

Ε12782

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

Jewish Life in Modern Times (1st Edition, 1914;
2nd Edition, Revised, 1929).

The Ruhlben Prison Camp (1917).

The Journal of a Jewish Traveller (1925).

A Ghetto Gallery (1931).

Britain's Nameless Ally (1942).

The Jews in the War (1st Edition, 1942; 2nd Edition,
Revised, 1943).

History of the Jews in Vilna (Philadelphia, 1943).

The Progress of Zionism (7th Revised Edition, 1944. French
Edition, 1945).

**THE
ZIONIST MOVEMENT**

by
ISRAEL COHEN

NAWAB SALAR JUNG B. KHAN

**LONDON: FREDERICK MULLER LTD.
29 GREAT JAMES STREET, W.C.1**

FIRST PUBLISHED BY FREDERICK MULLER LTD.

IN 1945

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY

THE CAMELOT PRESS LTD.

LONDON AND SOUTHAMPTON



A LABOUR OF LOVE

FOR

T. C.

PREFACE

FORTY years ago the only literature in English about Zionism consisted of a translation that I made of a pamphlet by Dr. Max Nordau, which gave an account of the movement during the first few years after the advent of Herzl. Since then, in consequence of the enormous progress that has taken place, there has grown up a vast and voluminous literature in various languages, dealing with all the multifarious aspects of the Jewish national movement. There are many books that describe all the stages and the different types of Jewish agricultural colonisation in Palestine, there are many that depict the social and cultural features of the new life in the country, there are many that discuss Britain's political relations with it, there are some devoted solely to the question of the administration of the Mandate, and there are others that concentrate on the Arab problem. There are also countless reports and pamphlets detailing the manifold activities of the Zionist Organisation and of its affiliated bodies both in Palestine and in the rest of the world; there is quite a substantial library of publications by the British and the Palestine Governments on the processes, methods, and results of the implementation of the Mandate; and there are verbatim records of the proceedings of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, before which the Mandatory had to appear every year for a searching cross-examination. Few countries have given birth to so many White Papers in so short a space of time as the Holy Land, and few episodes of such a local character as the Arab revolt of 1936-39 have given occasion to the production of so many books. But despite this great and growing accumulation of literature on the efforts of Zionism to realise its aspirations, there has been no comprehensive history of the movement. Adolf Boehm's two stout volumes (*Die Zionistische Bewegung*) carried the story only up to the year 1925, and Sokolow's *History of Zionism*, also in two portly tomes, did not go beyond 1919. Since then there have been no attempts in English to present a general account of Zionist history, except for a couple of books (by Leonard Stein in 1925 and by Lotta Levensohn in 1941), both possessed of unquestioned merits, but rather small in compass.

It was thus to fill a want that has been keenly felt, especially at the present juncture in the affairs of the Jewish people, that I have written this book. The task has not been easy, and had I not been

favoured with the special knowledge gathered in the course of a long and intimate connection with the Movement, I should probably have found it impossible of accomplishment. For I have lived through much of the modern history that I have described. I was fortunate to be present at the first public meeting in London addressed by Herzl in July, 1896. I was a delegate at the Conference in March, 1898, that led to the establishment of the English Zionist Federation. I have attended every Zionist Congress since that of 1903, the last over which Herzl presided, and have taken an official part in every Congress since that of 1911. For a period extending over thirty years, from the spring of 1910, I was in the secretariat of the Central Office of the Zionist Organisation, and in the closest association with a long succession of Executives, first in Cologne, next in Berlin, and longest of all in London—an experience shared by no other person. I have thus had the privilege of observing the evolution of the movement from a specially favoured vantage-point.

The difficulty in composing this book has been due only partly to the problem of compressing a vast amount of multifarious and important material within a reasonable space. It has been due largely to the fact that the history of Zionism, from the beginning of its modern phase, is not what might be described as a "single-track" narrative. There are several tracks, which sometimes run parallel, frequently meet, and then part again, but which must always be closely followed to watch subsequent meetings and partings. The scene of operations often shifts, and there are sometimes major operations in two places simultaneously. There are the activities of the Zionist and Jewish Agency Executives in London and Jerusalem, the manifold aspects of the colonising work in Palestine, the relations between the Mandatory Government and the Jewish Agency, the relations between the Government and the Mandates Commission, the discussions and decisions about all these things at the Congresses and the Jewish Agency Council, and the normal and occasionally abnormal programmes of work carried out by the numerous constituent bodies of the Zionist Organisation in all parts of the world. I have attempted to unfold this political kaleidoscope in logical and chronological sequence, to provide both a history of the movement from the earliest times as well as a picture of the variegated conditions of the present day. I have tried to reveal both the continuity and the fervour of the Jewish national aspiration and the extent to which it has thus far been realised. I have not suppressed the disappointments and the

disillusionments that have occurred only too often, and have set forth the reasoned justification of the complaints and criticisms that have had to be made. I have sought to explain and to stress the hope that throbs in the hearts of millions of Jews in this critical and fateful time concerning the national destinies of their people. In short, the purpose of this book is to spread knowledge and understanding of an age-long ideal battling for fulfilment, for in that way the ideal can assuredly be helped forward towards its goal.

I should like to express my warmest thanks to my friend, Sir Leon Simon, C.B., who has kindly read through this book in typescript, for many valuable suggestions, by which I have benefited. I am also much indebted to Mr. Ephraim Broido for reading the proofs and making additional useful suggestions.

I. C.

LONDON.

On the Eve of Hanukah, 5705—December 10th, 1944,
Anniversary of the Victory of the Maccabean War of
Independence.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	15

Definition of Zionism—The resultant of a complex of forces—A cardinal religious ideal—Reform Judaism and the "Mission of Israel"—Advocates of realisation—Founding of Political Zionism—Grounds of opposition—Nation or religious community—"Dual nationality"—Political and economic factors—Oppression in Eastern Europe—Anti-Semitism—Moral and material considerations—Attitude of Ottoman Government—Balfour Declaration—Practical Developments in Palestine—The War and the Future.

PART I

THE PERIOD OF ASPIRATION

CHAPTER I. PALESTINE SINCE THE DISPERSION	27
---	----

Jews in Palestine throughout the centuries—Struggles for independence—Local autonomy under the Romans—The "Wailing Wall"—Promises to restore independence—Palestine in Jewish law—Under Arabs and Seljuk Turks—Scholastic activity in ninth and tenth centuries—The Crusaders—Judah Ha-Levi—Benjamin of Tudela and other pilgrims—Under Saladin and the Mamelukes—Nahmanides, Estori Farhi, and Obadiah of Bertinoro—Under Ottoman rule—The Cabbalists at Safed—Don Joseph Nasi, Duke of Naxos—Jerusalem in sixteenth century—The *Hakabah*—Succession of Pseudo-Messiahs—Settlements of Hassidim and *Mithnagedim*—Under Egyptian régime—Renewal of Turkish rule—Capitulations.

CHAPTER II. THE ADVOCACY OF RESTORATION	43
---	----

Early secular proposals for restoration—Napoleon's appeal—An anonymous letter—Appeals of writers and clergymen in England—Sir Moses Montefiore's visits to Palestine—Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Palmerston—Colonel Charles Henry Churchill—Colonel George Gawler—Mordecai Manuel Noah—Arthur Hollingsworth—Montefiore's pioneer work in Palestine—Warren, Conder, and Cazalet—Laurence Oliphant—Joseph Salvador—Ernest Laharanne—Jean Henri Dunant—Zevi Hirsch Kalischer—Founding of Mikveh Israel—Moses Hess—*Rome and Jerusalem*—The *Haskalah* in Russia—David Gordon—Peretz Smolenskin—Moses Leib Lilienblum—Eliezer ben Yehudah—Leon Pinsker's *Auto-Emancipation*.

PART II

THE PERIOD OF PREPARATION

CHAPTER III. THE "LOVE OF ZION" MOVEMENT	58
--	----

Persecution in Russia—*Hoove Zion* societies—The *Bilu*—The first settlements in Palestine—The Kattowitz Conference and after—Activity in Rumania, Austria, Germany, England, and the United States—Nathan Birnbaum—Emma Lazarus—Ahad Haam and Spiritual Zionism—"Sons of Moses"—The work of Baron Edmond de Rothschild—Defects of administration—Handicaps of *Hibbath Zion* Movement.

CHAPTER IV. HERZL: POLITICAL ZIONISM 67

The advent of Theodor Herzl—Literary career—The Dreyfus Affair—*The Jewish State*—Approach to Baron de Hirsch—Opposition to Herzl's ideas—The first supporters—Founding of *Die Welt*—The First Zionist Congress—The Basle Programme—Organisation and administration—*Hatikanah*—Spread of political Zionism—Jewish Colonial Trust—Audiences with German Emperor—The London Congress—"Democratic Fraction"—Founding of Jewish National Fund—Negotiations with Sultan of Turkey—Appearance before Aliens Immigration Commission in London—*Altneuland*—The Sinai Peninsula Project—British Government's East African offer—Visit to Russia—Decision of Sixth Congress—The Kharkov Conference—Audiences with King of Italy and Pope Pius X—Death of Herzl—Summary of his achievements.

CHAPTER V. POLITICAL AND PRACTICAL ZIONISM 83

Report on the East African offer—The *Zionist Zion*—Decision of Seventh Congress—Founding of Jewish Territorial Organisation—Transition to practical work in Palestine—Mizrachi and Poale Zion—David Wolffsohn as President—Opposition in various countries—Zionist Deputies in Russian Duma and Austrian Parliament—The Brussels Conference—Wolffsohn's visit to Russia—The Young Turkish Revolution—The struggle between the "politicals" and the "practicals"—Transfer of Zionist headquarters to Berlin—Cultural questions at Eleventh Congress.

CHAPTER VI. THE BEGINNINGS OF ZIONIST COLONISATION 93

Transfer of the Rothschild settlements to the "I.C.A."—Colonising activity of *Hapoel Zion*—The Second *Aliyah*—The Anglo-Palestine Bank—Herzl *Gymnasium* and Bezalel—Work of Palestine Office—Founding of Tel-Aviv—Palestine Land Development Company—Training Farms—Yemenites—Character of Jewish agriculturists—Ideology of Poale Zion and Hapoel Hatzair—Ber Borochov and Aaron D. Gordon—*Hashomer*—The first co-operative farms—The *Abuzoth*—Revival of Hebrew—Jewish school system—Hebrew language conflict.

PART III

THE PERIOD OF RESTORATION

CHAPTER VII. PALESTINE AS BRITISH TRUST 103

The First World War—Suppression of Zionist institutions in Palestine—Zion Mule Corps and the "Judeans"—Great Britain's interest—Genesis and evolution of Balfour Declaration—Divided counsels in English Jewry—Motives of the British Government—Endorsements by Allied and Associated Powers—Statements by Central Powers—Interpretations of Balfour Declaration—Zionist Commission in Palestine—Foundation of Hebrew University—Communal organisation—Feisal-Weizmann Agreement—Arab delegations before Peace Conference—Demands of Zionist delegation—Attitude of Military Administration in Palestine—Arab reactions—Trumpeldor's heroic fight—Disorders of 1920—Conferment of Mandate on Great Britain—Sir Herbert Samuel appointed first High Commissioner.

CHAPTER VIII. EXPANSION AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE MOVEMENT 122

Post-war growth of Zionism—The Conference of 1919—Establishment of Central Office in London—Resolutions of Conference of 1920—Controversy about funds and investments—Founding of Keren Hayesod—Reorganisation Commission—Twelfth Congress—Resolution on development of Palestine—Providing the budget—Relations between Keren Hayesod and Keren Kayemeth—Revision of Constitution—Election of new Executive—Political affairs—The Geneva Bureau—Zionist Press—Relations with Federations—Zionist parties—Women's International Zionist Organisation—Youth and university societies.

CHAPTER IX. THE PALESTINE MANDATE 135

Establishment of Civil Administration in Palestine—Advisory Council—Hebrew as an official language—Communal reorganisation—Election of the Mufti of Jerusalem and of President of Supreme Moslem Council—Transjordan made Arab Emirate—Mr. Churchill rejects Arabs demands—Disorders of 1921—Haycraft Commission of Enquiry—Arab delegation in London—Debate in House of Lords—White Paper of 1922—Defining the Jewish National Home—House of Commons Debate—Ratification of Mandate—Redrafting of Preamble and Article 2—Palestine Order-in-Council—Arabs reject new Advisory Council and Arab Agency—Government's reports to Mandates Commission of League of Nations—American-British Convention—Inauguration of Hebrew University—Balfour in Palestine—Progress under the Samuel Administration—Lord Plumer as High Commissioner—Legislative measures and administrative changes—Economic developments—Arab Congress's demands.

CHAPTER X. BUILDING THE NATIONAL HOME, 1919-29 153

The Palestine Zionist Executive—Immigration Ordinances—Organisation of immigration—*Hahutzim*—Economic depression and relief measures—General Federation of Jewish Labour: organisation activities—Agricultural developments—Main types of settlement—*Kvutzah* and *Moshav Ovdim*—Activities of Jewish National Fund—Urban developments—Census of industries—Electricity, cement, oil, and other industries—Anglo-Palestine Bank and other financial corporations—Educational system—Hebrew University—Organisation of health work—Hadassah and *Kupath Holim—Knesseth Israel* and *Vaad Leumi*.

CHAPTER XI. EXTENSION OF THE JEWISH AGENCY 169

The Mandate and a "Jewish agency"—Decision of Carlsbad Conference of 1922—First negotiations with Anglo-Jewish representatives—Decision of Carlsbad Congress of 1923—New Executive—Non-partisan conferences in New York—Formation of Revisionist Party—Resolutions of Vienna Congress of 1925—Agreement of Weizmann with Louis Marshall—Joint Palestine Survey Commission—Basle Congress of 1927—Findings of Survey Commission—Agreement reached by conference of American Jews—Zurich Congress of 1929 resolves to extend Jewish Agency—Inaugural session of Council of enlarged Agency—Constitution of Agency—British Government's assurance to Zionist Organisation.

CHAPTER XII. OUTRAGES, ENQUIRIES, AND CONGRESSES . . . 182

Relations between Jews and Arabs—Right of Worship at "Wailing Wall"—Arab agitation—Anti-Jewish outrages of 1929—Shaw Commission of Enquiry—Findings of Commission—Reservations by Lord Snell—Criticism of Commission's Report—Sir John Hope Simpson's mission—Mandates Commission and Shaw Report—Simpson's Report—Passfield White Paper—Prime Minister's Letter of 1931—Enquiry by Mr. Lewis French—"Displaced Arabs"—Proposed Palestine Loan—Reorganisation of Police—Mr. Strickland's Enquiry—Investigation of Administration—International Commission on "Wailing Wall"—Basle Congress of 1931—Sokolow elected President of Zionist Organisation and Jewish Agency—Prague Congress of 1933—Assassination of Arlosoroff—Revisionists and discipline—"New Zionist Organisation"—Lucerne Congress of 1935—German Jewry and *Hebrews*—Dr. Weizmann's re-election as President.

CHAPTER XIII. THE ARAB REVOLT 204

Arab demand for self-government—Disorders of 1933—Proposed Legislative Council—Jewish Agency's objection—Arab Higher Committee proclaims general strike—Campaign of terror—Appointment of Palestine Royal Commission—Findings on Arab and Jewish grievances—"Palliatives" recommended—Question of cantons—Proposed plan of partition—British Government's statement of policy—Resolutions of Zurich Congress of 1937—Decisions of Jewish Agency Council—Conclusions of Mandates Commission—Resumption of Arab terrorism—Counter-measures by Government—Results of three years' violence.

CHAPTER XIV. FROM PARTITION SCHEMES TO WHITE PAPER . . . 217

Government retreat from partition plan—Partition Commission's Report—Jewish Agency's comment—Government conferences with Jews and Arabs—White Paper of 1939—Statement by Jewish Agency—Decision of House of Commons—Rejection by Mandates Commission—Resolutions of Geneva Congress of 1939—British Government's letter to Secretary-General of League—Stoppage of Immigration into Palestine—Land Transfers Regulations—Government reasons analysed—Violations of Mandate.

CHAPTER XV. PROGRESS IN THE NATIONAL HOME 230

Official obstructions to immigration—Illegality of "political high level"—Fluctuations of immigration—"Illegal" immigrants—Immigration and population—Land in Jewish ownership—Establishment of new settlements—Agricultural improvements—Citrus plantations—Dairy produce—Manufacturing industries—Electricity and potash—Commercial developments—Haifa and Tel-Aviv ports—Marine affairs and fishing—Co-operative movement—Census of wage-earners—Activities of Keren Hayesod, National Fund, and other Zionist bodies—The W.I.Z.O.—Anglo-Palestine Bank and other financial corporations—Total amount of Jewish capital—*Tishbi's* expenditure on public services—Benefits to Government and to Arabs.

CHAPTER XVI. NATIONAL LIFE IN EVOLUTION 245

The *Yishuv* a highly organised national community—Revival of Hebrew—School system—Agricultural training—Haifa Technical Institute—Bezalel School—Hebrew University—Medical Centre—Institutes of Jewish and Oriental Studies—National Library—Museum of Archaeology—Bialik Foundation—Kook Institute—Literary activity—Ben Yehuda and Imber—Bialik as poet, publisher, and teacher—Tchernichowski's works—Fichman, Lamdan, Rachel, Brenner, and others—Journalism—Hebrew dailies and other periodicals—Plastic arts—Dramatic companies—Palestine Symphony Orchestra—Song and dance—Organisation of Jewish health work—Sport—The "Maccabiad"—Differences in *Yishuv*—Eastern and Western Elements—*Aliyah Hadashah*—Diversity of political parties—Differences in religious observance—Safeguarding tradition—Sabbaths and festivals—Social justice.

CHAPTER XVII. ZIONISM IN THE DIASPORA 261

Federations and Separate Unions—Activities of societies—Shekel campaign—Conditions in Eastern Europe—Zionism in political and cultural life—*Tarbut*—Suppression in Soviet Russia—Expansion in Austria and Germany—*Jüdische Rundschau*—Czechoslovakia and Hungary—Position in France, Italy and rest of Continent—Progress in Great Britain: political activity—Activities in Canada, South Africa, and the Antipodes—Importance of movement in United States—Emergency Committee in New York—American Jewish Conference—Argentina, Brazil, and other parts of South America—North Africa—From Near East to Far East—Functions of Congress—Meetings of Jewish Agency organs and other bodies—A vast clearing-house.

CHAPTER XVIII. THE SECOND WORLD WAR 278

Varied effects upon Zionist world—Dr. Weizmann's offer to Great Britain—Voluntary registration of *Yishuv*—Economic effects—Tragedies of refugee ships—Recruiting of Jewish volunteers—Abortive negotiations for Jewish Fighting Force—Jewish contribution to defence forces—Military service in Near and Middle East—Transport and public works—Services at sea—Agricultural developments—Industry in war service—Scientific and technical contributions—Immigration of refugees—Efforts on behalf of Hitler's victims—White Paper policy in Palestine—Trials for arms smuggling—Aspersions upon *Yishuv*—The *Haganah*—Raid upon Ramath Hakovesh—The White Paper *versus* Balfour Declaration.

CHAPTER XIX. PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE 293

Policy of the White Paper—Salvaging European Jewry—Post-war solutions—Minority rights and financial reparations—The abortive Evian Conference—Failure of previous attempts to find lands of refuge—Abrogation of White Paper necessary—Primary purpose of Mandate—White Paper contrary to Mandate and to declared British policy—Position following termination of Mandate—Case for Arab State examined—Testimony of Royal Commission—A binational State a frustration of Jewish hopes—Bases for Jewish claim to State—Palestine's value to Jews and to Arabs compared—Official resolution on Jewish Commonwealth—Question of Palestine's absorptive capacity—Durable settlement of Jewish question by realisation of national aspirations.

up in the language of their forefathers, with their faces towards the holy Mount Moriah. Not only in the three regular services of the day, but also in the elaborate grace after every meal, they uttered or chanted their supplications for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the sanctuary of Zion. Physically they might live within the walls of a European Ghetto, but spiritually they were encircled by the hills of ancient Judæa. Their religious festivals commemorated momentous events in their early history; their fasts, which were real days of mourning, recalled the disasters that had befallen their State. Their Scriptures, upon which they were bidden to meditate day and night, filled their minds with scenes of the land in which their kings had ruled, their prophets had taught, and their Psalmists had sung. The Talmud and other religious works which they studied, often at the peril of their lives, gave them comforting glimpses of the land that their fathers had tilled and of the Temple in which they had worshipped. No preacher in their midst ever concluded his sermon without the Hebrew invocation, "And may the Redeemer come unto Zion!" to which the whole congregation responded with a fervid "Amen!" Twice a year, at the domestic celebration of the Passover and at the termination of the Day of Atonement, they declared with sincere emotion: "Next year in Jerusalem!" And it was a real and physical Zion to which they looked forward, not the "new Jerusalem" of the Christian mystic. That was why, throughout the Middle Ages, there were Rabbis, poets, and other pietists, who went on pilgrimages to the Holy Land, to spend their declining years in religious study and to be buried there. The Jew who was unable to undertake such a hazardous journey was deemed fortunate if, when he died, a handful of earth from Mount Moriah was placed under his head in the grave, so that he might rest on sacred soil; and the liturgical formula of comfort for mourners is to this day: "May the Lord comfort you amongst all those that mourn for Zion and Jerusalem!" If any further proof were needed of the intensity with which the Jews clung to the belief in their restoration, it was provided repeatedly by their enthusiastic response to the calls of the various false Messiahs, who appeared at intervals during the first seventeen centuries after the fall of Judæa, rending the gloom with a glorious vision that was soon dispelled.

Such was the faith that animated all Jews until the early part of the nineteenth century, when certain Rabbis in Germany, influenced by the teaching of the philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn,

and his disciples, began to express a different view. They were votaries of the doctrine of "enlightenment," as it was called, who saw the salvation of their people solely in the adoption of the language, culture and customs of their Christian neighbours. They were anxious to further, not only the intellectual progress, but also the political emancipation of their people by secular education, and they also thought it necessary to reform the ritual of the Synagogue and to revise its doctrines in accordance with the conditions of their time and environment. These founders of Reform Judaism, notably Samuel Holdheim (1806-60) and Abraham Geiger (1810-74), maintained that the belief in a personal Messiah who would conduct the scattered children of Israel back to their ancestral land must be abandoned, and they expunged from the liturgy all prayers for his coming and the restoration of Zion. In place of these dethroned aspirations, the German reformers conceived a new theory: that the reason for the dispersion of the Jews was to discharge a mission among the Gentiles—the propagation of a universal Monotheism through Judaism. But such a "mission of Israel," however laudable in itself, is alien to Jewish tradition and contradicted by the facts of Jewish history. The Rabbis from the earliest times were strongly opposed to proselytisation, and insisted upon most exacting tests in the case of any person who wished to adopt the Jewish faith.

The theory of such a mission was a complete innovation, and was specifically devised to afford a justification for the continued existence of the Jews as a religious community after denying them the character of a nation. It was accepted by only a few congregations in Germany, England, and the United States. The overwhelming majority of Jewry regarded the dispersion, not as a blessing, but as a punishment, and continued to declare, in the words of their ancient liturgy, "Because of our sins have we been exiled from our land," and to pray for the rebuilding of Jerusalem "speedily in our days." They did not, indeed, deny that it was the duty of the Jews, as "the people of the Book," to proclaim the unity of God, to spread the principles of truth and justice, and to act as exemplars of social righteousness, but they maintained that it was unnecessary for them to remain in dispersion to perform this civilising function. They had learned only too well from their centuries of tribulation that they were powerless to teach their persecutors, and that any deliberate attempt to do so would be resented with scorn and rejected with indignation. Besides, if their oppressors were unfaithful to the

teachings of Christianity, what prospect was there of their adopting the more exacting discipline of Judaism? On the contrary, they believed that only with their return to their ancient land and the restoration of their national polity would they be able to develop a scheme of life that would be a pattern to the nations.

