of the group-consciousness. Its fate was the fate of the group. When the tribe was subjugated by a stronger one, its God was subjected to the God of the victorious tribe. When Christian monotheism was spread among the European tribes, the universal God came as an important rival of the tribal deities, therefore

hostile to the tribal allegiance as well. Religion therefore clashed with early nationalism, and where the former gained ground, the latter was weakened. Further more, the Bible, being taught by the Church, became associated with it. And where the secular influence got free play, the knowledge of the Bible was hindered. The Holy Scriptures became the religious literature par excellence, as opposed to the purely national cultures.

As far as the Jews were concerned, the progressive evolution was absolutely different. To begin with, the Bible represented for them The National book, as well as the book of the Divine Commandments. It told their history, hailed their national heroes, and through the mouth of their leaders, proclaimed the election of the Jewish people.

On the other hand, the transition from a tribal to a Universal God did not provoke, with them, a clash between religion and nationality, because monotheism was not imported to them all elaborated from without. It appeared as the result of a slow, internal evolution following the lines of national development. Being thus the fruit of a smooth transformation, monotheism appeared as an inherent part of the life of the people, as a matter of fact, as its climax.

Numerous are the passages of the Bible which show that the God of Israel was primarily conceived as a tribal God, having a name of His Own, and related to the Jewish tribes in the same way as the other tribal deities stood in relation to their

respective tribes. The only difference was this. When the Jewish tribes fell, their God did not fall with them. Jehovah remained their omnipotent God even when they were subjected to their stronger neighbours. Jehovah was Almighty and Eternal. He protected the Jewish people who were in bondage. He would deliver them from the hands of their persecutors. That is why the people of Israel could not die. They would be always freed and strengthened by their God who would never fail them.

Before conceiving God as Universal, the Jewish people considered Him as Their God, the God of Israel. The fundamental creed of the Jew is : " Hear, o Israel; Jehovah is our God; Jehovah is One." Another evidence of the close connection between God and the Jewish people is the difference between the Christian and the Jewish attitude towards the Creator. The Christians consider God primarily as Universal , His connection with Israel being but a preliminary stage in the process of universal revelation. Whereas the Jews consider God as being primarily the God of Israel, and afterwards the God of the Universe. When Christians recite the following verse: "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other Gods before me ", they usually omit an intermediary sentence which they deem irrelevant, but which is vital to the Jews. The verse actually reads: " I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me."(1)

(1) Exodus XX , 2

Even when He has reached the degree of universality in the Jewish conception, God remains the God of Israel, the same One who had elected the Jewish people and protected it all along its risky trials, throughout all history. And the Jewish religious dogmas still retain a particular feature in that they remain statements about God as well as about the Jewish people : The belief in the Messiah, for instance, is a religious belief. But it is also the faith in the ultimate redemption of the Jewish people. The revelation to Moses, on the other hand, is not God's appearance to an individual as such, but to the spiritual leader of the people, to give him the Commandments which were to regulate the life of Israel, and to show him the way to the Promised Land.

Evidences of this kind could be given in great numbers. Yet, the ones quoted are sufficient for our point to be made clear: "Dogmas such as these are not simple the articles of faith of a church, to which anybody may gain admittance by accepting them; they are the beliefs of a nation & out its own past and its own future." (1)

If we go a step further in the history of the Jewish Scriptures, we will witness the appearance of other religious books, such as the Mishna, the Talmud, the Shulhan Aruch. Those books were composed throughout a long period of time and have a great religious value, But they have a national value as well because the incentive which led to their composition was prima-

(1) Leon Simon.- Studies in Jewish nationalism. London, 1920.  
p.14

rily the desire to preserve the entity of the Jewish people. When the Jews were dispersed in the diaspora, they carried with them only the Bible. They had no state, no army, no flag, no government to remind them of their national life. It was therefore through the religious channel that nationalism had to be kept alive. Thus, a set of elaborated prescriptions connected with all the circumstances liable to happen in human life and based on the Mosaic law, was established. " These were given the force of religious injunctions for the express purpose of keeping the Jews thus reminded of their distinctive nationality and differentiating them from the nations amongst which they lived. So wherever they went, they retained their peculiarly Jewish customs and were still Jews." (1)

The Jew had to remember that he was a member of the Jewish people every day of his life, throughout all the actions he performed. He began his day by recalling that Israel was the elect people, in his morning prayer. He turned his face in the direction of the Holy Land when at the Synagogue, and thus emphasised that there, was the hope of his salvation. The post-Biblical Holy Books provided him with specific commandments to follow through all his life, and thus succeeded in preserving the existence of the people, as such, in spite of the discouraging conditions in the dispersion. The Jewish people, being deprived of all the normal attributes of nationhood, had therefore

(1) Dr Joseph. op cit p.243

come to multiply the religious prescriptions in order to safeguard at least the spiritual entity of the nation. It is because the Jewish national spirit and culture appeared only through the religious channel that people began to think that the difference between Jew and non-Jew was nothing more than a religious one.

An attempt has been made in recent times to draw a line between the practises which were essentially religious and the ones which were national. We find now-a-days Jews who are nationalists without believing in the Jewish faith, as well as reformed Jews who, though believing in the Scriptures, withdraw deliberately from them all the allusions made to the Jewish nation. Both attitudes are false to the essence of Judaism, because in it, the existence of God and that of the Jewish nation are, so to speak, functions of each other. They are so intimately connected that one of them could never be conceived to the exclusion of the other.

Having seen the picture of the Jewish nation maintaining itself by means of cultural and religious weapons only, we are not surprised to find it an anomaly in the modern world. Given that the main field where national life is displayed is usually the state, from that to infer that the Jewish nation does not exist, there is only one step, very easy to take. "No state, no nation", is a well-spread axiom. Thus many a Jew will consider himself a Frenchman, or a German of Jewish faith. Literally, this is right, yet incomplete. The statement should run as follows: "My state is France, my religion is Judaism, and my



nationality, a Jew. " Of course, in particular cases, the nationality might be the French or the English one, the Jewish one being considerably weakened. But generally speaking, a Jew is a Jew by his historical consciousness, his fellowship to the Jewish people, as much as by his allegiance to the faith of Israel.

All the Jewish festivals, or the greatest part of them, commemorate the delivery of the Jewish people from a foreign yoke. The popular feast of Purim hails the spectacular annihilation of Haman, who came to symbolize thereafter the traditional enemy of the Jews. Passover, on the other hand, is a memory of the exodus from Egypt, the end of Israel's sufferings under Pharaoh. As a matter of fact, Passover characterizes very well the national-religious aspect of Jewish Holy Days. For, the whole ceremony of the "Seder", Passover's night, recalls by all its numerous and traditional details, the survival of the Jewish people to its enemies, and the ultimate punishment of the latter by God. The ceremony ends with the words of "Next year to Jerusalem", words which may have lost their value of sincere hope in the mouth of many Jews, but which, nevertheless, symbolise the traditional longing of the people to be reconnected with the Holy Land of Israel.

From the foregoing analysis, one must conclude that the Jewish religion was never only a matter of theology. The ultimate proof of the existence of the national spirit in the Jewish religion is that, deprived of its national elements, Judaism

would have no chance to live. The reformed Jews have grasped that. They began by rejecting the national contentions of the Bible and by accepting among their dogmas only those which were purely religious. They refused to admit the present existence of the Jewish nation and set the limits of their Judaism around the religious cult only. A long time did not elapse, though, before they recognised their error. Many of the religious practises became useless. The pious among the Reformed Jews did not find in the Liberal cult the religious message they were asking for. These and other facts convinced the liberals of the artificiality of their behaviour. For Judaism can only be alive and flourishing in the heart of the Jewish people, as a whole. It has no salvation for the individual, similar to that offered by the Christian church. It has a message for the whole nation, and the individual Jew can find peace in it only as a member of that nation.

Speaking of the Mosaic law, Ahad-Haam, the philosopher of Jewish nationalism, writes: "All the laws have one...object: the well-being of the nation. The happiness of the individual is not regarded. The individual Israelite is treated as standing to the people of Israel in the relation of a single limb to the whole body//..... .  
 One long chain unites all the generations, from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to the end of time. The covenant which made with the Patriarchs he keeps with their descendants; and if the fathers eat sour grapes, the teeth of the children will be set on edge. For

the people is one people throughout all its generations." (i)

So does Leon Simon, in conclusion of a comparative study between Hebraism and Hellenism, write: " Hebraism tends to insist on the Hebrew nation as the mediating term between its individual members and the infinite, and for that reason the Hebrew as individual is relatively incapable of achieving in his own life the synthesis of spirit and body, of attaining complete harmony and equilibrium."(ii)

On the other hand, if Judaism be only a religion, no atheist could be a Jew. Yet some of the greatest atheists are duly recognised by the world as being Jews; Einstein being the most prominent of them. The religious criterion has proved a failure since a great minority of Jews are not faithful believers and still remain Jews by their culture or longings. It is therefore wrong to consider Judaism as a religion only; it gathers a culture, a spirit, a historical past, which make of it a nationality as well.

In conclusion, according to the statements made by famous students of Jewish history, on the one hand, and following the short survey we have made ourselves of Judaism, on the other, the fact remains certain that Jewish nationalism has always remained alive throughout its religious as well as its cultural history. The survival of the Jewish nation does not, however, pertain to the world of miracles. If the people maintained

(i) Ahad-Haam, Essays on Zionism and Judaism. London 1922. p.8  
(ii) Studies in Jewish nationalism, op cit p.36

an existence of its own during thirty-five centuries, it is because of determined factors of its history.

On the one hand, the Jewish people has survived physically because persecutions were never simultaneous throughout the globe. They were not the fruit of an internationally concerted action. Whereas a single Jewish community was being annihilated, the other communities could live almost peacefully, and were not even aware of the sufferings of their brethren in a distant part of the world.

On the other hand, given the dispersion, the Jewish nation had no centre the destruction of which could have caused that of the whole people. During the greater part of its history, the Jewish people led the life of numerous and tiny cells unconnected with each other. The different communities lived mostly a provincial, as opposed to a national, life. Still, this anomalous situation had the advantage of making the Jewish people undestructible. All students of biology know the case of the polypus which, when cut to several pieces, does not die because it has not got a centralised nervous system. The nervous centres are spread all along the body and enable the different cells to live independently from the others.

So it is with the Jewish people. It has neither a political, nor a cultural centre where the antisemite can hit. Each tiny community is a spiritual centre which will continue to live and struggle by its own means even if it cannot depend on the neighbourhood. And apart from the material means, there is,

above all, the hope of an ultimate redemption. That is the real strength behind the outward weakness of the people. The Jews have no armies, no armaments to defend their nation, but they have the messianic hope, the passionate belief that the day will come when they will once again lead a normal life in the regained mother land of their prayers. The messianic hope is sometimes wrongly considered as a utopia, a romantic and vague longing of white-bearded rabbis. Although during centuries it remained in the form of a dream too beautiful to come true, its influence on the morale of the people, throughout all history, has never been equalled. It helped the Jews of the Middle-Ages to bear unaccountable sufferings, it led twentieth-century and well-to-do Jews to leave the different countries where they lived and lead the hard life of pioneers in the Holy Land; in a word, it was The hope which made the Jewish people endure the miserable life which was its lot ever since the destruction of the Jewish state, with courage and an unflinching faith in the future.

The anomalous position of the Jews during the ages made them spontaneously discard the present, and turn to the past or the future for more smiling perspectives. Thus they believed in the messianic redemption. In the same way, they strengthened considerably their historical consciousness.

The strange situation of the Jews having obliged them to go back to history for a better understanding of their case, they have got acquainted with the long and eventful history of their people. Now, rich of the glories of the past, and more es-

pecially of the vicissitudes that befell his fellow-Jews during the ages, the modern Jew finds his aloofness accentuated with regard to his Gentiles fellow-men. He finds his heritage greatly different from theirs. On the contrary, he draws nearer to his fellow-Jews to whom a sincere bond of brotherhood unites him.

The Jews have been originally connected with each other by the state, ethnic parentage, and religion. To-day, the factor which plays most in grouping them together is historical consciousness. Memories of the past, pertaining to the domain of culture, ethics, philosophy, on the one hand, folk-ways, emotions awakened by recalling stirring achievements, on the other, all that links together the people of Israel, and makes them conscious of their common nationality. That is how Dubnov explains the action of historical consciousness : " A long chain of historical traditions is cast about us all like a strong ring... In the course of centuries, as generation followed generation, similarity of historical fortunes produced a mass of similar impressions which have crystallised, and have thrown off the deposit that may be called "the Jewish national soul". This is the soil in which, deep down, lies imbedded, as an unconscious element, the Jewish national feeling, and as a conscious element, the Jewish national idea." (1)

As a matter of fact, historical ties quicken all feelings of nationality in general . But whereas in other cases,

(1) Jewish history, op cit. p.28



material bonds intensify that feeling and concretise it, in the case of the Jewish nation, the absence of material attributes in the present make the influence of the past ones all the more powerful.

In conclusion, what are the main elements which make of the Jewish nation a live entity? To begin with, we have religion which provided the channel through which the Jews were moulded together in the diaspora, and which is so intimately connected with Jewish nationality that it becomes one of its important elements, though not a sine qua non condition of it. Immediately afterwards comes historical consciousness which has been that "something common to us all, so comprehensive that in the face of multifarious views and degrees of culture it acts as a consolidating force." (i)

The third element, which is the necessary conclusion to be inferred from the above mentioned premisses, is the attachment to Zion. The Jews have been followed everywhere by the memory of the Holy Land. Their attitude was the embodiment of the ever-alive words of the Prophet: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning." (ii) Though they were early exiled, the Jews were never spiritually disconnected with Palestine. Professor Zimmern suggested that "if the Jews ceased to feel a peculiar affection for Palestine or the Irish for Ireland, they would cease to be a nation as the gipsies have ceased to be a nation." (iii) Thus the allegiance to their mo-

(i) Dubnov, op cit, p.31

(ii) Psalms CXXXVII, 5/6

(iii) quoted by Dr Joseph op cit p.96

therland, in spite of the abstract form it affected during twenty centuries have bound the Jewish people together as indefectibly as a concrete motherland would have done. " Through good and evil days alike Palestine remained the desire of their hearts. In the ease and security of Andalusia hardly less than in the gloomy recesses of the ghetto, they stretched out their hand to Palestine, sang of it, prayed for it, wept for its fallen majesty, and patiently awaited the hour of redemption."(1)

Among the other factors which developed the national feeling were the Jewish culture, language, and tradion<sup>k</sup>. They all made for a tightening of the national link. Finally, oppression and anti-semitism, acted, though in a negative way ;They rendered denationalisation uneasy, even impossible.

On the negative side of the picture, Jewish nationalism lacks a state, a concrete political centre to which will converge the cultural, spiritual currents of the diaspora. But does it lack it really ? Does the Jewish people offer the example of a nation which has maintained itself without motherland ? No. The Jews on the contrary are an instance of a nationality indissolubly bound to a motherland, so much so, that up to twenty centuries after the loss of that motherland, the people still live in the hope of its redemption.

Given the above-summarised state of things, do the Jews now-a-days satisfy the requisites of a nationality ?

(1) Stein.- Zionism. London 1925. p.20

Professor Gooch analyses nationality as follows. He says ;  
 " The nation is a spiritual entity. Though neither the occupation of a defined area, nor community or race, language, religion, government or economic interests are indispensable to national self-consciousness, each of these factors constitutes a powerful tie and tends to produce the cohesiveness and solidarity in which the strength of nations resides. "(1) The Jews possess those spiritual ties which make healthy and vigorous nations. Given their past and the test of political science, no doubt remains whatever about the existence of their nationality.

Were we allowed to make use of contemporary history, we would add that the Jews have, through their unhesitating attitude towards the present conflict, displayed once more their existence as a nationality. It has been said that no nation worthy of the name could remain indifferent to an international conflict of the size of the present war. The Jewish nation has brilliantly passed this new test in going over the United Nations' side since the outbreak of the conflict. I do not mean by that that the Jews are to be praised because they unanimously hailed the Allies. I only mean that they displayed another manifestation of nationhood in taking a united attitude when necessitated by circumstances. Many peoples who have been considered as live nations have remained up to now hesitant, trying , as it were, to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds , whereas the Jewish communities in the whole world, and especially Palestinian

(1) quoted by Dr Joseph op cit, p. 312

Jewry, have shown a dignified understanding of the national responsibilities. "I think, therefore I am", has been the motto of the Jews up to now; "I act consciously, therefore I am", might be their motto in the future.

Before leaving the question of Jewish nationality, let us quote Lord Balfour's observations about its unusual character. Lord Balfour wrote : " The position of the Jews is unique. For them , race, religion and country are interrelated as in the case of no other race, no other religion and no other country on earth. In no other case are the believers in one of the greatest religions of the world to be found only among the members of a single small people, in the case of no other religion is its past development so intimately bound up with the long political history of a petty territory wedged in between states more powerful far than it could ever be; in the case of no other religion are its aspirations and hopes expressed in language and imagery so utterly dependent for their meaning on the conviction that only from this one land, only through this one history, only by this one people, is full religious knowledge to spread throughout all the world." (1)

In brief, we have shown through this short study of the Jewish people that nationalism displayed itself since the first days of Jewish history, and, above all, in its most prominent

(1) quoted by Dr Joseph op cit p 236

achievement, I mean in the Jewish religion. The existence of the Jewish nation has always been implied in the dogmas of the Jewish religion, to-day no less than in early history. We have witnessed, on the other hand, that the Jews possessed the very elements of which nationality is made and displayed them in contemporary history as well as the other nations did.

What light does this conclusion throw on the understanding of the Jewish problem? We have exposed in precedent chapters the modern aspect of that problem, we have witnessed the growth of antisemitism which made it much more acute. However, we have relegated antisemitism to its place, namely, <sup>to</sup> that of a single feature of the question. The problem itself is, we have already said, that of a people which is a minority everywhere, a majority nowhere. At the end of this chapter we can stress the national character of the sparsely settled Jewish minorities. Of course, the Jews are religiously and ethnically speaking, different. But it is above all their national aloofness which is responsible for the existence of a Jewish problem. The Jewish nation is living devoid of the national centre necessary to focus and normalize its life. Owing to that anomaly, the Jews have become endowed with hindering complexes which have poisoned their life and the life of the peoples among whom they lived. They have brought forth an intense Judeo-phobia which was the beginning of unbearable persecutions.

It is not here the place to enter a discussion about the solution of the problem. But as we are tackling the question of homelessness, it is

only normal that we should suggest the first solution which strikes the student after having surveyed the whole matter: Since the actual dispersion of the Jewish people on the globe and the lack of spiritual and political centralisation has been the ultimate cause responsible for the creation of a Jewish problem, it seems only logical that the cure of the problem should be found in the formation of a Jewish national state. The comprehensive discussion of that solution will be fully studied in a coming chapter.





the following chapter.

For the Jewish problem, as all historical problems in the fruit of an organic evolution. It did not suddenly emerge in 1933, nor with Hertzl's writings. It has now existed for more than twenty centuries and it is by an exact knowledge of the reasons of the old order only that we will be able to grasp its actual significance. In going back to history for a proper understanding of a present problem, we break with the theological interpretation which states that things are what they are because of Divine intervention and that no earthly causes are to be sought in relation to worldly events. I do not infer by that that we actually reject the basis of the Theological interpretation. As a student of history, one has the right to favour a definite historical interpretation of events, and I take this opportunity to say a word of the spirit in which this essay has been undertaken. It is the attractive contention of some historians that the theological interpretation of history can be combined with the most recent researches in psychological, sociological, or economic interpretation. I mean that one could combine the belief in the Divine origin of the world with a pluralistic interpretation of historical events, in considering the various factors which play in the causation of events as agents of a supernatural force. This conception will allow us to turn to the past for an analytical understanding of a contemporary question.

When did the existence of a Jewish problem and that of a special intercourse between the Jewish and other peoples first display itself? According to the most ancient historical record, I mean, to the Bible, the first manifestation of a hostile outlook on the Jews goes as far as Assuerus, that is, five centuries before the Christian era. Now, the Book of Esther, where the fact is noticed, has been the subject of numerous scientific criticisms, and the reality of Esther's story has been contested on more grounds than one. However, be the story of Haman and the Jews historically true or not, what remains certain, is that the Jewish people was already considered as a peculiar people under the Persians, therefore before the dispersion. The Jewish Encyclopedia, in an article on the origins of antisemitism, writes: "Its history begins with the period of the Book of Esther, when the charge was first made that the Jews are a "people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws are diverse from all people; neither keep they the king's laws. Therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them."(Esther, III, 8)

We have already seen how the Jews, when conquered by a stronger nation, did not give away their pride nor their belief of being a superior people, thus calling forth the hatred and jealousy of their rulers. This happened already

before the Romans, as a matter of fact, ever since the Jewish state lost its independence. But the alien character of the national-religious Jewish minority was not expressly stressed before the dispersion, more precisely, before the rise of Christianity. True, the Jews were considered as members of a foreign nation under the Roman law, but no discriminating emphasis was laid on this feature. They were granted the rights of citizenship together with all the subjects of the Empire, by the Edict of Caracalla (212 A D). Further more, they enjoyed religious freedom and a certain degree of judicial autonomy, this being the outcome of their twofold ( national and religious ) minority situation. " In the Roman codes and legal textbooks they are called "natio", "gens", "populus". It is upon this that their exceptional legal status and religious privileges are based; and so far as Roman law came to take cognizance of the matter, the hereditary privileges of born Jews were not conceded to other subjects who became proselytes to Judaism." (i)

The right to practise the Jewish religion had been conceded by Julius Caesar and confirmed by Theodosius when the rise of Christianity seemed to endanger it." It is established that there are no laws by which the sect of the Jews is forbidden to exist," reads his statement. (ii)

I have pointed out the main attitude of the Roman emperors on purpose, in order to show that before the rise of Christianity, there was no Jewish problem. Of course, there

(i) Prof G Foote Moore, quoted by Dr Joseph, op cit, p.242

(ii) quoted by Parkes.-The Jew and the medieval community, p.101

existed in the Jews' hearts the desire to go back to Zion, ever since they had been ousted from it. But the Jews had all the Roman Empire in which to live, work, and freely practise their religion. Their national aspirations remained latent as long as they were not violently and outwardly opposed. Early Christianity was responsible for endowing the world for generations to come with a bitter, sickening Jewish problem. Had the Jews lived peacefully among the Christians during the Middle-Ages, had such a thing as a ti-Jewish religious hatred not existed, there would probably have never developed an antisemitic virus to poison the life of all Jews to come, and, irony of fate, the Jews would probably have <sup>been</sup>, little by little, absorbed by the surrounding communities. By the time nationalism would have come and stirred them, there would have probably remained only a tiny fraction of the former Jewish nationals. I am personally against assimilation to that extent. But, if an objective contemplation of the case is viewed, the unbiased student has to recognise that, but for the early Christians' attitude, the Jewish problem would have been eliminated from among the modern world worries, as a matter of fact, it would have never developed into an acute international problem.

So Christianity began to spread under the Romans and with it an intense hatred of the Jews. The emperors proved susceptible to the influence of the Church and dis-

played their new attitude by incorporating many articles of Canon Law into the Roman code. To begin with, the Edict of Caracalla was made void by the new proclamation which made of religion a requisite of citizenship. Following that series of new edicts were taken, making of religious discrimination a legal obligation. The judicial additions of the emperor Theodosius to the code were typical of the trend of thought. He took all the steps which made of Jew an inferior being through the following centuries: prohibition of the most elementary human rights, absolute interdiction from mixing with Christians, and so forth.

The reason behind many of these edicts was that the Church was anxious to differentiate between Jew and Christian. All the Christian practices which had their roots in the Old Testament were given away. In the same way, Jewish characteristics were emphasized, the members of the Jewish community segregated, so as to avoid any defiling intercourse with the accursed authors of the deicide.

When the Arabs came to rule the Roman Empire, they found a set of regulations quite ready to be used against the unbelievers, Christians and Jews alike, as it were. Under the Arab domination, the Jews suffered the same vexations as under their former rulers, with the difference that this new Judeophobia was intermittent. The Arabs showed at certain times a great deal of understanding, evidence of which



is found in the Jewish golden age under the Moors. The latter lived in very good terms with their Jewish subjects, and Spain witnessed a flourishing Judeo-Arab collaboration in all fields of culture.

On the other hand, when fanaticism prevailed, it was never hidden behind a wall of rationalisation. It was an unsophisticated prejudice, nothing more. The Arab disliked the Jew because he was a heretic, not because he poisoned wells, or emitted a particular odor. In this, he was more sincere than the medieval Jew-baiter, who dissimulated his religious hostility under a heap of unlikely charges.

Meanwhile, from the Mediterranean countries, the Jews had spread over Europe and now lived under medieval Christian princes. There, their Judaism marked them for a definite life set by detailed regulations, or better, by detailed prohibitions. Indeed, after the differentiating attitude of the Church, the Jews could not live as ordinary citizens of medieval Europe any longer. They became associated with certain qualifications which made of them strange, abnormal human beings. The ordinary Christian of the eleventh or the twelfth century considered every Jew as potentially capable of the worse crimes, a kind of witch who could do the strangest malevolent things without difficulty. Would he see a Jew with a tail or two heads, he would not be in the least surprised, so much he expected of his mys-

terious power.

At the basis of all these primitive superstitions lay the hostility of the Church. The Jews' situation, as it were, was that of "an intolerant minority under an intolerant majority." (1) In the ancient world, so many deities were worshipped that tolerance necessarily followed. With the coming of monotheism inaugurated by the Hebrews, intolerance began to gain ground. Jehovah being the only God, not only of the Hebrews, but of all the peoples, the belief in pagan deities was to be held as a heresy. When a sect of the Hebrew population decided to follow St Paul and believe in Jesus as the son of God, the rest of the Israelites drew away from them and considered them with utter contempt. The contempt was handsomely returned by the early Christians, and so grew a reciprocated hatred between them.

When the Church came to have the upper hand, through its prevailing influence on the medieval nobility, it displayed its anti-Jewish feelings through all available means. It provided the plot of primitive drama, it was the subject of the priest's weekly sermon, it followed from the evangelical interpretation of the Old Testament, in a word, it struck the medieval man in most of his social relationships very seldom non-connected with the church.

It would be suitable to note, by the way, the easiness with which antisemitism takes the color of the con-

(1) James Parkes.- The Jewish problem in the modern world. London 1939  
p.14

temporary trend of thought. It was religious in the Middle-Ages, nationalist in the nineteenth century and even now, finally economic. It is because it began by being connected with religion that the Jewish problem has often been mistaken for a purely religious matter. The religious aspect of the problem has largely contributed to its maintenance through the ages, but, notwithstanding its chronologically prominent role, it is, we repeat it, a basic error to consider it as the main cause of the Jewish tragedy.

The Church thus succeeded in presenting to the mediaval minds the picture of a Jew who, in spite of being their contemporary, had crucified the Lord ages ago, and still used to sacrifice Christians to his God. He was therefore hated in all the domains susceptible to the Church's influence, that was, far from slightly.

