



The American
of
JEWISH FAITH

the Viewpoint Expressed in Editorials
of the *Information Bulletin* of the
American Council for Judaism

The American
of
JEWISH FAITH

The Viewpoint Expressed in Editorials
of the *Information Bulletin* of the
American Council for Judaism

956:11

A 2

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM, INC.

1001 KEYSTONE STATE BUILDING • 1321 ARCH STREET

Telephone RITtenhouse 8357

PHILADELPHIA 7, PA.

President

LESSING J. ROSENWALD
Philadelphia, Pa.

Vice-Presidents

FRED F. FLORENCE, Dallas, Tex. **RABBI LOUIS BINSTOCK**, Chicago, Ill.
MRS. ELY J. KAHN, New York, N. Y. **RABBI LOUIS WOLSEY**, Philadelphia, Pa.
RABBI IRVING F. REICHERT, San Francisco, Calif.

Treasurer

D. HAYS SOLIS-COHEN, Philadelphia, Pa.

Executive Director

RABBI ELMER BERGER, Philadelphia, Pa.

Foreword

*L*IGHT and heat, for a long time, have been supposed to be inseparable. Comparatively recent discoveries have revealed, however, the existence of what is known as cold light. That is precisely the kind of luminousness the world now needs in the ascertainment of truth. Much of the misery and error the world has suffered from is due to the distortion that the heat of excessive emotionalism has caused. The prime requisite in the search for truth is to permit the cold light of reason to illuminate the facts, historical and contemporaneous, and from them to deduce guiding principles for action. This does not preclude a healthy, nay, a dynamic emotion to energize the principles and convert them into unshakable conviction.

Our nationalist friends in the main have reversed the process. They begin with an emotion and proceed to arrange the facts so as to support that emotion. The psychologists call that rationalization. They hunger for a political structure called state

or commonwealth in the blind hope that somehow their sense of inferiority will be compensated. They forget that the German people suffered from the same dread disease despite the fact that they had a State of their own. But the truth is that the sense of inferiority is a delusion, self-induced. The religious Jew has no feeling of homelessness, does not debase himself into a state of inferiority. The religious Jew has achieved dignity and self-respect without the artificial and useless prop of a Jewish State. True, some Jews, alas, have been driven from their homes, and it is our first duty to find homes and security for them. But it does not mean, as nationalist Jews fervently proclaim, that Jews are homeless.

The articles in this booklet, from the editorials of the "Information Bulletin" of the American Council for Judaism, are a reasoned, earnest attempt to present another aspect of the so-called Jewish problem (which is in essence, a human, a world problem). The reader will find no name-calling, no bitterness, no arrogance of opinion here. Its purpose is to heal the hurt of Israel, to preserve and stimulate the faith of Israel, and to bring peace and security to all the children of God.

WILLIAM H. FINESHRIBER
Rabbi, Congregation Keneseth Israel

May 1, 1945
Philadelphia, Pa.

QUESTIONS ARE IN ORDER

IT is refreshing to find a Zionist periodical which treats material of interest to Jews with decency and dignity and which seeks in an honest and earnest way to examine the implications and consequences of the various positions taken on Jewish life. Such a journal is the *Reconstructionist*. And it is significant that the *Reconstructionist* has been raising the same questions as has the *Information Bulletin* of the American Council for Judaism.

The answers that the *Reconstructionist* gives are naturally different, consequent upon a different interpretation of Jewish life and aspirations. But the important quality manifest in the *Reconstructionist* is that it refuses to be content with shibboleths, evasions and obscurities. Again and again the publication seeks the meaning behind the barrage of propaganda by which the nationalist strategy bespeaks all things to all men.

The following are revealing extracts from recent issues of the *Reconstructionist*:

"But before such an Assembly can come into being, there must be some wide, though not necessarily universal, consensus on the nature of the Jewish collective entity, on the status that Jews wish to be recognized as having in the sight of the Gentile world and in their own. The definition of that status is a problem which, partly from considerations of expediency and partly from intellectual inertia or

From issue of July 15, 1944

sheer muddle-headedness, American Jewish leadership has been consistently evading." (*Issue of June 1944*).

"The failure of Zionist leadership to give clear definition to its conception of Jewish status is one for which we must pay a heavy penalty. Any self-appointed group of individuals may speak in behalf of the Jews and present a program for Jewish living based on its own theory of what should constitute the essential character of the Jews as a group." (*Issue of June 9, 1944*)

"But do they not then owe Jewry a clarification of the status of the Jews in the post-war world as they envisage it? What is meant by the adjective "Jewish" as applied to the projected Jewish Commonwealth? That it does not mean that all Jews will be citizens of the Commonwealth regardless of where they live is clear, but that is merely a negative characterization. It is equally clear that Arabs and other Gentiles living in Palestine, if and when it be reconstituted as a Jewish Commonwealth with a Jewish majority, will not by virtue of that fact become Jews, although they will be citizens of a predominantly Jewish state. What meaning then will be attached to the term "Jew" that will not apply to the non-Jewish population of the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine and will apply to Jews in other parts of the World?

"Zionist leaders need to answer these questions with perfect clarity and persuade the bulk of American Jewry, at least that portion of it represented in

the American Jewish Conference, to accept their answers." (*Issue of June 9, 1944*)

"We have not yet determined whether we are to use the term race, religion, nation or culture to clarify the nature of our Jewish entity and identity. Until modern Jews discover their role in the modern world, they will continue to suffer maladjustment and they will not be in a position to make a significant contribution to the better world which is in the making." (*Issue of June 23, 1944*)

It is clear from these quotations, typical of many more, that the *Reconstructionist* is not satisfied with the answers that political Zionist leadership has given. It too feels that the Zionist purpose and meaning have only been obscurely put. How different this is from the pretense frequently encountered that "the differences between Zionists and anti-Zionists are only minor."

To clarify these differences has been one of the purposes of the American Council for Judaism. We have confidence in the good sense of the American Jewish community. Given the facts, provided with material relative to the different philosophies and their consequences, illuminated by full and free open debate, American Jews, we have no doubt, will choose wisely in determining between the status of a "nationalist" group or that of a religious community.

FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

IN our *Information Bulletin* of May 15th we addressed an appeal to leaders of the Jewish communities in the United States to prevent in good time the injection of a Jewish issue into the political campaign.

We said at that time: "It would be a calamity of the first magnitude if, in a year tense with a supreme war effort and with the politics that accompany a presidential election, any Jewish issues were raised to muddy the political waters. Nothing is as likely to destroy the security and stability of representative government as the intrusion of special, religious, racial and group issues. If Jewish leaders throughout the United States are aware of the responsibilities of their leadership, they will demand and make sure that Jewish problems and subjects of Jewish interest are not made a political football.

"The responsibility transcends in importance all of the divisions within Jewish life. *The votes of American citizens of Jewish faith are not for sale.*"

The editorial was warmly greeted by leaders of public opinion. Unfortunately, it now appears, the appeal was unheeded by those to whom it was addressed. The leaders of the Jewish community were otherwise occupied; the Jewish defense agencies had other things to do.

Only the Zionist nationalist propagandists con-

From issue of Aug. 1, 1944

tinued to exert their intensive, persistent and unyielding pressures. Their skilled persuaders kept busy; and burrowed away with traditional zeal.

As a result there was inserted first in the Republican platform and then in the Democratic platform a plank on Palestine.

The Republican plank speaks of "unrestricted immigration into Palestine", of "the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration", of "a free and democratic commonwealth", — a repetition of the hoary formula of securing signatures to unread testimonials.