It was not until after the middle of the nineteenth century that the first practical steps were taken to convert the ideal into reality, for until then the Jews had been unable, owing to political impotence and difficulties of organisation, to engage in any concerted action. The mere fact that they bestirred themselves, after so prolonged an interval, to organise their return, was a testimony to the undiminished ardour with which they clung to the idea and to their faith in the possibility of its realisation. Their first attempts were preceded by more than seventy years of recurring and insistent advocacy by a number of both Jews and non-Jews of eminence. One of the earliest proposals was made by Napoleon, who, in the course of his Near Eastern campaign at the end of the eighteenth century, announced that he would help to resettle the Jews in Palestine if they would rally to his banner, but his proclamation was but a passing sensation. Thereafter there was scarcely a decade in which some pamphlet or other on the question or some project or other did not make its appearance. In England the idea was urged by a succession of statesmen, clergymen, and writers, most notably by Lord Shaftesbury; in America it was advocated by the politician, Mordecai Noah, in France by the historian, Joseph Salvador, and in Germany, independently, by the Socialist, Moses Hess, and the Orthodox Rabbi, Hirsch Kalischer. But a more powerful incentive to action came from the persecution of the Jews in Russia, which became a regular feature of their unhappy lot under Tsarist tyranny from the year 1881. Societies of "Lovers of Zion" sprang up in many cities in that country, and later also in Rumania, England, and the United States, to promote the resettlement of Jews in Palestine, and their agitation was strongly reinforced by the writings of some Russian Jewish thinkers, who contended that only settlement in a land of their own would assure the Jews salvation from their sufferings. It was Leon Pinsker's trenchant pamphlet, *Auto-Emancipation*, with its insistence upon the need of the Jews to become a nation again in fact as in name, that yielded the most fruitful results, as it was followed by a Conference in 1884, which gave an impetus to the creation of Jewish agricultural villages in Palestine. These settlements had a very arduous struggle owing to

the inexperience of the pioneers, the lack of money, and local difficulties, and they would probably have been doomed to total failure but for the generous assistance readily and repeatedly given by Baron Edmond de Rothschild, of Paris. But however zealous and self-sacrificing those early settlers were, the total fruit of their labours after fifteen years, viewed in relation to the traditional hope of Israel, seemed very meagre, and the support that they received from sympathisers in other countries was scanty and unpromising, when the advent of Theodor Herzl brought about a complete transformation. What had hitherto been in practice no more than a religious-philanthropic movement was now to become an organised political movement.

The first Zionist Congress in 1897 constituted the real foundation of Zionism as a political movement. It formulated the aim of Zionism as consisting in creating for the Jewish people "a Home in Palestine secured by public law," and outlined the practical and political steps to be taken for the achievement of this object. Its decisions immediately aroused vehement antagonism among various sections of Jewry, who either regarded the traditional aspiration as an ideal whose beauty lay in its apparent unattainability, or who thought that the task must be reserved for the coming of the Messiah. The new movement also met, at first, with the opposition of the "Lovers of Zion," because it pronounced against petty colonisation or piecemeal penetration into Palestine, but after a time the "Lovers of Zion" became its most ardent and energetic supporters and merged their activities into the greater scheme. The principal hostility came from those Jews who maintained that the restoration of their people to their ancestral land could be accomplished only by the Messiah, and by another section who contended that it should not be accomplished at all. The opposition was thus based, on the one hand, on purely religious grounds, and, on the other, on supposed political grounds.

The religious opponents were headed by a number of Rabbis in Western Europe and America, who argued that the Jews must await the coming of the Messiah before any move was made in the direction of an organised resettlement in Palestine, and that any attempt to anticipate him betrayed a lack of faith and meant forcing the hands of Providence. But most of the Rabbis of Eastern Europe saw no conflict between the aims of Zionism and the belief in a personal Redeemer: they maintained that to lead back all the Jews to their ancestral country was a herculean task that must indeed await the Messiah, since it could obviously not be accom-

plished by human effort, but that that was no reason why every endeavour should not be made to resettle as many as possible in their own day. Indeed, traditional Judaism had always taught that it was an act of religious merit to redeem as much as possible of the Holy Land from its present owners. Those who opposed the movement on political grounds included most of the lay leaders of the principal Jewish communities and many writers in the Western world. The policy that they urged was termed "assimilation," a conception that varied in scope and import according to its proponents, from complete identification of the Jews with all phases of the life of the people in whose midst they dwelt, save in the matter of religion, to complete absorption in their environment. Their principal motive consisted of the fear that they or their fellow Jews might be suspected by their Christian neighbours of half-hearted loyalty to the State of which they were citizens; but their fear was unjustified, as no spokesman of the Christian world ever uttered such a reproach. Indeed, believing Christians thought it only natural that the Children of Israel should wish to return to their ancestral land.

For the first time the Jews were plunged into a vehement controversy as to whether they were a nation or only a religious community. The dispute raged on both sides of the Atlantic and was carried on in the Press, in the pulpit, and on the platform, as well as in homes, societies, and council chambers: it has, in truth, not ceased to this day, although, in consequence of later developments, it has long lost its original bitterness. Until the advent of Herzl, the term "nation" had been used in regard to the Jews for centuries both by themselves and by Christian divines and scholars without provoking any doubts or contradiction, for it did not convey any political connotation. But now the Jewish opponents of Zionism, who had previously regarded the term as innocuous or figurative, either sought to give it a purely spiritual significance or else denied its aptness altogether. They could not, however, argue away the complexity of attributes and qualities that the Jews possessed in common apart from their religion—their descent from a common stock, their ancient language, their literature, their folklore, their centuries of suffering, their hopes and their solidarity, all of which sufficed to constitute them a nation. There was no need to prove racial purity, for no other nation could lay claim to it, nor was such purity an essential quality of nationhood; neither did it affect the issue that many Jews were ignorant of their literature, of which much was of a secular character, and

likewise of their ancestral tongue. Both literature and language still lived, and flourished, binding together the scattered groups of a historic people, and forming important factors in the preservation of the distinctive identity of the Jews. It was as a nation that they had always regarded themselves from the first day of their exile — as a nation in exile; while, on the other hand, many Jews who contended that they were only a religious community were not particularly distinguished by their observance of the rites and precepts of their faith. The adherents of Zionism, however, while maintaining that the Jews were a nation, naturally did not claim that they formed a political nationality, for this implied State sovereignty, which they did not possess.¹ They likewise denied that they claimed or were guilty of "dual nationality," and pointed out that those who advanced such a reproach were themselves guilty of a confusion of terminology.

The fallacy underlying the anti-Zionist standpoint consists in implying that the word "nationality" means the same thing in Central and Eastern Europe as in the rest of the world, whereas in fact it means two different things. In Central and Eastern Europe it denotes a people or race, whereas in Western Europe and the rest of the world it is used as synonymous with "State." The Western connotation is essentially political; the Eastern is only ethnical. Nationality in the West means citizenship, with all the rights and duties that it entails, whereas in the East it means community of stock, language, and historic development, without necessarily involving an implication of political allegiance, since it does not represent a political organism. The Western sense is of wider import than the Eastern, for the State is seldom co-extensive with one nation: it often contains many. In the old Russian Empire of the Tsars there were people belonging to dozens of nationalities, but while they were Poles or Lithuanians, Finns or Ukrainians, Letts or Kalmucks, they were all Russian by citizenship. Similarly in the Polish Republic between the two great wars there were not only Polish citizens of Polish nationality, but also members of the Lithuanian, Ukrainian, and White Russian nationalities, who were also citizens of the Polish State. And likewise in the United Kingdom there are not only Englishmen, but also Welshmen, Scotsmen, and (Ulster) Irishmen, who all bear allegiance to the same Crown, an allegiance equally acknowledged by British

¹ Professor R. Coupland, who was a member of the Palestine Royal Commission of 1937, has given in his book, *The Future of India*, the following simple definition of a nation: "If a people feels itself to be a nation, it is one."

citizens of Jewish nationality. The Zionist can therefore not be taunted with "dual nationality," for there is no such thing. He is simply an English, French, or American citizen of Jewish nationality, and there is not the slightest degree of incompatibility between his loyalty to the State of which he is a citizen and his attachment to the nationality to which he belongs by descent. Nor would his position be changed in any way by the possible creation at some future date of a Jewish State. If he continued to live outside the Land of Israel his State allegiance would remain entirely unaffected; only if he settled in that land and legally assumed its citizenship would he cease to be a citizen of the country he had left and owe allegiance to the Jewish State. He would then be Jewish by citizenship as well as by nationality.

The furtherance of the Zionist Movement, from the very outset, derived a potent incentive from the conditions of oppression that afflicted at least one-half of the Jews in the world at the time when it was founded. There were nearly six million Jews in Russia and Rumania who were subjected to a vindictive system of intolerance and ill-treatment. In Russia they were harassed by a multiplicity of laws, which had been enacted over a period of two centuries. They were confined within a Pale of Settlement, restricted in the choice of occupation, thwarted in their quest of education, limited in respect of property rights, barred from State and municipal service, exposed to galling burdens in connection with military service, and the prey of official chicanery and recurring pogroms. In Rumania the Jews had been cheated of the civil rights which that country's signature under the Berlin Treaty of 1878 was designed to secure them, and they were treated, not as foreigners, who might enjoy the protection of some other State, but as outlaws. Moreover, the large Jewish population in Galicia, although under the comparatively tolerant rule of Austria, were in a chronic condition of economic distress, from which, as from the persecution in Russia and Rumania, there was no escape save in emigration. In the greater part of Central Europe the Jews, it is true, were not exposed to violence or injustice, nor were they racked by poverty, but they were the victims of repeated outbursts of anti-Semitism, which, in the form of the Dreyfus scandal, had even disgraced a country like France with its century-old tradition of "liberty, equality, fraternity." The political and civil rights exercised by the Jews in Central and Western Europe were by no means always accompanied by a spirit of tolerance on the part of their non-Jewish neighbours: on the contrary, those rights were often

neutralised by bureaucratic regulations or social discrimination. There were, of course, many Jews who hoped and believed that the practice of justice and tolerance would gradually spread throughout Europe, and that they would all eventually enjoy perfect equality politically and socially, just as there were many who continued to believe in the coming of the Messiah. But the prospect of such a fundamental improvement, at the time when Herzl first appeared on the Jewish scene, seemed remote, and hence the greatest response to his call naturally came from the Jews living in the regions of political bondage, economic depression, and social hostility.

Intimately interwoven with the main factors that influenced Jews in favour of the Zionist ideal were other moral and material considerations. There was the feeling of resentment against the abuse, mockery, or ill-concealed contempt to which Jews were subjected even in Western countries, no matter how actively and usefully they took part in the national life. There was the just anger against the mean envy aroused by instances of Jews who achieved wealth or fame solely through their industry or intellectual gifts. There was the mental distress caused by the collective condemnation of the Jewish people because of the misdeeds of individuals. There was the desire, since the Jews were repeatedly called aliens even in countries where they had been domiciled for centuries, to have a land where they could not be exposed to such a gibe, and where they would feel fully at home. There was the longing to be free from all handicaps and restrictions in the economic field, so that Jews could practise all trades, crafts, and professions, and show that they could be just as efficient in tilling the soil or building a town as in buying and selling. There was the wish to show the world what the Jews could achieve in a land of their own after having suffered for centuries the reproach of being only middlemen or parasites in other lands. Had they not worked long enough in others' vineyards, and was it not time now that they tended their own? Had they not a literature and a culture which they could properly develop only by renewed and intimate contact with their ancestral home? And did they not owe it to the prestige of their nation, and to the martyrdom of their forefathers, that they should at last make an effort to restore its independence, so that the name of Jew throughout the world should henceforth be uttered with respect?

~ Owing to the opposition of the Ottoman Government to any large-scale Jewish settlement in Palestine, the activity of the

Zionist Movement until the First World War was largely confined to the fields of propaganda and organisation in many parts of the globe, although some attempts were also made at practical work in Palestine. It was not until the British Government had issued the memorable Balfour Declaration in November, 1917, in favour of the establishment of a National Home in Palestine for the Jewish people and subsequently accepted the Mandate for the administration of the country, that an opportunity was given to the Jews to carry out their long-cherished aspirations. The policy of the British Government resulted in a very considerable accession to the Zionist Movement on the part of Jews who had previously held aloof on so-called political grounds, and much larger funds were provided by Jews throughout the world for the manifold tasks of national resettlement. A further advance was made in the practical sphere some years later by the extension of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which was originally identical with the Zionist Organisation, by including non-Zionists who were in sympathy with the establishment of the Jewish National Home but who still declined to accept all the implications of Zionism. This enlarged co-operation was prompted by a realisation of the important contribution that Palestine made towards the solution of the economic problem of the Jews of Eastern and Central Europe, who were unable to secure anything but very limited admission to oversea countries that formerly had a liberal immigration policy.

The Jewish achievements in Palestine during the past quarter of a century have certainly wrought a radical transformation in the country, not only in the economic, but also in the social and intellectual fields, for far greater progress has been made there in that period than in the previous eighteen centuries. That progress, which has benefited all sections of the population, would have been much greater still but for the restrictionist policy exercised by the Mandatory Government, which has been influenced by the antagonism of certain Arab leaders, expressed from time to time in violent disorders. This policy culminated, a few months before the outbreak of the Second World War, in the issue of a White Paper containing drastic proposals that amounted to a nullification of the letter and the spirit of the Balfour Declaration. It was a document, born of the spirit of appeasement that prevailed at the time, and although it was rejected by the Mandates Commission as incompatible with the terms of the Mandate, it has nevertheless been upheld by the

Mandatory Government, with consequences that have been disastrous to the Jewish people and detrimental to the interests of Palestine itself.

Whatever part the founders of the Zionist Movement hoped that Palestine would play in the destinies of Israel, that part has been enormously enhanced in consequence of the events of the last decade. The relentless persecution to which Hitler subjected the Jews in Germany as soon as he rose to power, and the gradual deterioration that followed in the position of the Jews in Central and Eastern Europe, resulted in a growing tide of emigration, of which a large portion found its way to Palestine owing to the barriers raised by most of the countries in the west or overseas. That tide of unhappy humanity is bound to swell still further in consequence of the barbarous and devastating policy with which Hitler has scourged the Jews in all the lands that have fallen under his yoke. Since the beginning of the war Palestine could have welcomed tens of thousands of Jewish refugees, who would have ardently and energetically taken their share, either in the military or the economic field, in the struggle for the overthrow of their enemy; but the number admitted has been rigorously regulated. When the war is over, Palestine will unquestionably have to make a very substantial contribution towards the settlement of the Jewish problem. The ill-starred White Paper of 1939, which Mr. Winston Churchill called "another Munich," should share the fate of the Munich Agreement concerning Czechoslovakia, which has been repudiated by the British Government. The Balfour Declaration was inspired in no small degree by the desire felt by British statesmen during the First World War that Palestine should play a leading part in the healing of the Jewish tragedy. That tragedy has grown immeasurably in extent and gravity during the Second World War, and it therefore calls not only for the reaffirmation of the Declaration, but also for the practical and liberal fulfilment, at the earliest opportune moment, of all its manifold implications.

PART I

THE PERIOD OF ASPIRATION

CHAPTER I

PALESTINE SINCE THE DISPERSION

THE lapse of over eighteen hundred years from the downfall of the Jewish State to the founding of the Zionist movement has evoked from many a sympathiser with the Jewish national idea the comment that it was remarkable that Jews should have determined to return to their ancestral land after having been separated from it for so long a period. It has also provided opponents of the movement with the argument that such prolonged separation had made the Jews utterly forfeit any right to their national restoration. Both the sympathisers who have made such a comment and the opponents who have advanced such an argument are fundamentally mistaken. The Jews have never been separated from Palestine. From the day when it fell under the yoke of the Romans, until the day when it was delivered by a British army, there were always Jewish communities in the country. At times numerous and at others greatly diminished, suffering nearly always from poverty or persecution or both, yet upborne throughout by fortitude and faith, Jews were domiciled in Palestine, both in the towns and in the rural districts, through all the violent changes of fortune that overtook it. No governors, however ruthless, succeeded either in exterminating them or in stamping out their belief that they would survive their oppressors. Romans and Byzantines, Persians and Arabs, Seljuk Turks and Crusaders, Saracens and Mamelukes, Mongols and Ottoman Turks, they all in turn lorded it over the Holy Land for different periods and in different ways. But, for the most part, Palestine was ruled, or oftener misruled, as the outlying province of a Power whose capital was far away. Throughout all those eighteen hundred years and more after the conquest of Judæa, no other national polity was established to take the place of the ancient Jewish State, and throughout that period the Jews waited patiently and hopefully for the day when they would be able to restore their national estate.

The Jews did not give up their independence, embittered and riven though it had been in its closing phase by internal strife, without a desperate and protracted struggle. In the five years of fighting

against the legions of Vespasian and Titus, which culminated in the year 70 C.E. in the sacking of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple, they lost hundreds of thousands of lives. Vast numbers were driven into exile by political repression and economic distress, but the mass of the Jewish population remained rooted to the soil, and the village of Pekiin, in Upper Galilee, has contained a Jewish community to the present day. New spiritual centres sprang up in provincial townlets, and Judæa and Galilee, as well as numerous places in the south and Transjordan, remained Jewish in population and manners. The seething resentment against the Roman Procurators burst forth sixty years later in the revolt headed by Bar Kochba, who reconquered Jerusalem and conducted a valiant and stubborn resistance for three years (132-5 C.E.). The Romans laid waste the whole country, destroyed fifty Jewish fortresses and 985 Jewish villages, and killed nearly 600,000 Jews, before they suppressed the rebellion. Resolved that there should be no further trouble on the part of the Jews, they ploughed up the site of Jerusalem, put to death all who were suspected of having supported the revolt or who might assist in some future rising, and carried off large numbers into slavery. The Holy City was transformed into a Roman colony, called *Ælia Capitolina*, and Judæa became Palestine. A stream of exiles flowed to Egypt, Mesopotamia, and various countries of Europe. The Jews in Palestine, who had dwindled to a few thousands, were taxed and forbidden to visit Jerusalem on pain of death except once a year, on the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple, when they were permitted to contemplate and bewail its ruins. After the pressure of the Romans relaxed, Jewish life was restored in various parts of the country and a number of smaller towns revived.

For nearly four hundred years the Jews were allowed by the Romans to maintain a system of local national autonomy. The Sanhedrin, then the legislative and juridical organ, was transferred from Jabneh in the south to Usha in Galilee, and thence to Tiberias. It became the political centre of the Jewish nation, and its president was entitled *Nasi* (or Prince), an office held by members of the family of Hillel, a reputed descendant of the House of David. The *Nasi* was recognised by the Romans as the head of the Jewish community in Palestine and of all the Jews in the Roman Empire. He supervised Jewish municipal and village self-government, and was the recipient of the taxes regularly paid both by the Jews of Palestine and by those abroad. During the late Roman and early Byzantine periods a large and wealthy Jewish community developed in Palestine, and the ruins

of more than fifty synagogues dating from that era have been discovered (the most famous being those of Capernaum, near Tiberias, and of Beth Alfa in the Esdraelon Valley). The legal provisions concerning agriculture and land tenure in the Palestinian Talmud, which was compiled at that time, show that in the sixth century the greater part of the soil of Palestine was in Jewish possession. Most of the Jews were agriculturists and artisans: they lived in well-organised communities all over Galilee, Judæa, and Transjordan, along the Mediterranean coast, and even in the area between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akaba. It was only in Jerusalem that they were not allowed to live, though not a few came there to pray at the Western Wall of the Temple, the only remnant of that once imposing shrine.¹ During this period, in the Jewish centres of Tiberias, Ludd, and Cæsarea, the great codifications of Jewish law—the Mishnah and the Palestinian Talmud—were compiled, summarising the great religious and cultural heritage of Judaism from previous ages, and laying down the principles and precepts of the Jewish religion as practised to-day. The office of Nasi was continued until the early part of the fifth century, when it was abolished by Emperor Theodosius II.

On two occasions in those early centuries the Jews were given promises by powerful monarchs that their independence would be restored, but the hopes and elation thereby aroused were doomed to disappointment. The first promise was made by Emperor Julian the Apostate, who, before setting out in the year 361 to fight against the Persians, issued a declaration to the Jews that he would rebuild their Temple and restore their independence, but he was killed in battle two years later. After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, Palestine came under the dominion of the Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire, whose rulers applied a policy of repression against the Jews. They expropriated their lands, imposed taxes upon them, and attempted mass conversions to Christianity. But, despite persecution and emigration, the number of townlets and villages with a Jewish population mentioned in the Palestinian Talmud and the Midrashic literature of

¹ The Western Wall (sometimes called the "Wailing Wall") of the Temple, which is regarded in tradition and accepted by archaeologists as of Solomonic origin, was, according to statements in Rabbinical works of the third century, and according to definite reports of travellers in the tenth century, the particular place before which the Jews congregated for prayers and lamentations. Apart from services, held on Friday evenings, on the New Moon, on the 9th of Ab, and in later years more frequently, there has been in existence since 1601 a book of over forty pages of special prayers published at different times and in various countries, indicating that the wall was a place of pilgrimage for Jews living abroad as well as for those in Palestine.

the period amounted to about 400, scattered all over the country. The Jews were generously supported by Jewish communities throughout the Diaspora in maintaining themselves against the oppressive measures of their rulers. Their numbers were increased by the infiltration of Jews from other lands, and the Rabbinical Academies of Palestine enjoyed the allegiance of the Diaspora in matters of religious and ritual law. These fraternal relations also found expression in a political form, for when, early in the seventh century, the Persian King Chosroes II invaded Palestine and the Jews of Galilee gave him active help, they were joined by thousands of Jews from Syria and Babylon. They were encouraged to throw in their lot with the invader because of his promise to re-establish the Jewish State, but after they had assisted him to reconquer Jerusalem and reminded him of his pledge they were rewarded with penalties and banishment. The Persians held the city for fourteen years, until 628, when they were driven out by the Byzantines, who took a brutal revenge upon the Jews and renewed their policy of expropriation and forcible conversion. But nine years later the Byzantines themselves were defeated and routed by an Arab army under Caliph Omar, who occupied the whole of Palestine (637).

Despite the political persecution and material distress which sorely afflicted the Jews in Palestine century after century, the country was regarded by the Jews in all other lands as their national centre in the theory and practice of Jewish law. The bond that linked them together was manifested in their liturgy and in religious and ritual observance. In their morning service the Jews in the Diaspora prayed: "O bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth and make us go upright to our land." Although settled in regions where the climatic conditions greatly differed from those in their ancestral land, they continued to pray for rain and for dew at the seasons when the climate of Palestine demanded it, but when such supplications were meaningless where they were living themselves. Their spiritual subjection to their ancient homeland, which has continued throughout the ages, prompted Benjamin Disraeli to write: "The vineyards of Israel have ceased to exist, but the eternal Law enjoins the children of Israel still to celebrate the vintage. A race that persist in celebrating their vintage, although they have no fruits to gather, will regain their vineyards."¹ The provisions of Talmudical law that were elaborated in the early centuries and are still in force regarding the priority

¹ *Tancred.*

of Palestine in legal relations, both religious and secular, are significant. A Jew who leaves Palestine cannot compel his wife to go with him, but if he goes to settle there and his wife refuses to accompany him he can divorce her (*Kethuboth*, 106b). So important was it considered to secure a domicile in the Holy Land that, although it is strictly forbidden to transact any business on the Sabbath, it was permissible to enter into a contract on that day for the purchase of a house in Palestine (*Gittin*, 8b).

The primacy that Palestine enjoyed in the life and thought of the Jewish people found expression in a number of striking sayings in Rabbinical literature, of which the following are typical:

"He who has walked four yards in Palestine is assured of a place in the world to come" (*Kethuboth*, 111a).

"It is better to dwell in the deserts of Palestine than in palaces abroad" (*Bereshith Rabba*, 39).

"The merit of living in Palestine equals that of the fulfilment of all the commandments of the Divine Law" (*Sifre*, Deut. 80).

"Whoever lives in Palestine, lives sinless" (*Kethuboth*, 100b).

"God says: Dearer to me is a small group of students in Palestine than a large Sanhedrin abroad" (*Yerushalmi*, *Nedarim*, vi, 13).

"The air of Palestine makes one wise" (*Baba Bathra*, 158-9).

These sayings explain how it was that, although the material conditions in Palestine were often forbidding, Jews in the Diaspora felt an inescapable urge to settle there. When the country was invaded by the Arabs, it contained a considerable Jewish community, estimated at between 300,000 and 400,000, of whom 20,000 were in Caesarea. Caliph Omar, who built the imposing Mosque in Jerusalem, called the Dome of the Rock, the only outstanding monument of Arab architecture in the country,¹ maintained the exclusion of the Jews from the Holy City; but his successors allowed them to live there, entrusted them with the supervision of the Temple site and vicinity, and even permitted them to build a synagogue on the Temple Mount near the Wailing Wall. Moreover, lands confiscated by the Byzantine Government were returned by the Arab conquerors. In the eighth century, when Palestine became involved in the strife and wars between rival Arab dynasties, the position of the Jewish community began

¹ The Mosque was actually "the work of Greek architects and artificers" (Sir Flinders Petrie, *The Revival of Palestine*, p. 3).

to deteriorate, especially after the capital of the Moslem Empire was transferred from Damascus to Baghdad. The country was ruled by despotic governors, first Persians and then Turks, who persecuted the non-Moslem communities, expropriated Jewish land, and reduced the Jewish farming population to poverty. Towards the end of the ninth century, Palestine fell under a condominium of the Baghdad Government and the Turkish rulers of Egypt, followed a century later by its attachment to the Egyptian Caliphate. Under Caliph Al-Hakim there was a wave of religious persecution against both Christians and Jews, which wrought havoc to the Jewish community. Conditions became still worse, amounting to anarchy, in the eleventh century, in the latter half of which the country was conquered by the Seljuk Turks, who held it for some fifty years, until it was occupied by the Crusaders.

