

AUGUST 1944

CONTEMPORARY
*Jewish
Record*

UNPROMISED LAND

I. N. STEINBERG

CONCERNING MINORITIES

HANNAH ARENDT

OF FAITH: A POLEMIC

WALTER RATHENAU

40 Cents a Copy: \$2.00 a Year

Give the

CONTEMPORARY
JEWISH RECORD
for the NEW YEAR

Subscription Offer RATES Good Until October 15, 1944

1 One-Year Subscription \$2

3 One-Year Subscriptions \$5

Four or More One-Year Subscriptions \$1.50 each

IMPORTANT: Your own renewal subscription may be included in this offer. Add 50¢ a year for foreign and Canadian postage.

An appropriate Gift Card will be mailed to each recipient.

The CONTEMPORARY JEWISH RECORD has become indispensable to anyone who wishes to be informed and enlightened upon the status and destiny of the Jewish people throughout the world in these most critical years of their existence. 'Everyone' should include, at least, every American Jew."

MARVIN LOWENTHAL, Author

Send your order with remittance today

CONTEMPORARY JEWISH RECORD

5 FOURTH AVENUE

NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

CONTEMPORARY
*Jewish
Record*

Volume VII, Number 4 : AUGUST 1944



Published Bimonthly

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Contemporary Jewish Record

CONTENTS FOR AUGUST 1944

		PAGE
Unpromised Land	I. N. Steinberg	339
Concerning Minorities	Hannah Arendt	353
A Letter from London	Albert M. Hyamson	369
Socio-Economic Relations of Arabs and Jews in Palestine	Bernard D. Weinryb	375
The Yivo	Shlomo Noble	385
Bialystok Transplanted and Transformed	Joseph Chaikin	392
Chronicles		401
Books in Review		
Art, Freedom and Use	Herbert Poster	417
The Idol of Sources	Isaiah Sonne	420
Warsaw, 1915	Israel Knox	422
Father to Son	Harold Rosenberg	424
Alone	Clement Greenberg	425
Magazine Digest		427
The Cedars of Lebanon		
10. Of Faith: A Polemic	Walter Rathenau	434
Contributors		448

Editorial Board: MORRIS D. WALDMAN, JOHN SLAWSON, HARRY SCHNEIDERMAN, JULIUS B. MALLER. *Editor:* ADOLPH S. OKO; *Managing Editor:* LOUIS BERG; *Assistant Editor:* ISAAC ROSENFELD; *Circulation Manager:* GLADYS BOBRICK.

Published every two months by The American Jewish Committee at 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. 40¢ a copy; \$2 a year; Canadian and Foreign, \$2.50. Entered as second-class matter August 11, 1939, at the post office in New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1944, by The American Jewish Committee. Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance. Unsolicited mss must be accompanied by return postage. Indexed in International Index to Periodicals, Index to Labor Articles, Magazine Subject Index, and Public Affairs Information Service.

Unpromised Land

I. N. STEINBERG

ON MAY 25, 1939, Mr. J. C. W. Willcock, Premier of the Labor Government of Western Australia, discussed for the first time with this writer the project of Jewish colonization within the borders of his state.

I had arrived in Perth a few days earlier as representative of the Freeland League of London in order to ascertain whether a proposal for a Jewish settlement in the Kimberley region of Western Australia would be acceptable to the Australians. After explaining in general the idea and the principles of our proposed settlement, I asked the Premier what the attitude of his government would be toward such a scheme, and waited with understandable tension for his reply.

It was clear and forthright. "I am not prejudiced against Jewish colonization. But you must go and personally investigate the area in view to avoid failure."

This simple statement by the Australian statesman and labor leader was a happy surprise. It had always been the accepted view that Australians in general, and labor in particular, were hostile to any project of settling foreigners as a group in their country. Yet Mr. Willcock seemed entirely friendly to the idea. He proceeded: "Of course, we must have the guarantee that your people will stay in the Jewish settlement, develop it and not leave for the cities to become a charge on the government. But, first, go and see the Kimberleys for yourself."

This was the first step toward the realization of the aims of the movement for a large-scale Jewish colonization in Australia. How did the Freeland League arrive at this idea and why did it concentrate its efforts on that far-distant continent?

To be sure, this was not the first time that Australia had come into the ambit of Jewish colonization plans. In 1910 Israel Zangwill, head of the Jewish Territorial Organization, started conversations with Sir Newton Moore, then Premier of Western Australia, in connection with a plan for settling one million Jews in the north of that state. "You cannot expect great peoples like the Chinese and the Japanese to remain

impassive about big new empty lands which lie in their vicinity," said Zangwill in an interview with an Australian paper. "What we require is a colony so large that it will enable the Jews who take possession of it to be commercially strong enough to retain their individuality and particularly their religion."*

Zangwill's endeavors, however, could not succeed; his projects envisaged and demanded always the granting of *political autonomy* to a Jewish colony. The governments of potential lands of refuge for Jews were not prepared to grant such autonomy. Thus the Australian project was forgotten and never afterwards mentioned among the many territorialist schemes. If the Freeland League was to put Australia again on the map in the desperate Jewish search for a land, it could do so only on a new basis—a non-political basis. The physical, economic and cultural aspects rather than the political had to be stressed in any plan for the broad colonization of Jews in a new country. A concentration of Jewish colonists on constructive work of an economic and spiritual nature would remove political difficulties, allay political fears on the part of the people of the country of adoption, and at the same time release all the latent energies of the Jewish pioneers for the one historic purpose—the building of a new Jewish home.

THE Freeland movement developed in pre-war Europe quite naturally, not so much from any single ideological source, but from the urgent needs of the Jewish people at that time. The thirties of this century were full of misgivings and real threats to the Jewish masses, especially in Poland. The whole atmosphere of Europe—after Hitler's rise to power—was laden with the electricity of racial hatred and expectation of war. Led by their historic instinct, the Jews felt that—situated as they were in the border areas of Poland, Russia and Germany—they would once again become the first victims of the approaching storm. While continuing bravely but hopelessly to fight for their civil and political status in a Poland dominated by open reactionaries and anti-Semites, great numbers of Jews and their youth in particular attempted desperately to get out of that country and the European continent. Unfortunately, there were not many real chances of escape. The way to the democratic countries was barred by the impossibility of obtaining the longed-for visas and permits; the path to Palestine, by the insurmountable difficulties of securing a certificate.

* Republished in the *Hebrew Standard* of Sydney, October 14, 1910.

Out of this situation arose the desire of the trapped masses for a new place in the world where they could in safety and peace rebuild their endangered lives in a constructive and Jewish way. They were no longer interested in Territorialism as a philosophy and special school of Jewish thought; they wanted, above all, a *territory*, a concrete piece of land, in some remote country overseas where they could start life afresh, without fear and want. This was the reason why the new Freeland movement was in no way antagonistic to Zionism, and why it constituted itself not as a party but as a "League." The new movement appealed to *all* sections and groups of the Jewish people, irrespective of their national and social allegiances, to join together for the specific purpose of establishing a Jewish settlement in some unoccupied area of the world. The idea caught the imagination of large sections of Jewish youth, and the year 1938 already saw the first Freeland groups for agricultural training (built somewhat on the pattern of the *Halutz* idea) near Vilna and Warsaw.

A movement of this type might, by its very nature, originate in the very thick of the Jewish masses of Poland or Lithuania. However, its practical program of securing a country for colonization could only be realized in the centers of Western European democracy—in London, or in Paris.

Thus the Freeland League, after holding a conference in London in 1935, gave to its executive the mandate to investigate the possibilities of settlement in various regions and to start negotiations with the governments concerned.

The first signs of a feasible plan came from the French Government. Its Minister of Colonies, M. Moutet, in 1937 made a tentative proposal to various Jewish organizations in Paris (among them the Freeland League) to participate in a plan for the colonization of Madagascar, New Caledonia and some other islands of the French Colonial Empire. The proposal attracted at that time much public attention but did not meet with any vigorous support on the part of responsive Jewish bodies. Among the many reasons for this coolness, one was decisive: there existed in the regions suggested by France a strong and self-conscious native population. A Jewish colonization would have to overcome this most dangerous obstacle from the very start.

It was thus reasonable to turn to the possibilities within the British Empire. This line of research was facilitated by a great change in British public opinion in 1938 with regard to the refugee problem. The

failure of the Evian Conference on Refugees in July of that year had demonstrated how difficult it had become to rely on the good will of the many states represented there, and the horrible pogroms against German and Austrian Jewry in November, 1938, hammered into every head the conviction that the need was desperate for a constructive solution of the problem. Neville Chamberlain, then Prime Minister, proclaimed in Parliament his readiness to offer some areas in Africa and South America specifically for Jewish colonization.

Simultaneously many leading personalities in British Jewry realized that, apart from the accepted practice of infiltration of Jewish refugees into all possible countries, a policy of more concentrated colonization in one or a few overseas areas was advisable. This remarkable change of mind made it possible for the Freeland League in London to establish its Advisory Council, consisting of eminent Jewish leaders interested in Jewish colonization outside of Palestine though not opposed to Zionist efforts. Sir Charles D. Seligman, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, Lt. Col. Stanley Cohen, the Hon. Mrs. Ernest Franklin, Philip Emanuel, Charles Sebag-Montefiore and others became members of the Council under the chairmanship of Sir Robert Waley Cohen.

The movement very soon after its formation was able to proclaim a concrete objective. Out of innumerable projects emerged the plan for a Jewish settlement in Australia, a plan which seemed to meet best the four conditions of colonization formulated by the League. These were:

(a) A large area capable of absorbing as many Jewish people as might be necessary, and capable also of economic expansion.

(b) A healthy country with sufficient fertile soil, water supply and a tolerable climate, so that a normal economy and a Jewish community could gradually develop.

(c) An unpopulated, or scarcely populated area, in which the Jewish pioneers and settlers could from the start be spared the problems and conflicts connected with the adjustment to a native population—in brief, no "Arab" problem.

(d) A democratic country in which the process of settling Jews could easily fit into the general economic and political framework of the people of that country and thus be based on a permanent mutual agreement.

Australia is a continent with vast undeveloped and unpopulated spaces awaiting the dynamic touch of man. Australia, further, is a democratic country built on a strong Anglo-Saxon tradition and far-reaching ideas

UNPROMISED LAND

of social security. Moreover, Australia as a state could be approached by a Jewish body not only on humanitarian grounds (the Australian Government in 1938 granted 15,000 permits for refugees!), but also on the basis of her own vital need for population and development. The Freeland League began negotiations with Australians in London along these lines, setting forth a concrete plan for a large-scale settlement in the *East Kimberley* Province of Western Australia (the northwestern part of the continent, adjacent to the Indian Ocean).

A wealthy and respected Christian family, the M. P. Duracks of Perth, proposed at that time to transfer to the League their big leasehold estate in the Kimberleys, extending over 7,000,000 acres (about 10,800 square miles) between the Ord and the Victoria Rivers. This tremendous area was being used only for pasture; it had never been explored from the agricultural or industrial viewpoint, and was inhabited by only a handful of whites and natives. The region appeared attractive, but it needed, of course, thorough scientific investigation on the spot.

It was no less important to transfer all negotiations in connection with our scheme to Australia. The Freeland League knew only too well that the Australian people in general were cold toward any scheme involving the close settlement of foreigners in their country. The task before the League was to convince public opinion in Australia that a Jewish settlement of refugees would not only alleviate the tragic fate of Jewry but also contribute to the future economic and cultural welfare of the Australian people. A Jewish settlement would in no way endanger the political coherence and stability of the Australian state since the Jews would owe allegiance to no other state and would become Australians as soon as possible. On the other hand, such a settlement would help Jewish refugees to recover, mentally and physically, from their terrible sufferings in Europe and to start in a familiar communal atmosphere the difficult work of pioneering in a strange country.

ON BEHALF of the League I left England and arrived in Perth in May, 1939. As mentioned above, the first talk with the Premier of Western Australia was encouraging; but it was only the beginning of a long campaign.

A most gratifying feature of the situation was that not only the Ministers of Mr. Willcock's cabinet showed active interest in our project, but also the other leading institutions of the state. The University, the Anglican Church, the Chamber of Commerce and the Press all re-

sponded favorably. Dr. Le Fanu, Archbishop of Perth and Primate of Australia, went so far as to call a conference of clergymen which passed a resolution in favor of the Jewish project. Each of the representative institutions approached the problem from its own point of view: spiritual, scientific, economic, patriotic. They all arrived at the same positive conclusion which was, perhaps, best formulated by Professor Walter Murdoch, Chancellor of Perth University, a man of the highest moral repute in the country.

When the project is submitted to the arbitrament of public opinion, Australia will be on her trial; it will be a test of her humaneness—and of her intelligence. . . . On every ground, moral and material, we should support this project with enthusiasm. Israel's extremity is Australia's opportunity.

The leading daily paper in the state, *The West Australian*, with a circulation of 75,000, propagated the same idea with remarkable fervor. It is significant that the paper has maintained its favorable propaganda up to the very present, publishing as recently as March 14, 1944, a leading article on "Jewish Migrants," in which it stated: "There is plenty of room in our North for a colonization scheme for European Jews. The establishment of such a settlement would be an interesting experiment in a new type of colonization."

There was no doubt: the people of Western Australia were prepared to accept the project favorably. More than that: the very idea of a "Jewish" settlement in the country touched their hearts and appealed to their minds.

With this good augury we embarked on our journey to the "mysterious" Kimberley country. I say "we" because there were four in the party: M. P. Durack and his son; George F. Melville (a lecturer on agriculture at the University), and myself. We left by plane and traversed in eighteen hours the distance of 2,200 miles from Perth to Wyndham, the small seaport of the district, which served as the door to East Kimberley. We then spent several weeks in covering (by car) an area of some 750 miles, in an effort to get the best possible picture of the huge region.

It was fascinating to survey the endless, empty spaces around us stretching far beyond the horizon. What a contrast to the pathetic narrowness of the European areas within which a score of nations and millions of people were fighting for every inch of the ground. No great imagination was needed to envisage villages, fields, irrigation canals, workshops, schools, synagogues and even cities springing up in the very

midst of this green wilderness. Application of modern technique and scientific planning would do wonders when combined with these untapped riches of nature. We watched an airplane landing on a spot where the most graceful animals of Australia, the kangaroos, were quietly hopping about, and it seemed to us a symbol of the future.

Our expedition made all possible investigations, collected samples of the soil, took photographs of the landscape, the grasses, rivers and mountains, and prepared tentative plans for a systematic development of the area. The main idea in the report was to create conditions for a *mixed economy* based not on one specific economic activity but on a combination of three: the raising of sheep and cattle, tropical agriculture and secondary industries. An agro-industrial economy was envisaged in order to offer the Jewish colonists a choice of occupations, a material, as well as a spiritual equilibrium.

The colonization process, as contemplated, was to be a gradual one in accordance with the pioneering character of the whole project, and using as far as possible co-operative methods of work. Within a few years there could be a surplus of products for export, and Wyndham offers an excellent port, especially to the densely populated countries to the north—in Near Asia. Of course, the building up of the contemplated spheres of economic activity would have to be preceded by a great program of public works, devoted to the laying of the foundations of the settlement (housing, roads, fencing, irrigation, central power). These tasks as well as serious scientific research work would certainly occupy the settlers during their first years.

The expedition left the region fully convinced of its suitability for a large-scale settlement of white Europeans. Neither the topography nor the climate appeared to present unusual obstacles. With the exception of a few months in the year (December to March), when the summer rains occur, the climate is similar to that of a Mediterranean summer. The inhabitants of Western Australia as well as scientific observers were in agreement with our views. Professor J. A. Prescott, the leading Australian authority on agriculture, reported in 1940, after a personal inspection of the area: "I have no doubt that Europeans could adapt themselves to such climatic conditions. This area is exceptionally well placed with respect to the distribution of useful soils." In December 1941, Dr. A. P. Davis, who had spent many years in East Kimberley, declared in Perth that a community of white people would there "have for its home a country which is free from all the major tropical diseases

and which, from the point of view of health, will bear favorable comparison with any other tropical country in the world."

WHEN we returned to Perth we submitted two documents for the consideration of the West Australian Government: the Report on the tentative economic plans for the proposed settlement, and a Memorandum outlining the principles on which it should be based. The following are some of the principles:

(a) The Settlement should not become a separate political entity, but should be incorporated into the economic and political framework of the Commonwealth. Australian law and administration should be introduced from the beginning; and the settlers, who would come from many states of Europe, would in due course become Australian citizens. Thus there would be no danger of encountering "minority problems."

(b) All the work in connection with the pioneering stage would be undertaken by the Freeland League or a special Jewish Colonization Society. It would be responsible for the selection of the settlers and for the development of the settlement in such an effective and attractive way as to give no serious incentive for leaving the area. After investing their energies, labor and inspiration in the soil of the new free community the pioneers would hardly destroy it with their own hands for the doubtful benefits in the cities.

(c) The economy of the settlement would be scientifically planned, thus preventing waste of human and material resources within the new area, and competition with Australia's economic life. Most of the economic activities of the settlers in the initial stage should be established on a co-operative basis so that the settlement might become self-supporting at the earliest possible date.

(d) Subordinate, of course, to the supreme authority of the State and Commonwealth Governments, the colonists should exercise control over their economic and cultural affairs, it being understood that the settlement should be free to develop its spiritual and religious forms of life in accordance with its cultural heritage.

On August 20, 1939, the Government of Western Australia gave its approval to the project. In a letter to me, Mr. Willcock, the Premier, stated:

The report and memorandum dealing with the proposals in connection with the settlement of the Kimberley area by Jewish refugees, have had the consideration of my Government. . . . The Government agrees with your

points of view. . . . Your next step appears to be to make possible your desire to approach the Commonwealth Government and ascertain their attitude to the project and to the introduction of refugees for the purpose of forming a settlement. Should your approaches in that connection be met with success, this Government would desire its representative to confer with you and reach agreement regarding many conditions.

Among the tentatively suggested conditions two are worth mentioning. The Government wanted to be directly represented by one of its officers at the center where the refugees were to be recruited for the proposed scheme; and, with regard to education, "any schools established should comply with the standard of efficient schools as set out by the Education Department."

This decision of the Government marked a significant fact in Australia's public life since it clearly departed from the traditional policy on immigration. No wonder that this decision of a Labor Government made a deep impression in the entire Australian press as a sign of the changing public mind.

Encouraged by this initial success, the emissary of the Freeland League was to have proceeded to Canberra, the site of the Commonwealth Government, as suggested by the Government in Perth. Yet it was even then felt, and later confirmed, that this apparently natural line of action might have endangered the cause. Australia is a genuinely democratic country with an influential national press and a citizenry that sharply watches its interests. It would not do at all if consent to the Kimberley scheme were to be given by the Commonwealth Government without the knowledge of the people of Australia. A colonization of Jews, wherever it might take place, could never be safely embarked upon without the express good will of the people in that country. The history of Jewish colonization has shown with sufficient clarity that the main problem cannot be solved by diplomatic negotiations with governments alone, but needs even more the enlightenment of the people in the midst of whom the Jewish wanderers intend to build a permanent home. Thus the way from Perth to Canberra was complicated and prolonged: we had first to visit the Eastern states of the country. There, in Melbourne and in Sydney, was concentrated the industrial and influential part of the population. Public opinion had to be won in these regions for the Jewish cause.

This campaign took several years—from 1939 until 1943. The powerful Trade Union movement had to be approached first through its cen-

tral body in Melbourne. The Australasian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) gave from the start an attentive hearing to the scheme. They did not put any objections to it of a racial or political nature, but they wanted to be clear about two points: whether Jewish immigrants were capable of doing hard pioneering work on the land, and whether the colonists would be prepared to stay on in the settlement. Both questions were intended to reassure organized labor in Australia that there was no danger of Jewish immigrants settling in large numbers in the cities to undermine the social standards of the Australian workers. We had no difficulties in explaining to the labor leaders how far the intentions of the Freeland League were from endangering the social standard of their people and how remarkably well Jews had succeeded in hard colonization and other manual labor in Palestine, Russia, Poland and the United States.

The ACTU then expressed its approval of the Kimberley project on July 30, 1940, and began soliciting the opinions of the Trades and Labor Councils in the various States of the Australian Commonwealth.

The resolution of the ACTU was confirmed by the Labor Councils of Sydney (New South Wales), South Australia and Tasmania. The secretary of the Council in Sydney (representing 300,000 workers of New South Wales) stated in a letter:

We wish you every success in the endeavors to establish in the Kimberleys a haven for the victims of Fascist ferocity that compelled them to leave their homelands and we hope the settlement will be an established fact in the near future.

The ACTU expressed its views on this subject not just once, but continued to confirm them in the years to follow and to make them known to the Commonwealth Government. Other social and communal circles in Melbourne and Sydney took the same attitude. Dr. D. Mannix, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, stated in a letter to me:

I hope that the people and Government of Australia, recognizing the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, will give sympathetic consideration to the proposals [for Kimberley] which you have been authorized to place before them. You have all my good wishes for the success of any scheme that will help the refugees and wipe out a stain on our common humanity.

On February 27, 1943, the heads of three Christian denominations in Australia (Church of England, Methodist and Presbyterian) addressed an open letter to Prime Minister Curtin urging "a decision from

the Government in answer to the request that a considerable area in Australia be set apart as soon as circumstances permit for a Jewish refugee settlement."

Particular mention must be made of the "crusade" for this Jewish cause untiringly conducted by the Anglican Bishop in Sydney, the Right Rev. C. V. Pilcher, in letters to the press, in sermons from the pulpit and over the radio. In a radio speech, he said:

More important than anything else are the moral and Christian aspects of the Jewish Kimberley project. Australia has now an opportunity, before all the world, of alleviating in some measure the indescribable sufferings of those many thousands whom Hitler has rendered homeless.

It is impossible to enumerate here all the manifestations of good will on the part of the Lord Mayors of the capital cities of Australia, the Chambers of Commerce, the national press and the universities of the country, and from prominent jurists and other public figures. In particular, the chancellors of the universities and the leading professors of all college faculties were everywhere the first to formulate and to sign the public appeals to the Australian people and government. They were also instrumental in the establishment, in 1943, of the "Committees of Friends of the Kimberley Plan." In their appeals they stated:

Today, more than ever before, Australia should acknowledge her increased moral and political responsibilities to the world at large, and extend all possible aid to persecuted peoples. Patriotism can no longer be confined to one country; it has a higher and wider implication, which includes every activity calculated to rebuild justice and order. . . . The opportunity to help in the rehabilitation of homeless people will be as great in Australia as in any country in the world; and the approval by the Federal Government of the proposal to form a Jewish settlement in the Kimberleys would be an indication that we are not unmindful of that opportunity.

It would certainly be a mistake to assume that this positive attitude was adopted by all the constituent Australian bodies on humanitarian and Christian grounds alone. Patriotic motives and practical considerations also, and perhaps in the first place, dictated their attitude. Australia stands on the eve of great historic developments as a member of the British Commonwealth and as a Pacific power. She knows that she might become the major outpost of "white" civilization in that portion of the globe. Dr. V. Evatt, Minister for External Affairs, expressed these ambitions in a recent speech before the Australian Parliament and stressed the fact that from now on Australia must "partake in the shap-

ing of international affairs not only in the Pacific but also in Europe. We have now realized how intimately our security is bound up to all of Southwest Asia."

Australia can play this part only if her economic and cultural energies are developed to a far greater extent than ever visualized before. Is the Australia of today in a position to satisfy her own and the world's historic needs? With her seven million population placed against a milliard of colored peoples in her immediate neighborhood, with her primary industries always dependent on the dangerous fluctuations in international markets, Australia seems to be short of the requirements for becoming a great nation. Her manufacturing industry has developed during these war years, but how is she going to retain it in the postwar years of competition? Even the prospects for her agricultural and pastoral products (wheat, wool, meat) are becoming doubtful in the face of the expansion of agriculture in England and Europe. Yet the Australian people are accustomed to a relatively high standard of living and they are uneasy about maintaining it. There is only one natural way of securing these standards and the economic balance in the country: expansion, the most vigorous expansion, of her own population.

A no less important need for Australia is the enrichment of her cultural life by a steady influx of industrious and spirited immigrants. Divergent as might be the approaches to Australia's postwar plans, they all demand first and foremost—people, people, and people. All classes and sections of Australia are gradually coming to the same conclusion.

From whence shall the new population come to Australia? She cannot rely on mere natural increase which is very low, or on large-scale immigration from the British Isles. There is good cause for stating that Britain will not desire to lose any of her people after the war, for they will all be required at home in the great task of reconstruction for many years to come. There is but one element to which the country can look with confidence—the European refugees, and particularly the Jews. Thus the Kimberley project appears to public opinion in Australia as one of the reasonable ways of contributing to her needs for population and economic development.

IN NOVEMBER 1941, the project was submitted to the Commonwealth Government. Unfortunately the war with Japan, which began the following month, forcibly postponed the consideration of a plan envisaged for the peaceful postwar period. The whole North of Australia

came under the direct threat of the Japanese. The Freeland League, therefore, could do no more than continue its work of enlightenment and propaganda. Much as Australia as a whole is free from direct and organized anti-Semitic movements, there is yet some popular sentiment against colonies of "foreigners" (foreigners in general, rather than Jews). The sentiment of the man in the street is composed of prejudices and economic fears built up through generations of insular and isolated life. The Government itself has to educate this mysterious and uncontrollable man-in-the-street before making its own decision.

Its line is perhaps best formulated by its economic adviser, Professor D. B. Copland, in 1942:

Australia may need a break with certain traditions, and the surrender of certain cherished beliefs which belong to the time when Australia felt she had sufficient security to insist upon a policy to which the rest of the world did not readily subscribe. That feeling of security has been shattered by recent events, and she would have to make some revision in her external responsibilities.

This revision is openly proceeding. Prime Minister Curtin stated several times that Australia needs an increase of population up to 20,000,000 at least. On August 9, 1943, he spoke during the election campaign as follows, with direct reference to the north of Australia:

Australia could not discharge her important role without population. We have to double or treble our present seven millions. Even that will not be sufficient because it will be relatively small in number to the millions which are so close to us. Quality of population must also be an important factor in our security.

He repeated the same idea quite recently at a press conference in Washington when, in response to a question on his attitude toward proposals that the Kimberley region be thrown open to Jewish refugees, he said that his country was eager to see the widest possible immigration to Australia both during and after the war. He declared that the Kimberley region could not be developed without great planning and the spending of public funds.

P. J. Clarey, president of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and labor representative to the recent conference of the International Labor Office in Philadelphia, spoke on May 4, 1944, at a New York luncheon in his honor arranged by the Freeland League. On this occasion he asserted that under proper safeguards against deterioration of social and economic standards, Australia could support a population of

from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 people, and that the Commonwealth, at the end of the war, would probably reconsider its policy of strict control of immigration. At this same luncheon, Mr. Clarey, representing 1,200,000 workers of Australia (from a population of 7,000,000), again confirmed trade union support for the Jewish Kimberley plan.

THE project of colonization in Australia does not claim to solve the whole Jewish problem; it does, however, strive to give a constructive reply to a part of this problem. There is no use denying that the desperately complicated Jewish question cannot be solved by some one and indivisible method. The very complexity of the tragedy requires a variety of approaches and methods. Part of the surviving Jewish people in Europe will probably try to stay on in the old countries and to rebuild their ruined Jewish life. Their heroic efforts will have to be supported wholeheartedly by the solidarity of the Jewish people the world over (the J. D. C., the Jewish Labor Committee and other relief organizations are already preparing themselves for this task). Another, even greater, part of Jewry will certainly strive to reach Palestine, to restore the Jewish people on its own soil as a political nation. The Zionists are well in charge of this mighty popular movement. Still, there will always be a third part of the Jewish people who will prefer—for many reasons—to settle in some new, undeveloped and unpopulated continent where they would surely be free of political worries and conflicts. Instead of roaming the roads of the earth in search of individual homes, they might look for a place where an organized Jewish settlement would offer them and their children a sound economic basis and the normal Jewish atmosphere of a collective home. The Australian project will appeal to them.

No one of these methods need stand in the way of the others. The decision obviously remains with our suffering people.

Concerning Minorities

HANNAH ARENDT

THAT "the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must" (Thucydides) is a very old maxim; and it is a very old tradition of Western civilization to expect statesmen and politicians to concern themselves with the protection of the weak. On the other hand, the precept identifying the weak with minorities and the strong with the majority, or dividing peoples living together intermixedly into "minorities" and "majorities," is so novel and modern that it is permissible perhaps to question its wisdom in general.

The last twenty-five years, actually, should have taught the whole world that national conflicts between peoples cannot be resolved by setting some up as nations and others as "minorities": forcing the former to renounce part of their sovereignty within a system of national states for the sake of their "minorities," while trying to persuade the latter to acquiesce to a protection acknowledged only with extreme reluctance. All experts to the contrary, it has been shown that national minorities act in the same way as parliamentary minorities: under favorable conditions they try to become majorities and under unfavorable they strive to create factors of disturbance. In the last respect they are much more successful than parliamentary minorities, which usually have a stake in the continued existence of a state embodying common interests. As the example of Czechoslovakia and other states shows, national minorities do not hesitate to form alliances with other national minorities and engage on their own initiative in foreign politics outside the borders of the territory in which they are located.

It is more than doubtful, in fact, whether it was at all wise to have introduced the minorities principle into the European "belt of mixed populations," where various peoples have been settled among one another for centuries and where it can be decided only arbitrarily which of them are great enough to be promoted to the status of nations ruling over others as minorities. In any case, the introduction of the principle became inevitable once the Western principle of national states began to be applied generally throughout Eastern, Central and Southern

Europe. Today, in retrospect, the final collapse of the whole venture seems to have been no less inevitable.

Ever since it has been shown that the protection afforded by minority treaties was able neither to defend the weak nor settle national differences in a peaceful way, it has become fashionable, paradoxically, to talk of "minorities" in connection with insoluble conflicts or with groups of people in need of protection. The greater the conflicts of our society, the more strongly groups and individuals are possessed by a general sense of insecurity; and the more people feel themselves, whether justly or unjustly, handicapped from birth, the readier they are to declare themselves "minorities" and ask for protection against a majority that is often fictitious. When Negroes in this country, or Jews or Italians or Poles, say that they are a "minority," they only mean that they feel themselves assailed or wronged by all white people or all Gentiles or all non-Poles. The majority is always different, changing for each minority, and in most cases, thank God, it is an imaginary one—though the need of protection is not by any means imaginary. When, moreover, it is pointed out that the whole country "is built up of minorities" (Francis Biddle), the whole classification is reduced politically to an absurdity.