On the other hand, he was regarded with suspicion because he was not an ordinary "citizen". Indeed, no Jew could acquire the rights of citizenship unless he abjured the ancestral faith, which meant that no conservative Jew could ever be a normal citizen of mediaval Europe. He was tolerated thanks to royal whims, but he was regarded as an alien, no matter how long he had lived in a given country. He was never considered as lawful as a Christian settler. As written in the Charter of John of France (1361), "ils n'ont pais ne lieu propre aucun en toute Chretiente; ou ils

puissent demourer, frequenter ne y habiter, se ce n'est de la propre et pure licence et volenté du Seigneur ou Seigneurs soubz qui ils se voudroient asseoir pour demeurer soubz eulz comme leurs subgiez, et qui à ce les voudroient recusillâr et recevoir." (i)

The Jews, however, had settled early in Europe, and still earlier in the East. The settlement of the first Jewish community in Rome goes as far back as 100 B. C. From that date on, the Jews spread all over Europe. "The immigration of the Jews into these important and wealthy provinces ( France and Spain ) took place probably as early as the time of the Republic or of Caesar. The Jewish merchants whose business pursuits brought them from Alexandria or Asia Minor to Rome and Italy, the Jewish warriors whom the emperors Vespasian and Titus, the conquerors of Judea, had dispersed as prisoners throughout the Roman provinces, found their way voluntarily or involuntarily into Gaul and Iberia. The presence of the Jews in the west of Europe is a certain fact ... <sup>only</sup> since the second century." (ii)

The fact that the Jews settled early in Europe, though "only since the seconde century" seems to have been ignored or intentionally disregarded in the Middle-Ages. However, this ignorance can be explained: The Bible being

(i) quoted by Parkes. The Jew and the medieval community,  
op cit. p.1

(ii) Prof Graetz.-History of the Jews. Philadelphia 1894, p.34  
vol 3

the only book widespread in the Dark and Middle-Ages, all Christians knew that the Jews pertained to an old nation and had lived in a Jewish state in Palestine. Further, the Church taught them that they had been expelled from the Holy Land because they had obstinately refused to recognize the Savior. The mediæval man had therefore sufficient reasons to believe that the Jew was not an integral part of the country in which he lived. He never forgot it. As Max Nordau wrote : "Tous les autres peuples qui envahissaient un pays et qui s'y fixaient pouvaient compter sur la prescription dans la mémoire populaire. On ne songeait pas à appeler étrangers les Francs établis en Gaule , et qui lui ont donné leur nom; on ne considérait plus comme des étrangers les Longobards en Italie, ni les Magyars en Pannonie. Mais le bénéfice de cette prescription n'était jamais accordé aux Juifs.....L'éternelle dispersion des Juifs était représentée par l'Eglise comme la punition de leur crime inexpiable; et le clergé avait soin d'entretenir toujours vive la notion du caractère étranger du peuple juif." (1)

Here, it may be pointed that in the Middle-Ages already, the Jewish problem had taken also the shape of a national problem. The provincialist narrowness of the mediæval Christian instigated him to thrust the Jew away almost as much as did his uncompromising religious fanaticism.

(1) Les Juifs et le Judaïsme au 19ème siècle. Paris, 1913.  
p.5

What remains certain is that the Jew could not be made to fit in the political life of Europe in the Middle-Ages, nor, as we are going to see right away, in its economic life. " In a Europe where every civic act was part of a Christian religious ceremony, there was no equality for the Jew, indeed no place for him at all." (1)

When every other man was legally protected by an official allegiance to a king, to a country, even to a workers' corporation, the Jew was the illegitimate child disavowed by everybody. A glimpse into the economic history of the leventh to the fifteenth century will show that the workers were gathered in guilds which protected their employment and their interests. No worker was able to sustain himself outside the protection of his fellow-craftsmen' guild.

But one of the most important prohibitions in Canon law was the interdiction for Christians to mix with Jews, no matter what kind of relationship theirs was. It immediately followed that Jews were not to be admitted in the guilds. As, on the other hand, they were not allowed to hold any position where they would be superior to Christians, the Jews were impelled to form workshops of their own, where from the most skilled worker to the youngest hand boy, everybody would be Jew. Medieval fanaticism led them to form economic cells of their own throughout the country where they lived, and condemned them to remain strangers to all the

(1) J Parkes, op cit p.16



aspects of the general economic development.

What happened then ? Driven from all the social and economic activities of the ordinary medieval man, the Jew turned exclusively to the ghetto for living and making a living. It is under those circumstances that he gained the epithet of "isolationist" before history. Records are witness that segregation was urged upon him, that his most ardent desire was to lead an ordinary and normal life without being pointed at as a different being at every move he made. He began by living close to his fellow-Jews, scared as he was of the insecurity of his lot. But life in the Jewish quarter soon became compulsory, and he who came to the Gentile city after a certain hour was punished by the severest sanctions. The Jew led this ghetto life during centuries, indeed up to the end of the Jewish Middle-Ages, that is, to the nineteenth-century. He was granted elementary human rights a little more than a hundred years ago. If he has not yet an absolutely normalised life, now-a-days, he has behind him centuries of tradition which cannot be even willingly forgotten at once.

The measures taken by the Church may be explained by a sincere desire to differentiate between Christians and Jews, but they soon led to shameful discriminations. The Jewish badge which began by being a mere sign of distinction became an object of shame and contumely. The Jew was recognised from

far by every medieval Christian, and estranged his possible sympathy as soon as he had identified the Jew.

How did the Jew manage to live under such dreadful conditions ? Before the rise of Christianity, the Jew led a peaceful and industrial life in the East. He was a peasant, a farmer, or a shepherd, in a word, he was closely tied to the land. But as conquest followed conquest, he was seized by the new ruler and sent away most often as a slave. His land was confiscated. In Europe, when he was freed, he could not be a peasant any more. For, to hold land under the feudal system meant taking the religious oath to the Lord, and performing certain duties among which was going to war, which Jews were not allowed to do. So, the Jew could by no means enter the feudal organisation. As regards the tenure of land outside it, there could be hardly question of it in the Middle-Ages. Nevertheless, a few cases were just recorded of Jewish free-holders, when the law forbidding the Jews from owning any kind of private property was initiated. The Jew was by now definitely cut off the land.

He turned to handicrafts. But, as we have already seen, he would not be admitted in the guilds. He tried to form Jewish craftsmen's guilds, but they could not stand the quasi-monopolistic power of the other ones. Then, he turned to commerce.

We have sketched the process of the process of the

economic life of the Jew from agriculture to commerce on purpose. The Jew is too often charged with unproductiveness, with being an eternal middleman, for the history of his economic wanderings to be disregarded by the student. Again, we conclude from this new instance that the modern Jew is what history made him. He has not been a merchant because of his exaggerated financial ambitions. He has not ~~given away~~ farming and agricultural production because of any physical deficiency of his. He has been driven to peddling and later on to trading only because all other occupations were closed to him.

However, the medieval Jew did not remain a great merchant for a long time. Although he had international connections which could have advantaged him over other competitors, the formation of great commercial-guilds from which he was debarred destroyed his last hope. There have surely remained certain Jews who managed, one way or the other, to keep a strong hold on few commercial enterprises. But those were rare exceptions. The opening was not available for the great mass of medieval Jewry. The Jew remained therefore a miserable being who often did not even find means for his subsistence inside the ghetto. While speaking of medieval Jewry, one must bear in mind the intense degree of misery which it had attained. The ghetto was crowded, even too small to allow for natural increase. Consequently, only the elder son of the family was allowed to get married. Life was insecure,

and the population of the ghetto was liable to be seized, pillaged, tortured, or killed at the slightest excitation of the mob. Means of livelihood were almost non-existent and ghetto life always meant for the Jew utter distress. What was his eagerness then when he heard of an occupation which, though risky, might provide him with a comfortable material life! He dashed forth into it without further hesitation: He did not know that in so doing, he was making his future worse, and that he was gaining for his posterity the disgraceful title of professional usurer.

When he realised that money-lending was the last calling that remained open to him, the Jew seized eagerly that last opportunity. That he did not choose it of his own free will, that it was imposed upon him as the only job which could be held by a Jew, are facts too widely known to be repeated here. What one can gather, however, from contemporary reports, is that the Jew was one of the most humane money-lenders of the Middle-Ages. For, and this is less widely-known, the Jew was not 'the only' money-lender. Though Christians were forbidden to indulge in these transactions, some of them counted among the greatest money-lenders of the Middle-Ages, the Caorsini, and the Lombards, for instance, who charged noticeably higher interests than the Jew. The trouble was that only a minority of Christians lent money, whereas the majority of the Jews did. It was therefore

easy for the mediæval European to believe that all money-lenders were Jews and vice-versa.

But not only were the Jews identified with usurers, they were charged with discrimination against the non-Jew as dictated by the Bible. Were that true, I do not see how a mediæval Christian could be shocked by it, given the systematic discrimination that the Church itself enforced everyday upon the Jew.

But it is not true. The Bible reads as follows : "unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury." How is this verse to be understood ? Dr Adler, a distinguished Chief Rabbi of London, explains it as follows: This measure was taken in order to avoid the concentration of wealth into a few hands in Palestine. If Jews took to money-lending with interests among themselves, it would soon happen that some of them would accumulate huge fortunes, and some others would be ruined. Thus, if a Jew needed money in order to build, or to set up an enterprise, he could get money from another Jew without interest. The case was different when foreign merchants who came to cross Palestine were concerned. If a Jew had money non-invested in his own land, and he lent it to a foreigner who used it in a gainful business, he could, on good grounds claim a certain interest, without endangering the national equilibrium. Had the foreigner been a destitute man borrowing money in order to make a

living, he would not have been charged with interest. For the Bible says further: " And if thy brother be waxen poor and his hand faileth with thee, then thou shalt relieve him. Yea though he be a stranger and a sojourner; that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of him or increase, but fear thy God."

Medieval society, in spite of its bitter hatred of Jewish money-lenders, needed them, and preferred them to the Christian usurers. Credit was beginning to be used in commerce, and primitive industrialisation; when cash money was needed, the Jew was resorted to. Otherwise, he continued to be despised as before. " Hold, Father," said Isaac in Ivanhoe, "mitigate and assuage your choler. I pray my monies upon no one. But when churchman and layman, prince and prior, knight and priest, come knocking to Isaac's door, they borrow not his shekels with these uncivil terms. It is then: " Friend Isaac, will you pleasure us in this matter, and our day shall be truly kept on God sa'me'. And " Kind Isaac, if ever you served man, show yourself a friend in this need! " And when the day comes and I ask my own, then what hear I but "Damned Jew" and "The curse of Egypt on your t'ive" and all that can stir up the rude and uncivil populace against poor strangers." (1)

In fact, the Jew found himself in a distressing vicious circle. Jew-hatred drove him out of all crafts, to money-lending. And money-lending nourished Judeophobia to a degree!

(1) quoted by Mc Call.- op ci p.171



He bore the miseries of his new occupation because he needed money. He needed money if he wanted to escape; he needed money if he wanted to live. And he spent it lavishly on such occasions. For him it did not mean comfort, and a secure future. It meant a short but immediate relief from persecution, and that was enough.

That was the use of a tiny fraction of the benefits. Where did the whole profits go? They went to the Jew's pocket only momentarily; for they found very quickly their way to the royal chests. In fact, the royal princes allowed the Jews to carry on their lending transactions because they were the ultimate winners of the game. They summoned the Jewish notables from time to time, and threatened them with expulsion, or massacre, unless they gave the crown a huge amount of money, which the Jews did, no matter how difficult it was sometimes to find the whole amount. The Jews became therefore "servi camerae" and kept that status till the 19th century. Numerous are the medieval documents which state that the Jews are the private property of the princes. "The Jews are ours and the peculiar patrimony of the royal treasury" said a Spanish king in the fourteenth century.(1) And Henry III of England proclaimed: "No Jew shall remain in England, unless he serve the king, and as soon as any Jew is born,

(1) quoted by J Parkes. The Jew and the medieval community  
op cit.- p.107

whether male or female, let him serve Us in some way." (i)

The prince did not miss an opportunity of exploiting "his Jews", nor did the other Lords. In fact, it was in everybody's interest to persecute him and rob him of all his possessions. It was in the Lord's interest, in the Church's, and in the debtors'. But being robbed was not the worse of his troubles. He was persecuted with ~~fanaticism~~ fanaticism. "The swarms of slaughterers may have had hearts", writes G Pearlson, "but there existed one word by which the softest could be petrified, by which the tear of commiseration could be disdainfully kept aside and the very hand extended in succour to the dying and suffering drawn back in horror, that word was "Jew". " (ii)

In fact, the life of medieval Jewry was most miserable, and very often tragically ended. Some of the most flourishing centers of Jewish culture were destroyed, whole communities butchered like herds of cattle. The pretences were numerous. The Jews were the enemies of Christ and civilization; they ritually slaughtered Christians at Passover; they defiled hosts; their bodies emitted a peculiar odor; they poisoned wells; they spread the plague, and what not ! The saddest fact in all that is that the medieval Christian really believed in those charges. He would have never dreamt that those were the

(i) quoted by J. Parkes.- op cit. p.112

(ii) G. Pearlson. op cit. p.112

fruits of a malevolent and morbid imagination. How could one expect him not to hold the Jews as a whole responsible of those crimes, when he blindly believed in those devilish deeds !

And when popular excitement was not at its highest, circumstances always happened to stir it anew. The Crusades were the sign of repeated dreadful slaughters, not to speak of the Spanish Inquisition. On the whole, apart from the purely religious origin of certain massacres, persecutions corresponded to some economic or physical distress. Starvation, the plague, all waves of great epidemic diseases brought forth new Jew-baitings. So, in the Middle-Ages, as in the present time, as we have already noticed in a previous chapter, the periodical persecutions of the Jews were the corollaries of great social diseases. When the victim could not identify the author of his misfortunes, what did he do ? He avenged himself on the Jew. The Jew was such a malevolent being that he was liable to have provoked any epidemic. And anyway, he was so weak that even if innocent, he could never loudly protest against the libeller.

The Jew could not defend himself. He was at the mercy of the first fanatic he met. And yet he had much to say. Could not he claim a fair retribution for his contribution to the intellectual development of society ? In

the movement which preceded the Renaissance, was his share slight in introducing to the European world the treasures of Greek and Arab genius ? Here is what Cecil Roth says:

" The Mediterranean world at this time was divided culturally...into three portions. There were the Greeks...the Arabs...and the Latins...All these three sections were cut off from one another by differences of language, religion, and tradition. The gulf would have been unbridgeable, but for one element which was to be found in all... The Jews were the only real Europeans, whose purview extended beyond the boundaries of the Latin world to the Greek on the one hand, and the Arab on the other; who possessed a common language...which was understood, in certain circles at least, the whole world over... who were so endowed with linguistic knowledge that they could travel from land to land without great difficulty...It was hence to the Jews that Christian students had recourse for some inkling of the intellectual achievements of the Arabs, and even the ideas of the sages of ancient Greece." (1)

But the Jew could not claim a retribution for what he had done. He would not have claimed it, anyway. What he was eager to get were not the honours due to scholars, but the elementary respect due to human beings. That is what he craved for. He was tired of being pointed at as a different man. He did not want notoriety, but uniformity.

(1) The Jewish contribution to civilization.-London 1938  
p.43

mity. What did Shylôck say ? " I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions ? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is ? If you prick us, do we not bleed ? If you tickle us, do we not laugh ? If you poison us, do we not die ? " (1)

This cry uttered from the bottom of a Jew's heart is thoroughly representative of the longings of medieval Jewry. Why did assimilation walk on the heels of emancipation ? Because the Jews wanted to be merged in the surrounding environment, even if they got partly drowned in it. They wanted to be brilliant or middling, industrious or lazy, good or bad, as any other ordinary people, without being sickeningly pointed out and cross-examined by every passer-by! And this was offered to them by assimilation, at least in its early days, as we will see a little later.

Thus was the situation of the Jew in the Middle-Ages. And when we say Middle-Ages, let it be clearly understood that we mean the Jewish Middle-Ages, i.e. the period extending between the Dark Ages and the French Revolution, or rather the beginning of the nineteenth century. For the various changes which marked the history of Europe in

(1) The merchant of Venice, quoted by Rennap.- op cit.p.8

the intervening centuries did not affect its Jewish population. Royal houses succeeded one to the other, revolts and wars took place without influencing noticeably the status of the Jews. They continued to lead their ghetto life with the same drastic prohibitions up to the proclamation of the rights of man. If the Dark Ages are supposed to have begun after the golden Age of the Arabs, that is, in the seventh century, the Jewish Middle-Ages count well "twelve centuries of persecution".

Here, it would be only fair to point out that some quiet interludes gave the Jews short respites throughout this dark part of their history. Humanistic rulers such as the Carolingians, distinguished ecclesiastical figures the most prominent of whom was Bernard de Clairvaux defended most enthusiastically the Jewish cause. Those tolerant intervals, if only intervals, gave the Jews a breathing-spell, and inspired them more courage to face the future.

Before we pass to a brighter chapter of Jewish history, let us pause for a second and consider the Jewish situation at the eve of the French Revolution. The Jew had come to Europe soon after the Exile, bringing with him his Holy Books, his inborn qualities, and a vigorous faith in the future, based on self-reliance and trust of mankind. Here he was after a few centuries of European



civilization, weak, diminished, afraid, another man. He had come out with trust; he was now desperate. He had come with a healthy cleverness and ability to work; he left the Middle-Ages with an execrable occupation, and a cunningness exhibited only in the foiling of his persecutors. He had come with scholars and enlightened scientists; he found himself now among pedants and narrow-minded, petty ghetto arguers. All these changes were not incidentally brought about. They were the only possible result of centuries of segregation and inhuman restrictions.

Herein lies the light that this chapter of history is capable of throwing on the understanding of the Jewish problem : That the character of the Jew, his habits , his folk-ways have been distorted by an artificial life imposed upon him by medieval society. Hence the charges of middle-men, money-lenders, isolationists, and so forth. After this short study of Jewish medieval life, we are able to assert that these qualifications, if only partly true, do not pertain to the inherent nature of the Jew. They were forced upon him by history, and so can they be wiped out by another chapter, though not by a conjurer's trick. The world which to-day rejects the Jew on the ground that he is too different to be assimilated among other human beings forgets that it is responsible for the formation of the modern Jew. If the twentieth-century Jew is an execrable being, the world has to stand him

all the same. Thank God , his lot is not as bad as that. Nevertheless, in the words of Senator Wallace: " If the Jew is a bad job, in all honesty, we should contemplate him as the handiwork of our own civilization." (1)

The other important point we have to retain from this survey is the great strengthening of the Jewish religious and national ties. This was naturally to be expected. After centuries of segregation, similar persecutions and similar longings, the Jews came out of the ghetto very closely knit together. They had so much prayed for the return to Zion and its glorious days, that they were not likely to forget quickly their national bonds. They had enjoyed a great deal of communal autonomy, and longed for more, though they were not in their present situation able to claim it. In a word, the Jewish problem, born and brought up through the diligent care of the Christian Middle -Ages, was to be found in the eighteenth-century in the state of an acute disease, indeed, a matter of life or death for the Jewish population, and as a remnant of mediævalism which hung to all the fields of European civilization and hamper its development.

(1) quoted by G. Pearlson.- op cit.p.324

" Les hommes naissent libres  
et égaux en droits."

Déclaration des droits de  
l'homme et du citoyen.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### T HE MODERN TIMES.

We have seen in an introductory study how Jewish history was distinctly different from other histories, on more than one point. The European chapter that we are reviewing now is far from being an exception.

We have analysed up to now the Jewish medieval ages and by now, the reader will be expecting a survey of the Enlightenment, of the end of feudalism, of the birth of the industrial age, of the century of Reason, in a word, of all the important features which characterize the history of society in the centuries which followed the close of the Middle-Ages. Here again, the reader will be disappointed, because all the above-mentioned chapters are lacking in Jewish history! The student will have to make a jump from the Middle-Ages to the very end of the eighteenth-century, and more often to the later years of the following century.

For the Jewish Middle-Ages did not end before then. As we have already observed, civilization progressed, revolutionary scientific discoveries were made without affecting in the least the stagnation of Jewish life. No noticeable change was felt in the "Judengasse" through dull and miserable centuries, up to the days of the French Revolution. Then, the Declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, and the life of the Jews was revolutionised all at once.

#### I. EMANCIPATION.-

It was not out of sympathy for the Jews that an end was put to ghetto life; nor was it out of a desire to be fair to them that they were recognised as ordinary human beings. It was the necessary consequence of the theory of natural rights. European society was not eager to welcome the Jews among its sons; nor were the promoters of the French revolution particularly overwhelmed with joy at the idea of emancipating the Jewish people. Indeed, they did not agree to it before September 1791, and even then, it was not without some opposition that the law suppressing any kinds of discrimination against Jews was passed.

The American Jews were the first to get emancipated (1783). Next came the French (1791). And little by little, all the European Jews were granted rights of

citizenship. It would be erroneous to imagine that the Jews themselves welcomed the new era. On the contrary, many of them were afraid of the new world into which they were suddenly thrown. The orthodox among them foresaw the "defudai-sation" which was bound to follow. In Holland, for instance, Jewish emancipation was obtained against the will of the communal leaders (1796). But the younger people in general were overcome with joy. They were suddenly allowed to enter a marvellous world where other young people lived free and happy; they were allowed to enjoy a thousand inventions which, compared to ghetto restrictions, made of their new life an earthly paradise.

In 1808, came the turn of Westphalia, whose Jews were declared full citizens, "subject to no special restriction." In 1811, the Frankfurt Jewish community was "sold" equality of rights, which shows that such medieval transactions were not completely given up yet. In other parts of Europe, emancipation was only partial. The Jews of Prussia were still forbidden from holding office (1812). Those of England could not be electors nor elected. In Austria, Bavaria, and Saxony, the drastic medieval restrictions were hardly modified.

Nevertheless, a great many Jews were, by the obtention of partial or complete citizenship, awakened to the life of their contemporaries. One will never exaggerate the

suddenness of that change. True, the Jews were not complete strangers to the world that surrounded them. A few of them had even been granted equality with Gentiles long before 1789, as a reward for services rendered to the crown. But the great majority had never participated or even stepped in the life of the nineteenth-century world. How great was their bewilderment therefore, when all the doors where "no thoroughfare for Jews" had been written for centuries, flew open before them !

Professor Soltau, in his book on the "Economic history of Europe", imagines the surprise of a Roman, contemporary of Lugdunum, had he come back to the world and beheld one of the great cities, about 1870. The amazement of our medieval Jew when he was thrown into the nineteenth century was not slighter, and which is more, it was real. Here was a mass of people whose only culture was Biblical, and who, in the intellectual field, had not gone beyond scholasticism; they suddenly found themselves in a surrounding where reference was made to greater philosophers than Maimonides, and where scientific criticism was throwing down piecemeal the results of centuries of religious belief. Here was a community of small artisans, of middle-men, of miserable Talmudic students suddenly allowed into a world that industrialism had already revolutionised. The more you examine the situation,



the more you are struck by the disharmony bound to exist between the newly-emancipated Jews and their modern contemporaries.

Equality does not imply similarity, as Kallen says. The years following Jewish emancipation have proved it in many ways. The Jews could not fit in the modern picture because they could not assimilate in ten years the progress made by society during a few centuries. The anachronism they represented bred suspicion, and was one of the causes of Reaction.

In fact, the liberal movement had grown mostly against the will of the European sovereigns, and as soon as the old ruling houses took the situation in hand again, I mean, after Waterloo, they tried to put the clock back. As far as the Jews were concerned, the rights which had been granted to them were cancelled in many countries. They had to go twenty-five years backwards, not twenty-five usual years, but a lapse of time in which they had almost caught up with the progress of four centuries. This was hardly possible. Had equality of rights not been granted in 1789, the Jews would not have unusually suffered from the change. But now that they had tasted freedom, they could not stand the cloistered life of the ghetto any more. That is why, after the Congress of Vienna, masses of Jews opted for conversion. They wanted to live as free human beings, and not as inferior creatures, and they were ready to do so at the cost of their Judaism.

They were going through a process which might have been successful in the Middle-Ages, but which would not work any more in the nineteenth-century. Indeed, the situation was entirely modified. In the Middle-Ages, the Jew was fundamentally reproached with his faith. As soon as he gave it up, the Gentile world had nothing against him. After 1815, the Jew was not only reproached with his faith; as a matter of fact, the religious ground of accusation hardly existed any longer. The modern world reproached him with his different culture, his peculiar social life, his strong allegiance to the Jewish people, all bonds which he could not rid himself of through conversion.

In consequence, modern society made the Jew feel that his troubles were not ended with the water of baptism. That blind alley made numerous Jews enlist under the banners of liberalism and participate in the Revolution of 1848. With the success of the liberal movement, they were at last granted complete equality of rights. Such was the history of the first part of the nineteenth-century : a series of concessions, then a period of reaction; a new series of concessions, another reaction. The life of the Jew was still insecure. Didn't 1815 follow 1789, and 1849 1848 ?

Still, in 1848, the Jew was wholly emancipated. Was he going now to settle comfortably, and lead a peaceful life? No, for if he was " de jure " emancipated, he was never so "de facto".

The Jew was a normal citizen before the law, but not before society. We have already noticed that prejudice dies hard. Hostility towards the Jew was implanted in the Gentile minds by religious leaders. Even after the decline of religious belief, brought forth by the century of Reason, the prejudice subsisted. What centuries of history had not succeeded in rubbing out was not going to vanish because of a single legal act.

Moreover, the spreading of Hegelianism had strengthened everywhere, and above all in Prussia, the idea of a national state. The excitement caused by this idealisation of nationalism turned into an antisemitic wave. The Jews were not "nationals" of the states in which they lived. So why tolerate and encourage them? On the contrary, throw them aside. They are not ready to assimilate, and in many cases, are not able to, because nationalism is a feeling, and cannot be acquired at once. There is therefore no place for them in the modern state.

The German Jews were therefore not freely admitted in the collectivity. Germany was the birth-place of modern antisemitism, as we have noticed in a previous chapter. It began by taking a political shade; then it turned intellectual with Treitschke and Nietzsche; and finally it turned racial. We should like to remind the reader, by the way, that if we have somehow dwelt on antisemitism a little longer than we should have done it is by no means out of a confusion between antisemitism and

the Jewish question. The study of antisemitism is indispensable in an essay of this kind, because it provides us with the outward manifestation of the latent existence of the Jewish problem. The Jewish problem will exist as long as the Jews will have an incomplete national status and all the characteristics which follow from it. What antisemitism does is not the creation of the problem, but just the reminding to the world and to the Jews in particular, of the existence of such a problem.

The Dreyfus case, on the other hand, came unfortunately to confirm that antisemitism was not dead, even later. The French Jews had been active, loyal Frenchmen; they had been "irrefutable proofs that the consistent Israelite can be a patriot and lover of his adopted country." (i) The French had welcomed them in all their activities and the Jews behaved irreproachably in return. Yet, the accusation laid against Captain Dreyfus awakened the old prejudice and showed that, no matter how he behaved, a Jew remained a Jew for his fellow-citizens. Yet, the behaviour of Captain Dreyfus had been admirable. Not only was he innocent, but he loved the French Army to such an extent that he more than once asked the suspension of his trial in order to avoid the Army courts being publicly dishonoured. Yet, not only was he sent for many years on Devil's Island as a consequence of false testimonies; but the whole body of French Jews was despised and gained the epithets of "Dirty Jews" and "Judas".

(i) G pearlson op cit p89

It should be unforgivable to forget, by the way, the sincere and wholehearted sympathy extended to the Jews by the French Protestants in this tragic crisis of theirs. As a matter of fact, their siding with the unfortunate Jews was so unanimous, that it brought forth a deep movement of anti-protestantism. Catholics and Protestants in France were never so violently opposed in modern history. In brief, the Dreyfus case did not only bring the French Jewish problem to a state of acuteness, it tore the whole of France. In every village, every group, in every family, there were people for and against Dreyfus. The effect on French unity was disastrous. But however bad it could be, the effect on the Jewish problem was still worse. The Jews throughout all Europe were getting a dreadful warning : that of their fatal insecurity, and, as we shall see a little later, that of the tragic inefficiency of assimilation.