Despite the intolerance and disturbances that bore heavily upon them during the greater part of the period from the seventh to the eleventh century, the Jews in Palestine were able to devote themselves to scholastic activity, in which they rivalled their brethren in Babylon. The Karaites, who founded their sectarian movement in Babylon in the eighth century, established themselves in strong numbers in Palestine and built a synagogue in Jerusalem, which existed until the arrival of the Crusaders. Since they based their religious system upon the letter of the Scriptures alone and were well versed in the Bible and Hebrew grammar, they compelled their Rabbanite opponents to engage in these studies too, and hence there arose in Tiberias a school of Massorettes and grammarians; whose rules were authoritative for all Jewry. The Massorah was the science of the exact determination and transmission of the Biblical text and its grammatical elucidation, and the scholars who founded it devised the Tiberian system of punctuation of the Hebrew Bible, which is older than the Babylonian and was adopted throughout the Diaspora. Discoveries made in the Cairo Genizah have brought to light the fact that, probably from the ninth and certainly from the tenth century, there was in Palestine a complete Talmudical college organisation, headed by a "Gaon" (or Rector), with students, scribes, and judges, who collectively formed a large and small Sanhedrin, such as formerly existed in Jabneh. Its seat was probably in Tiberias, where there was a succession of "Geonim" for at least three centuries, towards the end of which period the holders of the office seem to have had the title conferred or confirmed by the Government. There was another field of intellectual activity too

in which the Jews in Palestine were then pre-eminent—namely, the composition of neo-Hebrew or liturgical poetry (*Piyut*), which afterwards acquired a great vogue in Spain and Babylon. The first of these synagogue poets were Jose ben Jose and Jannai, who certainly belonged to Palestine.

Distressing as their situation had been in previous epochs, the Jews in Palestine were exposed to a much graver calamity upon the arrival of the Crusaders. These soldiers of the Cross had already left a horrible trail of plunder and massacre behind them in Europe, especially among the Jews in the Rhineland. Many Jews in France and Germany believed that 1096 was the year of Redemption, and therefore abandoned their homes to go to Palestine; and at the same time seventeen communities of the Chazars (a people of Turkish origin living in the south of Russia, who embraced Judaism in the seventh century) also set out for the same destination. The Jewish authorities in Palestine declared that there was no evidence of the early coming of the Messiah, as they had also done in reply to an inquiry from communities on the Rhine in 960, but they were unable to damp down the ardour for the return to Zion. A terrible fate befell the Jews in Palestine after the invasion in 1099 of the Crusaders, who considered it their mission not only to wrest the country from the Turks, but also to slaughter both Moslems and Jews. The Jews defended themselves bravely: they were the last on the walls of Jerusalem; but when the Crusaders entered the city they drove all Jews whom they could seize into a synagogue and put them to death by fire. Tens of thousands of Jews in various parts of the country were slain, large numbers were expelled, and many were sold into slavery. All the Jewish communities of neighbouring lands were full of refugees, and it was only in remote villages of Galilee that Jewish agricultural settlements survived. But despite the tales of slaughter and persecution that reached the communities in the West, the longing for the return was by no means lessened. It formed the frequent theme of medieval poets, whose Hebrew elegies were dolefully chanted in the synagogue on the Fast of Ab, which commemorated the destruction of Jerusalem. The sublimest and most powerful expression of this yearning is found in the poetical and philosophical works of Judah Ha-Levi (1085-1141), the greatest Hebrew poet since Bible times, who lived in Spain until about a year before his death. He composed a number of elegies on Zion, of which the most moving is the following:

"Zion,
 Hast thou no greeting for thy prisoned sons,
 That seek thy peace, the remnant of thy flock?
 I would pour forth my soul upon each spot
 Where once upon thy youth God's spirit breathed.
 Prostrate upon thy soil now let me fall,
 Embrace thy stones, and love thy very dust!
 Shall food and drink delight me when I see
 Thy lions torn by dogs? What joy to me
 Shall daylight bring if with it I behold
 The ravens feasting on the eagle's flesh?
 But where thy God Himself made choice to dwell,
 Lasting abode thy children yet shall find."

In his great philosophical work, the *Kuzari*, Judah Ha-Levi expounded the view that Palestine was perpetually permeated with a spirit of holiness which existed in no other place on earth: it was by virtue of that quality that prophets and psalmists had been inspired of old, and whosoever betook himself thither would be able to obtain close communion with his Maker. Not content to meditate on this aspiration, he resolved to realise it and set out on the hazardous journey, but what fate overtook him after he left Egypt is unknown, and legend has filled the gap.

Less than thirty years later, in 1169, the famous Jewish traveller, Benjamin of Tudela, visited Palestine and found hardly more than a thousand Jewish families. In Jerusalem there were 200 Jews, who lived in a corner of the city below the Tower of David, and some of them leased the only dyeing works. In Beyrout there were 50 Jews and in Sidon 20, but in Tyre there were 400, including Talmudical scholars as well as some engaged in farming and seafaring. During the later period of the Latin Kingdom some communities were strengthened by new settlers from Europe, who were admitted to promote the development of commercial relations with that Continent. In 1175 another traveller, Petahya of Ratisbon, found in Jerusalem only one Jew, who paid a high tax for the dye-works (all other Jews having been driven out). In Bethlehem there were 12 Jewish dyers, and in Joppa (Jaffa) there was only one Jew, also a dyer. But Ascalon contained 200 Jews, including some Talmudical scholars, Tiberias 50, including Talmudists and Cabbalists, Acre 100, and the newly established city of Toron de los Caballeros (probably Shunem) about 300.

The position improved after the Latin Kingdom was brought

to an end in 1187 by the Kurdish Sultan Saladin, who drove out the Crusaders and occupied all Palestine. He was far more tolerant and chivalrous than the soldiers of the Cross, and on the intervention of Maimonides, who was his physician, he allowed Jews to return to the country. There was consequently a substantial influx during the thirteenth century from all parts of the Diaspora—even England, France, and Germany—including scholars, merchants, and professional men. The French scholar, Samuel ben Simson, who travelled in Palestine in 1210 and compiled a list of the pietists whose graves he visited, was probably the pioneer of the migration in the following year of over 300 French and English Rabbis, including Jonathan ha-Kohen (Lunel), Simson ben Abraham (Sens), and other eminent scholars. These pilgrims arrived in groups, one of which formed its own community in Jerusalem, as recorded by the Hebrew poet, Al-Harizi, who visited them in 1216, the first of many communities that were subsequently established on the basis of their country of origin. Palestine was governed by Saladin's dynasty, the Ayubides, from Damascus and Cairo, until the middle of the thirteenth century, when it was invaded and ravaged by two wild peoples, first bands of Korasmians, and then hordes of Mongols, who devastated Jerusalem in 1260. But three years later the Mongols were driven out by the Mameluke Sultan of Egypt, Bibars, and from that time (with a brief interruption in 1400, when Palestine was devastated by the Mongols under Tamerlane) the country was ruled from Egypt until 1517, when it was taken by the Turks.

Under the Mamelukes the Jewish population increased considerably, and there were communities in Judæa, Galilee, the coastal cities, and Transjordan. Many Jews devoted themselves to agriculture, but the majority settled in the cities, which became important centres both of economic and of intellectual activity. The Jewish community of Jerusalem was revived by the famous philosopher and mystic, Nahmanides (R. Moses ben Nahman) of Gerona, who, when he arrived there in 1267, found only two Jews, brothers and both dyers, but in response to his fervent appeal a new community was formed in less than a month, with its own synagogue. Nahmanides may be said to have been the pioneer of the Jewish resettlement in Palestine in the Middle Ages, for, although he lived in Jerusalem only another three years, he attracted many students to the college that he founded, and there was an influx from Syria and other countries into the Holy City. Many of the new settlers engaged in the study of the Talmud and

the Cabbalah and had to be maintained by the community, but others were doctors, copyists of Hebrew books for sale in other countries, tailors, shoemakers, dyers, weavers, cattle and sheep rearers, and dealers in wine and oil. Conditions in the fourteenth century have been described by a French Jewish traveller, Estori Farhi (a contemporary of Maundeville), who, after the expulsion of the Jews from France in 1306, set out on his wanderings and reached Palestine in 1313. He journeyed through the country for seven years, comparing his impressions with the observations of older chroniclers, and wrote a most interesting compendium on the laws, customs, and geography of Palestine, entitled *Kaftor va-Ferah*. He states that Jews came from neighbouring lands to celebrate the festivals, as their forefathers had done when the Temple existed. On the Mount of Olives, at Tabernacles, prayers were offered for the Jews in the Diaspora, and there were solemn assemblies and processions on other occasions. Here the New Moon was announced, college rectors and judges were appointed, lawsuits were decided, sentences were pronounced and bans were proclaimed—in short, all the principal functions of a central Sanhedrin.

From the fifteenth century, however, the community was sorely troubled by a combination of evils—internal friction, heavy taxation, outbreaks of Moslem fanaticism, hunger, and disease. The Jews in Jerusalem were burdened with the payment of an annual tax of 400 ducats to the Sultan of Egypt, besides 50 ducats to the governor of the city for a licence for the manufacture of wine; and as the richer members tried to escape their share of the collective liabilities, the executive of the community had to sell precious Hebrew books and scrolls of the Torah as well as to borrow money. The executive also enacted a law that the estate of every Jew who died in Jerusalem without heirs should fall to the community. Owing to the various troubles, many Jews left the city, and the executive found themselves obliged, in 1487, to send “messengers of Zion” to lands of the Diaspora to collect contributions for the relief of the community. A gradual improvement was brought about by the energetic efforts of Rabbi Obadiah of Bertinoro, famed as commentator on the Mishnah, who, on his arrival in Jerusalem in 1488, was appointed Chief Rabbi. He succeeded in reducing the hardships of tax-gathering and raised the spirit of his fellow Jews by his daily lectures; and by the time of his death in 1520 (or possibly later) the community had greatly increased in numbers, to about 1570, through the arrival of refugees

from Spain and Portugal, including Marranos who had fled from the terrors of the Inquisition. These exiles were largely distinguished for their education, scholarship, and business enterprise; they soon rose to leading positions in the community, and they continued Rabbi Obadiah's work after his death. Thanks to their intellectual superiority, these Sephardim were able to merge the older elements, the Arabic Jews, called "Moriscos," as well as those from Morocco, called "Maghrebim," into a single communal organisation, upon which they impressed their own specific character. The Jews from Germany and Poland, however, held aloof and retained their own independent Ashkenazi organisation and rites. Such was the main division of the Jewish population for some centuries, as Jews from Bokhara, Persia, and the Yemen did not arrive until the nineteenth century, and those from Central and Eastern Europe joined the Ashkenazim.¹

In 1517 the Turkish Sultan, Selim I, conquered Palestine and Syria, which remained under Ottoman rule for 400 years. The principal features of this régime were taxation and neglect: little or nothing was done to promote the security and welfare of Palestine or to further its trade and commerce. The first rulers had no objection to the country's development by the efforts of others, and looked with favour on the steady expansion of the Jewish community, which was recruited mainly from Spanish refugees, who brought with them knowledge, technical skill, and capital. Other welcome settlers were Jews expelled from Provence in 1550 and 1576, and also a number who came from Italy on the ships that sailed regularly between Venice and the Levant. But despite the general tolerance shown towards the Jews, they were not safe from sudden outbursts of religious and racial hatred on the part of the populace, acts of violence by local officials, or devastating incursions by Bedouin. On the other hand, owing to the wide extent of the Ottoman Empire, the Jews in Palestine came into closer contact with a larger number of their brethren, and they began to display considerable scholastic and spiritual activity, especially in Safed. This city, which had a Jewish population of 15,000 in the middle of the sixteenth century, was a great centre of religious study conducted in many colleges and schools under the most famous Jewish scholars of the time. It was there that the distinguished Talmudist, Rabbi Jacob Berab, who settled in Safed about 1533, sought to revive the ordination of Rabbis according to ancient procedure, so as "to accelerate the Redemption"; it was there that Rabbi Joseph Karo (1488-1575), author

¹ See "The Jewish Population of Palestine," by Dr. Lazar Grünhut, in *Zionist Work in Palestine*, edited by Israel Cohen (Fisher Unwin, London, 1911).

of the authoritative religious code, the *Shulhan Aruch*, and the mystic Isaac Luria (1534-72) and his chief disciple, Haim Vital (1543-1620), established a veritable citadel of the Cabbalah, whose cultivation throughout the Holy Land was stimulated by anxious waiting for the Messiah; and there too that the first Hebrew printing press was set up in Palestine. There was an attempt at practical activity also, for Don Joseph Nasi, Duke of Naxos, a fugitive from the Portuguese Inquisition, who was a favourite of Sulaiman and Selim II, received permission to rebuild Tiberias for his fellow Jews with the help of Government bodies and the local Arabs. Building was carried on for one year (1570) in Tiberias and seven neighbouring villages; mulberry trees were planted for the production of silk that would rival the wares of Venice, and wool was imported from Spain for the weaving of cloth. But owing to the indifference of the Jews, the opposition of the Arabs, revolts in the Lebanon and North Palestine, and the change of attitude of the Government, the ambitious project was abandoned.

The position of the Jews in Jerusalem in the sixteenth century was often desperate: poverty and hunger were widespread, the community was in debt, there was an epidemic in 1594, and a famine five years later, so that there was an appreciable migration to Safed. Impressed by the gravity of the situation, Rabbi Moses Alschech, who had left Venice to settle in Safed, addressed an urgent appeal to his former community to raise and remit money immediately; and similar appeals were soon made to the Jews in Poland, Bohemia, Germany, and Hungary. Special collecting boxes (*kuppah*) were placed in synagogues, and trustees (*Gabbaim*) were appointed to look after them. The money received was distributed among the needy, and hence this system of relief was called *Halukah* ("distribution"). But however generous the Jews of the Diaspora, who were prompted by piety and the desire at least to maintain others in the land where they considered it their duty also to live themselves, there was no effective protection from the spoliation of corrupt and greedy officials. In 1625 Mohammed ibn Faruch, who became Governor of Jerusalem, extorted money and goods from the Jews in Jerusalem, and his two brothers-in-law, Ibrahim Aga and Othman Aga, indulged in a similar practice. The leaders of the community were seized in the Sephardic and Ashkenazic synagogues, imprisoned, and tortured, and a reign of persecution continued for two years, until Ibn Faruch was compelled to flee from the forces sent against

him by the Sultan. Among those who left Jerusalem to escape ill-treatment was a former Chief Rabbi of Prague, R. Isaiah ha-Levi Horowitz, a famous scholar and Cabbalist, who had arrived there in 1622 and afterwards went to Safed. A kinsman of his, author of a travel chronicle, *Darcho Zion* ("Paths of Zion"), called him a *Nasi* ("Prince") of Palestine and cited his learned opinion that the poor of Palestine were everywhere to be regarded as "the poor of thy town"—that is, they were to be treated on a basis of equality with the poor in the communities of the Diaspora. The writer of this chronicle stated that every Jewish householder in Jerusalem had to pay a poll-tax of three *Löwen-thaler*, and that conditions became very much worse in consequence of the massacres of 1648 by Chmielnicki's hordes in Poland, whence a few thousand gulden used to be received each year. So acute was the distress in Jerusalem that of 700 widows 400 died of hunger.

It was at this time of widespread affliction, when the masses of Jewry were looking forward ardently and impatiently to the coming of the Messiah to deliver them, that the most distinguished and spectacular of the claimants to that dignity announced his advent. Sabbatai Zevi (1626-76), who was born in Smyrna, had been preceded by a succession of false Messiahs who appeared at intervals in Asia and Europe throughout the centuries, and who all evoked an enthusiastic response that bore eloquent testimony to the faith in the national restoration. In the early part of the second century Bar Kochba, who conducted a valiant but futile struggle against the Romans in Palestine, was even hailed by the great Rabbi Akiba as the Messiah. In the latter half of the fifth century Moses of Crete proclaimed that he would lead his followers through the sea to the land of their forefathers, but lured them only to disaster. In the eighth century there were Serenus of Syria and Abu Isa of Ispahan; in the twelfth there was the ill-fated David Alroy, of Azerbaijan, whose claim to be the Messiah gave comfort and courage to the Jewish communities that suffered from the Crusades; in the thirteenth there was a pretender in Spain, Abraham Abulafia; at the end of the fifteenth there was an Ashkenazic claimant in Istria, Asher Lemlein; and in the sixteenth there appeared the romantic couple, David Reubeni and Solomon Molcho, who, after enjoying the favour of the Pope and the Portuguese Court, both met with a violent death. In Safed the famous Cabbalist, Isaac Luria, a native of Jerusalem, gave himself out in his mystical teachings as the incarnation of the

Messiah of the House of Joseph; after his death his disciple, Hayyim Vital, a native of Safed, declared that he was the Ephraimite Messiah, whereupon Abraham Shalom claimed to be the Davidic Messiah. But by far the greatest spiritual upheaval in Jewry was produced by Sabbatai Zevi, who, although received with distrust by Rabbis in Jerusalem, when he came there in 1663, cast such a potent spell over countless Jewish communities from Constantinople to Amsterdam when he openly proclaimed himself Messiah in 1666, that many Jews set out for Palestine or prepared to do so after selling their homes and businesses. The claims of all these and other pseudo-Messiahs, whether they were adventurous impostors or genuine mystics, and the credulity and elation they all aroused in varying measure, were so many manifestations of the unceasing and irrepressible yearning of Israel for the return to his ancestral soil. Only a generation after the fiasco of Sabbatai Zevi, when there was still a feeling of bitter disillusion, Jehuda Hassid (that is "the pious"), of Siedlce, who lived for a time in Germany, announced the advent of a new Messiah in Palestine and conducted thither a large company of Jews in 1700, but died six weeks after his arrival from the effects of the exhausting journey. Of the 1,300 who accompanied him, about 500 died on the way, and of the others some went over to Islam or Christianity or returned to Europe.

Early in the eighteenth century the Jewish community of Jerusalem was again in distress, and as there was a danger of the leaders being thrown into jail, messengers were again sent to Europe for financial help. There was a widespread response, in which the Viennese banker, Wolf Wertheimer, distinguished himself by collecting 22,000 gulden, to which Frankfort alone contributed nearly one-half. Despite the reverses that befell the house of Wertheimer, the total of 22,000 gulden remained intact for many decades, and eventually Emperor Francis I of Austria signed a letter on August 8th, 1808, authorising the "Internuntius" at Constantinople to hand over the yearly interest to the three Jewish communities of Jerusalem, Hebron, and Safed, for distribution among their poor in proportion to their numbers. From the middle of the eighteenth century there set in a considerable influx of Hasidim from Poland, Russia, and Galicia, who mostly settled in Safed and Tiberias. There was an efficient governor in Galilee, Omar ed-Dahr (1740-75), who furthered the development of Tiberias and invited Jews to live there. His successor, Achmed el-Djezzar, was notorious for his cruelty, but maintained

order and security, and during his régime there arrived a body of 300 Russian Hasidim under the leadership of Rabbi Mendel of Vitebsk, Rabbi Abraham ben Alexander of Kalisk, and Rabbi Israel of Polotzk. They settled in Safed, and some of them later moved to Tiberias and Pekiin. About the same time many Jews from Tunis and other parts of North Africa also migrated to Palestine.

The example set by the Hasidim was followed by their opponents, the *Mithnaggedim* (called in Palestine *Perushim*, or "separatists"); they had an organised community from 1810 in Safed, headed by Israel of Schklow, a disciple of the famous Gaon Rabbi Elijah Vilna, and the number of Jews in that city grew despite poverty and suffering. In Acre, in the early part of the nineteenth century, Haim Farhi, member of an influential Jewish family of Damascus, occupied the important position of Finance Minister and State Secretary to the ruthless Djezzar, who requited his services by mutilating him, and Djezzar's successor, the Pasha Abdalla, who owed his promotion to Farhi, had his loyal minister put to death and confiscated his property (1820). Farhi's brothers tried to avenge his fate by having a ban decreed in Constantinople against Abdalla and besieging Acre with the aid of other Syrian Pashas, but all to no avail, as Abdalla bribed the Pashas to withdraw. Thereupon Abdalla revenged himself upon the Jews in Acre, Safed, and Tiberias, by imposing new taxes upon them. His evil rule was brought to an end in 1832 by Mehemet Ali, the founder of Egyptian independence, who drove him out and also beat the Turks. The Egyptians were masters of Palestine for the next eight years and tried to introduce reforms, but the taxation they levied was as heavy as that of the Turks, with the result that there was a revolt of the Arabs, who secured temporary control of Jerusalem and Safed and pillaged the Jews mercilessly. After the suppression of the revolt further misfortune overtook the community in Safed in 1837, when an earthquake caused nearly 2,000 Jewish deaths. Of the survivors the *Perushim* moved to Jerusalem, where the Ashkenazi community has since then steadily grown, while a section of the Hasidim went to Hebron at the bidding of their Rabbi. There were many Jewish victims of the earthquake in Tiberias too, but Jerusalem was entirely spared. In 1838 the Druses rose against Egyptian rule, Safed was again plundered, and disorders spread to such an extent that the European Powers intervened in the dispute between the Sultan Abdul Medjid and the Pasha of Egypt. England, Russia, and Austria sided with the

century was that made by Napoleon Bonaparte in the course of his campaign against Egypt and Syria. According to his official gazette, the *Moniteur Universel*, he issued a proclamation on April 20th, 1799, in which he invited "all the Jews of Asia and Africa to rally under his banners, in order to re-establish ancient Jerusalem." This proclamation was issued after Napoleon had begun the Siege of Acre, and until recently the text of it was unknown. But, thanks to a fortunate discovery, a copy of the text has been brought to light, which shows that Napoleon's appeal was addressed not only to the Jews of Asia and Africa, but to all Jews.¹ He apostrophised them as "unique nation" and "rightful heirs of Palestine," referred to the country as "your patrimony," and called upon them "to take over that which has been conquered, and . . . to remain master of it to maintain it against all comers." His appeal concluded:

"Hasten! Now is the moment, which may not return for thousands of years, to claim the restoration of civic rights among the population of the universe which had been shamefully withheld from you for thousands of years, your political existence as a nation among the nations, and the unlimited natural right to worship Jehovah in accordance with your faith, publicly and most probably for ever (Joel iv. 20)."

This proclamation was accompanied by a letter from Aaron, son of Levi, styled "first Rabbi and Priest of Jerusalem," who appealed to his brethren "to rebuild the walls of the orphaned city and a Temple to the Lord," and urged "let all men of Israel capable of bearing arms gather and come up to us." A month after the issue of the proclamation, Napoleon, without having entered Jerusalem or even penetrated to Acre, set out on his return to France, probably before his offer had reached any important Jewish community. He gave up his dream of an Oriental empire, the idea of rebuilding a Jewish Palestine disappeared from his programme, and his disappointment found vent in the exclusion of his magniloquent manifesto from his official gazette.

In all probability Napoleon had been prompted to make his proposal by a letter addressed by a Jew to his brethren in the previous year. In this letter the anonymous writer pointed out that nine years after the issue of the Declaration of Human Rights,

¹ The credit of the discovery is due to Dr. Franz Kobler, who gave a full account of it in four articles in *The New Judaea* (September, October–November, and December, 1940, and February, 1941).

the hatred of the Jews by the nations had not lessened, and argued that the yoke resting upon them would not be removed until they regained their rank as a nation among the other nations of the world. He therefore exclaimed: "O my brethren! Let us rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem," and invoked the "invincible nation" of the French as the instrument for achieving the glorious aim. The letter, which was published in Italian, French, and English, found a wide circulation and made a profound impression both in Jewish and non-Jewish circles, particularly in England.¹

The idea of the restoration found frequent championship in England from the beginning of the nineteenth century in the most varied circles—theological, literary and political. Christian writers based their advocacy upon the Biblical promises and were partly moved by the hope that the Jews, on their return to Palestine, would be converted to Christianity. They included James Bicheno whose *Restoration of the Jews—The Crisis of All Nations* first appeared in 1800, Thomas Witherby, who pleaded in his *Attempt to Remove Prejudices concerning the Jewish Nation* (1804) both for the Jews' restoration to Palestine and for their civil equality elsewhere, and L. Mayer, whose *Restoration of the Jews* reached a third edition in 1806. In the literary sphere the idea was popularised in the *Hebrew Melodies* of Lord Byron, who gave poignant expression to the homelessness of the Jews in the famous lines:

"The white dove hath her nest, the fox his cave,
Mankind their country, Israel but the grave."

In his romance, *David Alroy* (1853), Benjamin Disraeli, who had travelled in the Near East in 1831, revealed his sympathy with the ideal of Jewish national restoration by making his hero say:

"You ask me what I wish: my answer is a national existence, which we have not. You ask me what I wish: my answer is, the Land of Promise. You ask me what I wish: my answer is, Jerusalem. You ask me what I wish: my answer is, The Temple, all we have forfeited, all we have yearned after, all for which we have fought, our beautiful country, our holy creed, our simple manners, and our ancient customs."

Disraeli gave exuberant utterance in another novel, *Tancred* (1847), to his conviction concerning an ultimate Jewish return to Palestine.