Because it is the need of protection and not a numerical relation that is decisive as to minority consciousness, any group of people exposed to professional or social discrimination establishes itself as a minority. As a matter of course steps are taken to provide protection to the "minority" formed by persons over the age of sixty-five (see *Harper's Magazine*, November 1943). The fact that the universal human fate of old age will never be obviated has already sufficed to provide the aged with a kind of protective association which segregates and shelters them as a minority from the rest of the human community. The contemporary individual's fear of discrimination—which, as a Jew or Negro or invalid or person over forty, he meets at every turn—is so great that he is neither amused nor frightened by the idea that life itself is a slow maturing from minority existence as an infant into a happy phase as part of the adult majority and then an inevitable decline into the unfortunate minority of the elderly and senile. If he were asked why the ancients said that those whom the gods love die young, he would probably reply that the gods of the ancients were unwilling to let their favorites suffer the sad fate of becoming members of a minority.

The contemporary minority expects to be protected by the real or imaginary majority—whether against the assimilatory tendencies of the

majority itself, which wishes to prevent its survival, or against the notorious propensities of the contemporary mob toward its extermination. It differentiates itself in principle thereby from those minorities to which it owes its designation—the religious nonconformist groups and parliamentary minorities. Religious "minorities" arose when the Protestant principle of freedom of conscience accomplished the suppression of the principle that *cuius regio eius religio*. In the eyes of the enlightened despots all faiths deviating from the state religion had a claim to toleration. On the other hand, parliamentary minorities, which stem from the Anglo-Saxon two-party system and entered history claiming from the very beginning the rights of prospective majorities, never really set themselves up as permanent minorities but received all the respect and consideration owed to future rulers.

The difference between the member of a modern minority and the member of a parliamentary or religious minority is that the former attains his minority status by an accident of birth alone, not by free choice or by a free profession of faith. As member of a weak minority, he, of course, must behave more or less as the religious nonconformists did, content to be tolerated; as member of a stronger minority, he will place his hopes in parliamentary fashion on eventual majority status and on a transfer of power. But he will never be able to invoke that principle which since the eighteenth century has been called Tolerance, and which, as a human attitude, formed the spiritual, and often the social basis too, of despotic toleration and the mutual respect of parliamentary factions.

Tolerance rests on a conviction of the intrinsic value of reason as capable of being expressed in the most varied opinions and ways of life, and at the same time on an understanding of reason's frailty, the nature of which involves the possibility of error. Tolerance honors the liberty of human action and the rationality of human thought precisely because, as the opposite of any kind of fanaticism, it recognizes the limitations of freedom and of reason. Tolerance, quite correctly, is co-ordinated with humanism; it is simply the expression of the belief that man as the subject of rational thought and free behavior amounts to more in every case and counts for more than any of his opinions or acts. Tolerance guarantees the dignity and solidarity of the human race by understanding that error and failure are functions of reason and freedom, and by assuming that the same reason and same human frailty exist in all peoples. In this sense tolerance is altogether a basic political attitude.

Minorities, however, had better not appeal to it for protection. For this charity of mind becomes mere conceited impudence if it "excuses" and "tolerates" natural differences between man and man for which no human action can be held responsible.

II

THAT Jews are found at the head of the so-called minorities movement is no cause for surprise, once you start with the assumption that the so-called minority problem originates in the need for security and protection. There is, in fact, no event in the international politics of this century in which their participation has been as prominent as in the creation of the minority treaties after the First World War. The Jews, who formed a majority in no country, were regarded as the *minorité par excellence* and therefore the natural and best representatives of the interests of all minorities. The Jews—or at least it seemed so to the Jewish as well as non-Jewish participants at the peace conferences—were the only people whose interests could be defended in no other way than by internationally guaranteed protection as a minority.

Of more importance than such formal considerations was the political fact that the Jews were the only people who did not seem interested in becoming a nation. And to avoid any appearance of such an ambition, all arrangements relating to Palestine were excluded from the minority treaties—as though it were a question of two separate peoples, one of which had been granted a claim to a national home in Palestine, while the other asked only to be assured definitely of its survival as a permanent minority with a dispersed population. The desires of Western Jewry, which wanted at all costs to avoid the term "*national minority*," were of great convenience to the authors of the minority treaties. The way in which the latter discussed "racial, religious or linguistic minorities" seemed to suit the needs of the Jews, but the truth was that this was only a means to avoid coming into conflict with the promised rights of national self-determination; the natural implication was that there was no such thing as a national minority with a claim to a national state of its own.

The result was an unpolitical, cultural-humanitarian interpretation of minority rights such as could be formed on the basis of Jewish needs, and with the approval of Jewish groups, who belonged numerically among the most important minorities. Minorities under the Versailles system came to be, in point of fact, those unlucky remnants of nation-

alities left over after the rights of national self-determination had been carried out. The treaties were compromises between the new nations, which were to be prevented from assimilating or exterminating alien peoples within their borders, and those minorities which could not be granted their own national states or be identified with the territories in which they were majorities. Again, the Jews appeared to be the only people for whom minority status was no compromise but a form of organization arrived at naturally.

It is idle to speculate whether this minorities system would have survived if it had not only been imposed on the newly created states, but had had every country belonging to the League of Nations bound to it. The discrimination between the old and the new states was in any case resented from the very beginning, especially by Poland. A separation of states had been created, some requiring general supervision and some that could be trusted politically. The countries concerned looked upon the minority treaties as instruments of Allied hegemony preventing them from concluding more independent, bilateral treaties with the countries of origin of their minorities. Again, the strongest argument for the minorities system and against bilateral treaties was the existence of the Jews, who had no country of origin and therefore became the strongest and most convinced advocates of the system.

Perhaps, in spite of this opposition, the protective system would have functioned better, at least while it lasted, had there been only unified national states and recognized minorities to deal with in the great Eastern and Southeastern European region of mixed nationalities. Instead, states had appeared there, which, for all their claims to national sovereignty, made a mockery of the ethnic uniformity of population characteristic of the great national states of the West on whose pattern they had been planned. The Czechs called their state Czechoslovakia, but this did not prevent the Slovaks from carrying on systematic obstruction. In Yugoslavia the Serbs pushed through their unified national state against all the votes of the Croats and Slovenes, who were not recognized as minorities. The picture presented by Poland, a state embodying a nationality that amounted to hardly more than two-thirds of its entire population, is familiar enough. Whether they were recognized juridically as minorities and given international protection—as was the case with all peoples settled in more than one of the new states—or whether they were established to all appearances as "state peoples" in countries ruled *de facto* by other nationalities—as were the Slovaks and

the Croats—none of these small peoples intended to remain permanent minorities, with the exception of the Jews. While the newly founded states considered themselves to be national entities, which they were not ethnographically, the recognized minorities looked toward a neighboring state in which they themselves were majorities and aspired to closer political connections with them, if not territorial unification itself; and the nationalities not juridically recognized as minorities launched a bitter struggle, forming definitely separatist movements and seeking independent existence as states.

In the League of Nations the creators and executors of the minority treaties soon saw themselves forced to interpret their real intentions more strictly and to point out the "duties" the minorities owed to the new states. It thus developed that the treaties were conceived of merely as a painless and humane method of assimilation—which, of course, enraged the minorities; but nothing else could have been expected within a system of sovereign national states. Full respect for the "minorities," even the mere scrupulous observance of the protective treaties, would actually have meant placing severe restrictions on national sovereignty—which would also have had an effect on the recognition accorded the national sovereignties of the Western powers. The representatives of the great nations were well aware that minorities within national states must sooner or later be either assimilated or liquidated. And it did not matter how much they may have been moved on humanitarian grounds to protect splinter nationalities from persecution, or that political considerations led them to oppose the direct intervention of great powers, especially Germany, in behalf of groups of compatriots in minority status beyond their borders—they were neither able nor willing to overthrow or reform the laws by which national states exist.*

* Switzerland is a particularly fortunate exception, which alters little in the rule established above. For she is no real national state in the sense of the Western democracies, least of all in the sense of France, the nation *par excellence*. The Swiss state apparatus is not centralized but rests directly on the self-administration of the communes, and consists of a kind of federation of these communes, which, as cantons, have unusually extensive powers. The success, the great political stability, of the Swiss system is owed, moreover, to the fact that the country is composed of three ethnic-national groups whose national ambitions are completely fulfilled by France, Germany and Italy. In the nineteen-twenties Benes seems to have considered organizing Czechoslovakia on the Swiss pattern, and much has been heard in recent years of resolving the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine by the same method. Success here seems doubtful, since peoples are involved in both cases who have for the first time been given the chance of national development and state rule, and whose national ambitions have never as yet been realized elsewhere.

A hitherto unknown element was introduced into European politics by the minority treaties which the League of Nations guaranteed. Not that minorities had not existed before; the Congress of Vienna in 1815 had taken steps to secure certain rights to the Polish populations in Russia, Prussia and Austria; all later international settlements referred, characteristically, to "religious"—not "national"—minorities to whom "civil"—but not "political"—rights were guaranteed. But the minority as a permanent institution, as a *modus vivendi* between different ethnic-national groups living in the same state territory, was something absolutely new in the history of national states—at least as posited theoretically by the treaties.

The fashioning of the treaties of 1919 and 1920 was followed by the constitution of a Minorities Congress whose task was to represent the interests of all minorities regardless of nationality. This made it appear as though the nationality groups involved had finally reconciled themselves to their status and were ready to organize themselves internationally in order to protect minority rights in general as well as the rights of labor and other economic and class interests. It did not seem strange that national claims were to be satisfied by international means amid a system of national states, nor that the Minorities Congress took a name that implicitly contradicted the treaties with their careful avoidance of the ominous word "national." This name was Congress of Organized National Groups in European States. But when it is remembered that in postwar Europe between twenty-five and thirty million people lived officially in minority status—naturally, very many more in real fact—and that the "nationality groups," taken together, far outnumbered the peoples holding state power, there is no reason to be surprised that something like a "nation of minorities," with the Minorities Congress as its parliament, was set up on the basis of much publicized common interests.

This paradoxical new nation had but a short life. The bond by which it was held together corresponded to no real political solidarity between the different nationality groups. The Minorities Congress was held together by the two groups representing compact ethnic or national agglomerations in almost every one of the new states—the Germans and the Jews. The strength of both groups depended on the ability of each to act in concert independently of their divergent national memberships. The German minorities in Rumania and Czechoslovakia voted as a matter of course with the German minorities in Poland and Hun-

gary. The same was true of the Jews. In 1933 the chairman of the Congress expressly emphasized: "One thing is certain: we do not meet in our congresses merely as members of abstract minorities; each of us belongs body and soul to a specific people, his own, and feels himself tied to the fate of that people for better or worse. Consequently, each of us stands here, if I may say so, as a full-blooded German or full-blooded Jew, as a full-blooded Hungarian or full-blooded Ukrainian" (see *Sitzungsbericht des Kongresses der organisierten nationalen Gruppen in den Staaten Europas*, 1933, p. 8). In other words, national and ethnic-national interests swept everything else aside and formed inter-territorial ties completely independent of the minorities treaties, which were precisely intended to dissolve such inter-territorial relationships.

That the Minorities Congress, with its claim to represent minorities as such—"abstract minorities"—was a snare and a delusion, if not an outright fraud, was publicly disclosed in 1933, the year in which the Jewish delegation asked for a protest against the treatment of Jews in the German Reich. The representatives of the German minorities announced their solidarity with Germany, and a majority of the Congress voted with them against the proposal of the Jews. Thereupon the Jewish delegation, the delegation of the *minorité par excellence*, walked out of the Congress forever. The solidarity of the minorities was revealed to be a deception: each group showed itself to be interested in the fate of its own people alone and not in that of minorities in general.

III

THE political problem that the minority treaties tried to solve was the old problem of *nationality* and the old conflict between peoples that have achieved national states and those that have not yet attained national emancipation. By a process lasting several centuries and through a struggle against feudal aristocracy and dynastic despotism, several of the larger European peoples, notably the French, organized themselves into nations in such a way that the people, at least in theory, took over the immediate administration and direction of the state apparatus. This is the meaning, which has been lost sight of over and over again, of the French Revolution, a meaning that produced the idea of the nation and of the sovereignty of the people, along with the political principles of *liberté, égalité* and *fraternité*; it was developed through the accomplish-

ment of the seizure of land by the peasants and the arrogation to the French people themselves of the title to the national territory.*

Even in France the true significance of the transformation of a people into a nation has become fully manifest only during short revolutionary periods. Nevertheless, it has so decisively determined the tradition of French political thought that since the Revolution all great statesmen of France have conceived of the nation as a *plébiscite de tous les jours*, that is, as a union entered into voluntarily and with full political responsibility.

The French conception of the nation, which can be fully realized only in a republic, met a diametrically opposite notion in Germany during the Napoleonic wars, a notion that was derived partly from resistance to Napoleon's wars of conquest and partly from the lack of a national and social revolutionary movement. Territorial unification and the liberation of the peasants, the preconditions for the creation of a nation, had not been achieved in Germany, and as a result a caricature of a nation was established from above, the sovereignty of the throne being retained and no acknowledgment being made of the sovereignty of the people.** It is true that this did not enable even the German theoreticians to circumvent the conception of the people as the core of the nation. But in their view the people became an object that suffered history fatalistically and neither assumed responsibility for its processes nor tried to understand them. According to these theoreticians, the sense of being involved in an inescapable community of fate was what made a people a nation, not the consciousness of having the sovereign power to decide its own destiny. They put nationalistic sentimentality in place of the political responsibility of the free citizen for the fate of his country.

It is one of Europe's misfortunes that the emancipation of the people in the form of a nation could only be accomplished in a few Western countries. The German conception of nationality and nation imposed

* In recent times several nations, especially the Poles and the Hungarians, have tried to organize themselves nationally without really touching the great landed estates or distributing land to their peasants. The impossibility of this could have been proved historically by citing the fact that France, the classic example of a nation, has remained a country of peasants, and that the unfortunate outcome of the Peasants' Wars in Germany retarded German national development for centuries and in the end rendered it abortive.

** In this connection we need not go into the English concept of the nation, which arose from and fits the insular location of the country and the successful colonizing efforts of its people.

itself completely on all Central and Eastern European countries, the peasant populations of which lived in feudal or semi-feudal states of dependency. The peasant classes themselves, living in economic as well as political slavery and with a history of desperate but unsuccessful revolts, were touched by it least of all. It chiefly affected the intellectuals, who oriented themselves toward German intellectual life in a fateful way. The leading elements in more than half the national movements of Europe stood under the more or less conscious influence of Germany. This meant, politically, that the intellectuals were satisfied—when it came to the worst—to identify freedom with aggression and patriotism with nationalism; and that in any case they believed it possible to dispense with the preconditions of nationhood in the French sense, the liberation of the peasants, the sovereignty of the people and the elimination of the feudal aristocracies.

Even more important than ideological influence was the fact that, while the French conception of the national state depended on the identity of people and territory, large regions of Europe were inhabited by mixed peoples. Poles have lived for centuries on German territory, Ukrainians on Polish, Albanians on Greek, and Germans on Polish territory and in the Baltic states area—anyone half-acquainted with European geography can extend this list indefinitely. None of these nationalities—this is especially true of those in the Balkans—has ever felt with the same absoluteness as Western Europeans that their national adherences were identical with the places in which they lived. Therefore they all believed that the term “community of fate” could express their national loyalties better than *plébiscite de tous les jours*.

For these peoples, national adherence long ago became something portable, separate from country and state, something that clung to the individual like his origin, his “nationality.” If France is the classic example of nationhood, of the identity of people and territory, the Jewish people, it may be said, is the classic example of nationality, having been able to retain its identity for millennia without a country of its own. Such an achievement might be thought of as a “miracle” when compared to that of the model national state of modern times. But this “miracle” dwindles to a mere textbook illustration when measured against the fate of the small peoples “without a history” who have never been able to develop into nations. During the period in which more fortunate peoples organized themselves into national states, these “nationalities” had also sought liberty and self-determination. It was only natural

that their aspirations should have involved them in a competition with great nations that often seemed ridiculous, and that they should have developed boundless pretensions and have become nationalistic even before they became nations.

The national movements of these nationalities were directed against the states and state peoples in whose midst they lived and whose oppression they suffered. In all these countries, especially in old Austro-Hungary, national and social oppression coincided to such an extent that certain occupations—generally the more lowly ones—were identified with specific nationalities. The identity of national and social oppression was only intensified by the fact that the upper strata of the oppressed nationalities were usually assimilated to the ruling nationality. The elements left over in the nationality groups after this process were of an amazing uniformity with respect to class, a uniformity that made a joke of modern class relations. The gulf separating these “classless” nationalities from the West became all the greater as the class divisions and class struggles of the latter grew sharper. Western labor movements in particular have always been inclined to dismiss the struggles of the nationalities for liberation as “nationalistic.” The Austrian Social Democrats were the one exception. They had the best chance to study the situation and therefore knew that the “class enemy” of these nationalities was the same as their national enemy and oppressor. In the social movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the “unhistorical” strata of Western Europe’s population strove by means of internal political struggles to attain the spotlight of history and a place on the stage of politics; in much the same way the “unhistorical” nationalities of Eastern Europe tried to secure a place in European politics by national-revolutionary movements.

All these nationalities could not help beholding the dawn of a better age in the peace treaties of 1919. The minority treaties and the heaping together of many different peoples in single states were destined to disappoint such hopes. Instead of the old national state of Austro-Hungary, which managed to settle its nationality difficulties for better or worse by a kind of despotic bureaucratism tempered by inefficiency, a series of small national states was set up, much too small to subsist economically, much too young to be authoritative, and acquainted with neither a tradition of bureaucratic despotism nor the wise old ways of muddling through. To the minority or nationality groups—i.e., all those peoples to whom states were not conceded at Versailles—the treaties seemed the re-

sult of an arbitrary or partisan game, or of an intrigue, which granted rulership to some and servitude to others. To the new state peoples the allotments of territory seemed just as completely arbitrary, and they lost no time in adding innumerable new border conflicts to the already existing territorial differences. No Hitler was needed to start a free-for-all fight in this corner of Europe.

IV

TOMORROW'S peace treaties will have to deal with the same problem of nationalities that the peace treaties of yesterday tried to evade by the minority formula. But meanwhile the problem has become much more difficult, like all political problems pending since the beginning of this century.

One of the reasons for the intensification of the nationalities problem is that the peoples that proved unable to attain national freedom inside Europe have contributed vastly to American immigration in the last fifty years. Far from dissolving themselves in the famous melting pot, they have shown an astonishingly tenacious will to survive and an astonishing ability to preserve their identities beneath apparent assimilation. Their interest in the fortunes of their old homelands goes in most cases far beyond sentimental memories, and even after generations is often the most effective means of mobilizing these people politically. All this is, of course, well known in Europe; the nationalities count on their brothers living here to act as their spokesmen, and hope, perhaps not unjustly, that American foreign policy will take splinter nationalities into consideration. Experience gained through their emigrated brothers has extraordinarily strengthened their consciousness of nationality as something independent of place, and this has raised the whole nationalities problem to a new stage as compared to the period before the First World War.

The period that witnessed the strengthening of the consciousness of nationality—the consciousness of the identity of a people as independent of geographical location and detached from it—also saw the weakening of the old national feeling which had so long been the decisive factor in European politics. Fascism, especially National Socialism, is even today frequently misinterpreted as “nationalism” or “chauvinism,” although Italy's reckless imperialist policy and the consistent substitution of the race concept for the nation concept in Germany are the best proofs

that “nationalism” alone can no longer be relied on to mobilize people. All the fascist movements, the Spanish and Italian as well as the German, met on common ground in their attempts to mobilize their so-called “national comrades” beyond their respective borders. Unfortunately, such efforts harmonized with the vague popular feeling that national adherences no longer coincided unconditionally with national boundaries. The fascists took this dissociation of national consciousness from native soil into account when they converted their peoples into hordes of murderers and plunderers able to feel at home wherever protected by numbers. Plans for unlimited conquest on principle, undetermined by national needs or by any regard for the welfare of the peoples concerned, have replaced the old wars of revenge or conquest of national states, the aims of which, although often extravagantly chauvinistic, were fixed.

The heroism, political maturity and numerical strength of the underground movements today ought already to have shown us that the apathy which first greeted the invading Germans—actually amounting in some cases to a welcome and the acceptance of a “protectorate”—was due more to political factors than to any process of degeneration or decay. Neither the large nor the small peoples of Europe had been prepared for a national war. In their desperate hope for a reorganization of the European political community, they were ready, unfortunately, out of pure ignorance, to give anyone who talked in general of a new European order at least one chance. As soon as this ignorance was dispelled they emphatically demonstrated that it was not the people but their forms of political organization that were worn-out or decadent.

The process by which the nation as a form of organization was disintegrated reached in a way its culminating point in the defeat of France, the nation *par excellence*. What mattered was not the defeat in itself but the fact that Frenchmen were unwilling for the first time in their national history to fight for the survival of their nation as such; that in the two decades between the wars a widespread mood that was mistaken for pacificism prevented France from pursuing a normal national policy; and finally that Hitler's diabolical propaganda for a united Europe took root in fertile soil and in places far removed from the milieux peopled by paid enemy agents, fifth columnists or convinced fascists. Hearing great statesmen and small journalists refer so calmly to the future France as a third or fourth-class power, one asks oneself in amazement whether they realize that this is equivalent to predicting

the demise of the European national states in general and a completely revolutionary future for the Europeans themselves, who would be forced to devise new forms of state organization.

The final downfall of France would damage the already endangered prestige of the national state in Europe so greatly that it would be possible to predict with a fair degree of certainty that the next peace treaties would be faced throughout Europe by the same difficulties and problems which twenty-five years ago were found only in Central and Eastern Europe. The whole continent would become a region where greater and lesser peoples settled among each other without giving up their respective nationalities. As a second or third-class power, France—to refer again to the most important case—would be unable on the whole to prevent Spanish and Italian agricultural workers from overflowing its southern borders and Belgian or even Polish miners from swarming in from the north and east, while the foreign-language islands already existing in France would be constantly reinforced. And thus the minority problems of Eastern Europe would soon arise in the midst of the ethnically unified nations of the West.*

Political developments no less than contemporary economic necessities argue for such an evolution. The advocates of the minority concept have been greatly encouraged thereby; they wish to introduce the minority concept everywhere, generalizing it and revising and improving the treaties and international guarantees connected with it. If the Allies were to decide after all to preserve the *status quo* in Europe in spite of the critical weakening of the sovereignties of all the European states, it is quite possible that the old minorities statute would be reinstated. The result would be that an even greater percentage of the peoples of Europe would be faced, on an even larger scale, with the old alternative between their own national states and those of others. And the outcome, presumably, would be the same: "They will prefer their own" (C. A. Macartney, *op. cit.*, p. 475).

V

THE real solution to the nationality and minority problem of our time is already available in outline. It was theoretically sketched out by Otto Bauer and Karl Renner at the beginning of this century in a proposal inspired by study of the Austro-Hungarian situation: the so-called "per-

* See C. A. Macartney, *National State and National Minorities* (Oxford, 1934), p. 487.

sonal status."*. In terms of practical politics it has been partly realized in the Soviet Union, the only nationalities state of the twentieth century.

Bauer's proposal grew out of the circumstance that the real nationality conflicts of old Austro-Hungary had little to do with disputes over boundaries or territory but arose from the fact that the development of industry had drawn certain groups of people away from their native soil into cities where they formed "foreign-language islands." Bauer realized that nothing could be done about the territorial sovereignties of these groups; their original homelands were as a rule too small to sustain independence economically; and to apply the old territorial principle would simply mean "delivering considerable portions of the national body as free gifts into the hands of other nations" (p. 334). And "because of the shifting of population from linguistically uniform peasants' villages to industrial areas, which almost always include national minorities, a constantly diminishing portion of the population [lives] in communities in which on the whole there is no minority question."

The scope of the process by which nationality groups—neither willing nor able to surrender their nationalities—are separated from their homelands has meanwhile increased tremendously, and has affected unusually large numbers of people. It has become a typical phenomenon throughout Europe, not only in the Soviet Union—where the industrialization of an originally purely agricultural country has caused veritable migrations—that extremely diverse peoples should live together in cramped places, which are, so to speak, nationally indifferent. The same is true of the great industrial centers in this country. There is no question but that Hitler expected, by stirring up nationalities against each other, to rock the foundations of the Russian state and of ours as well—both states depending as they do on the peaceful cohabitation of very different peoples, none of whom rules or tyrannizes over the other. As we all know, Hitler succeeded in his purpose in every European national state with a minority population of any proportions; what he failed to reckon with in the cases of both America and Russia was that he was dealing with specifically modern state structures, which no longer retained the national-state form and where peoples were no longer oppressed as ethnic-national groups. The fact that in Russia, especially, a real people's war against Germany was unleashed is the best immediate proof that a new and well-functioning form of political organization,

* See Karl Renner's *Der Kampf der oesterreichischen Nationen um den Staat*, Vienna, 1902, and Otto Bauer's *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die oesterreichische Sozialdemokratie*, Vienna, 1907. Only Bauer's book is referred to in the following.

and not only bureaucratic terror, is responsible for the amicable relations between the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. Conclusive is the fact that no pogroms have developed against the Jews in the Ukraine, despite the fearful disasters of the first months of the Russo-German war and systematic propagandistic incitement.

The Soviet Union, in distinction from the United States, has had it set down in its constitution that it is not a national state and is not ruled by a state nationality. It includes many peoples but has neither a national majority nor national minorities. Each of its citizens is represented by nationality in the national legislature—as a Russian or Jew, Ukrainian or Georgian; and while it is only too true that none of the citizens of the U.S.S.R. enjoy political freedom, it must be admitted that they all lack it in equal measure. Though a bureaucracy and a police indeed rule Russia, they are not a *Russian* bureaucracy and a *Russian* police, oppressing other nationalities for the benefit of Russians.

We have mentioned the example of the U.S.S.R. because it comes closest, fundamentally, to complying with Bauer's and Renner's old proposal, which was motivated by European conditions and adapted to European problems. The "personality principle would constitute the nation as an association, purely, of individuals, not as a territorial corporation" (p. 353). "National councils" to handle the national affairs of each nationality would be chosen by all persons who had voluntarily enrolled themselves as members of the respective nationalities, regardless of where the individual citizen happened to live. By such voluntary enrollment the French principle of the nation as a *plébiscite de tous les jours* would be applied in an up-to-date way to nationalities, and all the disastrous and nonsensical determinism involved by the Germanic "community of fate" would be done away with.

The state, in Bauer's concept, "places . . . its administration in the hands of its nations and [thereby becomes] dependent on them. The state guarantees the national rights of its nations; and these rights . . . can never be rescinded, for if the state were to destroy national self-administration it would be destroying its own administration and committing suicide" (p. 358). Thus the state would be the result of a federation of peoples, each retaining full sovereignty, and—here Bauer's solution differs most from Soviet Russia's—the national territory would become the national homestead of the people, its real home, while the nations as nationalities would administer their common affairs in a state composed of national councils.

A Letter from London

ALBERT M. HYAMSON

THERE is a general feeling of relief of tension in the constitutional atmosphere, if one may so term it, of Anglo-Jewry. The shock caused by the extremes to which the so-called "caucus" proceeded some months ago in their endeavor to tie Anglo-Jewry to the Jewish nationalist chariot wheel is largely subsided. The Board of Deputies, now entirely in the hands of the Jewish Nationalists—one is almost justified in saying of the caucus—proceeds with a certain amount of caution, but its claim to represent Anglo-Jewry is resented widely in the community and is looked on with much doubt by well-informed observers outside. The Anglo-Jewish Association to which a number of responsible Zionists, as well as non-Zionists, fearful of the lengths to which the "caucus" may drag them, have adhered, is handicapped by its great anxiety not to have an internecine war, to present a united front of Jewry, at any rate of Anglo-Jewry. Its devotion to worldwide Jewish interests is in this respect a handicap. Furthermore, the number of men who can devote time, thought and energy to its work is limited and almost the whole of the younger generation of this class, the natural leaders of Anglo-Jewry of tomorrow, the lieutenants of the leaders of today, is absorbed in national duties, many of them across the sea. These handicaps do not apply to the other party in Anglo-Jewry, many of those directing its affairs being free to devote the whole of their energies to that task and having an adequate reservoir of assistance on which to draw.

Anglo-Jewry is not at present united. This is brought out by the fact that two independent bodies, not necessarily always in agreement, have equal access to the Government when matters of moment to the welfare of Jewry are under consideration. Yet developments tending toward consultation if not co-operation have occurred since the break of July 1943. As I have already suggested, the Board of Deputies is not altogether intransigent and the Anglo-Jewish Association is as anxious as ever, perhaps more so, to co-operate. In the circumstances, attempts to

find a *modus vivendi*, not so much at first of joint action as of consultation with a view to parallel action, began almost before the ink on the signature dissolving the Joint Foreign Committee was dry. The first attempt failed after negotiations had proceeded some appreciable distance, when it appeared that the Board of Deputies intended close co-operation with the World Jewish Congress, in which it seemed that there was an intention to involve the Association. After this failure had presumably opened the eyes of the Board to some extent to its limitations, it reconsidered the situation and after further talks an agreement was reached between the two bodies for the pooling of information, the exchange of views and consultation. Two points stand out in this agreement: the Association preserves its complete independence; it does not recognize any claim on the part of the World Jewish Congress to speak on any subject in the name of Anglo-Jewry.

The situation has been summarized by the president, Mr. Leonard Stein, speaking at a public meeting shortly after the agreement. Out of this new agreement, he said, inevitably arose the question of the relationship of the Association with the World Jewish Congress. The ambition of the Congress, which was for the most part a non-British, American body and even then only a group in American Jewish life, by no means representative of it as a whole, was, as he saw it, to secure the great and invaluable advantage of being able to say that it was supported by Anglo-Jewry. In his opinion and he thought he could say in the opinion of his colleagues in the Association, it would be awkward, inconvenient, even definitely harmful, that it should be thought that there was a Jewish body that had the power and representative character the Congress claimed. Even if such a body were created the Congress was by its constitution not fitted to play the part. He did not wish to suggest that there should be no co-operation between Jews in different countries. Of course there should be such co-operation for the furtherance of relief and assistance. But the World Jewish Congress was not needed for such a purpose.

