early to predict whether the Evian Committee will be able to carry out its share of the agreement to provide 150,000 young German Jews with places to which to emigrate. There can be no doubt, however, that Nazi Germany will continue to exploit Jews and the Jewish issue for both its internal and external needs.

ALBERT AARON

●

JEWISH TERRITORIALISM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

I

TERRITORIALISM in its historical sense is a movement which aims at the solution of the civic, economic, national or cultural problems of the Jews who may suffer disabilities in any or all of those respects, by settling them in compact masses in one or more territories with autonomous or semi-autonomous forms of government. In its most extreme forms, Territorialism is nationalistic in principle, approaching very closely the view of that particular school in Zionism which believes that continued Jewish existence outside of Palestine is impossible. The difference is only one of geography and tradition. There is the same assumption that it is impossible for Jews to continue to live as they have heretofore, scattered throughout the world. Hence its adherents believe that every effort must be made to obtain and develop a territory large enough to settle all the Jews, thus "normalizing" the Jewish people into a nation like all other nations.

Both Territorialism and political Zionism derive their motive force from the same source—the plight of the Jew. Both see the necessity for migration, and the economic and psychological "normalization" of the position of the Jew. Unlike Zionism, Territorialism hopes to preserve the Yiddish language and secular culture based upon it and contains no religious groupings.

Differing from the nationalistic version of Territorialism is the Philanthropic School. Less articulate than the first, the Philanthropic School recognizes the necessity of emigra-

tion as a means of easing the plight of the Jewish masses in East and Central Europe. Therefore, its spokesmen urge the grant of a territory or territories to which these Jews might emigrate. They are not so much concerned with the social, political or cultural conditions of the new settlement. To them, Territorialism is a solution for emergencies.

Like most other ideological movements, political Territorialism seeks justification for its philosophy in Jewish history. It points to several instances of Jewish states outside of Palestine. As one of its proponents indicates "Territorialism is even older than the oldest Zionism, for it began in Goshen, before the march of tribes under Moses through the wilderness and before the conquest of the Land of Israel under Joshua." Further examples cited are the kingdom of Adiabene in Mesopotamia, the rulers of which had embraced Judaism in the first century B. C.; the various independent Jewish principalities in pre-Islamic Arabia, and in Ethiopia; the Khazar reign; and the Jewish kingdoms in Berber North Africa in the late Middle Ages. Instances in history are pointed out when Jews lived in autonomous and almost self sustaining communities, such as in Babylonia during ancient times and the early Middle Ages. Whenever a new territory is proposed, its Jewish historical connections are usually pointed out. Such connections can be easily established, as there is practically no land in the world where Jews have not lived in groups or where individual Jews have not pioneered.

II

While messianic hopes and efforts at the restoration of Jewish nationhood have been directed throughout history toward the Holy Land, attempts of projects for the settlement of Jews on an autonomous or territorial basis outside of Palestine are of comparatively recent date. Both continents of America were the ground for earliest efforts of this kind. Their scope was less ambitious than that of the Territorialist plans of today. In 1652, Joseph Nuñez de Fonseca attempted to found a colony of Jews in the island of Curaçao under the authority

of the Dutch West India Company. The experiment was short lived. About 1654 a similar project was formed for settlement in Surinam for Jews who were forced to escape from Brazil upon its reconquest by the Portuguese. The French West India Company granted in 1659 to David Nasi, a Portuguese Jew, the right to establish a Jewish colony in Cayenne. Marshal Maurice de Saxe, a natural son of August II, the king of Poland, contemplated, about 1749, the establishment of a Jewish kingdom in South America, over which he was to rule. A similar method of carving out a royal career was entertained by John Perceval, the second Earl of Egmont, in the middle of the 18th century. The last three never advanced beyond the stage of paper projects.