The insertion of this plank, pertaining to a religio-political issue, was regrettable enough. What is more, it offered nothing that had not previously been expressed on countless occasions. Its very meaning is uncertain, depending as it does upon interpretations and definitions of many controversial terms. It may have been with intent that this portion of the platform was so loosely phrased.

While the plank was hailed by the Zionists, they were not altogether satisfied with its ambiguity. But the most serious consequence of the introduction of the Palestine plank into the Republican platform was that the Zionists used it as a springboard for introducing their maximum demands into the Democratic platform.

They met with success. The Democratic platform "favors the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a

policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

Thus what the Zionist-nationalists could not accomplish before a responsible legislative body possessing official status and having before it testimony on all sides of the question, — the House Foreign Affairs Committee,—they obtained from a political convention assembling a platform with which to attract the maximum number of votes.

Yet it would be sheerest folly to read into that statement anything more than the expression of a vote-getting sentiment. The Balfour Declaration too "viewed with favor"; but, as has long appeared, that was not a clear enough guide to interpretation, policy or commitment.

Both the Republican and Democratic Platforms contain in their Palestine planks a thoroughly impractical and impossible clause—*unrestricted immigration*. No country let alone Palestine could contemplate unrestricted immigration of any kind and long survive.

The blunt truth is that neither plank can be interpreted to mean implementation in military, diplomatic and economic terms; or a readiness on the part of the United States to assume equal or major responsibility in a mandate over Palestine.

The views of the State Department, which works closely with the President and which is less concerned with vote getting, were described in the *Christian Science Monitor* in the following words: "Those

within the Department who have been working on the Palestinian question for a long time point out that it is perfectly simple for a group of men to gather in Chicago and issue such a statement in an election year, but that they would find the affair considerably more complicated if they were the ones forced to carry out the policy they propose."

Both planks represent in actual effect a victory for a pressure group in words — and in words only. Neither clears up ambiguities. The fundamental questions of objective, methods and degree of responsibility remain unanswered. Far from representing a clear course for the American people, the planks continue the uncertainty in an atmosphere of words lacking precision, clarity or a hint of implementation.

Only one thing, therefore, has been added to the past record: the disturbing fact that in a political campaign of paramount importance, fraught with sensitivities and imponderables, the Zionists have succeeded in persuading political leaders to include a statement on Palestine as an appeal to a group-vote.

How patent this pressure was can be gathered from the threat of Representative Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn, New York, who is reported to have told the Resolution Committee of the Democratic Party: "In the light of what the Republican platform contained, I warn the platform committee it would be highly dangerous for my party not to include a

Palestine plank. It would be particularly dangerous so far as my own bailiwick is concerned. You can't carry New York without Brooklyn and you might not carry Brooklyn without such a plank."

We are aware of the urgent compulsions upon every politician to garner votes; to obtain re-election. But we assert unhesitatingly that Congressman Celler has done a grievous disservice to the Jewish community of Brooklyn, to the Jews of America and, indeed, to the country as a whole.

Consider the implications of his statement! Congressman Celler is here publicly implying that the paramount, the determinant issue for the Jewish voters of Brooklyn is the plank on Palestine. Congressman Celler is here indicating that the Jews of Brooklyn will be moved to cast their vote entirely by their appraisal of the merits of the Palestine plank of the Democratic Party as against the merits of a similar plank of the Republican Party. It follows from Congressman Celler's remarks that if the Republicans carry New York State (and thereby, perhaps the election) it will be because of the Jewish citizens of Brooklyn voting in a response to an appeal—relating to Palestine. Likewise if the Democrats carry New York State (and thereby perhaps win the election) it will have been because the American Jews who vote in Brooklyn have been swayed by the language of a platform plank—in regard to Palestine.

What more pernicious can be said of American

Jews? What more calculated to undermine confidence in their broad interests, and in their basic concern for all things affecting American domestic and foreign policy?

It is beside the point that Congressman Celler is unqualifiedly wrong. We believe that the Republican candidate will not garner a single additional vote because of the Palestine plank in the Republican platform. We believe that the Democratic candidate would not have lost a single vote of any American Jew by the omission of such a plank.

We American citizens of Jewish faith are too deeply rooted in the realities of our life, in this our own country, to indulge in such fantastic nonsense. Our determinant concern, as the concern of all other Americans, is with the basic and compelling issues that effect the security of our country,—our stability, our prosperity, our domestic harmony.

Our concern is with the paramount issues of an early victory, of the part the United States will play in an enduring peace in which all, Jews and non-Jews, will have well-being; of social security, of the full development of enterprise, of the rights of labor unions, of equality before the law, of fair employment practices, of jobs for the returning veterans, of a sound economic policy, of educational opportunities. Those are the things that really matter to all Americans and that, when secured, make it possible for us, Americans of the Jewish faith, to be of help to those of our co-religionists who need our help.

Let no one be misled by the chatterings and alarms of those who have axes to grind. Let no one underestimate the good sense of the American Jews. *The votes of American citizens of Jewish faith are not for sale.*

We believe that a serious injury has been done to the American Jews by this pressuring for what is, at best, only verbal testimonials. Our very capacity to help Jews abroad who will need our help most is being impaired to the extent that such activity continues.

We believe moreover that inevitably such actions will continue as long as the Zionist-nationalist group attempts to dominate American Jewry life. Are Americans of Jewish faith willing to accept the dictation of the Zionist-nationalists whose purposes, standards and yardsticks are determined first and foremost by a political program for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state? Are American Jews content to remain neutral?

Only by freeing themselves from this ideology; by recognizing it as a menace, by organizing to challenge a program that would lead Jews further and further along the road to separatist minority status can American Jews hope to integrate themselves soundly and wholesomely in the life of this country. In no other way can they gather strength for themselves, their fellow Americans and their fellow Jews in the tasks ahead.

TRADING FOR OUR BIRTHRIGHT OF EQUALITY

FOR some time there has been recurrent talk that Great Britain, to solve its Palestinian problem, will revive a plan for partitioning Palestine thereby establishing a small Jewish state. There are those who believe that in this way Great Britain would meet the obligations it assumed in the Balfour Declaration, concerning the establishment of a Jewish national home "in" Palestine.

And there are indications—despite all public denials—that the proposal may be accepted by the Zionists—in willful disregard of political, economic and geographical realities.

The very logic of the Zionist-nationalists may compel the acceptance of the creation of a Jewish state within the present boundaries of Palestine, a Jewish state no matter how small. For the Zionist-nationalist philosophy is based upon a theory of a "homeless" Jewish people lacking an "address." By that theory the creation of a sovereign state to be a so-called "address" and "home" would constitute the very solution which they advocate. True, the state would be small but the Zionist-nationalists have themselves built up a lavish portrait of their ingenuity and of their capacity to develop undeveloped territories to an inordinate extent.

The partition plan, therefore, may become the bait to tempt Jewish nationalists with what they

From issue of Aug. 15, 1944

themselves have stressed year after year—the recognition of a “Jewish nation.”

It is relevant, therefore, to give thought to the proposal and to consider what real problems—other than the arbitrary national theory which forms the core of the Zionist philosophy — will be solved by partition.

Will partition solve the problem of refugee Jews who need one thing most of all: immediate rescue?

Rescue is being effected primarily by the armies of liberation. Where special sanctuaries must be set up, they will obviously be set up at points nearest rescue operations. What major role can a truncated Palestine play? Of what value would it be to have the responsibility of rescue imposed upon a minuscule Jewish state as against the United Nations?

What effect will partition have upon securing the rights of the Jews in Europe?