"The proposed new agreement with the Board of Deputies," Mr. Stein continued, "must not be taken to mean that the Anglo-Jewish Association will be involved in the Congress' actions and decisions. The original agreement between the Board and the Congress, if the Association had adhered to it, would have resulted in this. But important changes had been made and the new draft did not go beyond consultation without binding any party to accept the decisions or course of action

of the other. There has been no modification of the objections of the Association to the Congress. These objections are as firm and as strong today as they have ever been."

THE topic that has attracted most attention in Anglo-Jewry during the past three or four months has however not been the relationship between the Anglo-Jewish Association and the Board but the Polish courts-martial. The general lines of this incident and of its development are no doubt familiar to your readers. But it may be well to restate them as they are seen on this side.

Anti-Semitism, active as well as passive, has unfortunately never been unknown in Polish Government and military circles, at any rate since the constitution of the Polish Republic; and although one may accept the sincerity of those at present in political control and their determination to do everything possible to exorcize the evil, a complete change cannot be expected in a few months or even a few years. For some months there had been complaints of petty tyranny carried to the verge of persecution in the Polish Army—something more than the bullying prevalent in all armies from which the Polish Army cannot expect to be exempt. The complaints were not only by Jews, and although the presence of an anti-Semitic impetus cannot be questioned, it is clear that the movement is also anti-minority in general.

When the British Government heard of the complaints, it made representations to the Polish High Command, who in consequence took steps to bring the persecution to an end. In this the Polish authorities were only partly successful. The persecution in its more overt form ceased, but under the surface, threats to some extent took its place and the relations between the Jewish and Orthodox (Ukrainian and White Russian) soldiers on the one hand and some of their colleagues and those in charge of them on the other grew worse. Two hundred and seven Jewish soldiers thereupon left their posts, went to London, and appealed to the British authorities, who, with the agreement of the Polish Government, incorporated them in the British Army. It was made clear however that this step was an isolated one and not to be taken as a precedent. Such a decision was inevitable from both the British and Polish points of view and in the opinion of many also in the interests of Polish-Jewish relations.

Nevertheless, the example of the 207 Jewish soldiers was followed by others, Orthodox Christians as well as Jews, but this time some of the men were caught by the Polish military authorities who put them on

trial as deserters. A number of members of Parliament, drawn from all parties, and always alert when even a suspicion of injustice arises, showed themselves sleepless, in this as in other matters, in watching over Jewish interests. Moreover, it is realized that as it was Parliament that had made Polish courts-martial on British soil possible, the affair was a British concern as well as a Polish and a Jewish one. The subject of the courts-martial and the incidents that led up to them were brought before the House of Commons on a number of occasions. The spokesman of the British Government showed every sympathy with the sufferers from persecution and every desire for its cessation and said that the Polish authorities were at one with them in this desire, but it was obvious for several reasons that the transfer of a further section or sections of the Polish Army to the British forces could not be contemplated.

Of the soldiers arrested by the Polish Military Police twenty-one were tried by court-martial for desertion and sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from one to two years. (Under the Polish Military Penal Code one year's imprisonment is the minimum punishment for desertion, fifteen years the maximum.) All these men had refused to return to their units: the charges against others who were willing to return were dropped. At the same time specific charges of ill-treatment of Jewish soldiers were put under investigation. Further courts-martial of Jewish and non-Jewish soldiers however followed and in these the punishment was in most cases heavier—from one to three years' imprisonment. All of the sentences were subsequently annulled by the Polish Government. Some of the men nevertheless threatened to refuse to return to their units, but none of them seem to have put these threats into effect.

Among suggestions put forward for the relief of the situation was the constitution of special Jewish battalions in the Polish Army, but this was not favored by Polish-Jewish leaders, whose sympathy with the Jewish men is not the less on that account. For instance, Dr. Emanuel Szerer, one of the two Jewish representatives on the Polish National Council, expressed the opinion that the segregation of the Jewish soldiers could only help to alienate the Jewish and non-Jewish elements in the Polish Army, not all of the latter being by any means imbued with anti-Semitism. As for their incorporation in a possible "Jewish Army," the advocates of which inevitably set out to make the most of the unfortunate occurrences, the view was expressed that since Polish Jews were Polish citizens their place was in the army of their own country. This view was to some extent supported by a statement of the Polish Minister of

National Defense who pointed out that not only did the majority of Jewish soldiers make no complaints of unfair treatment but that in the course of six months thirty-seven of them had been granted commissions and twelve Jewish officers promoted. Two Jews had in the course of the war received the highest Polish military decoration, the equivalent of the Victoria Cross, and a number of others had received less outstanding decorations.

The Polish National Council after the immediate question had been answered, appointed a commission of inquiry into the whole question of desertions. The six members include the two Jewish representatives on the National Council. A demand in the Council for the resignation of the Polish Minister of National Defense was deferred until such time as the Commission would make its report. In the meantime some fifteen or twenty Polish officers and men have been punished for offenses against Jewish soldiers and one officer has been removed from his post.

HAVING dealt with the constitutional crisis in Anglo-Jewry and the Polish courts-martial, I now turn to a matter that is somewhat more delicate, although what I have to say does not refer to American writers alone. I refer to the rising tide of resentment in circles, where to suspect anti-Semitism or similar prejudice would be ludicrous, against the persistent anti-British tone that is being adopted in Jewish newspapers and other publications. To a very large extent I recognize that the effect of this campaign is not intended and not realized, but this knowledge does not reduce the harm it is doing. It raises prejudice against the British and British interests and this prejudice and its causes are being more and more resented. In times such as these the campaign, which gives the impression of being organized, would in any circumstances be regarded as unfriendly. Those who have charge of Britain's interests, with whom the welfare of Britain and its people and their future rest, have all their thoughts and energies fully absorbed and want to be free of unnecessary worries and annoyances. But when practically all the charges that are so freely thrown about are not only baseless, but often suggest the very opposite of what most members of Parliament and most civil servants are doing or trying to do to translate into acts their sympathies—subject of course to their duty which is not to Jews alone—the resentment is all the greater.

The Englishman is patient and very long suffering, but there is a limit to even the longest drawn patience. The English civil servant is different

from civil servants in other regimes. When required he gives his advice honestly and fearlessly, but the decision does not rest with him. The decision comes from a higher authority and then as a rule, with very few possible exceptions, he carries it out as honestly and fearlessly as he has given advice. By the nature of his office he is silent. A British civil servant who made speeches on controversial subjects would very quickly find himself unemployed. Thus the civil servant is unable to reply to any attack no matter how unfair. This fact makes him easy game to some controversialists. But he is still a human being, and these attacks leave their mark on him and also on his friends and on the whole of his class. As I have said, the Englishman is long suffering and attacks in moderation do not overmuch worry him, but there is no moderation in most of the attacks and suggestions that have of late been reaching these shores. One can realize the exigencies of electoral warfare; one can appreciate the advantage and temptation of having a scapegoat, especially one that cannot reply. No one asks for a closure on justified criticism. But one can ask that criticisms should be based on facts, not on figments of the imagination. Even the British official should sometimes be given the credit for good intentions, and not invariably be in effect described as the spiritual descendant of Satan or at least of Torquemada or Hitler.

June 25, 1944

Socio-Economic Relations of Arabs and Jews in Palestine

BERNARD D. WEINRYB

ANY attempt to reduce Arab-Jewish relations in Palestine to a common denominator is doomed to failure. It is dealing in half-truths to consider the political sphere alone or, in the "traditional" manner, to regard the Arab attitude toward the Jews merely as a result of the struggle of the effendi class (landlords) to retain their dominance in the country. Arab-Jewish relations are rooted in a number of social, economic and psychological factors which have not remained static during the last twenty or twenty-five years, but have changed with the country's changing life. For an understanding of Arab-Jewish relations it is necessary to analyze the nature of these changes.

I

CONTINUED Jewish immigration to Palestine and decades of Jewish activity in the country have not succeeded in improving the relationship between the Arab and Jewish peoples.

The Jews did not settle *among* the Arabs, but beside them. Jewish colonies and later communal and smallholder settlements, Jewish urban quarters and Jewish towns were founded and developed *outside* the Arab villages, towns and cities. Jews and non-Jews in Palestine do not live together, mingling in trains and busses, in restaurants and cafes, in stores, offices and factories. Jews and Arabs meet on business only, as employer and employee, as buyer and seller, as landlord and tenant, as councilmen in a "united" city (Jerusalem, Haifa), or when placing joint demands before the Government. In such relationships people do not reveal their inner lives, their true feelings or attitudes.

Very few Jews know Arabic and still fewer Arabs know Hebrew. The Arabs who call out their wares in Yiddish in the market places, in the streets of Jerusalem and the older colonies, do not really know the language but have merely picked up a few words. Hence, communication between Jew and Arab passes for the most part through the medium of

a foreign language (French, English, German, etc.); in which case again the talk is mainly of an official nature, and seldom reaches the intimacy or the chattiness likely to reveal the "inner side" of a person. Jews and Arabs alike must depend for an understanding of each other on official channels, on the opinions expressed in newspapers as interpreted by the few who are able to read and understand both Hebrew and Arabic. This approach to a better understanding is not very satisfactory, for the information that reaches one group or the other is apt to be garbled by the prejudiced interpreter, while the source of information, the press, is in itself biased, since it is the mouthpiece of the group that issues it.

Without wishing to weigh here the whole question of how far a "free" press expresses the public opinion of a country, it can be taken for granted that an undeveloped press in a backward country is far from being a true reflection of public opinion. The Arabs in Palestine have a limited number of papers with a small circulation, issued by a few groups of the intelligentsia, while the majority of the people is illiterate. This press, as the product of a relatively small group, in no way mirrors the real attitudes of the great masses. This onesidedness of the Arab press has helped give rise to the theory that Arab nationalism is the dominant factor in the public life of the Palestinian Arabs. The Arab press, which constitutes the main documentary evidence reaching the non-Arab (Jew and non-Jew), is nationalistic, anti-Jewish, and indeed directed against all foreigners in general.

II

THIS is not to say that the Arabs generally and the Palestinian Arabs in particular are kindly disposed toward Jews and foreigners. The Arab is, first of all, the product of his religion, which is a deeply exclusive one and which relegates non-Moslems to a "lower" category of existence. His religious culture excludes non-Moslems from his society. He feels that his traditional way of life is to some degree endangered by the non-Moslems pouring into the country. These newcomers have a different ethical code, different relations toward women, a different attire. And inasmuch as their "outlandish" modes of living are attracting some Moslems or leading to a relaxation of Arab mores, they are bound to arouse some opposition.

Another source of Arab opposition is inherent in the immigration itself. The immigrants appear to the natives as intruders responsible for

every misfortune. In America, too, despite her immense resources and possibilities of development, immigrants have often been blamed for economic crises or for the displacement of workers by technological changes. The traditional and official attitude in Jewish circles is that since the Arabs have reaped and are reaping great economic advantages from the Jewish immigration—sale of land and agricultural products, lease of property, income from wages, reduction of taxes—they are or should be in favor of such immigration. The truth is—in Palestine as elsewhere—that the economic advantages affect only one part of the population, while another part suffers both from the fact of the immigration and from the technological and other changes introduced by capitalistic development of a backward country.

Psychologically speaking, it makes little difference whether or not the effect of these changes is of great economic consequence or even whether most of it is not purely imaginary. The welfare of certain Arab groups did not grow in proportion to the general development of the country; and this in itself is sufficient to create dissatisfaction.

It is certain that in Palestine not many Arabs suffered directly from Jewish immigration. The small number of so-called "displaced Arabs," noted by the Special Commission after the riots of 1929, probably were isolated cases, offset many times by the number of Arabs who profited immensely or even became rich as a result of the Jewish immigration. The best proof of this is the fact that in the postwar period Palestine was transformed from a country of Arab emigration into a country of Arab immigration. But the number of Arabs who have some reason or other to resent Jewish immigration is probably not small. These range from the Arab shepherd who can no longer lead his goats to graze on land acquired by Jews, and the peasant who envies the neighboring Jewish colonist his better crops and higher standard of living, to the Arab craftsman whose craft lost in importance as a result of economic progress, or the businessman who fears the competition of modern methods.

The opposition to the Jews of the urban groups in particular is one of the most serious problems of Jewish-Arab relations—a problem which has been more or less overlooked in official and unofficial circles.

III

THE rapid capitalistic development is naturally more noticeable in the cities. The Jewish city of Tel Aviv has acquired a population of almost 200,000, and such old cities as Jerusalem and Haifa increased their

populations manifold, adding new Jewish as well as Arab quarters. Such Arab cities of Jaffa and Ramleh were also expanded by an increase in population and the building of new quarters.

But the urban development in Palestine is not entirely a new, postwar phenomenon. Like most Levantine countries, Palestine previously had a relatively large urban population. Its status as an agricultural country did not prevent it from developing a sector of industry and trade. In examining the 1931 census we find that the percentage of the Arab population occupied in trade is not much below that of the Jewish population. About 13.8% of the Moslem earners, 17.1% of the Christian, and 18.8% of the Jewish earners were then employed in trade and communications. It is this comparatively large non-Jewish (Moslem and Christian) section of the population employed in trade and kindred occupations which was, at least in part, unfavorably affected by the changes in the Palestinian economy brought about by capitalistic development which accompanied Jewish immigration.

First of all one must take into account changes that affected the position of the Arabs (and other non-Jews) engaged in trade, since the part played by Jews in this field was growing. The Jewish share in trade increased from 33.5% in 1931 to about 45.5% at the end of 1936. In foreign wholesale trade the Jewish share in grain import increased in the same period from 16% to 31% and in export of citrus fruit from 29% to 46%. Although in absolute numbers the Arabs probably did increase their participation in trade, the relative decline may have strengthened their fear of competition.

Still greater are the indirect effects of Jewish commercial activity in Palestine. Trade was for centuries adjusted to the primitive methods of the Middle East, being carried on for the most part in so-called bazaars, where the merchant had his narrow little store packed with goods, and the business of trading was carried on with typical Oriental bargaining. With capitalistic development there sprung up modern stores that differed greatly from the old trading places. Although in actual figures the number of Arab merchants probably grew in the years after the census of 1931, and although the business of the Arab stores probably increased, the relative importance of traditional Arab trade was nevertheless considerably reduced. Also, some primitive Arab industries, such as the soap industry, suffered as a result of the new technological methods introduced by the Jews. These facts of some actual or merely relative displacement of non-Jewish city-dwellers by the Jew

or by modern progress and still more the fear of further displacement and competition, helped to arouse the Arab city population against the Jews or disposed them favorably toward the program of the extreme nationalists.

IV

THE effect of the changes described above on the urban population can be indicated in the following observations:

1. During the Arab strike and anti-Jewish riots which began in April 1936, most of the non-Arab city population (Armenians, Greeks, etc.) supported the Arab movement. This attitude was widely noted in Jewish circles. Some saw in it a manifestation of anti-Semitism, but most observers thought that the Christian population supported the Arabs out of fear of the Arab terror. The truth is, however, that not only terror was at work—it may even be that the Arab terror played a minor role—but that the Christian groups, being themselves to a great extent composed of the urban merchants, were, like the Moslems, antagonized by the economic development brought about by the Jews.

2. In the riots of 1920 and 1929 most of the anti-Jewish acts were accomplished close to the Arab villages and on the highways, whereas in the first weeks of the riots of April 1936, only the cities were in upheaval while the villages were quiescent. It was not until later that the villages were drawn in and played a major role in the attacks on Jews.

This changed situation in 1936 is no accident but the consequence of developments in the postwar years. The backward elements of the Arab population in the villages and hamlets, as well as the nomadic tribes, still adhere in part to a code deriving from the "good old days" of Turkish rule, when groups lived on robbery and payment for "protection." Assaults and acts of aggression among Arabs themselves are not rare. Even in quite recent years the police statistics of Palestine reported hundreds of acts of aggression in the Arab villages and hamlets (in 1931: 1,027; in 1932: 1,345 and in 1933: 819). The Arab villagers probably rioted against the "Jewish intruders" in part out of enmity, but mainly with an eye to booty. Between the riots of 1929 and those of 1936, the situation of a great many village Arabs changed. The prosperity years and the growing immigration created a market for their agricultural products and a demand for farm hands. The income from the sale of these products and from wages earned served to raise the standard of living of the village population and to improve their husbandry. When

the riots of April 1936 broke out they were more satisfied and more eager to retain their customers than they had been in 1929. Only after some weeks had passed, as terror spread and the relations with the Jews were broken by the force of events, did the village population join the aggressors.

In the cities in 1936 the situation was quite different. From the outset it was the urban population that precipitated the riots. Participating in the first actual attack upon Jews were a great many Arabs from Horan—those starved, ragged and for the most part illegal immigrants from Syria, that *lumpen-proletariat* of the Near East which forms a receptive element for every sort of propaganda offering a possibility of aggression and robbery. But the main element in the strikes and the organized struggle against the Jews was (and still is) the urban Arab and to a great extent also the Christian population which fears Jewish competition or sees the importance of its own economic function dwindling under the impact of capitalistic development.

V

ON THE Jewish side, the political factors affecting Arab-Jewish relationship are modified by other considerations. Not all Jews have the same approach to the Arabs. They differ to some extent in accordance with their social and geographical background. Thus some Oriental Jewish groups are too much bound to their traditional way of life and primitive type of thinking to fit into the general political patterns of the Yishuv. The Oriental Sephardim, who are of a higher level of culture than the other old groups in the Yishuv, have had some success in adapting themselves to the patterns of the new Yishuv and are seeking "leadership" or "co-leadership" in the Jewish community. A part of the "old Yishuv" is standing aside politically, though it is doing its share in the upbuilding of the country. These older groups, whose relative strength in the Yishuv has been dwindling, are culturally and socially closer to the Arab population than to the newer Jewish immigration. In practice, at any rate, they work more closely with them. In the Sephardic-Oriental sections of Jerusalem, for instance, and in the old Yishuv, Arab workers are more customarily employed in building, and Arab products are more widely used.

The various Jewish groups differ in their attitude toward the Arabs also in terms of economic approach. Capitalistic economy, based on a search for profits, does not as a rule acknowledge national boundaries,

and capitalists generally would be eager to exploit foreign labor groups or to lower the wage standard through the employment of such groups. But in Palestine the situation is somewhat different. The Jewish economy developed side by side with the Arab economy, but touched it only slightly and moved within its own orbit. About 86% of Jewish products are sold to Jewish customers. Even from the purely economic point of view, therefore, the Jewish capitalist must be interested in retaining wages within the Jewish economy and in avoiding too great a reduction in the living standards of the Jewish worker. Similarly, it is to his interest to purchase agricultural products from Jews, thereby enabling this class of seller to become a consumer of Jewish city-products. This leads to the employment of exclusively Jewish labor in industry.

There are exceptions, of course. There is the individualist employer who desires to increase his profits by employing cheap, unorganized Arab labor, or the Jewish consumer who wishes to economize by consuming the cheaper agricultural products of the Arabs. But, in the long run, the national motive, or the pressure of public opinion, works not against but in line with the economic interests of the Jewish employers in Palestine.

This is not the case in enterprises that are not producing for the local Jewish market. The citriculture of the colonies in Judea is designed mainly for export and there most of the colonists employ Arabs as well as some Jewish workers. Nationalistic pressure and the clamor of public opinion have so far failed to change the situation. And while the smaller colonists of Samaria, the so-called "nationalistic farmers" (Ikkarim Leumim) who also produce citrus for export, did start out with the idea of employing only Jewish workers (especially since they receive credits and other benefits from Jewish national institutions), they have to a great extent deviated from this principle since the prosperity years of 1934 and 1935.

In other enterprises which produce mainly for export or for the Jewish and non-Jewish markets alike, both Jewish and non-Jewish workers are employed. The standards of wages differ, however. The Arab worker receives lower wages than the Jew and is sometimes assigned to a different kind of work. This is the situation in the Dead Sea works of Palestine Potash Ltd., where chemical products are manufactured for export, and in the Nesher cement factory. In the match factory, Nur, which originally produced for both Jewish and non-Jewish markets, Arab and Jewish workers have been employed.

VI

WHAT are the prospects for the future? What are the possibilities of an Arab-Jewish rapprochement?

If Jews and Arabs continue to live decade after decade in one country they will learn to understand each other in the literal meaning of the word: they will learn each other's language. The feeling of estrangement will gradually disappear. This may open the way to more friendly relations.

A further betterment of the situation of the Arab village population will make for a reduction of nomadism and a resultant interest in the maintenance of order and the freedom to deal with customers. Good neighbor relations may then develop. We have some indications of this in the friendly relations of some *Kvutzot* and *Moshavei Ovdim* with their Arab neighbors. Not being competitors or employers exploiting cheap labor, these settlements have evolved more or less satisfactory relationships with the neighboring Arab settlements. A higher standard of living for the Arab village population might also lead to a diminution of the cultural differences between the Jewish and Arab populations and prepare the ground for mutual understanding.

A harder and longer task is the problem of an understanding with the urban population, which is in every country the more dynamic, more nationalistic or at any rate more influenced by nationalistic propaganda. There is, so to speak, a kind of vicious circle here: the more the country is developed along capitalistic lines, the larger grows the Arabic urban population through influx from the villages, and the larger this population grows, with corresponding changes in the economy of the country, the greater is the opposition to the Jews. In every country, during the period of the Industrial Revolution, sections of the urban population tried to block the growth of capitalism. In countries or places where capitalist development was influenced or caused by national or racial groups other than the majority of the people, the socio-economic opposition turned into nationalistic channels. This was the case with the Huguenots in Germany, with the Germans (and Jews) in some parts of Poland and Russia. Similar tendencies can be observed, as we have mentioned, in Palestine, and may probably become more pronounced in the transitional period with any further evolution toward a capitalistic economy.

This antagonism is also being nourished by the economic exclusive-

ness of the urban Jewish population. If some Jews in the cities use Arab agricultural products, these products are in the main purchased directly from the producer and not from the Arab stores. The probability is that between 96% and 98% of the Jewish goods and services of the city find Jewish consumers. In other words, almost the entire Jewish urban economy lies within the inner circle of the Jews themselves since both producer and consumer belong to the same group.

The fact that the Jewish producer is dependent mainly on the Jewish consumer, on the Jewish market, excludes the use of Arab labor or Arab services. Wages paid to Arab workers or profits made by Arab merchants on goods sold to Jews are diverted from the Jewish market and thus reduce the possibility of further Jewish production. This exclusiveness severely hampers any plan for a rapid rapprochement of the Jewish and Arab urban groups.

A policy of deliberately favoring Arab labor, Arab services and Arab trade in the cities in order to hasten their transition to the capitalistic economy and thus to diminish their opposition to the Jews could prove disastrous for the Jewish economy. Economic exclusiveness, on the other hand, leads to further antagonism. It is hard to predict the future, but present trends show that a rapprochement, if it can be facilitated by direct effort, must be a very slow process—a process regulated with extreme care and understanding of the whole economic and social situation.

VII

SOME tendencies, however, which have developed during the present war may lead in entirely different directions. The closing of the sea-lanes with the resultant shortage in commodities, as well as the manpower shortage caused by the needs of the British Army in the Near East, have to a certain degree altered the situation in the Arab economy and in the Arab labor market. The rise in prices of agricultural and other products was proportionally higher in the Arab sector than in the Jewish. As a result the wages of the Arab workers rose relatively more than those of the Jewish workers. Food prices and wages in the Arab market show therefore a tendency to approach the Jewish level.

The war also brought some social shifts in the urban Arab population. The lack of materials and the need for trained artisans in government work led some Arab artisans to give up their shops and become wage-earners. This resulted in the emergence of an Arab workers' class,

an element no longer attached to the soil and thus entirely dependent upon wages and therefore forced to demand higher wages.

These tendencies were indicated in the recent census of Arab labor in Haifa undertaken by the Jewish Federation of Labor (Histadrut). This census showed, moreover, that in most of the enterprises in Haifa in which Jews and Arabs worked together, wages were now tending to become equalized.

It seems also that these tendencies are not confined to Haifa, the great industrial center of Palestine. In a recent conference of Arab labor, some of the leaders demanded equalization of wages for the Arab and the Jewish worker. This Arab demand is new in Palestine. The Arabs have always considered their lower wages as a good means of competing against the Jewish worker, and were anxious to maintain the disparate wage levels. As late as 1942 the voice of the representative of the Histadrut in the Wage Committee of the Government demanding equal wages for both groups was a lone one.

If both these tendencies, the proletarianization of the small Arab artisans and the equalization of the wages of the Jewish and Arab worker, continue to develop, entirely new possibilities of rapprochement will arise.

As the disparity in wage levels lessens, the inequality in living standards will diminish and this is bound to decrease the necessity of group differences in places where Jews and Arabs work together. The competition of Arab work will then no longer be a cardinal problem and the necessity of maintaining the exclusiveness of the Jewish economy will be reduced. These new trends may therefore be the beginning of a new development in Arab-Jewish relations.

The Yivo

SHLOMO NOBLE

THE academic center of New York, housing Columbia University, Union Theological Seminary and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America has recently become the home of that unique institution of Jewish learning, the Yiddish Scientific Institute, generally known as the Yivo.

A link in the chain of notable Jewish academies that stretched from Jamnia on the Mediterranean to Lublin and Volozhin in Eastern Europe, the Yivo continues their tradition of keeping Jewish learning alive amidst an enveloping gloom. There are, however, several important aspects in which it differs from all other Jewish academies. Modern Jewish institutions of learning were established primarily as rabbinical schools for the training of professional functionaries. The professional character of these schools demanded that they focus their attention upon certain aspects of Jewish life and thought, and relegate others to the background, or ignore them altogether. Their approach to Jewish life and knowledge was historical and fundamentally oriented toward the past; their directives were prescribed by the particular ideology inspiring them, ranging from extreme Reform to rigid Orthodoxy. The Yivo, born as a result of the awakening of the Jewish people in Eastern Europe in the period following the First World War, made the entire unfolding panorama of a multicolored and multiform Jewish life its domain of investigation. Neglected corners of that life were illuminated by the Institute; phases of existence hitherto deemed unworthy of scientific investigation were rehabilitated and restored to academic dignity. Autobiographies of immigrants, ditties of mendicants, and private letters were collected and made the subject of serious study. The Yivo took the position that vital Jewish scholarship must come into intimate contact with the people, delve deeply into the springs of their creativity and shed light on the folk psyche in all its manifestations.

When the founders of the Yivo met in March 1925, in Vilna, they thus defined the nature and functions of the institution they were about

to initiate. It was to be, in the first place, a center of Jewish learning and a rallying point for Jewish scholars. At the same time the institution was not to be restricted either in methods or in spirit, but to co-operate with other academic and research bodies in the solution of problems of mutual interest. Its function was to study and interpret those aspects of our past that have a bearing on our present and future; to collect and preserve Jewish cultural monuments; to analyze certain difficulties of the present with a view to their amelioration; and to put its findings and other scientific data at the disposal of Jewish groups and movements everywhere. The results of its studies and research were to be presented to the public by means of the printed word and the open forum. Since these ramified research activities had their roots in the life of East European Jewry it was but natural that they should reflect its atmosphere and find their expression in the current idiom of that Jewry—Yiddish. This was the only medium of communication between the Jew in Poland and the Jew in Rumania, the Latvian Jew and the Carpatho-Russian Jew.

The Yivo was not immune to certain dangers of partisanship which threaten all organizations of this nature—the dangers of a narrow social and political ideology. But the Yivo steered a clear course between partisanship and amorphousness by interpreting *Yiddishe Visnshaft* as knowledge, objective, vital and creative. Such a program attracted nationalists as well as cosmopolitans, the orthodox and the free-thinking, Hebraists and Yiddishists. Hospitality to all opinion—provided it helped to enrich and quicken Jewish life and learning—was the policy of the Yivo from its inception, and it has not deviated in the least from that policy.

To DISCHARGE its functions with the maximum of efficiency the following organizational structure was created by the institution, and—because of the gratifying results it yielded—retained with few minor changes to date. Scientific work was to be carried on by four sections, interrelated yet autonomous: a section for history; economics and statistics; psychology and education; language and literature. Within the last section, two special commissions were created: one for bibliography, whose task it was to record the current literary productions by Jews in all languages, as well as writings by non-Jews touching upon Jewish problems; and one for folklore, whose function it was to gather and classify the wealth of that material current among the Jewish people.

Under the auspices of the history section archives were founded for the preservation and codification of original documents, manuscripts and other source material. The library and the museum were independent of these sections, but served them all. To insure the high quality of the work of the sections, the Institute set up stringent requirements for eligibility, so that their membership consisted on the average of no more than five or six people. To facilitate administrative procedure the city of Vilna, "the Jerusalem of the Diaspora," was chosen as the central seat of the institution. Branches were established in Warsaw, Berlin, and, later, Paris. Overseas, the North American and Argentine branches were especially active. On the eve of the present war, "Friends of Yivo" societies were functioning in more than thirty countries the world over.

Although the institution was intended to serve the main body of the people, its publications were planned to meet the most exacting demands of scholarship. From the beginning the Yivo resolved that not one iota of the scholarly value of its work was to be sacrificed for the sake of popular appeal. In the conflict between "popular science" and scholarship the latter carried the day in the Yivo. But scholarship had to have relevance to the contemporary scene. The occupational surveys carried out by the Yivo served not only to show the percentage of Jews in the various branches of economy, but also as an aid in the occupational transposition of the Jew. Indirectly, these studies were also very effective as apologetics, replacing impressionistic appeals to the outside world with factual knowledge. The taunt of Jewish non-productivity was countered with figures on Jews in agriculture, in textiles and other industries. The charge of Jewish criminality was refuted in an authoritative manner by Professor L. Hersch's study *Delinquency among Jews*, published in Yiddish, English, Polish and French. Similarly, in the three volumes of historical studies, illuminating older periods of Jewish life, the analogy of certain aspects of the past with the present and their significance for it were constantly underscored. How meaningful, alas, a study by Jacob Shatzky of the massacres of the Jews in the Ukraine in 1648—the tragic *Gezerot Takh*—was to the Jews of Central Europe in the nineteen thirties! In the various regional histories of the Jews in Poland the indigenism of the Jews and their rich contributions to the respective sections of the country were clearly demonstrated. The Jew was impressed with a sense of belonging, and the non-Jew was inspired with respect for his Jewish neighbor and his contribution to his native land. A recent Yivo study by Mark Vishniak on the political transfer of minorities may con-

tribute in considerable measure to a clarification of the problems involved in the reconstruction of the world of tomorrow. Relevance to current problems has remained the outstanding trait of the Yivo's undertakings.