¹ The text appeared in the *Courier de Londres* and in a special edition of that journal; it was published in *The Monthly Visitor*, Vol. IV, London, 1788, pp. 383-6; and republished in 1806 in the second edition of James Bicheno's *Restoration of the Jews*. In France an extract of the letter and favourable comment appeared in the magazine, *Décade Philosophique et Littéraire*, April 19th, 1798.

A more comprehensive and analytical treatment of the subject was presented many years later by George Eliot in her famous novel, *Daniel Deronda*, which appeared in 1876. One of her heroes, the spokesman of the Jewish national aspiration, says, in the course of a speech:

“There is a store of wisdom among us to found a new Jewish polity, grand, simple, just, like the old—a republic where there is equality of protection. . . . Then our race shall have an organic centre, a heart and a brain to watch and guide and execute; the outraged Jew shall have a defence in the court of nations. . . . And the world will gain as Israel gains.”

Of the various personalities who began to show practical interest in the earlier half of the nineteenth century in the settlement of the Jews in Palestine, the first and most distinguished was the great humanitarian, Sir Moses Montefiore (1784–1885), who, in 1827, made the first of his seven pilgrimages to that country. Eleven years later he paid his second visit for the purpose of submitting to the Viceroy of Egypt, Mehemet Ali, then in control of Palestine, a scheme for Jewish colonisation, and to this cause he devoted zeal, thought, and money throughout his life. In 1838 also, Lord Shaftesbury pleaded for a Jewish settlement in Palestine under the guarantee of the Great Powers, and he subsequently elaborated his views in an anonymous article in the *Quarterly Review* (January, 1839). During the London Conference of 1840, at which the future of Palestine and Syria was discussed, Lord Shaftesbury addressed a memorandum on the subject to the Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston. In an article published in *The Times* of August 17th, 1840, it was stated that “the proposition to plant the Jewish people in the land of their fathers, under the protection of the Five Powers, is no longer a mere matter of speculation, but of serious political consideration,” and on August 26th *The Times* printed an earlier memorandum to the Powers, together with encouraging replies from most of the sovereigns addressed. A further memorandum on the subject appeared later in the year, expressing the views of a group of statesmen that “the cause of the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine is one essentially generous and noble,” that the colonisation of Palestine by the Jews would be a remedy for contemporary conflicts, and that “it would be a crowning point in the glory of England to bring about such an event.” Palmerston was not unfavourable, but there was no Jewish organisation capable of dealing with so stupendous a problem, and he therefore

manifested his sympathy by giving instructions to the British Consul in Jerusalem to accord official protection to the Jews in Palestine—a concession that may be regarded as the forerunner of the Balfour Declaration of November, 1917. Support for the idea of the restoration was also expressed at a meeting held at Carlow, near Dublin, on February 28th, 1841, under the chairmanship of the Dean of Leighton, and a memorial sent to Palmerston asking for intervention by the British Government elicited from him a reply (March 8th) that the Government would limit their efforts “to obtain for such Jews as may wish to settle in Palestine full security for their persons and property.”

After Mehemet Ali had been driven out of Palestine in 1841 and the country was restored to Turkish rule, the question was taken up by Colonel Charles Henry Churchill (grandson of the fifth Duke of Marlborough), a young officer on the staff of the Allied Army, which had forced the Egyptian ruler's withdrawal. Churchill, who was stationed in Damascus, conveyed to the Jews in that city the *firman* that had been obtained by Sir Moses Montefiore from the Sultan Abdul Medjid, granting them civil equality and repudiating the ritual murder libel, and he evinced the profoundest interest in the idea of the Jewish resettlement in Palestine. He wrote a letter to Montefiore on June 14th, 1841, in which he urged that the Jews should direct their energies “towards the regeneration of Syria and Palestine,” and said that there was no doubt that they “would end by obtaining the sovereignty of at least Palestine.” He was anxious that the co-operation of the Jews on the Continent should be secured and therefore sent Montefiore an address, translated into German, on August 15th, 1842, with the request that he should forward it to his friends in Germany. But nothing practical resulted from this suggestion; as the Jewish Board of Deputies, of which Montefiore was President, instructed him to reply that the Board was “precluded from originating any measures for carrying out the benevolent views of Colonel Churchill.” Montefiore, however, availed himself of the services of this zealous officer by entrusting him, in 1843, with a fund for the granting of loans to Jews in Palestine.

Another British military officer who evinced a similar interest in the matter was Colonel George Gawler, founder and second Governor of South Australia, who wrote *Tranquillisation of Syria and the East*, which was sub-titled “Observations and Practical Suggestions in furtherance of the Establishment of Jewish Colonies in Palestine: the most sober and sensible remedy for the miseries of Asiatic

Turkey." In 1849 Gawler accompanied Montefiore on a further visit to Palestine, and four years later renewed his proposals that Jewish settlements should be promoted there by England, which "does most urgently need the shortest and safest lines of communications. . . . Egypt and Syria stand in intimate connexion. A foreign hostile Power mighty in either would soon endanger British trade."

Although no political action was taken, public interest was sustained in various ways. In 1844 there was formed in London the "British and Foreign Society for promoting the restoration of the Jewish nation to Palestine." A *Tract for the Times* was published by a clergyman named Bradshaw, who asked Parliament to grant £4,000,000 for the restoration if the Churches collected £1,000,000. In the following year E. L. Mitford, of the Ceylon Civil Service, wrote *An Appeal on behalf of the Jewish Nation, in Connection with British Policy in the Levant*, in which he urged the re-establishment of the Jews in Palestine "as a protected State, under the guardianship of Great Britain" with a view to "their final establishment as an independent State."

The idea of Jewish colonisation was strongly supported at the time by the *Spectator*, whose interest was aroused by the report of a speech delivered by the American Jew, Mordecai Manuel Noah (1795-1851), in New York. Noah, who had occupied various posts in the American Government service, originally proposed a Jewish colony on Grand Island near Buffalo, but after realising the impracticability of the scheme, became an ardent advocate of the restoration to Palestine. In his address, in October, 1844, he urged that it was the duty of Christians to help the Jews to regain the land of their fathers, and he received a letter from John Adams, the second President of the United States, who wrote: "I really wish the Jews again in Judæa as an independent nation; . . . once restored to an independent government, and no longer persecuted, they would soon wear away some of the asperities and peculiarities of their character." Another advocate was an Englishman, Arthur Hollingsworth, who wrote a pamphlet in 1849 dealing with "the prophetic evidence for the restitution of Palestine to the Jews", and a second one in 1852, in which he urged the establishment of a Jewish State on the ground that it would be of great importance to Great Britain for the purpose of safeguarding the overland route to India.

The most useful action at the time was taken by Sir Moses Montefiore, who, in 1854, together with Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler,

appealed to the Jews of England for funds to relieve distress in Palestine due to the failure of the harvest and the crisis caused by the Crimean War. A sum of £20,000 was raised, to which was added a legacy of £10,000 for the benefit of Palestine Jews from Judah Touro, of New Orleans, and thereupon Montefiore went out again to Palestine in May, 1855. The result of this visit was that he obtained from the Sultan a *firman* permitting the purchase of land, and that he bought land at Jerusalem and Jaffa on which he planted gardens, erected a windmill, and opened a girls' school, besides establishing agricultural settlements at Safed and Tiberias. In 1874 the Jewish Board of Deputies published correspondence between Montefiore, Colonel Gawler's son, the Haham Bashi (Sephardic Chief Rabbi) of Jerusalem, and many of the local Jews, "on the promotion of agricultural and other industrial pursuits," and in that year, at the age of ninety, the venerable philanthropist made his seventh and last visit to the Holy City. He suggested sanitary improvements, dwellings for the working classes in garden suburbs where vines, olive-trees, and vegetables, should be grown, and loan societies to enable Jews to buy land. The Sir Moses Montefiore Testimonial Committee, which was founded in 1878 to commemorate his approaching centenary, adopted some of these suggestions, and by 1887 a hundred and sixty houses and buildings, the best of the kind in Palestine, had been erected in Jerusalem, near the Jaffa Gate, one of the many memorials to an illustrious name.

There were several other Englishmen who displayed an enthusiastic interest in the idea of restoration. They included General Sir Charles Warren, who, in 1879, proposed the formation of a chartered company, which should obtain a concession from the Sultan to permit a Jewish settlement with a view to self-government; Colonel C. R. Conder, who spoke and wrote in support of the idea indefatigably for some decades; and Sir Edward Cazalet, who in 1878 urged a large settlement of Jews under British protection and suggested the establishment of a Jewish University in Jerusalem. Even more zealous than these was Laurence Oliphant (1829-88), writer and traveller, who projected a large Jewish settlement in Transjordan in 1879, but failed to obtain the Sultan's consent. He visited Palestine twice, accompanied by his Jewish secretary, Naphtali Herz Imber, the author of the Zionist anthem, "Hatikvah," and took the keenest interest in the Jewish development of the country to the end of his days. He also went to Eastern Europe to distribute the money of the

Mansion House Relief Fund among the Jewish victims of pogroms and discussed Jewish questions with leaders of the *Hibbath Zion* ("Love of Zion") movement in Russia, Austria, and Rumania. His last years were spent at Haifa, where he was untiring in the help that he gave to Jewish settlers in the neighbourhood.

In France, too, there were exponents of the idea. The historian, Joseph Salvador (1796-1873), who was a profound believer in the future of Judaism, and the undisputed intellectual leader of French Jewry in the latter part of his life, published in 1860 a work, *Paris, Rome, Jerusalem*, in which he urged the holding of a Congress of the Powers for the reinstating of his people in their ancient land. Twenty years earlier there had appeared a book, *La Nouvelle Question d'Orient*, by the private Secretary of Napoleon III, Ernest Laharanne, who pleaded for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine and emphasised the great cultural benefits that the Jews would confer upon the Near East. And the founder of the International Red Cross, Jean Henri Dunant, was likewise an enthusiast who in 1876 created the first Palestine Exploration Society.

While the idea of the resettlement of the Jews in their ancient land had numerous adherents in the Western world, a movement for its realisation began to develop among the Jews in Central and Eastern Europe from about the middle of the nineteenth century. These protagonists were more strongly moved than the advocates in England or France, for they were impelled by a complex of more powerful and varied motives: religious conviction, national consciousness, and personal experience of the intolerance, hardships, and dangers to which their people were exposed in the Diaspora. For them the restoration to Palestine was not a project for the benefit of some remote group of people, but a matter of vital concern to their own communities; they were less interested in the political advantages that might thus accrue to some Power than in the national and religious ideals of their own people; and above all they wished to see the beginning of the realisation of eighteen hundred years of prayer.

The first and most distinguished of these advocates of practical activity was an orthodox Rabbi, Zevi Hirsch Kalischer (1795-1874), born at Lissa, who was a Talmudical authority of extensive repute and author of commentaries on the Pentateuch and the *Shulchan Aruch*. He enjoyed great influence owing not only to his profound scholarship but also to the fact that he occupied the position of Rabbi at Thorn (in East Prussia) for forty years without any

salary, living on a shop kept by his wife. As early as 1830 he wrote to his former teacher, the famous Rabbi Akiba Eger, on the necessity of the return to Palestine, and several years later entered into correspondence on the subject with Baron Amschel Mayer Rothschild, Sir Moses Montefiore, and other notabilities of the time. In 1843 he published his *Emunah Yesharah* ("The Right Faith") in two parts, in which he expounded his system of enlightened orthodoxy, and in 1861 he issued a third part, *Drishath Zion* ("The Quest of Zion"). The views concerning Palestine that Kalischer expressed in this book seemed so advanced to his contemporaries that it required much learning and dialectical argument to convince some Rabbis that his position was strictly orthodox. His three main theses, which were sustained by a considerable array of Biblical texts and Talmudical dicta, were: that the salvation of the Jews, as foretold by the prophets, can come only in a natural way by self-help, and does not need the advent of the Messiah; that the colonisation of Palestine should be advocated and undertaken without delay; and that the revival of sacrifices in the Holy Land at the present day was admissible. He urged that a society of rich Jews should be formed to undertake the colonisation of Palestine; that many Jews from Russia, Poland, and Germany should be helped by the society to settle on the land; that a guard of able-bodied young Jews should be trained to protect the settlers from attacks by Bedouin; and that an agricultural school should be founded in Palestine to educate Jewish boys and girls in farming as well as in various secular subjects.

Kalischer was ardently supported by a number of other eminent orthodox Rabbis, among whom were Elijah Gutmacher (famous in his later years as a Hasidic wonder-Rabbi), Israel Hildesheimer, and Isaac Ruelf, author of *Aruhath Bath Ammi* ("Healing of My People"). In 1860 he convened a conference at Thorn of Rabbis and influential laymen, to whom he submitted his plan for practical work. One of its results was the establishment in the following year of the first Zionist society, in Frankfort-on-the-Oder, by Dr. Hayim Lourie, but as the society met with difficulties it was transferred in 1864 to Berlin, where it was organised, with Kalischer's active co-operation, as the "Society for the Colonisation of the Land of Israel." A more important and lasting result was the establishment in 1870, in response to the insistent requests of Kalischer, of the first Jewish agricultural school in Palestine, Mikveh Israel, near Jaffa, by the Alliance Israélite Universelle, the French Jewish philanthropic organisation which was founded in 1860. The

creation of this school owed much to Charles Netter (1826-82), a leading member of the Central Committee of the Alliance, who obtained the requisite permit from the Sultan in 1870, remained at Mikveh Israel for another three years to supervise its organisation, revisited it several times, and died there. The school, which exists to the present day, disappointed first expectations, as most of its trained pupils emigrated to Egypt and America as agronomists instead of remaining in the country to further the Jewish settlement, but it has played a useful part in the agricultural education of the youth.

Another outstanding protagonist in Germany, but of quite a different character, was Moses Hess (1812-75), who wrote the first critical exposition of the bases of Jewish nationalism. Born at Bonn, and brought up in the atmosphere of religious tradition, he threw himself at an early age into the maelstrom of political life as a journalist and speaker. From a National Liberal, he became an advanced Socialist-Democrat and a fellow worker of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, but owing to disillusionment and the attitude of the Prussian Government, he retired from the political fray after the Revolution of 1848 and lived in Paris for many years. It was there, partly under the influence of the Damascus blood accusation and of reflections aroused by the struggles of various European nations to attain independence, that he devoted himself to a comprehensive examination of the Jewish question and produced his classic work, *Rome and Jerusalem*, in 1862. This book, which is permeated throughout by the spirit of an ardent Jewish nationalist, is all the more remarkable as it was written twenty years after Hess had been estranged from his people; but his Jewish consciousness re-asserted itself so strongly that he even advised his fellow Jews to give up their emancipation if they found it irreconcilable with Jewish nationality. "No modern people struggling for its fatherland," he wrote in his Preface, "can deny the Jewish people its right to its own land without involving itself in the most fatal inconsistency." He regarded the restoration of the Jewish State as a necessity both for the Jewish people and for humanity alike, and believed it would bring about improved relations between capital and labour.

"With the Jews, more than with other nations, which, though oppressed, yet live on their own soil, all political and social progress must necessarily be preceded by national independence. A common native soil is a primary condition if better and more

progressive relations between capital and labour are to be created among Jews. The social man, just like the plant and animals, needs for his growth a wide, free soil; without it he sinks to the status of a parasite, which feeds at the expense of others."

For the Jews such independence was attainable only in Palestine, the cradle of their civilisation and the goal of their age-long yearnings. They would always remain strangers among the European nations, who might emancipate them for reasons of humanity and justice, but would never respect them so long as the Jews placed their own great memories in the background and adhered to the maxim: *Ubi bene, ibi patria* ("Where it is well with me, there is my fatherland"). The Jewish type was indestructible and the Jewish national consciousness could not be extinguished, although the German Jews, for the sake of social and political emancipation, persuaded themselves to the contrary. Hess referred for confirmation of some of his views to the book by Laharanne and to Kalischer's *Drishath Zion*, from both of which he quoted passages. He hoped that France, which was then engaged on the construction of the Suez Canal, would help the Jews to found colonies from Suez to Jerusalem and from the banks of the Jordan to the shore of the Mediterranean. But his work, which was a spiritual autobiography, written in an engaging style and full of profound thought and acute observations, made little or no impression upon the Jews of Germany, to whom it was primarily addressed, for they were bent upon achieving the blessings of emancipation. It was only from the historian, Heinrich Graetz, that it elicited approving comment.

The Jewish masses in Eastern Europe—in Russia, Poland, and Rumania—were quite unaffected by the various works and pamphlets urging the Jewish return to the Holy Land, which appeared west of the Vistula, probably because, with the exception of Kalischer's book, they were written in languages that most of them did not understand. But they did not need any external stimulus: they produced their own champions of the same idea independently and under the influence of the oppressive conditions under which they lived and suffered. From the middle of the nineteenth century the *Haskalah* movement, which had begun to develop in Russia spasmodically even earlier, was cultivated by a number of Jewish writers and thinkers as the means whereby they hoped to achieve the emancipation of their people. The *Haskalah*, which means "enlightenment," was the movement

a *Haskalah* writer, Simha Pinsker, who had been one of the founders of the "Society for the Dissemination of Culture among the Russian Jews," but the anti-Jewish policy of the Russian Government, culminating in the pogroms, compelled him to abandon the assimilationist standpoint and radically to revise his view of the Jewish future. His *Auto-Emancipation* provides the most searching analysis of the Jewish situation that had yet been written, and by reason of its penetrating insight, breadth of outlook, and pregnant style, it produced a more deep and lasting impression and influenced a far wider circle than any previous advocacy of the same idea.

Pinsker summed up the helpless and humiliating position of the Jews in some striking aphorisms:

"We do not count as a nation among the other nations, and we have no voice in the council of the peoples, even in affairs that concern ourselves. Our fatherland is an alien country, our unity dispersion, our solidarity the general hostility to us, our weapon humility, our defence flight, our originality adaptability, our future to-morrow. What a contemptible role for a people that once had its Maccabees!"

It was because the Jews were not a living nation, but everywhere aliens, wrote Pinsker, that they were despised. Civil and political emancipation was not sufficient to raise them in the estimation of other peoples. The only proper remedy was the creation of a Jewish nationality, of a people living on its own soil: that was the auto-emancipation of the Jews, their emancipation as a nation among nations by the acquisition of a home of their own. They should not persuade themselves that humanity and enlightenment would ever be radical remedies for the malady of their people. The lack of national self-respect and self-confidence, of political initiative and unity, were the enemies of their national renaissance. In order that they should not be obliged to wander from one exile to another, they must have an extensive and productive place of refuge, a gathering-centre of their own, which their ablest representatives—men of finance, science, and affairs, statesmen and publicists—should combine to create. The societies already in existence should convene a national congress or select a directorate, which should decide which was the more suitable territory—Palestine or America—"to allow the settlement of several millions." Pinsker had an open mind at first on the question of territory, but soon became a convinced supporter of Palestine. He proposed that

the suggested directorate, in conjunction with a group of capitalists, should form a limited company, which should buy a large tract of land. Part of this tract should be sold to individual Jews at a little above cost price, and the proceeds of the sales, together with the yield of a national subscription, should be used by the directorate as a fund for the settlement of poor immigrants. He fully realised that the success of the plan would depend upon the support of governments, but once that was secured, they would have, instead of many refuges, one single refuge politically assured. His pamphlet made history, for, although it did not achieve its ambitious purpose, it led to the first practical efforts to realise the national idea.

PART II

THE PERIOD OF PREPARATION

CHAPTER III

THE "LOVE OF ZION" MOVEMENT

THE first practical response to the various appeals to the Jewish people to return to Palestine was made by the Jews of Russia. The hopes in which many had indulged, that they would achieve civil equality and just treatment like their brethren in Western Europe, were blasted after the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, when a period of intensified reaction set in, accompanied by the first blizzard of pogroms that became a sinister feature of the Tsarist tyranny. These massacres were instigated by the ruling circles in an attempt to divert the discontent of the people from the corrupt and negligent Government to the Jews, who were accused of producing the general misery by their alleged exploitation. The result was that the Jewish communities in many cities in the south and south-west of Russia were exposed to slaughter and pillage for three months in 1881, and the excesses were repeated in the two following years. This reign of terror, together with a further crop of restrictive laws, compelled thousands of Jews who had previously believed in the coming of better times to abandon that hope and to look for salvation in other directions. Large numbers hurriedly emigrated to the United States as a sure and quick way to freedom and safety; and hosts of others speedily exchanged their faith in assimilation for the Jewish national idea. The enthusiasm for "enlightenment" collapsed, and its place was taken by a new movement called *Hibbath Zion*, the "Love of Zion."

In a great number of Jewish centres societies were formed of *Hovevé Zion*, or "Lovers of Zion," who discussed the question of settling in Palestine as an immediate and practical problem and urged the study of Hebrew as a living language. These societies, which met in secret and at the risk of arrest by the police, were headed by resolute and influential personalities, mostly professional men, communal leaders and Rabbis, such as Leon Pinsker in Odessa, the writers Joseph Finn and Judah Leo Levanda in Vilna, the historian Saul Pinhas Rabinowitz ("Shefer") in Warsaw, Rabbi Samuel Mohilever in Bialystok, and Dr. Max Mandelstamm

in Kiev. The youth and, above all, the students flocked to the movement with particular ardour. A group of twenty-five Jewish students of the Kharkov University toured through Russia and recruited five hundred enthusiasts, fellow-students and others, who were eager to go out to Palestine at once as pioneers on the land, and to dedicate their lives to the realisation of the national ideal. They adopted as their motto the words from Isaiah, *Beth Jacob lechu ve-nelcha* ("O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us go forth"), and were called after the initial letters, "Bilu." They transferred their committee from Kharkov to Odessa, and sent delegates to Constantinople to negotiate for the purchase of land in Palestine, but without any result. Efforts for the same purpose made by Sir Edward Cazalet and by Laurence Oliphant, who had met the would-be emigrants at Brody in the course of his relief mission (on behalf of a London committee) to the victims of the pogroms, were likewise of no avail. The Turkish Government, fearing a Jewish invasion, issued a prohibition against immigration into Palestine, and the Russian Government forbade a continuance of emigration propaganda. The intended exodus was thus quashed, and only a small band of twenty young men, after having most of their money stolen on the way and other unpleasant adventures, succeeded in reaching Palestine.

The first settlement, or colony, as it was called, was founded in 1882, not far from Jaffa, by ten of the young "Biluim," headed by David Levontin and Joseph Feinberg, and was named Rishon le-Zion ("First in Zion"); while other Russian Jews helped to restore the settlement of Petah Tikvah ("Gate of Hope") in the same district, which had been founded in 1878 by some Jews of Jerusalem, who had abandoned it owing to an outbreak of malaria and afterwards returned. In the same year two agricultural settlements were established by Jews from Rumania, one at Rosh Pinah ("Head Corner-stone"), near Safed, the other at Samarin, on the road to Haifa. They were followed the next year by some Polish Jews, who created the settlement of Yesod Hamaalah ("Foundation of Ascent") near Lake Huleh. Thus, within a very short time, a footing was secured in the four districts of Judæa, Samaria, and North and South Galilee, in which most of the Jewish settlements were subsequently concentrated. But the pioneers were faced by a more exacting and formidable problem than they had anticipated. Ignorant of agriculture, unused to the climate and to hard physical labour, handicapped by the lack of proper housing and drinking water, and exposed to attack by the Bedouin, they found them-

selves saddled with what seemed a Herculean task. In addition to all these difficulties they suffered from want of funds, which formed a very serious obstacle. They would therefore have probably been forced to give up their venture in despair but for the timely and ample help that came from a noble-hearted French Jew, whose interest was aroused by Rabbi Mohilever, Joseph Feinberg, and Laurence Oliphant. Their saviour was Baron Edmond de Rothschild (1845-1934), of Paris, who, from the moment his enthusiasm was fired, continued to play the part of a princely benefactor to the Jewish resettlement for upwards of fifty years until his death. He at once responded by providing generous subsidies for the colonists, and by founding in 1884 a further settlement, called Ekron, in Judæa, on which he installed Jews from the agricultural colonies of Southern Russia. The settlers of Samarin showed their gratitude by changing its name to Zichron Jacob ("Memorial of Jacob") in memory of Baron Edmond's father; and in the same year nine members of Rishon-le-Zion left to found the new settlement of Katra or Gederah ("Hurdle") in Judæa, which they wished to make self-supporting.

The leaders of the *Hovevé Zion* societies did not wish to let the practical developments in Palestine depend upon philanthropy, and therefore resolved to combine their scattered forces in order to be able to render more effective aid themselves. Leon Pinsker, whose pamphlet and prestige made him the inevitable leader, with the energetic co-operation of Rabbi Mohilever and Rabinowitz, convened a Conference of representatives of the societies at Kattowitz. It met from November 6th to 12th, 1884, and was attended by thirty-four delegates. The proceedings began on the hundredth birthday of Sir Moses Montefiore, and in appreciation of his services the Conference decided that the organisation in which all the societies should be federated should be called the "Montefiore Association for the Promotion of Agriculture among Jews and especially for the Support of the Jewish Colonies in Palestine." Pinsker, who presided, emphasised the need of the Jews for a land in which they could live in freedom and till the soil, so as to refute the charge that they were an unproductive element, and he declared that the only land that would satisfy their purpose and fulfil their aspirations was Palestine. It was agreed to help the colonists financially, and also to send delegates to Constantinople to secure permission for the work in Palestine to be conducted without hindrance, but although the permission was not granted the work was continued. Pinsker was elected

President of the new Association, and Lilienblum Secretary, and the central office was established in Odessa, where Pinsker was also President of the local *Hovevei Zion* society.