At present, the nations of the anti-Nazi coalition have pledged a complete restoration of the rights of the Jews of Europe. It is not likely that the sudden setting-up of a minuscule Jewish state will complicate that situation by problems of conflicting responsibility and obligation?

What effect will partition have upon relations with the Arabs?

In the last analysis, the prosperity and well-being of the Jewish community in Palestine either as an integral part of the Near East or as a state by itself, depend upon friendly relations with the Arab

world. A community of half a million—or several times that number—can never be self-sufficient. It must have a friendly and cooperative hinterland. Will the forcible establishment of a minuscule Jewish state hold out the promise of friendly relations or the crystallization of enduring bitterness?

How will partition affect the economic development of Palestine?

That development has in large measure been due to the generous help and investment of Jews in other parts of the world. Up to now, such help has been, largely, of a philanthropic character and rationalized as such. The establishment of a minuscule Jewish state would, however, attach a political quality to such help. Will not partition complicate and embarrass the support given by Jews in other parts of the world?

What will be the effect of partition on the status of Jews all over the world, on expanded settlement and migration opportunities?

Will partition, in fact, solve any of the problems?

These are basic and grave questions. There is a desperate need to reflect upon these considerations. Unless that is done, the Zionist nationalist political leaders may create a situation in which Jews the world over will be confronted with a *fait accompli* which will markedly affect their lives and destinies.

AN APPEAL TO WORLD OPINION

IN the past month, a number of Jewish organizations have made public statements of policy for postwar guarantees for the rights of Jews. While these statements have come from various Jewish bodies, all had a common emphasis on equality of rights in law and in fact for all citizens of all countries.

Each declaration in its own way embodies the fundamental position of the American Council for Judaism. This has been put as follows: "For our fellow Jews we ask only this, equality of rights and obligations with their fellow-nationals. This means equality in the countries in which we live and choose to remain; equality to return to those lands from which Jews have been forcibly driven; equality to migrate wherever there is an opportunity for migration."

The recent declarations bring to mind the sessions of the American Jewish Conference of about a year ago. Now only one of the groups advocating such an International Guarantee of Equality of Rights, the Conference was originally convened to secure a common program on which all American Jewish groups might unite. In fact, those groups who were represented were, without exception, prepared to adhere to a declaration calling for full protection of equality of rights to all nationals of all countries

From issue of Sept. 1, 1944

without regard to religion, language, race or land of origin.

Unfortunately, that clear call for equality was negated by a resolution on Palestine which forced dissent from some of the participating groups and, more important, was inconsistent with the basic declaration for an international bill of rights.

For the American Jewish Conference Resolution, not content with a program to secure equality of treatment of Jews everywhere (and therefore, in Palestine as well, which would mean the abandonment of the White Paper), demanded that the gates of Palestine be open "to *Jewish* immigration," and that the *Jewish* Agency be vested with authority to regulate immigration into Palestine and to utilize uncultivated land for *Jewish* colonization.

This demand must be considered side by side with the appeal for a bill of rights on which the American Jewish Conference has just memorialized the State Department. Its two basic principles were summarized as follows:

1. Full and complete protection of life, liberty, freedom of worship and *civil rights* for the inhabitants of all countries without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.

2. Unequivocal *equality of rights* in law and in fact for all the citizens of every country.

The Conference is thus on record asking for complete equality of rights all over the world while at

the same time it demands special powers and special privileges for Jews in Palestine.

In its general platform the Conference demands equality of civil rights for the inhabitants of all countries without distinction. In its Palestine Resolution it excludes the non-Jews of that country from an equal share in one of the most important of civic responsibilities, that of regulating immigration.

In its Bill of Rights memorandum the American Jewish Conference speaks of complete protection of the civil rights of all people in all parts of the world. Its Resolution on Palestine demands that the gates of Palestine be opened to *Jewish* immigration only, that its control be in the hands of a *Jewish* Agency, and that the objective must be the creation by such artificial methods, of a *Jewish* majority. There is no other limitation placed upon the time during which Palestine shall be denied self-government. Thus, within a year of its convening, the full force of the American Jewish Conference resolutions is made clear. For it is presenting to world opinion the spectacle of a body of American Jews—citizens of a democracy—demanding a denial to non-Jews of Palestine what is insisted upon as the unequivocal right for all, in all other parts of the world.

It has long been clear that the Palestine Resolution was a mistake. At the sessions of the Conference, it became the occasion for a schism which has remained and even intensified in the intervening year. But its retention now makes vivid still another

weakness, the fatal weakness of inconsistency and the application of a double standard inherent in the whole Zionist Nationalist program. For it is inconceivable that Jews—or any group—can sustain a case for equality in all parts of the world at the same time that they press a claim for favored opportunities to dominate the life of Palestine. It is self-defeating to advance a case for unequivocal equality of rights when simultaneously another demand is projected denying to others equality of rights — in an immigration or colonization program. Such inconsistency does no credit to Jews; nor is it likely to be acceptable to an emerging democratic world community conscience.

Only one course is open for those who place the welfare and security of all Jews everywhere above party, partisan, political ambitions: a withdrawal of the Resolution on Palestine and its demand for a Jewish Commonwealth and for the exclusive control by Jews of immigration or of any other of the civil powers of a community. The Biltmore Zionist Platform on which the Conference Resolution was based is an albatross around our necks which will become heavier as the time approaches for world opinion to consider the plight of the Jews who have suffered under the Fascist whip. At that time, only an undeviating, uncompromising claim for full equality everywhere, uncompromised by demands for domination will be heard — and will deserve to be heard.

THE "OLD ADAM" IN THE "NEW PALESTINE"

WE have long advocated for those interested in the problems of the Jews and the Zionist program for their solution, a study of the literature issued by the Zionists themselves. For the discerning reader, careful to avoid the shibboleths, the slogans and the skillful phrases calculated to appeal to all views, will find in that literature the very concepts which lead us to regard the Zionist nationalist propaganda as of the gravest menace to Jews the world over. Almost every issue of the official Zionist publications is revealing. Merely as an example we take the September 15th copy of the *New Palestine*, the official publication of the Zionist Organization of America.

One of its more significant items, is the report by Dr. Joachim Prinz under the heading "Basic Zionism." In his article Rabbi Prinz tells of a tour that enabled him to discuss Jewish problems with hundreds of servicemen in the army camps and air-fields of the Southwest. There then appears the following significant paragraph (*italics ours*):

"Palestine and Zionism played a very important part in all our discussions. Whatever the topic was, we invariably landed there in the most spirited 'question-answer periods' I ever witnessed. Palestine—for whom? Palestine—for what? Haven of refuge? Why there are better havens of refuge in the world! We say: They won't be open

From issue of Oct. 15, 1944

to the Jews. All right. But let's assume they were. How if Australia admits a million Jews? We say she won't. They insisted that such or a similar possibility must be discussed. They were right. We say: We need Palestine because the Jews will not be able to return to their old homelands. They were not so convinced of that. That's what they were fighting for, they said. The war would not make sense if the Jews were not permitted to return to their old home countries. We say, that postwar Europe will be anti-Semitic. They said: How do we know now? Europe may be fed up with it. And besides: if we cannot achieve this, why fight the war? We fight it for the rights of all people; why not for the Jews? Nobody can determine now what the Europe of tomorrow will be. Why not assume it will be good, good for everybody and therefore good for Jews? *It was uncanny how they discovered the poverty of our commonly accepted argumentation of a Palestine dependent upon a Jewish postwar situation of which we know neither the facts nor the figures. We had to tell them the truth. We have to teach them basic Zionism instead of Zionist philanthropy. We had to assume the fundamental Zionist concepts which have so little in common with the often preached 'haven of refuge.' We had to talk about a Jewish national home, about national aspirations, about halutzuit and the new Jew, about the renaissance of people and land, about the dream and the reality."*

Note this paragraph. Study its meaning. Is not this "basic Zionism" identical to what anti-Zionists have said about the nationalist propaganda? Note

the statement that "We had to tell them the truth." Note Rabbi Prinz's admission that the fundamental Zionist concepts have little in common with the often preached "haven of refuge." Note above all the antithesis between "basic Zionism" and so-called "Zionist philanthropy," that is, the strong contrast between the fundamental concepts and objectives of the Zionist movement as against the propaganda appeals which have lured many unsuspecting American Jews into nominal affiliation.