The institution spared no effort in obtaining rare socio-psychological source-materials. Thus, to gain insight into the temper and aspirations of the youth of the *interbellum* period it sponsored several autobiographical contests. These contests brought in over six hundred autobiographies comprising one hundred thousand written pages of unique material, indispensable to students of that period. Unfortunately, this material, together with other invaluable literary and art treasures, fell into the hands of the Nazis during their occupation of Vilna; its restitution for the benefit of Jewish scholarship should be included in the postwar arrangements for the return of the cultural riches of Europe which have been plundered by the Germans.

EAST and Central European Jewry responded most enthusiastically to the Institute. In the remotest districts "Friends of Yivo" societies sprang up, offering their help. The Jewish masses living in unparalleled poverty would save from their meager incomes a *zloty* here and there and bring it as an offering to the Yivo. The unanimity of purpose in dedication to a spiritual task, which in an earlier period of Jewish history led towns and provinces to vie with one another in the establishment of *yeshivoth* and the maintenance of scholars, was now manifest in the building of the Yivo. The young man who walked two days, hungry and thirsty, in order to bring an object to the museum of the Yivo was no isolated case of selfless devotion to the cause. Neither was the young man who wandered for weeks with a group of beggars in order to record the stories current among them for the folklore collection.

The warm reception accorded the Yivo by the people found its counterpart in the academic world. The Yivo immediately gained the confidence of learned circles when it made its debut, two years after its establishment, with two volumes on philology, a volume of historical materials, and a volume on economics and statistics. The Institute became a factor to reckon with in the realm of scholarship. If a historian of art in Vienna was puzzled by the origin of the "Star of David," he turned to the Yivo for enlightenment. Non-Jewish scholars, too, recognized the importance of the institution and the significance for general scholarship of some of the specifically Jewish problems, and co-operated

with the Yivo. A well-known professor at the University of Vienna sought the aid of the institution in making a comparative study of European languages. The Esthonian philologist, Paul Ariste, became a contributor to Yivo publications and delivered a series of lectures at the institution in Yiddish. In 1939, John Dollard, distinguished social psychologist of Yale University, accepted an invitation to lecture at the Yivo as a visiting professor. (His trip to Vilna was cut short in France by the outbreak of war.) Thus the faith reposed in the Yivo by its curatorium, consisting of Eduard Bernstein, Simon Dubnow, Albert Einstein, Sigmund Freud, Moses Gaster, Edward Sapir, David Simonsen, Bernhard Wachstein and Chaim Zhitlovsky, was fully merited.

When the Yivo acquired its own quarters in 1930, its activities gained new momentum and scope, and expanded in all directions. It soon became evident that available scholarship was not adequate to the demands of an ever-growing audience desiring knowledge and guidance. The publications of the Yivo, avidly seized upon, in a measure satisfied that desire. But the demand persisted for a guarantee of the flow and increase of that knowledge. In response to this demand the Yivo established in 1935 the *Aspirantur*, a graduate school for training qualified young people to carry on research in the tradition of the institution. The enterprise was so successful that three years later it was necessary to open a *Proaspirantur*, an undergraduate school, to prepare the numerous applicants for the *Aspirantur*. The topics investigated in these colleges ranged from such practical subjects as "Dramatics as an Aid in Education" to academic problems such as a linguistic investigation of an East European document of the sixteenth century. The director of these schools was constrained to turn away annually dozens of well-qualified applicants for lack of accommodations.

Receiving very little aid from the outside, and depending mainly for its support upon the impoverished communities of East and Central Europe, the Yivo nevertheless flourished and grew. Ample testimony to its achievements, quantitatively and qualitatively, were the 30,000 pages of published material, the library containing over 40,000 volumes and 10,000 volumes of periodicals, and the folklore collection of over 100,000 pieces. But the Yivo was not content. It made plans for the establishment of a university and initiated research projects on a very large scale. Then came the catastrophe of 1939. Fortunately, the section for economics and statistics, under the secretaryship of Jacob Lestchinsky, had already found a haven in the United States, joining the section

for psychology and education headed by Leibush Lehrer, the home of which was originally in New York. Upon the collapse of France in the summer of 1940, the section for history, housed in Paris, managed to move to New York, together with its secretary, the late E. Tscherikower. This section saved part of its archives and all of its printed material and transported them to these shores with the aid of friendly individuals and organizations in America, including the American Jewish Committee. Later that year, the secretary of the section of language and literature, Max Weinreich, who was also the director of the *Aspirantur* and *Proaspirantur* came to America, and the work of the Yivo was resumed in the New World.

The task of rebuilding the institution and adjusting it to the new environment proceeded simultaneously. To recoup their loss, the library and archives have continually extended their possessions through purchase and gifts so that to date they count 35,000 items, exclusive of documents, manuscripts and pamphlets. In some fields, notably that of Jewish periodicals in all languages, the library has attained considerable prominence. The Institute's adjustment to the American locale is manifest in the constant rise in the number of American topics investigated. The history of Jewish immigration into the United States and the rise of labor movements among the Jews of America were made the subjects of thoroughgoing study. Recently, the institution sponsored an autobiographical contest for immigrants, which brought in 250 entries, comprising about 35,000 written pages of extraordinary material. Some of this material is already being utilized in socio-psychological studies. The economic, religious and cultural aspects of Jewish immigrant life so faithfully and so richly reflected in these autobiographies, beckon invitingly to the historian of the Jews in this country. It is through research of this type that the community of interests and the academic relationship between the Yivo and other Jewish institutions of learning are growing ever closer.

MEANWHILE, the Yivo is not neglecting other fields of investigation. In its American career the Institute has published works on Haskalah and Hassidism, on Jewish educational policy in Poland in the nineteenth century, and has also issued a study of Yiddish translations of the Pentateuch. These works, together with the bimonthly *Yivo Bletter*—originally published in Vilna—the new non-technical bimonthly *Di Yiddishe Shprakh*, and the quarterly *Newsletter of the Yivo* in English and Yid-

dish comprise a total of six thousand printed pages for the past four years.

In addition to publishing activities, the work of the *Aspirantur* and *Proaspirantur* is continuing, and the Yivo hopes ultimately to transform these training seminaries into a post-graduate school for Jewish Social Studies. Furthermore, the members of the various sections frequently call meetings of outside scholars and the public at large, to discuss specific problems, or for a general exchange of opinions. The annual mid-winter conference has become almost an institution in itself. The timeliness of the subjects discussed at these conferences, their scope, and the variety of viewpoints of the speakers attract a large and diverse audience. I mention at random several topics considered at the last meeting: "Jewish Universalism" by I. N. Steinberg, "Negroes and Jews" by Milton R. Konvitz, "Resistance in the Polish Ghettos" by S. Mendelsohn, "Jews in the American Army" by Samuel C. Kohs, and "Saul Tchernichovsky's Ideals" by Israel Afros. Of more than passing importance are also the cultural exhibits arranged periodically, such as the recent portfolio of photographs by an artist-photographer, Roman Vishniac, depicting life in Poland in the *interbellum* period, or the Moses Leib Lilienblum exhibit celebrating the centennial of his birth.

For the English-reading public the Yivo has issued A. A. Roback's *The Story of Yiddish Literature*. In addition it has published several timely brochures. One of these, *The Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto*, by S. Mendelsohn, has reached a circulation of thirty thousand. In the immediate future an annual publication in English, *Yivo Studies*, will be undertaken, containing translations of some of the representative material appearing in the *Yivo Bletter* and the other publications. The Yivo also plans to publish a periodical recording developments in all fields of Jewish learning in all languages.

These ramified activities require suitable facilities. And so in 1943 the Yivo acquired the building that was originally erected by Jacob H. Schiff to house the Jewish Theological Seminary, and established its headquarters there. From Vilna to New York—in this passage the Yivo symbolizes the timelessness and universality of Jewish life and Jewish learning. Vilna and New York! Vast is the distance separating these two cities, and the bond uniting them is the Yivo.

Bialystok Transplanted and Transformed

JOSEPH CHAIKIN

THE Jewish community in the United States has no monopoly on the *Landsmannschaft* form of organization—it may be found among the Germans, the Irish, the Poles and others—but in no other immigrant group are the *Landsmannschaften* so deep-rooted, so persistent and so widespread as among the Jews who settled here from Eastern and Central Europe. There are about 3,000 *Landsmannschaften* in New York City alone, with a membership of half a million, and perhaps an equal number in the rest of the country—though here no reliable figures exist and estimates are dangerous. Most of these groups have endured through three generations, long after the impulse and the need that gave them birth have disappeared, so that many a younger member has never seen or hardly remembers the town that gave his society its name. These associations still perform a useful function, philanthropic or social; a fact that is acknowledged by their representation in the councils of such large national organizations as the Joint Distribution Committee or the American Jewish Congress—and they perhaps merit more attention than is usually accorded them.

EASTERN and Central European Jews found their way to this country even during the Colonial period. Haym Salomon, who made such a significant contribution to the cause of the American Revolution, was a Polish Jew, and there were others. Their number was increased in the 1848 wave of German immigration; many of the German Jews who migrated to this country at that time stemmed from East Europe. The real mass migration of Eastern European Jews began, however, in the eighties, in flight from the Czarist persecutions.

America was hospitable enough to the new immigrants and remained hospitable almost up to the time of the First World War. Immigrants in good health and moral character were admitted without question; passports and visas were not required. Even the initial restrictions against imported contract labor did not affect the Jews, for they were neither

transported here by "padrones" nor recruited by the special agents of American industries. They came at their own risk and had to make their own individual adjustments, which were always difficult. They were aided in transit by charitable groups of Jews in Germany, Austria, France and England. In this country the established German-Jewish groups came to their assistance, but the flood was too great to be channeled and in the main the newcomers had to depend upon themselves.

It was only natural that the immigrants, ignorant of the language and the ways of their new home, should band together for mutual assistance and turn first to the people they knew—their *landsleit*, who came from the same town in Eastern Europe, from Vilna, from Grodno, from Kovno, from Bialystok. The *landsleit* who had arrived earlier became the guides and guardians of those who came later. The first night's lodging, an introduction to the first job, credit for the first supply of the peddler's pack, or pushcart load, was furnished through the aid of the *landsmann*, though he might have preceded the newcomer to this country by only a few months. Ties of gratitude and mutual assistance were thus established, and have in many cases endured to this day through the children and the grandchildren of the early immigrants. These formed the early basis of the *Landsmannschaften* and may help explain their survival to the present day.

But as the tide of migration rose ever higher, the problems of the newcomers could not be solved within the means of individual *landsleit*. Those who had been aided were not disposed to deny aid to others, but it was now necessary to organize a pooling of resources and of collective experience. *Landsmannschaften* grew in size and number; the fact that the Jewish immigrants were urban dwellers and came largely from the same communities made organization easier and more natural.

We may trace the beginnings of the Eastern and Central European *Landsmannschaft* organizations among the Jews back to 1848 in the larger cities, but their real development came with the rising tide of immigration. The societies grew both in number and in the scope of their activities. Material assistance to the newcomers, important as it was in itself, was not the only reason for the formation of the *Landsmannschaften*. The urge to reconstitute in the new land at least a part of the life of the old—the only life that was familiar—was strong among the immigrants, and expressed itself most strongly in the desire to meet in prayer with familiar faces. Small, mushroom congregations sprang up—the *Ansche*, or the "men" of such and such a town. Separate plots

were fenced off in Jewish cemeteries, for the exclusive use of these congregations and societies. The Landsmannschaften ministered to the material, religious, and social needs of the immigrants on a more intimate basis than could the existing social service organizations. Nor did their services end with the help they gave in this country. Relatives in the old country, in the original communities now depleted of the younger men, were assisted in large measure by the organization of Landsmannschaften. As the newcomers became established, their charities abroad increased in volume and overshadowed their work in this country.

It is our purpose to trace the history of the Bialystok Landsmannschaft—one that has gone through all the stages of organization and reached the peak of its development—in the hope that a close scrutiny will afford us a picture of the whole Landsmannschaft movement in the United States.¹

II

BIALYSTOK, before its occupation by Hitler, on the first day of Rosh Hashanah, September 1, 1939, was an important industrial city in the White-Russian section of Poland. It was not an old city, by European standards. The original settlement of the village, Bialy, on the banks of the river of the same name, dates back to the beginning of the fifteenth century. Some Jewish settlers must have lived there by the end of the seventeenth century, since there are records of the revival in that region and at that time of the ugly "blood-accusation" against Jews.

The official beginnings of the Bialystok Jewish community, however, date back to 1749. In that year, Count Branitzky, a Polish feudal lord, owner of the village of Bialy, and of much surrounding territory, succeeded in obtaining a township charter for Bialystok from the Polish King, Augustus III. Count Branitzky invited Jews to settle in his domain. He even built a number of frame houses near his castle, and offered them rent-free to the original Jewish settlers. Fourteen years later, he built a synagogue for the community. But as the Jewish population grew, he made the settlers pay heavily in taxes for his favors and hospitality.

During the second partition of Poland, in 1793, Bialystok was first awarded to Prussia. Sixteen years later, the town reverted to Russia.

¹ A serious study of the Landsmannschaften in this country, from 1840 to 1938, was undertaken by the Yiddish Writers' Group of the Federal Writers' Project, Works Progress Administration, and published by the Yiddish Writers' Union (Peretz Verein) of New York.

In 1918, it became part of the re-established Polish State. Under all its various rulers, the Jewish community of Bialystok grew and prospered. In 1840, Germans introduced the first textile factories there. Ten years later, Jews followed the example of the Germans and established successful textile works of their own. In 1859, Bialystok was connected with the outside world by railroad, and the town's growth was assured.

The religious and cultural life in the Bialystok Jewish Community was on the upgrade from the beginning of the nineteenth century. In 1805, the first Jewish printing press was established in Bialystok. It prospered until the Russian Government, for reasons of censorship, closed down all Jewish printing shops in the Empire, except one in Vilna and another in Slavuta. The community developed industrially, to such an extent that in 1877 to 1878, the first important strike of weavers in Russia occurred there, lasting several months. The growing proletarian character of the Jewish population of the town even influenced some of the local *gymnasium* students in the direction of Socialism. The first Socialist agitator and journalistic propagandist in Hebrew, Aaron Lieberman, began his activities in his Bialystok home, before he emigrated to London and the United States, in the eighties.

Unlike many other growing Jewish communities in Poland, Bialystok was always better known for its industries and commerce than for its learning. To be sure, it had its quota of synagogues and talmudic students, and even boasted a number of outstanding rabbis. Rabbi Samuel Mohilover, the forerunner of modern Zionism, the orthodox leader who succeeded in interesting Baron Rothschild in Palestinian colonization, was for many years the chief rabbi of Bialystok. But the town acquired a greater reputation as a center of Jewish workers in textiles, tobacco and the building trades.

The Jewish population of Bialystok increased greatly during the latter part of the nineteenth century. The census of 1897 reports 42,000 Jewish inhabitants, representing 66% of the entire population. The brutal pogroms of 1906 and 1907, in which several hundred Jews were killed, a thousand injured, and much Jewish property destroyed, led to a great migration of Bialystok Jews to America, and the community lost thereby a considerable portion of its youth. The First World War, and the oppressive economic policy of the Polish Government in the twenties and thirties were also not conducive to a revival of Jewish life. The census of 1931 showed only 31,000 Jewish inhabitants in Bialystok, forming 45% of the total population.

Until the outbreak of the Second World War, the Jewish community of that city nevertheless continued to furnish its quota of important men. Dr. Ludwig Zamenhof, the originator of Esperanto, achieved world fame while he worked at his practice as an oculist in his Bialystok home. Dr. Joseph Chazanowitz, who labored early and late ministering to the physical needs of the poor in Bialystok, was the founder of what is now the Jewish National Library and University in Jerusalem. The late Prof. Leo Wiener, of Harvard University, a famous linguist, began his scholarly career in his native Bialystok. Maxim M. Litvinov (Meyer Wallach) was born and obtained his early schooling in the home surroundings of his orthodox Jewish family in Bialystok. Ossip Dymov, an outstanding Russian short-story writer and dramatist; the famous opera star, Rosa Raisa, and scores of other celebrities in various fields of endeavor, carried with them in their careers the world over the cultural heritage of their home town.

This, briefly, is the background of some 75,000 Jews who migrated from Bialystok during the period of the 1880's, to the beginning of the Second World War. Of this number, at least 50,000 settled in the United States, about half of them in the metropolitan district of New York. Their Landsmannschaft organizations and institutions form a cross section of the immigrant Jewish community in the United States. By and large, their migration was actuated by the same economic necessities, religious, social, and political compulsions, that were the major reason for all Jewish migration from Eastern and Central Europe. Their experiences here did not differ much from the experiences of migrants from Warsaw, Vilna, or any other Jewish population center in Slavic countries or Rumania. They brought here approximately the same skills and knowledge. And they shared also the material poverty and rich cultural heritage of their fellow immigrants.

III

THE first organization of Bialystok Jews in this country was the Bialystoker Benevolent Society, chartered in New York in 1864, but no longer in existence. The Congregation Beth Haknesseth Anshe Bialystok of 5 Willet Street, New York City, was organized in 1878. It celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1928, and continues to be the recognized synagogue of the Bialystok Landsmannschaft despite the fact that very few of the *landsleit* still reside on the lower East Side.

Other secular organizations, in New York and elsewhere, were organized by immigrants from Bialystok in the following order: Ahavath Achim, 1884; Somech Noflim, 1886; Brotherly Love Association, 1890; Bikur Cholim, 1897; Bikur Cholim in Brooklyn, 1898; I. O. B. A. Lodge, 1901; Unterstutzungs Verein, Brooklyn, 1902; Bricklayers Benevolent Association, 1905; Branch 88, Workmen's Circle, 1905; Young Men's Association, 1906; Branch 127, Workmen's Circle, Chicago, 1906; Branch 137, Workmen's Circle, Philadelphia, 1906; Branch 121, Workmen's Circle, Paterson, N. J., 1907; Branch 256, Workmen's Circle, Newark, N. J., 1908; Ladies Aid Society, Harlem and Bronx, 1909; Arbeiter Unterstutzungs Verein of Newark, N. J., 1912; Bialystoker Center, New York, 1919; Relief Committees, Chicago and Paterson, 1919; Bialystoker Center, Chicago, 1922; Ladies Auxiliary, N. Y., 1923; Ladies Auxiliary, Chicago, 1925; Ladies Auxiliary, Newark, N. J., 1927; Ladies Auxiliary Bikur Cholim, Brooklyn, 1928; Bialystoker Social Center, Los Angeles, 1928; Bialystoker Center and Home for the Aged, New York, 1931; Bialystoker Credit Union, New York, 1933.

The names of these organizations, as well as their dates of origin, indicate a general pattern. Mutual-aid, assistance to the needy, and care for the sick, houses of prayer, even an organization of building tradesmen, were among the first institutions. All these organizations, it should be noted here, were replicas of similar groups in Bialystok.

"Old timers" who landed in this country in the middle eighties still recount the difficulties of adjustment during their first years of residence in America. Most of them were weavers, but when they arrived here, they took up cigar making. The few *landsleit* who preceded them were cigar makers, and could not help their friends to find employment in weaving establishments. Later, in the nineties, and at the turn of the century, when they were more Americanized, they found their way into the textile industry of New York, Hoboken, and Paterson. In Paterson they were eventually instrumental in developing successful textile establishments. Some acquired considerable wealth in their new ventures. But this happened only after a few *landsleit* paved the way.

European training in various trades, particularly in the building lines, soon enabled the Bialystok men to come into their own in their new home. Building booms in Harlem, Brooklyn and the Bronx, as well as in many other cities throughout the East, furnished ample opportunities for Bialystok carpenters, bricklayers and other building workers,

to prosper. The newcomers also adapted themselves successfully to other trades and professions in this country.

In the cultural field, their contribution was no less notable. Jacob Sapirstein and Sigmund Kanterowitz, the outstanding Yiddish publishers in New York in the nineties, were both from Bialystok. They began their careers here as publishers of popular works of fiction, in weekly serial pamphlet editions. Mr. Kanterowitz, whose ambitions were more literary, even attempted to establish the first Yiddish intellectual monthly, *Der Neier Geist*, in the late nineties, with the philologist and author, Alexander Harkavy, as his editor. The venture was a "moral" success only. Mr. Sapirstein turned from pamphlet publication to the creation of a Yiddish daily press. His *Abend Post* met with uneven success at the turn of the century. He founded the *Jewish Morning Journal* in 1903, with another Bialystok *Landsmann*, the historian, Peter Wiernick, as his editor-in-chief. This conservative Yiddish morning newspaper is still an outstanding journal of opinion in the Jewish community.

IV

THE peak of its activity was reached by the Bialystok Landsmannschaft in 1919, with the establishment of its first federation of organizations, known as the Bialystoker Center of New York. Led by a young newcomer, David Sohn, who subsequently became the leading spirit of his community, this federation of townsmen raised substantial sums for relief of Bialystok Jews abroad. Soon after the Armistice, five representatives were dispatched, in rotation, two of them on repeated missions of charity, from the Landsmannschaft of Bialystok to the people of their old home town. These men proved to be capable and self-sacrificing. They traveled from America to Bialystok at quarter-year intervals between 1919 and 1922, distributing \$625,000 transmitted from American Jews to relatives in Europe, plus \$66,000 as a general contribution to the charities of the Jewish Community of Bialystok.

The collective cost of these transmissions was under 4%. The service was popular with the people of the Landsmannschaft here, and with their relatives in Europe, and the Center continued to serve as a transmitting agency, without the intermediary of private bankers, from 1922 to 1932. During that decade, five million dollars was sent by the *landsleit* to their native city, and only the depression cut short this activity.

The Joint Distribution Committee is reported to have heartily approved this "separatistic" service of the Bialystok Landsmannschaft, on the theory that the remittances sent through this special agency were of particular value because they were carried on by people who were well acquainted both with the financial status of the senders, and the particular needs of the recipients. The Second World War has put an end to this work for the time being. Active workers, therefore, encourage their organizations to raise substantial funds for the day when help can again be sent across. But they also urge their followers to take advantage of the well-organized apparatus of the Joint Distribution Committee.

In the meantime, activities of the Bialystok Landsmannschaft in this country continue along the established lines. The most important local institution of the Landsmannschaft is its Home for the Aged, a modern ten-story structure on East Broadway, in the heart of the old East Side, which has been functioning since 1931. It houses over five hundred old men and women, and has an annual budget of \$100,000, raised by its own membership. The office of the home is also the center of other charitable activities, distributing \$10,000 a year in small sums to needy families and individuals. The most important feature of this service is that it is carried on in the unprofessional manner of mutual help, maintaining the ancient Jewish tradition of true *Zedakah*.

The Bialystok Center has published for twenty-four years a well-edited monthly magazine, *The Voice of Bialystok*. This publication was originally all in Yiddish, but since its fourth or fifth year, it has been found necessary to add an English section, which is growing in size. The editor, David Sohn, is also the superintendent of the Home for the Aged, and is assisted in his editorial duties by Jacob Krepliak and other Yiddish writers in the Landsmannschaft.

The process of Americanization is gradually changing the language of the Landsmannschaft organizations, both in New York and in other cities, from Yiddish to English. The majority is still Yiddish-speaking, but English is becoming the growing medium of communication at meetings, social gatherings, and conferences. It is symptomatic that the list of donors printed in the official magazine is chiefly in English. The number of English communications to the editor is also on the increase. However, the important literary material of the publication is still in Yiddish.

The Bialystok Landsmannschaft organizations in New York, Newark, Paterson, Chicago, Los Angeles, claim a collective membership of 10,000, or about one-fifth of the estimated 50,000 Bialystok immigrants living in this country. Their influence, however, extends beyond mere numbers. They represent perhaps the most enterprising of all Landsmannschaften. As far back as 1919, the societies, united under the auspices of the Bialystoker Center of New York, attempted to form a miniature "World Federation" of their own. Thus they encouraged after the Armistice an organization of Bialystok refugees in Berlin. They established connections with Bialystok pioneers in Palestine and contributed liberally to the assistance of both groups, in Germany and Palestine, for several years. At the same time, they established connections with societies of Bialystok immigrants in Buenos Aires. The leaders of the Landsmannschaft in the United States at one time even entertained a notion of an "International Conference" of their own.

The first step in that direction was made in June 1934 at a national convention in New York, attended by sixty-two delegates from Bialystok organizations in nineteen American cities. A second convention was held in New York in 1939, with an increased body of delegates and organizations. The war destroyed all these ambitious plans of the Bialystoker Landsmannschaft.

Leading men of the Landsmannschaft still hope, however, that it may be possible to assemble delegates of their organizations in the near future for the mobilization of resources toward the immense undertaking of help and reconstruction abroad after the war. They look forward to a complete co-operation with the Joint Distribution Committee in this effort, but they are certain that even under the aegis of the J. D. C., they will prove the usefulness of their particular group as a solidifying force in the Jewish community of America.

Chronicles

(Prepared by BETTY P. ROSEN, Library of Jewish Information)

MAY-JUNE

UNITED STATES

Temporary sanctuary for the duration of the war for 1,000 refugees from Italy to be placed in an "emergency refugee shelter" at Fort Ontario near Oswego, N. Y., would be arranged immediately by the Government, President Roosevelt announced on June 9. Instructions were immediately transmitted to Ambassador Robert Murphy at Algiers and to the War and Navy Departments to select and transport as expeditiously as possible these refugees, who were to be admitted outside of the regular immigration procedure. Responsibility for the necessary security precautions and for the equipment of the shelter was placed in the hands of the War Department; the administration of the camp was assigned to the War Relocation Authority; and the financial arrangements were temporarily entrusted to the Bureau of the Budget, "until UNRRA is in a position to assume the financial responsibilities involved." Three days later, June 12, President Roosevelt formally notified Congress of his action. Pointing to the Nazis' determination to complete their program of mass extermination before their defeat, and citing as example "the fury of their insane desire to wipe out the Jewish race in Europe," he stressed the need for helping Hitler's victims, and announced that the War Refugee Board was "entrusted with the solemn duty of translating this Government's humanitarian policy into prompt ac-

tion." Indicating the temporary nature of this scheme for refugee aid, he declared that "upon the termination of the war they will be sent back to their homelands."

This action was apparently taken in response to widespread public demand for the establishment of "free ports"—reserved and guarded areas where refugees could live temporarily without being considered legal residents of the country, and therefore not subject to immigration quota restrictions—first suggested by the columnist Samuel Grafton sometime in April. During the month of May, appeals for the establishment of such refuges came to the President from many Jewish and non-Jewish groups, including the A.F.L., the C.I.O., the International Labor Organization, the National Committee against Nazi Persecution and Extermination of the Jews, the Washington Episcopal Diocese, the Jewish Labor Committee, the National Council of Jewish Women, the Synagogue Council of America, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

An appeal to this effect was also addressed (May 25) to the President in a statement signed by seventy-two leading Americans, including Associate Justice Frank Murphy, governors of eighteen states, members of Congress, and prominent educators, clergymen, industrialists and labor leaders.

Support of the "free port" idea was also voiced by leading newspapers.

Proposals for the establishment of

temporary refugee havens were brought before both houses of Congress before the President acted. A resolution to this effect was introduced in the Senate on May 29 by Sen. Guy Gillette (D., Iowa), and similar resolutions were introduced in the House by eight Congressmen during the following two weeks. Rep. William T. Byrne (D., N. Y.) who introduced the last of these on June 13, after the President's announcement of the Fort Ontario shelter, declared that the present plan to admit 1,000 refugees "should be just a start." Hearings on the various bills, scheduled in both houses for June 21, were postponed due to the adjournment of Congress on June 23 for the national political conventions.

The President's action in setting up the emergency refugee shelter was welcomed by the American Jewish Conference in a statement issued on June 11, which expressed the hope that Turkey will follow America's example and that the British Colonial Office will open the doors of Palestine to Hitler's victims. In Congress and in the press, the opinion was expressed that provision of refuge for 1,000 persons was a good beginning, but was not sufficient contribution from the United States toward the solution of the refugee problem.

In a highly unusual action, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 3 issued a statement condemning the threatened extermination of Hungary's Jews, and calling upon the Hungarian people to help the Jews escape and to obstruct Nazi persecution. On June 21, the House Foreign Affairs Committee also called upon Hungary to halt the mistreatment of Jews and reminded the Axis satellite of future punishment. The next day the resolution was formally introduced in the House by Rep. Sol Bloom (D., N. Y.), chairman of the committee. Both statements were broadcast by the Office of War Information in several foreign languages for relay to the Continent. Commenting upon the House resolution, Secretary of State Cordell Hull on June 26 declared that there could not be too many persons, officials or groups join-

ing in such strong and indignant protest, and took the occasion to repeat the pertinent part of the warning to war criminals issued at the Moscow Conference.

In a broadcast beamed to Hungary on June 27, Archbishop Francis J. Spellman of New York condemned the persecution of Hungary's Jews as a "direct contradiction of the doctrines of the Catholic faith professed by the vast majority of the Hungarian people." Similarly, two days later, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ of America, through its general secretary, Samuel McCrea Cavert, urged American Christians to pray for Hungary's persecuted Jews and appealed to "our Christian brethren in Hungary to refuse to be silent in the presence of this crime and to do everything possible to aid and comfort the Jewish victims."

The conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in Philadelphia, issued (May 12) a declaration calling upon the United Nations to repeat the warning of punishment to war criminals; to recognize the remaining Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe as prisoners of war; to keep the doors of Palestine open for Jewish immigration; and to establish "free ports."

The 25th annual convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union on June 4 adopted a resolution incorporating similar demands.

Zionism and Palestine

The establishment of a "Hebrew Committee for National Liberation," consisting of seven Palestinian and stateless Jews, which declared itself the "temporary trustee of Hebrew national interests" and set up an "unofficial embassy" in Washington, was announced on May 18. The group, who termed themselves "Hebrews in exile," claimed to represent the Jews of Palestine and Europe, and disclosed plans for seeking a "co-belligerent status" for the "Hebrew Nation" with the United Nations. The committee was immediately assailed by the American Zionist Emergency Council—speaking for all major Zionist bodies in the U. S.—as "a half dozen adventurers from Palestine with no standing,

no credentials, no mandate from anyone unless it be from the Irgun Zvai Leumi in Palestine, an insignificantly small pistol-packing group of extremists. . . ." Similar statements characterizing the group as "irresponsible" and "fraudulent," and warning the American people against being misled by them, were issued the same day by the Zionist Organization of America, the American Jewish Conference, the American Jewish Congress, and Hadasah.