At the end of the 18th century the question of emancipating the Jews or at least changing their economic status was a burning issue in Poland and in the formerly Polish regions of Russia. Proposals for the amelioration of their situation ranged between wholesale deportation and complete emancipation. The more reactionary elements in Poland resented, as they do today, the presence of a large number of Jews in the country. The middle classes, in particular, objected to their emancipation. Solutions by both friends and enemies of Jews were often couched in terms of a mass or territorialist settlement. Abraham Hirszowicz, for instance, in his desire to change the occupational structure of his coreligionists, suggested in 1790 that Jews be settled on land in the Ukrainian provinces of Poland. However, he did not propose an autonomous status for this settlement. Nota Notkin, former "court adviser" to the King of Poland, motivated by similar desires, went further in 1797 in his plan presented to the Russian Government. It called for a large-scale migration of Jews to the government of Ekaterinoslav and to other provinces in New Russia and their settlement on the basis of agriculture, sheep raising and industry.

Napoleon's summons for the Paris Sanhedrin aroused the fear of the various governments that he might gain the sympathy of the Jews throughout the world. Russia in particular was concerned with such a possibility because of the

presence of a large number of Jews in her newly-acquired territories. A reflection of this fear was the proposal submitted in 1807 by a certain Polish German to Alexander I, the Czar of Russia. It emphasized this danger and proposed the mass migration of Polish Jews to Southern Russia as a means for its prevention.

Even after Poland had lost her independence the same attitudes concerning the solution to the problem were expressed in a number of proposals. In 1815, a Polish priest Xavier Szamowski suggested that in addition to gradual emancipation, the Congress of Vienna grant to the Jews some place where they could establish their own state. In 1818, an anonymous Polish pamphleteer proposed the establishment of a Jewish state in Tartary instead of Palestine. In the same year another anonymous pamphleteer advocated the solution of the Jewish problem in Poland by concentration in a separate territory in Russia, preferably in one of the Southern regions. A similar Tartary project was brought forth in 1818. This view found expression in the resolution of the Sejm of the Kingdom of Poland requesting the Czar to grant the Polish Jews an unsettled territory.

Pestel, the leader of the ill-fated Decembrist revolt in 1825, proposed among other solutions to the problem of the Jews in Russia, the establishment of a Jewish state in Asia Minor. Gregory Peretz, another Decembrist, goes down into history as the first to propose the settlement of the Jews "as a separate people" in Crimea.

The same tendencies continued. A Polish philosopher, Joseph Goluchowski, advocated in 1845 the forcible migration of the Jews from Poland to a distant region of Russia possibly on the shores of the Caspian or Black Sea, where a separate state with religious and political freedom was to be set up. Several Polish noblemen actually submitted in 1856 a proposal that the Jews be deported to a new Jewish state to be established in some unsettled region. Upon the visit of Czar Alexander II to Warsaw, they demanded that the plan be carried out. The Jews naturally objected to such schemes.

The vast unoccupied stretches of land in America made it, during that period, the favorite ground for seekers of territories. Thoughts of colonizing Mexico by Jews were entertained early in the nineteenth century by Edward King, Viscount Kingsborough. In 1819, a certain W. D. Robinson (suspected of being a land speculator) published in London a pamphlet in which he proposed that the wealthy European Jews purchase for their poorer brethren land along the Upper Mississippi and Tennessee rivers.

The best known territorial scheme in America is, of course, the attempt by Mordecai Emanuel Noah to establish an autonomous Jewish settlement on Grand Island near Buffalo, New York, under the name of Ararat. Noah announced his grandiose plan to the Jews of the world in his usual dramatic manner. The cornerstone for it was laid on September 2, 1826, in an Episcopalian Church in Buffalo, in the presence of Christian clergymen, state and federal officials, Masons, American Indians, and a mob of generally curious. The project made no progress beyond this stage.

In 1832, a German merchant, Bernard Berend, approached Baron Rothschild with a similar plan for the purchase of land in North America to settle poor Jews from Germany, Poland and Italy. In spite of objections, he published in 1845 in the *Orient* an appeal for the same purpose. In 1843, a certain William Renau established a Jewish Colonization Society. A Mr. Meyer selected, on behalf of the Society, suitable land for settlement in the town of Schaumburg, Cook County, Illinois. In the same year, a Philadelphian by the name of Julius Stern, submitted a detailed plan for the purchase of large stretches of land in the West where the colonists would form their own state, elect their own legislature and be permitted to rest on the Sabbath. The Reverend Isaac Leeser approved of the plan but objected to the establishment of a separate state in the Union. Incidentally, Leeser was well-informed of the situation in Europe and stressed the need of providing a place for mass emigration in Canada, Palestine or Australia, if it were not possible to achieve it in America. In about 1845, Texas was discussed as a possible place for

colonization of Jews. A certain Simon Berman proposed in 1859 and at other times a plan for settlement of Jews on the basis of agriculture, industry and construction work in Ohio, Palestine and other places.