Thus the essential quality of the Zionist agitation is for the moment revealed. Observe that it is not the critics of the Zionist movement who point out that Zionism has nothing to do with refuge; with the somber and stark and fundamental problem of rescuing lives and creating a decent status for Jews. A Zionist spokesman in the official publication of the American Zionist movement strips the Zionist propaganda of its humanitarian camouflage and reduces it to its true nationalist elements of a "national home" and "national aspirations."

We recommend to our readers, Christians and Jews alike, and to Zionists, so-called neutrals and anti-Zionists that they bear this clarification in mind when next the hue and cry is raised that Zionism is a humanitarian movement concerned with philanthropy or with the rescue of the lives of Jews in despair.

Yet another revealing item appears in the self-same issue which we believe worthy of emphasis.

The leading editorial in the September 15th issue of the *New Palestine* is a rhapsodic peering into the future and in it the amazing concept is advanced that Jews are to leave Europe. The precise words are "We have been left homeless there. We are going home" (*meaning, to Palestine*). Thus in two brief sentences an official Zionist publication disposes cavalierly of the right and will of Europe's Jews to return to what have been their homes for centuries. Thus, by an irony of history, the Hitlerian objective of making Europe *Judenrein* is advanced by a segment from among the Jews themselves.

The editorial concludes with a hosannah to a hoped for new world and speaks of such a world in the following terms: "Its symbols will be a free Jewish people *on both sides of the Jordan* and a Law that goes forth from Zion." (*italics ours*)

Here again an intimation is given of a new Zionist propaganda drive, as if in token of the long-time political conflicts and pressures that Zionism will bring upon us, if left unchecked by an aroused American Jewish sentiment. Here is the intimation, made at the very time political strings are being pulled for establishing Palestine as a "Jewish State," that Palestine itself will not be enough. "A free Jewish people *on both sides of the Jordan*," it is hinted, is the next move in this artfully contrived international chess game.

We doubt whether American Jews associate them-

selves with these concepts of the place of the Jews vis-a-vis Europe; or with these imperialist, expansionist ambitions of the Zionist political leaders.

We are convinced that there is one basic motive and one only that animates all Jews and friends of Jews: a humanitarian desire to help harassed Jews; to do everything possible to acquire for Jews everywhere the status of free men.

That motive compels us to be on our guard against those manipulators who propose to turn our sympathies and those of our Christian friends into the service of national and international power politics.

THE POLITICAL USE OF STATISTICS

THE annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America has come and gone. Its sessions were marked by all of the brilliant pageantry of which the nationalist-Zionist machinery is capable. True, there were clashes behind the scenes: conflicts, organizational rivalries and personal tugs of war. But out on the stage everything was harmony—and acclamation.

One of the main acts was the reading of the endorsement of Zionist aims by the Republican candidate for president, Thomas E. Dewey, in a statement that went beyond the plank of the Republican Party. After that, a hush of expectancy was generated, until the message from President Franklin D. Roosevelt was read, a statement which, in the language of the Zionist press, "makes Zionist history."

Actually, President Roosevelt's statement was a re-affirmation of the Palestine plank adopted by the Democratic convention. It was however hailed as the first and most forthright statement "on the future of the Jewish people" by the same Zionist leaders who have been protesting all these years that *every* American president since Woodrow Wilson had endorsed the Zionist program.

From that point on, the Zionist political leadership proceeded to rule the Palestine issue out of the recent political campaign. True, the very same thing had been said immediately after the Repub-

From issue of Nov. 15, 1944

lican and Democratic conventions. The assurance this time was in the nature of a "positively."

Yet beneath all the acclaim, and dramatic tumult there is an undercurrent of uncertainty. Despite their brave words Zionist leaders are not quite sure how to take the statements which were read with enthusiasm to the assembled delegates. They know that, when all is said and done, this is a political year. They know that the congressional resolution still has to pass and that, while it may pass overwhelmingly, it would not mean that congress is prepared to assume any responsibilities. A reading of the Hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Committee makes that clear. The Editor of the *Jewish Frontier* goes so far as to say that "The President must be aware that he cannot much longer content himself with statements of such a general character."

In fact, the very language of the Biltmore Resolution may now rise to plague the Zionist manipulators. They had discovered so clever a formula: the use of the word "Commonwealth" rather than "State." Aware of the apprehension of the Jews of the United States as to involvements with a political state, and conscious of the doubts that might be generated among Christian Americans by the forthright use of the phrase "Jewish State," the device was adopted of projecting the term "Jewish Commonwealth." But it may be that cleverness overreached itself. The strategists may have miscalculated. The party pledges of a "commonwealth" and

the candidates' endorsements of those pledges may be interpreted by them as in support of a commonwealth of Jews *which is part of a larger federation*. There is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for example, which is at the same time a member of the federal union of the United States of America.

The political realities of the Near Eastern situation may point the way to such an interpretation of the candidates' endorsement. Nothing in the language of the planks or the endorsements excludes the possibility of the formation of a Near Eastern Federation in which Palestine would be a "free commonwealth."

Thus, the misgivings among Zionists are understandable. They have pushed ahead too rapidly. They are disturbed by the apparent ease with which they advanced their political demands. They suspect—and not without reason—that their "triumph" may turn out to be much, much less than they have led their public to believe.

However that may be, the dramatic highlights of the convention tended to blot out the most important and potentially troublesome development: the message of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, in which he maintained that "*we shall also need the manpower of the American Jewish community.*"

Behind this statement there is an astonishing background of circumstances, almost unbelievable in their confusions and contradictions.

For whatever the real motivations, the Zionist

propaganda in the United States has been based upon the postulate of an urgent post-war need to find a home for millions of dispossessed European Jews. The Hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee heard this note repeatedly. Again and again, a figure of "four" and "five" million Jews was brought out, sometimes obliquely, as indicating the opportunities in Palestine, always with the direct or subtle implication that there were as many Jews who would need to find refuge.

This propaganda theme was effective, and it is not unfair to presume that the effect produced was a calculated one. At that time our *Information Bulletin* made the following comment:

"It is difficult to speak temperately of so devious and dangerous a propaganda. For propaganda it is, pure and simple. The voluntary post-war movement of people is here confused with the enforced migrations of the wartime and temporary flight from the Nazi hordes. The truth is that those who speak so recklessly of mass immigration after the war do not and cannot know enough of the vital statistics. Certainly they do not know of the desires of the survivors. Indeed, what facts we have justify no such inference about mass emigration. The sombre figures of the surviving Jewish population of Europe contradict the wild talk of millions of European Jews ready for mass emigration."

Now we find from the address by Dr. Israel Goldstein, President of the American Zionist Organization at the Zionist convention that "a surviving

remnant of approximately one and a half million Jews uprooted from their homes, will be found scattered over the continent, many of them emerging out of caves, forests and other hideouts."