A cable received (June 2) by the Zionist Emergency Council from the Jewish Agency for Palestine branded the newly-formed committee as an "unscrupulous piece of political charlatanism," and pointed out that the "rights and interests of the Jewish people as a whole in regard to Palestine are represented by the Jewish Agency. . . ." Similar comments were received here from the Jewish National Council of Palestine and from the Histadruth.

The New Zionist Organization in Palestine dissociated itself from the "Hebrew Committee for National Liberation" in an editorial appearing on May 26 in its publication *Hamashkif*. The national council of the New Zionist Organization of America, meeting in New York on June 19-21, issued a statement similarly disclaiming any connection with the newly-formed committee. This action, however, was opposed by a group of twelve members of the N.Z.O., who charged that the national council was not a democratically elected body; and a few days later (June 23) split away from the N.Z.O., expressed their "wholehearted support" of the "Committee of Liberation," and organized themselves as the "Union of Zionist Revisionists in the U. S." On June 16, the Department of Justice disclosed that the "Hebrew Committee for National Liberation" had registered as a foreign "agent of the Hebrew nation."

The first meeting of the American League for a Free Palestine, formed to support the principles and objectives of the "Hebrew Committee for National Liberation," was held on May 24. A statement circulated (May 8) by the Zionist Emergency Council to its mem-

ber groups warned against the activities of the League. Literature distributed by the League reprinted lists of former endorsers of the Committee for a Jewish Army and the Emergency Committee to Save the Jews of Europe, thereby conveying the impression that these individuals were sponsors of the League. This action brought sharp protests from a number of labor leaders (May 23), including William Green of the A.F.L. and R. J. Thomas of the U.A.W., and from forty-six rabbis (June 1), who asserted that their original intention was being distorted and demanded the withdrawal of their names. A similar statement was issued by Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis on June 2. In refusing an invitation to join the League's sponsoring committee, Sen. Robert F. Wagner (D., N. Y.) on May 24 denounced the "Hebrew Committee for National Liberation" as an "organization which serves no useful purpose and can only confuse and mislead American public opinion."

A petition signed by 1,700 American university professors urging President Roosevelt to act in behalf of free entry of Jews into Palestine, "so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth," was submitted to the White House on May 16, fifth anniversary of the issuance of the White Paper.

The Agudas Israel of America, which met in convention June 22-26, demanded the abrogation of the White Paper and an "international trusteeship that will allow the homeless Jewish masses to immigrate into and live in Palestine in equality with all other inhabitants." The convention also urged peaceful understanding and co-operation with the Arabs.

Increased participation by Central American Jewish communities in Jewish National Fund activities was evidenced by the remittance of over \$40,000 to the J.N.F. in New York during the past six months, it was announced June 2. At a press conference on June 29, the president of the Palestine Foundation Fund disclosed that \$2,750,000 has been remitted by

the fund in the past six months to the Jewish Agency in Palestine for the rehabilitation of refugees from Europe. The National Labor Committee for Palestine on June 4 announced the transmission of \$250,000 to the Hista-druth in Jerusalem for colonization and rescue work, and for the organization of new co-operative enterprises.

The Community

The joint conference of the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, the National Association of Jewish Center Workers and the National Council for Jewish Education, held in Cleveland May 17-21, emphasized the need for revision of Jewish social welfare, youth and educational programs to fit new needs, and pledged the resources of these agencies toward facilitating the orderly demobilization and reabsorption of returning servicemen into civilian life.

Special D-Day services were held in synagogues throughout the country on June 6, in response to a call issued by the Synagogue Council of America which had prepared a special prayer for the occasion.

Several major religious groups held conventions during the period. The United Synagogue of America, which met in Atlantic City May 5-7, urged legislation to place religious officials and employees under the provisions of the Social Security Act; demanded the abrogation of the White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine; and voiced support of the American Jewish Conference. The convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, held in Cincinnati June 23-26, voted to retain its position of neutrality with regard to Zionism, and welcoming the establishment of the National Community Relations Advisory Council as a step in the direction of unity of Jewish defense forces, asked for representation on the Council. Resolutions adopted by the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly of America which met June 26-29 under the theme "Spiritual Leadership in Tomorrow's World" demanded a Jewish Commonwealth in

Palestine and lauded the establishment of an emergency refugee shelter by President Roosevelt.

On the occasion of his 25th anniversary as rabbi of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, second oldest Jewish congregation in New York City, Dr. Israel Goldstein was honored with a four-day celebration.

The national war service centennial convention of the B'nai B'rith, held May 6-10 (see: War Effort), approved the action of its executive committee continuing the organization's full participation in the American Jewish Conference and its Interim Committee; and expressed appreciation of the purpose and achievements of the Fair Employment Practices Committee.

The Independent Order B'rith Abraham, which convened in Atlantic City June 11-13, asked both major political parties to incorporate in their platform planks calling for legislation to make anti-Semitism and other racial bias a criminal offense; urged promulgation by the peace conference of an international bill of rights based on the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter; voted to petition for the abrogation of the White Paper; and voiced support of the American Jewish Conference.

The convention of the United Rumanian Jews of America, held May 13-14, voted to initiate a campaign for \$100,000 for the assistance of Jews in Rumania, and to collect clothing and other supplies for relief kits. A series of resolutions demanding full economic, political and cultural equality for the Jews of Poland after the war was adopted by the convention of the American Federation for Polish Jews, which met in New York June 17-19. The meeting also urged free immigration to Palestine under the supervision of the Jewish Agency.

The admission of the Jewish War Veterans to membership in the National Community Relations Advisory Council was announced on June 8.

Refugees and Relief

More than half of the \$32,000,000 quota of the United Jewish Appeal campaign was raised in the first five

months of 1944, it was reported June 18. A U.J.A. announcement of June 30 disclosed that during the first half of the year its constituent organizations spent a record sum of \$20,600,000 for overseas relief and refugee aid.

The Joint Distribution Committee has allocated over \$2,000,000 for its parcel service in 1944, it was announced on May 20. The report indicated that Jews in Asiatic Russia received 31,799 packages of food and clothing from October 1943 to May 1, 1944, and that the current rate of shipment was 7,000 packages per month. By arrangement with lend-lease authorities in the Middle East, reported June 1, the J.D.C. will receive part of the lend-lease stocks in Teheran for use in its parcel service. Enough commodities to fill 100,000 parcels, to be dispatched at the rate of 10,000 packages monthly, will be procured in this way. Considerable quantities of goods have been secured gratis by the J.D.C. from the Polish Red Cross for Polish refugees in Russia, the same report revealed. Since the large influx of Jewish refugees into the Yemenite city of Aden, which began about June 1943, the J.D.C. has appropriated about \$25,000 for their relief and in addition nearly \$80,000 for the transportation of a number of them to Palestine, it was disclosed in a survey published in the Jerusalem press on May 2. A report on J.D.C. activities in Italy issued June 30 revealed that the J.D.C. budget allocation for occupied Italy was \$120,000 for the first six months of 1944.

Some 4,200 Jewish immigrants and 1,000 Jewish refugees on temporary visas were admitted to the United States during 1943, according to the annual report of the executive director of the National Refugee Service, made public on June 4. During the last week in April, 93 Jewish refugees were admitted to the country as quota immigrants, a HIAS report of May 12 disclosed.

Intergroup Relations

Addressing the interfaith unity session of the B'nai B'rith national war service convention, Supreme Court Justice

Frank Murphy characterized anti-Semitism as "not only un-American, but anti-Christian," and called for unified action among Christians to purge the country of anti-Semitism. An educational program designed to expose to the American people the dangers of "subversive propaganda by hate-mongers" was outlined at the session.

A statement signed (June 21) by 140 Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious leaders representing all sections of the country was submitted to the State Department, calling for the early establishment of a permanent International Office for Education to bring about peaceful international collaboration to advance educational development and to achieve through education understanding among nations, races, peoples and cultures.

The Churchman Award, given annually to one who has rendered distinguished service in "the promotion of good-will and better understanding among all peoples," was presented on May 23 to Bernard Baruch.

Hearings before the House Labor Committee on proposed legislation to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee were opened on June 1, but no action had been taken on the measure before the adjournment of Congress on June 23. Meanwhile, despite violent opposition from Southern senators, an appropriation for continuing the FEPC was voted by Congress (May 26 and June 20).

War Effort

B'nai B'rith groups have spent approximately \$1,000,000 on war service activities in their communities since Pearl Harbor in addition to contributing \$200,000 toward the organization's national war service projects, it was disclosed at the national war service centennial convention of the B'nai B'rith, which took place in New York, May 6-10. The extension of the organization's war service program to include the supply of Army and Navy hospital ships with recreational material was authorized by the convention.

In the campaign conducted by the Zionist Organization of America to sell

\$50,000,000 in war bonds among its membership during the month of June, over \$20,000,000 in bonds were sold during the first two weeks of the drive, incomplete reports received (June 27) by Zionist headquarters disclosed.

At the annual dinner of the National Jewish Welfare Board, May 3, it was learned that 241 Jewish chaplains are now serving in the armed forces, 94 of whom are overseas.

Delayed reports revealed that a Liberty ship named for Harry L. Glucksmann, founder of the Jewish Center movement, was launched on April 29. Liberty ships named for Congressman Michael Edelstein and for Dr. Cyrus Adler were launched on June 4 and June 5 respectively.

Casualty reports of the period listed 135 killed and 101 wounded.

Necrology

Rabbi Joseph Konvitz, president of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, died at Belmar, N. J., on June 6 at the age of 66.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH GREAT BRITAIN

An appeal addressed to the United Nations' governments urging them to redouble their efforts to rescue Jews in Europe faced by imminent extermination was voiced by the Board of Deputies, which met in special session on June 18 to discuss the problem of Jewish rescue. The resolution urged that all measures be taken to impress upon the peoples of German satellite nations the importance of helping Jews escape from the Nazis; and asked that the United Nations provide asylum and settlement opportunities for refugee Jews, with special emphasis on Palestine.

A resolution unanimously adopted on June 14 by the Council of Christians and Jews expressed concern at the increasing peril to Jews involved in the recent extension of Nazi domination in Central and South-Eastern Europe, and urged "all men of good-will in these regions . . . to refuse to assist the persecutors and wherever possible to shelter the victims." The Archbishop of Can-

terbury, who presided over the meeting, voiced his disappointment at the unwillingness of government authorities to admit more refugees.

Addressing a memorial meeting for the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, held in London on May 21, Chief Rabbi Joseph Hertz appealed to the United Nations to attempt to secure war prisoner status for the Jews of occupied Europe, so that they could be exchanged for German prisoners held by the Allies. A delegation of leaders of organizations concerned with rescue was recently received at the Foreign Office, it was reported June 25, to confer on means of expediting the transfer and reception of refugees from enemy territory.

The vital need for immediate rescue measures, however, did not eclipse the significance of long-range problems which would accompany the cessation of hostilities. A memorandum presenting basic principles for the stabilization of the status of Jews in Europe after the war was submitted by the Board of Deputies to the Government and to the Commonwealth Conference of Dominion Prime Ministers, it was revealed at a meeting of the Board on May 21. A recent meeting of Board leaders with the Soviet Ambassador, where matters of postwar policy with regard to Jews as well as questions arising out of their present situation were discussed, was also reported to the Board session. At a conference of representatives of sixty Jewish organizations which met on June 12 to speed their campaign to raise \$200,000 to purchase ambulances for the Red Army, the secretary of the Board of Deputies announced the Board's readiness to co-operate with the Jews of Russia in their postwar activities.

Labor Party leader Arthur Greenwood, addressing a May Day meeting called by the Poale Zion, advocated as the solution of the problem of Europe's remaining Jews the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine under a self-governing Jewish authority to be created after a Jewish majority has been attained through free immigration.

The executive committee of the

CANADA

Council of Christians and Jews on May 31 endorsed the seven-point interfaith "declaration on world peace" issued last October by 144 American Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders, calling for the establishment of a world order based on moral law, and for the organization of international institutions to maintain peace with justice.

A proposal made in the House of Commons on June 8 for automatic naturalization of German and Austrian refugees serving in the British forces overseas to protect them should they be captured by the Germans, was rejected by Home Security Minister Herbert Morrison on the grounds that members of the armed forces are protected by the prisoner of war international convention, regardless of nationality. Of the 1,500 Jewish refugees interned on the island of Mauritius some three years ago when they attempted to enter Palestine without visas, 149 have been accepted for service in the armed forces, and 93 have died on the island, Colonial Secretary Oliver Stanley revealed in Commons on June 14.

Synagogues throughout the country were crowded on the Sabbath following D-Day, when services were marked by special prayers for the Allied soldiers in France issued by Chief Rabbi Joseph Hertz.

London press reports of May 28 described the first large-scale collective farm in the country, run by thirty-six Jewish boys and girls of the Hehalutz organization under the supervision of the War Agricultural Committee.

AUSTRALIA

The admission of 100 Jewish refugee children, who are to receive agricultural training under the supervision of the Welfare Guardian Society, was authorized (May 12) by the Australian government.

A conference of trade-unionists convened by the Australian Council for Jewish Rights urged the government (May 23) to study the possibility for postwar Jewish immigration, and demanded action to combat anti-Jewish social and economic discrimination.

After twelve years of obstruction from municipal authorities who sought to prevent the erection of the structure, the Beth Israel Congregation in Quebec City on May 21 dedicated its new synagogue. A few hours before the opening ceremonies vandals set fire to the synagogue, causing considerable damage. This act of vandalism was condemned by Quebec's attorney general, Leon Casgrain, who assured a Jewish delegation on May 24 that "this province is one where freedom of religion exists in its complete form." The incident was also denounced (May 24) by Dr. C. E. Silcox, director of the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews, as a "logical sequence of . . . bitter anti-Semitic propaganda before the war and the un-Christian petitions circulated by French Canadian organizations against allowing any Jewish refugees to enter Canada."

A statement issued June 7 by the Canadian Jewish Congress expressed regret that the anti-Jewish activities of the civic authorities of Quebec City had brought no public protest from the Provincial Government or from the clergy, and blamed this indifference for the latest act of violence. Meanwhile, an official inquiry commission was investigating the synagogue fire.

The Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees has recognized the Canadian Jewish Congress and the United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Agencies as the official representatives of Jewish relief interests in this country, it was announced May 1, following conferences in Montreal between Saul Hayes, executive director of the Congress, and Sir Herbert Emerson, director of the Intergovernmental Committee.

The United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Agencies recently sent (May 25) \$75,000 to Palestine for the rescue work of the Jewish Agency and the Joint Distribution Committee in nearby areas.

A second group of 75 Jewish refugees from Spain and Portugal arrived in Montreal on June 2. Nearly all of the first group of 276 refugees from that area who arrived early in April

have found employment and have been satisfactorily settled, it was reported May 21 by the United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Agencies.

Archibald J. Freiman, 64, philanthropist and Zionist leader, who had been president of the Zionist Organization of Canada for 25 years, died in Ottawa on June 4.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The murder of 6,000 Czechoslovakian Jews who had been deported to the Ukrainian city of Kamenetz-Podolsk from Hungarian-occupied sub-Carpathia was reported (June 7) by the Soviet commission investigating Nazi atrocities. Seven thousand Jewish internees in the fortress city of Terezin were recently transferred to execution centers in Poland and massacred, the Czechoslovak State Council disclosed June 19. The Council resolved that all those connected with the murder would be mercilessly punished, and called upon the populace to help save their Jewish fellow citizens.

According to Slovakian newspapers reaching Zurich June 15, which quoted a report by a Hlinka Guard leader, Jewish forced laborers in Slovakia earned 48,000,000 crowns (about \$1,632,000) during 1943, all of which was retained by the government.

Following reports of mass arrests of Jews in the Hungarian-occupied Carpathian regions of Mukacevo and Uzhorod, the government-in-exile broadcast (May 1) a warning to Nazis and Hungarians against maltreatment of Jews, stating that confiscation of Jewish property, imprisonment and murder of Jewish citizens will be punished in accordance with current preparations for the punishment of military crimes against citizens of the Republic.

FRANCE

All able-bodied Jews remaining in the country are to be conscripted for forced labor, according to an announcement by Minister of Labor Marcel Deat, reported (May 1) by the pro-Nazi *L'Oeuvre*. Vichy sources (May

3, 23) estimated that there were still about 200,000 Jews in the country.

The round-up of Jews, including many children, who had been hiding in the Haute-Savoie region, was recently resumed, according to Swiss reports reaching London June 13.

A Vichy radio announcement of May 7 disclosed that the special 10% tax on Jewish property has been increased to 20%. Furniture confiscated from Jews was being distributed to people in the capital who lost their belongings in air raids, the Paris radio reported June 19.

Meanwhile, reports reached Geneva (May 1) describing guerrilla activities by French Jews who escaped from labor camps in Poland and conducted successful raids to free other prisoners from concentration and labor camps. The assassination of François de la Rocque, head of the fascist, anti-Semitic Croix de Feu, was announced on June 20 by the Vichy radio.

The French Committee of National Liberation has appointed (June 14) a special Committee on Jewish Property to study the problem of restoration of Jewish property confiscated in North Africa during the Vichy regime or transferred to non-Jews in order to evade confiscation.

The formation of the Association for the Re-establishment of Judaism in France was announced on May 23 in New York, where its central office is to be located. The new body aims to help establish and maintain contact between agencies engaged in Jewish rehabilitation and relief work in France and its colonies, and to re-establish Jewish religious organization there.

HUNGARY

The anti-Jewish drive continued in full swing following the familiar Nazi pattern of arrests, deportations, forced labor, economic destruction and segregation in ghettos. To supply the increased need for anti-Semitic propaganda material for a successful campaign of persecution, the Hungarian Institute of Jewish Research, founded in Budapest eighteen months ago, expanded

(May 3) and intensified its activities.

Local authorities in all cities of more than 10,000 population were ordered by the government to set up ghettos for Jews, Budapest newspapers reaching Zurich May 3 disclosed. The Jews were to be settled in areas likely to be bombed in Allied raids, Laszlo Andre, Commissioner for Jewish Affairs, announced May 2, while a Budapest radio report of June 4 revealed that non-Jews had been given priority rights on the use of air raid shelters. By May 17, there were 323,000 Jews in ghettos or concentration camps throughout the country, according to an official announcement broadcast from Budapest. A list made public on May 24 by the Commissioner for Jewish Affairs enumerated 34 cities with substantial Jewish populations which had already established ghettos. Meanwhile, the number of Jews in Budapest increased considerably as thousands fled from the provinces to the capital. As all the Jews in Budapest could not be herded into one ghetto, several ghettos were established in the suburbs of the city—in sections most exposed to air raids—the Swedish *Svenska Dagbladet* reported (May 9). By June 24, all the Jews in the capital had been moved into ghettos, according to Nazi reports. A maximum of two square meters of housing space was allotted to each individual in ghetto dwellings in Budapest, Zurich sources disclosed (June 27).

Mass-arrests, particularly of wealthy Jews whose businesses had been liquidated, continued throughout the country. A Lisbon report of May 4 stated that 300,000 Jews had been rounded up in the Carpathian region during the past three weeks. Jews in Hungarian-occupied Yugoslavia were interned, according to information received (May 23) by the Yugoslav Government-in-exile.

Thousands of those arrested were deported, and the arrival of the first transport of Hungarian Jews in Poland was reported (June 11) by the Jewish underground to the Polish National Council in London. According to information received (June 29) by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ

in America from the World Council of Churches in Geneva, 450,000 Jews have been deported from Hungary to Poland, and deportations were continuing at the rate of some 12,000 daily. Six trains carrying Jews from Hungary passed through the Krakow district between May 15 and 27 going in the direction of the Oswiecim "death camp," according to a report received (June 19) by the Polish Government-in-exile. The same report stated that 62 cars packed with children between the ages of 2 and 8 arrived in Poland from Hungary on May 30. A message from the Polish underground dated June 14 disclosed that 100,000 Hungarian Jews had been executed at Oswiecim.

A decree ordering all Jewish women between 18 and 30 to report for compulsory labor was reported on May 8 by the Nazi Transocean news service. All male Jews between 18 and 48, except physicians, pharmacists and essential war workers, have been ordered to report for "auxiliary military service," Swedish sources disclosed (June 5).

Meanwhile, the virtual elimination of Jews from the country's economy proceeded under the newly instituted anti-Jewish regulations. Small Jewish firms were forced to close down, while larger industries and those essential to the public welfare began to undergo the process of "aryanzation." Jewish lawyers were ousted from the Bar Association and from the Lawyers' Chamber, Jewish drug stores were taken over by the government, all Jews were banned from the stock exchange, and licenses of Jews in practically all fields were cancelled. Even agricultural holdings owned by non-Jews but farmed by Jews were placed under government-appointed "trustees." Because of the shortage of doctors, however, the Commissioner of Jewish Affairs announced (May 1) that it would be impossible to bar Jewish physicians from practicing, nor could the regulation restricting them to treating Jewish patients be enforced.

Jews were also being stripped of their personal possessions. Budapest Jews were ordered (May 11) to leave behind most of their household equipment when they moved to the ghettos. Sys-

the fund in the past six months to the Jewish Agency in Palestine for the rehabilitation of refugees from Europe. The National Labor Committee for Palestine on June 4 announced the transmission of \$250,000 to the Histadruth in Jerusalem for colonization and rescue work, and for the organization of new co-operative enterprises.

The Community

The joint conference of the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, the National Association of Jewish Center Workers and the National Council for Jewish Education, held in Cleveland May 17-21, emphasized the need for revision of Jewish social welfare, youth and educational programs to fit new needs, and pledged the resources of these agencies toward facilitating the orderly demobilization and reabsorption of returning servicemen into civilian life.

Special D-Day services were held in synagogues throughout the country on June 6, in response to a call issued by the Synagogue Council of America which had prepared a special prayer for the occasion.

Several major religious groups held conventions during the period. The United Synagogue of America, which met in Atlantic City May 5-7, urged legislation to place religious officials and employees under the provisions of the Social Security Act; demanded the abrogation of the White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine; and voiced support of the American Jewish Conference. The convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, held in Cincinnati June 23-26, voted to retain its position of neutrality with regard to Zionism, and welcoming the establishment of the National Community Relations Advisory Council as a step in the direction of unity of Jewish defense forces, asked for representation on the Council. Resolutions adopted by the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly of America which met June 26-29 under the theme "Spiritual Leadership in Tomorrow's World" demanded a Jewish Commonwealth in

Palestine and lauded the establishment of an emergency refugee shelter by President Roosevelt.

On the occasion of his 25th anniversary as rabbi of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, second oldest Jewish congregation in New York City, Dr. Israel Goldstein was honored with a four-day celebration.

The national war service centennial convention of the B'nai B'rith, held May 6-10 (see: War Effort), approved the action of its executive committee continuing the organization's full participation in the American Jewish Conference and its Interim Committee; and expressed appreciation of the purpose and achievements of the Fair Employment Practices Committee.

The Independent Order B'rith Abraham, which convened in Atlantic City June 11-13, asked both major political parties to incorporate in their platforms planks calling for legislation to make anti-Semitism and other racial bias a criminal offense; urged promulgation by the peace conference of an international bill of rights based on the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter; voted to petition for the abrogation of the White Paper; and voiced support of the American Jewish Conference.

The convention of the United Rumanian Jews of America, held May 13-14, voted to initiate a campaign for \$100,000 for the assistance of Jews in Rumania, and to collect clothing and other supplies for relief kits. A series of resolutions demanding full economic, political and cultural equality for the Jews of Poland after the war was adopted by the convention of the American Federation for Polish Jews, which met in New York June 17-19. The meeting also urged free immigration to Palestine under the supervision of the Jewish Agency.

The admission of the Jewish War Veterans to membership in the National Community Relations Advisory Council was announced on June 8.

Refugees and Relief

More than half of the \$32,000,000 quota of the United Jewish Appeal campaign was raised in the first five

months of 1944, it was reported June 18. A U.J.A. announcement of June 30 disclosed that during the first half of the year its constituent organizations spent a record sum of \$20,600,000 for overseas relief and refugee aid.

The Joint Distribution Committee has allocated over \$2,000,000 for its parcel service in 1944, it was announced on May 20. The report indicated that Jews in Asiatic Russia received 31,799 packages of food and clothing from October 1943 to May 1, 1944, and that the current rate of shipment was 7,000 packages per month. By arrangement with lend-lease authorities in the Middle East, reported June 1, the J.D.C. will receive part of the lend-lease stocks in Teheran for use in its parcel service. Enough commodities to fill 100,000 parcels, to be dispatched at the rate of 10,000 packages monthly, will be procured in this way. Considerable quantities of goods have been secured gratis by the J.D.C. from the Polish Red Cross for Polish refugees in Russia, the same report revealed. Since the large influx of Jewish refugees into the Yemenite city of Aden, which began about June 1943, the J.D.C. has appropriated about \$25,000 for their relief and in addition nearly \$80,000 for the transportation of a number of them to Palestine, it was disclosed in a survey published in the Jerusalem press on May 2. A report on J.D.C. activities in Italy issued June 30 revealed that the J.D.C. budget allocation for occupied Italy was \$120,000 for the first six months of 1944.

Some 4,200 Jewish immigrants and 1,000 Jewish refugees on temporary visas were admitted to the United States during 1943, according to the annual report of the executive director of the National Refugee Service, made public on June 4. During the last week in April, 93 Jewish refugees were admitted to the country as quota immigrants, a HIAS report of May 12 disclosed.

Intergroup Relations

Addressing the interfaith unity session of the B'nai B'rith national war service convention, Supreme Court Justice

Frank Murphy characterized anti-Semitism as "not only un-American, but anti-Christian," and called for unified action among Christians to purge the country of anti-Semitism. An educational program designed to expose to the American people the dangers of "subversive propaganda by hate-mongers" was outlined at the session.

A statement signed (June 21) by 140 Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious leaders representing all sections of the country was submitted to the State Department, calling for the early establishment of a permanent International Office for Education to bring about peaceful international collaboration to advance educational development and to achieve through education understanding among nations, races, peoples and cultures.

The Churchman Award, given annually to one who has rendered distinguished service in "the promotion of good-will and better understanding among all peoples," was presented on May 23 to Bernard Baruch.

Hearings before the House Labor Committee on proposed legislation to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee were opened on June 1, but no action had been taken on the measure before the adjournment of Congress on June 23. Meanwhile, despite violent opposition from Southern senators, an appropriation for continuing the FEPC was voted by Congress (May 26 and June 20).

War Effort

B'nai B'rith groups have spent approximately \$1,000,000 on war service activities in their communities since Pearl Harbor in addition to contributing \$200,000 toward the organization's national war service projects, it was disclosed at the national war service centennial convention of the B'nai B'rith, which took place in New York, May 6-10. The extension of the organization's war service program to include the supply of Army and Navy hospital ships with recreational material was authorized by the convention.

In the campaign conducted by the Zionist Organization of America to sell

\$50,000,000 in war bonds among its membership during the month of June, over \$20,000,000 in bonds were sold during the first two weeks of the drive, incomplete reports received (June 27) by Zionist headquarters disclosed.

At the annual dinner of the National Jewish Welfare Board, May 3, it was learned that 241 Jewish chaplains are now serving in the armed forces, 94 of whom are overseas.

Delayed reports revealed that a Liberty ship named for Harry L. Glucksmann, founder of the Jewish Center movement, was launched on April 29. Liberty ships named for Congressman Michael Edelstein and for Dr. Cyrus Adler were launched on June 4 and June 5 respectively.

Casualty reports of the period listed 135 killed and 101 wounded.

Necrology

Rabbi Joseph Konvitz, president of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, died at Belmar, N. J., on June 6 at the age of 66.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH GREAT BRITAIN

An appeal addressed to the United Nations' governments urging them to redouble their efforts to rescue Jews in Europe faced by imminent extermination was voiced by the Board of Deputies, which met in special session on June 18 to discuss the problem of Jewish rescue. The resolution urged that all measures be taken to impress upon the peoples of German satellite nations the importance of helping Jews escape from the Nazis; and asked that the United Nations provide asylum and settlement opportunities for refugee Jews, with special emphasis on Palestine.

A resolution unanimously adopted on June 14 by the Council of Christians and Jews expressed concern at the increasing peril to Jews involved in the recent extension of Nazi domination in Central and South-Eastern Europe, and urged "all men of good-will in these regions . . . to refuse to assist the persecutors and wherever possible to shelter the victims." The Archbishop of Can-

terbury, who presided over the meeting, voiced his disappointment at the unwillingness of government authorities to admit more refugees.

Addressing a memorial meeting for the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, held in London on May 21, Chief Rabbi Joseph Hertz appealed to the United Nations to attempt to secure war prisoner status for the Jews of occupied Europe, so that they could be exchanged for German prisoners held by the Allies. A delegation of leaders of organizations concerned with rescue was recently received at the Foreign Office, it was reported June 25, to confer on means of expediting the transfer and reception of refugees from enemy territory.

The vital need for immediate rescue measures, however, did not eclipse the significance of long-range problems which would accompany the cessation of hostilities. A memorandum presenting basic principles for the stabilization of the status of Jews in Europe after the war was submitted by the Board of Deputies to the Government and to the Commonwealth Conference of Dominion Prime Ministers, it was revealed at a meeting of the Board on May 21. A recent meeting of Board leaders with the Soviet Ambassador, where matters of postwar policy with regard to Jews as well as questions arising out of their present situation were discussed, was also reported to the Board session. At a conference of representatives of sixty Jewish organizations which met on June 12 to speed their campaign to raise \$200,000 to purchase ambulances for the Red Army, the secretary of the Board of Deputies announced the Board's readiness to co-operate with the Jews of Russia in their postwar activities.

Labor Party leader Arthur Greenwood, addressing a May Day meeting called by the Poale Zion, advocated as the solution of the problem of Europe's remaining Jews the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine under a self-governing Jewish authority to be created after a Jewish majority has been attained through free immigration.

The executive committee of the

CANADA

Council of Christians and Jews on May 31 endorsed the seven-point interfaith "declaration on world peace" issued last October by 144 American Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders, calling for the establishment of a world order based on moral law, and for the organization of international institutions to maintain peace with justice.

A proposal made in the House of Commons on June 8 for automatic naturalization of German and Austrian refugees serving in the British forces overseas to protect them should they be captured by the Germans, was rejected by Home Security Minister Herbert Morrison on the grounds that members of the armed forces are protected by the prisoner of war international convention, regardless of nationality. Of the 1,500 Jewish refugees interned on the island of Mauritius some three years ago when they attempted to enter Palestine without visas, 149 have been accepted for service in the armed forces, and 93 have died on the island, Colonial Secretary Oliver Stanley revealed in Commons on June 14.