As we move eastwards, the picture grows darker and darker. In Russia, the tyrannical attitude of the tsars was even worse than the medieval fanaticism. There was no more question of emancipation for the Russian Jews than of liberty for the Russian peasant. All of them were unslaved. But, indeed, the situation of the Jew was much worse. He was confined in determined "Pale of settlement" and could not move freely, even in the Pale. But that was not the worse. Dreadful pogroms took place every now and then, and the Jewish population was pitilessly massacred. 1881, 1882, 1905

were years of mourning for Russian Jewry. Mass-emigration began to the U.S.A. The majority remained nevertheless in Russia where they lived in acute distress up to 1917. With the coming of the Bolchevik Revolution, a new era began for the Russians in general, and for the Jews in particular. Complete equality was given to them. For the first time in history, a Russian Jew could live where he pleased, choose the job he liked, forget the "misfortune" of being born in Israel.

It is strange to realize how, when complete emancipation was finally granted to the Jew, it was at the price of his Judaism. A Jew, in his capacity as such, could not be a free man. Only when carried away in the new organisation of the USSR, could he enjoy liberty, therefore, after having got rid of the religious background which meant so much to him. We will see more of the situation in Soviet Russia a little further.

Still going eastwards, we should finally quote the tragic events of Syria and the troubles brought forth after the murder of Father Thomas, in Damascus (1840). An accusation of ritual murder was made against the Jews of Damascus, after the dispartion of a well-know priest. A few notables were seized and made to endure dreadful tortures in order to confess the truth of the accusation. The whole community was held responsible for the crime. The danger in which they found



themselves was such ~~that~~ they appealed to their European coreligionaries for help. A. Crémieux and Sir Moses Montefiore were respectively sent on behalf of the Jews of France and Great-Britain, in order to arrange matters with the Khedive at Alexandria. After trying negotiations, they succeeded in convincing the Turkish authorities of the innocence of the Jewish accused, and in removing from the Jewish community the blame so arbitrarily cast on it.

Anyway, the Jews continued to lead a half-comfortable half-insecure life in the different states of Europe up to the World War. It is significant to note that England was the first country to grant complete equality to its Jews. An English Jew could be a member of the House of Commons, he could be a peer. No official function, however important, was closed to him.

The war happened, and with the peace Conference came two events which were to modify the status of the Jews: On the one hand, the granting of minority rights which were intended to protect the security and freedom of national minorities; and, on the other, the recognition of the Jewish people as a nation.

Up to 1919, the Jews had been an "object of discussion" in the main international agreements which had been signed. The Congress of Vienna (1815), that of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), the Conference of Constantinople (1856), the Congress

of Berlin (1878) and finally the Conference of Algésiras (1906) had all dealt, among other things, with one aspect or the other of the Jewish situation. The Versailles Treaty was however the first international contract which no longer "looked at Jews as scattered human fragments, but began to consider them collectively as a single national entity entitled to its own existence and to the reestablishment of its state centre in Palestine," and later "as a state in the process of formation." (1)

The international recognition was to be for the Jews of far-reaching and historical significance. It was, as we will see in a moment, the beginning of their national emancipation.

As to minority rights, they were very soon forgotten. The events of Germany, of Poland, and others are too near to us to need any reminders. They all showed that the status of minorities was, as many other items, to remain an academic achievement.

Let us gather now briefly the threads of our argument. We have reviewed in this chapter the different stages of emancipation, and have attempted to give a brief outline of the Jewish situation since. We have seen that the removal of Jewish disabilities did not necessarily mean the end of the Jewish troubles. We have attributed to prejudice, to the revolution which occurred in Jewish life and the disharmony

(1) Dr H. Feinberg.--Some problems of the Palestine mandate

that followed, the cause of that situation. After this short review, we think that we can attribute to a deeper factor the main reason of the disequilibrium. When the Jews were segregated, when they were given an inferior legal status in the Middle-Ages, they were treated so as a community. Even when they were accused of the monstrous crimes, it was against the whole body of Jews that the Gentile anger arose.

When they were emancipated, they lost their characteristic national feature. They were disfranchised as a community, they were enfranchised as individuals. It was because every Jew was a man, because he was born with certain natural rights that he was recognised as equal to any other citizen. But as he was emancipated, he was stripped of his Jewish heritage. "The effect was formally to convert the Jews from a nationality into a sect : "Judaism, wrote Deputy Schwendt to his constituents in Alsace, is nothing more than the name of a distinct religion." The Jews were enfranchised, not as they had been disfranchised, in their collectivity, as a corporate entity, a nationality, but individually, Jew by Jew,... without heredity, history, language, culture, or social memory, a mere "now" in the temporal extent of the generations!"<sup>(1)</sup> The emancipated Jews thought it worthwhile, and they even tried to help the situation in thinning their Jewish allegiances, through the camouflage of Reform Judaism. We have seen in the beginning of this essay how they failed, and

(1)H.Kallen, op cit p.35

how they are trying to compromise in bringing again in the liberal field the element of Jewish nationality.

The Jewish problem, being a national problem, needs a national solution. The Liberal Jews will not succeed in annihilating the life of the Jewish nation, by their mere assertion that it does not exist. Once for all, the Jews must take the bull by the horns. They have dodged, up to now, in vain. They will not be saved from their lifelong worries unless they are decided to face reality, and stop trying vile or provisional compromises. One is amazed to find now-a-days Jews who pretend that Zionism is a fancy, that it is much noise about nothing. One may be for or against Zionism, but I deem that no one has the right to minimize its aim and the sacrifices it has cost for the sole sake of solving the Jewish question. One may find that one's happiness lies in any other country than Palestine, and that one does not have to back the Zionist movement. Yes, but if the solution of the Jewish problem, the end of the Jewish tragedy may be quickened at the expense of one's happiness, there is no place for hesitation. Among the Jews who came to settle in Palestine, there were some who came for instance from the USA. They had no pogroms to escape from, they were very well off in the States. They came to Palestine where they had difficulty with the language, with the people, with many internal disturbances.

Many of them who had liberal professions took up farming, and agricultural work. Do you think they enjoyed the material difficulties which they had to face ? Certainly not. Their life was, no doubt, more comfortable, and easier, in America. But this is not the time for individual issues to be dealt with. Has the coming of these Jews in Palestine helped the development of the country, has it quickened, however slightly, the solution of the Jewish question ? If it has, then it was right. The majority of the Jews in the world will not be asked this sacrifice. On the contrary, all the efforts spent are spent for their sake. For the number of Jews who could settle in Palestine is certainly small. Zionism does not aim at solving the question only for this small minority, but for the majority who will stay scattered here and there. It is for the sake of normalising their situation that other Jews have taken the difficult path of Zionism. So instead of rushing and choosing a solution which could possibly provide an individual way out, (which it will often fail to do) the Jew should give a hand to help his "people" to get out, as a whole, of its unfortunate situation, and do homage to the men who are giving up their comfort and well-being for this only end!

May I quote a sentence attributed to Abraham Lincoln:  
 " Let us all hang together now, or indeed, we will be all hung separately!"

We have alluded more than once in this chapter to

the passage of the Jew from one world to another, through emancipation. That passage was not only difficult, but painful. The Jew was literally torn between two worlds, two philosophies, two roads to happiness. (The future has shown that none of the ways has up to now led to happiness, but nevertheless, at that time, the Jew found himself before a crossroad, and he "had" to choose.) He had behind him a history very dear to him; a religious heritage; and a national spirit; but before him, he had The World, Freedom, Peace, for ever. (He did not know that those would be only temporary.) His personal security called him to the new world, but the memories of generations of simple, pious forefathers called him back. What was he to do ?

Greater and greater everyday became the number of those who chose the World. And after having chosen it, they conjured up pseudo-scientific principles for the sake of clearing their conscience. One of these beliefs was that, culturally, the Jews were inferior to the Gentiles. They did not take inconsideration the stagnation of Jewish life during centuries. Discoveries are often the piling up of a hundred scientists' observations. The Jews, being kept out of the world, had no opportunity to get stimulated by such observations. On the other hand, when they had been given that opportunity, the Jews did not remain unproductive. Golden Spain, and later the various countries of Europe in the ni-



nineteenth-century were witnesses of Jewish cultural achievements in no way inferior to that of non-Jews; even much more considerable if you consider the very slight proportion of Jews to Gentiles.

Another idea widely-spread among the Jews in Europe at the end of the nineteenth-century was that they were responsible for the misfortunes that befell them. Instead of realising that what they were was what the Gentile world had made them, the Jews reproached themselves with the tragedy of their situation. What followed from these and similar beliefs was that Jews began, on the one hand, to imitate the Gentiles; and, on the other, that they developed the philosophy of assimilation.

Before passing to the study of Zionism, and after having exposed the origin, evolution, and present state of the Jewish question, I think it suitable to say a word of the attempts which have already been made to solve it. We will therefore say a word of Assimilation which has been and is still the great rival of Zionism in the discussion of the Jewish question.

## II. ASSIMILATION.-

On what premisses do the assimilationists found their philosophy ? Their diagnosis of the Jewish problem is the following : The Jewish problem exists because the Jews have stubbornly refused to give up their national and cultural identity. Let them give up tradition and participate in all the fields of interest of their fellow-citizens, and there will remain no trace of the problem.

When they found the doors of the world widely opened before them after their new emancipation, a great number of Jews followed the Assimilationist doctrine. As a matter of fact, they all got assimilated more or less, whether or not of their free will. But only a certain number got assimilated consciously, with the sincere belief that by so doing, they would not be singled out any more. At the beginning, the experiment was a real success. The Jews lived among the Gentiles without discrimination, without prejudice, as real fellow-citizens, as real brothers. If during that period a few incidents happened, nothing really serious seemed to endanger that newly-won fraternity." The period was not really Jew-conscious and did not notice a Jew until he was pointed out. If a man was a normally decent citizen it was a matter of total indifference whether he were Jewish or not." (1)

About the practical process of assimilation, it would be worthwhile quoting the observations of Dr Rupin, author of elaborated studies about Jewish sociology. Dr Rup-

(1) J. Parkes, - on cit. p. 46

pin writes : " The rate of assimilation is higher :

- a) the smaller the percentage of Jews in comparison with the non-Jewish population of their immediate environment.
- b) the livelier the economic intercourse between Jew and non-Jew.
- v) the higher the standard of non-Jewish culture.
- d) the greater the wealth of the Jews." (1)

These conditions being promoted more and more every day, the rate of assimilation began to rise pretty quickly. One of the channels through which it rose was Liberal Judaism. We have already exposed in a previous chapter its essentials. We will now explain its failure as an agent of assimilation. Liberal Judaism began, as the reader remembers, by denying the existence of a Jewish nation, and restricting the scope of Judaism to a modernised, religious field.

The Jew did not find in it the feeling of kinship that he found among the orthodox Jews of the old Synagogue. The Reform attracted therefore only a small number. But the trouble was that it did not retain even that small number. It is even said that the son of a Liberal Jew is seldom a Liberal himself. He turns either atheist, or orthodox. By modernising the dogmas, and keeping only a minimum of religious prescriptions, the Liberals stood half-way between the orthodox Jews and the converts. Further, as

(1) Dr Ruppin.- The Jews of to-day. London 1913 p.21

individual judgment was ultimately given a free play in the maintenance of tradition, one never knew when reforms were overdone. Once you have given up one practise, one creed, there is no reason which can stop you from giving up more and more. That is actually what happened. The reformed Jews grew more and more liberal every day, and often ended the cycle by being baptised.

Conversion is outside the scope of assimilation, though it is its logical end. Reform Judaism failed therefore in its attempt at assimilation since it attained smoothly an end which it would have originally condemned, namely, conversion. "Whole communities were dissolved in Holy water" writes Steinberg. Some, by slight and successive drifts, the others by drastic decisions. "It was left to Heine to crystallize the spirit in which baptism was accepted: "The baptismal certificate, he remarks, is the admission ticket into European civilization." (1)

That the ticket turned out to be falsified, we will see in just a minute. Let us mention presently another movement which cost the Jew a part or the whole of his identity, I mean, the Jewish Enlightenment or Haskala, as it is called in Hebrew. This movement, of which Moses Mendelsohn was the most distinguished promoter, aimed at modernising Jewish culture. The price of this modernisation turned out to be Judaism itself. Independently of the will of Mendel-

(1) M. Steinberg.- op cit p.166

sohn himself, a debacle followed his teachings. His own children and grandchildren drew decisively away from Judaism. The effect of Enlightenment proved to have been the undermining and destruction of the basis of Judaism, without any positive contribution to replace it.

The result of all these movements, of all the theories which flourished along the path of assimilation, was failure, unfortunately definite failure. From the end of the nineteenth-century to the tragic picture of Nazi Germany, individual testimonies abound of the inefficiency of assimilation. And for those who believe that assimilation was not enough, that only complete absorption, i.e. conversion could have saved the Jews from persecutions, here is the personal opinion of a well-known baptised Jew about it. I refer to Henry Heine. That is what he wrote: "I am hated by Jew and Christian alike. I regret very deeply that I had myself baptised. I do not see that I have been the better for it since. On the contrary, I have known nothing but misfortunes and mischances." (1)

The fact is not accidental that it is the country in which Jews were the most assimilated that gave birth to the most dreadful persecutions ever witnessed by the civilised world. Indeed, one will never repeat it enough, there

(1) Henry Heine, quoted by M. Steinberg, op cit.- p.235

were practically no Jews in the world who were as much assimilated; who were Teutonised as Tutoons can be; who served their country with more self-denial; who contributed so actively to every single department of national life; who were as loyal, as loving sons to their country, as the Jews of Germany. They are being duly rewarded for that loyalty, they have been since 1933. Is that the brilliant achievement of assimilation? Let no one rise and say that Germany is a particular case. The German Jews were deeply devoted Germans, that is all I want to know. And that is how they are rewarded of the slow and painful efforts of assimilation, of the more painful loss of their Jewish allegiance. The German case may be a "spectacular case"; it is not unique. The loyalty and good services rendered by the French Jews to their mother-country are being paid in like coin. So are the Poles', the Rumanians', and already the Hungarians'.

Indeed, not only has assimilation failed, but it has made the problem worse. There are now thousands more dissatisfied, bitterly disappointed Israelites. What happened to them is what often happens to refugees in distress. They give all what they practically own to an individual who promises them flight into a friendly country; and instead of a secure haven, they find themselves led to a hell worse



than the one they escaped from. The assimilated Jews found themselves cheated. They gave up all what was dear to them in order to ensure to their children a secure and happy future. And they found out that their children were enduring sufferings worse than theirs.

As Ludwig Levisohn said: "The attempt to obliterate the difference is but to render the aggressor fiercer and the persecuted more defenceless. There is no fairest hope except in auto-emancipation."

Naturally, our judgment of the failure of assimilation is based on the study of contemporary events. Twenty years before, it would perhaps have been different. Even in a scientific survey of this kind, it would be idle to profess an "olympic detachment" about momentous contemporary issues. Writing as we do in the year 1944, we know well enough that assimilation has written its own death-warrant. Given its poor results, it should not be necessary to discuss it any more, at least while seeking an efficient solution of the Jewish problem.

We will not close the chapter, however, before trying to explain that failure. The duty of the student of history being to interpret the facts, and not only to record them, we will proceed to a short analysis of the failure of Assimilation as a solution of the Jewish question.

To begin with, instead of checking the development of antisemitism, assimilation certainly helped it. After having attacked the Jew during centuries on the ground that he refused to surrender his identity, the world was now despising him because he was assimilated. In a word, prejudice was still ruling the spirits, fanatical and groundless more than ever. As long as it was alive, no success of assimilation could reasonably be expected.

On the other hand, the Jew thought that he would gain the world's respect by being assimilated. On the contrary, he was despised all the more. The surrender of his national spirit, and of an elaborated culture was in itself a confession of inferiority. How could it lead to more consideration?

How could the Frenchman, the German, or the Englishman, believe in the exuberant patriotism proclaimed by the Jew when they all saw him abandon his history, his culture, his age-old allegiances, for the sake of his own well-being? It was not wrong to qualify assimilation "a multiple treason". As the new philosophy of "reconstructionism" (1) sees it: "Assimilation involves an act of moral self-betrayal...a treachery to a people in the hour of its need. and a selfish neglect of the interests of mankind", because "the totality of civilization consists not in universal

(1) see Chapter one.

homogeneity, but in the variety of individual, disparate cultures." (i)

Above all reasons, assimilation failed because it was based on an erroneous analysis of the Jewish problem. The assimilationists thought that the keeping up of Jewish identity was the cause of all the troubles. They were wrong. By giving up their identity, the Jews were in an even more anomalous position; They were, on the one hand deJudaised, and on the other, refused any other characteristic. The Jewish problem has always been and still remains a national problem. All attempts at solutions which ignore this fact are condemned to a fatal ending. "Those who treat the Jewish problem as the sum total of innumerable individual problems, render it insoluble," says Prof. Namier. "For each individual case is troublesome and their aggregate unbearable... The first step towards a solution of the Jewish problem is for us to recover our historic national consciousness; then, and then only, can we expect the non-Jews to count with us. A nation is not a mere sum total of the individuals who compose it; it transcends them all, and possesses weight and values which none of them can claim individually."(ii)

Finally, let us quote the technical impossibilities of assimilation, as analysed by Dr Joseph.

(i) M. Steinberg.- op cit. p.255

(ii) Prof. Namier.- op cit p.10

The first impossibility, he says, is to abandon a national allegiance because of a rational motive; nationality being a matter of feeling and not of logic, cannot be dependent on rational arguments. The same reason is the cause of the second impossibility. One cannot suddenly adopt a foreign nationality just because one has decided to.

And finally, there remains the consent of the foreign nation to welcome you among its children, a factor which has been singularly lacking!

In closing, we would like to make one point clear: We did not intend here to condemn all assimilationists, many of whom are honest, and self-sacrificing people. We did not want to criticize assimilation as a fact, either. It was inevitable, given the circumstances. What we have intended to stress is that Assimilation, as an ideal, has proved wrong, that "there is no salvation for the Jewish people or for Judaism in the doctrine of assimilation..." Indeed, if it "had been unchecked by other forces, it would have been a stepping-stone to complete absorption for those Jews who have come under its influence." (1)

We have seen why the success of the process has been shattered. For the same reason, its failure brought forth a stronger desire of auto-emancipation, a new dignity and

(1) Leon Simon.- op cit p.23

self-respect for the Jew, in his capacity as such. It brought about, if not a happier, at least a healthier atmosphere in the Jewish world. "Carry thy standard high o my people," became the Jewish watchword.

If the fate of the Jew was to suffer, let him suffer at his post, instead of lying defenceless in a stranger's field.

Speaking of attempted solutions of the Jewish problem, one should mention the trial made by the USSR, however uncertain is the knowledge about it. Soviet Russian has made a definite attempt to solve "its" Jewish problem one is bound to take it in consideration.

### III. THE COMMUNIST SOLUTION.-

Socialists and communists are agreed as to their interpretation of the Jewish problem. They both attribute its existence to the evils of the capitalistic regime. The Jewish question is, according to them, one of the contradictions which follow from a wrong social economic system. Let the system be replaced by a sounder one, and the question will be solved.

The Socialists have attempted to find a way out of the problem through Socialist Zionism. Though widely different in their outlook on the question, Nahman Syrkin and Ber Borochof represent that proposition. This is what Borochof writes : " Socialism has several aspects. Economically, it means the socialization of the means of production; politically, the establishment of the dictatorship of the toiling masses; emotionally, the abolition of the reign of egotism and anarchy which characterizes the capitalistic system;

" And so is it with Zionism. Economically, it means the concentration of the Jewish masses in Palestine; politically, the gaining of territorial autonomy; emotionally, the striving for a home." (1)

We will not insist on the discussion of this suggestion, since it can be reduced to Zionism plus socialism. We are not concerned here with the economic regime which will be instituted in Palestine. On the other hand, the advantages and disadvantages of the suggestion are the same as the

(1) Borochof.-Nationalism and the class struggle. New York 1937



Zionist ones. They will therefore be discussed in the later criticism of Zionism.

The communists, though starting from the same premise, reach a totally different conclusion. For them, the Jewish problem is not to be solved "in Russia" in function of Jews and non-Jews and their relationship. It is to be solved as a workers' problem, and nothing else. Otto Heller writes : " La solution de la question juive dans l'Union Soviétique n'est pas un problème juif. C'est un problème soviétique, un problème de la dictature prolétarienne... Ce n'est plus la question juive au sens traditionnel du mot. Ici, il ne s'agit plus d'apaiser un conflit entre Juifs et non-Juifs. La question... a débordé ses limites propres... C'est celle du sauvetage d'une masse de plus d'un million de travailleurs, celle du retour des Juifs à cette activité économique que lui interdisaient les régimes passés." (1)

The question of the return to the land is of course a most interesting suggestion. The Jews have been torn from the land centuries ago, and the return to a healthy agricultural life is certainly an achievement worth of consideration. ( We will see in a moment that Zionism is achieving it as well) But, the experience of Jewish colonisation in Birobidjan which promoted a new interest in agricultural production, did not go without some sacrifices. The question is

(1) La fin du Judaïsme.- Paris . p.79

to know whether it was worthwhile, or not.

The Jews are therefore considered as a mass of workers whose economic function is the cause of important troubles. They have to be readapted to a new, productive organisation. If the attempt is successful, they will form a group of healthy workers, but workers without religion, since communism is based on a negation of religion; and without nationality, because the existence of a Jewish nation is denied by the communist leaders.

The experiment in Birobidjan is not to be considered like the suggestion of Ougania. There, the Jewish people would settle on a national basis. But in Birobidjan, the Jews would be as an autonomous mass of workers with a very <sup>cultural</sup> loose bond to connect them, and no religious one at all. Of course, one cannot judge a situation still very vaguely known. But some consequences are necessarily following from the very principles of communism, and those consequences have turned to be complete dejudaisation. The existence of the Jewish nation is said to be a fancy, an imaginary creation because, according to Lénine, people of the same nationality do not form a nation unless they are very closely tied by strong economic bonds. The Jews do not therefore form a nation.

Communism and conversion lead therefore to the same end:

annihilation of the Jew as such. While the path followed by the former is more liberal, seems more dignified, the end it reaches is as condemnable as conversion itself. Though the Jews may have attained a higher degree of freedom, or of economic normalisation through it, it is not to be considered as a suitable solution of the Jewish problem. On the first hand, it attempts a solution for only a part of the Jewish people, namely, the Russian Jews. And we have already remarked that unless a national solution is found to the problem, all the remedies suggested could be at best palliatives.

On the other hand, it leads to the very end that Jews have avoided during two thousand years, namely, religious and national suicide. What Birobidjan will offer in a modified Soviet Russia, under a modified communist regime, we cannot foretell. But as far as we can gather from the actual state of things, communism can offer no satisfying solution to the Jewish question.

PART THREE :

## Z I O N I S M

" How shall we sing the Lord's song  
 " In a strange land ?  
 " If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,  
 " Let my right hand forget her cunning  
 " Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth  
 " If I remember not thee;  
 " If I prefer not Jerusalem  
 " Above my chief joy. "

Psalm 137 (4,5,6)

CHAPTER SIX

## The growth of Jewish Nationalism

Paradoxical as it may seem, Jewish nationalism is both the oldest and the newest movement of Jewish history. It is the oldest since Israel's history almost begins with it. It is the newest since the Zionist movement to which it has given birth is a formation of the end of the last century. Given its age-long history and its manifold aspects, we will divide our study of it in different sections the first of which will be the review of Jewish nationalism

I. UP TO 1896.-

( 1896 being the date of the publication of Hertzl's "Judenstaadt", the source of a new orientation of Jewish nationalism.)

We said above that Jewish history began with Jewish nationalism. The Exodus from Egypt and the Return from the Babylonian captivity are early events of the first part of Jewish history. They have remained significant events ever since. The pious Jew of the Roman Empire, or later of mediæval Europe, the happy Jew of Moorish Spain, all remembered with fervour the Biblical account of the return to the Holy Land with Moses and Josiah. They still read the stories of the happiness that was the Jews when Cyrus allowed them to go back to the Land of Israel, after the long captivity of Babylon. They still wept on the ninth of "Ab", date of the first and second destruction of the Temple. As a matter of fact, they still do.

Nothing is more poignant for a Jew, nothing is more meaningful for a sympathetic onlooker, than to see the day of mourning traditionally celebrated by the Jews on that occasion, especially in Jerusalem. Jews of all countries and beliefs, orthodox, nationalists or indifferent, old men as well as youngests, all <sup>etc</sup> to the depth of their being the tragic significance of that anniversary, and unite in the common sorrow. And this does not only happen in Jerusalem. It happens in all the towns where a Jewish com-

munity exists; it has so happened during two thousand years. I have seen myself people crying as if they were themselves the exiles, as if the city of which they were deploring the destruction had not been destroyed twenty centuries ago, but under their own eyes. And this emotion did not come from uncontrolled hysteria. It was the expression of a sorrow deeply felt by every member of the people. Every Jew wept over the misfortune of the community, over the calamities that never ceased to befall the nation ever since the Exile.

Numerous are the religious or national anniversaries that remind the Jew of the lost Zion, and inspire him with a latent yearning to go back. "Next year in Jerusalem" is being more and more meant everywhere. The orthodox Jews who, in spite of a strong anti-religious current, remain very numerous, mean it from the bottom of their hearts; as to the others, those who had lived outside the Jewish atmosphere and who are now driven back to it by the force of pogroms, when they say "Next year to Jerusalem", it seems too beautiful to come true.

The steadfastness with which the Jews remained faithful to Jerusalem through their long and difficult path is one of the most sublime facts of their history. During one generation only, the one who lived immediately after their emancipation, the Jews seemed to have forgot-



ten it. But a long time did not elapse before they recognised their failure to their duty, and stood by the old allegiance. But what is the failure of one generation before the faithfulness of twenty centuries? Ever since the Dispersion and during all the centuries, the Jews never forgot their nationality. They stuck to it passionately.

"No temptation, ...no inducement... however powerful, no suffering, no martyrdom, no agony could make them forget the sacred debt they owed to God, to their ancestors and to themselves. They always considered it their duty to be members of one great family, bound together not alone by a common past, but by a community of undying ideas, aspirations, and hopes for a national future. They remained unmistakably true to their duty..... This everlasting, all-absorbing and unconquerable idea of a national future is absolutely Jewish. It has accompanied the Jews from the cradle to the grave." (1) Thus speak Nahum Sokolov, the author of the comprehensive "History of Zionism", himself one of its most distinguished representatives in our days.

In fact, Zionism is only the new designation of an old emotion. The longing for Zion was embodied in the messianic belief since the early days of the Jewish religion, and was, so to speak, its geographical aspect. Indeed, both the belief in the Messiah and the return to Zion are so

(1)History of Zionism. London, 1919 p.XV

intimately connected in the Scriptures that they can hardly be conceived of separately.

On the whole, the Jews were passive in their longings. The love of Zion was part of their aspirations, but it did not in any way influence their daily life. They relied blindly on God for the practical realisation of their wish. Like that old rabbi who spent all his days praying by the Wailing Wall, and who was once asked by a young pioneer what he was doing, they would have answered; / We pray for the rebuilding of the Land of Israel.

However, some attempts, if only few, were made in earlier times for a practical return to Zion. The revolt of Bar-Kochva in 135 was the last attempt made under the Romans. Anyway, during the twenty centuries which have passed "since the destruction of Palestine as a Jewish political entity, there was not a single century in which the Jews did not attempt to come back." (1)

During the Middle-Ages, no mass-emigration proved possible before the Spanish Inquisition. Then, the majority of Jews who fled from Spain found a very hospitable refuge in Turkey, and from Turkey, in Palestine. Jewish life began to be reorganised in the Holy Land. An influential Jew obtained the permission to rebuild the city of Tiberias, and

(1) Dr Weizman.-The Jewish people and Palestine. Tel-Aviv 1936 p.12

did so very successfully. Other communities began to spring up. Infortunatly, the work of the Spanish settlers was later destroyed. And it was not before another century that Tiberias was rebuilt, together with Jerusalem, Hebron, and Safed. The communities established in the new cities developed successfully, and sometimes attained the number of twenty-thousand inhabitants.