This is a far cry from the image of many millions of Europe's Jews knocking at the world's gates. Rabbi Goldstein now speaks of "one and a half million" Jews as surviving in Europe (outside of the Soviet Union). That means that the reservoir for the immediate population flow into Palestine is far smaller than the past claims. For of those million and a half, no doubt a substantial number will want to resume their lives and their economic and cultural participation in the countries in which they have lived for centuries. No one will seriously advance the notion that the Jews of France or Belgium, or Holland or Czechoslovakia or Italy or Yugoslavia will seek to leave their homelands in any large numbers. No one will seriously claim that *all* of the Jews in the remaining countries of Europe will want to give up their place in European society.

A sober scrutiny of the figures, drastic as they are and compact with tragic connotations, exposes the hollowness of the Zionist-nationalist claims. The present estimate of the Z.O.A. President is that about a million and a half Jews will have survived in Europe. From that as a maximum number, deductions will have to be made for the Jews who will want to remain in their homelands, for Jews

who will seek out other open opportunities for immigration; and, of those who wish to go to Palestine, for those who, having suffered on the rack of Nazi terror, will not be the human material adaptable to the hardships and problems of a pioneer country.

It comes down to this: that the Zionist-nationalists, after having used their own myth to the hilt, must now come to grips with the prospect that the rapid acquisition of a majority in Palestine is very slim if it is to be based upon an immigration of European Jews.

Dr. Weizmann's message, therefore, gives the clue for the new "party line"—the use of *American* manpower. We hope to discuss on another occasion, the implications to the position of the Jews of America of an organized drive to assemble, train and prepare American Jews for emigration to and settlement in Palestine. Here we only underscore the Zionist admission of, at best, their own miscalculations. The American nation is called upon to take a position for which the rallying cry has been the actual homelessness of Europe's Jews. At the same time the machinery is being wound up for action to organize and train a young generation of *Americans* of Jewish faith to leave their country and to settle in Palestine out of a sense of "patriotism" — for Palestine.

THE NEW ZIONIST OFFENSIVE

ON October 27th the "New Palestine" official publication of the Zionist Organization of America published without comment a message from Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the Jewish Agency in which there is introduced a significant innovation in American Zionism: *a call for the manpower of the American Jewish community for the upbuilding of Palestine.*

Dr. Weizmann's exact words are as follows:

"But money alone will not suffice. We shall also need the manpower of the American Jewish community. We shall need a new form of Chalutzit from the western shore of the Atlantic; a Chalutzit of sturdy young men and women, who, by their experience and skill and by the example of their patriotism and devotion will be able to cooperate in the building of the Jewish Commonwealth, and thus aid, guide and comfort the destitute remnants of European Jewry, who will press against the gates of Palestine to a new life for themselves. It is a Chalutzit called for not, heaven forbid, by personal need or interest, but by a higher and greater urge—the urge to participate in the Redemption and Emancipation of Jewish life."

Here is a provocative call to American Jews which deserves its forum of public opinion. For involved in this program is not the familiar Zionist activity, supposedly remote from our own lives and from our American problems. It is not the conventionally

From issue of Dec. 1 1944

alleged case of enlisting help for Jews who need help; of Palestine "for those who want to or need to go there." It is not a call directed to refugees or homeless Jews.

Nor is Dr. Weizmann's appeal merely an extension of the past history of American Jews collaborating in Palestine up-building. For years American Jews have contributed temporarily of their special skills and talents to the growth of an underdeveloped country. Now something new is added: a clarion call is issued for a *Chalutzit*—for settlers—just as there have been similar movements organized in eastern Europe for the permanent settlement of their young Jews in Palestine.

This is in keeping with the historic philosophy of Zionism as stated by Dr. Weizmann in 1918:

"We have never based the Zionist movement on Jewish suffering in Russia or in any other land. These sufferings have never been the mainspring of Zionism. The foundation of Zionism was, and continues to be to this day, the yearning of the Jewish people for its homeland, for a national center and a national life."

Thus the essential Zionist challenge is flung before the five million Jews of America. It is a challenge to Jews living in the world's greatest democracy to support a project designed to turn the eyes of Americans of Jewish faith away from their future in their own country and towards a future in Palestine.

This means that the ultimate expression of the Zionist logic is being brought directly home to us. Its rationale is clear: that out of loyalty to a Jewish State in Palestine, substantial numbers of American Jews should abandon their ties to this country and dedicate their talents and their futures to a country other than their own.

It is not without significance that this strikingly important message was not debated at the Zionist convention. Past experience has demonstrated, however, that intimations and hints and trial balloons put out by the Zionist political leaders are rapidly transformed into realities. Only one thing can prevent this dangerous reality; a determined Jewish public opinion.

What is that opinion?

We believe that American Jews do not regard their status in this country as in the nature of a temporary lodging from which substantial numbers will depart—out of a sense of patriotism for Palestine. We believe Americans of Jewish faith are, and properly regard themselves as, an integral part of the fabric of American life. We are determined to remain thus integrated. We believe it unthinkable to consider our future and our children's future in any terms other than the closest identification with the future of the United States.

Any intimation or effort to the contrary is most calculated to unsettle this status.

The organization of American Jews to settle in

Palestine is not a normal expression of their lives. It cannot in the nature of things be casually developed. It must be artificially stimulated. It must be propagandized by direct and by subtle appeals. Of necessity there can be only one direction that such appeals can take. Some of the consequences of such appeals can be foreseen. Every economic and social difficulty, great or small, would be manipulated to cultivate a sense of defeatism. The earnest if hopeful and challenging tasks of integration would be seized upon to sow a lack of faith in American democracy. Subtly but inevitably there would be sustained a division among Americans that can only injure the unity of a country made up of many peoples of many faiths.

With the greatest solemnity we declare that in Dr. Weizmann's statement American Jewish leaders are confronted with their most serious challenge. They must speak up before it is too late.

What do American Jews think of this proposal of the official leader of the World Zionist Organization that American Jewish manpower be organized for settlement in Palestine—out of motives of *patriotism for Palestine*?

A BANKRUPT POLICY

THE defeat of the Palestine Resolutions in the House and in the Senate is a demonstration of the complete bankruptcy of Zionist policy.

One blow after another preceded the final rout. First, there were the omissions from the House Resolution of the key word "Jewish" from the phrase "Jewish commonwealth" and of the significant language urging the United States to "take appropriate measures." The House Rules Committee failed to recommend even the amended Resolution. In the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee in turn passed an amendment substituting for the phrase "Jewish commonwealth"; and finally rejected the Resolution on the basis of testimony of Secretary of State Stettinius.

Thus two years of a highly organized political pressure campaign carried on, presumably, in the name of all American Jews exploded in defeat.

This is the record; a record that can only move us deeply in that the defeat of the complete Resolution means that no protest is being made against the British White Paper which limits and restricts the immigration of Jews, as Jews, into Palestine. With the defeat, there has gone the hope that in the immediate future Palestine might be extended as a haven of refuge.

This painful experience imposes upon all American Jews the obligation to consider just what trans-

From issue of Jan. 1, 1945

pired. Only a careful sifting of the truth from the propaganda will make it possible to chart a wiser course of action.

To understand what happened, it is necessary, in the first place, to recognize that the Resolutions, as introduced, were authorized by the Zionists and that the text embodied policies laid down in the so-called Biltmore Zionist platform and at the American Jewish Conference. *The heart of the strategy was to embody two different provisions in one Resolution.*

One provision sought to express the American viewpoint in opposition to the British White Paper of 1939 and to enable a continuance of immigration of Jews into Palestine. (The term "unrestricted" was, of course, gratuitous, since no immigration, anywhere in the world, can be completely unrestricted.)