Out of a long discussion in 1869 concerning mass emigration from Roumania, there emerged a concrete plan by one Leo Strauss. He proposed the purchase of nine townships (207,360 acres) in the West for Jewish settlement by a loan of three million dollars to be raised among American Jews.

In 1881 one Moses Schrenzel of Lemberg published a pamphlet which contained a plan for the immediate establishment of a Jewish state in America. He disapproved of Palestine because of the poverty of its soil, the material expense involved in its resettlement and the objection of both Turkey and the Arabs. He later became an adherent of the *Hoveve Zion.*

A similar plan was put forth in a Polish pamphlet published six years later in Galicia under the pseudonym of Omega. The typical territorialist arguments of today were the basis for this proposal to establish a Jewish state to be named "New Judaea" and located between the Nebraska, Kansas and Arkansas rivers. Plans of settlement, financing, education and government were outlined in detail. The author maintained that it was possible to transfer all the Jews from Europe to the new state within 15 to 30 years.

The pogroms in Russia in 1881 and 1882 resulted in a feeling of mass hysteria. It was brought home to the intellectuals and masses as well that they had little to hope for in Russia. Russification as an ideal was dead. This is not the place to evaluate the drive which this crisis gave to the *Hibbath Zion* movement, the early form of Zionism, which was immediately translated into action by the emigration to Palestine of the student and youth contingent of the *Bilu.* It is less known, however, that in addition to those who dreamed about the creation of a network of Jewish colonies in Palestine, there were others who looked forward to America, the land of freedom. The disputes between the pro-Palestinians and the pro-Americans proved to be merely academic. The problem

was solved by life itself in favor of America which absorbed a huge majority of the emigrants. Many youths were looking forward to a national and social solution to their problems in the land of freedom across the Atlantic.

Out of the *Am Olam* (Eternal People) movement, which started out with the idea of regulating the mass exodus to America, there soon emerged several groups which had as their purpose the establishment of cooperative agricultural settlements. Organized groups of followers of this movement as well as other groups, established in the early 1880's the Cremieux settlements in Louisiana and South Dakota, the Bethlehem settlement in South Dakota, and an unnamed settlement in Arkansas. In 1885, the Lasker settlement was established near Dutch City in Kansas, and at about the same time the Montefiore settlement was established in the same state, and the Painted Wood settlement was founded near Bismarck, North Dakota. Several were established in 1882 in New Jersey. A few others were organized in Connecticut. The New Odessa settlement was founded in Oregon. These settlements bore no relation to any of the plans mentioned before. They were rather in the nature of minor experiments in Utopias and bore no political or territorialist tinge. Their existence was brief mainly because of the lack of agricultural experience on the part of the settlers and their inability to adjust themselves to the collective life which they had chosen.

III

In the early stages of the Zionist movement, Territorialism and Zionism were almost interchangeable. A land was needed. Its location did not matter so much to some of the outstanding leaders. Leo Pinsker, for example, in the Zionist classic, *Auto-Emancipation,* called for a return of the Jews not to "our Holy Land, but to our Land. All we need is a large stretch of land which should belong to us and from which no foreign master could exile us." Lilienblum hesitated a long time between the ideas of Territorialism and Zionism. There are even indications that early *Hoveve Zion* groups seriously debated whether Palestine was a fitting or obtainable

place for the establishment of the Jewish National Home. The Minsk branch which was founded under the name of *Kibuz Nidhe Israel* had as its purpose to obtain a territory in any place. Even Theodor Herzl, the father of political Zionism, started out as a Territorialist. He stated in his *Jewish State:* "We shall take what is given to us and what is selected by Jewish public opinion". One of his favorite places was the Argentine. Nachman Syrkin, the Labor Zionist theorist and organizer, also was a Territorialist when he embarked upon his propaganda activities at the time of his publication of the *Hamon* and other similar appeals.