The Association held a second conference in 1887 at Druskenik for the purpose of improving and expanding its organisation, and a third conference two years later in Vilna, at which thirty-five societies were represented. It was seriously hampered in its efforts to carry on useful activity, and especially to raise funds, by the protracted delay in obtaining official approval; but at last, in 1890, its statutes were legalised under the name of "Society for the Support of Jewish Agriculturists and Artisans in Palestine and Syria." The first general meeting of the Society was attended by 182 delegates, who elected Pinsker as Chairman, and confirmed the choice of Odessa as headquarters. Pinsker spent the remaining year of his life in conducting propaganda both in Russia and Germany, and died in 1891. He was succeeded as Chairman of the "Odessa Committee," as the Society was popularly called, by Abraham Gruenberg, who held office until 1896, and the next Chairman was Menahem Ussishkin (1863-1941), who had become one of the leading figures in Russian Zionism and was destined to play a prominent part in the wider arena of world Zionism.

The *Hibbath Zion* movement soon spread to many parts of Europe and also to America. One of the first countries in which it secured a strong footing was Rumania, where the position of the Jews was no better than in Russia: the pledge that had been made by the Rumanian Government at the Berlin Congress of 1878 to emancipate the Jews was cynically ignored, and their status was that of outlaws. The founders of the first societies were Dr. Nathan Karpel Lippe and Samuel Pineles in Jassy, and Dr. Moses Gaster (afterwards Chief Rabbi of the Sephardi community in England) in Bucarest; and by the year 1882 thirty-two societies were represented at a conference at Focsani. In Austria the movement received a stimulus from the anti-Semitism of the German nationalists, who adopted the racial programme and excluded Jews from the University students' corps and gymnastic societies. The Jewish students of the assimilationist camp formed their own corps after the Austrian pattern; but another group, who originated mainly from Eastern Europe, and were headed by Perez Smolenskin and Dr. Nathan Birnbaum (1864-1937), founded the first Jewish nationalist students' society, "Kadimah," in 1882, in addition to which there was another society, "Admath Jeshurun." After the untimely death of Smolenskin the leading personality in Jewish

nationalist circles in Vienna was Birnbaum, who has the credit of having coined the term "Zionism" and who was a man of ardent but various and variable convictions. Beginning his career as a Marxist freethinker, he played a conspicuous part in the earliest phase of political Zionism and in Austrian Jewish politics, and ended as a fervid adherent of the ultra-orthodox Agudath Israel organisation. In 1885, at the early age of twenty-one, he founded a paper, *Selbst-Emanzipation*, in Vienna, and eight years later he published a pamphlet on *The National Rebirth of the Jewish People in Its Land* and proposed the convening of a congress for the purpose. In Berlin, apart from a society of *Hovevê Zion*, called "Ezra," there was also a society of Russian Jewish students, founded by Leo Motzkin and Joseph Lurie, and including Chaim Weizmann, Shmarya Levin, and Victor Jacobson—all of whom were destined to play important parts in the movement. The leaders of the latter society, together with Heinrich Loewe, formed another society, "Jung Israel," for German Jewish students, whose first manifesto, issued in 1893, stressed the need of holding a congress "to formulate the ultimate aims of political pan-Jewish Zionism." There were also groups of Jewish nationalist students, mainly from Russia, in Switzerland, particularly in Berne and Geneva.

In England there was not only a *Hovevê Zion* organisation, under the leadership of Colonel Albert Goldsmid and Elim d'Avigdor, with branches called "tents," but also independent societies, such as the "Bné Zion" in London and the "Dorshê Zion" in Manchester. In France the movement had the warm support of the Grand Rabbin Zadoc Kahn, but a Central Committee that was formed in Paris in 1890 to serve as a link between *Hovevê Zion* societies of all countries proved ineffectual, the real authority remaining in the hands of the Odessa Committee. In the United States the philo-Zionist movement was espoused from the early 'eighties by two different sections—immigrants from Russia who had received a traditional Jewish education and retained a strong Jewish consciousness, and several eminent Rabbis, such as Pereira Mendes, Benjamin Szold (father of Miss Henrietta Szold), Aaron Wise (father of Dr. Stephen Wise), Gustav Gottheil (father of Professor Richard Gottheil), and Marcus Jastrow. The first societies were established in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia: there was a Hebrew paper, *Hatzofeh Ba'aretz Ha-hadasha*, published by Zevi Hirsch Bernstein; and as early as 1882 a public lecture was given on the "Bilu" by Joseph Bluestone, who had arrived in America three years before. The call of Zion also found an inspired champion

in the poetess, Emma Lazarus (1849-87), who, deeply stirred by the Russian pogroms and the influx of refugees into America, poured out her soul in *Songs of a Semite, By the Waters of Babylon*, and *The Banner of the Jew*. She also wrote *An Epistle to the Hebrews* in which she aroused the religious and national consciousness of American Jewry, and her name is immortalised by her lines of welcome to the homeless refugees inscribed on the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbour.

The *Hovevê Zion* societies on both sides of the Atlantic sent what money they could to the struggling settlements in Palestine and followed their slow progress with deep concern. But there was one member of the Odessa Committee who was more critically disposed than his colleagues and gave expression to his views in a trenchant article that caused a sensation. The article, which appeared in *Hamelitz* in 1889, was entitled *Lo zeh Haderech* ("This is not the way"), and was signed by a pseudonym, "Ahad Ha-am" ("One of the People"), which soon became famous. The writer was Asher Ginsberg (1856-1927), born in a village near Kiev, who, in addition to a Talmudical education, had studied modern subjects in Berlin and Vienna. He settled in 1886 in Odessa, where he soon came into close touch with the leaders of the *Hibbath Zion* movement. His first article was equally remarkable for the individuality of its views and the lucid style and cogent phrasing in which they were expressed: it signalled the appearance of a new thinker in Israel. Ahad Ha-am strongly criticised the methods adopted by the *Hovevê Zion* to realise the Jewish national rebirth in Palestine on the ground that they were based upon a wrong conception of what was necessary. He denied that Palestine was suitable for mass immigration and that Jews could become real farmers, and he maintained that even if the country could absorb a large number it could not have any decisive influence upon the political position of the Jews, owing to the fewness and impotence of the settlers. He attributed the lack of success not to the *Halukah* system or the bad methods of the administrators of the colonies, but to the attempt to force into rapid growth what should be allowed to undergo gradual evolution.

Jewish nationalism was "a new and far-reaching idea," which went backwards instead of forwards in Palestine, and progress could be achieved only by a radical change of method. For Ahad Ha-am the primary problem was not the saving of Jews by ameliorating their physical existence, but the preservation and development of the Jewish spirit. He was concerned, not with the material needs

of Jewry, but with the critical condition of Judaism, by which he understood something more comprehensive than the Jewish religion; but although anxious about the conservation of the Jewish spirit, he was sarcastic about the so-called "mission of Judaism", which was advanced by opponents of Zionism as a reason for their antagonism. He deplored the spiritual disintegration of Judaism which could not be healed in the Diaspora, since this did not allow the free development of Jewish national life. The only country where such development could take place was Palestine, which should form a home not for Jewry but for Judaism. There a cultural or spiritual centre should be created, from which currents of influence should radiate throughout the Diaspora, and thus all Jews would again be invigorated and unified. The full realisation of the national ideal must wait until, through the influence of the spiritual centre, the national will became sufficiently strong to bring it within the realm of possibility. This spiritual centre should be built up on the basis of *Hibbath Zion*, which must become the dominant factor in a select group of Jews. Ahad Ha-am recognised that even a spiritual centre must have a material or economic basis, but he attached more importance to quality than quantity. His system of thought, which he developed in succeeding years, was called Spiritual or Cultural Zionism.

In order to realise his ideas Ahad Ha-am founded an Order of "Sons of Moses" ("B'né Mosheh"), whose members were to represent a high standard of ethical integrity and to work for the national revival in a spirit of supreme disinterestedness. Most of the members of the Order were leading *Hovevê Zion*. He visited Palestine for the first time in 1891, on behalf of the Odessa Committee, and went there again in 1893. After these visits he wrote critical reports, in which he made proposals for the purchase of land, the cessation of subsidies to the colonists, and concentration on cultural work. A Bialystok group of "Sons of Moses," under the leadership of Rabbi Mohilever, founded the settlement of Rehoboth in 1891. The Order also made important contributions to Jewish national education by opening the first girls' Hebrew school in Jaffa and many Hebrew schools in the agricultural villages; and it founded the first two publishing firms for the issue of works of Hebrew literature in Russia, "Abiasaf" and "Tushiyah." Owing to the clash of opinions and personalities the Order was dissolved in 1896. In that year Ahad Ha-am founded a Hebrew monthly review, *Hashiloah*, which he edited until 1902. It was devoted to Zionist and general Jewish questions, contained articles by all the

leading Hebrew writers of the day, and exercised a decisive influence upon the intellectual outlook of the Hebrew-reading public.

Meanwhile, thanks largely to the benevolent patronage of Baron Edmond de Rothschild, further progress was made in the sphere of agricultural colonisation. In 1890 Mishmar Ha-Yarden ("The Watch on the Jordan") was founded in North Galilee by some Russian Jews, who soon needed the Baron's help. In 1891 began the chequered history of Hedera, a swampy site in Samaria, where the first settlers suffered severely and many died from malaria, until the marshy land was drained and improved by the extensive plantation of eucalyptus trees at the cost of the same benefactor. Motza and Ein-Zethim were also established in 1891, and five years later came Metula in the extreme north and Artuf, founded by Bulgarian Jews off the railway line between Jerusalem and Jaffa. In places where corn-growing was unprofitable, French vines were planted under expert direction, and in Galilee horticulture and silk-worm cultivation were introduced. Large wine-cellars were built, the largest of all being at Rishon le-Zion, and as there was no proper agency for the sale of the wine and the Baron sometimes had to buy the entire yield himself, the Carmel Wine Company was organised by the *Hovevé Zion* in 1896 and opened up markets in Europe and America as well as the Orient. The Baron also provided funds for the building, not only of houses, but also of synagogues and schools, hospitals and asylums for the aged. To supervise the settlements he appointed administrators, whose autocratic methods provoked irritation and criticism. They introduced a system of discipline and tutelage, which deprived the settlers of all spirit of independence and initiative; and instead of regarding the farm-villages as the foundation of the Jewish national revival they treated them merely as a philanthropic undertaking. Moreover, most of the settlements were based solely upon wine-growing, so that if there was a failure of the vintage or of markets the settlers required further relief; and the most serious blemish, from the Jewish point of view, was that the hired labour consisted entirely of Arabs, who worked for low wages, and with whom it was impossible for Jewish workers to compete. The colonisation thus suffered from both economic and moral drawbacks, but the *Hovevé Zion*, who were unable to furnish more than £6,000 a year as against the Baron's millions of francs, were powerless to effect any proper improvement. Such a state of affairs was certainly discouraging after fifteen years of arduous struggle and after all the glowing visions that had been conjured up by writers and propagandists.

Between 1880 and 1895 the Jewish population in Palestine had risen, by immigration and natural increase, from 20,000 to 50,000, but of this number only 3,000 had come from Eastern Europe to form the agricultural settlements.¹

There was therefore a feeling of despondency in the Odessa Committee when it first met under the chairmanship of Menahem Ussishkin in 1896; but this feeling soon gave way to another, for a new and arresting figure now appeared upon the scene, whose advent indicated that the days of *Hibbath Zion* were over. The "Love of Zion" movement had played a very useful, and indeed, essential, part in familiarising the Jewish world with the idea of the return to Zion and in recruiting the first bands of pioneers to begin converting the idea into a reality. But its methods were too slow and haphazard, its organisation too small and unrepresentative, and its resources too pitifully scanty, to be capable of achieving the grand objective.² The bulk of its work depended upon the benevolence of a single man, and, no matter how bountiful his generosity, or how self-sacrificing the toil of the pioneers, such a system was unworthy of a national cause, and its results were depressingly inadequate. Other methods and measures were needed, with a much larger organisation representative of the Jewish people as a whole, and these were now to be created by political Zionism.

¹ See article by Arthur Ruppin in *Palästina*, No. 6-7, Vienna, 1927. The Jewish population at the beginning of the nineteenth century was 8,000 (8 per cent. of the total population), which increased to 10,114 by the year 1855 (Ludwig August Frankl, *Nach Jerusalem*, Leipzig, 1858). Of the 50,000 Jews in 1895 there were 28,112 in Jerusalem, as follows: 15,074 Ashkenazim, 7,900 Sephardim, 2,420 Moroccans, 670 Georgians (from the Caucasus), 530 Bokharans, 1,288 Yemenites, and 230 Persians (A. M. Luncz, *Palästina Calendar* [in Hebrew], Jerusalem, 1895).

² The Odessa Committee continued in existence until it was dissolved by order of the Bolshevik authorities in 1919.

CHAPTER IV

HERZL: POLITICAL ZIONISM

THE founder of political Zionism was Theodor Herzl, a journalist and playwright, who had no previous knowledge of any of the writings and strivings that had preceded him in the cause of the national restoration of his people. Born in Budapest on May 2nd, 1860, the only son of a well-to-do merchant, and brought up in an assimilationist *milieu*, he had only a superficial knowledge of Jewish affairs and Jewish culture, but personal experience took the place of a traditional education in quickening his Jewish consciousness. He studied law at the University of Vienna, where his parents settled in 1878, but after graduating in 1884 and practising at the bar for a year he decided to devote himself to a literary career. Gifted with a facile talent for the writing of charming feuilletons and diverting plays, he soon attained a recognised reputation, which won him the important position in 1891 of Paris Correspondent of the Vienna newspaper, the *Neue Freie Presse*, then the most influential organ in Central Europe.

Three years later began the trial of Captain Alfred Dreyfus on a trumped-up charge of treason, and Herzl, who had to report the affair for his paper, was suddenly jolted out of the carefree mood in which he had hitherto enjoyed the social distractions and the literary and political diversions of the French capital. He was a witness of all the dramatic proceedings that led to the degradation and banishment of the martyred Jew, and of the accompanying outbursts of anti-Semitic hostility; and he was painfully moved by the tragedy which had sundered the French people into two opposing camps and evoked the consternation of the civilised world. A century after the French Revolution had given the Jews civil equality as part of the ideal programme of "liberty, equality, and fraternity," Herzl saw that the Jews were threatened with a movement of reaction, and he was inevitably driven to cogitate on the position. He first embodied his thoughts in a play, *Das Neue Ghetto*, which he wrote in the autumn of 1894, but had to wait over three years before it was produced. The Dreyfus Affair, however, was not the first episode that had outraged his Jewish feelings. His family had no sooner moved to Vienna than he was stung by an inflammatory anti-Jewish speech of the fanatical Burgomaster, Karl Lueger; four years later he was perturbed by his reading of Eugen Dühring's vitriolic work, *Die Judenfrage*; in 1883 he with-

drew from a university students' union because of its anti-Semitic attitude; and on two occasions some years later, while travelling in Germany, he heard after him the cry of the mediæval Jew-baiter, "*Hep, hep!*" But the drama enacted in Paris seared his soul to the depths, as no previous experience had done: it threw the grimmest light upon the Jewish problem and forced him to address his mind to a solution.

Herzl set forth his views and proposals in a pamphlet entitled *Der Judenstaat*, which he wrote in the summer of 1895, and which held him in thrall throughout the weeks of its feverish composition. Somewhat similar ideas had already been expressed by Moses Hess in his *Rome and Jerusalem* and by Pinsker in his *Auto-Emancipation*, but Herzl had not heard of them at the time and, when he was told of them later, said that if he had known of them he would never have written his own brochure. Seldom has a movement owed more than did political Zionism to the fact that its founder was totally ignorant of his predecessors. He based his plea for the creation of a Jewish State upon the conviction that no matter how useful, patriotic, and self-sacrificing Jews might prove wherever they were, they would never be left in peace. The Jewish question existed wherever there were Jews in perceptible numbers, and since they naturally moved to places where they were not persecuted they succeeded only in importing anti-Semitism through their migration. They might perhaps be able to merge themselves entirely among the nations surrounding them if they could be left in peace for the space of two generations, but the nations would not leave them in peace. It was neither a social nor a religious question, but a "national question, which can be solved only by making it a political world question, to be discussed and settled by the civilised nations of the world in council." The solution that Herzl proposed was that the Jews should be "granted sovereignty over a portion of the globe large enough to satisfy the rightful requirements of a nation." The rest they would manage for themselves, and for this purpose he suggested two agencies, a "Society of Jews" and a "Jewish Company," significantly using these English terms. The "Society" was to undertake all the preparatory work of organisation and political negotiation, and the "Company" was to attend to the manifold financial and economic questions. "The Jewish State is essential to the world," he wrote. "It will therefore be created." Unlike Pinsker, he worked out his plan in elaborate detail; but, like him, he did not commit himself to a particular territory. He advanced Palestine and Argentina as

the two alternatives, but left it to Jewish public opinion and the "Society" to decide which it was to be. He had not long to wait for the answer. In the Introduction to his pamphlet he wrote that, with its publication, his task was done and he would not take up his pen again unless he were driven to it by the attacks of noteworthy antagonists. The attacks came fast and furiously.

Herzl did not publish *The Jewish State* immediately. He first submitted the manuscript to a journalistic friend, who returned it with an expression of the deepest alarm, as he feared that Herzl had gone out of his mind; but Herzl felt reassured when he correctly added up a column of telegram expenses which his colleague had failed to get right. Herzl then showed the manuscript to Dr. Max Nordau (1849-1923), who was an eminent psychiatrist as well as a world-famed author; and Nordau not only vindicated the sanity of Herzl, but declared himself willing to assist him. Nevertheless, Herzl still refrained from publication before attempting to secure influential support for his scheme. He first of all approached Baron Maurice de Hirsch (1831-96), a multi-millionaire who had made a vast fortune from the building of railways in Russia and the Balkans, and founded the Jewish Colonisation Association (commonly called the I.C.A.) in 1891 with an initial sum of £2,000,000, later increased to £10,000,000, primarily for the establishment of Russian Jews in agricultural settlements in the Argentine and other parts of America. But Baron de Hirsch believed in ameliorating the condition of persecuted Jewry only by philanthropic methods; he was opposed to any political solution of the Jewish question, and he died before Herzl had a second opportunity of discussing his proposals with him. In September, 1895, Herzl returned to Vienna to take up the position of Literary Editor of the *Neue Freie Presse*, a post that he retained until his death; but although fully employed by his newspaper duties and the writing of plays, he felt impelled to go ahead with his scheme. Armed with an introduction from Nordau to Israel Zangwill (1864-1926), he went to London in the hope of securing the interest of leading personalities in the Anglo-Jewish community; but the response that he received from the Maccabees, a club of professional men to whom he expounded his views, as well as from important members of the community, both lay and clerical, although friendly to him personally, was anything but encouraging. He therefore resolved to address himself to the Jewish public. On February 14th, 1896, *Der Judenstaat* appeared in Vienna, and English and French translations promptly followed.

The pamphlet aroused attention throughout the world and immediately produced a general discussion of the Jewish problem both in Jewish and in non-Jewish circles. It was debated in the Jewish Press for months and formed the subject of the keenest and even bitterest controversy. Its critics and assailants were more numerous and influential than its active supporters. They included the leaders of the Western communities on both sides of the Atlantic, who were wedded to the policy of assimilation, and saw in Herzl's proposals a reflection upon their local patriotism; a host of Rabbis (dubbed *Protest-Rabbiner*) who denounced them as a violation of the "Mission of Israel" and a contradiction of the Messianic doctrine; and a multitude of miscellaneous writers who attacked Herzl on the ground that he was trying "to put the clock back," or that he would increase strife among nations by creating a new one, or that the Jews were totally unfit for agriculture and that the scheme was utterly impracticable. The supporters of the scheme were naturally far more numerous in Eastern Europe, where the Jewish national consciousness was more alive and the *Hibbath Zion* movement was active, but it also had vigorous champions in Central Europe and the Western world, particularly in academic circles. They rebutted the criticisms of the opponents with cogent arguments: they pointed out that half of the Jews in the world—that is, those in Russia and Rumania—were treated by their Governments as outlaws and pariahs, and it was therefore the sheerest irony to taunt them with lack of patriotism; that they were enjoined always to pray for the immediate ending of their exile, and not for its prolongation until some remote and unknown future, when the Messiah would appear; that the re-establishment of the Jews as a nation would not increase international strife, since they had not the least aggressive aim; that their fitness for farming had already been proved in Russia; and that the scheme could be rendered practicable if only it received adequate support. The *Hovevei Zion* were at first divided in their attitude, partly because Herzl, despite his nationalist standpoint, was the product of an assimilationist *milieu*, but still more because they feared that the Turkish Government would be alarmed and put a stop to further colonising activity in Palestine; but the bulk of them soon rallied to his side and many of the others followed.

Herzl found a band of eager supporters in the members of the "Kadimah" and other Jewish student societies in Vienna, Czernowitz, and Graz, who called upon him to assume the leadership of their movement; he was enthusiastically acclaimed

at a public demonstration of Jews in the East End of London in the summer of 1896; and he received messages of allegiance from individual Jews and Jewish societies in various parts of the world, including Palestine. Anxious to obtain political support, he saw the Grand Duke of Baden (thanks to the mediation of the Rev. William Hechler, Chaplain to the British Embassy in Vienna), through whom he hoped to be able to approach the German Emperor. He then went to Constantinople, where he saw the Grand Vizier, but was unable so soon to penetrate to the Sultan. A visit to Baron Edmond de Rothschild proved equally sterile, for despite the generous interest which that noble-hearted philanthropist displayed in the Jewish resettlement of Palestine, he was apprehensive of any sort of political scheme. Herzl therefore realised that the only way in which he could hope to secure practical co-operation was the democratic method of calling a congress of representatives of the Jewish people. It was a bold and hazardous idea, for no such gathering had ever been held in all the centuries of the Dispersion. Munich was at first selected as a convenient meeting-place, but the heads of the local Jewish community and the Executive of the Union of German Rabbis protested so vigorously against what they regarded as a slur upon their loyalty, that the city of Basle was chosen instead. As a medium of propaganda for the cause, which was all the more necessary because of the hostility of so many Jewish papers, Herzl, with his own money, founded a weekly journal, *Die Welt*, which was first published on June 4th, 1897, with a yellow cover—the colour of the mediæval badge of shame, now elevated to a symbol of national pride. He took this step despite the wishes of the Jewish proprietors and editor of the *Neue Freie Presse*, who were hostile to the Zionist movement and rigorously excluded any mention of it from their paper throughout Herzl's life.

It was not until after he had overcome considerable obstacles that Herzl succeeded in convening the first Zionist Congress, which opened on August 27th, 1897, and lasted three days. It was attended by 204 delegates from all parts of the world, constituting a veritable microcosm of the Jewish people, and comprising all shades of thought, all varieties of social strata, and a medley of physical types. There were Ashkenazim and Sephardim, Orthodox and Reform Jews, Rabbis and freethinkers, veteran *Hovevê Zion*¹ and newly converted nationalists, *bourgeois* and Socialists, business-

¹ Ahad Ha-am was present, but owing to his opposition to political Zionism he did not attend another Congress until 1911, when the control of the movement passed from the "political" to the "practical" Zionists.

men and intellectuals, artisans and students; and there was a babel of languages which, in the subsequent proceedings, necessitated the translation of resolutions from German into Russian, Yiddish, English, and French. The Congress was an inspiring assembly and a turning-point in Jewish history, for it was the first time after eighteen hundred years of exile, that representatives of the Jewish people had come together to deliberate on the means of achieving their national rehabilitation. Herzl not only dominated the Congress, but adorned it, for his tall, distinguished and handsome figure, with his well-shaped head, lofty brow, dark, penetrating eyes, and flowing black beard, was reminiscent of an Assyrian monarch. Indeed, his commanding presence, his readiness of speech, and his resonant voice helped in no little measure to make him the ideal leader.

In his inaugural speech, Herzl made no reference to his pamphlet, nor were its contents discussed either at that or at any succeeding Congress. He declared that Zionism had united the scattered limbs of Jewry upon a national basis and thus brought about the return to Judaism even before the return to the Jewish land. The Zionists formed no secret league, but strove to create an organisation, which, in free and public discussion, would deal with the Jewish question and solve it by converting it into the Zionist question. The attempts at colonisation already made in Palestine had proved the fitness of Jews for agriculture, but had failed because they were based on the principle of philanthropy. A people could only help itself. The return of the Jews to their ancestral land could and should take place only in a legal manner, after the necessary guarantees had been provided. The realisation of Zionism lay in the interest of Turkey as in that of all civilised peoples. The Ottoman Empire would be strengthened by the Jewish influx, and the lands of the Diaspora would be freed of anti-Semitism by the exodus of surplus Jews. The Jewish people had created for itself in the Congress an organ that it urgently needed for its life and that would be of permanent duration.