Other small-scale imigrations were made later, and so, century after century, a new number of Jews came to increase the number of the community reestablished in Palestine. The adventure of the False Messiah (1665) came to show to the world that the longing for Zion was not only a vague religious aspiration but that it was converted to action as soon as an opportunity was available. A Jew from Smyrna called Shabetai Zvi proclaimed himself the Messiah and declared that he was designated to take the Jewish people back to Palestine. At this news, active preparations were made throughout all the diaspora, "from Alexandria, Salonica, and Aleppo to London, Hamburg and Amsterdam." Idealists and orthodox Jews, businessmen, all rallied around the pseudo-messiah. Herein lied the evidence of the real desire of the Exiles to go back to their land, Eretz-Israel, the Land of Israel, as it is commonly called by Jews.

The Messiah proved to be an impostor, but the feeling of the people was genuine.

However, the Jews continued to lead their miserable ghetto life, while waiting for the real Messiah. A revolutionary event happened and distracted their thoughts from the messianic hope : They were emancipated. The beginning of the nineteenth-century witnessed the hysterical joy, the rushing towards the outside world that we have already noticed in a previous chapter. The world had opened its doors and welcomed the Jews. Was not that wonderful ? Can't we understand that in such circumstances the Jew somewhat neglected his religious feelings, and consequently his longing for Jerusalem ?

Unfortunately, the beautiful dream of Assimilation vanished and the Jew rediscovered his old Jewish feelings; the more heartbroken he was, the more desperately he now clung to his Jewishness. The feeling that he was not accepted as a Jew in the surrounding community made him rethink his situation. Emancipation had failed; assimilation had proved a blunder; antisemitism was making headway in the most liberal societies. Where was he to stand ? The Jew was at a loss.

Suddenly, the Zionist solution appeared to him, very much like the "deus ex machina" of classic dramas, as Stenberg says. He saw in that solution the means of restoring his self-respect, and the respect of others to him; the means of leading a free, normal life in the

ancestral soil, and a guarantee of preservation of his Jewish identity. He clung to it passionately, desperately, as to his last chance.

However, the first serious proposals concerning the return to Zion were not initiated by him, but by Gentiles. Napoleon is reported as early as 1799 to have invited all the Jews "à venir se ranger sous ses drapeaux pour rétablir l'ancienne Jérusalem." Later, during the crisis occasioned by the occupation of Palestine by Mehemet-Ali, it was Great-Britain who took the lead in the Zionist proposals. The events in the Middle-East were making of the future of Palestine a matter of immediate concern. Lord Shaftesbury made himself the champion of the Jewish cause and urged the government to provide facilities for a wide-scale Jewish colonisation in Palestine. Palmerston did not agree to the suggestion. However, to show its goodwill, the British Government instructed its representatives in Palestine and Syria to take all Jews, whatever their nationality be, under their protection.

Once the crisis was passed, the proposals were forgotten. However, public opinion remained sympathetic to the idea of Jewish return to Palestine. The President commented upon it favourably. George Eliot, at the right time, published her "Daniel Deronda" and commanded the sympathy of the intellectuals. The idea of the Return

to Zion was quite lively in the consciousness of the English world. And when later Laurence Oliphant undertook himself to contribute to the realisation of the scheme, the British government gave him all his support. It was the expression, as some writer put it, of the sympathy of a Bible-loving people for the people of the Bible.

Meanwhile, Jewish spiritual leaders were making a significant contribution to the Zionist idea. Moses Hess propagated his views on the Jewish problem through his "Rome and Jerusalem" (1862). He noticed the failure of Assimilation and stressed the necessity of a national solution to the Jewish problem. Emancipation has failed because it offered an individual solution, he said. What we need is national emancipation, recognition of the Jewish nation and normalisation of Jewish life. "It is only with the national rebirth that the religious genius of the Jews will be endowed with new strength and again be re-inspired with the prophetic spirit", he writes. (1) He encouraged resettlement in Palestine as soon as an opportunity would arise, and the development of Jewish national life in all fields of action and thought. Let us remark, by the way, that this penetrating analysis of the Jewish problem was made some thirty

(1) Rome and Jerusalem.-New York 1918.

ty years before the publication of Theodore Hertzl's writings.

"Rome and Jerusalem" had a commanding influence on the contemporary Jewish thought. Hess's unflinching belief in France made it particularly close to the French Jews' hearts.

Soon after "Rome and Jerusalem", an "Appeal to our brethren" was issued by a Polish rabbi of the name of Hirsh Kalisher. It urged all the Jews of the Diaspora to move from contemplation to action, and help in the rebuilding and repopulation of the Holy Land. This appeal is the more significant that it comes from an orthodox rabbi. Whereas certain other orthodox Jews regarded it as heretical to return to Zion before the coming of the Messiah, Rabbi Kalisher joined faith to practical sense and said: Heaven helps those who help themselves. "Even if the time of Grace has not yet come, he writes, when we should think of erecting an altar to the Lord in Zion, . . . . . the following proposal is still practical." Follows a project of colonisation in Palestine and suggestions as to the development of a Jewish agricultural life, and so forth. "God in his Grace will then support us, and we will, though small in our beginning, continually grow and come more and more into the possession



of the Holy Land, as the prophet foresaw. We, however, must make the beginning, as I have proved by numerous citations from Talmud."(i)

Rabbi Kalisher's appeal had at least one consequence. It won to his cause the "Alliance Israélite Universelle" which had been founded in 1860, and induced this body to found a Jewish agricultural school near Jaffa. The school was founded in 1870. It is "Mikveh Israel" (The Hope of Israel) that is up to now one of the great agricultural schools of Palestine. The fact is important not so much because of its fruit, as one of the early beginnings of colonisation.

A little later, Russian Jewry began to make its contribution to the Zionist theory. Peretz-Smolenskin, a staunch Zionist, led a vigorous propaganda in a Hebrew paper he founded, and insisted, again, on the necessity of preserving the identity of the Jewish people. He exposed the good results already achieved by Jewish culture and emphasized the duty of every Jew to preserve them as such.

1882 brought two important though very different additions to the history of Judaism, namely, the Russian

(i) quoted by Moses Hess.- op cit p.175

pogrom, and Pinsker's "Auto-emancipation". The latter followed from the former.

Pinsker pleaded for Jewish national emancipation and for the establishment of a national home. In a short but striking pamphlet, he summarised the evils of the Jewish situation. He attributed all the troubles of the Jews to the abnormality of their situation. They were, as he said "the disembodied ghost of a race", a "living corpse among the nations." It was not surprising therefore that they were treated everywhere as aliens, as inferior beings. If they seek the end of their miseries. the Jews must emancipate themselves, they must regard themselves as members of the Jewish nation, for "in the unobtrusive circumstance of the Jews not appearing as an independent people before the eyes of the nations, lies the secret of their exceptional position and of their endless miseries... The world saw in this people the uncanny appearance of a dead man, who walks with the living. This ghostly appearance of a walking dead man; of a people without unity and organization; without land or band; .....this astonishing spectre, unparalleled in history could not but produce a peculiar and strange impression on the imagination of the nations." (1)

(1) Auto-emancipation.- op cit p.11

It is interesting to note that Pinsker began by asking for a Jewish national home, but not for Judaea. He joined afterwards the "Chovevei Zion (Lovers of Zion)" whose main task was to help Jewish colonisation in Palestine. He therefore ended as a Zionist.

While speaking of the movement of the "Lovers of Zion", let us say a word about its achievements. The movement began by spreading in Russia, and from there, in the Western Jewish communities. The aim of the organizers was to encourage emigration to Palestine, and to raise funds in order to help the settlers who were enduring enormous sacrifices. The land was barren, malaria and other scourges made life very difficult. Nevertheless emigration took wide proportions. The "Chovevei Zion" tried to get a Charter from the Porte but they did not succeed. Nevertheless, they got their movement legalised in Russia, and thus continued officially their activities. The numbers of Jewish settlers in Palestine are significant of the work accomplished by the movement:

1839 .....	11.000
1878 .....	34.000
1914 .....	100.000

The "Chovevei Zion" however, were responsible for a part only of the achievements. Large-scale immi-

gration was supported by Baron Edmond de Rotschild and by the Jewish Colonisation Agency ( I.C.A.) which administered a fund created by Baron de Hirsch for Jewish relief. It is to those agencies and to the support of Jewry all over the world that the first Jewish settlers owed their maintenance. In spite of innumerable difficulties, the Jewish colonies soon flourished and gave birth to an entirely "Judaised" and healthy life. Agricultural development was proving successful. A relatively prosperous export trade was organised. A Jewish cultural life was being at last led in the Land of Israel . Hebrew was revived and used as a living language. at school, at home, in social life. The "visions were being slowly translated into realities. The Jews had not only established themselves as a valuable element in the economic life of Palestine : they were gradually building up a vigorous and many-sided society in which their fellow-Jews elsewhere saw, with hope and pride, the promise of a Jewish renaissance." (1)

## II. FROM 1896 ONWARD.-

Thus, when Hertzi came, the impulse had already been given. Jewish settlement had already been encouraged in Palestine. What was Hertzi's contribution to the movement, then? Hertzi, as his predecessor Pinsker, saw the Jewish problem in its true light. "The solution of the Jewish difficulty," he said, "is the recognition of the Jews as a people and the finding by them of a legally recognised home to which Jews in those parts of the world in which they are oppressed would naturally migrate."

We already see in his statement the twofold aspect of modern Zionism: The completion of Jewish national life, on the one hand; and the foundation of a refuge for persecuted Jews, on the other. Before Hertzi, nobody had pointed with such a conviction to the recognition of the Jews as a nation as an immediate and indispensable preliminary to the normalisation of Jewish life. Nobody had fused the existing Zionist forces in a coherent whole, as he did. The "Lovers of Zion" had done diligent work, but without plans nor organisation. Hertzi called a Zionist congress which met at Basle in 1897. He systematised Zionist work and propagated it skilfully.

But his contribution would have been a second-rate one if it had only consisted in organisation. He did

more. He raised the Zionist issue to the plan of International relations. He asked for an international recognition of the Jewish nation, and an internationally recognised home for it. "We should be given sovereignty over a tract of the earth's surface that is adequate for our rightful needs as a nation, he said. We shall provide everything else ourselves." Indeed, he organised a thoroughly elaborated association for the establishment of the settlers on the land, the "Jewish Company", and another one to administer their possible ownings in the land they were leaving. He set in a broad but comprehensive sketch the main conditions of realisation of the Zionist project.

In all fairness to Hertzl, one should not portray him as an ardent "Zionist", a Zion-Zionist, I mean. Hertzl suggested Palestine as well as Argentine as a possible basis for the national home. But this was not out of rational objection to Palestine, as much as out of ignorance of the part Palestine played in Jewish national life. In 1897, he became a Zion-Zionist. The aims of the First Congress he was presiding, which came to be known as the Basle programme, began with the following: "Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law."(1)

(1) quoted by Stein.- op cit p.88

There is one thing to be added, among others, to Hertzl's conception of Jewish nationalism. " A nation is in my mind, he wrote, a historical group of men of a recognisable cohesion, held together by a common enemy. Then , if you add to that the word "Jewish", you would have what I understand to be the Jewish nation."(i) I think that Hertzl's judgment of antisemitism as a factor of Jewish nationality is exaggerated. Apart from the negative effect of antisemitism, I deem that Jewish historical consciousness, connection with the Holy Land, Jewish faith, culture and social life are greatly responsible for the moulding of Jewish nationalism. Zionism can by no means be reduced to a reaction against antisemitism. It is much more than that. As Nordau says: "Il n'est pas exact de dire que le Sionisme est un geste de truculence ou une réaction désespérée contre l'antisémitisme.... Sans doute, maint~~e~~ Juif instruit n'a été conduit à se rattacher au Judaïsme que par l'antisémitisme..... Mais chez la plupart des sionistes, l'antisémitisme n'a été que la contrainte qui les obligea à réfléchir à leurs relations avec les peuples, et leur réflexion les a conduits à des résultats qui resteront durablement acquis à leur esprit et à leurs sentiments, quand bien même l'antisémitisme disparaîtrait entièrement du monde." (ii)

(i) quoted by Stein. op cit p.77  
(ii) Le Sionisme Paris p. 10



I think that this is true of Hertzl as well. The fact that antisemitism led him to rethink the Jewish problem induced him to attribute to it too great a share in the formation of the problem.

Hertzl founded political Zionism. He contributed largely to the development of the Zionist movement at large, but it is very fortunate that Ahad-Haam succeed him promptly. Hertzl made of Zionism a matter too much "terre-à-terre", only concerned with politics and details of organization. Asher Ginsberg ( One of the People, as he was called in hebrew), came very timely to raise the value of Zionist ideals, or more justly, to put them in their true place. Ahad-Haam sought a refuge for Judaism , more than for the Jews, I mean, for the culture, the Biblical heritage, the spirit of Jewish life. His ideal was the following:

" A national spiritual centre of Judaism to which all Jews will turn with affection, and which will bind all Jews together; a centre of study and learning, of language and literature, of bodily work and spiritual purification; a true miniature of the people of Israel as it ought to be... so that every Hebrew in the Diaspora will think it a privilege to behold just once the centre of Judaism and when he returns home will say to his friends : If you wish to see the genuine type of a Jew, whether it be a Rabbi or a scholar or a writer, a farmer or an artist, or a business-

man, then go to Palestine and you will see it." (i)

Ahad-Haam aimed at the genuine spiritual regeneration of the Jewish people. He wrote a series of essays which are of the utmost interest for the student of Judaism, indeed, for any student of philosophy. He is deeper than Hertzl in more ways than one. His clear insight makes him realize the fundamental abnormality of the Jewish situation, the spiritual one. Here is a people with a developed culture, with intellectual gifts, with an honoured faith, without spiritual centre. The Jews have always had a spiritual centre during their wanderings. It was once Babylon, another time Yavné (the refuge given by the Romans to the Jewish centre of learning), another time Spain. Indeed, Jewish history has been characterised as the successive shiftings of the Jewish cultural centres. Modern Jewry live without that centre.

While he reestablished in its true light the cultural aim of Zionism, Ahad-Haam completely disregarded its political aim. In a world of Power-Politics as ours, a nation can not unfortunately live denied of all political attributes. The unbiased student will combine the cultural and political aims of Zionism as respectively expounded by Ahad-Haam and Hertzl, and will get a

(i) Essays on Zionism and Judaism . London 1922 p.132

right understanding of a moderate, balanced Zionism. For, as the student will have gathered, Zionism is not a "rigid body of dogma." It is a complex of living forces, It is by the interplay of those forces, and the readaptation which has taken place every time the movement has been subjected to one of them that Zionism has slowly found itself.

And if some one asks us after this short review what is Zionism, we will not answer that it is simply an organised movement which aims at resettling the Jewish people in Palestine. We have seen that it is more than that. It is in reality "a complex of emotions, ideas, and practical necessities. The traditional attachment of the Jews to the cradle of their race and faith," above all, "their mystical belief in the final ingathering, their wounded pride, their uneasy consciousness of a questionable status, their anxiety to regain their self-respect and to vindicate their right to self-expression, the outward pressure from the crowded ghettos of Eastern Europe;(1) and the unflinching wish to preserve their identity, all these elements have contributed to the formation of Zionism.

(1)Stein.- op cit p.11

### III. TERRITORIALISM.-

In speaking of Hertzl and his views on Palestine, we purposely omitted to mention the Ouganda offer, which we will deal with presently.

To begin with, let us say a word of definition. Territorialism is the movement which aims at a Jewish national restoration, but which, for some reason or another, does not ask specifically for Palestine, but would do with any other territory. The movement has been called by some a non-Zion Zionism, but, as we are going to see, the word Zionism does not apply because the difference in the land infers a total difference in outlook.

The territorialist attitude is taken by some, not because of the difficulties which are in the way of re-settlement in Palestine, but because the land factor is disregarded by them as unimportant. Israel Zan gwill who was at the head of the movement went to the extent of opposing himself to Palestine. (Zinsker did so very definitely before he joined the "Chovevei Zion"). The reason given by him is the danger of revivifying a dead body. Zionism is reactionary, he says, and therefore dangerous. "Zionism takes its vision and ideal from the past; territorialism places them in the future. Territorialism moves along the lines of "creative evolution"... The past is for inspiration, not imitation, for continuation, not repetition. Even if Judaea

is reestablished in Palestine it can never be the old Judaea again, any more than Hebrew, if it becomes again the national language, can be restricted to the Biblical vocabulary. Aeroplanes must now fly through Hebrew literature as well as archangels."(i)

This was written in 1921. Had Zangwill witnessed the present state of Palestine, he could have hardly maintained his fear about "all who play with the past and revive the intellectually extinct."

It is backed by Zangwill's interpretation of the national solution that the Jewish Territorial Organisation was founded (I.T.O. The territory they sought came to be called Itoland.) The question took a practical importance when the British Government, at the instigation of Joseph Chamberlain, made the Zionist organisation the tentative offer of a territory in East Africa, project which came to be called "the Uganda offer"(1903). The majority of the members of the Congress were on principle opposed to it. A commission which was sent to examine the country returned with a discouraging report. So the project was ultimately rejected, and a report made in the Seventh Zionist Congress, recognising the good will of Great-Britain, but stating the inability of the Congress to accept anything which was not Palestine.

The refusal was considered as insane by numbers of

(i) The voice of Jerusalem.-New York 1921 p.271

onlookers, but a closer study of the matter will show that the Zionists were not wrong.

The importance of Palestine, and no other land, in moulding Jewish nationalism must, by no means, be disregarded, It is the memory of Palestine which linked the Jews together through all the countries of the Exile, it is the hope for its redemption that preserved Jewry in spite of all the disrupting forces of the diaspora. The memory of Palestine was spiritualised, since the people who longed for its revival never saw it in their life. "The fact is that the link between the Jew and Palestine is a national link in the most absolute sense, writes Leon Simon, in the sense of being entirely independent of any sort of personal connection. The individual Jew may live his life outside Palestine,... but deep down in the roots of his being, bound up with the very sense of his Jewishness, there is the conviction that until the return takes place, his nation is in exile, because, however satisfactorily he and millions of other Jews may adjust themselves to their different environments, the life of his nation cannot be properly lived except in Palestine." (1)

It is perfectly true that the memory of the old

(1) Studies of Jewish nationalism.- op cit p.101

national life in Palestine has been an essential part of the tradition that preserved Jewish identity. Moreover, it is because of Palestine that we are entitled to speak of a Jewish people at all. "The territory is determined by history. To restore Jewish national life means to reconnect the Jews with the "Land of Israel".

The importance of Palestine to the Jew could be stressed by a comparison between Jewish and Roman nationalisms for instance. The Roman could export his nationalism wherever his conquests led him. It was quite independent of the Roman soil. The Jew could live a full national life only in Palestine, since the concept of the Land of Israel was the main element of his national consciousness. "In the light of what has been said, it will be clear that the modern Jewish aspiration for a return to Palestine is not simply, is not fundamentally, a desire to change political conditions for the benefit of a particular nation. It is first and foremost a natural expression of his Judaism on the part of the modern Jew."(1)

Let us not forget the part played by Palestine for all the religious Jews, by the way. The words of the prophet remain true : " How shall we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land ?" And in the words Blanche Dugdale, what we want is Eretz-Israel, not ersatz-Israel.

(1) Leon Simon.- op vit p.105



In fact, as all Jewish life is going to be reorganised, as one country is going to give the tone to all departments of national life, it appears clearly that no country in the world can claim to be regarded as exhibiting the norm of Jewish life except the "Land of Israel". "The moral authority implied in such a claim, and of course only moral authority is in question, could never be acquired except by a type of Jewish life developed under favourable conditions in the one spot on the globe which history has made unique and sacred for all Jews as such." (i)

After having been surprised at the refusal of Uganda, Lord Balfour himself was convinced of the wisdom of the step taken. "The scheme was certainly well-intentioned, he writes in the introduction to N.Sokolov's "History of Zionism", and I think, <sup>had</sup> many merits. But it had one serious defect. It was not Zionism. It attempted to find a home for men of Jewish religion and Jewish race in a region far removed from the country where that race was nurtured and that religion came into being. Conversations I held with Dr Weizman in January 1906, convinced me that history could not thus be ignored and that if a home was to be found for the Jewish people, homeless now for nearly nineteen hundred years, it was vain to seek it anywhere but in Palestine." (ii)

(i) Simon. The Elements of Zionism.- London 1934 p.30

(ii) History of Zionism.- op cit p.XXIX

Some attempts were made, after the failure of the Uganda offer, to settle the Jews in Argentine, San-Domingo, Madagascar, British Guiana. All of the failed. The fact is, that independently of any sentimental argument, there is no suitable land available. Tropical or Arctic regions are hardly to be seriously considered.

On the other hand, the spiritual effect of such a settlement would be almost valueless. The constant efforts of the I.T.O. have succeeded in settling some thirty thousand Jews in Argentine and Brazil. That is very good. But the achievements have been far from impressing the Jewish world. The American settlers may be happy where they live but they have by no means influenced Jewish life in the Diaspora, they have not set a norm of life to be regarded as an ideal by Jews all over the world. As Leonard Stein puts it very wittily, no one has ever suggested that "from Mauricio shall go forth the Law and the Word of the Lord from Entre-Rios."

Experience has therefore shown in Argentine, in Crimea, in Bifobidjian, that even favourable geographic conditions could not allow Jewish settlement to develop where the national idea was missing. Territorialism has indeed shown, as well as Reform Judaism, that a Jewish life regardless of the basic national elements of Ju-

daism, was impossible to live. "An inspiration of high intensity is needed to transform a long-urbanised people into agricultural workers, says Prof. Namier. The rebirth of the Jewish people is bound up with Palestine." (i)

And Israel Zangwill wrote, in spite of his Territorialistic convictions. "The yearning of the Jewish soul to which Yehuda Halevy gave such touching expression is an emotion of no small spiritual potency." (ii)

Territorialism and neo-territorialism have failed because they refused to see the Jewish problem in its true "Jewish" light. They saw it as a national problem, as any other national problem, but not particularly connected with the Holy Land of Jewish prayers. By now, it has been learnt, in the words of the Rev. de Sola Pool, that: "Whether we look at the physical national history of the Jews with its unbroken attachment to the Land of the Fathers, or whether we look to the spiritual history of the Jew expressed in Judaism with its thousand-fold roots in, and fruits from, the soil of Palestine stands revealed as the background of the Torah, the matrix of the Jewish spirit, the home of the Jewish people, the central fact and symbol of our Jewish unity." (iii)

(i) The Manchester Guardian. Nov 26 1943

(ii) The voice of Jerusalem. - op cit p. 288

(iii) Rev. de Sola Pool quoted by Paul Goddman. The Jewish National Home - London 1942 - p. 144

### III. SPIRITUAL JUSTIFICATION OF ZIONISM.

We have so far studied the origin and growth of the Zionist movement, and the various aspects it took during its evolution. We have shown, as we went on, the interpretations proper to every one of the Zionist leaders, and the specific aims every one of them sought to attain for the Jewish people, through the Zionist channel. Before we close, we should however state the comprehensive aims sought by modern moderate Zionism.

To begin with, we will deal with the question often asked by sympathetic but ignorant onlookers: Why should you persist in your determination to lead a national life? Look what it cost you of sufferings in the past. If you can be happy without it, give it up.

As I said, statements of the kinds show, though well-meaning, a total ignorance of Jewish history, of Jewish nationalism, and of elementary dignity. Why should we live as a nation? Such a question, if asked to an Englishman, would shock him to a degree. With him, the question does not arise why should the English live as a nation. It follows from English history, from the Englishman's characteristics, from his belief in his value and mission as an Englishman. But whereas facts are evidences when dealing with other nations, they become doubtful pro-

positions when concerning the Jews. As says Zangwill, there is no reason whatsoever why "long live England" should be honourable and "Long live Judaea" aggressive. If the test of nationhood makes all nations equal in moral rights, so much the better. If the rights are proportional to services rendered, the Jews still have a claim. "If the aspirations of some of the nationalities that have arisen in our sight had any internal justification, need it be questioned, whether the Jews have a similar right? They take a larger part in the international civilization. They can show more services rendered to humanity; a greater past and history; a common and unmingled descent; an indestructible vitality; a steadfast faith; and an unexampled martyrology. No people has been so much sinned against by other nations. Is all that not enough to make it capable and worthy of a country?" (1)

This plea expressed by Pinsker is in itself as he said a symptom of degradation of Jewish standards; The fact that we find ourselves justifying our very right of existence "as Jews" is an insult for the Jewish people, and for humanity at large. In the twentieth-century, it should be a shame that the Jewish nation, the most ancient of all existing nations, should still have to plead for its right of existence. In the post-war world, the peoples will have to take such guarantees as will make ours a

(1) Pinsker, op. cit. p. 31.

better world. "Freedom of thought and of religion, freedom from want and from fear must be the first aim for all peoples after the war, writes Prof. Brodetsky, and for the Jews, freedom also to live." (1)

Assuming that this freedom to live is at last recognised, (in fact it has already been recognised, but recognition without the wholehearted will to enforce it in practice, remains unfortunately purely academic) what are the Jews going to do with it, what are their plans of restoration for the future?

The Zionist aims at national restoration are still as in Hertzl's time, twofold: The first of those aims is to found a land of refuge for those Jews who cannot live elsewhere, or would not be admitted to live elsewhere. This aim has become a matter of vital concern to-day. The Jews were persecuted at all times, and there has always existed the need of such a refuge. But other havens were available; the U.S.A. and South-America had their doors opened, and the majority of the immigrants rushed to the New world.

To-day, the persecutions are more pitiless and conducted on a larger scale than ever. And the doors of the New as well as of the Old Continent are hermetically closed, to boot. Where are all the Central European Jews

(1) In The Jewish national home. op. cit. p. 269

who will outlive the war to go? The crushing of the Nazi power will not coincide with the eradication of anti-semitism. Life in most of the presently occupied countries will still be impossible for the Jew. Palestine will be the only outlet possible for him. And when I say that it will be the only one, I do not refer either to spiritual or national longings, I say the only one because it is either Palestine, or the Nazi hell. There will be no other alternative. "It is no wonder that a certificate for Palestine is considered the highest boon in this part of the world. One in twenty, one in thirty, may get it, and it is the redemption of these people; it is tantamount to freedom, the opportunity to live and work, and that is why they watch with such intensity all that is going on here, and whether or not the doors of Palestine will remain open or will remain closed." (1)

A gross misconception of Zionism has made people believe that the return of all the Jewish people to Palestine was intended. This erroneous view is still widely spread among Jews, which proves once more how the Jewish problem and Zionism are misunderstood even by those who should know it best. The whole regathering of the people is not aimed at. Palestine should be a welcoming centre, first

(1) The Jewish People and Palestine. op. cit. p. 9.



for the Jews who are denied elementary human rights elsewhere, and secondly, for the Jews who feel that they will lead a happier, a more Jewish life there. However, this second category will have to be restrained, given the actual economic possibilities of Palestine (the assumption being made that the political difficulties will have been made away with.) The Jews who are not Zionist because of the fear of being severed from their actual mother lands can stop worrying. They will never be asked to pack up and go to Palestine, if that is not their own wish. The probabilities are, on the contrary, that immigration certificates will be refused to those for whom it will not be absolutely indispensable, at least in the first phase of reorganisation.