Accordingly, it is not surprising that the Zionist leaders sought, in the face of Turkey's constant refusal to grant the charter for the colonization of Palestine, possible places outside of Palestine. Some viewed such a land as a permanent solution. Others, such as Max Nordau in the case of the Uganda Project, called it a *Nachtasyl* (night asylum). In 1899, Davis Trietsch and others proposed that the Zionist Organization transfer its colonization activities to the Island of Cyprus. The sentiment for Palestine, however, prevented even the discussion of this scheme by the Zionist Congress in 1899. In 1901, some German Zionists took up seriously the proposal of settlement in El-Arish, a strip of territory under Anglo-Egyptian jurisdiction located south of Palestine. Their effort was taken up by Herzl, and in 1903 a scientific expedition was sent there to investigate the possibilities of settlement. Nothing came of it.

An offer of territory was the cause of a real crisis within the Zionist movement. In 1903, Joseph Chamberlain on behalf of the British Government, suggested to Theodor Herzl the establishment of an autonomous Jewish settlement in Kenya. This project went down in history under the misnomer of the Uganda Project.

Herzl, the West Europeans and some of the laborite delegates were in favor of accepting such offers. The majority of East European and religiously inclined delegates opposed them vehemently. At the Seventh Zionist Congress (1905) the Uganda Project and other plans for colonization outside

of Palestine were rejected by a large majority of the delegates. The pro-Uganda minority, in its intense desire for an immediate solution of the problem, refused to abide by the decision of the Congress. Its adherents convened in Berne in the same year and, under the leadership of Israel Zangwill, the Herzl of Territorialism, organized the Jewish Territorial Organization, known popularly as ITO. The object of this most important Territorialist group in history was "to procure a territory upon an autonomous basis for the Jews who cannot or who will not remain in the lands in which they already live." Under the vigorous leadership of Zangwill, the ITO embarked immediately upon a search for a suitable territory. It considered, and sometimes investigated, possibilities of settlement in Mesopotamia, Cyrenaica, Mexico, Angola, Siberia, Australia, and Canada. It was unable either to recommend or obtain any of these countries for immediate settlement. Because of the lack of real opportunities for territorial colonization, the ITO embarked upon a task which was diametrically opposed to its original aims. It conducted the practical work and distribution of Jewish immigrants in America from New York and other great centers of population to the Southern states and the West under what was known as the Galveston Movement. This experiment, which set the precedent for the present activities of the National Coordinating Committee in the settlement of German refugees outside of New York, was financed by Jacob H. Schiff and initiated under the direction of Morris D. Waldman.

The World War put what was then thought a temporary halt to the ITO's search for suitable territories. The last convention of its international council which was supposed to have been held at Zurich in September, 1914, never met because of the War. The issuance of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 brought an end to the activities of the ITO. Its adherents correctly pointed out that they had never objected to the settlement of Palestine and decided that "in view of the work of the Zionist Organization, its own activities shall be in suspense." In 1925, it was formally disbanded.

IV

It was natural for proletarian groups to embrace Territorialism. The early labor Zionist groups were very much influenced by this ideology. The enticing offer of Uganda appealed to those who looked for an immediate solution in terms of mass emigration. The possibilities of Palestine as a land capable of absorbing large numbers of Jews within a reasonable time seemed to be remote and visionary. Thus the movement was immediately divided into two camps—Palestinism and Territorialism. Like all Socialists, these groups attempted to justify their stands from a materialistic point of view. Elaborate theories of emigration as an organic and necessary part of Jewish life were worked out to justify Territorialism from a non-idealistic "realistic" point of view. A good example of such thinking was the platform of the largest Socialist Territorialist group, named curiously enough, Socialists Zionists (S. S.) They applied to the Jewish situation the contemporary Marxist theory that the development of capitalism was constantly increasing the ranks of the proletariat at the expense of the petty bourgeoisie. This in turn, they maintained, would bring about the realization of socialism in the classical revolutionary manner. However, they thought it to be impossible for the Jewish declassed bourgeoisie to become proletarians, because of the competition of non-Jewish workers and because of national oppression. Unemployment or emigration must be the lot of the Jewish masses. Their class struggle was of little value since the true class struggle was reserved for bona fide proletarians. Emigration could be but a temporary relief, for the same process of "declassment" was bound to be repeated eventually in the new land as a result of economic development and of the ever-occurring national oppression. Moreover, since the Jewish masses could not be proletarianized or industrialized, their class struggle was a helpless, negative one. Therefore, the emigration was to be converted into mass colonization of one specific Territory.