Herzl was followed by Nordau, who, in a masterly address, gave a review of the general situation of the Jews, emphasising their economic plight in the East and their moral distress in the West, both of which the Congress would seek to remedy. Nordau was a brilliant speaker, and his critical survey of the general position of Jewry was an attractive feature of the opening session of several subsequent Congresses. There were also reports on the conditions of the Jews in individual countries, and a series of addresses on

important aspects of Zionism—its historical and economic bases, the state of colonisation in Palestine, the cultural needs of Jewry—as well as proposals by Professor Hermann Schapira, of the Heidelberg University, to create a Jewish University and a National Fund for the purchase of land in Palestine.

The two main achievements of the first Congress were the formulation of the Zionist Programme and the establishment of the Zionist Organisation. The Basle Programme, as it was commonly called (after its birthplace), was unanimously adopted in the following terms:

“The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law.¹

“In order to attain this object the Congress adopts the following means:

“1. The systematic promotion of the settlement of Palestine with Jewish agriculturists, artisans, and craftsmen.

“2. The organisation and federation of all Jewry by means of local and general institutions in conformity with the local laws.

“3. The strengthening of Jewish sentiment and national consciousness.

“4. Preparatory steps for the procuring of such Government assents as are necessary for achieving the object of Zionism.”

This Programme formed the basis upon which all future activity was to be conducted, and in order to provide the apparatus for attaining its objects there was created an organisation of world-wide compass (“the Jewish Society” of the pamphlet). The Zionists in each country were to form local societies, which should be united in a federation, and each federation should stand in direct communication with the Central Office in Vienna. The government of the Organisation was entrusted to a General Council (Greater “Actions Committee”),² composed of repre-

¹ There was considerable discussion before agreement was reached on the original German text, “*öffentlich-rechtlich gesicherte Heimstätte*.” A number of delegates insisted upon the term “*völkerrichtlich*” (“according to international law”) to signify the distinction between the new political Zionism and the previous colonisation activity, but as that was thought to impinge upon the independence of the Ottoman Empire, a compromise was reached in the term “*öffentlich-rechtlich*” (“according to public law”), which was meant to convey that the Jewish Home should be guaranteed by the constitution of the Ottoman Empire.

² This term, though merely an Anglicisation of the German *Actions-Comité* (Executive Committee), is here retained as it has universally been embodied in the Zionist terminology.

sentatives of different countries, and to a Central Executive (Smaller "Actions Committee"), whose members all lived in Vienna, the residence of Herzl, who was elected President. Every person was to be regarded as a Zionist who subscribed to the Basle Programme and paid the small annual tax of a shekel (1s. or its equivalent) to provide the Executive with their working fund. The payment of the shekel conferred the right to vote for a delegate to Congress, which was to be the supreme controlling organ of the movement, the ultimate arbiter upon all questions of policy and all important measures to be undertaken in the name of the Zionist Organisation. The historic deliberations concluded with the singing of a Hebrew song, *Hatikvah* ("The Hope"), by Naphtali Herz Imber, which had been heard at intervals during the three days' proceedings, and henceforth became the Jewish national anthem.¹

After he had returned to Vienna Herzl made the following entry in his Diary, under the date, September 3rd, 1897:

"If I were to sum up the Basle Congress in one word—which I shall not do openly—it would be this: at Basle I founded the Jewish State. If I were to say this to-day, I would be met by universal laughter. In five years, perhaps, and certainly in fifty, every one will see it. The State is already founded, in essence, in the will of the people to the State."

The Congress gave a powerful impetus to propaganda in all parts of the world, and numerous adherents were won over to the Basle Programme. In almost every country in Europe in which Jews lived in considerable numbers, in North and South America, in South Africa, in the Far East, and even in Australia and New Zealand, societies were formed which registered their affiliation to the Zionist Organisation. Most of the *Hovevei Zion* societies that had hitherto held aloof, especially those in England and the United States, now declared their adhesion.² The opposition of the anti-Zionists, especially in the press and the pulpit, continued, but this merely stimulated the nationalists to redoubled energy. Zionism

¹ The common belief that the tune of "*Hatikvah*", written by Imber at Jassy in 1878, was taken from the musical poem *Vltava* by Smetana has been refuted by the Rev. H. Mayerowitsch, who has shown that it was adapted from an ancient Sephardic tune used by the Spanish and Portuguese Jews for Psalm CXVII (Hallel) and from other texts in their liturgy. The composer was a Sephardi musician, Henry Busato (or Russotto). See letter in the *Jewish Chronicle*, November 26th, 1943.

² The Zionist Federation of Great Britain and the Zionist Organisations of the United States and Canada were all founded in 1898.

became the leading question of the day: it infused new life into Jewish communities; it instilled new hope into thousands of cultured Jews in the West who had lost the faith of their forefathers and were faced by absorption in their environment; it fortified the drooping spirits of Jewry in the East. It enkindled a love for Jewish literature and a pride in Jewish history; it stimulated the study of Hebrew as a living language; it quickened the growth of Jewish dignity and self-respect. Its aspirations were expounded in a gradually increasing number of Jewish newspapers in various languages—Hebrew and Yiddish, English and French, Russian and Polish, Italian and Spanish, Hungarian and Rumanian. Within the first year Zionist societies had multiplied eightfold, and each succeeding Congress recorded a growth of numbers or an extension into new and remote regions, such as Singapore and Nairobi, Winnipeg and Wellington.

There were only five more Congresses in Herzl's lifetime, all of which were also held in Basle, with the exception of the Fourth, which took place in London. The Second Congress, in August, 1898, was attended by nearly twice as many delegates as the first: they were actually elected by communities and societies and included a large representation from Russia and Galicia, with many Orthodox Rabbis. Its principal outcome was the decision to establish a bank, which was intended to serve as the financial instrument of the Organisation (the "Jewish Company"). It was founded as a joint stock company in London, under the name of the Jewish Colonial Trust (for Herzl attached the highest importance to creating Zionist institutions with firm foundations in England).¹ It had a nominal capital of £2,000,000, but although the subscription list for £1 shares was opened in March, 1899, it was not until the sum of £250,000 was subscribed by 140,000 shareholders in all parts of the world that business operations could begin in 1902. The laborious task of floating the bank was largely the work of David Wolffsohn, a well-to-do merchant of Cologne, and Jacobus Kann, a banker of The Hague, both intimate friends of Herzl, and the time they needed to accomplish it was largely due to the concerted opposition of the wealthier section of Jewry, and especially of the financiers, who did their utmost to decry the undertaking. While this financial instrument was being

¹ In a message to the Zionist Conference in London, dated February 28th, 1898, which led to the establishment of the English Zionist Federation, Herzl wrote: "From the first moment I entered the movement my eyes were directed towards England, because I saw that, by reason of the general situation of things there, it was the Archimedean point where the lever could be applied."

fashioned, Herzl took an important political step. He was radically opposed to any gradual infiltration into Palestine and was bent from the outset upon obtaining a Charter from the Sultan Abdul Hamid of Turkey for an autonomous settlement. He aimed at enlisting the support of the German Emperor, William II, for this project, and, thanks to the friendly offices of the Grand Duke of Baden, he secured an audience, on October 18th, 1898, in Constantinople, with the Emperor, who was then on the way to Palestine. But the hope that emerged from that interview was dispelled at the following one, a fortnight later, on November 2nd, in the vicinity of Jerusalem, when the Kaiser merely made an evasive reply.

At the Third Congress (August, 1899), which marked a further growth of the movement, Herzl formally announced that the immediate aim of Zionist policy was to obtain a Charter for an autonomous settlement in Palestine; but nearly two years elapsed before he succeeded in opening negotiations with the Sultan on the matter. There intervened the Fourth Congress (August, 1900), the only one to be held in London, which served the purpose of making the movement better known in the English-speaking world, arousing the sympathy of the British public, and stimulating the interest of official circles. "England, the great, England, the free," exclaimed Herzl in his inaugural speech, in an inspired moment of prophecy, "England, with her eyes roaming over all the seas, will understand us and our aims. From this place the Zionist idea will take a still further and higher flight: of this we may be sure." The most exciting discussion was on cultural matters, which had also figured at previous Congresses, as some Russian Rabbis deprecated secularist tendencies that they feared might militate against religious tradition. But the Congress served its main purpose, and Herzl was brought into touch with Lord Lansdowne, then Foreign Secretary.

Internal differences were rather pronounced at the Fifth Congress (December, 1901), where a compact group mainly of Russian Zionists, disciples of Ahad Ha-am and styled the "Democratic Zionist Fraction," insisted upon greater attention being devoted to Jewish national culture, although they were expressly in favour of a legally secured home as the basic condition for a satisfactory cultural development. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, as one of the leaders of the group,¹ proposed the establishment of a Jewish University, and the Congress agreed to the appointment of a Cultural Com-

¹ Other leading members were Leo Motzkin, Berthold Feiwel, and Victor Jacobson.

mission; but the "Democratic Zionist Fraction," which published a detailed programme six months later, and was the first party to arise in the movement, soon dissolved, though its demand for immediate practical work in Palestine was energetically advanced at subsequent Congresses. A more notable outcome of this Fifth Congress was the resolution to establish the Jewish National Fund for the acquisition of land in Palestine as the inalienable possession of the Jewish people, an institution destined to play a very important and vital part in the future. A new constitution of the Organisation was adopted, and it was decided that future Congresses should be held every two years instead of annually.

Herzl was little interested in questions of national culture and was of the opinion that such matters, as well as colonising work, should be deferred until after the requisite political guarantees had been obtained for an autonomous settlement. It was not until May 18th, 1901, that thanks to the friendly mediation of Arminius Vambery, the famous Hungarian Jewish traveller, he succeeded in having his first audience with the Sultan, to whom he made various financial proposals to secure a Charter. The Treasury of the Ottoman Government was at that time in a tottering condition, and Herzl proposed to buttress it by an annual tribute, which the Sultan could use as interest for a loan that the Jewish Colonial Trust would arrange on his behalf. The negotiations dragged on over twelve months, in the course of which Herzl submitted other proposals in subsequent interviews with Abdul Hamid and made anxious soundings in London, Paris, and other financial centres, as to the possibility of raising the large sums that would be needed. But all his efforts were in vain, for although in the final interview, on July 23rd, 1902, he offered the Sultan £1,600,000, the only concession that the impecunious potentate was willing to give was for the Jews to colonise in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Anatolia, but not in Palestine. "A Charter without Palestine! I refused at once," wrote Herzl in his diary.

Only a couple of weeks earlier Herzl had given evidence in London before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, which had been appointed in consequence of the agitation against the large influx of Russian Jews into the East End of that city. He emphasised persecution as the cause of Jewish emigration from Eastern Europe, pointed out that anti-Semitism was thus carried by the emigrants to another country, and maintained that Zionism was the only solution of the problem.

During this stay in London he broached to Lord Rothschild, the

head of the Anglo-Jewish community, who was a power in the financial world and a member of the Royal Commission, the idea of creating a Jewish colony in British territory—either in the Sinai Peninsula or in Cyprus. The prospect of further negotiations with the Sultan, which had not been formally broken off, seemed hopeless, and he was concerned and perturbed by the need of finding an immediate asylum for the Jewish victims of oppression. His mind must have undergone a painful ordeal, for Zionism was indissolubly bound to Zion, and for the past three years, apart from his political endeavours, his imagination had in all his leisure moments hopefully explored the future possible developments in Palestine. Several months after he returned from his fruitless talk with the Kaiser he began to write a romance, *Altneuland*, in which he attempted to forecast the conditions in Palestine twenty years later. He depicted a Jewish society that enjoyed many of the improvements and amenities due to technological science, that was organised on the lines of progressive reform, and that lived in idyllic peace with its non-Jewish neighbours. He aimed at achieving a propagandist rather than literary success, but when the book appeared in October, 1902, he was bitterly disappointed to find it assailed because it failed to portray a background of Jewish cultural life, with Hebrew as the national tongue. The most scathing criticism came from Ahad Ha-am, who was thereupon attacked by Nordau in a rather intemperate article, which provoked an indignant rejoinder from some of Adah Ha-am's friends. But this controversy did not prevent *Altneuland*¹ from achieving a measure of popularity and being translated into several languages, while the motto on its title-page, "If you wish it, this is no fairy tale," became an oft-quoted maxim in the Zionist world.

The continued impasse in Constantinople at length impelled Herzl, in his restless quest, to turn to London for a way out. Through the mediation of Leopold J. Greenberg (1860-1931), an English member of the Actions Committee, he had an interview on October 22nd, 1902, with the British Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain, who told him that a Jewish settlement in Cyprus would be opposed by the local population and that the question of the Sinai Peninsula must be discussed with the Foreign Secretary.

¹ In this novel several of Herzl's friends and colleagues are introduced under a thin disguise, e.g. David Wolffsohn as David Litvak, Joseph Cowen as Joe Levy, Professor Mandelstamm as Professor Eichenstamm, Dr. Alexander Marmorek as Professor Steineck, and the Rev. William Hechler (Chaplain to the British Embassy in Vienna) as the preacher Hopkins.

The next day Herzl was received in the Foreign Office by Lord Lansdowne, who favoured the idea of a Jewish settlement at Wadi El Arish in the Sinai Peninsula, and agreed to give Greenberg a letter of introduction to Lord Cromer, the British Proconsul in Egypt, for the purpose of negotiation. A technical commission was sent out to investigate the territory, but found that it would be unsuitable unless adequately irrigated. Anxious to leave nothing undone in the interest of the project, towards the financing of which the I.C.A. was prepared to give £1,000,000, Herzl also went out to Cairo, after Greenberg had left, to continue the negotiations with Lord Cromer. But his efforts were in vain, as the Egyptian Government rejected the scheme on the ground of the impossibility of sparing sufficient water from the Nile for irrigation, although it was known that it was also opposed for political reasons.

The failure of the El Arish project was immediately followed by an offer of territory by Chamberlain in British East Africa, which he had recently visited and which had impressed him as suitable for a Jewish settlement. Herzl at first hesitated to consider this, as he still hoped that the El Arish scheme would materialise and even that the Sultan might become amenable, but the news of the terrible pogroms in Kishinev and other cities in Russia, which horrified the world in April, 1903, swiftly brought about a change of attitude. The Guas Ngishu plateau, near Nairobi, lacked the redeeming feature of the Sinai Peninsula—namely, close proximity to Palestine—but the offer was rendered attractive by the promise of autonomy under a Jewish governor. Besides, as Greenberg, who acted as Herzl's confidant in the negotiations with Chamberlain, pointed out, it was of great political importance to receive a formal offer of territory from the British Government. The discussion as to details therefore continued in London, while Herzl planned a visit to Russia. Information had reached him of a secret order issued on June 24th, 1903, by the Russian Minister of the Interior, to all provincial governors and chiefs of police, that all Zionist meetings and collections must be forbidden, and he wished to have this decree cancelled and also to secure the Russian Government's friendly intervention with the Sultan. Accordingly, in the following August he visited St. Petersburg, where the all-powerful Minister of the Interior, Von Plehve, promised that he would allow Zionist activities as long as they were concerned only with the creation of a Jewish centre in Palestine and with mass emigration from Russia, but uttered a warning that any attempt to carry on nationalist propaganda, which he considered harmful to Russia's policy of

a homogeneous state, would be suppressed. Von Plehve also promised to support Herzl's efforts in Constantinople, and the Finance Minister, Witte, agreed to the opening of branches of the Jewish Colonial Trust in Russia.¹ From St. Petersburg Herzl went to Vilna, to become acquainted with the life of Russian Jewry, and it was while in that citadel of Jewish culture and Jewish poverty, where he was welcomed with the enthusiastic ovations worthy of a king, that he received a historic document from the British Government. It was the letter containing the formal offer of territory in East Africa, in which the Jews would enjoy autonomy under a Jewish governor, subject to a commission of inquiry being sent out to investigate the land and finding it suitable for settlement.

So far from Herzl's political efforts being greeted with general approval, they caused an outburst of violent criticism at the Sixth Congress (August, 1903), which was his last. He was upbraided for having parleyed with Plehve, whom the Jews in Russia regarded as the instigator of the latest pogroms; but the reproaches on this account were mild in comparison with the passionate attacks upon the East African project, which its opponents consistently referred to disparagingly as Uganda. In anticipation of the storm, Herzl declared that the venture must be regarded only as an emergency undertaking, that the Jewish people could not have any other objective but Palestine, and that his views on the land of his fathers were unchangeable, but that the Congress could find means of making use of the offer. For it was a matter of ameliorating and alleviating the condition of the Jewish people, without in any way surrendering any of the great principles on which the movement was founded. "This is certainly not Zionism and never can be," he exclaimed. Nordau sought to influence the Congress by pointing out that East Africa was intended only as a *Nachtsyfl*, a shelter, in which the Jews could be trained as a nation for their future mission in Palestine. But all arguments failed to convince or mollify the opponents, who largely belonged to the Russian delegation, although it was primarily in the interests of Russian Jewry that the plan was conceived. The issue put to the Congress was not that the offer should be accepted, but that a commission of inquiry should be despatched to investigate the territory, on the definite condition that the cost should not be defrayed by the Zionist

¹ According to Dr. Adolf Friedemann, a confidant of Herzl, the Russian Government afterwards took the promised steps in Constantinople, but they were rendered nugatory by Herzl's untimely death (*Das Leben Theodor Herzls*, 1914, p. 78). Witte's promise remained unfulfilled owing to his fall.

Organisation of the Jewish Colonial Trust;¹ and when the resolution was adopted after a roll-call,² by 295 votes to 178, the Russian opponents immediately withdrew to a separate hall, where many of them wept as if they had lost Palestine for ever. But Herzl afterwards pleaded with them, assured them again of his unalterable attachment to Zion, and they returned to the Congress the following day.

The hostility to the scheme increased during the ensuing months and came to a climax in December, 1903, when a number of prominent Russian Zionists, under the leadership of Menahem Ussishkin (who had been in Palestine during the Sixth Congress), assembled in Kharkov, and sent a delegation to Vienna to present Herzl with an ultimatum. This was to the effect that unless he undertook in writing to abandon the East African scheme and to confine himself to Palestine, the Russian Zionists would cease to remit their shekel contributions to Vienna and would convene an opposition Congress at an early date. Herzl refused to comply with the ultimatum and told the deputation that he had shown one of the Kharkov dissidents in the previous month a letter written to Plehve after the Sixth Congress, in which he dealt solely with his Palestinian policy. After the deputation returned to Russia, Herzl went to Rome, where he had an audience with the King of Italy, who was sympathetic to the idea of Zionism, and also with Pope Pius X, who, however, refrained from making any statement. The unrest within the movement continued, and a special meeting of the Greater "Actions Committee" was therefore held in Vienna on April 11th, 1904, to allay the conflict. Herzl succeeded in convincing his opponents that he was and would remain faithful to Palestine, and the stormy proceedings concluded after five days with a resolution of conciliation and confidence. It was the last discussion in which Herzl took part, for his end was approaching. He had suffered at intervals for some years from a heart affection, on account of which he went to Edlach, in North Austria, for a cure; but there his condition became seriously aggravated by an attack of pneumonia, from which he died, at the early age of forty-four, on July 3rd, 1904. His death was mourned by Jews throughout the world, and his funeral was attended by thousands.

¹ The cost of the expedition, amounting to £2,000, was defrayed by the Hon. Mrs. E. A. Gordon, a Christian friend of the Zionist movement. See the author's *Journal of a Jewish Traveller*, p. 153.

² Each delegate answered either "Ja" or "Nein," and hence those in favour of the expedition were called "Ja-Sager" ("Yes-sayers"), and the opponents "Nein-Sager" ("No-sayers").

Within the short space of eight years Theodor Herzl had wrought a revolution in Jewish life and Jewish thought. He had created the Zionist Organisation to enable the Jewish people to shape its own destiny, instead of always being the sport of tyrannies and catastrophes. He had brought into being the Zionist Congress, which gave his people the opportunity of debating its national affairs in a parliamentary forum. He had founded the Jewish Colonial Trust and the Jewish National Fund as essential financial instruments of the movement. He had secured recognition for the Jewish question as a serious international problem. He had negotiated with European sovereigns and Cabinet Ministers, who acknowledged the competence of the Zionist Organisation to establish a Jewish State. He was the first Jewish statesman produced by his people after eighteen hundred years of exile who dedicated himself entirely to its national revival. Undaunted by antagonists and undeterred by scoffers and sceptics, he had fulfilled his historic task selflessly and self-sacrificingly, and left an imperishable legacy of incalculable value to be developed by his followers.

POLITICAL AND PRACTICAL ZIONISM

THE death of Herzl was a severe blow to the Zionist movement, not only because he was its founder and leader, but also because all hopes for the early achievement of its object had been largely concentrated in his person. None of his colleagues in the Executive possessed a fraction of his authority and driving power or was endowed with the requisite capacity for succeeding him. The only man whose position in the movement and whose fame in the outside world seemed to make him the most fitting successor was Dr. Max Nordau, but he declined to accept the burden on grounds of health, although he was doubtless also influenced by other considerations. The problem of the succession was aggravated by the bitter conflict that raged within the movement regarding the outcome of the British Government's offer of an autonomous territory in East Africa, for the opponents of the offer, who were called *Zioné Zion* ("Zionists of Zion") were indefatigable in their agitation to ensure its rejection. The East African project and the future leadership were thus the two main questions that occupied the Seventh Congress, which met at Basle in 1905 from July 27th to August 2nd.

The scientific commission that explored the proffered territory was divided in its views, for while the two Jewish members (Alfred Kaiser and N. Wilbuschewitz) reported that it was quite unsuitable for a Jewish settlement, the non-Jewish leader (Major Gibbons, an English colonial expert) was of opinion that, with perseverance and in time, the land could be developed to accommodate 20,000 agriculturists. The opponents, not content with the unsatisfactory report, were resolved not to leave anything to chance, for, on the eve of the Congress, they held a conference, under the leadership of Menahem Ussishkin and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, at Freiburg (in Southern Germany), in order to organise their plan of action and to ensure that the Congress would decide that practical work should be undertaken in Palestine without further delay. The debate at the Congress was prolonged and passionate, for there was a party headed by Israel Zangwill, who was just as keen that the British offer should be accepted, in the interest of Jews in urgent need of an asylum, as its opponents were that it should be rejected. The resolution adopted by the

majority of the Congress was a dignified rejection, and likewise a reaffirmation of the principles of Zionism. It declared that the Zionist Organisation adhered to the fundamental principle of the Basle Programme and rejected any colonising activity outside Palestine and its neighbouring lands. It expressed its sincerest thanks to the British Government for the offer of an autonomous territory and stated that the Zionist Organisation, after receiving the commission's report, could not concern itself with the project any longer. It also warmly acknowledged the desire that had been evinced by the British Government to help in bringing about a solution of the Jewish question, and voiced the hope that the Zionist movement would be likewise favoured by its good offices in some future project that would be in accordance with the Basle Programme. That event came twelve years later.

The delegates who were in favour of the British offer immediately withdrew from the Congress and seceded from the Organisation. Under the leadership of Zangwill, who was actively supported by Dr. Mandelstamm and the Zionist Socialist leader, Dr. Nachman Syrkin, they at once created the Jewish Territorial Organisation, which adopted as its programme the establishment of a Jewish autonomous settlement in any part of the world. This new body was commonly called (after its initials) the "I.T.O.," and its adherents were known as "Territorialists" or "Itoists."¹

The liquidation of the East Africa question and the absence of any early prospect of fruitful negotiation with the Ottoman Government inevitably led, under the pressure of the *Zioné Zion*, to the adoption of a policy which would both satisfy their demand for practical work in Palestine and also further the political aim of the movement. The Seventh Congress accordingly resolved that, while unsystematic or philanthropic colonisation should be avoided, suitable measures should be taken for the furtherance of agriculture and industry and for the intellectual improvement of the Jews in the country. But it was at the same time laid down that no land should be bought on account of the Jewish National Fund as long as such purchase could not be effected on a sure legal basis. Even Herzl, although firmly opposed to any colonisation in Palestine being undertaken before the coveted Charter was secured, had

¹ The "I.T.O.," which had its office in London and was under the presidency of Israel Zangwill, conducted negotiations with various governments and carried out explorations of Cyrenaica and Angola with negative results. It also regulated part of the Jewish emigration to the United States via Galveston. It lingered on until the end of the First World War, when some of its representatives (notably Dr. M. D. Eder) joined the Zionist Organisation, and it was formally dissolved by Zangwill himself.

agreed, at the Sixth Congress, to the appointment of a Palestine Commission to conduct a scientific investigation of the economic resources of the country; and the report presented by the members of this Commission, Professor Otto Warburg, Dr. Franz Oppenheimer, and Dr. S. E. Soskin, showed encouraging results despite the small fund allocated for the purpose. The decision of the Seventh Congress was thus both a logical and practical sequence. It was but the initial stage of a protracted struggle between those who urged immediate work in Palestine, and those who advocated deferment until "the great moment" when political guarantees were secured, a struggle that ended some years later in the victory of the former.