I am perfectly convinced that a great part of the Jews who are anti-Zionists are so because of their misunderstanding of Zionism, or more justly, because of their ignorance of it. Let the Jew understand the real aims of Zionism, let him grasp that Zionism will not do him harm, but on the contrary, that it will help him to live a happier life wherever he is, let him appreciate the duty it will accomplish towards the most unhappy sections of world Jewry, and I doubt very much if he will remain indifferent, or opposed to it. (Of the situation of the Jews in the diaspora as a result of Zionism, we will speak a little later.)

The second fundamental aim of Zionism is to normalise the life of the Jews in the various countries in which they are settled, and by so doing, to contribute to a solution of the Jewish problem. This aim is not less important than the first, on the contrary, it is more significant because it will lead to far-reaching and durable consequences in the Jewish world.

Here we come to the most important part of our essay, namely, the contribution of Zionism to the solution of the Jewish problem. We have analysed the Jewish problem as being that of a homeless nation, with a minority status everywhere, that of a civilisation deprived of a spiritual center, that of a nation which is living, and yet whose most important attributes are dead; finally, that of a people who has acquired through an age-long segregation, certain characteristics which make of it an abnormal body among the other nations. Zionism, by the Jewish restoration in Palestine, proposes to deal with every one of those issues. In so far as it will succeed in normalising the life of the Jews abroad, in so far as it will make Jewish life a healthy, complete national life, it will have contributed to the solution of the Jewish problem.

"Normality must be our aim, says Prof. Namier, to be no longer either prodigies or outcasts, or both. Jews with a national consciousness and purpose must be given an honest chance to build on the foundations which

they have laid in Palestine: a Jewish National state must arise there once more (and then, after we have ceased to be a "peculiar people", even the position of those who remain in the Dispersion will become more normal.) There must be a country where Jews can live, work, and amuse themselves as they please; be good, bad, great, or ridiculous: but like all nations among themselves, not under the eyes of strangers... If, having concluded the Great Journey, we shall become altogether humdrum and mediocre, that, too, will be our own affair: but our children will have a better life - and this suffices." (1)

How is this "norm" to be attained? First of all, the Jews will possess a territory of their own. This is the indispensable basis of national restoration. Speaking to the Italian people, Mazzini said: "Without country, you have neither name, token, voice, nor rights, no admission as brothers into the fellowship of the Peoples. You are the bastards of Humanity. Soldiers without a banner, Israelitees among the nations, you will find neither faith nor protection; none will be sureties for you."(11) When the Jews will enjoy the possession of a free, national territory, they will regain the first important attribute which they missed throughout nineteen whole centuries. With it, they will enjoy a healthy internal political life, and normal international relationships with the other states

(1) The Jews. op. cit. p. 12

(11) quoted by Kallen. op. cit. p. 47

On the other hand, the restored motherland will be the Jewish spiritual centre. Jewish culture has for such a long time been mixed with foreign cultures, that it will be necessary for the Jews to regain the spirit of their own culture. Judaism has still a spiritual contribution to make to Jewish life. When it is cast aside, it means the loss of culture of profound significance. And though the national home will contain only a small fraction of the people, that fraction will be sacred for the whole people, and will give birth to such spiritual achievements as will characterize Jewish culture, as a whole. The Jews of the Diaspora will see in it the free development of the true Jewish spirit, when it lives its own life, unrestrained by outside restrictions.

The spiritual influence of Palestine must be such as to counteract the powers of destruction in the outside world, to increase the resistance of the Jewish people to such a point that it can escape annihilation. The spiritual revival will strengthen the allegiances of the Jew to his culture, and to his nation, and will contribute therefore to emancipate him in the Jewish sense, to make him a Jew conscious of his Jewishness, and if not overproud of it, then conscious of its inherent value.

All the aspects of the situation can be reduced to the idea of auto-emancipation: The regeneration of

Jewish life will make the diaspora Jew more self-conscious and therefore less susceptible to the attacks of anti-semitism. It will restore self-respect to the Jewish people, and will bring the Jewish nation into the respect of the other nations of the world. The Jews will lose the characteristic of a "ghost people" and will acquire an intelligible position in the world. On the other hand, the regeneration of social and economic life which is intended as well, will take away from the anti-semites their most important weapons. They will not be able to say any more: The Jew is a middleman; the Jew is a parasite; for they will see him as a farmer, an agricultural worker, a mason, an industrial producer, and in fact, accomplishing all the duties of an active and intelligent man of the world.

The Jew will not be in a perpetual state of inferiority "vis-a-vis" his fellow-men. He will enjoy all the advantages they enjoy, and perform all the duties they perform. Jewish life will be reformed, and will present the characteristic of a healthy, emancipated, comprehensive Jewish national life. This indispensable reform is possible only through Zionism. No other circumstances could provide the means of rejudaising and normalising the life of the Jews.

A word should be said here about the encouragement of Nationalism in an era when the idea of International-

alism, is, if not prevalent, yet making headway. Is the strengthening of Jewish nationalism contrary to the new trend of thought? Not at all. On the contrary nationality is the prerequisite of internationalism. It is really "the necessary stepping-stone between the individual and that humanity which is so dear to cosmopolitans. The problems of the world at large are too vast and too vague to enable the individual to translate his desires concerning them into concrete action. The nationality is an entity which the individual understands and whose problems he can cope with. (1)

On the other hand, if a liberal change is brought about in the world, it will be towards Internationalism and not cosmopolitanism, I mean, towards the establishment of more friendliness in the relationships of the different nations one to the other. The strengthening of nationalism will not harm that state of things, on the contrary it will lead to a true understanding of Inter-Nationalism. Anyway, Internationalism and the display of international good will will never be brought about if there are still unsatisfied sentiments of nationality. Once nations are granted freedom of life and development as such, then it will be possible to foster the coordination of those elements which make for international good will and understanding.

(1) Dr. Joseph. *op. cit.* p. 337



We will deal with the advantages of nationality relating to civilization and culture in a later chapter. About the scrupuls Zionists could have of fostering a nationalistic movement, we have seen that those are unfounded apprehensions. We will conclude with a quotation from Prof. Zimmern's book on "Nationality and government". Prof. Zimmern writes:

"Only those who have seen at close quarters what a moral degradation the loss of nationality involves or sampled the drab cosmopolitanism of Levantine ports or American industrial centres can realize what a vast reservoir of spiritual power is lying ready, in the form of national feelings, to the hands of teachers and statesmen. To seek to ignore or stamp out this force is to promote spiritual impoverishment.....  
Nationality is the one social force capable of maintaining for these people (the immigrant proletariat of the U.S.A.) their links with the past and keeping alive in them irreplaceable sentiment of self-respect which is indispensable. (1)  
And we will add: It is through the restoration of their national life that the Jews will be able to remake the synthesis of religion a nationality, the only synthesis which can lead to the "really Jewish" life. In the light of this statement, one is bound to realize that nothing

(1) quoted by Dr. Joseph. op. cit. p. 369



else than Palestine will ever count for the Jewish people. Many propositions have been made to the Jews during the last 50 years, but, as Blanche Dugdale (Lord Balfour's niece) writes, and we will end with her quotation: "All these suggestions arise from pity and compassion, and there is as much difference between that and the real feeling which we want to inspire towards Zionism and towards the Jewish problem, as there is between Eretz Israel and ersatz Israel. Jews are being offered ersatz Israels all over the world, and the whole aim of every Zionist should be to explain to well-meaning, but ill-informed, friends that there is no possibility of an ersatz Israel until Eretz Israel is allowed to develop naturally, as was intended when the Balfour declaration was signed."(1)

"Whereas recognition has there by been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country;"

The Mandate for Palestine)  
(Preamble)

#### CHAPTER SEVEN

#### ZIONISM INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNISED.

When Oliver Cromwell readmitted the Jews in

(1) quoted by Goodman op. cit. p. 10

England in 1655, he was inaugurating a new line of British policy, that of anglo-Jewish friendship. It is argued by certain historians that one of the reasons that led Cromwell to allow the entry of the Jews in England was the belief that the dispersion had to be complete before the Jewish people could come back to its national home.

The Jews came back to England in the seventeenth century, and sympathy towards them was not long in manifesting itself. Through English literature, evangelical sermons, and statements made by well known statesmen, the connection of the Jewish people with Palestine was emphasized, the idea of a possible return propagated. Macaulay was very keen on granting at last justice to the Jewish people. "In the infancy of civilization, he said, when our island was as savage as New Guinea, when letters and arts were still unknown to Athens, when scarcely a thatched hut stood on what was afterwards the site of Rome, this contemned people had their fenced cities and cedar palaces, their splendid Temple, their fleets of merchant ships, their schools of sacred learning, their great statesmen and soldiers, their natural philosophers, their historians and their poets. What nation ever contended more manfully against overwhelming odds for its independence and religion? What nation ever, in its last agonies, gave such signal proofs of what may be accomplished by a brave despair?...Let us do justice to them."(1)

(1) quoted by Mathews op. cit. p.86

And Byron wrote:

"Tribes of the wandering foot and weary breast,  
How shall ye flee away and be at rest?  
The wild dove hath her nest, the fox his cave,  
Mankind their country - Israel but the grave." (i)

We have already spoken of Lord Shaftesbury, and Laurence Oliphant. We have alluded to the strong pro-Zionist feeling created by George Eliot. Indeed, up to the twentieth century, Englishmen of prominent rank whether in the cultural or the political field, have toyed with the idea of resettling the Jews in their ancient country. It is this traditional sympathy of the English toward the homeless Jewish people that was partly responsible of the framing of that all-important document that came to be the Balfour Declaration. As General Smuts said: "The Balfour Declaration was not a mere accident, but in its large historic setting and its solemn form is one of the greatest acts of history. It still stands on rock foundations, and the structure that will arise from it will be greater than the declaration itself."(ii)

#### I. THE BALFOUR DECLARATION.

As we have just attempted to illustrate, the Balfour Declaration did not come as an isolated, illogical event in Anglo-Jewish relationship. It was, on the contrary the advanced phase of an evolution which went as far back

(i) quoted by Mc Call. op.cit. p. 68

(ii) quoted by Goodman op.cit. p. 34

as 1655. We do not infer that this was the only cause of the Declaration. We will deal presently with the other causes. What we want, however, to stress, is the tradition of sympathy with Zionist views that existed in England long before 1917.

On the other hand, a very definite pro-British sympathy is to be noted on the Jewish side, since 1897, at least, as far as Zionism is concerned. Hertzl clearly foresaw the role that England would play when the "Sick Man of Europe" would finally die, and he adopted, even since the formation of the Zionist organisation, a definitely pro-British policy. "From the first moment I entered the Movement, he said, my eyes were directed towards England, because I saw that by reason of the general situation of things there was the Archimedean point where the lever could be applied." And later: "England, mighty England, free England, with its world-embracing outlook, will understand us and our aspirations. With England as a starting point we may be sure that the Zionist idea will soar further and higher than ever before." (i)

This reciprocated friendship grew to the extent that in 1917 "Zionist aspirations found almost unanimous approval in both Houses of Parliament, not only among the the leaders but among the rank and file. There were Zionist protagonists equally among Conservatives and (i) quoted by D Goodman op. cit. p. 13.

Liberals, and British Labour (like the Labour International) was in full sympathy with the Zionist implications in the possible solution of the Jewish question." (1)

On the other hand, the report of an incident which occurred in the life of the Jewish community will, contrary to prevalent views, prove the strong Zionist feelings of the majority. In 1916, the English Zionist Federation published an "Outline of programme for a new administration of Palestine and for a Jewish resettlement of Palestine in accordance with the aspirations of the Zionist movement." Against this policy, a section of the Jewish population was grouped in the "Anglo-Jewish Association", and the "Conjoint Foreign Committee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews." In May 1917, a letter strongly opposing Zionist views was published in the Times by the presidents of the two associations. The poor impression caused by that letter was so violent, the immediate revolt of the Zionists so widely felt, that the members of the two associations publicly and emphatically disavowed their directors, and adopted a new policy more harmonious with that of the Zionists. "In spite of the prestige formerly enjoyed by the leaders of the Board of Deputies the Anglo-Jewish community had now manifested overwhelmingly and beyond any further doubt, that it stood behind the Zionist demand for the establishment of a Jewish

(1) P. Goodman op. cit. p. 14.

home in Palestine." (1)

Meanwhile, Dr. Chaim Weizman, the official representative of the Zionist organisation, had, through the intermediary of G. P. Scott, the editor of the Manchester Guardian, met Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Herbert Samuel and Lord Balfour, and had a talk with them about the Jewish situation and Zionist aims. But Mr. Asquith, when sounded by Mr. Samuel about the government's attitude to the matter, was indifferent. It was not before 1917, when the military situation went badly for the Allies that the Jewish case found indirectly a hearing before the Authorities.

It was believed in London that the rallying of the American Jews to the Allies' cause could have a decisive effect on the attitude of the U.S.A. towards the world conflict, and at least on the American trade with Germany. To win that sympathy, the government was ready to recognise Zionist aspirations, widely popular among American Jewry, and back them with an official pledge. The practical aims of the policy were clearly stated by Lloyd George: "The Zionist leaders gave us a definite promise that, if the Allies committed themselves to giving facilities for the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine, they would do their best to rally Jewish sentiment and support throughout the world to the Allied cause. They kept their word." (ii)

(1) D; Goodman op.cit. p. 24

(ii) quoted by Goodman op. cit. p. 32

Another factor which contributed very much to the recognition of Zionist aspirations was the personal participation of Dr. Weizman to the British war effort. His discoveries about the manufacture of acetone, that he placed at the disposal of the British Government, made the Prime Minister say that "he felt a debt of gratitude, and so did the Allies, to the brilliant scientific genius of Dr. Weizman." (1)

Finally, let us remember the names of some prominent British Jews who individually contributed to the bettering of Anglo-Jewish relationships. I refer to The Rotschild family, Lord Herbert Samuel, the late Lord Reading, Sir Alfred Mond, and Dr. Hertz. With the sympathies of statesmen like David Lloyd George, Arthur James Balfour, Lord Robert Cecil, and Lord Milner (all of them in the war cabinet), on the other hand, the Balfour Declaration took actual shape.

On the 2nd of November, 1917 the Minister of Foreign Affairs, A.J. Balfour, sent the following letter to Lord Rotschild, which came to be called the Balfour Declaration:

Dear Lord Rotschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following

(1) quoted by Goodman op.cit. p. 24

The Help of the Jews in Turkey is considered as another factor taken in consideration by the framers of the declaration



declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet:

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

It took weeks before the final draft of the Declaration was adopted, which means that every word of it was weighed carefully before being definitely written. Nevertheless, endless controversies have been engaged since the declaration was formulated, about its meaning and scope. Before going any further in the study of other international documents concerning the Zionist case, let us stop therefore and ascertain the meaning of this first and fundamental document.

Most of the discussions have of course been around the significance of "national home", what it inferred, and what it excluded. Mr. Churchill, in 1922, in a statement made about the official interpretation of the Declaration, wrote: "When it is asked what is meant by the development of the J.N.H. in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but

the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a J N H in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognized to rest upon ancient historic connection." (i)

The Royal Commission, sent in Palestine in 1937 to report to the British Government on the situation, in an elaborate study of the Balfour Declaration, quoted Mr. Churchill's above-mentioned statement of policy, and adds: "The definition of the N H has sometimes been taken to preclude the establishment of a Jewish state. But, though the phraseology was clearly intended to conciliate as far as might be, Arab antagonism to the N H, there is nothing in it to prohibit the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State, and Mr. Churchill himself has told us in evidence that no such prohibition was intended." (ii)

(i) quoted by Goodman *op.cit.* p. 36

(ii) The Royal Commission Report. London 1937, p. 33

And further, the Royal Commission writes:

"Thus His Majesty's Government evidently realized that a Jewish state might in course of time be established, but it was not in a position to say that this would happen still less to bring it about of its own motion. The Zionist leaders, for their part, recognised that an ultimate Jewish State was not precluded by the terms of the Declaration, and so it was understood elsewhere..... General Smuts, who had been a member of the Imperial War Cabinet when the Declaration was published,.... Lord Robert Cecil in 1917, Sir Herbert Samuel in 1919, and Mr. Churchill in 1920 spoke or wrote in terms that could only mean that they contemplated the eventual establishment of a Jewish state. Leading British newspapers were equally explicit in their comments on the Declaration."(1)

It is interesting to note, by the way, that the term "national home" was used by the Zionist themselves before the Balfour Declaration. At a meeting of the English Zionist Federation, in May 1917 a motion was passed in favour of "a Jewish N H" in Palestine. This information is edifying for those who later attempted to identify the home with a status of permanent minority. Since that was what the Zionist themselves demanded, it could never be a minority status.

(1) quoted by Guggenheimer, op. cit. p. 2

(1) The Royal Commission Report, London 1937, p. 25.

No statement could give more light to the meaning of the "national home" than Lord Balfour's own interpretation. In his Introduction to Sokolov's "History of Zionism" he says that the assimilation of "The national and international status of the Jews to that of other races... would be promoted by giving them that which all other nations possess: a local habitation and a national home." (i) In other words, a "national home" is "that which all other nations possess."

The British were not alone in interpreting the Balfour Declaration as they did. The U.S.A. did the same. The Arabs themselves understood very well the range of the Declaration. "The Times" of 12th December, 1918, a year after the declaration, published the following statement made by the Emir Feysal: "The two main branches of the Semitic family, Arabs and Jews, understand one another, and I hope that as a result of interchange of ideas at the Peace conference, which will be guided by ideals of self-determination and nationality each nation will make definite progress towards the realisation of its aspirations. Arabs are not jealous of Zionist Jews, and intend to give them fair play.." (ii)

I do not say here that The Emir Feysal was the mouthpiece of the Arab people, or that his declaration

(i) Sokolove. op. cit. p. 33

(ii) quoted by Ben-Gurion. "The Pal; post 29th May, 1939.

bound all the Arabs. All what I want to illustrate is that the Arab leaders understood very well the meaning of the Balfour declaration, and the implications of the "national home". What was the Arab response to the Declaration, we will see in the next chapter.

Now, some objections are raised to the Balfour Declaration, on the ground that it was a hasty step, and that it did not take ~~in~~ enough in consideration either the Arab or the Jewish situations. The challenge that Balfour ignored the existence of Arabs in Palestine is answered by Mrs. B. Dugdage, Lord Balfour's niece and secretary in her uncle's biography: "But he did not urge the establishment of the N H in Palestine irrespective of British policy in the Middle-East, she says or without considering the difficulties and risks of large scale Jewish immigration into the midst of an established Arab population. In Balfour's opinion the type of Jew likely to be attracted by the agricultural life of the Zionist settlements was also likely to be an element that would help to rescue Palestine from the desolation bequeathed by Ottoman rule. For some time after the Declaration he was never called upon to express an opinion about the Arab attitude, for the simple reason that no hostility had been evinced by Sherif Hussein of Mecca and his sons." (1)

(1) The Manchester Guardian 3rd May, 1936.

The second argument used against the Balfour Declaration is that it did not consider seriously enough the prejudice to be caused to "the civil and religious rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." The Cabinet took in consideration the opposition of a section of British Jewry whose mouthpiece was Edwin Montagu, and the final draft of the declaration was purposely delayed until this particular matter had been thoroughly studied. On the other hand, it was the opinion of the British cabinet that the declaration would not harm the Jews who would stay outside Palestine. Lord Balfour expressed his colleagues' opinion when he said: "There is no doubt that many of this class look with a certain measure of suspicion and even dislike upon the Zionist movement. They fear that it will adversely affect their position in the country of their adoption.....I cannot share these fears. I do not deny that, in some countries where legal equality is firmly established, Jews may still be regarded with a certain measure of prejudice. But this prejudice, where it exists, is not due to Zionism, nor will Zionism embitter it. The tendency should surely be the other way."

We will discuss later the position of the Jews outside Palestine, but let it be granted, for the sake of the present argument, that the British cabinet took equally in consideration the position of those Jews, as well as that of the Arabs of Palestine;

What was the response of British Jewry to the Balfour Declaration? That of a re-union of the former opponents. "The best indication, writes Janus Cohen, that Zionist efforts bore ample fruit was to be found in the fundamental change of view since the Balfour Declaration towards the establishment of the J N H adopted by the Anglo-Jewish communal leaders, both collectively and individually." (i) There remained perhaps a handful of Jews who still rejected the declaration. British Jewry, on the whole, had shown gladness, and intense gratitude. As to world Jewry, it welcomed the declaration with boundless enthusiasm. In Russia, in America, in Palestine, even in the enemy countries, the Jews heralded the new era with cheers. "It would require a volume, says J. Hodess, to reproduce a bare record of the rejoicings, demonstrations processions, triumphant choruses of synagogal thanksgivings, blessings, and hymns of praise for Great Britain throughout the world....It would however hardly communicate the inward inarticulate emotions, or reproduce the profound religious and mystical moods the document had created in Jewry. An agonised, martyred people was aroused...the captive loosed himself from the bands of bondage." (ii)

The declaration had been approved by President Wilson before it had been issued. It was endorsed by France and Italy in 1918. Even the Vatican gave its

(i) The Jewish national home. op. cit. p. 103

(ii) Ibid. p. 99



consent. Let us remember, by the way, the memorable answer made by Pope Benedict XV to Mr. Sokolov in 1917: "We shall be good neighbours."

In 1920, the Balfour Declaration was incorporated in the treaty of San Remo. In 1922, it was embodied in the League of Nations' Mandate for Palestine.

Before we deal with the mandate and the mandatory policy in Palestine, let us deal with legal objections raised as to the validity of the Balfour declaration. The first objection is that the Balfour Declaration was dictated by military necessity and had therefore no legal value. To that we will answer by a single question: What is then the value of the Mac Mahon pledge, and why has it been given such an importance, if commitments dictated by military necessities have no binding values?

The second and more serious objection is the following: Any international agreement inconsistent with a previous pledge is considered as null and void. The Balfour Declaration is inconsistent with the Mac Mahon Pledge. It is therefore invalid. We are going to deal with that issue presently.

## II. THE MAC MAHON PLEDGE.

Ever since the Mac Mahon pledge was made, controversies have taken place about its range and real meaning, and more especially about the inclusion or

exclusion of Palestine from the pledge. The debates took such an importance that the Zionist leaders were often told in political "milieux": Your case is very good. But if you could prove indeniably that Palestine was excluded from the pledge Mac Mahon took to the Sherif of Mecca, how stronger it would be! The Zionists spent endless efforts in order to prove that, so did the British Government. But public opinion was not unanimous about it, until finally, the British Government published all the letters exchanged between the Sherif of Mecca and Sir Henry Mac Mahon. Now a conclusive and reliable refutation can at last be established.

For the sake of better understanding, we will reproduce here part of the letter which gave birth to the whole debate. As it is well-known, the British authorities thought in 1915 that Arab help could be valuable in hastening the fall of Turkey and the end of its rule in the Middle-East. Negotiations were therefore gone into with the Sherif of Mecca, in order to reach an acceptable agreement. Sir Henry MacMahon was acting on behalf of the British Government. The Sherif proposed Arab cooperation in return for the independence of the Arab countries limited "On the north, by the line Persia-Adana to parallel 37° N. and thence along the line Birejik Urfa-Mardin-Midiat-Jazirat-Ahmadia to the Persian frontier;

on the east, by the Persian frontier down to the Persian Gulf; on the south, by the Indian ocean (with the exclusion of Aden whose status will remain as at present); on the west by the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea back to Mersin." (1)

After delays and lengthy negotiations, Sir Henry McMahon answered in a letter dated October 24, 1915 from which we extract the following/

"It gives me the greatest pleasure to convey to you, on their behalf (The Government of Great Britain) the following declarations which, I have no doubt, you will receive with satisfaction and acceptance.

The districts of Mersin and Alexandretta, and portions of Syria lying to the west of the districts of Damascus, Homs, Hama, and Aleppo, cannot be said to be purely Arab, and must on that account be excepted from the proposed delimitation.

Subject to that modification, and without prejudice to the treaties concluded between us and certain Arab chiefs, we accept that delimitation". (11)

The Sherif protested against the exclusion of "the portions of Syria lying to the west of the districts of Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo. McMahon wrote back in maintaining the exclusion. And in his last letter, he once again confirmed that, "in the event of France maintaining her claims, Great Britain could not hold out any guarantee that those portions of Syria which had been excepted from the Arab area in the note of the 24th of

- (1) Hussein's first note to McMahon - quoted by Antonius. The Arab Awakening - London 1938. p. 414  
 (11) McMahon's 2nd note to the Sherif. Ibid P; 419

October, 1915, would be included in the territories in which she had pledged herself to recognise and uphold Arab independence" (i) The whole point for us is therefore to find out if Palestine was included in the "territories in which England had pledged herself to recognise and uphold Arab independence", or not. †

As stated by the Report of the Palestine Royal Commission, "the British Government have never accepted the Arab case", namely, the inclusion of Palestine in McMahon's pledge. In 1922, Mr; Churchill, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, stated the official interpretation of the McMahon document. He said: "The letter is quoted as conveying the promise to the Sherif of Mecca to recognise and support the independence of the Arabs within the territories proposed by him. But this promise was given subject to a reservation made in the same letter which excluded from its scope among other territories the portions of Syria lying to the west of the district of Damascus. This reservation has always been regarded by His Majesty's Government as covering the vilayet of Beirut and the independent Sanjak of Jerusalem. The whole of Palestine west of the Jordan was thus excluded from Sir H. McMahon's pledge."(ii)

Again in 1923, the Duke of Devonshire, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, made a similar

(i) Antonius. op.cit. p. 175

(ii) The White Paper of 1922 quoted by Goodman, op.cit.p.tt

statement." I have not been content merely to accept those statements as they appeared, he said, but since I have been at the Colonial Office, I have, to the best of my ability and power, most carefully investigated the subject for myself, and I certainly see no reason,... to dissent from the interpretation which the late Government has placed upon the promises. Whether they were expressed in the best terms or not, it is perhaps not for me to say, but undoubtedly there never was any intention, when the pledge was given, to recognise the independence of the Arabs so as to include Palestine. I think that is perfectly clear, and in my own mind I am certain of it. Although the terms may not have been expressed in the clearest possible language, I think it was the intention of both Sir H. McMahon and the government at the time, when those pledges were given, that Palestine should not be included." (1)

On the other hand, as soon as the agreement with the Sherif was finally settled, the British Government began to negotiate the Anglo-French agreement, the one which came to be called the Sykes-Picot convention. In that convention, Palestine was to remain under international control. Great Britain could not, in good faith, however vague and diplomatic her commitments with the Sherif had been, promise him Palestine on the one hand, and immediately after agree to put it under international control. So

(1) Documents relating to the McMahon letters London 1939  
p.15

pleaded Mr. Churchill: "His Majesty's Government have always regarded Palestine as excluded by these promises from the scope of their undertaking. This is clear from the fact, to which the Hon. Member refers, that in the following year they concluded an agreement with the French and Russian governments under which Palestine was to receive special treatment." (ii)

During the Anglo-French negotiations, France had asked for the supervision of a portion of Syria including Palestine. Great Britain had rejected the proposal, not on the ground that she had already promised it to the Sherif, but, as Mr. Antonius says himself, "for two main reasons: one was that she desired to have under her own control in the Haifa-Acre bay a port to serve as an outlet from Iraq to the Mediterranean; the other was that she did not relish the prospect of France or any other Great Power establishing herself in immediate proximity to the Suez Canal." (iii)

For the sceptics who would not be trustful enough in England's good faith during the negotiations, I would add that the presence of Sir Mark Sykes, a great friend of the Arabs, prevented the possibility of such a breach of faith. Had Palestine been included in the

- (i) H.L. Official Report, 1.3. 1923 quoted in "Documents relating to the McMahon letters London 1939, p. 15  
 (ii) Ibid.  
 (iii) Antonius op.cit. p. 246.

pledge given by Sir Henry McMahon, Sir Mark Sykes would have never signed the agreement which bears his name, and in which Palestine is to be under international control.