The organization of the Poale Zion as an active party in 1906 served to offset the Territorialist influence within the

Labor Zionist groups, which at one time included more Territorialists than adherents of Zion. A further blow to the labor wings in Territorialism was the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia which caused many splits within the labor movement and brought an end to organized Jewish life in that country. In Poland, a small group called the Independent Jewish Socialist Party continued a vegetative existence until its merger in 1938 with the Poale Zion Party with provision for autonomous Territorialist activities.

Communist leadership, too, was compelled to face the issue of Territorialism as a practical experiment in statesmanship. True, Lenin was an adherent of the assimilationist solution for the Jewish problem, which he, like most Marxists, considered to be a purely economic one. "The Jewish question," he stated in 1903, "stands now as follows: assimilation or isolation? and the idea of a Jewish nationality has a definitely reactionary character." Stalin, too, followed the same policy in an essay on the Jewish problem written before the War. Territorialism like any other religious or national movement among Jews was therefore fought bitterly by the Bolsheviks upon their ascendancy to power. However, the exigency of practical affairs caused the Soviet Government to disregard its theory and to embark upon two Territorialist projects, Crimea and Biro Bidjan, in addition to the minor autonomous agrarian regions in the Ukraine. There are various interpretations of motives behind its activities. Some would view them as an application to Jews of Soviet principles concerning national minorities. There is no doubt that both the precarious economic situation of the Jewish masses in Russia during the first decade that followed the November Revolution, and the desire on the part of the Bolsheviks to create competition against Zionism were the two major motivating forces.

In 1924, a special representative of the Soviet Government in Berlin began to lay the ground for mass colonization in the Crimea, where a Jewish republic was to be established. The chief instigator of this project was the Jewish Soviet economist, Larin, who visualized a Jewish center with a population of 400,000. The tempo of colonization was rather fast at the

start. Its sponsors planned a settlement of about 12,000 families by the end of 1932. In that year, the Soviet press reported, however, that only 9,273 families actually were settled there and only 4,000 of these remained there on January 1, 1932. Further colonization for this region was abandoned mainly because of the substitution of Biro Bidjan as the locale for a new Jewish autonomous republic and because of the objection on the part of Crimea's indigenous population. The financing of the Crimea project was aided in a large measure by American Jews who were anxious to settle their declassed co-religionists on land. Their activity was carried out with the assistance of the Agro-Joint, a subsidiary of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. In the very first stage of experimentation of the Crimean and Ukrainian projects, minor sums were donated by the Joint Distribution Committee to the Agro-Joint. Since 1928, the settlement was financed by the American Society for Jewish Farm Settlements in Russia, Inc. The Agro-Joint continued to serve as subsidiary for that group. In 1938, arrangements were made by the Agro-Joint to discontinue its direct help. The Comzet was the Soviet agency in charge of this work. While the Crimean experiment was more territorialist in nature than the Ukrainian, the latter was one of the most ambitious attempts to settle Jews on land.

Colonization activities were transferred to Biro Bidjan. A decision of the Presidium of the Central Executive of the Soviet Government of March 24, 1928, which followed a report of the Comzet, called for "the establishment of a close settlement of Jews" in the Amur region on the border of Manchuria. It was indicated that in case of successful colonization experience, the ultimate goal would be the transformation into "a Jewish national territorial administrative unit." The actual work of settlement was begun in May of the same year.