The problem of the leadership was solved by the election of a new Executive of seven members, which involved the removal of the Central Office from Vienna. The Executive consisted of David Wolffsohn of Cologne, Leopold Greenberg of London, Alexander Marmorek of Paris, Jacobus Kann of The Hague, Menahem Ussishkin of Odessa, Dr. J. Kohan-Bernstein of Kishineff, and Professor Otto Warburg of Berlin. The first four belonged to the so-called "political" Zionists and the other three to the "practical" ones, for, although all alike were adherents of political Zionism, the emphasis that the *Zioné Zion* insistently placed upon the need of beginning work in Palestine without waiting for any political guarantees caused them to be designated the "practicals," while those who consistently stressed the prior need for such guarantees were known as the "politicals." David Wolffsohn (1856-1914), the most intimate friend of Herzl and an old *Hovev Zion*, who was born in a Lithuanian townlet and had become a prosperous timber-merchant in Cologne, was elected President, and the headquarters of the movement were accordingly transferred to that city. The Congress was immediately followed by a general meeting of the shareholders of the Jewish Colonial Trust, at which it was decided that the statutes of this bank, which allowed it to conduct operations in any part of the world, should be so amended as to limit its sphere of activity to Palestine and neighbouring countries. This change was insisted upon by the "practical" Zionists, who feared that the funds of the bank might be used on some future occasion for a "territorialist" project; but the application for this purpose made in the High Court in London, which entailed protracted proceedings, was strongly opposed by Israel Zangwill and failed.

Before the controversy over the question of general policy had

given rise to the division into "politicals" and "practicals," two parties had already been formed in the movement. A group of orthodox adherents in Russia, who wished to emphasise that Zionism should be realised on the basis of Jewish religious law and tradition, founded the "Mizrachi" (abbreviated from the Hebrew words, *Merkaz Ruhani*, "spiritual centre") in Vilna, in 1902. This party immediately gained an appreciable following in other countries and held its first general conference in 1904 at Pressburg (Bratislava), at which Rabbi Isaac Reines, of Lida, was elected President. The other party, "Poale Zion" (Workers of Zion), which consisted of those who wished to combine the Zionist programme with the principles of Socialism, was formed in Austria in 1903, in the United States in 1904, and in Russia, Palestine, and England in 1906, and held its first general conference in The Hague in 1907. These two parties, constituting the Right and Left wings of the movement, always endeavoured to assert their particular standpoint at Congresses.

David Wolffsohn was the President of the Zionist Organisation for six years (1905-11), and devoted himself to its development and consolidation with great zeal and energy. Although lacking the brilliant qualities of his predecessor, he displayed unsuspected gifts of leadership and force of character, which were stimulated by the opposition that continued to be waged against the movement. He enjoyed the valuable support of Nahum Sokolow (1861-1936), a polyglot scholar and Editor for many years of the Warsaw Hebrew daily, *Hatzefirah*, who was appointed General Secretary, and of Dr. Berthold Feiwel, who became Editor of *Die Welt*, and director of the Jüdischer Verlag, the publication department of the Central Office. His friend, Dr. Max Bodenheimer, a prominent lawyer in Cologne, took charge of the Jewish National Fund, which had been directed in Vienna by Johann Kremenetzky. The antagonism that the movement had to suffer became all the more serious as it was no longer confined to the assimilationists and the ultra-orthodox, but was supplemented by the "Itoists," who for several years conducted a sort of vendetta against the parent organisation. In Germany Professor Ludwig Geiger, who occupied a leading position in the Jewish community and enjoyed some reputation in the non-Jewish world, declared that German Zionists should be deprived of their citizenship. In Russia, Maximilian Winaver, a prominent Jewish figure among the Constitutional Democrats (commonly known as the "Cadets"), complained, without justification, that the political activity of the Zionists was

endangering the Jewish position. An ultra-orthodox section of Jews in Russia were particularly fanatical in their opposition and were dubbed *Ha-Lishkah Ha-Shehorah* ("The Black Cabinet"): they carried on their campaign through the medium of a journal, *Ha-Peles*, which appeared in Berlin, and caused the temporary closure of a Zionist library in Vilna. In Great Britain the hostility was waged less by the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hermann Adler, who had stigmatised Zionism as "an egregious blunder," than by the communal leaders and by influential writers like Claude Montefiore and Lucien Wolf. In France the "Consistoire" and the Alliance Israélite were antagonistic and contemptuous. In America, too, there was powerful opposition on the part of distinguished laymen and many Reform Rabbis.

Nevertheless, the Zionist movement, after recovering from the double shock of Herzl's death and the secession of the "Territorialists," made steady progress, furthered by an increasing consciousness of the hopelessness of the situation in Central and Eastern Europe. It gained its largest following in Russia, which then contained about six million Jews, and provided a separate political platform in the desperate struggle against the tyranny of the Tsardom for constitutional liberties. At a Conference held in Helsingfors in December, 1905, the Russian Zionists adopted a programme, in which they demanded not only complete civil equality for the Jewish population, but also the recognition of the Jewish nationality as an entity with rights of autonomy in all affairs of Jewish national life. The Zionists put up their own candidates in the elections for the first Duma in 1905 and succeeded in having five returned among the fourteen Jews who were elected. But Russia's first Parliament was soon dissolved¹ as it proved too progressive for the Tsar and his reactionary advisers, and when the elections to the second Duma took place in 1907 only six Jews were returned, of whom only one was a Zionist. In Austria the Zionists formed a separate organisation for political purposes, as they wished to avoid the criticism that Zionism, an inter-territorial movement, interfered in the internal political affairs of the country. In the general election of 1907 four Zionists were returned as deputies to the Austrian Parliament, three for constituencies in Galicia and one for Czernowitz: they fought not only for Jewish

¹ The forcible dissolution of the first Duma called forth an organised demonstration in the form of the famous Viborg Manifesto (1906), the signatories of which were liable to legal prosecution. Among them was Dr. Shmarya Levin, whose parliamentary career was thus cut short, and who went abroad to become a popular Zionist propagandist in many countries.

rights, but also for general social and cultural progress, and owing to the multiplicity of political parties in the old Empire their support was often canvassed by some of these, and even by the Government itself, when the turning of the scale in favour of some important decision depended upon a few votes. But in the next general election, in 1911, only the Jewish national member for Czernowitz was returned, while in Galicia the Polish authorities, energetically supported by the Social Democrats and the Jewish assimilationists, prevented the re-election of any Jewish nationalist.

Although Wolffsohn did not engage in the diplomatic activity that had absorbed the energies of the founder of the movement, he had to concern himself from time to time with matters that called for action of a political or quasi-political nature. Soon after he was first elected to the Presidency, the world was again shocked by an outbreak of pogroms in Russia, which lasted from October, 1905, until the following July. The Zionist Executive considered this calamity of sufficient importance to be recorded in detail, and commissioned Leo Motzkin (1867-1933) to write an official history, which was published in two large volumes in 1910, under the title of *Die Judenpogrome in Russland*, by the *Jüdischer Verlag*. The massacres gave a fresh impetus to a flood of Jewish emigration from Russia, and the Zionist Executive accordingly decided to invite the leading Jewish philanthropic organisations to a conference in order to organise joint measures for regulating emigration and caring for the refugees, tasks which had hitherto been done separately by different bodies. But the Zionist Organisation was still too weak to meet with a favourable response from the heads of the Alliance Israélite, who were among its bitterest opponents, or from the wealthy "I.C.A.," and the only bodies that sent delegates to the conference, which was held in Brussels in January 1906, were the Anglo-Jewish Association, the "I.T.O.," and the "Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden" (which was formed in 1901 for the purpose of supervising Jewish emigration from Eastern Europe and befriending the emigrants). The Conference, over which Wolffsohn presided, adopted resolutions affirming the need of the permanent co-operation of all Jewish relief organisations, and urged the appointment of a commission to investigate the immigration and colonisation possibilities of various countries, especially in the Orient, but its deliberations achieved no lasting results. Not only did the Tsarist régime cause an unceasing exodus of Jews, but it also hampered and repressed various forms of Zionist activity. Zionist workers were occasionally arrested for conducting

propaganda on behalf of the Jewish National Fund, and editors of Zionist papers for publishing nothing more revolutionary than an appeal to buy the Shekel; and it was in order to be entirely immune from police interruption that the Russian Zionists usually arranged to hold their general conference at the time when and in the city where the Congress took place. The position became particularly serious in the summer of 1908, when Wolffsohn found it necessary to pay a visit to St. Petersburg, to have an interview with the Premier, Stolypin; but although the latter repeated the assurance that had been given by Plehve to Herzl, that there would be no interference with the Zionists as long as they confined themselves to the Palestine programme, the Russian authorities continued their policy of repression.

The establishment of a constitutional government in Turkey in 1908 was at first welcomed by Zionists, who hoped that their aspirations would receive more sympathetic consideration from the Young Turks than they had from the old Sultan; but it was not long before they realised that the new régime was just as jealous of the sovereignty and integrity of the Ottoman Empire as Abdul Hamid himself. The Young Turks were uncompromisingly opposed to the fostering of separate nationalisms within the confines of the Empire, and their antipathy to Jewish nationalism was stirred up by a small clique of assimilationists, who misrepresented and maligned the aims of Zionism, not only in their own Judæo-Spanish papers, but also in the Turkish Press. It thus became necessary to take effective measures for dispelling the misunderstandings and misrepresentations prevailing in political circles in Constantinople, as well as for enlightening the public in general. Since the appointment of a political representative in the Ottoman capital might have aroused suspicion instead of dissipating it, a branch of the Jewish Colonial Trust was opened there in October, 1908, under the name of the Anglo-Levantine Banking Company, and Dr. Victor Jacobson (1869-1934), a leading Russian Zionist (previously in charge of the Beyrout branch of the Anglo-Palestine Company), was entrusted with its management, so that he could at the same time discharge the functions of a diplomatic emissary. Dr. Jacobson devoted particular attention to the Press and, with funds provided by the Zionist Executive, he founded two French papers—*Le Jeune Turc*, a daily for the general public, which advocated autonomy for the nations in the Ottoman Empire, and *L'Aurore*, a Zionist weekly. Efforts to win the local Jewish community over to the Zionist cause met with the hostile resistance of

the Haham Bashi (Chief Rabbi) in Constantinople, but they were much more successful in the more Jewish *milieu* of Salonika, where they were ardently and eloquently championed by the Chief Rabbi, Jacob Meir.

At the Ninth Congress, which was held in Hamburg in December (26th-31st), 1909 (the first Congress attended by delegates from Turkey, whose red fezzes made them an object of attraction), President Wolffsohn proclaimed the absolute compatibility of Zionism with loyalty to the Ottoman Empire. He declared that the objects of the movement would be pursued in complete harmony with the spirit of the Ottoman Constitution and with the fullest regard for the laws and institutions of the Empire. But there was one point in Herzl's policy which had now become questionable—namely, the need for a Charter. Dr. Nordau, President of the Congress, stated that the Charter idea had outlived its day and would be relegated to the archives of the movement. There was no need, however, he said, to alter the Basle Programme, since this made no mention of a Charter; and as for the reference to "government assents" which it contained, and which might have been interpreted as "the assents of governments," it meant solely the assents of the Ottoman Government itself. But despite these explanations and asseverations of loyalty, there was no change of attitude on the part of the Turkish Government, which failed to appreciate the enormous services that could be rendered by a large and organised Jewish settlement in Palestine.

Throughout Wolffsohn's six years of office the dominant theme of contention was the question of pressing forward with developments in Palestine, and the Zionist camp was divided into "practicals" and "politicals." At the Eighth Congress, which was held in 1907 (August 14th-21st) at The Hague (chosen because an International Peace Conference was meeting there at the same time), there was a particularly notable debate on the question after hearing the report of the Palestine Commission submitted by Professor Warburg. The principal spokesmen of the political school were Leo Motzkin and Dr. Alexander Marmorek, while the views of the "practicals" were persuasively expounded by Dr. Weizmann. The discussion revealed a narrowing of the gap between the two sides, since the political protagonists were not in principle opposed to work in Palestine, but only wished that it should not be allowed to obscure the great political aim to be striven after; and, on the other hand, Dr. Weizmann, who (as a chemist) coined the term "Synthetic Zionism," urged the political value of practical work.

The outcome of the discussion was the decision to form a Palestine Department of the Executive, which was allocated 25 per cent. of the revenue of the Central Office,¹ and to create a Palestine Office in Jaffa. Dr. Arthur Ruppin (1876-1943), an economist who had specialised in questions of Jewish sociology, was appointed Director of this Office in 1908, and the first steps taken in accordance with his proposals were the establishment of the Palestine Land Development Company and the grant of a loan by the Jewish National Fund for the building of a modern residential quarter near Jaffa. The Congress also resolved that Hebrew should be recognised as the official language of the movement and be gradually introduced into its controlling organs, and that the President of future Congresses should not be identical with the President of the Organisation or a member of the Executive.

The Executive elected at the Eighth Congress consisted only of Wolffsohn, Kann, and Warburg, as Wolffsohn maintained that an Executive of seven persons scattered over Europe could not act effectively, whereas three members could meet and correspond more frequently and act more unitedly. Since Warburg was the only representative in this triumvirate of the "practicals," the latter were discontented, and at the Ninth Congress they made an effort to secure the election of an Executive composed entirely of members of their own camp. The effort failed: the triumvirate had to be re-elected at the eleventh hour; and Sokolow, whose sympathies were with the "practicals," resigned the position of General Secretary. The "practicals" derived some solace at least from the unanimous decision to found a co-operative settlement in Palestine in accordance with the proposals submitted by Dr. Franz Oppenheimer, an economist of progressive views, who had first been introduced to the Zionist world by Herzl at the Sixth Congress.

At the Tenth Congress, however, which was held at Basle in 1911 (August 9th-15th), the "practicals" at last achieved their goal by the election of an Executive consisting solely of adherents of their own school. The new leadership was composed of Professor Warburg, Dr. Arthur Hantke (a Berlin lawyer), Dr. Victor Jacobson, Dr. Shmarya Levin, and Nahum Sokolow. The Congress did not elect a President, but left it to the Executive to choose its chairman, a position to which Professor Warburg was appointed.

¹ The annual income of the Central Office (apart from the Jewish National Fund) derived from the Shkel payments, never exceeded £8,600 before the First World War. It was therefore found necessary in 1911 to supplement this by a "Central Fund" of voluntary contributions, which in 1913 yielded £4,900. The total amount collected by the Jewish National Fund up to the middle of 1914 was £170,000.

This Congress was also notable for the fact that for the first time an entire session, devoted to cultural matters, was conducted in Hebrew. In consequence of the change of Executive the Central Office was transferred to Berlin, together with the official organ, *Die Welt*, and the *Jüdischer Verlag* (the head office of the Jewish National Fund remaining in Cologne). The new Executive devoted themselves to the expansion of the movement and the furtherance of propaganda, one of its members, Sokolow, being the first official emissary to America; and the Palestine Department did what it could with its limited resources to advance various undertakings in Palestine.

The Executive were re-elected at the Eleventh Congress, which was held in Vienna in 1913 (September 2nd-9th), with the addition of Dr. Yehiel Tschlenow, a Moscow physician, also of the "practical" school, who shared with Ussishkin in the leadership of the Russian Zionists. It was the first Congress from which Nordau, whose brilliant surveys of the general position of Jewry had formed the most attractive feature of the opening session of all previous gatherings, absented himself. He sent a message, in which he wrote that "the financial instruments of our movement, which have been forged with arduous toil, are not strong enough to withstand imprudent or reckless handling." His letter implied support for the "politicals," who still retained control of the Jewish Colonial Trust and successfully resisted the efforts of the "practicals" to oust them from that key position. There was again a lengthy debate between the spokesmen of the two rival schools, in which an important speech was made by Ruppin, who reported on the results achieved already in Palestine and pointed out that they afforded valuable guidance in the work of national renaissance and should not be appraised by a commercial criterion. Cultural questions also occupied a prominent place, for not only was the Congress preceded by a World Conference of Hebraists, but an entire session was again conducted in Hebrew; and after an address by Dr. Weizmann on the founding of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Congress enthusiastically agreed to the appointment of a commission to make the preliminary investigations for this purpose. The proceedings closed with a valedictory speech by Wolffsohn, the President of the Congress, who ended with the words: "*Auf Wiedersehen* at the Twelfth Congress." Little did he dream that it would be eight years before the Zionist Parliament met again and that he himself had only one more year to live.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ZIONIST COLONISATION

DURING the twelve years that elapsed between the publication of *The Jewish State* and the beginning of colonisation in Palestine by the Zionist Organisation, comparatively little progress was made by the first groups of Jewish settlers in the country. The repeated appeals that were made to Baron Edmond de Rothschild either to intervene in the conflicts between the settlers and his "administrators" or to help in solving economic difficulties, led in 1900 to his transferring the control and management of all his settlements in Palestine to the Jewish Colonisation Association, although he continued to take an interest in them and to provide further support whenever necessary. The I.C.A. established a new régime designed to enable the settlements gradually to become independent. It simplified the general system of administration, allowed the settlers a measure of self-government, and introduced rational methods of cultivation as well as new cultures. It created a training-farm at Sedjera, near Nazareth, and helped those who there acquired the requisite qualifications with a sufficient loan, repayable on easy terms, to buy land and cultivate it on their own account. Most of these farmers obtained holdings in Galilee, where they engaged first in corn-growing, and afterwards also in cattle-raising and horticulture; but although this system was intended to produce some profit, its success was often frustrated by the Government tax, which usually amounted to much more than the statutory tithe of the crops. The principal factors that favoured the Jewish farmer were the gradual rise in the price of land and the opportunity he had of employing cheap Arab labour; but while these factors benefited him individually they militated against the development of a Jewish national community, as he preferred the labour of Arabs to that of Jews, who needed higher wages for their higher standard of living, and was sometimes tempted to dispose of his farm at a profit.

The *Hovevei Zion*, under the general direction of the Odessa Committee, continued their modest efforts and also endeavoured to replace the old philanthropic system by one that would help agricultural workers to become independent. They established these workers on the outskirts of the large settlements, and provided them with a cottage and small plot of land, so that they could

first modern school in which all subjects were taught in Hebrew. In the following year the Organisation brought into being an institution for applied arts and crafts, the Bezalel, in Jerusalem which was a contribution to solving the problem of poverty among those dependent upon the *Halukah*. The various crafts taught were carpet-weaving, basket-making, filigree ornaments, lace manufacture, carpentry, Damascus metal-work, and ivory-carving. The Bezalel also acted later as a pioneer in establishing a domestic industry in a rural area. It settled a group of Yemenite Jews (who first began to arrive in Palestine in 1909) at Ben-Shemen, near Lydda, and provided them with cottages, gardens, and a workshop, so that while mainly engaged in filigree work and carpet-weaving, they were also able to devote time to market-gardening and poultry-rearing.

The systematic development of colonisation in Palestine by the Zionist Organisation began in 1908, when Dr. Ruppin established the Palestine Office in Jaffa. It was from this Office that all kinds of practical activities were directed, and all sorts of proposals and plans were worked out; and it was from there that Zionist institutions and the properties of the Jewish National Fund were administered and negotiations with the authorities were conducted. As the work of the Office expanded, its staff was increased by the appointment of agricultural, technical, and legal experts. The first two projects that were carried out were in connection with urban housing and agricultural development. An estate company, "Ahuzath Bayith," was given a loan of £10,000 by the Jewish National Fund for eighteen years, guaranteed by the Anglo-Palestine Company, to build a modern Jewish quarter on the border of Jaffa; that little suburb, in which were situated the Palestine Office, the bank, and the Herzl *Gymnasium*, was named Tel-Aviv ("Hill of Spring") and grew into the most populous city in the country. The Palestine Land Development Company was established in 1908 by Ruppin to facilitate the purchase, sale, and development of land. It acquired large tracts, prepared them for cultivation, and divided them into small holdings suitable for farmers of moderate means, while it also constructed ways of communication and provided a water supply. It prevented the rise of land values due to competitive buying by arranging with the I.C.A., the Anglo-Palestine Company, and the "Geulah" (a small Russo-Jewish Company) that all purchases they wished to make should be carried out solely through its agency. The P.L.D.C. also took over the management of two plots of the Jewish

National Fund on the Sea of Tiberias, Kinnereth (1908) and Degania (1909), where farmsteads were established for the training of Jewish workers under expert direction. It was intended that the workers should earn sufficient on these estates to enable them, with their savings and experience, to be established as independent farmers by the I.C.A. or the Jewish National Fund. The first training farm for girls devoted to poultry-rearing and market-gardening was also established at Kinnereth. Of the few hundred workers who were trained on the J.N.F. farms, some found employment in the old settlements and others formed workers' co-operatives. To enable them to secure work in the large settlements, cheap cottages were built on the outskirts (as by the "Ezra" Society near Rehovoth), and the J.N.F. provided small family houses with gardens as well as lodging quarters for single men.

An impetus to the employment of workers in the settlements was given by the immigration of Jews from the Yemen, who were accustomed to a hot climate, rough work, and plain living, and who also had the advantage of knowing Arabic as well as Hebrew, besides being Ottoman subjects. These Yemenites, who were capable market-gardeners and skilled artisans, seemed calculated to replace the Arab workers as hired labourers, and by the year 1914 there were 1,500 of them in the colonies, where their wives did domestic service. The Odessa Committee helped by founding a settlement for thirty Yemenite families as cottagers at Nahlat Yehuda, near Rishon le-Zion (1913). But this system, owing to its rather small range and the fact that the cottagers had to have some means of their own, could benefit only a comparatively small number; besides, the workers themselves, animated by a strong spirit of independence, were mostly opposed to it. There was therefore a groping after a new form of colonisation.

The Jewish agricultural labourers in Palestine were utterly different from land workers in all other parts of the world. They were neither clodhoppers nor illiterates, for they had mostly received a good education; they were not children of the soil, for their forefathers had been separated from it for nearly two thousand years; and they adopted one of the hardest and most poorly paid occupations, not for lack of intelligence, but from a spirit of social and national idealism. They belonged to two different parties, the *Poale Zion* ("Workers of Zion") and *Hapoel Hatzair* ("The Young Worker"), each with its own ideology. They were both Socialist in principle, but while the *Poale Zion* were Marxists, *Hapoel Hatzair* was opposed to striving after the renaissance of Israel by class

conflict or by anything but creative work and the solidarity of all sections of the Jewish people. Both parties were agreed on the principles of the nationalisation of land, "self-labour" (that is, cultivating the soil with one's own hands and not by hired labour), and the use of Hebrew as the national language. They had a joint agricultural workers' union, which held periodical conferences, and they equally sought to master technical problems of agriculture and to effect improvements.

The creator of the *Poale Zion* system of thought was Ber Borochow (1881-1917), a Russian Jew, who evolved a synthesis of Zionism and Socialism. He pointed out that the Jews, without a land of their own, depended for their economic structure upon the nations who gave them hospitality and who expelled them when they did not need them any longer; that they had a preponderance of intellectual over manual labourers and were alienated from "primary production" (agriculture, heavy industry, etc.); and that only a territory of their own could bring about a normalisation of Jewish economic life. The first members of the *Poale Zion* arrived in Palestine in 1904 and 1905, their ideas soon found many adherents, and they had their own organ, *Ahduth* ("Unity"). *Hapoel Hatzair*, whose organ had the same name as the party, came into existence in Palestine itself. Its fundamental principle, that the prerequisite of the national revival in the ancestral land was the increase of the Jewish working class and its penetration into all branches of economic life, led to its placing the idea of labour and the concept of "conquest of labour" in the very forefront of its programme. Indeed, the idea of labour acquired an almost religious significance in the system of *Hapoel Hatzair*, and it was probably on that account that the party was opposed to a definite formulation of its programme. Its spiritual leader was Aaron David Gordon (1856-1922), a native of Podolia, who was already a man of fifty when he went to settle in Palestine to devote the rest of his life to working on the land, although he had always been a townsman. He evolved a complete philosophy on the basis of work on the land, somewhat reminiscent of Rousseau's "Back to Nature," and expounded it in many articles and essays in Hebrew, of which a few volumes have been published. He had no faith in politics and maintained that "the redemption of the people can come only through the redemption of the individual," a process that can be brought about only by the "renewal of man," by his spiritual and moral rebirth, which depended primarily upon giving up a "parasitic" existence and going over to work on the soil.