Synagogues throughout the country were crowded on the Sabbath following D-Day, when services were marked by special prayers for the Allied soldiers in France issued by Chief Rabbi Joseph Hertz.

London press reports of May 28 described the first large-scale collective farm in the country, run by thirty-six Jewish boys and girls of the Hehalutz organization under the supervision of the War Agricultural Committee.

AUSTRALIA

The admission of 100 Jewish refugee children, who are to receive agricultural training under the supervision of the Welfare Guardian Society, was authorized (May 12) by the Australian government.

A conference of trade-unionists convened by the Australian Council for Jewish Rights urged the government (May 23) to study the possibility for postwar Jewish immigration, and demanded action to combat anti-Jewish social and economic discrimination.

After twelve years of obstruction from municipal authorities who sought to prevent the erection of the structure, the Beth Israel Congregation in Quebec City on May 21 dedicated its new synagogue. A few hours before the opening ceremonies vandals set fire to the synagogue, causing considerable damage. This act of vandalism was condemned by Quebec's attorney general, Leon Casgrain, who assured a Jewish delegation on May 24 that "this province is one where freedom of religion exists in its complete form." The incident was also denounced (May 24) by Dr. C. E. Silcox, director of the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews, as a "logical sequence of . . . bitter anti-Semitic propaganda before the war and the un-Christian petitions circulated by French Canadian organizations against allowing any Jewish refugees to enter Canada."

A statement issued June 7 by the Canadian Jewish Congress expressed regret that the anti-Jewish activities of the civic authorities of Quebec City had brought no public protest from the Provincial Government or from the clergy, and blamed this indifference for the latest act of violence. Meanwhile, an official inquiry commission was investigating the synagogue fire.

The Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees has recognized the Canadian Jewish Congress and the United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Agencies as the official representatives of Jewish relief interests in this country, it was announced May 1, following conferences in Montreal between Saul Hayes, executive director of the Congress, and Sir Herbert Emerson, director of the Intergovernmental Committee.

The United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Agencies recently sent (May 25) \$75,000 to Palestine for the rescue work of the Jewish Agency and the Joint Distribution Committee in nearby areas.

A second group of 75 Jewish refugees from Spain and Portugal arrived in Montreal on June 2. Nearly all of the first group of 276 refugees from that area who arrived early in April

have found employment and have been satisfactorily settled, it was reported May 21 by the United Jewish Refugee and War Relief Agencies.

Archibald J. Freiman, 64, philanthropist and Zionist leader, who had been president of the Zionist Organization of Canada for 25 years, died in Ottawa on June 4.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The murder of 6,000 Czechoslovakian Jews who had been deported to the Ukrainian city of Kamenetz-Podolsk from Hungarian-occupied sub-Carpathia was reported (June 7) by the Soviet commission investigating Nazi atrocities. Seven thousand Jewish internees in the fortress city of Terezin were recently transferred to execution centers in Poland and massacred, the Czechoslovak State Council disclosed June 19. The Council resolved that all those connected with the murder would be mercilessly punished, and called upon the populace to help save their Jewish fellow citizens.

According to Slovakian newspapers reaching Zurich June 15, which quoted a report by a Hlinka Guard leader, Jewish forced laborers in Slovakia earned 48,000,000 crowns (about \$1,632,000) during 1943, all of which was retained by the government.

Following reports of mass arrests of Jews in the Hungarian-occupied Carpathian regions of Mukacevo and Uzhorod, the government-in-exile broadcast (May 1) a warning to Nazis and Hungarians against maltreatment of Jews, stating that confiscation of Jewish property, imprisonment and murder of Jewish citizens will be punished in accordance with current preparations for the punishment of military crimes against citizens of the Republic.

FRANCE

All able-bodied Jews remaining in the country are to be conscripted for forced labor, according to an announcement by Minister of Labor Marcel Deat, reported (May 1) by the pro-Nazi *L'Oeuvre*. Vichy sources (May

3, 23) estimated that there were still about 200,000 Jews in the country.

The round-up of Jews, including many children, who had been hiding in the Haute-Savoie region, was recently resumed, according to Swiss reports reaching London June 13.

A Vichy radio announcement of May 7 disclosed that the special 10% tax on Jewish property has been increased to 20%. Furniture confiscated from Jews was being distributed to people in the capital who lost their belongings in air raids, the Paris radio reported June 19.

Meanwhile, reports reached Geneva (May 1) describing guerrilla activities by French Jews who escaped from labor camps in Poland and conducted successful raids to free other prisoners from concentration and labor camps. The assassination of François de la Rocque, head of the fascist, anti-Semitic Croix de Feu, was announced on June 20 by the Vichy radio.

The French Committee of National Liberation has appointed (June 14) a special Committee on Jewish Property to study the problem of restoration of Jewish property confiscated in North Africa during the Vichy regime or transferred to non-Jews in order to evade confiscation.

The formation of the Association for the Re-establishment of Judaism in France was announced on May 23 in New York, where its central office is to be located. The new body aims to help establish and maintain contact between agencies engaged in Jewish rehabilitation and relief work in France and its colonies, and to re-establish Jewish religious organization there.

HUNGARY

The anti-Jewish drive continued in full swing following the familiar Nazi pattern of arrests, deportations, forced labor, economic destruction and segregation in ghettos. To supply the increased need for anti-Semitic propaganda material for a successful campaign of persecution, the Hungarian Institute of Jewish Research, founded in Budapest eighteen months ago, expanded

(May 3) and intensified its activities.

Local authorities in all cities of more than 10,000 population were ordered by the government to set up ghettos for Jews, Budapest newspapers reaching Zurich May 3 disclosed. The Jews were to be settled in areas likely to be bombed in Allied raids, Laszlo Andre, Commissioner for Jewish Affairs, announced May 2, while a Budapest radio report of June 4 revealed that non-Jews had been given priority rights on the use of air raid shelters. By May 17, there were 323,000 Jews in ghettos or concentration camps throughout the country, according to an official announcement broadcast from Budapest. A list made public on May 24 by the Commissioner for Jewish Affairs enumerated 34 cities with substantial Jewish populations which had already established ghettos. Meanwhile, the number of Jews in Budapest increased considerably as thousands fled from the provinces to the capital. As all the Jews in Budapest could not be herded into one ghetto, several ghettos were established in the suburbs of the city—in sections most exposed to air raids—the Swedish *Svenska Dagbladet* reported (May 9). By June 24, all the Jews in the capital had been moved into ghettos, according to Nazi reports. A maximum of two square meters of housing space was allotted to each individual in ghetto dwellings in Budapest, Zurich sources disclosed (June 27).

Mass-arrests, particularly of wealthy Jews whose businesses had been liquidated, continued throughout the country. A Lisbon report of May 4 stated that 300,000 Jews had been rounded up in the Carpathian region during the past three weeks. Jews in Hungarian-occupied Yugoslavia were interned, according to information received (May 23) by the Yugoslav Government-in-exile.

Thousands of those arrested were deported, and the arrival of the first transport of Hungarian Jews in Poland was reported (June 11) by the Jewish underground to the Polish National Council in London. According to information received (June 29) by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ

in America from the World Council of Churches in Geneva, 450,000 Jews have been deported from Hungary to Poland, and deportations were continuing at the rate of some 12,000 daily. Six trains carrying Jews from Hungary passed through the Krakow district between May 15 and 27 going in the direction of the Oswiecim "death camp," according to a report received (June 19) by the Polish Government-in-exile. The same report stated that 62 cars packed with children between the ages of 2 and 8 arrived in Poland from Hungary on May 30. A message from the Polish underground dated June 14 disclosed that 100,000 Hungarian Jews had been executed at Oswiecim.

A decree ordering all Jewish women between 18 and 30 to report for compulsory labor was reported on May 8 by the Nazi Transocean news service. All male Jews between 18 and 48, except physicians, pharmacists and essential war workers, have been ordered to report for "auxiliary military service," Swedish sources disclosed (June 5).

Meanwhile, the virtual elimination of Jews from the country's economy proceeded under the newly instituted anti-Jewish regulations. Small Jewish firms were forced to close down, while larger industries and those essential to the public welfare began to undergo the process of "aryanization." Jewish lawyers were ousted from the Bar Association and from the Lawyers' Chamber, Jewish drug stores were taken over by the government, all Jews were banned from the stock exchange, and licenses of Jews in practically all fields were cancelled. Even agricultural holdings owned by non-Jews but farmed by Jews were placed under government-appointed "trustees." Because of the shortage of doctors, however, the Commissioner of Jewish Affairs announced (May 1) that it would be impossible to bar Jewish physicians from practicing, nor could the regulation restricting them to treating Jewish patients be enforced.

Jews were also being stripped of their personal possessions. Budapest Jews were ordered (May 11) to leave behind most of their household equipment when they moved to the ghettos. Sys-

tematic raids on Jewish homes to seize hidden valuables had been carried out during previous weeks throughout the country.

A decree prohibiting the publication and sale of books by Jewish authors was reported (May 1) by the Budapest radio. Bookshops and public libraries were ordered to submit to the Ministry of Education a list of all such books in their possession, which they were subsequently (May 12) ordered to surrender to be turned into pulp. On May 28, the Nazi *Transkontinent* agency reported that more than 500,000 copies of books by Jewish authors had been seized in Budapest alone. According to a Budapest radio announcement of June 23, some 2,000 libraries and 200 bookshops had already surrendered books by Jewish authors in their possession.

Still further anti-Jewish restrictive measures were adopted. A government order prohibiting Jews to conduct public religious services was reported May 3 by Transocean. As of May 25, Jews were barred from all theatres and concert halls, and were to be served only in designated restaurants, the Budapest radio announced on May 22. An order broadcast June 25 instructed Jews to surrender all arms in their possession within 24 hours, on penalty of death.

Demonstrations of sympathy for the Jews by the non-Jewish population, as reported from time to time throughout the period, took the form of smuggling food into the ghettos, concealing Jewish property, offering to adopt Jewish children, and assisting Jews to leave the country. According to reports reaching Zurich May 12, a number of non-Jews were arrested in Budapest for providing Jews with documents identifying them as Christians. Charged with issuing certificates of baptism to Jews, four Protestant clergymen in one locality were placed on trial, a Stockholm dispatch of June 18 disclosed.

As an expression of protest against the government order to expel Jews from membership, the officers of the Union of Front Fighters, war veterans organization, announced their resignation, May 4.

Reports reaching Geneva May 7 revealed that Jewish partisans, operating in the sub-Carpathian region, recently attacked a train carrying Hungarian Jews to Poland and released all the deportees.

A Voice of America broadcast from Cairo May 13 assailed the moving of Hungary's Jews into areas likely to be bombed as "murder in the moral and criminal law sense of the word," and warned that all participating in this crime would be punished.

ITALY

One of the first acts of the Allied Military Government after the liberation of Rome was to rescind all anti-Jewish legislation and to restore to the Jews their homes and property, PM's foreign editor reported from Rome, June 10. All Jewish and other political prisoners held in the capital were released, the British press reported June 7, and plans for restoring Jewish communal life in liberated Italy were under way. The famed synagogue of the Eternal City reopened its doors and held its first Sabbath services in nine months, on June 16, which included a sermon delivered by Chief Rabbi Anton Zolli.

The establishment of a special committee, composed of prominent citizens, to deal with the restoration of confiscated Jewish property was announced by the A.M.G. on June 30.

Various estimates of the number of Jews remaining in Rome were forthcoming. *Tempo*, organ of the Christian Democrat party (June 19), put the number at 5,000, while Joseph Schwartz, J.D.C. European director, estimated (June 28) that there were about 9,000 Italian Jews and some 2,000 refugees in the city. The day before their evacuation of Rome, the Germans deported to Poland some 1,500 Jews who had been held in prison, Rome and London dispatches of June 10 and 14 disclosed.

The opening of a J.D.C. office in Bari, which is to work in close co-operation with the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, was announced (June 28) by J.D.C. European director

Joseph Schwartz. The Bari office will bring relief to some 3,000 Jewish refugees in southern Italy, most of them stateless. Another J.D.C. office in Rome, to assist Jews in the capital and in northern areas, is to be opened soon. At the same time, Dr. Schwartz revealed that Jews in Rome continued to receive some aid from the J.D.C. during the German occupation by arrangement with diplomatic personnel attached to the Vatican.

Meanwhile, persecution of the Jews in northern German-occupied areas continued. Reports reaching Zurich, May 10, disclosed that almost all of the 2,000 Jews interned in the concentration camp at Piacenza had recently been deported to Poland. Over 500 Jews living in Florence have been placed in concentration camps, the Nazi Transocean news agency reported May 18, and about 500,000,000 lire (approximately \$25,000,000 in pre-war exchange rates) worth of Jewish property has been confiscated in that city. The confiscation of all Jewish property in Genoa was announced June 18 over the Fascist Republican radio. On May 16, the German radio claimed that more than 700 Jewish-owned farms comprising about 75,000 acres of land had been confiscated in Nazi-controlled areas, while Transocean reported June 23 that 35 percent of all Jewish property in northern Italy has been confiscated.

LATIN AMERICA

Leaflets, couched in violently scurrilous language, distributed by anti-Semitic nationalist groups in Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA (June 1), called upon the population to attack the Jews of the city on June 7, the day set by liberal and leftist elements as a day of civil disobedience designed as an expression of protest against the present dictatorial regime. Asserting that the Jews, "who are the leaders of the revolt against the government," were responsible for the civil disobedience campaign, the Nationalists threatened bloody reprisals. However, the day of "passive resistance," overshadowed by news of the

Allied invasion, proved a complete failure and passed without violent incident.

Toward the end of May, a Reuters Agency dispatch from Montevideo reported a recrudescence of acts of violence against Jews in the Entre Rios Province, and the Buenos Aires *Radical* published a list of Jewish-owned business premises that had been attacked. The Federal Commissioner for that province issued a statement on May 29 acknowledging that Jewish property had been damaged and attributing the violence to "irresponsible elements" against whom he promised to take action. Nevertheless, the Argentine Sub-Secretariat of Information called (June 3) all reports of anti-Jewish acts in Entre Rios false, and asserted that freedom for all creeds exists throughout Argentina.

A Montevideo report of June 20 disclosed that a number of public schools in Argentina have segregated Jewish children on separate benches, as a result of the introduction of compulsory teaching of Catholicism by government decree, from which Jewish pupils are exempt. Several days later, it was learned that Jewish children are to receive "moral instruction" in place of religious study. The segregation of Jewish pupils was denounced in the Buenos Aires Catholic newspaper *El Pueblo* on June 29 as "un-Christian," and school teachers were warned not to incite Catholic children against Jewish. The Catholic publication pointed out that if religious teaching results in persecution, then it is treason against religion.

The Buenos Aires Council of Jewish Aid to War Victims has contributed \$15,000 to the J.D.C. for the transportation of Balkan Jewish refugees to Palestine, it was announced in New York on June 20. Over 1,000,000 pesos (approximately \$250,000) was remitted to England during the past three years by the Argentine Jewish Committee to Aid Great Britain, reported June 21.

The first census of the Jewish population of PERU is now being taken, it was disclosed on June 21 in a dispatch from Lima.

PALESTINE

Jewish members of the Jerusalem municipal council walked out of the May 10 session of that body in a demonstration of protest against the participation of Mayor Mustapha Bey Khalidi in a conference of Arab mayors, held on May 5, which petitioned the Government to suspend Jewish immigration and land purchases and to establish self-government for Palestine's Arabs. Before they left the session, the Jewish aldermen protested the anti-Jewish activities of Khalidi in his capacity as mayor of a city where Jews constitute a majority of the population. A heated discussion ensued during the next few days in the press, Hebrew newspapers supporting the move of the aldermen, and the Arab press defending the mayor. Two weeks later, on May 24, the Jewish aldermen resumed their seats in the municipal council, as a result of the mediation efforts of the Government's district commissioner.

Anti-Jewish demands, similar to those voiced at the conference of mayors, were also incorporated in resolutions adopted by meetings held the same day by the Arab Chambers of Commerce of Haifa and Jaffa. Various Arab political groups intensified their nationalist demands during the period, with the emphasis placed upon Arab unity, for "the defense of our threatened homeland," as the Arab National Defense Party expressed it in a manifesto issued (May 16) to the Arab people. The Arab press, too, led by the *Falastin*, struck the same note of Arab unity against Jewish aspirations. The most extreme editorial appeared in the *Falastin* on May 14, recalling the years of the anti-Jewish riots, and asking to "hear the same tune as was heard in 1929 and 1936."

As part of the intensified Arab nationalist campaign, the Palestine Arab Party cabled (May 25) an appeal to President Roosevelt, asking his support of Arab demands for "independence, establishment of an Arab government and complete stoppage of Jewish immigration." According to a Jerusalem dispatch of June 21 (later substantiated

by the head of the Palestine Arab Party at a press conference on June 28, but never confirmed by official sources in Washington), a reply to the cable was received from President Roosevelt stating that the postwar status of Palestine would be determined by the United Nations in consultation with Jews and Arabs. An editorial in the *Falastin* (June 28) expressed dissatisfaction with the President's reply.

In contrast to these developments, May Day manifestoes issued by Jewish and Arab labor groups urged Arab-Jewish co-operation to develop the resources of the Middle East and raise the standard of living of its peoples.

While Arab nationalist activity was intensified, police and military authorities were bringing Jewish extremists under control. In the British House of Commons on May 3, Colonial Minister Col. Oliver Stanley announced that 81 persons had been arrested in Palestine in the past month in connection with terrorist outbreaks and arms smuggling. Several Jewish youths, most of them alleged members of terrorist groups, were sentenced by military courts during May and June to prison terms ranging from 18 months to 12 years, for the illegal possession of arms and ammunition. On June 27, a British military court sentenced to death a member of the Stern gang, convicted of firing on a British policeman in Tel Aviv, and the illegal possession of arms. An Arab youth was sentenced by a military court on May 1 to 2 years in prison for the illegal possession of ammunition.

The terrorists, however, had not completely suspended their activity. On May 17, three truckloads of members of the Irgun Zvai Leumi attempted to seize the Palestine Broadcasting System's central station at Ramallah, near Jerusalem, in order to broadcast an appeal to the country. The station's staff refused to man the equipment, however, and sounded a police alarm, but the terrorists escaped before the arrival of the police. In an exchange of shots between the fleeing terrorists and police cars on the road to Petach Tikvah, two police drivers were wounded. Placards posted (May 22) throughout Jerusalem

by the Irgun explained that they had no intention of destroying the radio station, but merely intended to broadcast in connection with the fifth anniversary of the issuance of the White Paper.

A new decree published June 29 in the official gazette divided violators of the arms law into two categories: "political" and "non-political." Military courts retained the authority to impose death sentences on "political" violators, while the civil courts, which deal with "non-political" violators, were authorized to increase the maximum sentence to 10 years' imprisonment.

The Community

The long-threatened split within the Jewish Labor Party (Mapai) appeared unavoidable as a result of the period's developments. The minority opposition group in the Mapai, known as Group B, decided at a conference on May 22 to present a separate slate of candidates at the forthcoming elections to the Histadruth executive committee and to the Assefath Hanivcharim (Jewish Representative Assembly). The opposition conference also elected a council to work out a political program for the group. The Mapai Council on June 4 served notice that it considered the decision of Group B to enter its own slate of candidates at the elections as "the practical establishment of a new party," and warned that every member who appeared on the competing list or who supported it would "expel himself from the party."

An appeal for unity in the Jewish community was voiced by the national conference of Mizrahi, held May 22-24, attended by the majority of the country's rabbinate, who also adopted a resolution urging the establishment of a Jewish state and the opening of the gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration. The Agudas Israel, which met in conference June 16-18, also urged all sections of the Yishuv to unite to defend Jewish rights in Palestine, at the same time calling for an honest solution of the Jewish-Arab problem, "without affecting Jewish rights granted by the Mandate." On the other hand, the New Zionist Organization, accord-

ing to a statement made on May 3 by its leader, Dr. N. Altman, has proclaimed a total war against the existing Jewish totalitarian regime in Palestine.

A day of fasting and prayer for the Jews in Nazi Europe, called by the Jewish National Council and the Chief Rabbinate, was observed throughout the country on June 5. The day was marked by a work stoppage in Jewish stores and in non-war industries, mass-meetings and religious services. At a Jerusalem mass-meeting, addressed by Chief Rabbi Herzog, an appeal was issued to the democratic world to accelerate its rescue efforts; it was announced that \$12,000,000 had been allocated by the Yishuv's War Needs Fund during the last fifteen months for the rescue of Europe's Jews. On May 16 it was disclosed that Chief Rabbi Herzog had recently sent an appeal to the Vatican asking for help in rescuing the Jews of Hungary.

Prayers for the success of the Allied armies were offered, in crowded synagogues throughout the country on D-Day.

Seven new settlements were established in the first half of the current Jewish calendar year, a delayed report of April 27, quoting the executive director of the Agricultural Council of the Histadruth revealed. The Jewish National Fund purchased 211,000 dunams (approximately 52,750 acres) of land during the past four years, it was announced May 2.

Refugee Immigration

During the month of May, more than 1,000 Jewish refugees, 800 of them from the Balkans, arrived in Palestine, bringing the total Jewish refugee immigration for the first five months of 1944 to 8,500, an announcement of June 6 by the American United Jewish Appeal disclosed. According to a report issued (May 1) by the Jewish Agency, 1,378 refugees from the Balkans reached this country during the first four months of this year.

The first transport of Jewish refugees to reach Palestine from liberated Italy arrived on June 2, consisting of some 570 persons, most of them from Balkan

countries. A group of 200 Yemenite Jews arrived in Jerusalem on May 31. According to an announcement (June 1) by the president of the Yemen Settlers Association, some 3,500 Jews from Yemen have been admitted to this country in the past few years; but another 3,000 are in Aden awaiting an opportunity to emigrate to Palestine. Another 600 immigration certificates were recently cabled by the Jewish Agency to its representative in Lisbon for distribution among refugees in Portugal and Tangier, it was learned on June 10.

Necrology

Joshua Ravnitzky, 85, famed Hebrew writer, publisher and collaborator of Hayyim Nahman Bialik, died in Tel Aviv on May 3.

POLAND

All concentration camps in the Lublin area have been "liquidated," an underground report received (May 9) in London by Emanuel Szerer of the National Council disclosed. The same report stated that some 4,000 foreign Jews living in Poland before the war, who had been interned by the Nazis in a camp near Hanover, were recently executed. A detailed report received in Zurich May 28 from Polish underground sources estimated that some 50,000 Jews have been massacred by the Nazis at the Majdanek, Trawniki and Poniatow camps.

Several thousand Jews have been sent to drain swamps (for the construction of German fortifications) in various sections of Poland, where hundreds die daily of malaria and starvation, an eyewitness reaching Switzerland (May 15) related. Another report received in Geneva May 15 said that Gestapo raids seeking to round up fugitive Jews living in hide-outs or with false identification documents have recently been intensified.

In Galicia and in the Kielce district, Jewish guerrilla units continued to operate successfully, an underground report received in Moscow June 4 disclosed. Another partisan band, com-

posed of Jews who escaped from the ruins of the Warsaw ghetto, has killed more than 2,000 German soldiers, it was reported in a message received by the Government-in-Exile June 23, while information reaching Moscow June 27 revealed that a Jewish guerrilla unit recently blew up the power station in Vilna and left the city in darkness for six days.

Medical and food supplies sent by the International Red Cross and the Swiss ~~osr~~ are reaching Jews in 34 labor camps in occupied Poland, it was reported June 11.

POLAND-IN-EXILE

In response to widespread public protest against the conviction and imprisonment (April 22) of 21 Jewish soldiers who left their units because of anti-Semitic discrimination and attempted to enlist in the British Army, President Wladislaw Raczewicz on May 12 granted amnesty to all the convicted men. (A week earlier, the Polish High Command had confirmed ten of the sentences and suspended the remaining eleven.)

During the weeks preceding the issuance of the amnesty decree, protests against the court-martial sentences and against anti-Semitism in the Polish forces continued to pour in from Jewish and non-Jewish groups. Despite the amnesty grant to the soldiers, a mass meeting, held in London on May 14 under the auspices of the National Council for Civil Liberties to protest against anti-Semitism in the Polish Army, called upon the British Government to arrange for the transfer of Jews from the Polish to the British forces. The question was again raised in the British House of Commons on May 17, when Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden emphatically stated that no further transfers would be permitted.

The appointment by the Polish National Council of a commission to investigate the charges of anti-Semitism in the armed forces was announced on May 2. The commission, composed of six members of the Council, including the two Jewish members, held its first

meeting on May 17. By the end of the period under review (June 30) no further activity of the commission had been reported.

Meanwhile, within the National Council, military authorities were being charged with failure to deal effectively with the problem of anti-Semitism, and on May 11 the resignation of Gen. Marjan Kukiel as Minister of National Defense, because of his failure to curb anti-Semitism in the army, was demanded by leaders of the Polish Socialist Party and by the Jewish deputies. Two days later, Socialist deputies introduced a motion demanding Kukiel's resignation, precipitating a heated debate on the issue during the following week. Action on the motion was postponed, however, until the Council receives the report of the inquiry commission. The removal of Commander in Chief Gen. Kasimierz Sosnkowski was also asked in the course of the debate.

A motion requesting President Raczewicz to issue a decree making anti-Semitic activities or propaganda by civilians or military personnel a criminal offense was introduced in the National Council on May 26 by the Jewish deputies.

The first meeting of the Welfare Council for Jewish Rescue in Poland, composed of three Jewish members and three non-Jewish representatives of Polish political parties, which was established by the Government-in-Exile May 11, was held in London May 25.

RUMANIA

The transfer of the Commissariat for Jewish Affairs from the Labor Ministry to the office of Premier Antonescu, reported on May 15 by the official German news agency D.N.B., presaged an intensification of anti-Jewish activities. According to a Bucharest *Transkontinent* dispatch of the same date, a number of Jews were sentenced to death there for allegedly evading forced labor. The arrest in Bucharest of Jewish refugees who recently fled to the capital from the war-torn provinces of

Bucovina and Moldavia was reported by the German radio on May 18.

A decree issued (May 30) by Premier Antonescu ordered the death penalty for Jews entering the country illegally and for all those facilitating their entry. Yet, German authorities refused to grant safe-conduct for the Turkish steamer "Tari," to proceed to Constanza for some 1,350 Jewish orphans waiting in Bucharest to leave for Palestine, a *New York Times* dispatch from Istanbul (May 23) disclosed. A report from Stockholm (June 9) revealed that German authorities had also rejected an offer made through the Red Cross by the Swedish Government to transport 40,000 Jews on a Swedish ship from Rumania to Turkey.

All Jews, native and foreign, were barred from all industrial, commercial, agricultural and professional employment in a sweeping decree issued on May 1, which virtually eliminated Jews from the country's economy. A Bucharest radio announcement on June 18 disclosed that all Jews between the ages of 16 and 17, and between 51 and 55, have been ordered to enlist in air raid rescue work units.

Jews in the province of Moldavia were ordered (May 8) to wear the yellow Magen David, because of alleged collaboration between Jews and Russians in areas near the front. A Bucharest report dated June 28 disclosed that a census of the Jewish population has been ordered in the Moldavian city of Jassy.

About 25,000 Jews (approximately one-third of the Jewish population) remained alive in Cernauti, capital of Bucovina, recently taken by Soviet forces after 33 months of German occupation, according to Moscow sources (June 20).

U.S.S.R.

The return of Jews to their homes in liberated Ukrainian cities was under way during the past months. Thousands of Jews returned to Kiev and were taking part in the restoration of their native city, the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee announced on May 21,

while the participation of repatriated Jewish artisans in the rebuilding of Berdichev was described in a May 24 Moscow dispatch.

Further accounts of Nazi atrocities against Jews in areas recently liberated by Soviet forces were released. Municipal authorities estimated that some 99,000 Jews were massacred by the Germans in Odessa, in a report issued on June 19, containing details of Nazi brutalities during the occupation of the city, as related by survivors. A report (June 6) by an official commission of scientists on the destruction of hospitals and medical personnel by the Nazis charged that all Jewish doctors in occupied regions had been executed. In Brest-Litovsk, some 17,000 Jews were massacred, a Moscow dispatch of June 30, which also described Nazi atrocities in other Polish and Ukrainian towns, reported.

The tenth anniversary of the establishment of Biro-Bidjan as an autonomous Jewish region was celebrated during the month of May.

According to a report submitted to a conference of J.D.C. officials in Cairo (May 9), there are more than 300,000 Jewish refugees in Asiatic Russia.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Some 1,000 Jews over 70 and under 14 years of age were still living in Vienna, AUSTRIA, according to the Swedish *Dagens Nyheter* of June 20, which also reported that "half Jews" and Jews of mixed marriages in Vienna have been mobilized for forced labor.

A report received (June 23) by HIAS in New York disclosed that there were 22,000 Jewish refugees in the ghetto (established a year ago by the Japanese) in Shanghai, CHINA, according to a census taken by the Far Eastern Jewish Central Immigration Bureau, an affiliate of HIAS which has been acting as the relief agency for the interned refugees.

The Stockholm *Svenska Morgensbladet* of May 18 reported that a considerable number of Jews from DENMARK were doing forced labor in German war plants.

All Jews serving in FINLAND's army have been transferred to non-combatant units, Swedish sources disclosed May 12.

Reports reaching Syria May 3 indicated that the Nazis have intensified their drive in recent months to round up the few remaining Jews in Athens, GREECE, while a report issued by the Greek Government-in-exile on June 7 disclosed that some 2,000 Jews, including holders of foreign passports, were deported from Athens to Poland during the preceding month.

Archbishop Erling Eiden, primate of SWEDEN, in an address before a gathering of church groups in Stockholm on May 9, attended by King Gustav, denounced anti-Jewish persecution as "sinful and anti-Christian." Some 100 Jewish refugees arrived in Sweden from Finland during the latter part of May, various reports of the period disclosed.

ORT activities in SWITZERLAND have been expanded through the establishment of a new professional school for refugee girls near Basle, vegetable gardens for agricultural study near Geneva, and a refugee camp in Sierre, it was announced on May 30. Two thousand refugees from Yugoslavia, most of them Jewish, recently arrived in Switzerland, a J.D.C. announcement of June 2 disclosed.