The plans for settlement were rather ambitious. A quota of 100,000 families to be settled within a reasonable time was set up. There was talk of even a million settlers. A sharp attack on Palestine by communists and their sympathizers throughout the world was launched on the basis that Biro

Bidjan was to solve the problem of the Jews in Poland and other countries. In the words of Otto Heller, the answer "of the Jewish proletariat and starving artisans of Eastern Europe" was, "next year in Biro Bidjan." During the period of the popularity of this project and even today, the many Yiddishists saw in Biro Bidjan the solution of the problems of survival of the Yiddish language and secular culture. The difficulties of the terrain and the shortcomings in preparation and method soon dampened their optimism. The sponsors were soon hoping that the number of Jewish immigrants could be brought up to 50,000 individuals by the end of the first Five Year Plan. Actually, 8,000 were settled. The second Five Year Plan, announced in September, 1932, provided for the settlement of 300,000 souls before the end of 1937, 50% to 60% of whom were to be Jews. On May 7, 1934, Biro Bidjan was proclaimed a Jewish autonomous region.

None of these ambitious plans were realized. It is estimated that Biro Bidjan today contains about 18,000 to 25,000 Jews out of a general population of more than 70,000. The lack of success in this territorialist venture is usually attributed to the half-hearted attempts on the part of the Soviet Government to carry out its plans; the lack of interest of the younger generation of Soviet Jews in any national Jewish projects of this type. The continuous liquidation on charges of Trotskyism and sabotage of the group of Jewish Communists who were interested in the upbuilding of Biro Bidjan and who conducted the colonization work, is given as another minor reason.

V

The disbanding of the ITO and the inaction of the Labor Territorialist groups did not imply the death of Territorialist ideology. During the past decade, from time to time, individuals have suggested territorial settlement in various places of the world. The accession of Hitler to power in Germany and the terrible plight of the Jews in that country, coupled with the political difficulties in Palestine and its inability to furnish a complete solution to the refugee problem, have brought about a revival of organizational activities among the Territorialists.

Poland furnished a natural ground for such activities. Adherents of territorial ideology are naturally to be found among former members of such groups. In July, 1935, a Conference of a number of Territorialist groups was held in London and a world organization by the name of the Freeland League for Jewish Territorial Colonization was formed. The composition of its followers is a varied one. It was headed by the late Dr. Moses Gaster, the former chief rabbi of the Sephardic community of London. It includes a number of intellectuals and many adherents of former groups. Some of its adherents insist on a socialist government for the future territories. Others insist on the Yiddish language and culture being recognized as the official intellectual media for such regions.

The program of this group is similar to that of the ITO. It seeks to provide an outlet for the Jews who want or who must settle outside of their present homes. No competition to Zionism is intended by the majority of the leaders of this movement. As a matter of fact, many of them emphasize the lesson which Palestine could teach the settlements in the new territory in collective living, agricultural colonization, pioneering and self-sufficiency.

It can not be said that the articulate Territorialists have abandoned completely their penchant for ideological speculation concerning the Territory or Territories. Yet, it must be granted that they have learned. There are few of the extreme school who still insist upon the Territory of the future as the complete solution of the problems of all the Jews in the world. Some of the Yiddishists, too, are less vocal in their demand that this territory be either turned into a "Yiddishland" or not be built at all. Some of the socialists advocate collectivist principles in agricultural settlement because this method was proven to be the most effective in Palestine, but not so much because of its social and ethical desirability.

Outstanding individuals and organizations of repute, active in the work of European relief, are beginning to investigate possible territories, because of their realization of the difficulties which most countries in the world are now placing

in the way of immigration of refugees. Such individuals and organizations look upon Territorialism rather from a practical point of view. They are not concerned with either its cultural or national problems or consequences. The present mission of inquiry in British Guiana is an example of an activity of this type. So is the so-called International Jewish Colonization Society founded in November 1938 by one Daniel Wolf in Amsterdam.

Zionists, too, have changed their attitude to Territorialism. In the early stages of both movements, the combat between them was based on real motives. The Zionists actually feared that a successful territorial experiment might spell the ruin to their plans for Palestine. Today, the situation is different. While many Zionists are skeptical concerning the possibilities of obtaining suitable territories, none of them, it can be said, would object to such experiments today, as long as they would not be set up as an effort to put a stop to Jewish progress in Palestine.