To this provision, a second proposal was added; a proposal for the creation by a so-called "Jewish people" of a so-called "Jewish commonwealth." This was to serve notice of a political unity among Jews and of their agreement as to the desirability of a Jewish national status.

These two provisions were not only different; they were antithetical.

The proposed expression of American opinion against the discriminatory provisions of the White Paper had an inherent appeal to legislators and to the general public.

All American Jewish organizations, without ex-

ception, were opposed to the continuance of the White Paper. *If ever there was unity, here was a perfect model*; a complete unity to secure the abrogation of a document that discriminated against Jews, as Jews.

The strength of feeling among Jews was matched by an outpouring of sympathy among our Christian friends. Few informed Americans were unpersuaded of the injustice of the discriminatory White Paper provisions.

Moreover, that section of the Resolution had an enormous emotional and realistic appeal. It concerned the problem of an outlet, a haven for those in need of immediate refuge; it set forth a worthy humanitarian goal.

Not least, this section of the Resolution had an unassailable rationale: it was fitting for the American people to go on record against the crystallization of an undemocratic policy inherent in discrimination against Jews at a time when a global war is being fought to sustain the democratic ideas.

This rationale was so powerful that reliance upon it would have thrown any opponents on the defensive. *They* would have had to justify a course of action inconsistent with commonly accepted democratic principles.

To this sound proposal there was added an intolerable burden, the burden of a narrow, political, Zionist objective. For the second section of the Resolution differed completely in character and

background from what preceded it. It introduced an undemocratic principle to color the complete Resolution; a concept as undemocratic in its own way as the White Paper is, save that in this case, the responsibility lay with the Zionists.

Among Jews, there was considerable difference of opinion on the subject of a "Jewish Commonwealth." Anti-Zionists were opposed on grounds of the democratic principle and by virtue of their faith in emancipation. Non-Zionists opposed it on the ground of untimeliness. There was even a subdued and underground reluctance among Zionists, dismayed by a demand for domination of Palestine by what is now one-third of its population.

Thus the second part of the Resolution, dealing with a "Jewish Commonwealth" as the creation of a "Jewish people," brought weakness not strength to a declaration aimed at the British White Paper.

The division in Jewish opinion was paralleled among Christian liberals. Many of them were prepared to go far to secure abrogation of the White Paper, to continue Palestine as a haven of refuge. But there was a reluctance to carry this humanitarian purpose further into political concepts only vaguely understood and, to a degree, opposed. The intelligent reader of the many testimonials assembled by the tireless Zionist propaganda machine cannot fail to note the distinctions that were made. A reading of the endorsements as they appeared in Zionist publications indicates clearly *that there was*

no agreement in support of a Jewish political state; that there was an agreement only on the humanitarian objective of maintaining Palestine as a haven of refuge.

The second section of the Resolution was unrelated to the practical needs of Jews in need of refuge. How unrelated it was to this need can be judged from the recorded action of the American Jewish Conference *against the establishment of temporary refugee centers for Jews in Palestine similar to the refugee center established in the United States.*

Last, there was the very special difficulty of justifying the demand for setting up a "Jewish Commonwealth." Its only rationale could be that of a nationalist mystic concept and of a political program that, in fact, long ante-dated the Hitlerian disaster. It was a continuation of the policy laid down by Dr. Weizmann in 1918 when he said: "We have never based the Zionist movement on Jewish suffering in Russia or in any other land. These sufferings have never been the mainspring of Zionism. The foundation of Zionism was, and continues to be to this day, the yearning of the Jewish people for its homeland, for a national center and a national life."

The differences between the two sections of the Resolution were thus sharp. One, was a sound, meritorious proposal, certain of widespread sympathy and support from all humane Americans. The other, was a political objective that was inadequately

known, suspect in some quarters and compounded of doubts and misgivings.

Yet the strategy of the Zionist political leaders was deliberately to knit one proposal to the other. It was clear that they were prepared to use the European tragedy as an instrument for the advancement of the basic purpose of Zionism, the furtherance of a fifty-year old political ambition. And they went out in full force: unceasing pressure upon leaders in public life; lobbying with legislators and public officials; a bloc demand upon the platform writers of the Republican and Democratic parties; a relentless pursuit of political candidates.

All ended in defeat.

For the injection of the idea of an American pledge for a "Jewish Commonwealth" muddled up the waters and brought about defeat of the measure in its entirety.

This was inevitable, for no other reason than that Congress is not prepared to deal piecemeal with the many elements of a general peace settlement. Our national legislators saw no reason for making an exceptional case of the postwar peace problem of Palestine from among the thousands of problems involving numerous countries, boundaries, relief tasks, economic concessions and military precautions.

The measure failed of passage. The Zionist policy was exposed in its utter bankruptcy. The Zionists are now left accountable for an outcome, whereby

Palestine cannot be used as an extended haven of refuge. The humanitarian objective on which Jews were united and for which there was overwhelming support from among non-Jews, fell victim, sacrificed to Zionist political strategy.

* * *

What now?

There is no reason to suppose that the Zionists will acknowledge the situation which their unbridled political drive has brought about. But, surely, there is a clear challenge to American Jewish leaders not to permit a repetition. Now, if ever, is the time to follow a policy independent of Zionist political pressure; a policy determined only by the needs of Europe's Jews and the obligations of Americans of Jewish faith as citizens of this great country.

We propose that the two sections of the Resolutions now unfortunately tied together, be introduced as separate Resolutions.

One would express in simple and unmistakable language the American point of view on the British White Paper on Palestine. It would appeal to our democratic ally, Great Britain, not to crystallize a discriminatory policy in territory mandated to it. It would call upon the British Government to revise the Palestine immigration policy so that within the normal bounds of an expanding economy, immigration shall be open to men of all faiths.

Such a Resolution would encounter little challenge within the United States and might well meet

with sympathetic response from the British Government that seeks a just solution. It would, as a minimum area of agreement, have the support of all American Jewish organizations. It would have the undivided support of Christian liberals. It would not, in all likelihood, meet with opposition from the State Department since it would represent a course of democratic action consistent with its recent policies.

We believe such a Resolution would pass.

If the Zionists insist, they can introduce a separate Resolution calling for the establishment of Palestine as a so-called "Jewish Commonwealth" in behalf of a so-called "Jewish people." But let there be no mistake about it: there will be no unanimous support for this Resolution from among American Jews. Indeed, those who believe the stimulated nationalism in Jewish life to be the greatest obstacle to our emancipation and integration, will fight it tooth and nail.

This approach will have the merit that Jews who need refuge will not be penalized by the arbitrary injection of Zionist political proposals. And it will have the particular merit of keeping the issues clear between humanitarianism and democracy versus Zionist power politics, so that Americans of the Jewish faith and Americans of the Christian faith can judge between them.

A PHILOSOPHY OF HOPE

THE January 15th issue of this *Information Bulletin* contained a summary report of the first annual conference of the American Council for Judaism. Yet no report could by itself convey fully the sense of dedication and aspiration, and the mood of historic awareness that permeated the Philadelphia sessions. Here were American Jews gathered together to re-state and hold forth in all of its glory of achievement and prospect, the program of emancipation and integration. The addresses were of a high order. The discussions, questions and evaluations were marked by the utmost sincerity of purpose. There was candor; and self-criticism. There was an awareness of the immensity of the tasks ahead. There was humble respect for the vastness of the human problem. Throughout, the conference conformed to the symbolism of its opening session: a religious service beautifully conducted by Rabbi Louis Wolsey; and the singing of the national anthem of Americans of Jewish faith: the Star Spangled Banner.