* * *

Chronicles are based on the reports of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, the Overseas News Agency, the Palcor News Agency, the Worldwide News Service, Jewish newspapers, the general press of the United States and a number of foreign countries, as well as private information. Foreign news is subject to censorship in the country of origin.

[Technical assistance on the issue was given by ROSE A. HERZOG.]

Books in Review

ART, FREEDOM AND USE

ART AND FREEDOM. By Horace M. Kallen. New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1942. 2 vols. 1006 pp. \$6.50.

MR. KALLEN has performed an invaluable service in bringing to a conclusive statement the hitherto wavering and tenuous projections of melioristic, liberal and instrumental thought in esthetic theory. It has now become fashionable to asperse liberal doctrine, either with the opinionated contempt of the radicals or the waspish delicacy of the followers of T. S. Eliot. Lacking the sectarian dogma of the radical or the arrogant concentration on pure spiritual values that characterizes the latter group, the liberals are beset and goaded on all sides. Stung frequently, they are apt only too often to register merely a feeble and pained demurrer.

In *Art and Freedom*, Mr. Kallen has undertaken a task of monumental proportions. He has attempted to organize and bring into coherent, systematic expression the often inchoate liberal approach to the maelstrom of relations between art, freedom and use. To the defense of this position he brings a staggering erudition—historic, metaphysical, esthetic and psychological. In order to prevent the reader from being overtaken by torpor as he burrows through this vast stockpile of artists and thinkers (including the known, the little known and the totally unknown) Mr. Kallen has been at great pains to keep his style energetic, blithe and even frolicsome.

Mr. Kallen's views on creation and social relations revolve about his pivotal conception of the urge to freedom which is central in every individual. To this fundamental urge into which enter a host of "inveterate impulsions and experiences," all other values are subordinated. With or without his willed consent, life is constituted for each individual by the forcible pull of some unique pattern of freedom within the chaotic welter of his experience. "While he lives he cannot do other than struggle." The resistance which this urge encounters is extraordinarily stubborn and varied, and the struggle to overcome it causes a constant drain on the individual capacity for discrimination and orientation.

The enterprise of liberation from the coercions and constraints which are either imposed upon the individual from without by the inevitable challenge of the environment, or arise within him in the form of repressed emotions

and unsatisfied desires, is termed "use" in Mr. Kallen's pragmatic trinity of art, freedom and use. Art, it can be understood from this account, is inextricably linked to the other two members of the trinity, essentially an instrument for the release of the spirit from its fetters—nor does it matter if this release is durable or fugitive.

Beauty is itself assigned an obviously relational role at the same time that it tends to dispossess other relations and rob them of their intrinsic significance. "Whatever other relations a thing may have, we are disposed to attribute beauty to it if it consummates this liberation." As a corollary to the thesis that beauty is a relational factor between object and spectator is added the tenet that any experience sufficiently puissant to excite an attitude of freedom must be characterized as an esthetic experience.

After a masterful summation of the relativistic viewpoint, Mr. Kallen proceeds to examine and expose the meaningless and vicious aspects of every attempt to tear art from its total context in what is probably the most all-inclusive and definitive account of the pragmatic-psychologic esthetic yet presented. Never for a moment does Mr. Kallen flinch at the consequences entailed in wrenching from the esthetic object every feature that has traditionally been regarded as essential or inherent, nor hesitate in the substitution of secular and psychological determinants for the conventional esthetic formulas.

This is the genetic and empiric approach with a vengeance. It comes then as no surprise to find Kallen lending his support to the everyday maxim of *chacun à son goût*. So intent is he on destroying any vestige of belief in the abstract singularity of the esthetic experience that he depreciates every traditional theory as "passional imperialism." The creeds of the professional esthete and the norms of the rigid moralist are alike asserted to be the consequences of personal needs masquerading as universal truths. Ultimately, Mr. Kallen emerges as so fervid a champion of individualism in art and morals that some critics have gratuitously taxed him with asserting that every individual has the right to do as he pleases.

It should, however, be understood that the defense, or rather, the exploration, that Mr. Kallen undertakes in support of his perfervid and iconoclastic theories consists of much more than a series of dogmatic pronouncements. He sets the stage skillfully for the drama of his three protagonists, art, use and freedom by deploying their relations in Plato's Greece and bringing them down through the ages, describing the vicissitudes, the systematic destruction of their intimacy, their mutual disruptions and alienations until the reconciliation and alignment brought about by modern science and liberal belief encounters the all but disintegrative shock of the totalitarian attack. It is a breathtaking historical vista that Mr. Kallen reveals, the curtain rising upon the symposium in Periclean Athens and descending upon such recent phenomena as the "Legion of Decency" and the W. P. A.

This historical, dramatic method, however, contains within itself dangerous lures to which even the wariest must inevitably succumb. Ironically enough, in isolating and pursuing a species of belief throughout the ages, Mr. Kallen tends to eliminate the actual freedom, plurality, nuance and flexibility which

likewise characterize any significant viewpoint evolving through history. His lines of battle are often arbitrary, with a mechanically consistent linkage of theories built on associations as static as the beliefs he condemns.

Aristotle, Occam, medieval nominalism, the poetry of Keats and Shelley, the pluralism of James and Dewey and Jeffersonian democracy tend to fuse in the reader's mind into a strange orthodoxy against which are seemingly pitted an improbable *entente* of Plato, Thomistic realism, Hegelianism, Wilde and the esthetes, and totalitarianism. The implausibility of such juxtapositions is largely mitigated by the necessity for sharpening the alignments on so vast a canvas, and the care with which Mr. Kallen circumscribes the disagreements within the limited frame of reference of art and freedom.

More dangerous is Mr. Kallen's extension of psychoanalytic and genetic methodology to the examination of a philosophy by the study of the character of an author. This bears unfortunate fruits in the linkage of Hegel's philosophy to traits of character which might equally well, apart from the specific case, produce an opposite metaphysics or politics. Similarly, one of the more wavering passages in this extensive graph of the changing equation between art and society is the attempted *reductio ad absurdum* of the theories of the esthetes of the nineties by a savage attack on Oscar Wilde.

Kallen attempts to explain away Wilde's separation of beauty and use (such separations being anathema to Kallen) by pegging it onto his egocentrism, homosexuality, and characteristic excesses. Pater, however, with few or none of Wilde's stigmata, makes much the same separation. Indeed, nowhere does Kallen ever seem to consider the possibility that depravity of character and artistic ability may exist cheek by jowl.

The daring of Mr. Kallen's approach becomes manifest in his discussion of the theory of the beautiful. So intent is he upon eliminating every vestige of power from the esthetic object in itself, that he refuses to compromise with those theories which are originally designed to correct the same traditional deficiencies. Kallen goes much further than either James or Dewey in his crucial denial that there are factors in an object which can be isolated and discriminated in terms of pure esthetic effect. Ultimately, in a complex and subtle analysis of the manifold problems involved, he explains beauty to be a relation between a mind and an object in which the mind is set or prepared for the reception of the object.

The esthetic reaction becomes, therefore, a product of education and training, a result of one's biography and at the same time the key to one's release from its constraints. In this reaction one escapes the limitations of personality, state and cosmos. The history of art is, then, indissolubly linked to the struggle for personal and political liberty. It is indeed novel and daring in a period when progress and use are so often condemned as the shibboleths of philistines to find Mr. Kallen engaged in a unification of values that does not shirk the responsibility of a thorough scrutiny of the past, nor shrink from predicting augmented opportunities for the realization of these values in the future.

HERBERT POSTER

THE IDOL OF SOURCES

RABBI ISAAC BEN SHESHET PERFET AND HIS TIMES. By Abraham M. Hershman. New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1943. 263 pp. \$3.00.

FEW recent historical publications have been based on such sound scientific foundations as is Hershman's book. He makes not the slightest attempt to improvise by conjecture the events of Perfet's life. Mr. Hershman sticks strictly to his source; his statements rest almost entirely on first-hand documents and are drawn chiefly from Perfet's own writings. An intimate acquaintance with these writings, and a thoroughgoing study of them, are manifest throughout the book.

In his adherence to Perfet's writings, especially the *Responsa*, lies the author's strength; but here also are to be found his shortcomings. He achieves his greatest success in his painstaking investigations into some biographical details, insofar as they are dependent on the exact interpretation of some phrases in Perfet's *Responsa*. Indeed, his patient and tireless labors, directed toward establishing the precise meaning and historical implications of certain passages in the *Responsa*, assure the author the sincere gratitude and appreciation of every student interested in the literature of this period.

But as soon as we turn from our microscopic analysis of biographical and historical details, and step back to gain a more comprehensive picture of Perfet's personality, as well as the communal life of his time, we become aware of the limitations of the book. We look in vain for any new trait or coloring in Perfet's cultural physiognomy or for any new light upon the events of his time. As a matter of fact, little, if anything, is added to the generally well-known contours of Spanish Jewry in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as delineated by Graetz and Dubnow, to say nothing of Amador de los Rios, Fritz Baer, etc. This is only natural, since, on the whole, Perfet's *Responsa* were known to contain valuable historical material which could not be ignored by any historian. All that remained to be done in that direction was to bring into relief some minor details overlooked or not sufficiently stressed in the more general expositions. That the author himself felt the center of gravity of his book to lie in these details, can be seen in the fact that the book abounds in notes and addenda.

Now the very fact that despite the author's best intentions and scientific earnestness the book shows such a meager harvest of substantial historical results, leads me to a consideration of our historiographical work and procedure in general. For, it seems to me, if something is wrong in the book, it is rather the fault of our whole historiographical approach, and it would be unfair to blame the author for not having broken with the prevailing trend. I shall not examine here the principles of our historical studies, but only try to point out one of the idols, to speak with Bacon, which may be responsible for certain shortcomings in these studies. I would call it *idolus fontium*. As

a matter of fact, modern historiography remains under the spell of "sources," wherein no distinction is made between real sources which can contribute to the clarification of the historical horizon, and the pseudo-sources which are rather likely to obfuscate our historical perspective. In consequence of this approach, most of the recent historical studies originate neither from a new conception of the historical process underlying certain events, nor from newly discovered facts which require an enlargement of the conventional historical patterns. Chiefly they arise from the discovery of new, or apparently new, sources, which do not necessarily mean new facts.

A further step in the development of the cult of sources is its decentralization; every single source becomes the cornerstone for a special historical construction. As a result of such decentralization, we witness, for example, the curious spectacle of having many almost identical expositions of the communal life of the Jews in Aragon in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, one focusing on the *Responsa* of Solomon Ben Adret, the other on Simon Duran, the third on Isaac Perfet. We have every reason to expect similar repetitions consisting in such mixtures as "Adret and Perfet," "Perfet and Duran," etc. In all these essays one is sure to find the standard chapters: The Autonomy of the Aljama, Taxation, Informers, etc., quite similar in concept and material (if there is any concept apart from the usual aggregate of facts). Can anyone imagine that such manipulations are likely to advance our historical knowledge?

I am the last to underrate the value of "critical" sources and to discourage their study. I myself have spent a considerable portion of my life in collecting and editing bits of sources. They obviously furnish the indispensable material for any historical construction. But we should never lose sight of the subsidiary character of sources; a clear distinction must be made between the task of the collector and editor of sources, and that of the historian in the narrower sense. Sources, it is true, are the indispensable bricks for any historical construction, and the more solid the material, the more solid will be the edifice. But God forbid that the bricklayer pass judgment on the architect. As *material* the sources are pluralistic in their essence, and attain their unity only through the plan and concept of the architect. It is not by mere chance that the best and most famous collections of historical sources, the various "Monumenta . . . Historica" are, with few exceptions, the product of an organized staff of collaborators, of a certain "Society."

I should like to conclude these brief remarks with a practical suggestion. In view of the fact that it has become fashionable to consider the *responsa* the "source of sources" for Jewish history in the Middle Ages (extending to the end of the eighteenth century), it would be highly advisable to adopt in their scientific treatment the method of collaboration which proved to be the most effective in dealing with sources as *source material*. A well-considered plan of a systematic collection and critical edition of all the historical material interspersed among the immense *responsa* literature should be devised by a committee set up by two of our scientific societies, The American Jewish Historical Society and The American Academy for Jewish Research.

The vast material would have to be divided geographically and chronologically into several sections, and the main task of the committee would then consist in the choice of the right collaborators to whom certain sections could be entrusted.

Within such a frame, Mr. Hershman could render a much more important service to our historical studies in preparing a critical edition of the material contained in the *Responsa* group embracing Perfet and his circle. All the useful minute observations and remarks which he has scattered throughout the notes and addenda of his book would find an adequate place, and their value emerge in the right light.

ISAIAH SONNE

WARSAW, 1915

DOWNFALL. By Zalman Shneour. New York, Roy, 1944. 252 pp. \$2.50.

ZALMAN Shneour is a prominent figure in contemporary Hebrew and Yiddish literature. Since the death of Hayyim Nahman Bialik and Saul Tchernichovsky, he has been regarded by some critics as the pre-eminent living Hebrew poet. He has also written many fine poems in Yiddish, and in recent years has turned to Yiddish prose. His first Yiddish novel *Noah Pandre* was translated into English in 1936, and *Downfall* is his latest translated book—although neither the translator's name nor the fact that the novel was originally written in Yiddish appear on the title page.

In *Noah Pandre* Shneour wrote about his birthplace, the town of his youth, Shklov. His people were simple workaday men and women, kind and warm-hearted. His central character was Noah Pandre, an oak of a man, who goes gently and gradually from a carefree, coarse and boisterous existence as butcher and ladies' man to a steadfast, good and useful life as Mary's husband and as partner to her father, Sender the coachman. Shneour succeeds in defining an environment and evoking a mood; he depicts customs, traditions and a way of life; he presents a milieu and a galaxy of people who are inseparable from that milieu. And he does it with tenderness, with a comprehending sympathy, with delicate poetic undertones. This is true of the first half of the novel. In the second half Shneour, the superb storyteller, becomes enmeshed in a series of events which take Noah away from his natural locale, Shklov, to a prison in Mogilev; and Shklov, with its townsfolk, is left in the background.

In *Downfall* Shneour is no longer preoccupied with Shklov in peaceful days; he is now concerned with a metropolis, Warsaw, in the years of the First World War. It is presumably a tale of the impact of the war and the German occupying forces upon the Jewish community in Warsaw, and especially upon one of its wealthiest and most respected families—the house of Reb Jacob Shatz. Through a process of "requisition," this merchant-prince, the owner of a large leather-store in Warsaw and of several factories elsewhere, is deprived of his goods and impoverished. The downfall of the

family moves along several levels—economic, social, spiritual. The house of Jacob Shatz topples to the ground; he loses his business and his other possessions. But his home too breaks up; his wife dies, his eldest son marries a Gentile girl; another son weds out of his "social station"; a daughter attempts suicide. The war has come to an end and there may be hope on the horizon for others, but the Shatz family will remain divided and dispersed and the heritage of its ancestors as well as the moral and spiritual code by which it lived will at best remain a memory.

This is the subject-matter of the novel. Unfortunately, Shneour does not treat it adequately, and the story achieves neither thematic nor structural unity. To begin with, the war and the collapse of the Shatz family are not integrated. It is true that on the day Lieutenant Lemke entered Shatz's store, the "requisition" began; and it proceeded apace when Shatz's seventeen-year old daughter failed to come to see Lieutenant Lemke—at his invitation—to obtain a more lenient interpretation of the confiscation orders. But it is clear that the family would have declined nonetheless, that Shatz's strength had ebbed away and that he lacked the inner resources and the courage to cope with this—or any other—major crisis. The linkage between the tragedy of Shatz's downfall and Lemke's unsated hunger for his daughter's body may be "true" enough but it is not the stuff great novels are made of, and it certainly does not serve Shneour as a frame for a fuller picture of Jewish life in Warsaw during the occupation. Indeed, the novel is replete with elements of melodrama which intrude upon the essential theme: such as a frightening encounter between Jacob's sensitive fourteen-year old son and a middle-aged Jewish homosexual, and a clandestine love affair between this boy, Vladeck, at eighteen, and a beautiful irresponsible woman ten years older than himself.

It would thus seem that *Downfall* shares the defects of *Noah Pandre*, but few of its redeeming qualities. The characters are vague, shallow, unrealized; the author's observations are trite and superficial; and neither the social "landscapes" of the war are made visible nor is its psychological and moral resonance rendered audible.

I must hasten to add that I am not at all certain about the ethos of the novel. It deals with the disintegration of the Shatz family and yet it is not a touching book. It hardly moves one to pity. Why? I think it is because at bottom the misfortunes of the Shatz family are not really tragic in the moral, philosophical or esthetic sense of the word; their sources are unilluminated and their motives are almost exclusively material ones—the misfortunes of "shopkeepers." They are not lifted to a spiritual plane, interlaced with a set of values; nor do they involve the basic, inescapable sorrows of life. A great conflict is going on; Poland is now occupied but none of Jacob's sons is in the army, and the family is intact. They pay—in suffering—with their goods, but not with their blood. And yet hundreds of thousands of Jews fought (and many perished) in the armies of the warring nations.

ISRAEL KNOX

FATHER TO SON

CAMILLE PISSARRO: *Letters to His Son Lucien*. Edited with the assistance of *Lucien Pissarro* by John Rewald. New York, Pantheon, 1944. 367 pp. \$6.50.

THE letters which the painter, Camille Pissarro, wrote to his son over a period of twenty years constitute an intimate history of the Impressionist movement in painting, as well as an extended biographical sketch of a man devoted entirely to art. Filled with the same quality of light, air and honesty which distinguishes his canvases, Pissarro's letters compose, bit by bit, like the strokes of an Impressionist portrait, the image of a greybeard to whom nature was always fresh and whose consciousness never ceased to set out on new voyages of discovery.

Pissarro, born in the Danish Antilles in 1831 of Spanish Jewish parents, was one of the pioneers and leaders of French Impressionism, together with Renoir, Monet, Cézanne, Sisley and Degas. The group had to fight long and hard for recognition; and in 1883, the year when the flow of letters to Lucien began, Pissarro, already past fifty years of age, was still carrying on the fight, even to the extent of leaving behind him the style for which some acceptance had already been won. The Impressionist movement itself was breaking up, with Renoir and Monet turning toward the Salon, and Cézanne retiring within himself. But Pissarro pressed on, allying himself with the newly appeared Pointilliste group headed by Seurat. As a result of this experimental integrity, sales of his paintings remained difficult throughout his lifetime, and the artist's letters often contain accounts of attempts, obviously painful though described with much matter-of-factness, to raise a few dollars for food and rent for his rather good-sized family. Yet economic hardship never succeeded in wearing Pissarro out internally, and at the age of seventy he observes to Lucien in this regard: "Let us pursue what we believe is good, soon it will be evident who is right. In short, money is an empty thing; let us earn some since we have to, but without departing from our roles!"

The correspondence started when Lucien, then twenty years old, went to London to work for a music publisher and continue his studies in drawing and painting, while living at the home of his uncle, Phineas Isaacson, whose wife was Camille Pissarro's half-sister—the Pissarros seem to have maintained fairly close relations with the Isaacsons throughout the years covered by the letters. The elder Pissarro was concerned to guide his young son's efforts to improve himself as an artist and to keep him informed about events at home. Thus the letters contain much practical advice on the study of drawing and painting, and on orienting oneself toward nature and the art of the past; they also teem with details concerning the vicissitudes of the Impressionists, their exhibitions, their efforts to obtain money from their dealer, Durand-Ruel, the new turns of thought in the art of Europe. In addition Pissarro had trenchant comments to make on the political and cultural events of the day—the comments of an untheoretical anarchist who felt himself in complete

solidarity with Courbet, leader of the revolutionary Federation of French Artists during the Paris Commune. . . . So guided, Lucien came to be associated with the painters of the generation following his father's—Van Gogh, Seurat, Signac and the other Neo-Impressionists—particularly distinguishing himself for his woodcuts and engravings. It would seem that the letters, which were not written for publication but to help the young man to shape himself, achieved their purpose to a remarkable degree!

Pantheon Press has done a handsome job of bookmaking for these days of material shortages. There are ninety illustrations in the volume—photographs of places, portraits of personalities referred to in the letters, reproductions of paintings by Pissarro and his contemporaries—all selected with the aim of filling out the text and bringing the reader closer to the things to which Pissarro was referring. The translation by Lionel Abel reproduces the simplicity and clarity of the original, an achievement quite rare among translators. One only regrets that the editor, Mr. John Rewald, did not develop in his Introduction a fuller biographical note on Pissarro for the years preceding the correspondence.

HAROLD ROSENBERG

ALONE

DANGLING MAN. By *Saul Bellow*. New York, Vanguard Press, 1944. 191 pp. \$2.50.

THE plot of this novel—the situation of a man in Chicago, waiting to be drafted—is but its pretext. Not yet a soldier, nor quite a civilian, Joseph, the hero, finds himself isolated. No one around him can rightly appreciate his suspended position. His successful older brother's answer to all problems is money. Most of his friends who have escaped the draft see their solutions in careers as petty bureaucrats. His wife offers her capacity to feel, but how can she understand? A mistress can give him a momentary sense of escape—but it is only momentary, and more shabby really than anything else. All that happens to him Joseph finds irrelevant. He has to work out his solution in private. Society can no longer define him by assigning him a vocation, for he has given up his job and waits alone all day in a furnished room for the mailman. A woman lies dying in the house. An eccentric old bachelor shuffles about next door and gets on Joseph's nerves in a variety of ways. Over-reaction, under-stimulation—Joseph ends up by going to his draft board and asking to be called ahead of time.

The book suffers because its theme is not adequate to the more general and profound plight of which the author tries to make it a metaphor. The peculiar circumstances of Joseph's isolation do not fully account for his detachment, his failure to sympathize and participate, to commit himself. His attitude has deeper antecedents than his present fix, and for these the author does not search enough.

Joseph is that kind of special case which is the intensified expression of a much more general one. He is the latest homeless generation. A Jew—as is to be gathered from his milieu—and a petty bourgeois and an intellectual who keeps in step with his period, he has been in and out of radical politics and has read, like Faust, all the books. But now he is more at a loss than before for a position on which to take his stand, an attitude equal at least to his personal problems. Self-realization and self-perfection are what he has come to want more than anything else, not to cope with history and collective difficulties—or to do that only to the extent that self-perfection requires. Meanwhile he refuses to commit himself. For his fellow human beings he has nothing but snobbishness and priggishness, and his only standard is a literary notion of distinction. (The stilted gravity, the almost Kafkaian formality of Bellow's style express this perfectly.) But the reader begins to suspect that Joseph's longings are more worldly than the author confesses. Perhaps all he needs is a change of environment, the company of really distinguished intellectuals and beautiful women. The suspicion persists because Joseph's disdain is not funded sufficiently with principles and is more a reaction to a particularly circumscribed way of life than to life in general.

I do not want to quarrel with this novel's defeatism in the same stupid, disgraceful, and paranoiac terms as did one of the editors of *Time*. Anyhow, I share that defeatism. But Bellow's narrative itself does not sustain it for the purposes of art. Joseph's crises are too internal and over-strained. Lacking movement and shape, the journal, which is the fictional device by which the story is told, converts the novel into itself and makes it a journal of confession in real fact, with all the limitations of that fact. It is a book with many telling passages of insight and generalization, but these do not redeem its failure to hold the reader's attention firmly. One reads it with the same lack of tension with which one reads an actual journal.

Yet all these qualifications, all these serious demerits, take away surprisingly little from the real distinction of *Dangling Man*, which is its contemporaneity. Bellow is an advanced writer, aware of the true problems of writing as well as of experience in our time. He is ambitious on the level of great literature. He may lack the ease and knowledge to state his theme on the plane of a world novelist, but for all that his book is worth almost the entire remaining output of American fiction in the past year. It raises the relevant issues in a relevant manner, as no other recent American novel does.

The question as to what ideas one can live by in this period without betraying the fullest claims of consciousness and reason is one that most American writers are poorly equipped to handle. It is for lack of aid from Bellow's colleagues—for lack of an objective novelistic framework—that this novel fails. Joseph, its hero, remains in the last analysis the raw material for one character among several others in a hypothetical and much larger novel.

CLEMENT GREENBERG

Magazine Digest

A VERY important development in Jewish affairs was noted by Eliahu Ben-Horin in the April issue of *Harper's*: "The Soviet Wooing of Palestine." Mr. Ben-Horin describes the significant change in Soviet policy toward Zionism that has been taking place in the last few years. Until the German invasion, the Soviets had been hostile both to cultural and political Zionism, condemning the movement as an instrument of British imperialism, and forbidding the teaching of Hebrew, which they considered a reactionary language. Zionism was regarded as a threat to Jewish solidarity with the Revolution. The failure of Russia's own Biro-Bidjan project further embittered the Soviet Union, and contributed to the isolation of Russian Jews from the rest of world Jewry. "It seemed as if no bridge could ever be built over the abyss dividing Soviet Russia from Zionism."

In 1943, however, a leading Soviet diplomat was reported to have told a Jewish delegation: "The whole situation has changed. Not only [do] Britain and Zionism seem to be at a constant variance, but our outlook, too, has undergone a serious evolution. Should Soviet Russia be interested in the future in the Middle East, it would be obvious that the advanced and progressive Jews of Palestine hold out much more promise for us than the backward Arabs..." This change of heart was accompanied by a change in line. In October 1943, Ivan Maisky, then ambassador to Britain, made an extensive tour of Palestine, submitting, undoubtedly, a very favor-

able report to Moscow. In 1944 an exhibition of the progress of Jewish colonization in Palestine was held in Russia. These, and similar overtures indicated that Russia was seriously wooing the Zionists.

Mr. Ben-Horin ascribes this friendliness to one of the traditional objectives of Russian foreign policy in Europe and in Asia—the securing of an outlet to the warm seas. Although Russia has gained considerable influence in regions near the Mediterranean, she still lacks a foothold on its shores. She may therefore have chosen to throw her weight behind Jewish national aspirations at a strategic moment—the moment when Britain has apparently decided to cast in her lot with the Arabs.

In "Arabian Oil and American Imperialism" in the June issue of *Harper's*, Mr. Ben-Horin discusses another aspect of the Middle East. He examines the arguments which were advanced for an American-owned pipeline through Saudi Arabia and finds them all unconvincing. Our oil reserves are not running so low as pipeline apologists would have us believe. He refutes the claim that the pipeline would put oil at our disposal for use in the present war, by pointing out that the length of time required to build it would run beyond even the most pessimistic estimate of the duration of the war; and doubts that the pipeline could always provide us with oil for use in future wars. Though such oil would be available it would not necessarily be accessible, since both the pipeline and its port of access would lie

in predominantly British-controlled territory. Ben-Horin condemns the entire proposal as imperialism—"more nakedly imperialistic than many an imperialistic power in the Old World."

While the editors of *Fortune* share none of Mr. Ben-Horin's outspoken opposition to imperialism, they, too, disapprove of "Mr. Ickes' Arabian Nights," in their June issue. In a detailed and comprehensive account of the political and economic background of the oil scheme, they claim the pipeline could have led to a very serious clash between British and American interests, had the Americans rushed in, throwing both sound business caution and international courtesy to the winds, and forgetting their own obligations toward "good neighborliness."

Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk's book, *Palestine, Land of Promise*, has stimulated many discussions of his proposal for a Jordan Valley Authority, patterned after the TVA. Ex-Senator George W. Norris, writing on "TVA on the Jordan" in *The Nation* of May 20, observes that "the TVA idea has gone round the world." He reviews the TVA's accomplishments in electrification, flood control and restoration of fertility; endorses Dr. Lowdermilk's project for Palestine, and discusses the extension of the "TVA idea" to the Danube Basin—a development which he believes would overcome the economic backwardness of the Basin countries: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Greece.

Alexander Lurie's article, "Jordan Valley Authority" in the May issue of *Jewish Frontier*, offers substantially the same arguments in favor of Dr. Lowdermilk's proposals for Palestine. Mr. Lurie observes, however, that this project, which would accommodate a settlement of some twenty to thirty million people in the Middle East, itself demands a large population in this area before it could be put into effect. He

therefore believes that the JVA constitutes an argument in favor of a Jewish majority in Palestine, to be brought about through unrestricted immigration. "The Jordan Valley development plan for Palestine is feasible only because we anticipate continued, large-scale Jewish immigration after the war." The most necessary condition for the operation of Dr. Lowdermilk's plan "is the explicit statement [by the British administration] that a Jewish majority is to be rapidly settled in Palestine. Without such an understanding the whole Jordan Valley Authority . . . has no basis."

ARTICLES on the future of Germany, her war guilt, and morale, continue to appear in the press, reflecting, on the level of political controversy, the still unsettled and indefinite nature of Allied intentions toward that country. "What is German?" asks Thomas Mann in the May issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. He deplores the present tendency to disparage democratic ideology as "middle-class ideas." Democracy "is actually nothing else than the liberal tradition." The present fashion to deprecate humanitarian democratic ideology is a symptom of the deep irrationalism of the time, the same irrationalism which swept in such great excess over Germany. It was this irrationalism which enabled the Germans, normally poor politicians, to create an instrument for the destruction of civilization out of their fairy tale of folk, their myth of racial and national purity. Mann hopes that civilization may be rebuilt precisely along the humanistic, democratic lines which irrationalism has attempted to discredit. While admitting that the German people share in the responsibility for the rise and success of nazism, Mann is opposed to the punitive annihilation of Germany as a political entity.

Paul Sering, in *The Nation* of May 6, calls "The Paradox of German Morale" the fact that while the Ger-

mans have faith neither in victory nor in the regime, they still give complete support to the war, putting forth even greater efforts as the inevitability of defeat becomes clearer to them. Nazi leaders have lost their prestige; the social disorganization resulting from bombing has weakened Germany's police. Nevertheless, there has been no significant increase in political opposition within Germany.

Mr. Sering points out that the Nazis have capitalized on the fear of defeat, making it an asset to morale. Allied propaganda and military successes have failed to break Germany's will to fight. Our propaganda consists only of vague and uncertain threats; our victories give the German people a foretaste of what they imagine the future will bring. All of which reinforces the Germans' solidarity with the Nazis.

ONE of the best of recent articles on anti-Semitism is "Grass Roots of American Jew-Hatred," by Daniel Bell, in the June issue of *Jewish Frontier*. Mr. Bell's analysis is of a type that has been rather infrequently attempted. While he approaches the problem in terms of the "deeply split personality of modern man," his actual emphasis is that of the anthropology of advanced cultures. Modern capitalist society creates various unbalanced personality types, the more brutal among which have been conditioned and sanctioned by class division and competitiveness. The extent to which this process has developed in America leads him to assert that "the country where anti-Semitism can emerge in the most violent shape and unabated fury is the United States. . . . Anti-Semitism, if it comes here, will draw deep from . . . national traditions . . . and, I believe, display the rawness, brutality and fierce extremes of violence that have marked this country's development."