Nor is the Territorialist solution sought by Jews only. Of late it is stressed increasingly by some governments which, in their double desire to obtain colonies and at the same time dispense with a large number of their Jewish populations, resort to Territorialism as a political expedient. The classic example in this situation is Poland, which is following its own 18th and 19th century precedents. On August 2, 1936, an official communique of the Polish Government maintained that the Jewish problem in the country could be settled only if Poland obtains colonies in South Africa or South America. On October 7, 1936, the Polish Foreign Office called upon foreign financiers to assist Jewish emigration from Poland to countries outside Palestine. On the following day, Poland officially asked the League of Nations to sponsor an international conference to discuss mass emigration of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe. The Poles also gave great publicity to a territorial project in Madagascar and sent there a commission of inquiry which included some Jewish experts. Since then the problem has been raised repeatedly from the platform of the Sejm.

The recent visit of Count Ciano, Foreign Minister of Italy, to Warsaw once more gave an opportunity for Poland to emphasize its territorial aims and ambitions. Roumania, too, seems to be embarking on the same course. There is no doubt that Territorialism will receive its full share of attention from these quarters in the future. Following the November pogroms in Germany came a tentative offer by Prime Minister Chamberlain of England of territories in British Guiana and other places. There are also instances of such proposals by well-intentioned Christians, whose sole motive is a genuine desire to be of service to Jews in their present plight.

There are other types of Territorialism in existence. One of them, for the lack of a better classification, could be called "the lunatic fringe" of the movement. Those who belong to this category come out, from time to time, with extremely detailed projects concerning new territories. They include such details as the color of the flag, the legal age of marriage and the shape of the coins to be issued in the new state. Their leaders and proponents hint nebulously at negotiations with certain countries with large territorial possibilities usually located in South America. They manage to gather about them a number of misled youths to whom they give lessons in pioneering in stuffy club rooms.

Even more dangerous are persons who frequently initiate projects for territories with far less altruistic motives. A prominent or not so prominent dentist or lawyer will interview, while on a cruise, the third secretary of the president of a South American republic and will return to give flashing headlines to the newspapers about projects for the settlement of a million Jews within the next year or so. A publication chronically short of funds will attempt to recoup its fortunes by sponsoring a project in a neighboring state through the means of a combination petition and subscription campaign. Naturally the publishers do not take the trouble to inquire about the true possibilities of the territory or the attitude of the government concerned. The results are disastrous. These adventurers thrive particularly in money-giving lands such as the United States.

Their victims include many individuals whose motives are beyond any doubt, but who are ignorant of the difficulties involved.

Today more than ever the problem of places for emigration is paramount among the Jews. At the same time the political and economic state of the world is highly inimical to the establishment of new territories. The acuity of the need, combined with the widespread conviction that a thoroughgoing revision in the status of the Jews of certain countries is necessary, tend to encourage hasty and ill-considered schemes. Such are even a greater danger today than no plans at all.

ABRAHAM G. DUKER

●

JEWS IN CANADA

I

THE historical connection between Jews and Canada dates back to the French occupation at the beginning of the 17th Century. The archives of that period show not only that quite a few merchants, officers and missionaries who came to "New France" bore names revealing a Marrano ancestry, and boasted of family traditions of Jewish origin, but also that much of the early trade between France and Canada was carried on by Jewish merchants of Bordeaux, among whom the name of the Gradis family was prominent. Nevertheless it was not until the British conquest of French Canada in 1763 that Jews began to settle permanently and legally in Canada, for an edict of the French King had previously prohibited the presence of professing Jews in the French colonies.

The first Jew known to have settled permanently in Canada was Aaron Hart, commissary officer on the staff of General Amherst when the British forces entered Montreal in 1760, and who was later to become Seigneur of Beçancour. Among other officers in the British armies, who subsequently also took part in the Indian wars, were Emanuel de Cordova, Hananiel Garcia, Isaac Miranda and Samuel Jacobs. Other Jewish merchants who came up from the New England colonies were Col. David Salesby Frank, Jacob de Maurera, Lazarus David,