The Arab claim, as regards the McMahon pledge, is the following: On the one hand, Palestine was never mentioned in all the correspondence between the Sherif and the English representative, and therefore it was not included in the disputed area. On the second hand, when setting the boundaries of the Arab territories to be liberated, the Sherif mentioned "on the west, the Red Sea and the Mediterranean sea back to Mersin." In answering his letter, Sir Henry McMahon put certain limitations, but did not explicitly reject the suggestion of this boundary. For that reason, the Arabs believed Palestine to be included in the future free Arab territory.

Both claims are easily refutable. On the one hand the fact that Palestine was not mentioned in the excluded area does by no means infer that it was not part of that area. The reader will remember that Palestine was part of Syria, and was seldom called by its own name before the drafting of the Mandate. Palestine could have perfectly been referred to as a "portion of Syria", and so it was in the McMahon pledge.

As to the second argument, the reader will certainly remember that McMahon accepted the Sherif's



boundaries, "subject to" the above-mentioned "modification."

Given that modification, it was not indispensable for McMahon to say that he rejected the western boundary. It was implied by the modification itself.

It would be a mistake to think that the British view was held only by the people who were interested in British interests. I think that a quotation from Lawrence would be very edifying about the matter. Lawrence was a great friend of the Arabs, a friend who meant their real well-being. The Arabs had no better advocate on the British side. And yet, here is what Lawrence, in the "Draft Preface of the "Seven pillars of wisdom," wrote: "The book dates itself to 1919, when powerful elements in the British Government were seeking to evade their war time obligations to the Arabs. That stage ended in March 1921, when Mr. Winston Churchill took charge of the Middle-East. He set honesty before expediency in order to fulfil our promises in the letter and in the spirit. He executed the whole McMahon undertaking for Palestine, for Transjordan, and for Arabia....."

"I do not wish to publish secret documents, nor to make long explanations: but must put on record my conviction that England is out of the Arab affair with clean hands. Some Arab advocates (the most vociferous joined our ranks after the Armistice) have rejected judgment on

this point. Like a tedious Pensioner I showed them my wounds (over sixty I have, each scar evidence of a pain incurred in Arab service) as proof I had worked sincerely on their side. They found me out-of-date."(i)

Elsewhere, he wrote: "Mr. Winston Churchill was entrusted by our harassed Cabinet with the settlement of the Middle East; and in a few weeks, at his conference in Cairo, he made straight all the tangle, finding solutions, fulfilling (I think) our promises in letter and spirit (where humanly possible) without sacrificing any interest of our Empire or any interest of the people concerned. So we were quit of the war-time Eastern adventure, with clean hands, but three years too late to earn the gratitude which peoples, if not states, can pay."(ii)

It is not here the place to discuss whether Great Britain did or did not keep the promises she made to the Sherif in McMahon's pledge. We can nevertheless say that all of them were not kept, at least not immediately. What interests us here is to see that Lawrence who had lived among the Arabs during the whole revolt, was convinced that Palestine was excluded from the pledge made to them. On the other hand, the writer has come across two documents which make it clear that the Arab leaders themselves understood the McMahon's pledge as the British did.

(i) The letters of T;E;Lawrence, Cop. 1938 p. 345  
 (ii) The Seven Pillars of Wisdom, New York 1938, p. 276

The first of them is a letter to "The Times" written by Colonel C.E. Vickery, in 1939. Colonel Vickery was sent to King Hussein in 1920, on behalf of the British Government in order to ascertain the contents of the letter sent to him by McMahon in 1915, in Arabic. Colonel Vickery says: "I read the letter through very slowly; it was not written in very scholarly Arabic and had no English translation in the margin, and it was quite evident that Palestine was not included in the proposals to the King. I can say most definitely that the whole of the King's demands were centred round Syria and only round Syria. Time after time he referred to that vineyard, to the exclusion of any other claim or interest. He stated most emphatically that he did not concern himself at all with Palestine and had no desire to have suzerainty over it for himself or his successors." (1)

The other document to which it was alluded is a statement of Mr; Winston Churchill before the House of Commons in 1922. The Secretary of state for the Colonies said: "So far as I am aware, the first suggestion that Palestine was included in the area within which His Majesty's Government promised to recognise and support the independence of the Arabs was made by the Emir Feysal, now King of Iraq, at a conversation held in the Foreign Office on the 20th of January, 1921 more than five years after (1) quoted in "Documents relating to the McMahon letters The seven pillars of wisdom, New York 1938, p. 18.

the conclusion of the correspondence on which the claim was based. On that occasion the point of view of His Majesty's Government was explained to the Emir, who expressed himself as prepared to accept the statement that it had been the intention of His Majesty's Government to exclude Palestine."(1)

Finally, let us say a word about a point in Mr. George Antonius' defence of the Arab interpretation. Mr. Antonius refers to the refusal of the British Government to publish the McMahon correspondence as a sign of the badness of the English case. He quotes a statement made by Sir Edward Grey, from which we extract the following: "A considerable number of these engagements, or some of them, which have not been officially made public by the Government, have become public through other sources. Whether all have become public I do not know, but I seriously suggest to the government that the best way of clearing our honour in this matter is officially to publish the whole of the engagements relating to the matter, which we entered into during the war..... I am sure that the most honourable course will be to let it be known what the engagements are, and if there is inconsistency, then to admit it frankly..."

I do not see what weight the quotation of Sir Edward Grey adds to the case. Sir Edward Grey asks simply

(1) "Documents relating to the McMahon letters. op.cit. p.15

for the publication of the McMahon correspondence. So did the Zionists. The fact that he asked for that publication does not necessarily imply that he thought the commitments to be inconsistent. Anyway, what can Sir Edward Grey's quotation, neutral as it is, mean before Sir Henry McMahon's own attestation? Together with the McMahon correspondence, a letter from McMahon to "The Times" (July 23, 1937) has been published. Given the vital importance of the letter, we will reproduce it entirely. It reads:

Sir, - Many references have been made in the Palestine Royal Commission Report and in the course of the recent debates in both Houses of Parliament to the "McMahon Pledge", especially to that portion of the pledge which concerns Palestine and of which one interpretation has been claimed by the Jews and another by the Arabs.

It has been suggested to me that continued silence on the part of the giver of that pledge may itself be misunderstood.

I feel therefore called upon to make some statement on the subject, but I will confine myself in doing so to the point now at issue- i.e. whether that portion of Syria now known as Palestine was or was not intended to be included in the territories in which the independence of the Arabs was guaranteed in my pledge.

I feel it my duty to state, and I do so definitely and emphatically, that it was not intended by me in giving this pledge to King Hussein to include Palestine in the area in which Arab independence was promised.

I also had every reason to believe at the time that the fact that Palestine was not included in my pledge was well understood by King Hussein." (i)

That letter confirms what all the documents we have quoted said, namely, that there is no truth whatever in the claim that Palestine was included in Sir Henry McMahon's pledge to the Sherif of Mecca.

This being duly proved, let us pass to the examination of the next document in which was embodied the recognition of Zionist aspirations, I mean, The mandate for Palestine.

### III. THE MANDATE FOR PALESTINE

When the Balfour Declaration was made, the Jews hailed it as the beginning of a new era. In fact, it was only a beginning. The declaration was strengthened and made an obligation under International Law in the Mandate for Palestine. The Mandate for Palestine was definitely ratified by the Council of the League of Nations on July 22, 1922. We are reproducing here below its more important clauses. The Preamble begins as follows:

"The council of the League of Nations:  
Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have agreed, for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to entrust to a Mandatory selected by the said Powers the administration of the territory of Palestine, which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire, within such boundaries as may be fixed by them; and  
Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the Mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on November 2nd, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said Powers, in favour of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and  
Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country..."

Of the 28 clauses which follow, here are the most important which concern the Jewish National Home and the rights of the non-Jewish population:



**Article 2**

The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race or religion.

**Article 3**

The Mandatory shall, so far as circumstance permit, encourage local autonomy.

**Article 4**

An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine.....

**Article 6**

The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.

Before we review the duties of the Mandatory

which follow from the above-mentioned clauses, let us examine the general character of the Mandate itself. To begin with, on what principles is the Mandate for Palestine based? First, there is the international recognition of the existing Jewish nationality. The mandate only confirms what previous declarations had already stated, namely, that the Jewish people is recognised to be a living nation, and is therefore entitled to all the rights and duties common to

other nations. The ratification of the Council of the League can be considered as that of the main powers represented in the League. And that is of profound significance. The fact that the Jews were finally recognised as forming a nation put an end to the tedious controversy which used to take place among Jews and Gentiles alike. Not that it gave to the Jews any added qualification for nationality, but it stated it in a conclusive way, and as legally as possible in a world of independent nations.

The second principle which lies at the basis of the mandate is the recognition of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine. This principle is not to be confused with that of historical rights. As says Stoyanovsky, in his study of the Palestinian man <sup>date</sup> much more is implied by "historical connection" in International law. The requisites of "historical connection" are more numerous, and therefore it is only seldom recognised that a certain people is "historically connected" with a given country.

Indeed, for a people to be recognised as historically connected with a certain country, the following conditions must be all fulfilled:

- 1) The nation which is recognised as having "historical connection with a given territory must have been at one time of its history in possession of that territory

2) It is essential that the people claiming the benefit of "historical connection" with a given territory should not have previously renounced it, either explicitly or tacitly."

This is an answer to the people who believe that the Uganda experience should have been tried. Had it failed, as expected by the majority of Zionist leaders the Jews could not have claimed Palestine, once again, at least not on a legal basis. It is the unfailing faithfulness of the Jewish people to Palestine during twenty centuries which allows us today to speak of "historical connection", it is this steadfastness which has provided the mandate with its legal basis.

3) The third condition is that the people which claims the benefit of "historical connection" shall not have lost its distinct national character.

4) The people claiming the benefit of "historical connection with a given territory shall not have acquired in the meantime any other national territory of its own." (the same implication as that of condition No. 2 follows)

5) Another essential condition is that such other rights and interests as may have been acquired in the meantime shall be safeguarded."

This condition differentiates "historical connection" from "historic rights" which do not take in consideration the rights of the population established on

the given territory in the absence of the people historically connected with it. When it is therefore argued that the mandate for Palestine is unfair because it takes in consideration the interests of one of the parties only, it is not true. The mandate is primarily based on the rights of the Jewish people in Palestine; but it takes equally in consideration those of the local population, which would have been disregarded had it been question of "historic rights" and not of "historical connection. Finally,

6) "In order to be valid, "historical connection" is to be internationally recognised. International recognition...does not create the connection, but implies an obligation on the part of its authors to abstain from interfering with such rights as may be involved."(1)

All the above-mentioned conditions having been fulfilled, the Jewish people has been recognised as "historically connected" with Palestine, in other words, the Jews have known that they are in Palestine in Mr; Churchill's words "of right, and not on sufferance."

It is here suitable to say a word of the concept of "national home" as applied in the mandate. It has been often said or hinted that the obligation of promoting a Jewish national Home, under the mandate, was a purely moral obligation. We do not wish to disclaim the ethical

(1) Stoyanovsky. - The mandate for Palestine. London 1928 p. 64 and following.

basis of the Palestinian mandate. In fact, nobody would dream disclaiming the ethical basis of any agreement which aim is to promote international understanding and security, for such a basis is to be found at the root of the League of Nations, and of International Law. But we wish to stress that the partly ethical origin of the Palestinian mandate, and therefore of the concept of "national home" used in it, does, in no way, deprive both of their legal character. "The principle laid down in all modern legal systems that,..."*le contrat fait la loi des parties*" cannot be questioned in international law any more than in municipal law....If it is admitted, as seems to be generally the case, that the Covenant of the League of Nations and the various mandates are international conventions in the legal sense of this term, there is not apparent reason why a certain part of one such convention, namely that part of the Palestine mandate affecting the Jewish national home, should be differently treated from the rest." (1)

This being asserted, we might ask ourselves/ What is the meaning of "national home" in the mandate for Palestine. The same as implied by the Balfour Declaration, will you say. No, "national home" as used in the mandate implies more than it was done at least explicitly by the Balfour Declaration. For the preamble reads: "Whereas

(1) Stoyanovsky. - op.cit. p. 70



recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting their national home", etc...

The term "reconstituting" was, as the other terms used in the drafting of the mandate, intentionally used, there can be little doubt about that. It follows necessarily from that sentence that the "national home" is to be similar to the one that existed in the past, i.e. when Palestine was an independent Jewish polity. Two things can therefore be inferred from that wording: Either the League of Nations purposely meant to go further than the Balfour Declaration; or the Balfour Declaration really meant more than it was believed to do.

In the light of this implication, it becomes clear that, as conceived by its drafters, the mandate was not an end in itself. It was of a transitional character, only a means to promote the further development of the Jewish community to be established in Palestine.

It has been implied by some students of the Palestinian mandate that the promotion of a "national Home" referred only to the establishment of a spiritual center for Jewry in Palestine. Were it so, we do not see why the Mandateory was entrusted to promote "such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home (article 2) nor

why it was necessary to recognise a "Jewish agency as a public body" (article 4), "to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine" (article 7), and to "facilitate Jewish immigration... and "close settlement by Jews on the land." (article 6).

The home was clearly intended to be a national home, that is, political as well as cultural.

The question has been raised of the consistency of the Palestinian mandate with article 22 of the Covenant of the League. Some politicians have argued that the Palestinian mandate aims at satisfying the needs of a people residing outside Palestine. If it has not done so at the expense of the people actually living in Palestine still the interests of that people were not the primary consideration of the League. The Palestinian mandate is therefore inconsistent with the corresponding provision of the Covenant. Such a view is due to a misunderstanding of the spirit of article 22. This article does not expressly reserve the mandates system for the people actually living in certain primitive conditions, but it says that the welfare of the people "who are not yet able to stand alone" forms "a sacred trust of civilization." The people thus alluded to in article 22 of the Covenant was of course the local population of Palestine. But, the Palestine Mandate differs from the other mandates in that



it is a combination of article 22 of the Covenant, the Balfour Declaration and the recognition of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine. In connection with the claim of inconsistency, the Peel Report reads as follows: "As to the claim, argued before us by Arab witnesses, that the Palestine mandate violates article 22 of the Covenant, ...we would point out" among other things, "that the acceptance by the Allied Powers and the United States of the policy of the Balfour Declaration made it clear from the beginning that Palestine would have to be treated differently from Syria and Iraq, and that this difference of treatment was confirmed by the Supreme Council in the Treaty of Sévres and by the Council of the League in sanctioning the Mandate." (1)

On the other hand, the provisions of the mandate were far from being exclusive. As Sir William Finlay wrote in the "Official Journal of the League of Nations", "The real point, and the only point, appears to me to be whether it can be said that the scheme contained in Article 2§ of the Palestine mandate-inaugurating the national home policy) is inconsistent with article 22 of the Covenant. I am clearly of the opinion that there is no such inconsistency. Article 22 of the Covenant does show that the general object is to secure the well-being and development of mandated territories. Article 2 of (1) Palestine Royal Commission Report, op.cit. p. 38

the mandate, of course, deals with a special scheme of immigration and settlement, viz, that of the Jewish people. But I see absolutely no inconsistency between the two."(1)

To put the matter frankly, one is bound to admit that the principle of self-determination was only partly granted to the Arab population of Palestine. That is a historical fact but it can be explained on the following grounds: On the one hand, the League of Nations, as the authorised representative of civilised humanity, had a definite if belated duty to fulfil towards the dispossessed Jewish people. On the other hand, the League had a duty towards the actual inhabitants of Palestine. But, given that those inhabitants did not form a nation by themselves, but formed only a part of the Arab nation, the duty towards them was not comparable to the one to be fulfilled towards the Jewish people. "This is asserted by the Permanent Mandates Commission. See quotation in following chapter, page ) True, the Arab population of Palestine could find the settlement unsatisfactory, though this did not follow necessarily. But that dissatisfaction was unavoidable if the League was to be consequent with its principles of justice towards the less powerful nations.

Finally, let us come to the duties of the Mandator towards the Jewish people and the Arab population of Palestine respectively. The mandate for Palestine has that

(1) quoted by Stoyanovsky.- op.cit. p. 44

in particular that it administrates provisionally a country on behalf of an absent people, it being understood once for all that the recipient of the Palestine mandate is not the Jewish population of Palestine, but the Jewish people, as a whole, whose connection with Palestine has been recognised.

This principle is amply illustrated by the respective duties of the mandatory towards the two parties. And when we say "duties", let it be understood that the provisions of the mandate are obligations for the mandatory and not discretionary recommendations to follow in its good will. The Mandatory is granted "full powers of legislation and of administration", true, but "save as they may be limited by the terms of this mandate"(article 1)

As follows from the policy of national home inferred by the terms of the mandate, the mandatory must:

1) Recognise an "appropriate Jewish agency...as a public body." That agency will have no administrative functions. But, it will be a representative body of the Jewish people, an intermediate between the Jewish people and the Mandatory.

It will be an advisory body to the mandatory on all questions relative to the national home, on the one hand, and to the general development of the country, on the other.

2) "Facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and...encourage in cooperation with the Jewish Agency

referred to in article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes." This clause has been recognised by the British government as "integral and indispensable... in the execution of the charge laid upon the Mandatory of establishing in Palestine a national home for the Jewish people." (1)

3) Introduce a land system appropriate to the needs of the country, having regard, among other things, to the desirability of promoting the close settlement and intensive cultivation of the land."

4) "Arrange with the Jewish Agency mentioned in article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and utilities, and to develop any of the natural resources of the country."

5) Finally, "facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine."

On the other hand, the duties of the mandatory towards the local population of Palestine are twofold:

1) The first is a negative obligation. The mandatory shall ensure that "nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." The same clause is repeated in article 6: "The administration...while ensuring that

(1) Cmd 1768 p. 4 quoted by Stoyanovsky op.cit. p.101

the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced,...."etc.

ii) The second duty is the following: "The mandatory.... shall ensure...to natives....a complete guarantee of their rights."

On the other hand, "the mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure... the development of self-governing institutions," and will "so far as circumstances permit, encourage local autonomy."

The reader will have noticed that, whereas the mandates for Iraq and Syria refer to the encouragement to be given by the administration in order to facilitate their progressive development into independent states, the mandate for Palestine definitely omits such a clause. The Arab population of Palestine will be granted a certain degree of "self-governing institutions", but no independence is foreseen. The term used in the Palestine draft was not a slip of the pen. It was meant to show that, though the mandatory would have to "safeguard the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine", and though the local population would be granted autonomy it was not the aim of the mandate that it should be politically independent. The safeguard of local interests, though binding, will not be the main purpose of the mandatory policy. For

to use the words of the Palestine Royal Commission Report, (1937) "unquestionably the primary purpose of the Mandate, as expressed in its preamble and its articles, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National home."<sup>(1)</sup>

In conclusion, as far as the Jewish National Home is concerned, Great Britain is endorsing an international duty in trying to promote it. When the Jews claim their rights in Palestine, it is, first, on the basis of the Balfour Declaration, but above all, on the basis of the Mandate for Palestine. For, whereas the Balfour Declaration is a pledge made to the Jewish people by the British Government, the Jewish National Home policy as embodied by the Mandate is an international obligation towards the Jews. All members of the League of Nations are therefore responsible for the enforcement of the Palestine Mandate and of the reconstitution of the National Home embodied therein. The responsibility of Great Britain, as appears from this conclusion, is twofold: 1) as a member of the League; and 2) as mandatory.

Let us see how she has performed this double-duty.

(1) Palestine Royal Commission Report, op.cit. p. 39.

#### IV. BRITISH MANDATORY POLICY

We do not intend here to review in detail the evolution of the policy of Great Britain during the twenty two years of her mandatory life. Such a comprehensive study would be outside the scope of the present study. It would suit an essay about the political status of Palestine, but not one about Zionism and the Jewish problem. We must remain somewhat outside the political atmosphere in order to be able to judge the situation. However, we cannot remain totally outside that atmosphere. We have therefore to examine British mandatory policy and its results if we intend to give our opinion about the mandate and the workability of the Jewish National Home policy as embodied in it.

We will give a very brief summary of the reports made by the British Governments concerning Palestine, up to 1937, and then we will review more in detail the Report of the Peel Commission(1937), and the White Paper(1939)because they affect more directly the present mandatory policy.

The first official statement about Palestine issued by the British Government was made in 1922, in Mr Churchill's White Paper. Mr Churchill stated that the national home meant "the development of the existing Jewish community" in Palestine, "in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take interest and pride." In order that that national home should succeed, it was essen-



tial that the Jews should know that they were in Palestine "of right and not on sufferance." (i)

In 1930, a Statement of policy was issued known as the Passfield White Paper. Lord Passfield purported to follow the policy stated in 1922, but, in fact, his interpretation of Britain's duty was, as declared by the author of the preceding White Paper himself, in contradiction with the terms of the mandate. "The very conception of a National Home," writes Felix Frankfurter, (Justice of the Supreme Court of the USA) "of an integrated national life, evaporated in the White Paper. Jewish capital is acceptable, but not Jewish labour; Jewish wealth, but not a Jewish life." (ii)

Lord Passfield's White Paper was based on an economic survey made by Sir John Hope Simpson in the same year. Sir John's ardent desire was to improve the lot of the fellahs, and he thought that by crystallising the national home in its present form, this end would be achieved. On the contrary, while drawing back the potentialities of economic development which went with Jewish colonisation, the bettering of the standard of life of the Arab peasant was far from being promoted. Sir John drew an estimate of the cultivable land much lower than had previously been accepted. His scheme not only nipped the National Home in the bud but according to British experts themselves, it did not

(i) in Goodman op cit p.58

(ii) ibid p.71

bring profit to the Arab fellah either.(1)

To remediate to the bad impression created by Passfield's White Paper, the Government set up a committee of Cabinet ministers to discuss the matter, and the outcome of the discussion was a letter sent by the Prime Minister to Dr Wizman (February 1931). Mr MacDonald's letter negatived all the objectionable passages of the White Paper and stated that it was the Government's "definite intention to initiate an active policy of development, which it is believed, will result in substantial and lasting benefit to both Jews and Arabs."(ii)

Mr Louis French was consequently sent to Palestine to study the effect of such an economic policy, and more particularly, to report on the question of dispossessed Arabs.(See chapter on Palestine Economic Possibilities.)

After the failure of the High Commissioner's scheme to set up a Legislative Council, in 1935, and after the riots which took place in 1936, the British Government sent the Palestine Royal Commission to study the Palestinian settlement very closely. The Commission came to Palestine in 1936, and in 1937, issued its well-known report.

(1) See the Political Quarterly (January-March 1931)  
 (ii) quoted by Goodman op cit p.83

THE PALESTINE ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT

After an elaborate study of the historical background of the mandate and of the respective rights of Jews and Arabs to Palestine, the Royal commission reviews the situation as it presented itself in 1937. It states the success of the Jewish National Home, as far as the Jewish population of Palestine is concerned. It tells of the valuable Jewish achievements in the social, cultural, and economic field. It says how the Jew who comes to Palestine is a transformed Jew, and how one feels that the National Home has finally made him happy. "It is impossible, it says, for any unprejudiced observer to see the National Home and not to wish it well. It has meant so much for the relief of unmerited suffering. It displays so much energy and enterprise and devotion to a common cause. In so far as Britain has helped towards its creation, we would claim, with Lord Balfour, that to that extent, at any rate Christendom has shown itself "not oblivious of all the wrong it has done." (1)

But, the report goes on to say, from the Jewish point of view, the situation cannot be crystallised at the present state of things. "On a wide range of important matters, it is true, the Jews enjoy a large measure of local self-government; but even in that field it is the Government of Palestine which possesses, if it does not

(1) The Palestine Royal Commission Report op.cit. p. 124

not always exercise, the ultimate control. And in more vital matters, the rate of immigration, the regulation of landsales, the protection of industry and promotion of trade, the maintenance of law and order, the provision of a garrison, in the matters, in fact, which really determine the fate of the National Home, its inhabitants have no constitutional power at all and no responsibility."(i)

The Commission says itself that the present state of things cannot be indefinitely maintained. Speaking of Immigration, for instance, the report reads: "In so far as immigration has been the major factor in bringing about this state of affairs (the success of the National Home) we consider that the Mandatory has so far fully implemented his obligation to facilitate the establishment of a National Home for the Jewish people in Palestine. But his does not mean that the National Home should be crystallised at its present size...We cannot accept the view that the Mandatory, having facilitated the establishment of the National Home, would be justified in shutting its doors."(ii)

Therefore, on the part of the Jews, the commission observes a certain satisfaction of the results achieved, together with a definite will to continue the development of the national home along the lines of the mandate.

(i) Ibid. p. 122  
(ii) Ibid. p. 306

The commission then proceeds to examine the situation of the Arab population. The effendi class, it remarks, has suffered the loss of a certain percentage of jobs in the administration. But it is regaining them progressively. Apart from that, says the report, "it is difficult to detect any deterioration in the economic position of the Arab upper class."<sup>(1)</sup> On the contrary, the Arab landowners have enriched themselves by selling part of their land to Jews at prices high above their pre-war value." A member of the Arab Higher Committee admitted that nowhere in the world were such uneconomic land-prices paid as by Jews in Palestine.

It is the condition of the fellah<sup>heen</sup>, however, which is the most important since they form the great majority of the population. After having examined their situation, the report says that "despite the disproportion between their numbers and the amount of cultivable land they occupy, the fellah<sup>heen</sup> are on the whole better off than they were in 1920."<sup>(11)</sup> Those who do not work on the land have easily found work in the industries, or in the public works undertaken by the Government. The question remains to find out, however, to what extent the Jewish national home policy is responsible for that amelioration if it is responsible at all. The Royal Commission answers

(1) Ibid. p. 125

(11) Ibid. p. 128

that question by an elaborate analysis of the Arab situation that we reproduce integrally:

- 1) The large import of Jewish capital into Palestine has had a general fructifying effect on the economic life of the whole country.
- 2) The expansion of Arab industry and citriculture has been largely financed by the capital thus obtained.
- 3) Jewish example has done much to improve Arab cultivation, especially of citrus.
- 4) Owing to Jewish development and enterprize the employment of Arab labour has increased in urban areas, particularly in the ports.
- 5) The reclamation and anti-malaria work undertaken in Jewish "colonies" have benefited all Arabs in the neighbourhood.
- 6) Institutions, founded with Jewish funds primarily to serve the National Home, have also served the Arab population.....
- 7) The general beneficent effect of Jewish immigration on Arab welfare is illustrated by the fact that the increase in the Arab population is most marked in urban areas affected by Jewish development. A comparison of the census returns in 1922 and 1931 shows that, six years ago, the increase per cent in Haifa was 86 in Jaffa 62, in Jerusalem, 37, while in purely Arab towns such as Nablus and Hebron it was only 7, and at Gaza there was a decrease of 2 per cent."(1)

The survey speaks for itself. Though the Arabs do not always recognise it, "on the balance, the National Home has meant a substantial gain to them."(11) However, the growth of the National home has brought forth a growing hostility on the part of the Arab towards Jews and British, as respectively the recipient and the promoters of the

(1) Ibid. p. 129

(11) Ibid. p. 131

mandate policy. The strengthening of Arab Nationalism makes it all the more difficult to enforce the mandatory policy any longer, says the report.

As seen by the Royal Commission, the situation has led to a deadlock. As a way out, the Commission proposed a plan of partition of Palestine between an Arab, a Jewish independent States, and a neutral intermediary zone. We are not going into the details of the partition scheme, but we will have to make a few things clear.