Among the major traditions which could contribute to American anti-

Semitism are: cynicism, vigilantism and violence, populism, and xenophobia. Americans, furthermore, are joiners, going in for hocus-pocus and mystical trappings which are meat for fascism.

Two other factors enter into Mr. Bell's analysis: the role of the big city political machines and the symbol of Americanism. The city machines could provide the organizational facilities for the spread of fascism, while the symbol of Americanism would serve the cause as it has always served reactionary movements. Another serious depression, especially if it finds the returning soldiers as poorly provided for as after the last war, might set off violence which "would rival the pogroms that have ravaged Europe."

The May issue of *The Jewish Forum* carries a very vigorous editorial "Calling for All Out Action Against Anti-Semitism." The editorial points to the growth of anti-Semitism, warning the Jews that they will only increase it if they continue to react weakly. The Jews must take on a struggle to the death against their enemies. And it would be futile to rely solely upon the national committees—"the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Conference, the Anti-Defamation League"—which "relegate work for the defense of the Jew . . . to a handful of individuals in some of the communities of the country. . . . Only Jews are assigned by the above bodies the task of organizing the defense against anti-Semitism." The greater part of this work must be done by Gentiles, since anti-Semitism represents a common danger to our country, and Jews make up only a small proportion of the population.

The editorial calls for the formation in every locality of a public relations committee, an investigating committee, an emergency committee (ready to intercede in cases of violence) and of public information, education, grievance

and legislative committees. The editors express their willingness to receive the public's suggestions, and to co-operate with all those who are interested in fighting anti-Semitism on a widely organized basis.

The June number of *American Mercury* carries a report on Jewish resistance in Nazi Europe, "The Jews Fight Back," by Ruth Karpf and J. L. Teller. The authors describe the organizing, shortly before the war, of a group of some three hundred trained guerrilla specialists in Palestine, whose task was to enter fortress Europe and assist the Jews in their struggle for survival. These guerrilla leaders kept in touch with Palestine through use of a code of proper names, formed by adding Slavic suffixes to Hebrew words. Thus, when starvation threatened the Jews of Poland, Tel Aviv was informed that "Cousin Raavsky" was visiting in the vicinity—*raav* being the Hebrew word for hunger. Money was sent to the

underground leaders of Poland, who rented farms which the more "Aryan looking" Polish Jews operated, thereby helping to feed the ghettos. When the Nazis began the systematic extermination of the Jews, Palestine received letters containing the name "Mr. Harogovitz"—*harog* meaning kill.

The article describes, in full and graphic detail, the activities of the Jewish underground in its race against Mr. Harogovitz. Letters eventually reported that the health of "Haganah"—self-defense—was improving. The first armed resistance against the Nazis, organized by the Palestinian guerrilla leaders (all of whom have since lost their lives) began in Warsaw in January 1943. The underground raided concentration camps and death trains, freeing the prisoners and organizing them into Jewish partisan groups. Their activities culminated in the memorable battle of the Warsaw ghetto, on April 19, 1943.

I. L. R.

Review of the Yiddish Press

A PATIENT lies seriously ill in a big office on Fifth Avenue. He hardly breathes; his blood pressure is weak; his head, heavy like lead. Relatives come to visit the sick one and offer advice, but in reality they have lost all hope of a speedy recovery."

In these graphic words, Meier Grossman, a Zionist leader and Yiddish journalist, describes in *The Day* the condition of the American Jewish Conference which he, like all other Zionist journalists, hailed so ecstatically as the panacea for all Jewish ills last year.

Mr. Grossman is not alone in his pessimistic diagnosis. Dr. Samuel Margoshes, editor of *The Day*, one of the most vocal advocates of the Conference, is even more pessimistic. In a series of English columns in *The Day* he speaks

of the "bitter disillusionment" about the Conference, of the mood of profound pessimism—almost despair—that prevails among all the previous supporters of that organization. Louis Segal, the general secretary of the National Jewish Labor Alliance and the man behind the throne of that organization, also voiced similar sentiments in an article in *The Day*. D. L. Meckler, editor of *The Morning Journal*, speaks of the atmosphere of "cynicism and disillusionment" around the Conference. "The organization has abandoned its aim of becoming the representative of a united Jewry, and Jewry is abandoning it in the same measure."

Practically the entire Zionist Yiddish press and all the leading Yiddish-speaking Zionists who a year ago were

most enthusiastic over the Conference and denounced everyone who was even slightly critical of it as a "traitor to Jewry," are now vying with each other in calling the body a "failure," a "lost dream," a "deliberate deception," a "trick of party slickers who are engaged in slipping something over" and throwing similar epithets at it. Never in recent years has one seen such a complete change of front on the part of the nationalistic section of American Jewry.

The search for the reasons of this great failure has occupied more space in the Yiddish press during the past two months than any other subject. The official complaints can easily be stated: the leaders of the Conference have allowed a year (and the most crucial year in Jewish life) to pass without doing anything toward the realization of the top-heavy program adopted at the Waldorf-Astoria last September. There has been less unity in American Jewish life during the year than ever before; the struggle of the various committees to "Save European Jews" has become scandalous; the jealousy of the various Jewish organizations for their "sovereignty" is at its highest peak. In a word, all the evils of disunity which the Jewish Conference was meant to abolish, or ameliorate, have been increased.

Out of the profusion of writing on the subject in the Yiddish press, one gathers that an undercurrent of opinion prevails among Zionist rank and file that its leadership overplayed its hand at the Waldorf-Astoria last year by attempting to force the maximum Zionist political program on a body which as a Jewish parliament was supposed to be above party politics. Zionist leaders have overestimated the power of Zionist sentiments among American Jews and have lost a great opportunity to establish a real united Jewish front. Moderate Zionists frankly admit their mistake and would like to rectify it at another session of the Conference. "It is no

secret anymore," states S. Dingol of *The Day*, "that the Palestine resolution led to the split and failure of the Jewish Conference. The Zionists were so certain of their majority at the Conference that they decided to sacrifice the American Jewish Committee for the 'Commonwealth Resolution.'" Thus, Mr. Dingol states more frankly what other Zionist journalists only hint at: namely that the Zionists sacrificed Jewish unity at the most critical juncture of Jewish life for the sake of party power, and they now want to correct their mistake.

Nor since the spectacular fireworks of last September at the time of the launching of the Jewish Conference, has there been such an outburst of passion, anger, denunciations and condemnation in the Yiddish press as on the occasion of the formation of the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation. But while a year ago the hue and cry was against the "Traitors to Jewry" outside the Zionist and nationalistic fold, this time the storm was raging against the brethren within, against the so-called "young men" in the Zionist movement who are more consistent in their nationalism, more extreme in their action, and more energetic in the pursuit of their political aims than the old leaders. If this storm has revealed anything at all, it is that the rifts within the Zionist ranks are greater than those between the Zionists and non-Zionist Jews and that the internal passions seething in the nationalistic Jewish movement are deeper and more fanatical than anything known among non-nationalistic Jews.

The attack on the Committee was led by Jacob Fishman and J. Glatstein in *The Morning Journal*, S. Dingol and S. Niger in *The Day* and B. Zivion in the *Forward*, and was conducted on two grounds: first, on the ideology of the Committee's declaration and second, on its undemocratic representation. *The*

Day and *The Morning Journal* also carried articles by Mordecai Danzis and Isaac Zar defending the Committee. B. Z. Goldberg of *The Day* took his usual middle course.

The ideological attack was fiercer and more intemperate in language. The declaration of the Committee dividing the Jewish people into real nationalist Zionists (designated as "Hebrews") and people merely of Jewish descent, has evidently hurt the Zionists in their weakest spot by revealing the uncertainty and confusion that exist in Zionist circles on the question of double allegiance. The subject is a very painful one for the Zionists and they seek to gloss it over. By its sharp declaration, the Hebrew Committee has brought the family skeleton out of the locker and paraded it at a very awkward time. Hence the passionate outburst. With one stroke of the pen, the Hebrew Committee has disinherited the bulk of the Zionist movement in the United States and has forced it to declare its nationalistic position more strongly than it cares to.

In his defense of the Hebrew Committee, Mr. Danzis pointed out that it had only stated frankly what every consistent Zionist secretly thinks in his heart—namely, that the true nationalistic Zionist loves Palestine above

everything else and can find spiritual contentment only there. All other Zionists are mere philanthropic supporters of Palestine. The Yiddish Zionist press has so often repeated the same words, that its rage did not sound very convincing.

The second line of attack, on the undemocratic representation and reactionary character of the Committee, was much stronger. "Surely, the Vaad Leumi in Palestine, the Jewish Agency, or any other large Zionist organization is more entitled to represent the 'Hebrew Nation' in Washington than the upstarts of the Committee," Mr. Dingol stated the case in a nutshell. To which the only reply the defenders of the Committee could advance was that most of the other Zionist bodies are no more democratic than the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation.

Mr. Zivion succinctly summarized the entire storm as an internal party squabble within Zionist ranks which does not concern the bulk of American Jewry. "Of more than the five and a quarter million Jews in the United States," says he, "the vast majority is not even aware of the deluge of protests against the young men of the Committee." Very few Jews know what the storm is about, and they care even less.

WILLIAM ZUKERMAN

Contemporary Jewish Record

PRESENTS

THE CEDARS OF LEBANON



A SERIES OF JUDAIC ESSAYS—X

Of Faith: A Polemic

WALTER RATHENAU

The story of Walter Rathenau (born in 1867; assassinated June 24, 1922) is the story of extraordinary qualities balanced by striking defects. He started life with considerable advantages, and grew up in an atmosphere of good middle-class virtues—ideals which, if not lofty, were at least eminently practical and perfectly honorable. The German statesman (he was first Minister of Reconstruction, later Foreign Minister) was not a leader; he lacked the power of imagination so conspicuous in the career of a Benjamin Disraeli. He was also without the defiance of a Léon Blum—Rathenau always had the consciousness of being, as a Jew, a "second-class citizen." But the son of Emil Rathenau, the organizer of the Allgemeine Elektrizitäts-Gesellschaft, was a great administrator.

Rathenau's writings possess conspicuous merits of form as well as of matter. His opinions in regard to Judaism changed during his life much more than his character. An interval of twenty years separates the present tract, written in 1917, from his *Höre Israel* (1897), in which he speaks of the Berlin Jews as being "an Asiatic horde on the sands of the March of Brandenburg," and advocates complete assimilation. This tract, significantly enough, he did not include in his *Collected Writings* (1918; 5 volumes), from which "Eine Streitschrift vom Glauben" was taken. The change came gradually. Martin Buber's writings seem to have left an impression on Rathenau. He even began to study Hebrew.

"Of Faith: A Polemic" is Jewish apologetic writing in the domain of politics—a class of literature of which Moses Mendelssohn's answer (1770) to the Swiss pastor, Johann Kaspar Lavater, marks the beginning. Rathenau's interlocutor was Curt Von Trützschler-Falkenstein, a Prussian nobleman.

YOU ask for a comment on your treatise, *The Solution of the Jewish Problem in Germany*; and you do that by appealing, as you put it, to my humanism. If I understand you rightly, you invoke my sense of the fellowship of humanity and my consciousness of the unity of the human spirit.

Your treatise is inspired by pure faith and humane convictions. This is why I am moved by your appeal. And the leisurely calm of this wartime

OF FAITH

435

Good Friday, so grim and un-springlike, will be devoted to you and to your reflections.

You ask that the German Jews embrace Christianity. In the last two thousand years the same demand has been often put forth, in loving kindness, and in hate and wrath. This in itself does not make your demand unjustified. For questions and answers change their aspect according to the times they mirror. Your arguments are not those of Lavater, and my reply will not be Mendelssohn's.

Judaism an undogmatic Faith

Let me say first a few words about the Mosaic creed, the features of which have likewise changed in the course of centuries. First it was a tribal faith, then a church religion, and then it was subjected to dogmatic speculation and the influence of enlightened deism; finally it was exposed to the disintegrating effects of scientific investigation. To many, the innermost essence of this creed has proved a riddle difficult to solve. There are Jews who cling to primeval rites and scholastic minutiae—just as there are Christians in certain regions of Germany whose effigies of the Holy Virgin exchange visits with one another or whose consecrated symbols are driven about in carriages. There are Jews who dissolve their concept of God into sheer pantheism—just as there are Christians who read communistic ethics into the salvation doctrine of the Gospels.

Nevertheless, Judaism, like Christianity, can be apprehended as a pure concept in a timeless sense, under the aspect of eternity, to which the disturbing inflections of place, period, and culture are of no more moment than the streaks in the crystal lenses of a refractor.

In contrast to post-Pauline Christianity, the Mosaic religion forms no church. The law of the land may organize Jews into religious communities; but this is a state measure, not a religious one. There is no Temple; the one that stood on Zion hill while Judaism was still embodied in a state religion and church is destroyed, and no law commands that it be rebuilt. The houses of prayer called synagogues are simply schools or places of worship where the rites of the cult may be performed at the discretion of the particular community. No law requires their attendance. Those who perform the religious rites are not priests but officers of the cult or, as their name implies, teachers of the congregation. They are appointed and they are dismissed. They have no authority to interpret the faith in any binding sense; let alone prescribe doctrine. Even as a body they lack the authority and power to do this. They cannot join, they cannot separate; they can neither grant nor withhold eternal grace. The authority to supervise religious belief, enforce ecclesiastical discipline, or excommunicate rests neither with them nor with their congregations—nor with anyone else on earth.

Ceremonial practices are voluntary: no one has to join in them, and it is up to the congregation concerned to determine their forms. To abstain from them does not involve the forfeiture of any right. There are a great many cultivated Jews who lead a religious life, yet never participate in ceremonial observances or ever visit a house of prayer. They are not subject to reprimand or reproach from anyone.

What then is the factor unifying this church-less religion? Only the profession of belief in the oneness of God. The Hebrew original form of this profession of belief has four words; in our language they go as follows: "The Lord our God, the Lord is One."

For a long time the books of the Pentateuch, with all their ritual, social, juridical, and hygienic prescriptions, were regarded as canonical. And there still may be numerous congregations, especially in Eastern Europe, that remain under the spell of this canon. But many of its regulations can no longer be complied with, as, for example, all those that relate to the priestly caste and the Ark of the Covenant. Thus, as in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah the Pentateuch was compiled, emended, and canonized in the course of one human generation, so any single individual could and can strip it, in part or in whole, of its binding power. No religious authority exists which can restore it to that status of state-ecclesiastical law to which it was raised by men at the time of the great Persian empire.

There have never been any other canonical writings. The prophetic, historical, and poetical books of the Old Testament, the enormous literature of the commentators, and the decisions and codifications of later times have in the course of centuries given edification and joy, hope and sorrow, fear and despair. Regarded at moments as infallible, at other times completely rejected, they have been treated with every conceivable degree of esteem and lack of esteem. Yet, whether they were made responsible for truth or for error, they have always remained the handiwork of men.

No educated man at present can be expected to remain faithful to the teachings of a philosopher of the past; just as little can a believing Jew be bound by the teachings and decisions of any religious authority no matter how ancient its prestige. Neither Messianic faith nor the creation of the world, neither the Seven Heavens nor the divine Throne-Chariot, neither the sanctity of the Sabbath nor the separation of clean from unclean—none of these is an inalienable element of religious salvation or religious wisdom. The Jew can reject them all, invoking the old formula of spiritual freedom which declares: "My soul too was present at Sinai." The Mosaic religion is not only without a church, it is also without a dogma.

You will believe, I trust, that I do not bring all this up in order to glorify Judaism. The time is past when religions were praised or vilified in disputes and controversies. Today we feel that form and action, language and

poetry, thought and belief are organic expressions of the soul, which cannot be transformed or exchanged at will. Therefore I can understand that one raised within the fixed and unambiguous forms and disciplines of a church might find a shapelessness, if not a lack of control, in the flexibility and the freedom of impulse granted by an undogmatic faith. It seems significant to me, however, that this flexibility, inherent in all the great Oriental religions, has withstood the test of centuries. It was able to survive and assimilate the intellectual content of antiquity, of the Christian Middle Ages, and of modern philosophy and science. And it could accomplish all this without struggle or bitterness and without surrendering its own essence.

Church and Religion

Perhaps you already sense the severity of your demand. The Christian, whether he is Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox, receives his faith in no other form than that of a church. Both spiritual powers are for him identical, and he can hardly conceive of a religion without a church. To this is owed his peculiar reaction to forms of confession other than his own. The idea of heresy, even though it solves the antinomy, no longer seems to be applicable: no believer would deny the title of Christian to a member of another denomination, and yet he cannot help feeling that the autonomous otherness of a rival church is a dangerous revision of the pure and true Faith. In asking the Jews to join organized Christianity, you tacitly and as a matter of course assume their entrance into one of the principal denominations. I don't want to take an easy advantage by asking which church you have in mind. I should like to try rather to broaden and deepen the concept of the church in relation to the concept of religion.

I draw a distinction between the organized church and the free community of the faithful. If the latter is actually the receiver and vessel of a pure faith, it can be regarded as a community of saints, or rather of the sanctified. This community is free in its reliance on the Word, the testimony and the revelation of its prophet and saviour. And even should there begin to appear signs of a conscious organization—signs, that is, of ecclesiastical tendencies—the organizers would still remain unofficial servants of the Word, and the uninfluenced, directly transmitted spirit which animates the community would continue to be conceived of and revered as the Holy Spirit itself.

The real danger to that community would be division, for the spirit works differently on the group as a whole and on its individuals. The desire for uniformity, for mutual support, common defense, and common action might grow and express itself in a conscious will to manifest authority. By a grandiose synthesis St. Augustine came to regard the Roman Empire as the model for all organizations; thus he arrived at the idea of the *Civitas Dei*

the City of God—by which religious life is organized into a state-like structure, the church. The church makes it possible to administer uniformly the religious affairs of different countries, regions, and continents. She furnishes the authority by which to settle the disputes which arise whenever entrenched and highly involved dogmas are threatened by the aggressive intellect. The church becomes complementary to the state and acquires temporal power. The animistic, fetishist, or theocratic elements of vanished primitive religions, rising again to the surface, are made useful. Age-old notions are reappropriated—those, for example, of the priesthood, of sacrifices, sacraments, consecration, sanctuaries, image worship, festivals, asceticism, liturgical efficacy, and local adoration.

The church stands out as a marvellous organization; it completely achieves the seemingly impossible task. A religious faith, with all its hundredfold ramifications and constantly increasing subtilizations of doctrine, is maintained against the attrition of time. Without any sacrifice of its uniformity, that faith is imposed upon the most various regions, climates, and peoples. Opposing and disintegrating forces are subdued; a world-wide community is instilled with a sense of solidarity and oneness; the kingdom of grace is realized in visible, earthly form; the delegation of powers to rule in the name of God, accompanied by inexhaustible sanctities and instruments of grace, is stabilized as the supreme transfiguration of power.

The State Church

After having surveyed this task and its accomplishment, we perceive that the church is the organizational form, or rather, the mechanizing form of faith: the apparatus by which a faith overcomes space, time, and peoples, and subdues all conceivable forces to its own high purposes. In an analogous sense the state may be considered the mechanizing form of the national will, as in a smaller scale the university is the mechanizing form of scientific investigation, and the academy the mechanizing form of the arts.

As long as the Western Church remained without a rival in her own area the distinction between the concept of a "Church" and the concept of "Region" was even less felt than today. It was only by sheer inspiration that the Reformers, and Luther in particular, were at all able to grasp it, and this would hardly have been possible had they not turned their attention to older forms of religion. With his truly German sensitivity and evangelical passion, Luther felt that the antique and prehistorical elements in the church's structure were alien to it—and he eliminated them. But he did not question the concept itself of the Church as the *Civitas Dei*, the state-like structure of its theocratic empire. To insure its continuance, he attached it to princes and to the state, thus creating the national church—that is, a state or established church.

The separation of religion as such from the church was thus advanced by a significant step. A deputy of the deity, an inspired arch-priest, no longer stood at the apex of the hierarchy, expounding the Word on the strength of his authority or even delivering the Word itself. The cleric was no longer a consecrated priest of mysteries; he became a mere authorized official. Faith no longer lay in the hands of infallible councils, but in the unique Word as preserved in Scripture. And the spirit was to keep it alive once it had been given on the strength of one's own decision a single, unequivocal interpretation.

The naïveté of a belief in a single, exclusive means of salvation was gone once and for all as soon as a number of churches began to contend among themselves, each claiming to be the sole one ordained of God, each striving to become the Church Militant all by itself. Demarcations of doctrine and symbol and emphasis on differentiating characteristics became obligatory for all parties. Each further step brought a twofold danger: that of running into the arms of the adversary and that of relaxing in the struggle.

Through the hardening of differences ecclesiastical beliefs were fixed for centuries to come, particularly as regards the Scriptures and their authentic interpretation. The interpretation itself, the confession and symbol, was determined with almost juridical exactness and became unalterable.

A case, of course, can be made for the argument that the essence of revelation is precisely that it gives unequivocal expression to the absolute, and therefore it can suffer no interpretation other than one which is revealed in its own turn. Nevertheless, revelation is clothed in the Word, and significantly enough, it is an old word, a translated, handed-on word that was written down only after a great interval of time. One of the weaknesses of human nature and of human speech is to be unable to comprehend things fully and testify to them clearly; on the other hand, a strength of the human mind and of human nature is that they are alive and can renew themselves and thus need and are capable of a constant renewal of the Word.

Catholicism and Protestantism

Until now the Catholic Church has failed to exploit a tremendous advantage it gains through its possession—in the past as well as at present—of a final authority which, within the confines of the Church's self-imposed duty to struggle and survive, has the power to renovate every single interpretation of the faith. Recently, the power of this final authority has even been increased by the transfer to it of the old sovereignty of the infallible councils. And though the latest popes have at every step fought against that spiritual movement which they call Modernism, the elevation of but one pope would suffice to transfuse a rich current of blood from the heart of our century into the still vigorous body of the Church.

Protestantism lacks such a final authority in matters of belief. The danger of petrification is lessened but by no means removed as long as its main leaders live, in their character as public officials and citizens, on terms and close terms with their congregations. For this Church can only be renewed from outside, by the state to which she belongs; and the intervention of that state is a serious matter. And an arbitrary renovation brought about from the bottom up by a state official would be even more dangerous. It would mean interfering with a legalized process recognized by the intervening official and acknowledged and approved by him precisely through his entrance upon his office and career. Protestant liberalism in ecclesiastical affairs is a contradiction in itself.

Therefore it is a mistake—a mistake which often happens—to try to persuade an evangelical-minded non-Christian or a nonconformist to enter the Protestant Church by pointing out some pastor who is no stickler for the articles of faith. That pastor ought to adhere strictly to that which is prescribed and not go one step further than his office and duty require him to. We all know that that which is prescribed is not a matter of chance and that it is upheld in full consciousness. Only a few years ago a Prussian monarch urged strongly that entrance into the Church be made more difficult, not easier. In the context of ecclesiastical policy these words are quite understandable, even though they are not altogether consistent with the mission to the heathen and the promise of grace contained in the Gospels. And so anyone who takes advantage of the easy-going interpretations of a spiritual official in order to make his entrance into the community of the Church no more for himself commits something similar to a tolerated offence, something incompatible with a clear conscience—least of all where man's most precious possession is concerned, the free choice of his heart.

Thus it seems all the more remarkable to an outsider that the majority of the cultivated members of the Evangelical Church whom he meets should declare that they cannot accept the acknowledged symbols of that Church without putting their own interpretations upon them. Consciously or unconsciously, these believers stand in opposition to doctrine, interpretation, and ecclesiastical prescription. They could not have consciously and freely joined the Church into which they were born; they belonged to it only because they happened to. In short, a considerable proportion of the Church's most intelligent members is opposed to her doctrine.

Please do not regard this reminder of a danger threatening the Evangelical Church as the unjustified criticism of a man of different creed. You set me the task of discussing your public invitation to join one or another of the great ecclesiastical communities, and I cannot do so without making some critical—though, I hope, sufficiently discreet—remarks about the nature of these venerable organizations.

Indeed, I should like to go a bit further into the question of the danger of alienation from the Church, and report an informal conversation I had shortly before the war with a clergyman friend. It was in a small country town. One evening in early summer we talked about church attendance and the reason why mostly women and old men and so few young people came to the sermons.

I said: "The Church is the communion of saints. Isn't it possible that the true spiritual communion and congregation has, unnoticed, become something other than the church? Something that has gone along parallel to it for a hundred years? Who can vouch for the fact that the church still embraces the vital religious spirit of our times?"

The clergyman wanted to know just what I meant. I continued: "Isn't it possible that the real communion of souls is to be found among our great men and their disciples? Isn't it in the final analysis the fellowship of Herder and Goethe, Schiller and Kant, Beethoven, Fichte, Fechner, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Tolstoy? And when this community testifies to one thing, and the synods to another—isn't there a legitimate question as to which really accords with the development of our spiritual life?"

At first my friend smiled, then he grew serious. I ventured a final question: "Don't you think that if you were to put up posters every week this summer, announcing that next Sunday so-and-so would speak at the church, the following Sunday someone else, and so on, the names listed being those of our most cultured men: scholars, poets, and statesmen, each of whom would declare his religious views or give an account of his innermost spiritual experiences—don't you think that in that case the church would be filled with both young and old and that people would even be attracted from neighboring parishes?"

This highly cultured clergyman, whom I revered, later on returned again and again to the subject of our talk. He told me that it had given him food for serious thought.

I have expatiated on the distinction between the concepts of church and faith at greater length than befits the summary and yet too lengthy form of this letter. But I have done so because it seems to me that a great deal of that which divides men spiritually can be traced to this source. So I do not hesitate to make also a personal confession.

Perhaps you have read my writings. If so, you know then that I stand on the basis of the Gospels. But I go my own way as to dogma and myth—more or less as almost all the believers among my Christian friends do. Can you really desire then that I should go and formally swear that I believe in the Apostolic Creed in its entirety? Could you approve of that in the light of the conception I expressed above—which you must share—of loyalty and faithfulness as regards the state and creeds?

If a nonconformist came to me today, or a Mohammedan or Buddhist, and said that through his own spontaneous meditation, interpretation, and feelings he had come to share honestly and with deep conviction the original faith of the Evangelists and the Apostles—neither more nor less—could I advise him to join one of the Christian denominations?

It seems to me that it would not be indulging in a presumptuous paradox to tell him: "Your faith sprang from the womb of Judaism. It is perhaps the only possible continuation of Jewish ethical monotheism. At the time of the latter's origin, when no other people was ripe for it, it swept thousands of Palestinian farmers into its fold. Ethical monotheism, as the chief element of their national religion, was checked only by the resistance of the city classes and of a foreign state power. Nor have these same factors in other countries and times always been favorable to the original teachings of the Gospels in their concrete form. If you wish on principle to stamp your faith with the label of some traditional religion—which is, after all, up to you—it seems to me that the only one to which your conscience could and should bend itself is Mosaic monotheism with its freedom from dogma and church."

State Religion

Having discussed the connection between state and religion, especially as concerns Protestantism, I should like to add a few more words on the nature of state religion to corroborate and reinforce what has already been said.

The city and state religions of ancient times were completely identical with the ancients' concept of religion, and therefore their languages have no word for state religion as distinguished from religion in itself. As long as there was no notion of foreign religions, or as long as this notion was only mirrored in barbaric-seeming images which were reinterpreted and assimilated to one's own use, the religion of the state was simple religion in general, religion *per se*. Its enemies were not alien faiths, but disbelief and denial—radical atheism.

Greek philosophy raised the first conflict, and Socrates was its victim. Rome avoided a similar conflict by importing deities and cults indiscriminately. It could not, however, avoid a struggle with monotheism, which was unassimilable, and it became necessary to destroy the Jewish Temple.

The Middle Ages were another period of absolute religion, but not of state religion, and certainly not of state church. On the contrary, there were periods in fact when state power was considered the worldly sword of the church. The state church is the product of the national state, especially the Protestant one.

It is one thing if an institution forms an integral part of the state structure, as does the army or juridical machinery, or if it happens to be pro-

tected and fostered by the state, as is the case with the arts and sciences. But it is another thing if it is an institution which the state claims and attaches to itself, like the church. The freedom of art and science is self-evident to us, and seems indispensable. Philosophy or painting would be unbearable under the direction and control of the government. Yet the highest of all our spiritual activities, faith and its institutional forms of expression, are automatically put in the state's charge.

The state is the organized will of the nation. Whatever the state touches serves that will. If it approaches art it is to subordinate art to a purpose. Alas, we have already heard too much of purposes and aims; now and again we even hear of the edifying aims of art, which by its very essence is free of all aim. There have also been times when official aims were imposed on the scientific disciplines—aims which were, of course, justifications of temporary measures of the state.

The Kingdom of Heaven is not of this world. And yet it has been possible to build churches in order to combat political ideas which were characterized and felt to be destructive and criminal, simply because recognized as hostile. The association of church and state always threatens to reduce religion and its forms and practices from the status of an end in itself to that of a means, to the status in the end of a vessel of education or reform.

Another danger, less grave ethically but more serious politically, is the competition arising among churches whenever religion is tied to the state. Once a church has become an integral part of the state, she must possess absolute sovereignty, like the state itself. She can and must require that every citizen acknowledge her. Her claim to sovereignty is a guarantee of her own belief in her infallibility and unicity. She cannot treat her dominating position as an accident or necessary evil; she must deduce her exclusive right to existence from it. To be consistent, she must do as was done of old: damn every opposing theory as pernicious error and heresy—for there is no such thing as dual absolute truth. And in the same measure that a qualified truth could not justify her claim to the fulness of state power, so is she unable to tolerate error in the highest questions affecting humanity, which form the special province in which she is most competent.

But such strict and inviolable logic is not in accord with tendencies of feeling which have arisen in the last hundred years. The futility of the religious wars has forced on us the acceptance of the principle of tolerance as a political reality. And the heretic, defying a supposedly universal order, has won by force the right to exist and to be respected—a right which philosophy and sentiment have subsequently confirmed. For the sake of survival the state church has had to put up with a compromise. She has had on the one hand to reconcile herself to treating other creeds