What might have been regarded as unattainable a bare two years ago was here demonstrated: the philosophy and program expressed through the American Council for Judaism are capable of enlisting the profoundest enthusiasm of Americans of Jewish faith.

It is not difficult to understand why a mood, at
From issue of Feb. 1, 1945

once solemn and optimistic, should have been evoked.

For here was a re-discovery of a pattern of emancipation and integration by which millions of Jews are today free men. Here was a meeting based on policies that have been demonstrated in the past 150 years to be of the utmost practicality, in fact to be the *only* practical policy for Jews in the modern world. The conferees recognized what Rabbi Berger profoundly pointed out, that "The Council is derived from a creative and practical ideal; from a program that has worked with astounding success in the lives of Jews in almost all parts of the world; a program that represents the normal human desires of Jews as normal human beings. . . . The process of making the man whose faith is Judaism stronger by identifying him with his neighbor in every way but his religion has worked. It will work again unless Jews themselves stultify the process."

Furthermore, they responded to the hope and challenge inherent in the Council's program. Some 25 years ago there were other voices of disaster that spoke of the millions of Jews of Russia as hopelessly lost unless there was a Jewish state to which they could emigrate *en masse*. History proved that the then Zionist protagonists of disaster were wrong.

Ever since the overthrow of Czarism, the Jews of Russia have been free and equal citizens and have suffered no discrimination by virtue of being Jews. It is true that for a time the official Soviet attitude

was hostile to religion; an attitude that has since been altered. But this affected all religious groups and did not single Jews out in the traditional pattern of anti-Semitism. The result is that the Jews of the U.S.S.R. are today integrated citizens of their country, living in complete equality of status with their fellow citizens.

Against the views of the American Council for Judaism, against its faith in America, in the advance of democracy and in the vitality of emancipation, the Zionists continue to offer a program based on frustration, defeatism and dissatisfaction. In an article by Dr. Kurt Blumenfeld in the "New Palestine" of January 19th, the official publication of the Zionist Organization of America, these notes are echoed and re-echoed.

"When a Zionist," writes Dr. Blumenfeld, "fails clearly to assert that he himself belongs to the Jewish nation, he shows that he wants Palestine to be the home only of oppressed, broken and penniless Jews. He wants to be a Zionist by proxy, and thus succeeds escaping all problems inherent in the Zionist attitude toward the re-creation of a Jewish nation."

And again. "The Jew who meets the Zionist movement now has to be confronted with and struck by the tragedy of the Jewish problem. Only when he realizes that he himself might be the victim tomorrow or the day after tomorrow will he react to the appeal of Zionism. A person who has true human value—and there are valuable elements among Jew-

ish youngsters everywhere—starts to think after having felt the shock.”

Thus is the Zionist nationalist propaganda of defeatism continuing its corrosive process. Thus there is maintained a process of undermining faith in democratic institutions, in emancipation, in the integrity of the position of the Jews in democratic countries.

Against that black sense of defeatism, this fomenting of mass dissatisfaction, the American Council for Judaism projects its platform and enunciates its clarion call to go still further on the road to emancipation and freedom. For it must be clear that the Zionist nationalist agitation reaches out beyond refugees or war-torn communities. The proposals for evacuation based on Jews as a national group involve the surrender of hard won rights whereby Jews enjoyed the full benefits of emancipation as members of a religious faith but as nationals of many countries. Such proposals, therefore, can have consequences far beyond their original impact.

Thus is this gauntlet thrown in the face of all that emancipation has achieved for millions and millions of Jews—for the overwhelming majority. Thus the pessimism and escapism of the Zionist nationalist program come up in sharp contradiction to the eternal aspirations of a free democratic world, as embodied, in regard to the lives of Jews, in the philosophy and program of the American Council for Judaism.

INTERNATIONAL POWER POLITICS VS. HUMAN BEINGS

ON February 13th, public announcement was first made of a split in the United Jewish Appeal, heretofore the combined fund-raising agency of the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal. The announcement, in the form of a statement by Mr. Paul Baerwald, pointed out that J.D.C. had offered to continue the 1944 agreement into the current year, that this was rejected by U.P.A., that U.P.A. also turned down the proposal of a special mediation committee of the Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds, and that U.P.A. will conduct its own national campaign.

At this writing it appears that the appeals for funds needed by the J.D.C. and the U.P.A. will be carried on independently although local communities may continue their joint fund-raising effort. The pressure from the communities may yet effect a merger of the two appeals. Yet, the underlying issues remain and they will not be solved by temporary compromises or appeasements.

Clearly, the officers of U.P.A. were determined to break the united fund raising effort of the past year. That this should come from a group which has shouted "unity" from the housetops and, under cover of that slogan, undertaken to suppress divergent opinion should occasion no surprise to those familiar with the history of Zionist tactics. Their

From issue of March 1, 1945

traditional procedure has been to raise "unity" as a rallying cry on all occasions where it served Zionist-nationalist purposes best, while united effort that did not suit Zionist purposes was ruthlessly discarded. Despite the verbal idealization of, and lip-service to, unity, the record makes it clear that the unity cry has been used only as a tool.

We of the American Council for Judaism have never enshrined unity as an end in and of itself. Common action for common purposes, where there is genuine agreement is one thing. But artificial unity on irreconcilable principles has not seemed to us either worthy or attainable. We are too sobered by the experience of the arbitrary unity imposed by totalitarianism.

We believe it important to evaluate principles—and to express them. We believe it salutary to take proper count of legitimate expressions of honest, differing viewpoints. We believe that common action can be attained only where different viewpoints are taken into account and those areas ascertained in which common action is possible. Thus, since all American Jews were united in a desire to bring about the abrogation of the White Paper, we were ready to join in united action. The Zionist forces on the other hand determined to sacrifice that unity in a partisan zeal to press a Jewish Commonwealth demand on which there was honest disagreement.

The decision of U.P.A. to break off the United Jewish Appeal may serve a salutary purpose.

A statement by Rabbi James G. Heller, national chairman of U.P.A., makes clear the motivation behind the breach of unity brought about by the Zionist organizations representing U.P.A. Their rationale is expressly stated: the U.P.A. leadership has determined to stress above all things "the centrality of the position of Palestine as the pivot and foundation of the Jewish future."

Against that centrality, there is another emphasis, the emphasis of the American Council for Judaism since its establishment and, we believe, the emphasis of the J.D.C. since it was first founded. That centrality is not an ideology, or an international political game—or power politics for a Jewish state. The centrality of the J.D.C. service is concern *for people, for human beings, for meeting the problem where the problem exists, for Jews in distress, for Jews who must be helped during a period of their desperate need for help* without regard to nationalist dogmas and struggles for political power.

Long ago we declared in an editorial in *Information Bulletin*: "We stand at a cross-roads of decision, at a time of indescribable tragedy for our co-religionists in Axis Europe. Are we to be occupied with the creation of a Jewish National State? Or are we to be concerned with human lives, the lives of harassed and driven Jews? We believe it a crucial wrong to confuse the two. One is a contention for a political ideology. The other is a battle for the elementary rights of men."

That basic issue remains. With the dissolution of the United Jewish Appeal American Jews may have a better opportunity to determine whether they assume for themselves an obligation to a foreign political party seeking to establish a foreign political state; or whether they regard as central, the ancient tradition of the Jewish faith: philanthropy, compassion and brotherly love.