The proposed Jewish state was to be 1/29 of historical Palestine. When one thinks that, given the whole post-war Palestine, (this being a theoretical supposition!) Zionism would still find it difficult to solve the Jewish problem, what if the Jews are given 1/29 of the territory which used to be the Jewish state!

Partition means the barring of the Jews from the 28/29 of Palestine, the cutting off of the great Jewish undertakings (Rutenberg electrical concession, the Palestine Potash Limited) from the proposed Jewish state. MacHover calls very rightly his book on the partition scheme "Jewish state or ghetto"? The partition scheme would make of the Jewish cell a tiny Jewish isle (much smaller than the "small notch" advocated by Balfour) drowned into an ocean of Arab states. Apart from that critical situation, the partition scheme leads to a worse consequence: It does not solve the Jewish problem, not even in providing



a heaven for those Jews who cannot live in Europe anymore. It is really a derisive proposal.

"Out of 400000 Jews, one third, or 142,000 will not be in the Jewish state at all. The number that is left is 258,000. In the same territory, according to the Commission, there will be 225,000 Arabs...The Commission.. have put a Saar, a Polish Corridor, and half a dozen Dantzig and Memels in a country the size of Wales."(i)

Lloyd George said it was "a scandalous report... a deplorable ending to one of the most imaginative and promising experiments which the Great War made possible.. Have the Jews failed in their part of the bargain? The promise they gave of help in the war was fulfilled in the letter and the spirit. And their help was truly helpful.. Have they failed in their efforts at colonisation? The trouble has arisen entirely from the magnitude of their success. The report handsomely acknowledges their triumphs."(ii)

The most tragic point of the situation is that, in spite of the derisive terms offered to the Jews by the scheme, the Jewish Agency declared that it was ready to negotiate on the basis of those terms. The Arab authorities refused to do so;

(i) Lord Samuel, quoted in "Bulletin of International News"  
 (ii) quoted by Machover.- "Jewish State or ghetto" London, 1938, p. 53.

In fact, a partition was not acceptable. Palestine had already suffered from a very dangerous amputation. The cutting away of Transjordan deprived it from the three quarters of its historical territory. Was this separation necessitated by the MacMahon pledge? The fact does not seem to be absolutely certain. Certain competent observers hold on the contrary that Transjordan was given away to the Emir Abdallah in order to conciliate Arab opinion. Lord Raglan, former British political Officer in Transjordan, said in a statement made before the House of Lords that the dealings of the Emire were creating a very insecure situation in Transjordan." The continuance of this state of affairs would have been a constant source of friction with our French Allies", he said. These were the grounds on which "we made Abdallah a present of Transjordan."(1)

Whatever may be the reasons of that first partition, the Jews have by now accepted it. It would not be reasonable to ask them to agree to a new and threatening one. By their behaviour up to now, the Jew have shown that they were not stubborn in their claims. They have realised that, given the present political situation, and the Arab rights, they could not be recognised to have rights over all historical Palestine. They have accepted that. It is the turn of the Arabs to realize the necessity

(1) Ibid. p. 80

of a compromise. The Jews have behaved reasonably about Transjordan. Let the Arabs, in turn, behave reasonably about Palestine.

### THE WHITE PAPER OF 1939

In May 1939, the British Government issued a new Statement of policy about Palestine (statement which has since been called the White, or the Black Paper, according to the people you belonged to). This statement offered an entirely new interpretation of the spirit as well of the letter of the mandate. We are going to mention herebelow the most important among the new conceptions it brings in the understanding of the duties of the Mandatory. The Statement of policy refers very frequently to the material provided by the Royal Commission report, but, as we are going to see, from the same premisses, it draws a diametrically opposed conclusion.

In reviewing the duties of the mandatory towards the promotion of the national home, the Statement omits three important points:

- 1) The recognition of Hebrew as one of the official language of Palestine.
- 2) The recognition of the Jewish agency as a public body.
- 3) The recognition of the historical connection of the

Jewish people with Palestine.

Do those omissions come from a desire for brevity? The writer will be allowed to doubt it.

The Statement of policy quotes Article 2 of the mandate for Palestine, "quotes" may however not be the appropriate word, given that important, if slightly noticeable, changes are brought to the wording of the article. The reader will remember that article 2 of the mandate reads as follows: "The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of ~~the national home, and the words "as laid down~~ Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble." When reproduced in the Statement, the article reads "a national home" instead of the national home, and words "as laid down in the preamble" do not figure at all.

This alteration, however, slight it may seem, deprives the national home of the historical and legal elements on which it is based.

On the other hand, the non-recognition of the Jewish agency does not merely imply the suppression of a privilege. It implies that the British Government does not recognise the representative of the Jewish people as a whole before the mandatory. It only recognises the "actual Jewish population living in Palestine. The abyss which lays between the new attitude and the one which

followed from the true meaning of the mandate does not need any commentary. It speaks for itself.

The Statement of Policy, on the other hand, gives in a masterly way, the impression that only the Zionist leaders believed that the Balfour Declaration implied the possible transformation of Palestine into a Jewish state. Whereas the Report of the Royal Commission admitted that some of the framers of the declaration were themselves of that opinion.

Not only is the Jewish agency ignored, but two new factors brought in the discussion, namely, "the will of the Arab population of the country", and the opinion of the "neighbouring Arab states." The Zionists do not ask a final settlement to be imposed on the Arab population of Palestine. Indeed, it is only by a settlement agreeable to and accepted by both parties that the problem can be solved. But, the writer will be allowed to observe that this new element, though desirable, does not follow from the mandate itself.

On the other hand, the second element, the opinion of the neighbouring Arab states, is a creation for which the Statement of policy should be entirely responsible. What is the future of a Jewish national home dependent upon the will of the Arab states is not difficult to imagine, the more so as the Jewish people is no more a party in the discussion.

About the specific issues of immigration and settlement on the land, the White Paper is even more explicit. Immigration will continue for five years, the maximum number of immigrants being 10,000 per year. As a personal contribution towards the tragic fate of the Jews of Europe, the Mandatory will allow another 25,000 immigrants to Palestine, which will make 75,000 immigrants altogether. Then immigration will stop. The Jews will be therefore condemned to a status of permanent minority, their number being restricted to one-third of the population of Palestine. The National Home will not be a home any more since a home is a place where you go back to. The right understanding of its duties by the Mandatory, together with the interests of the Arab population of Palestine, will have achieved that sensational result of reducing the Jewish people to a state of constant inferiority in Palestine. We do not wish to do here a long dissertation about the duties of the Mandatory which follow from its acceptance of the trust of the mandate. We would like however to remind the reader, and with him the ~~fan~~ers of the White Paper, that the original aim of Zionism is to hasten the solution of the Jewish problem. It is because the League of Nations has found itself morally and legally bound to help the reconstitution of the Jewish national home in Palestine, that England is to-day in Palestine. The Mandatory should not forget that point.

On the other hand, the Jewish problem having been analysed as resulting from the anomalous position of the Jewish nation, any attempt at helping the Jewish people means the drawing of the Jews back to a normal life. It is not by granting them a permanent minority status in the land of their fathers that the Mandatory will consider itself freed from the moral and legal obligations it has towards the Jews. The anomaly of the Jewish situation is indeed that they enjoy a minority status everywhere, a majority status nowhere. The fundamental basis of any solution of their problem should therefore be the granting of a majority status somewhere. The White Paper, while evading this issue, is not only a violation of the mandate in its spirit and letter, it is also the proof that even to-day there are competent politicians who do not grasp the fundamental origin of the Jewish problem.

About the "close settlement of the Jews on the land," the Statement of policy inaugurates again a new policy. It divides the land in Palestine in three categories: The first section, where no land can be bought by Jews is 63.1 per cent of the total superficies. The second section, where land purchase by Jews is allowed under certain circumstances, is 31.8 per cent of the total superficies. And the third section, where the Jews are allowed to buy land, subject to no restrictions, is 5.1 per cent.



The clauses of the mandates are also reversed, as it might have been expected, as far as the rights of the Arabs are concerned. From binding but not primary duties, the obligations to the Arabs become suddenly the principal aim of the mandate, and more binding than those which promote the national home. Up to the publication of the White Paper, the Permanent Mandates Commission has stated more than once that the duty towards the national home was the primary duty of the mandatory, and that such steps which would hinder its promotion should not be taken. The White Paper reverses the argument and attempts at promoting self-governing institutions and independence (the latter of which was never promised) at the expense of the National Home.

If the British Government had proclaimed that it misunderstood the duties embodied in the mandate when it accepted to enforce it, and that now it stated the true meaning of these duties, it would be all right. But the Statement of policy distorts facts and evidences, in its aim at departing from its international pledge. In the words of Mr. Churchill, "No one could claim that the British nation is bound for all time, irrespective of events or of their own physical and moral strength, to pursue the policy of establishment of the Jewish National Home. But from the moment that we recognize and proclaim that we have departed from these undertakings and are

regarding the Zionist cause as a mere inconvenient incident in the Colonial Office administration of Palestine, we are bound to return our Mandate to the League of Nations and forgo the strategic moral and material advantages arising from the British control of, and, association with, the Holy land." (1)

The Jewish people does not wish England to withdraw from Palestine, and the quotation of Mr; Churchill should not be so interpreted. What the writer wishes to suggest is that, if England had decided to depart from the obligations she had under the mandate, she should have said clearly so, instead of camouflaging her new political attitude under a heap of questionable arguments.

The preceding refutation of some statements made in the "White Paper" may seem useless. In fact, it is. But it was necessitated by the Statement of policy itself. Had not the framers of the Paper felt somehow guilty of a distortion of the spirit of the mandate, they would have <sup>not</sup> spent their time and their skill in an attempt to justify themselves. What remains true is that diplomatic argumentation of that kind will lead nowhere. Either England wants to go on enforcing the mandate genuinely, and wholeheartedly, or she doesnot. If she does, so much the better. If she does not, the most clever argumentation of the world will not bring her to do so.

(1) Answer to Lord Passfield.- quoted by Goodman op.cit.67.

The clue of the new British attitude is, at least to a certain extent, the result of the pressure of certain political forces. The White Paper, as admitted by a member of the House of Commons, had been a makeshift intended to win over to the British side the Arab population of Palestine, and the populations of the neighbouring Arab states, if not of the Moslems of India. The policy has failed. Britain has not gained the wholehearted sympathy of the Arab population of Palestine with which we are here concerned, moreover, it has put in danger the Anglophile feelings of the Jews, in Palestine as well as in the whole world.

As to the qualification of the British attitude in that connection, here is what the actual Prime Minister says: "I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain had entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience...I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute way if I lent myself by silence or inaction to what I must regard as an act of repudiation." (1)

Mr. Amery now Secretary of State for India, felt the same: "I could never hold up my head again to either Jew or Arab, he said, if I voted for what, in good faith, I repeatedly told both Jews and Arabs was inconceivable - namely that any British Government would ever (1) quoted by "The Manchester Guardian" October, 28, 1943

go back upon the pledge given not only to Jews but to the whole civilised world when it assumed the Mandate."(1)

The Permanent Mandates Commission found the White Paper policy "not in accordance with the interpretation which, in agreement with the Mandatory power and Council, the Commission had always placed upon the Mandate."<sup>1</sup>

The White Paper has not yet come into force, though the land regulations embodied in it are already applied. Whether it will ever be enforced or not it is to the future to tell. However, we might add that during the period of incertitude which is passing, Great Britain is already enforcing the spirit of the White Paper, so to speak. It has outwardly and repeatedly discouraged Palestine Jewry's war effort in order to demonstrate to the onlookers that the Jews have no particular status in Palestine.

The discussion of the White Paper has been necessary in our study in order to enable us to discuss the present issues at stake. I will add that it has not been a pleasant task. Indeed, it is most unpleasant to state continually one's list of grievances, and to criticize even reasonably one of the rare friends one has. But, as Dr. Weisman said to the Royal Commission, "these grievances will not be put forward in a spirit of criticism for the sake of criticism of the Government. We know that the

(1) quoted by "The Manchester Guardian" October 28, 1943

government has done a considerable amount for this country. We know that we are in this country at all because of the British Government and its organs here. In spite of the criticism which you may hear from time to time, I think deep down in the heart of every Jew there is gratitude that there is at least one nation in the world which has given us the chance to try to work." (1)

(1) Dr. Weisman op.cit. p. 29

"The Jews are very close to the Arabs in blood, and there is no conflict of character between the two races."

Hair Feysal's Memorandum to  
the Peace Conference

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### Workability of Zionism

The spiritual and legal justification of Zionism would remain purely academic if there were certain irremediable obstacles on the way of Zionism. Let us examine the elements which condition the realization of Zionist aims, after which we will be able to draw a conclusion upon a thorough knowledge of the matter. Let us therefore begin by a short analysis of

#### I. THE ECONOMIC POSSIBILITIES OF PALESTINE

THE concept of Palestine's absorptive capacity has seemed a scientific check on Zionism since the beginning of large-scale immigration. However, experiments made in recent years have shown that Palestine's absorptive capacity was much greater than it was primarily thought. The capacity of a country is measured in function of its cultivable surface, its density of population, its natural resources, and the economic possibilities it offers to its inhabitants.



Palestine has an area of 10,500 square miles, or 26,000,000 dunams, and a population of 1,450,000 inhabitants (1939). Economic experts maintain that large-scale immigration may still be allowed without endangering the economic status of the present population. Dr; Lowdermilk, while reviewing the agricultural achievements of Palestine Jewry, writes: "The marshy, pestilential lands have been reclaimed by draining and by the eradication of malaria at the sacrifice of many human lives. Wasted lands have been made to blossom as the rose. Like wise, the higher plains have been reclaimed and made to produce heavily in agricultural crops. Sand dunes, old and new, have been fixed and have been made into locations of thriving municipalities or have been converted by irrigation into productive citrus groves." (1)

This review gives an idea of the economic potentialities of Palestine. It is understood that, while speaking of the absorptive capacity of Palestine, the potentialities are to be considered as well as the already exploited resources. Sir John Hope Simpson, while making his report on "Immigration, land settlement and development" in Palestine, takes into consideration only the cultivated lands. That is an error. The cultivable lands should be all taken into account since Jewish colonisation and the use of modern technique has shown that a great part of the uncultivated land could be gainfully exploited in the future. (1) Redeeming Palestine's Soil - Pal; Post.



I In fact, half a million Jews have been successfully settled in Palestine, on some 12 per cent of the soil now considered as cultivable, of which a great part was previously waste. That means that there <sup>is</sup> still wide economic possibilities to be exploited. The Palestine Arab Delegation to the London Conference has declared that out of 26,000,000 dunams, 19,000,000 dunams were not suitable for settlement and cultivation by Arabs. Experience has proved that the Jews have turned into fruitful land territories previously considered as unfit for cultivation. That would be a means of promoting immigration and close settlement of the Jews on the land without trespassing upon the interests of the local population, since the latter declares itself that such lands cannot be used by it.

Of course, Jews cannot settle on sand dunes for instance, whatever may be their technical skill and their financial possibilities. The criterion of a cultivable land has been said to be a land where you can dig a well. Indeed wells provide today almost the whole of Palestine's irrigation water. And the new deep-well boring technique guided by geological exploration has opened wide possibilities of irrigation "even beyond the coastal plain in areas which were previously regarded as hopeless, such as some of the uplands of Galilee and Judaea. A very searching and detailed enquiry recently completed has led

to the conclusion that better utilisation of sub-soil resources, improved equipment, more efficient and more economical operation of water plants would make possible the irrigation from wells of an area of approximately 2 million dunams."(i)

On the other hands, the drainage and redemption of marshlands can provide with a wide scope of cultivable land. The typical instance is the Huleh marsh, which, for centuries, was considered useless by the populations of Palestine. Now it has been restored, free from epidemics and malaria, it has become one of the lovely cultivated spots of Palestine. The example of the Huleh has to be followed, and new territories will be available for settlement.

The storage of rain-water will, apart from natural springs, and deep-wells, provide an important volume of water to serve agriculture when it is most needed. The example of other countries with similar conditions proves that the construction of reservoirs for rain water can prove of the greatest utility for the cultivation of otherwise uncultivable land. "Careful estimates...show that an area of two million dunams might be placed under irrigation through the construction of rain-water reservoirs and connected projects for flood control and surface irrigation."(ii)

(i) Borocuy in Palestine and Middle East - Vol XV, 1943

(ii) Borocuy op.cit.

Thus, technical irrigation might provide us with four million dunams of cultivable land. This does not take into account the arid part of Palestine, the Neghev, where the quantity of rain-water passing underground is enormous. As Sir John Hope Simpson said, given the possibility of irrigation, there is practically an inexhaustible supply of cultivable land in the Beersheba area. This highly-technical irrigation scheme is not only the outcome of theoretical speculations. It is based on detailed investigation. On the other hand, similar problems have been solved in other lands and show that the difficulties are not insuperable.

Apart from the redemption of land still treated as uncultivable, the intensification of agriculture everywhere would render large-scale immigration possible.

But there is also the basis for a very active industrial life in Palestine. The Mosul pipe-line ends in Haifa, oil is therefore plentiful. Derivative industries can be successfully established. Speaking of the future of Palestine's industry, Mr; Shenkar, President of the Palestine manufacturers' Association says that, of course, after the war, industrial reorganisation and adjustment of production costs will be necessary. But there is no need to be exaggeratedly scared of a depression Palestine industry has already competed with dumped Japanese goods. It will be able to compete with con-

current goods. On the other hand, Palestine can become a "Belgium of the Middle-East". It is at the cross-road of great trade routes. It has easy access to the neighbouring Middle-East market. Moreover, the Jewish population is clever, and persevering. Besides, says Dr. Weisman, "they have no choice; they must succeed or go under."

There are already in Palestine considerable industrial achievements: the great electric works on the Jordan, the Dead Sea works which produce potash, bromine, etc. oil and soap works; a cement factory; and an iron foundry; a textile industry (cotton and silk); a clothing industry; foodstuffs; pharmaceutical products; etc.

Let us consider the four million dunams of possibly cultivable land, after irrigation works. A Jewish family has been calculated to live on 20 dunams; that makes the establishment of 200,000 families on the land possible. On the other hand, experience shows that, for every family which settles on the land, three others are absorbed in towns. That makes a total of 800,000 families, or about 4,000,000 people.

Of course, this cannot happen in a single year. It has to follow an intensive development of all Palestinian resources, agricultural as well as industrial. As a matter of fact, no exact approximation can be made as to the exact number of people the country will be able to

absorb under different conditions. Indeed, Lord Passfield said in 1930 that there was no room for another cat in Palestine, and since then some 400,000 immigrants have entered the country. These approximations only prove that there are still very wide possibilities, and the examples of Belgium, Switzerland show us the way towards a very dense settlement of people on the land, as well as in urban activities.

Josephus writes that a few million people lived in Palestine under the Romans. But of course his statement is only to a certain extent reliable upon, and of course the limits of Palestine were not the same as to-day. Speaking of the limits, we should bear in mind that the three-quarters of Palestine have been deliberately severed from the present territory. And it is somewhat hard to hear that Palestine is small and that the Jews are creating a congestion in the country!

One thing should be added before we leave that chapter: If immigration has been curtailed under the White Paper, it is not because of the economic possibilities of Palestine, but because of political reasons. The Royal Commission admitted itself that political issues were at stake when immigration was concerned. The absorptive capacities of Palestine are far from being reached. Palestine can still contain the Jews who must live there, because they have nowhere else where to go,

if a thoroughly elaborated, active development of the country is undertaken.

It should be useful here to note who are the Jews who are expected to settle in Palestine after the war. It is estimated that the total of world Jewry will be about 12,000,000; almost 5,000,000 in the U.S.A. 750,000 in the British Empire; 500,000 in Palestine; 3,000,000 in Russia; 500,000 in South-American, and about 750,000 in North Africa and the Middle-East. The question of emigration will therefore apply to about 2,000,000 homeless people, without taking in consideration the refugees who will necessarily be found floating over ill-adjusted frontiers. It will be a formidable task, but not insuperable. Problems at least as difficult will have to be solved at the peace conference. Let us hope that something will be done in order to solve this one.

## II. THE ARAB PROBLEM

We have intentionally left for the end the Arab problem, not because it is the least important, but, on the contrary, because it is on it that depends the future of the National Home. The careful study of the Arab question is indispensable in an attempt to realize Zionist aspirations, just as the consideration of the Jewish case is necessary if the Arab problem is to be solved in Palestine.

We have up to now dealt with the Jewish problem and its solution through Zionism, and with the various grounds on which the Jewish claims for a National Home are justified. We will now deal with the Arab aspect of the problem.

As stated by George Antonius, "the Arab claims rest on two distinct foundations: the natural right of a settled population, in great majority agricultural, to remain in possession of the land of its birthright; and the acquired political rights which followed from the disappearance of Turkish sovereignty and from the Arab share in its overthrow, and which Great Britain is under a contractual obligation to recognise and uphold." (1)

The first ground on which the Arab case is based, namely, "the natural right of a settled population" is indisputable (It is what the Jews themselves claim in the Diaspora.) We will not therefore dwell on it any longer. (1) The Arab awakening op.cit. p. 391.



What about the "political rights" which are claimed? Those rights are based mainly on the MacMahon pledge, which we have already analysed as not referring to Palestine. Therefore, to the extent to which they are based on the MacMahon pledge, the Arab claims cannot be considered as valid. We have sufficiently dwelt on the British pledge to make that certain.

Lord Balfour said in connection with the Arab claims in Palestine in 1922: "Of all the charges made against this country I must say that the charge that we have been unjust to the Arab race seems to me the strangest. It is through the expenditure of British blood, by the exercise of British skill and valour, by the conduct of British generals, by troops brought from all parts of the British Empire - it is by them in the main that the greening of the Arab race from Turkish rule has been effected. And that we, after all the events of the war, should be help up as those who have done an injustice, that we, who have just established a king in Mesopotamia, who had before that established an Arab king in the Hejaz, and who have done more than has been done for centuries past to put the Arab race in the position to which they have attained - that we should be charged with being their enemies, with having taken a mean advantage of the course of international negotiations, seems to me not only most unjust to the policy of this country, but almost fantastic in its extravagance"

We do not suggest by any means that all the Arab claims were satisfied at the Peace Treaties. The Arabs got much less than they were promised. But as regards Palestine, we would like to make it clear once for all that no promise was made to them whatever. That is why, while we immediately see the rightness of the claim based on natural rights, we cannot approve that based on political ones.

(1) quoted by Goodman op.cit. p. 55

But the second foundation of the Arab claim, though mainly based on the MacMahon pledge, is based on two other elements, Hogarth's pledge, and the Declaration to the Seven

When the Balfour Declaration was made known, says Antonius, King Hussein wanted to have a definition of its meaning and range. Commander Hogarth was sent to him and delivered him an oral message which said that "Jewish settlement in Palestine would only be allowed in so far as would be consistent with the political and economic freedom of the Arab population." (1)

The Arabs claim that that promise was not kept. As a matter of fact the message having been an oral one, it is difficult either to base an argument on it, or to answer an argument based on it. It is difficult to imagine how England would have pledged herself to secure the "political freedom of the Arab population" when she had mentioned only "civil and religious rights" in the Balfour Declaration. However, there is no possibility of discussion since the claim is not based on any written document.

The other legal basis alluded to is what is called the "Declaration to the Seven Arabs". In 1918, seven Arabs living in Cairo sent a memorial to the British Government, asking from it a definition of British policy with regard to the Arab countries. The Foreign Office answered with a memorandum from which we extract the following passage:

(1) Antonius op.cit. p. 268.

"With regard to the territories occupied by the Allied armies,...the policy of His Majesty's Government...is that the future government of those territories should be based upon the principle of the consent of the governed. This policy will always be that of His Majesty's Government." (1)

In other words, as far as Palestine was concerned, the principle of self-determination was intended to be applied. This Declaration is of great consequence in the defence of the Arab case. 'Were I to give a personal advice to my Arab friends, I would advise them to base their defence on that Declaration, and not on the MacMahon pledge which cannot be regarded any more as covering Palestine.) However, one can be allowed to ask why British statesmen have never alluded to that Declaration in dealing with the Arab problem in Palestine. The Palestine Royal Commission's ~~on~~ Report which contains a thorough analysis of the Palestinian background does not refer to it. We do not question the authenticity of the document nor Antonius' own rendering of the Arabic text, but we are surprised to note how seldom the Declaration is referred to, in official Statements concerning Palestine.

However, we might as well admit that the promise of self-determination contained in the Declaration, if it was made, was never applied to Palestine. If the Arab

(1) Ibid. p. 434.

political rights have any legal basis, the Declaration to the Seven is that basis. However, given that no reproduction of the document is to be found, no conclusive argument can be derived from it.

Another statement of the Arab case can be found in the Peel Report. "You say we are better off; you say my house has been enriched by the strangers who have entered it. But it is my house and I did not invite the strangers in, or ask them to enrich it, and I do not care how poor or bare it is if only I am master in it." (i)

This is another assertion of the natural rights of the Arabs stated in a different manner. It is a right statement except in its consideration as strangers of the former owners of the land. In connection with this, the Arabs have maintained that a right of conquest cancels the previous right. With regard to that, two answers can be given: The first is that the Arabs did not obtain their right of conquest at the expense of the Jews, I mean that the Arabs did not drive the Jews from Palestine. The second is that the British right of conquest has cancelled the Arab right, or more precisely, the Turkish right. So the argument based on the cancellation of previous rights of conquest does not strengthen Arab defence, on the contrary, it leads to the opposite end. It is even contended ii

(i) The Peel Report op.cit. p. 131

(ii) Romano.- Problèmes politiques de l'organisation Sioniste.

that the right of a people to come back to a territory from which it has been ousted cancels the right of conquest of the last occupant.

Therefore, the right of conquest cannot be the basis of a legal claim. The Arabs, on the other hand, argue that they have extended help to the Allies in the Middle-East, and that they have been promised independence (The argument comes back to the MacMahon pledge.) The Arabs helped the Allies, that is granted, in spite of the fact that the Palestinian Arabs fought in the enemy lines. But what about the similar Jewish claim? The Jews have contributed to the Allies war effort, and they were definitely promised a national home in return of their services, whereas no promise had been made to the Palestinian Arabs whatever. On the other hand, the Peel report says: "The Arabs do not appear to realize in the first place that the present position of the Arab world as a whole is mainly due to the great sacrifices made by the Allied and Associated Powers in the War and secondly, that, in so far as the Balfour Declaration helped to bring about the Allies' victory, it helped to bring about the emancipation of all the Arab countries from Turkish rule." (1)

So much about the claim of "acquired political rights". Let us now examine that of economic loss which has been often put forward by advocates of the Arab cause. Has the concern of the Jewish National Home meant an economic

(1) Peel Report op.cit. p. 24

loss or a profit for the Arab population?

We have quoted in the preceding chapter the statement made by the Peel Commission about the economic gains the Arab derived from the enforcement of the National Home policy. (See p. 224) We will add an important fact. Not only has the Arab population naturally increased in great proportions in the areas of Jewish settlement, but it has increased by immigration from the neighbouring countries. (1) If the Arabs are not better off in Palestine than in the other Arab states, why do some of them who are enjoying a total or partial status of independence in the neighbouring countries come to settle in Palestine? Indeed, Arab immigration, however slight, has shown two things: On the one hand that the economic status of the average Arab of Palestine was superior to that of an Arab in the neighbouring countries; and, on the second hand, that sometimes economic prosperity was given preference on political independence.

Now, if Palestine is to become the center of Jewish national life, there might be some members of the Arab population who would like to conciliate economic profit with political independence, and settle in some other Arab States. (The reader is asked to consider this as a mere possibility, not as a political design) They would sell their land at very high prices in Palestine, and buy some at a cheap price, in Transjordan, or in Iraq.