THE COLOSSAL GAMBLE

THE historic Crimean Conference has overshadowed another conference that was held during the same time—a meeting of representatives of Near Eastern and Arab states. All reports agree on the growing unity among the Near Eastern States. Their cohesion is constantly advancing. There are, of course, differences and a jealous guarding of independence; much as there was in the association of colonies that led to the creation of the United States of America. But no correspondent has failed to point to the powerful forces at work for union.

Moreover, every qualified reporter agrees that opposition to the Zionist-nationalist political program has been a major, perhaps a primary, factor in this cohesive process. The countries of the Near East are reported as prepared to moderate opposition to the immigration of Jews as Jews. But their hostility to the Zionist political program is complete.

This development is serious in a region vital to the peace of the entire world. For years Zionists have attempted to obscure the reality of the awakening Near East. For years they have pooh-poohed the strength of the nationalism of the Near East. For years they have described those nationalisms as artificial and hollow while picturing their own nationalism as genuine. But the reality has outlived the propaganda. The facts now speak loudly for

From issue of March 15, 1945

themselves: *Zionism has solidified the opinion of the Near Eastern world.*

This means at the very least that the Palestine Jewish community is an island in a sea of peoples who have been alienated to the point of embitterment by the Zionist political agitation. The significance of this situation must be particularly clear to American Jews who are alert to the compelling need of cultivating understanding and good will and harmonious relations between Jews and non-Jews in the United States. Millions of dollars are being spent every year to help the processes of understanding and brotherhood and good will in this country. At the very same time the situation in Palestine, to which American Jews have contributed so generously, has deteriorated to the point where the Jewish and the non-Jewish communities are at dagger-points.

The increasing hostility among the Near Eastern states must also be considered if there is to be a Jewish state in a partitioned Palestine. From its beginning such a state would have to contend with the proclaimed, violent hostility of every one of its immediate neighbors. Certainly, never in all history has a newly created state been weighed down with so burdensome a handicap.

The situation has implications beyond Palestine's Jews. There are large numbers of Jews in the countries of the Near East and North Africa. There were before the war over 600,000 Jews residing in that

area. In a Foreign Policy Association report on the Near East, John S. Badeau, pointed out: "The root of the trouble was in the announced *political* objective of Zionism to create in Palestine not a national *home*, but a national *state* — which could only be a Jewish state, which therefore could not be an Arab state. What the Arab objected to was the intrusion (to him) of a foreign people, apparently bent on gaining political control of his country with the help of money and protection supplied by the West. He therefore fought Jewish immigration, not because he resented the Jew as a Jew, but the Jew as Zionist."

A continued embitterment, however, makes easy a transfer from hostility to the Jew as Zionist to *hostility to the Jew as Jew*. This may well mean that for every Jew given temporary sanctuary in Palestine in the past ten years, the position and security of another Jew in the Near East and Africa are placed in jeopardy as a result of the Zionist political drive for domination.

Yet the Zionist nationalist agitation continues. Yet the Zionist propaganda still emphasizes power politics and a so-called "Jewish state," at a time when the imperative need is to assure security and equality of status for all Jews.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann continues to speak of a "Jewish nation" and, by coupling it with reference to a million of the Jewish faith who are in the armed forces of the United Nations, implies a pre-

sumptive claim—as if they were nationals of a Jewish state and not what they really are: Americans of Jewish faith, or English citizens of Jewish faith, of French or Russians of Jewish faith, etc,

Against this background, the American Jewish community is called upon to underwrite a political program whose explosive possibilities are becoming more and more apparent with every week that passes. Against this reality Americans of Jewish faith are being asked to back a colossal gamble with their united political support and with millions upon millions of dollars.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

THE imminence of the San Francisco Conference has brought into the forefront a proposal made by various Zionist bodies for so-called Jewish representation, not only in San Francisco but at other sessions of what may well be a series of conferences on problems of the peace. The proposal is not limited to suggestions that Jewish organizations be present as advisers, as consultants, as experts on the problems of Jews. It has taken on, instead, two specific terms: one, that representation be officially secured at such international conferences in behalf of a so-called "Jewish people"; two, a variant of this proposal (and the two are frequently blurred and confused), is representation in behalf of the Jews of Palestine.

This proposal is so revolutionary in character that it calls for careful reflection by American Jews and by all those gravely concerned with a sound world order. However cloaked it is in ambiguous terms, the nature of the proposal is such that every precaution must be taken to avoid irreparable injury to the status of Jews the world over.

The facts are that the Conference is a conference of sovereign states, and that Jews are citizens of various sovereign states. In the very nature of the society of nations Jews can have no political objectives apart from the fundamental interests of the countries of which they are an integral part. Once

From issue of April 15, 1945

we take account of this reality — the only reality which offers basic security to Jews the world over — the threat of the proposed Jewish representation becomes clear. For in effect it would mean a double representation at the peace conferences for Jews all over the world. They would be represented through the authorized delegations of the states of which the Jewish citizens are integral parts. In addition, they would have another status, ambiguous in character, without established responsibility or authority, but carrying with it implications of a special and distinctive political identification of all Jews which might, at points, conflict with their representation in the other capacity. One may well ask how this demand can effect the Jewish war sufferers of Europe who need, above all, a restoration of their position as integral parts of their countries and the full concern of their countries for their rehabilitation?

This proposal has already created a ripple of disturbance in friendly non-Jewish circles. The leading Protestant publication in this country, *The Christian Century* (a magazine whose articles and editorials have time and again been disseminated by Jewish organizations because they were so helpful to an understanding of anti-Semitism and the problems of Jews), had an extensive editorial on this proposal from which the following is taken:

"When a Jewish body," *The Christian Century* says, "asks that special representatives be seated, as Jews, in the councils of nations it is by implication

maintaining that Jewry is a separate nationality, and that Jews should be treated, not as Americans or Englishmen or Frenchmen or Germans or Palestinians, but as something else—as persons with an allegiance which differs from that of all other citizens of their countries.”

This is the first manifestation of general public opinion. It will unquestionably be followed by others. For the rationale of a special Jewish representation can only give substance to a doctrine already too widely disseminated by Dr. Goebbels in a propaganda program separating Jews from their fellow citizens and attaching to Jews the label of an alien status.

The other form of this proposal is that of a representation of the Jews of Palestine. In this form the recommendation is presumably supported by reference to the Balfour Declaration, although the precise meaning of that document has long been in debate and its present relevance is questionable in the light of situations unforeseen at the time the Declaration was originally issued.

But even that document is clear at one point. For it contains a specific provision that “nothing shall be done which may prejudice . . . the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.”

How is this provision, one of the *conditions* to the pledge of the Balfour Declaration, affected by the proposal for a so-called Jewish representation?

Americans of Jewish faith are citizens of the United States whose representation is in an authorized American delegation. We have a right not to be misrepresented. No one other than the American delegation can speak in our name.

A similar condition exists for those of Jewish faith who are citizens of other lands. Except for stateless Jews and stateless non-Jews whose status is the proper concern of an agency of the United Nations, Jews of the various sovereign countries will be represented through their respective national delegations.

Palestine is a mandated country and in due course provision will be made for hearings on the fate and status of specific mandated countries. We are confident that in all proposals affecting mandated territories the American Government will be concerned to safeguard the legitimate interests of all the elements of each mandated territory. Under such circumstances spokesmen of Palestine will no doubt provide adequately for Jews, Moslems and Christians in that country.

The voice of Palestine Jewish representatives, if and when heard, can not and must not be permitted to extend an authority or a presumptive claim to Jews outside of Palestine. In the very nature of things Jews outside of Palestine must be represented and spoken for by no delegation other than the accredited representatives of the countries of which they are integral and equal citizens.