(1) According to the official figures of 1937, out of 3,250 illegal immigrants 2,879 were non-Jews (Golding. p 187)



thus realising a double profit. That is all the more probable since in Transjordan, for instance, the inhabitants are in all points akin to those of Palestine. A point should be here made clear. The Zionists do not aim at dispossessing the Arab population of Palestine and at driving it outside the country. It has never been their intention to do so. The Arabs inhabit Palestine since twelve centuries and their rights at staying in Palestine have never been contested. But, as we said above, there is the possibility of a certain percentage of voluntary emigration, given the economic profit to be derived from the operation. Should this possibility remain in the state of possibility, I mean, unrealised, all the Palestinian Arabs and the Jews who would settle in Palestine could live side by side in a developed, productive Palestine. The brief survey of the economic possibilities of the country has shown this to be realisable.

Let us examine an often quoted point of Arab economic grievances, namely, the question of the land. To begin with, we would like to point out a fundamental inconsistency of the mandatory policy with regard to land transfer regulations: When the Arabs sell their land to Jews, they are considered as a people "not yet able to stand alone", nor to understand where their real well-being lies. In consequence, the mandatory acts as a tutor, and enacts a law forbidding the sale of land to Jews.



But when the Arabs say: We do not want the Jews in the country, whatever profit we may derive from their presence, they are considered as a mature, responsible people, and the mandatory takes measures putting their will into force. One of two things had to be conceded: Either the Arabs are not yet mature and need tutorship; and in this case the mandatory will prevent land sales to Jews, but at the same time allow immigration since it is beneficent to the country as a whole; or they are apt to decide for themselves; and in this case the mandatory will regulate immigration according to their wish, but will leave land transactions free. The argument cannot be continually twisted according to the urge of the moment.

Coming to the land question proper, the Arabs are afraid that the Jews will little by little dispossess them and be the owners of the land. Their fear is not well-founded at all. On the one hand, the Jews intend to devote the greater part of their activities to reclaiming the land that is not cultivated by the Arabs and further, declared to be uncultivable by them. There will be no dispossession here. On the other hand, if the Arabs wish to keep their land nobody obliges them not to do so. The question of the transfer of land is as all transactions, one of economic preference. If the Arab owner deems that the price offered for his land would be more worthwhile to have than the land itself, he will sell. But if he thinks that it suits him better to keep the land, however high

out of 9,000,000 dunams of cultivable land, the Jews own by now 1,500,000 dunams. What is however omitted is the fact that those 1,500,000 dunams which are now cultivable land were for the major part not so when they were bought.

Has the transfer of land lowered the standard of living of the fellah? A comparative study of the peasant population in 1919 and in 1939 for instance shows that on the contrary the standard of living of the Arab fellah has been raised. He has been often emancipated from the rule of the effendi, the hygienic conditions of his life are noticeably improving, and his family has greatly increased. Indeed, the impression that Jewish colonisation has harmed the Arab citizen comes to a large extent from the fact that consequences deriving from industrialisation and improvement of the means of production has been confused with consequences of the National Home. If they were occasioned by the national home policy, those consequences were none the less unavoidable.

The truth is that the position of the fellah is not endangered by Jewish colonisation, if it is not bettered. The claim of economic loss that has been put forward in the Arab defence is not justified. What remains valid is the natural right of the Arabs acquired by centuries of inhabitation. This right is the only one to remain incontestable. But the Arabs will not get a hearing before the world if they persist in disregarding all other rights than theirs. The Arabs have a case, it is

may the price be, he will keep it.

And, this fact should be more widely-known, an Arab who sells his land to a Jew does not by that very fact become an unemployed. He usually uses the proceeds to free himself from debts he has contracted towards the effendi, or invests his money in another gainful enterprise.

If he has sold all his land, he will get employment somewhere else. "Industrial development has gone far to provide employment for those Arabs who can no longer make a living on the land", says the Royal Commission. (i)

But what is more liable to happen is that the Arab landowner will keep a little part of the land. In fact, regulations forbid total transfer of land. The previous landowner must keep, and so he does, a minimum for his own sustenance. By the intensive cultivation of the remaining land, he sometimes gets almost as much as the whole land yielded by extensive cultivation.

There has been much talk about displaced Arabs, but it is not generally known how small is their number. A report drawn by Mr. Louis French in 1933 established the fact that "over a period of twelve years there were only 664 displaced Arabs. The Government thereupon made provision for those displaced Arabs who wished to have land to cultivate."(ii) This illustrates the fact that the Jews have settled, for the major part, on land not cultivated by Arab fellaheen. ~~It~~ It is often argued that,

(i) Peel report op.cit. p. 127  
 (ii) Goodman op.cit. p. 84.

out of 9,000,000 dunams of cultivable land, the Jews own by now 1,500,000 dunams. What is however omitted is the fact that those 1,500,000 dunams which are now cultivable land were for the major part not so when they were bought.

Has the transfer of land lowered the standard of living of the fellah? A comparative study of the peasant population in 1919 and in 1939 for instance shows that on the contrary the standard of living of the Arab fellah has been raised. He has been often emancipated from the rule of the effendi, the hygienic conditions of his life are noticeably improving, and his family has greatly increased. Indeed, the impression that Jewish colonisation has harmed the Arab citizen comes to a large extent from the fact that consequences deriving from industrialisation and improvement of the means of production has been confused with consequences of the National Home. If they were occasioned by the national home policy, those consequences were none the less unavoidable.

The truth is that the position of the fellah is not endangered by Jewish colonisation, if it is not bettered. The claim of economic loss that has been put forward in the Arab defence is not justified. What remains valid is the natural right of the Arabs acquired by centuries of inhabitation. This right is the only one to remain incontestable. But the Arabs will not get a hearing before the world if they persist in disregarding all other rights than theirs. The Arabs have a case, it is

time, but there are certain basic rights of the Jews that, if the Arabs are humane, understanding, law-abiding people they are bound to take into consideration.

An interesting point has been put forward by a Jurist(1) The Arabs have rights acquired by the fact of their inhabitation, he says. The Jews have historical rights. How is International Law to act? In the case of conflict between two legal principles, satisfaction is given to the one which, when enforced, will promote public order. The solution of the Jewish problem is a necessity for the public order. That solution is impossible outside the frame of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. Therefore the Jewish rights must prevail. There would of course remain to demonstrate that the Arab problem if unsolved, would not cause public disorder, which cannot be proved or disproved since it is a question of future probabilities. However, the argument remains a very interesting one.

A fundamental point which has to be borne in mind while studying the Judeo-Arab problem in Palestine is that the issue is not one between the Jewish and the Arab population of Palestine; It is one between the Jewish and the Arab peoples as a whole. Both peoples had national aspirations before the world war (1914). The Arab people came out of the war with a kingdom of Hedjaz, a partially independent kingdom of Iraq, a kingdom of Transjordan (not

(1) Cohen, "The Jewish problem before international law.

yet independent) and two countries under mandate (Syria and Lebanon), to be completely emancipated after a certain number of years. That was not what the Arab people wanted. The Arab people wanted complete and immediate independence for all the Arab countries. But nobody can satisfy all his wishes in this world. What did the Jewish people get? The mandate. (Note that whereas the mandate is considered as a derisive achievement when the Arab countries are concerned, it becomes a success when Zionist aims are dealt (with).

The Arabs of Palestine must be happy to know that the major part of the Arab countries is independent. While they live under special conditions, many of their brothers are their own masters. This reasoning should not have the effect of poisoning judeo-arab relationships, but on the contrary, it should bring satisfaction to the Arabs of Palestine. For, this should not be forgotten, the Arabs of Palestine do not form a nation by themselves. They are a section of the Arab nation, and Palestine is not for in the same way as it is a Jewish national center, then a national center. In fact, the Jewish national center. It is a Holy land, but not a national land. King Hussein has himself said that Palestine was not for the Arabs what it was for the Jews. Mr. Antonius refers to an article of King Hussein from "Al Qibla", exhorting the Arabs to welcome the Jews as their brethren. The same article reads later: "One of the most amazing things till recent times was that the Palestinian used to leave his

country, wandering over the high seas in every direction. His native soil could not retain him, though his ancestors had lived on it for over a thousand years. And, at the same time, we saw the Jews from foreign countries streaming to Palestine from Russia, Germany, Austria, Spain, America..

The cause of causes could not escape those who had the gift of a deeper insight; they knew that that country was for its original sons, for all their differences, a sacred and beloved homeland. Experience has proved their capacity to succeed in their energies and their labours... The return of these exiles to their homeland will prove materially and spiritually and experimental school for their brethren (i.e. the Arabs) who are with them in the fields, factories, trades, and in all things connected with toil and labour." (i)

Apart from the difference that Palestine has, in significance, for Arabs and Jews, the two cases themselves are not comparable. As asserted by the Permanent Mandates Commission in 1937, "It should also be remembered that the collective sufferings of Arabs and Jews are not comparable, since vast spaces in the Near-East formerly the abode of numerous populations, and the home of a brilliant civilization, are open to the former, whereas the world is increasingly being closed to settlement by the latter." (ii)

(i) quoted in Documents relating to the McMahon letters P.6  
 (ii) Gourion. Criticism of statement of policy Pal. post  
 May 23, 1939.



For the Arabs, Western Palestine represents less than one per cent of the Arab territories of the Near East. For the Jews it is all. <sup>in all</sup> If the Jews are condemned to remain a minority in Palestine, they will be deprived of all independent national existence. The Arabs enjoy it in a number of states. The adoption of an Arab national policy will mean for the Jews, in Mr. Churchill's words, "the end of the vision, of the hope, of the dream" Whereas for the Arabs, the adoption of a Zionist policy will mean that there will be one state less where Arabs will be independent

The Arabs can live anywhere in peace. The Jews are not allowed to live in most of the civilised countries. As Prof. Namier said, if the Jews as a minority in Palestine were engulfed in an Arab federation, they would be like the Czechs in a Greater Germany. But an Arab minority in a Jewish state surrounded by Arab countries would be a different position. In fact, how can the security of an Arab minority in a Jewish state be doubted? An elementary sense of prudence will guide the Jews to behave lawfully.

After all, Palestine remains for the Arabs "a small notch" in the vast Arab territories. For the Jews, it is a vital concern. And when I say vital, I mean it is either Palestine, or the permanence of a painful Jewish problem.

Is no agreement then possible? The Arab leaders

are now violently opposed to Zionism. Were they always so? No, in 1918 the situation was absolutely different. If the Arab leaders then were more understanding, it is not because Arab nationalism was not yet born. It is because they saw the problem in its true light, as a question between the Arab and the Jewish nations, not as a political rivalry between Arabs and Jews in Palestine, as many contemporary statesmen see it.

The Arabs recognised the Jewish national aspirations at the Peace Conference. On February 1919, the Arab case was laid before the Council of Five by the Emir Feysal as the head of a Hedjaz delegation...In the official note of the meeting the Emir is reported to have referred to Palestine as follows: "Palestine, for its universal character he left on one side for the mutual consideration of all parties interested. With this exception, he asked for the independence of the Arabic areas enumerated in this memorandum."(1)

The Arabs have always protested against the quoting of this and other passages from Feysal's speeches, arguing that Feysal was not the authorised mouthpiece of the Arabs at the Conference. Here is what the Royal Commission says about it: "The Emir Feysal, ... was not, it is true, directly representing the Arabs of Palestine; but the Arabs, as has just been pointed out, regarded

(1) D.H.Miller. My diary at the Peace Conf. Vol. 4 p.226 in "Documents relating to Machshon."

Syria as one country, and in Syria the Emir's leadership had been accepted. If his hopes, indeed, had been fulfilled, the development of the situation in Palestine might have been far more peaceful than it has been." (i)

Feysal was not the only one to adopt a conciliatory attitude towards the Jews. The Syrian delegation at the peace Conference displayed the same feelings. When admitted before the Supreme Council, in February, 1919, the Syrian delegation, headed by Chekri Chaneh, adopted the following resolution: "Palestine is incontestably the Southern portion of our country. The Zionists claim it. We have suffered too much from sufferings resembling theirs, not to throw open wide to them the doors of Palestine. All those among them who are oppressed in certain retrograde countries are welcome. Let them settle in Palestine, but in an autonomous Palestine, connected with Syria by the sole bond of federation. Will not a Palestine enjoying wide internal autonomy be for them a sufficient guarantee?"

"If they form the majority there, they will be the rulers, if they are in the minority, they will be represented in the Government in proportion to their numbers."<sup>ii</sup>

Thus, a definitely pro-Zionist attitude was displayed by the Arab delegates to the Peace Conference. The agreement signed between the Emir Feysal and Dr. Weizman

(i) Peel P. 27

(ii) Documents relating to MacMahon op.cit. p. 4

in 1919 illustrates this friendship very clearly. In connection with this agreement, we would like to point out that Feysal concluded it "in his father's name"(1) The agreement did not come into action because the condition put by Feysal, that the Arab countries should be set free, was not fulfilled. A nice point of International Law would be to analyse the value of the document now that finally Syria and Lebanon have been declared independent!

The fact that Lawrence was the intermediary between the negotiators may add to the weight of the treaty. The significance of the Feysal-Weizman agreement is great. It shows what was the Arabs' state of minds in 1918.

Feysal was not the representative of all the Arabs when he signed the document. But he remained the Sherif's son. His attitude, if not binding for the whole people, was representative of the attitude of the Arab leading class. The agreement remains the official proof that there is no fundamental irreconciliability between the Arab and the Zionist causes. In the light of the preceding documents, it appears that the establishment of a Jewish majority in Palestine could have been possible in 1918. Arab claims are recent and partly the fruit of political ambition and intrigues between the leading Arab families. The fate of the Palestinian Arabs is not as tragic as is stated by contemporary leaders. It could be reasonably satisfactory even in a Palestine where Jews would be the majority.

(1) Peel op.cit. p. 27

Cooperation and compromise should be the motto of present and future judeo-arab relationships. Because it is only through it that a solution of the Palestinian problem will be attained, for the Arabs, and that a preliminary step to the solution of the Jewish problem will have been taken, as far as the Jews are concerned. Jews and Arabs were not enemies in 1918. On the contrary, repeated statements were made on both parts, about Semitic kinship, and the numerous cultural and racial elements common to Jews and Arabs. If the situation has almost reached a deadlock to-day, it is partly because of the policy of the Administration, partly as a result of the occult interference of foreign powers.

There is no fundamental reason which could prevent a Judeo-Arab "rapprochement". Fanaticism, ignorance have often helped to develop misunderstandings. It should be the work of both Arabs and Jews to clear the atmosphere, to be ready to make concessions in view of an acceptable solution to both. For, and this should not be forgotten, a durable settlement will be attained in Palestine only if it is acceptable both to Arabs and Jews. A Jewish national Home established against the will of the Arab population would mean armed peace, and only temporary peace. But equally unacceptable to the Jews as a permanent solution would be a permanently Arab Palestine state.

It is not in our competence to suggest a possible solution. What we can only do is to stress the necessity of cooperation for both parties, and the possibility of reaching an understanding. In order to reach that understanding, a right outlook on the problem, that is, the view that the issue is one between the Jewish and the Arab peoples, and a comparison of the legal and ethical justifications of both cases, are, however, indispensable.

"There is hope for thy children".

Jeremiah XXXI. 17

CHAPTER NINE

Conclusion.

We have in this essay attempted to analyse the Jewish problem and its solution through Zionism.

Looking, as we were, for a solution of the present problem, we have found necessary to make a study of the question through the ages, and of the solutions attempted up to now. We have pointed out, as the reader will remember, the fact that the modern world, as a whole, does not understand the Jews, nor the Jewish problem. Many of the contemporary Jews themselves have a very incomplete and vague notion of the question. That is due partly to nationalism, which gives the people pride in their Judaism regardless of historical facts; partly to the fact that some Jews are interested in avoiding contact with Jewish history in their attempt at complete assimilation. In the main, this ignorance is due to the current of superficiality which is passing through our world. An individual thinks he knows enough about a question if he has heard a talk about it, and, above all, if he has read a book about it. With the widening of matters of interest, a consequent



loss has occurred in the depth of intellectual knowledge. The ignorance of the Jewish problem is to a great extent due to that fact.

As far as the Gentiles are concerned, study of the Jewish question is still more incomplete, and you will even hear a sympathetic European declare: We tolerate the Jews. That is good enough. Don't ask us to go and study their private troubles!

We have attempted to characterize the various phases of Jewish history and to situate the Jewish question in those periods. The Jewish problem, we said, begins with the end of the Jewish state, and though there was not acute problem under the Romans, it was already noticed that the Jews were an entity by themselves. It was due to the Christian Middle-Ages to make of the Jewish problem a subject of important persecutions, and therefore of primary concern. In its attempt at preventing normal relationships between Christians and Jews, the Church made of Jewish medieval life an utterly miserable and abnormal life. Segregation and persecutions up to the eighteenth and often to the nineteenth century made of the Jew a diminished, sick, and queer human being, so much so that a medieval writer found the necessity of acknowledging that "to a certain extent," the Jews were "human beings." The Jews came into Europe as a healthy, intellectual, active individual. He came out of the medieval ages completely distorted. The Gentiles, on the other hand, came out of

the medieval ages with a deep hatred of the Jews.

Anti-Jewish hatred, after having made its entrance into the world under a religious color, soon proved that it could be adapted to changed circumstances. It took an economic color, or a nationalistic one, or a racist one according to the urge of the moment. One fact is certain. The prejudice did not die. The Middle ages assumed a great responsibility. They endowed the world with a living prejudice which, were it not for their intervention could have not been born. The prejudice is to-day more alive than ever.

The Jews were emancipated soon after the French Revolution. They thought that the end of ghetto life meant the end of Jewish sufferings. For a certain time, their hope was not disappointed. But that period proved incredibly short. The Jews attempted to assimilate, but they soon realized that the price of liberty turned up to be submission. They had to choose between ostracism and extinction. Only a few chose extinction. And even for those, as Heine put it, the "entrance-ticket to Europe", I mean the baptismal ticket, turned to be forged. As soon as anything went wrong, people immediately remembered that one or two generations ago, Kevener was Cohen, and that he must be the source of the economic depression, or the political upheaval, whatever the case may be. This tendency proved so strong that Jews who emigrated, and who wanted to get absorbed in the greater community, were

converted first into Protestants, and then into Catholics. If somebody asked them what they were before, they could proudly say: Protestant.

Complete absorption is not to be considered for several reasons, the first of which is that the Jews have the right and the will to live as Jews. They think that Judaism is as good as any other religion, and that besides, it has still a contribution to make to them. Elementary dignity, as well as the belief in the inherent value of Judaism make them want to live and die as Jews. The other reason why absorption is impossible is that the consent of the Gentile world is required, and that consent is refused in nine cases out of ten.

On the other hand, the half-measure of assimilation has proved a failure. Christians were not ready to admit wholeheartedly the Jew in their community even if he spoke their language, read their books, and forgot his Judaism when outside the Synagogue. The half-measure of assimilation proved to the world something more, namely, that the Jew could not forget his Jewish national allegiance, even if he decided to. The failure of Liberal Judaism has clearly demonstrated that Judaism, when stripped of its national character, had no chance to live. I do not mean by that that Jewish nationalism is the most important part of Judaism. What I mean is that the religious Jewish allegiance cannot survive when severed from the national one, in the same way as Jewish nationalism cannot have any

sense if conceived with disregard of Jewish religion. They are both integral part of Judaism and only a solution which will make possible their close union will provide the means of survival of the Jewish people.

Zionism is that solution. It provides a regeneration of a complete and balanced Jewish life in the Holy Land. In connection with that, let us remember that Territorialism is inadequate, since it disregards historical and religious ties inherent to the inner conception of Judaism. (on the other hand, given that no White Man's land is by now available, the question remains purely academic).

In so far as it has attempted to recreate a purely Jewish life in Palestine, Zionism has fully succeeded. "It is not possible to see the National Home and not to wish it well" said the Peel Commission. This shows how convincing the enthusiasm and efforts of the Jews to rebuild the Land of Israel can be. On the other hand, in as far as Zionism aims at providing shelter, security, and spiritual satisfaction to the Jews now homeless and persecuted in Europe, Zionism is not the fruit of political ambitions, it is the consequence of elementary humanitarianism. The task will not be easy. The recreation of a civilisation has never been easy. But the Jews have shown that they were apt to bear heavy responsibilities, and their ability at building the National Home makes no doubt. Further, we have seen by a study of the economic

and political conditions in Palestine, that the possibility of realising an acceptable compromise was not to be precluded. One often hears that kindness and humanitarianism have nothing to do with politics. However, the legal character of international relations can hardly be said to deprive them of their moral character which lay at the basis of social life. As Professor Bordetsky says: "In the making of peace there will be much to give and much to take. No nation in the world will remain as it was: all peoples will have to contribute towards one another's happiness and safety. The Arabs may have many claims after the war. The victorious United Nations may have much to give to the Arabs; but the Jews can also give much to the Arabs. The Arabs must therefore cooperate to make the peace, and give a little in order to make it secure, no more than the acceptance of that which humanity joined to give in the Balfour Declaration."(1)

Whatever the Arabs have gained in the first world war, what they will gain in this will be due to the action of the Western democracies. Let the democracies once for all proclaim the justice of the Jewish cause. After the very assertions of British prominent statesmen, after the opinion of the Permanent Mandates Commission itself, the Jewish case for Palestine is far stronger than the Arab cause. What remains unfortunately clear is that, whatever the justice of a cause, ours remains a

(1) Goodman op.cit. p. 271

a world of power-politics. If the aspirations of the Jewish peoples are not realised, the reader will, I think, agree that this will not be due to the weakness of the cause, but to the interplay of strong political forces which hinder its realisation. These political forces have up to now hampered the attempts made in view of international understanding, and have required the sacrifice of certain interests in view of a higher aim, an aim which is the truer rule of International Law, and justice, whatever may be the interests involved.

The Jewish problem is very difficult to solve. But will humanity leave it unsolved because of that? All the problems which will have to be solved after the war will be difficult. The solution of the Jewish problem, is moreover, at least as fundamental to peace as any other. The trouble is that some people doubt the efficiency of Zionism as the real solution of the Jewish problem. These fears are only slightly justified. As we have seen, the Jewish problem is a national problem and therefore requires a national solution. It is the status of a homeless minority which is at the root of all Jewish troubles. It is therefore the restoration of the National Home which will be the closest toward a solution.

There will be, no doubt, some Jews in the post-war world who will be ready to risk once again the experiment of complete absorption. If that attempt ever succeeds

it will provide only an individual issue to the problem. But given that the Jewish problem is concerned with the Jews, as a whole, and not with any part of them, this will not affect the existence of the problem.

We have seen how the realisation of the National Home would provide an adequate solution for at least two million homeless Jews. That is not all. Zionism looks towards the redemption of all the Jewish people, and has therefore a significant contribution to make to the great majority who will remain outside the National Home. It will strengthen the Jewish feelings of all the Jews of the diaspora. And, strange as this may seem, an affirmation of their Jewishness will make the diaspora Jews more deserving of the world respect. There is no duality. "Weak-minded and nervous people feared that Zionism which recognizes the Jews as nationality will allow the anti-Semites to reproach us triumphantly as having no native land," wrote Sokolove in 1919. Nervous people to-day are afraid of the contrary. Anti-semitism did not wait for Zionism to make its entrance in the world. If there is a possibility of the intensification of anti-semitism through the realisation of Zionist aims, there is as well the possibility that anti-semitism will be much weakened. After all, the Jewish problem has had so much to do with psychological impulses, that rational prevision can be made as to its future through Zionism. What we say is that Zionism has a chance. Zionists, as all Jews, are optimists



it will provide only an individual issue to the problem. But given that the Jewish problem is concerned with the Jews, as a whole, and not with any part of them, this will not affect the existence of the problem.

We have seen how the realisation of the National Home would provide an adequate solution for at least two million homeless Jews. That is not all. Zionism looks towards the redemption of all the Jewish people, and has therefore a significant contribution to make to the great majority who will remain outside the National Home. It will strengthen the Jewish feelings of all the Jews of the diaspora. And, strange as this may seem, an affirmation of their Jewishness will make the diaspora Jews more deserving of the world respect. There is no duality. "Weak-minded and nervous people feared that Zionism which recognizes the Jews as nationality will allow the anti-Semites to reproach us triumphantly as having no native land," wrote Sokolove in 1919. Nervous people to-day are afraid of the contrary. Anti-semitism did not wait for Zionism to make its entrance in the world. If there is a possibility of the intensification of anti-semitism through the realisation of Zionist aims, there is as well the possibility that anti-semitism will be much weakened. After all, the Jewish problem has had so much to do with psychological impulses, that rational prevision can be made as to its future through Zionism. What we say is that Zionism has a chance. Zionists, as all Jews, are optimists

They are not the only ones. Lord Balfour said, in connection with the situation of the Jews outside Palestine: "I cannot share these fears...Prejudice, where it exists, is not due to Zionism, nor will Zionism embitter it. The tendency should be the other way. Everything which assimilates the national and international status of the Jews to that of other races ought to mitigate what remains of ancient antipathies (and evidently, this assimilation would be promoted by giving them that which all other nations possess: a local habitation and a national home)." (1)

Among the Zionists, let us quote Professor Brodetsky who says: "The United nations are fighting for freedom, and this cannot mean that human life should tend towards a civilization in which every individual is forced to live in the country of his race or nationality, or otherwise he will be foreign and unhappy. In any case, it is foolish to introduce ideas which are inconsistent with the actual conditions of life, and the reason why Jews have to ask for equality everywhere and for the Jewish Commonwealth simultaneously, is not because the Jews have chosen to put forward views which are inconsistent, but because Jews have chosen to put forward by history in a specially difficult situation....It is short-sighted to see only the millions of Jews who are now under Hitler tyranny, and to refuse to look at the half of Jewry that is living in liberty; it is equally short-sighted to see (1) in Sokolov op.cit. p. 33.

only the freedom of half of the Jewish people and to ignore the misery and hopelessness of the other half. "The best Zionist is obviously he who aims at his own settlement in Palestine. But he is also a Zionist who may be living quite happily in any land, but desires that a Jewish national home...shall exist...There is no fundamental difference between such a Jew and an Irishman who lives in England or in the U.S.A., and who wished to see a free Eire; or an Indian who lives in South Africa... and desires to see India free."(1)

And further Prof. Brodetsky says: "We believe that humanity is going forward to greater and to finer ideals. Perhaps the struggle to-day will give us a world with finer international and humane principle in the future....The aim of our people must be to become free, and to take part as a people in the human struggle, and not to be merely victims of those against whom humanity has to fight for the safety of civilization, and of the mistakes and neglect of those who are the champions of civilization." (ii)

Of course international good will is indispensable. Without it the solution of the Jewish problem will never be attained. We have agreed that, as far as the Judeo-Arab problem is concerned, any Palestinian solution, in order to be durable, must recognise and

(1) Goodman op.cit. p. 258

(ii) Ibid. p. 266

achieve a balance between the demands of Arabs and the fact of the Jewish national home. But there is a certain minimum which has got to be granted to the Jewish cause, given the unparralleled situation of the Jewish people.

About the international consequences of Zionism, we will only quote its contribution to international security and peaceful settlement; its contribution to civilization as a melting point between East and West; its help in promoting internationalism through the medium of satisfied and fulfilled nationalism. We will conclude now by a quotation of Mr. Churchill:

The Prime Minister said:

"Assuredly in the day of victory the Jew's sufferings and his part in the struggle will not be forgotten. Once again, at the appointed time, he will see vindicated those principles of righteousness which it was the glory of his fathers to proclaim to the world. Once again it will be shown that though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small."<sup>(1)</sup>

(1) Goodman op.cit. 123. (1941)