The spirit animating the members of the Second *Aliyah* was strikingly exemplified by the measures they took for the defence of the Jewish settlements against attacks by Bedouin marauders. Until 1908 the protection of the settlements was entrusted to Arab and Circassian watchmen, who did not always display the necessary courage and reliability. The Jewish workers, moved by a sense of national honour, took over the task themselves: they began by exercising control over the Arab watchmen, in addition to working all day, and then assumed complete charge of the protection service. They founded a watchmen's organisation, *Hashomer*, a body of mounted men, many of whom died heroic deaths in lonely patrols at night.¹

The new form of colonisation that was created to suit the ideals and desires of the Jewish workers was the co-operative farm, which was called *Kvutza* (lit., "group"). It was first attempted at Sedjera, where the workers leased the land from the I.C.A. and cultivated it on the basis of collective ownership and profit-sharing. In 1909 the first co-operative farm on Jewish National Fund land was established at Degania and yielded good results, and it was soon followed by the formation of other co-operatives in other parts of the country. The co-operatives carried out the "occupation," or preliminary development, of all tracts of land bought by Jews from 1908, but they had a difficulty in taking over the cultivation of such estates under their collective control, except in the case of those on J.N.F. land. The Jewish workers were naturally the most ardent champions of the principle that colonisation should take place only on such land, not only because of their Socialist outlook, but also because they knew that private settlers, even against their will, found themselves obliged to take cheap Arab labour. They therefore introduced the collectivist system, in which all members of the group shared in the ownership of the estate and drew the same compensation; any profit produced belonged to all in common and was devoted to the improvement and further development of the farm for the equal benefit of all. The co-operative settlement at Merhavia, which was founded in the fertile Vale of Jezreel by Dr. Franz Oppenheimer, in pursuance of a decision of the Congress of 1909, had a somewhat different history from the other *Kvutzoth*. It was established on a tract of land near Afule, in Samaria, belonging to the Jewish National Fund, which also provided the houses and the requisite equipment

¹ A book dealing with this heroic chapter of Jewish colonisation was published under the title of *Tzeker* in Jaffa in 1912; an enlarged edition in German and Yiddish appeared in 1918.

and buildings. It began under the direction of an agronomist, and each worker received a wage according to his capacity, but as the director also employed Arabs he was compelled to withdraw, and the settlement was then taken over by the workers. It was unable, however, to yield a profit, and after the First World War it was divided between two groups of settlers.

The progress made in the field of agricultural development in Palestine after the Zionist Organisation began its activity may be seen from the following figures:

<i>Period</i>	<i>Area in Hectares</i>	<i>Number of Agricultural Settlements</i>	<i>Population</i>
1882-99	25,000	21	4,500
1900- 7	33,000	27	7,000
1908-14	40,000	43	12,000 ¹

Jewish colonisation was furthered by the Palestine Office, not only by the creation of co-operative settlements, but also by the formation of plantation societies, called *Ahuzoth*. The members of these societies, which were established mainly in Russia and America, were persons of moderate capital, whose shares (paid in instalments) entitled them to a plot; and as the laying-out of the plantations progressed the shareholders assumed occupation in succession. The projects of all these *Ahuzoth* were carried out on J.N.F. land, one of the most notable being that of an American Company, "Poriah" ("Fruitful"), whose estate was situated near Kinnereth (1911). The most southerly point chosen was near Gaza, where a company of Moscow Jews established the plantation of Ruhama in the same year. The Zionist Organisation also contributed to the agricultural development of the country in other directions. It raised a special fund for afforestation, which was carried out by planting olive-trees at Hulda and Ben-Shemen (on a tract devoted to the Herzl Forest). It took steps to solve the problem of providing agrarian credits by arranging that the Anglo-Palestine Company should be lent £10,000 by the Jewish National Fund, to be used for long-term loans to co-operative societies. It carried out the preliminary stages of the establishment of the Jewish Agricultural Experiment Station (financed by American Jews) at Athlit, near Haifa, whose director, Aaron Aaronson, of Zichron Jacob, discovered primitive wild wheat. Its efforts and achievements in these various directions were limited solely by its available resources, and these—at a time when the greater part

¹ The total number of Jews in Palestine in 1914 was about 90,000 (half in Jerusalem), the total population being about 690,000.

of the Jewish world was either indifferent or opposed to the re-settlement in Palestine—were pitifully meagre.

Zionism also played an active part in the intellectual development of the Jews in Palestine, particularly in promoting the use of Hebrew as a living language. The pioneer of this movement was a Russian Jew, Eliezer ben Yehuda (formerly Perlman), who, after settling in the country with his wife in 1881, resolved to speak nothing but Hebrew and thus to compel others to answer him in the same tongue. This innovation provoked the anger and opposition of the Orthodox element, who considered it a desecration to use the language of the Scriptures for everyday purposes, but they could not prevent a development which was dictated by both national idealism and practical convenience. The battle for living Hebrew was fought out primarily in the schools, which were much divided in regard to language. In those that were founded and maintained by the Alliance Israélite the medium of instruction was French; in the Evelina de Rothschild School it was English; and in the Lâmel Teachers' Seminary and boys' school (which were Austrian foundations) it was German. On the other hand, Hebrew was the language of instruction for all subjects in the settlement schools, as well as in a few institutions in the towns, such as the Herzl *Gymnasium* and the girls' secondary school in Jaffa, a secondary school in Jerusalem, and some kindergarten schools. There was at first a lack of qualified teachers to impart education in Hebrew and no uniform outlook among them, but at the instigation of Ussishkin a Teachers' Union was founded, which tried to effect some uniformity as regards both syllabus and the character of the schools. When the German Hilfsverein began to take part in the educational work in Palestine, it adopted Hebrew as a medium of instruction in most of its schools. It was influenced by the necessities of the situation, for as the children spoke different tongues according to their land of origin—Yiddish, Ladino (Spaniolish), Arabic, Bokharian, Persian and Georgian—the only way in which they could be taught together and made to understand one another was through their national language. But the enthusiasm of the German organisation for a Hebraic spirit in its establishments began to wane about 1911, and the tendency to displace Hebrew by German became sufficiently marked to be criticised in August, 1913, at a conference of the Teachers' Union at Jaffa, at which the Hilfsverein employees formed one-third of those present.

The dissatisfaction of the teachers came to a head in connection

with the Jewish Technical Institute, which it was proposed to erect at Haifa for the purpose of training Jews as civil and mechanical engineers, surveyors, and architects. A site was provided by the Jewish National Fund, and a number of wealthy Jews of Europe and America, Zionists and non-Zionists, as well as organisations, combined to raise funds for the building and equipment of the Institute and an intermediate school attached to it. The Board of Governors consisted of representatives of the different contributors, among whom the Hilfsverein played a leading part, while the Zionist element was represented by Ahad Ha-am, Shmarya Levin, and Dr. Tschlenow. The Zionist members proposed that the teaching in the intermediate school should be solely in Hebrew, and that in the Technical Institute Hebrew should be used from the outset at least in one department. The proposal was rejected by a majority of the Board, who, under the lead of the German members, decided that all subjects should be taught in German and that Hebrew instruction should be given only so far as to enable the students to read Hebrew literature. The only grounds advanced by the German members for their attitude were pedagogical arguments, but these were refuted by the Hilfsverein's own teachers; and it was therefore generally presumed that the change was due to secret pressure exercised by the German Government, which had ambitions in the Near East and wished to make the schools nurseries of German *Kultur*.

The effect in Palestine was a veritable upheaval. A strike broke out at all the Hilfsverein schools, which the great majority of the teachers and scholars left to enter a number of new institutions that were promptly opened with the support of the Zionist Organisation and the Jews of Palestine and in which Hebrew was the sole medium of instruction. It was an impressive demonstration of attachment to the Jewish national tongue, which had a responsive echo in all Jewish communities throughout the world. Under the influence of public opinion and the pressure directly applied by the Zionist and American members of the Board of the Institute, a compromise was reached in 1914 whereby physics and mathematics were to be taught in Hebrew as soon as the building was opened, and other subjects were also to be taught in that medium after four years. But this compromise was destined to prove unnecessary, as the conflict which it solved was soon followed by a far more grim and formidable contest, which ended in a manner that facilitated the advancement of Jewish national aspirations on a scale undreamt of even by the most optimistic Zionist.

PART III

THE PERIOD OF RESTORATION

CHAPTER VII

PALESTINE AS BRITISH TRUST

THE outbreak of the First World War in August, 1914, which was destined to bring about a fundamental change in the fortunes of Zionism, seemed likely at first to involve the destruction in Palestine of all that Jewish effort and self-sacrifice had laboriously built up in the course of thirty years. The prospect was all the more alarming in view of the steady growth of Jewish colonisation which had taken place during the twelve months after the Vienna Congress of 1913. The programme of practical work decided upon by the Congress had induced over 6,000 Jews to migrate to Palestine, and although some of them drifted away again, a large number, including a goodly proportion of young men, remained and took root. Many of them found work on the farms of the Jewish National Fund; others engaged in business or professions in the towns, particularly Tel-Aviv, which in a few years had attained a population of 2,000. The plantation companies (*Ahuzoth*) had multiplied; the Palestine Office was negotiating for the purchase of 35,000 acres of the best land in the fertile Valley of Jezreel, the money for which was guaranteed by Baron Edmond de Rothschild and some Russian Jews; the agricultural settlements in Judæa had organised an association to look after their common interests; and the Hebrew school system founded by the Zionist Organisation was making good progress. It was on the eve of what seemed to be a new and promising era that the storm-clouds broke.

As soon as Turkey threw in her lot with the Central Powers, the Jews in Palestine began to be subject to a reign of oppression that did not cease until the land was delivered by the army of General Allenby. The Turkish Generalissimo in Syria and Palestine, Djemal Pasha, was a cruel despot, who persecuted Jewish and Arab nationalists alike. He not only determined to suppress all Zionist institutions, but for a time seemed also bent upon destroying the entire *Yishuv* (Jewish settlement), as he

suspected the Jews of espionage on behalf of the Allied Powers. He issued a manifesto in January, 1915, against "the subversive element aiming at the creation of a Jewish government in the Palestinian part of the Ottoman Empire." He ordered the closing of the Anglo-Palestine Bank and the dissolution of the watchmen's organisation, "Hashomer"; he prohibited the use of Hebrew for street names and shop signs in Tel-Aviv, and even threatened with capital punishment those who affixed Jewish National Fund stamps to their letters. He deprived the Jewish settlements of the arms that they had for self-defence, so that they became a prey to marauders and looters. All Jews who were subjects of any of the Allied Powers were offered the alternative either of becoming Ottoman citizens and serving in the Ottoman Army or of leaving the country. Many accepted naturalisation, for which they paid a high fee, and then submitted to the rigours and risks of military service. Some thousands got away safely to Egypt, but hundreds were deported to Syria amid great hardships that caused many deaths. Dr. Ruppin was expelled from Jaffa, and Dr. Jacobson had to leave Constantinople. Many Jews, officials and others, were arrested and put on trial on charges of espionage or siding with the enemy, some were tortured, and others languished in jail for months. Two Jews, Belkind and Leszansky, were hanged at Damascus, and two others committed suicide in prison, one of whom, Sara Aaronson, of Zichron Jacob, had bravely refused under torture to divulge anything about the intelligence she conveyed at night to a British submarine that called near Athlit. As soon as the Allied forces began their offensive against the south of Palestine, all the Jews of Tel-Aviv and the neighbouring area—about 5,000 in all—were evacuated to the northern district, and many died from exposure. In addition to this persistent persecution, the Jewish population also suffered from hunger and disease, aggravated by a locust plague in 1917, and death would have made even more extensive ravages but for the material relief that came from the Jews of America.

Dr. Shmarya Levin, a member of the Zionist Executive, was at that time in New York, where he co-operated with the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs, which had been constituted in case the Executive were unable to function, and which performed a vital service in despatching money, food, and medical supplies to the harassed Yishuv. The work of relief was organised by the Palestine Office (under the direction of Dr. Jacob Thon), which was transferred from Tel-Aviv to Jerusalem, where

it also maintained relations with the Turkish authorities and with representatives of other Governments still in Palestine.

The war sundered the Zionist world into three parts—the countries of the Allied Powers, those of the Central Powers, and the neutral countries. The headquarters were then in Berlin, and in order to maintain relations between the constituent bodies of the Zionist Organisation a special Bureau was established at Copenhagen, which was at first under the control of Dr. Tschlenow and afterwards under that of Dr. Jacobson and Leo Motzkin. The Head Office of the Jewish National Fund was removed from Cologne to The Hague, where it was directed by Jacobus Kann.

The Zionist Organisation, as an international body whose members were to be found in the armed forces on both sides, observed an official neutrality, but among the Palestinian refugees in Egypt there soon arose the desire to fight on behalf of the Allied Powers. Captain Joseph Trumpeldor (1880–1920), who had lost an arm while fighting in the Russian Army against the Japanese at Port Arthur, was the leading spirit of the movement, which was prompted by the thought that such action would strengthen the Jewish claim to Palestine after the war. He raised a contingent of 900 men, which was called the Zion Mule Corps, and under the command of Colonel J. H. Patterson it rendered valuable services in the campaign at Gallipoli from April, 1915, until it was dissolved in March, 1916. The agitation for the formation of a Jewish regiment was then conducted in London with great energy by Vladimir Jabotinsky, and although Anglo-Jewish officialdom was opposed and Zionist circles were divided, two battalions of Jewish volunteers were organised, which were designated the 38th and 39th Battalions of the Royal Fusiliers. These Jewish units, commonly styled "The Judæans," were recruited from young Russian Jews in England as well as from Jews in the United States, Canada, and the Argentine, in addition to the remnant of the Zion Mule Corps: they wore the "Shield of David" on their uniforms and had their own flag. General Allenby made his victorious entry on foot into Jerusalem on December 8th, 1917, amid the jubilation of all sections of the population; and after the arrival of the Jewish battalions in February, 1918, many Jews in the south of Palestine eagerly enlisted to form a third battalion, the 40th of the Royal Fusiliers, bringing up the Jewish strength to 5,000. About one-third of this total took part in the pursuit of the Turkish troops in the final drive into Transjordan, and acquitted themselves with such distinction in the crossing of the Jordan at

Um esch-Schert that they were mentioned in despatches. The country was completely cleared of Turkish troops by General Allenby in the following September, and thus was brought to an end the Ottoman régime that had lasted just a little over 400 years.

The fate of Palestine was decided not only on the battlefield, but also in the political sphere. Long before the military offensive was opened a group of Zionists in England, besides many other people, began to envisage the defeat of the Central Powers as an event that would at last lead to the possibility of the realisation of the age-long yearnings of the Jewish people. There was no member of the Zionist Executive in England at the outbreak of the war. The initiative was therefore taken by Dr. Chaim Weizmann,¹ a member of the Greater "Actions Committee," who had held the post of lecturer in chemistry at the Manchester University since 1903. The former exponent of "Synthetic Zionism" (at the Congress of 1907) was now to become the spokesman of political Zionism. Through the friendly offices of C. P. Scott, the Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, who was a convinced believer in Zionism, Dr. Weizmann was introduced, at the end of 1914, to two leading members of the British Cabinet, Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Herbert (now Viscount) Samuel, from both of whom he received a sympathetic hearing. Dr. Weizmann first met Mr. Lloyd George at a time when there was a serious shortage of acetone, a vital ingredient in the manufacture of cordite, which was essential for the production of shells. Mr. Lloyd George, who was Chairman of the War Munitions Committee, explained the situation, and shortly afterwards Dr. Weizmann was able as a result of his work to elaborate a process for the production of acetone. The following conversation in Mr. Lloyd George's own words then took place:

"I said to him: 'You rendered great services to the State, and I should like to ask the Prime Minister to recommend you to His Majesty for some honour.' He said: 'There is nothing I want for myself.' 'But is there nothing we can do as a recognition of your valuable assistance to the country?' I asked. He replied: 'Yes, I would like you to do something for my people.' He then explained his aspirations as to the repatriation of the Jews to the sacred land they had made famous. That was the fount and

¹ Dr. Weizmann was born on November 27th, 1874, at Motol (Province of Grodno, in Russia), received his early education at Pinsk, studied at the Universities of Berlin and Freiburg (graduating at the latter), and held the post of lecturer in chemistry at the Geneva University from 1901 to 1903.

origin of the famous declaration about the National Home for Jews in Palestine.

"So that Dr. Weizmann, with his discovery, not only helped us to win the war, but made a permanent mark upon the map of the world."¹

Early in 1915 Mr. Samuel submitted to the Cabinet what Lord Oxford, then Prime Minister, described in his diary as a "dithyrambic memorandum, urging that in the carving up of the Turks' Asiatic dominions we should take Palestine, into which the scattered Jews would in time swarm back from all quarters of the globe, and in due course obtain Home Rule." The matter was also mentioned in the diary of Lord Bertie, then British Ambassador in Paris, who wrote on January 25th, 1915: "Edmond de Rothschild . . . sent a Russian co-religionist established in Manchester to 'talk' about what I think an absurd scheme, though they say it has the approval of Grey, Lloyd George, Samuel, and Crewe; they did not mention Lord Reading. It contemplates the formation of Palestine into an Israelite State, under the protectorate of England, France, or Russia, preferably England."² As early as the spring of 1916 the British Government showed evidence of giving the question serious consideration, for there is an *aide-mémoire* dated March 13th, 1916, among other State Papers published by the Soviet Government,³ in which the British Ambassador in Petrograd informed the Foreign Minister, M. Sazonoff, that "the attention of His Majesty's Government has recently been drawn to the question of Jewish colonisation in Palestine. . . . The only object of His Majesty's Government is to devise some agreement which will be sufficiently attractive to the majority of Jews to facilitate the conclusion of a transaction securing Jewish support. . . . Sir Edward Grey instructs Sir George Buchanan to solicit from the Russian Government a serious consideration of this question."

Dr. Weizmann was joined at an early stage by two members of the Zionist Executive, Dr. Tschlenow⁴ and Mr. Nahum Sokolow, of whom the latter played an important part in the developments that followed. In 1916 Dr. Weizmann received an appointment in London as Director of the Admiralty Laboratories, and in that

¹ *War Memories of David Lloyd George*, Vol. I, pp. 348-50.

² *The Diary of Lord Bertie* (London, 1924), Vol. I, pp. 105-6.

³ *The Partition of Asiatic Turkey* (Moscow, 1924), pp. 161-2.

⁴ Died in London, January 31st, 1918.

capacity again came into contact with Mr. Arthur (later Lord) Balfour, at that time First Lord of the Admiralty, whom he had first sought to interest in Zionism in Manchester ten years previously. He now found Mr. Balfour a more attentive listener, as the Zionist question was coming nearer to the realm of practical politics. Simultaneously with these various political soundings, steps were taken by the newly formed British Palestine Committee, consisting of both Jews and non-Jews (and prominent among whom was the journalist, Herbert Sidebotham),¹ to enlighten the British public, through the medium of a weekly paper, *Palestine*, on the advantages that would accrue to Great Britain from the realisation of Zionist aspirations, and to win general sympathy.

It was not, however, until October, 1916, that the Zionist leaders first put forward a "programme for a new administration of Palestine and for a Jewish resettlement of Palestine in accordance with the aspirations of the Zionist movement." The principal features of this programme, which was rather detailed, were "the recognition of a separate Jewish nationality or national unit in Palestine," "autonomy in exclusively Jewish matters," and "the establishment of a Jewish chartered company for the resettlement of Palestine by Jewish settlers." Whether this programme elicited any response in the British Government is unknown, but it was natural that, as the war progressed, they should become increasingly interested in the aims of Zionism. Great Britain had a long tradition of sympathy with the Jewish people, which had been strikingly manifested in the days of Lord Palmerston and Lord Shaftesbury, and found practical expression in the offer of a territory in British East Africa; and, on the other hand, the future of Palestine could not remain a matter of indifference to a country so closely interested in the security of the Suez Canal and of Egypt. The informal conversations with individual statesmen gave place to discussions of a more formal character after Mr. Lloyd George had become Prime Minister and Mr. Balfour Foreign Secretary. The turning point came on February 7th, 1917, when a number of representative Zionists first met Sir Mark Sykes, who was in charge of the Middle Eastern Department of the Foreign Office, at the house of Dr. Moses Gaster. Weizmann and Sokolow had been introduced to Sykes some months earlier by Mr. James A. Malcolm, a British Armenian and a member of

¹ Herbert Sidebotham (1872-1940), who was a political leader writer on the *Manchester Guardian* and afterwards on *The Times*, was "Scrutator" on the *Sunday Times* for many years, published *England and Palestine* in 1918, and continued to render inestimable services to the Zionist cause by various writings until his death.

the Armenian National Delegation to the Peace Conference.¹ Sykes had already negotiated on behalf of Great Britain in May, 1916, the Anglo-French agreement known as the Sykes-Picot Agreement,² which did not become known to the Zionist leaders until some time afterwards, and he discussed the Zionist programme in all its aspects with the sympathy of one anxious to see the Jews play their proper part in the revival of the Middle East. Since the matter entailed negotiations with the French and Italian Governments, Mr. Sokolow was selected for the purpose, and his visits to Paris and Rome resulted in obtaining expressions of sympathy with Zionism from them both as well as from the Pope, Benedict XIV, who said that Jews and Catholics would be good neighbours in Palestine. The Zionists both in Russia and in the United States were kept informed of the course of the negotiations, and when Mr. Balfour in the spring of 1917 visited America, he discussed the question with President Wilson and also with Justice Louis D. Brandeis, of the Supreme Court, who was Chairman of the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs.

After the discussions had made some progress, the Presidents of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Association published a letter in *The Times* of May 24th, 1917, in which they publicly dissociated themselves from the Zionist proposals. They took exception to what they considered was "a claim that Jewish settlements in Palestine shall be recognised as possessing a national character in a purely political sense" and to what they regarded as a demand for special rights for the Jews in excess of those enjoyed by the rest of the population. Their letter was in effect an attack by the assimilationist school upon the fundamental principles of Zionism and an attempt to discredit the Zionist leaders. It provoked a storm of indignation in the Anglo-Jewish community, as it was obviously intended to frustrate the efforts to obtain a declaration of sympathy with Zionist aspirations from the British Government. The result was a revolt on the part of the

¹ In the course of a letter in the *Manchester Guardian* of December 4th, 1943, Mr. James A. Malcolm wrote: "In the course of the negotiations which I conducted with Sir Mark Sykes (acting on behalf of the War Cabinet), I had talks, at his request, in 1916 and 1917, with the Arab leaders in London on this very question [the necessity of promising the whole of Palestine to the Jews in consideration of the help they were able to give]. Of these, Hadad Pasha was the most important, because he represented King Hussein and the Emir Feisal. I can, therefore, speak from my own knowledge in affirming Arab concurrence in the agreement [between the British Government and the Zionist leaders in London]."

² According to this agreement, Palestine was to be divided into three parts: the northern part to go to France, Haifa and Acre to Britain, while the southern part and the Holy Places were to be under the control of an international régime.

majority of the Board of Deputies, who brought about the election of a new President and other honorary officers of pro-Zionist sympathies.

In July, 1917, the Zionist leaders submitted to the Government a formula embodying "the principle of recognising Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish people" and postulating "as essential for the realisation of the principle the grant of internal autonomy to the Jewish nationality in Palestine, freedom of immigration for Jews, and the establishment of a Jewish National Colonising Corporation for the resettlement and economic development of the country." As the need was now felt for discussion and consultation with other representative Zionists and machinery was required for the growing political work, a Political Committee was formed in the following month (which included Ahad Ha-am and varied in composition from time to time) and a Zionist Bureau was opened at Empire House in Piccadilly. The Cabinet, which had received representations antagonistic to Zionism from certain prominent English Jews, modified the Zionist draft and submitted their own version to representatives of both sides with a covering letter, in which it was stated that "in view of the divergence of opinion expressed on the subject by the Jews themselves, they would like to receive in writing the views of representative Jewish leaders, both Zionist and non-Zionist."¹ Mr. Sokolow and Dr. Weizmann accepted the revised version, which contained the phrase, "the establishment in Palestine of a National Home," though they would have preferred, as being in stricter consonance with the traditional hope of Israel, "the reconstitution of Palestine as the National Home." The Chief Rabbi of British Jewry, Dr. J. H. Hertz, and Sir Stuart Samuel, the new President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, were fundamentally in agreement with the Zionist point of view. But Mr. Claude Montefiore, President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, Sir Leonard L. Cohen, Chairman of the Jewish Board of Guardians, and Sir Philip Magnus, M.P., who were anti-Zionists rather than non-Zionists, raised objection to the formula, particularly to the word "national." After considering these various views, the Cabinet made some further modifications of the formula, Lord Milner, a member of the Cabinet, and Mr. L. S. Amery, a member of the Cabinet Secretariat, being specially engaged on the task. There was some delay, however, in giving official approval to the final text, partly,

¹ *Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation to the XIIth Zionist Congress: I, Political Report* (London, 1921), p. 12.

no doubt, because the Government had other important matters to consider, and partly because there was some opposition within their own circle, especially from Edwin S. Montagu, the Jewish Secretary of State for India. It was therefore deemed advisable to try to strengthen the hands of the friends of Zionism in the Government by obtaining support from America. Accordingly, Justice Brandeis approached President Wilson, who sent a personal message to the British Government, intimating his agreement with the idea of a pro-Zionist pronouncement. At last, after all obstacles had been overcome, the following letter was addressed on November 2nd, 1917, by Mr. Balfour to Lord Rothschild:

“FOREIGN OFFICE,

“November 2nd, 1917.

“DEAR LORD ROTHSCHILD,—I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty’s Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet:

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

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

“Yours sincerely,

“ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.”

In promulgating this historic statement, henceforth known as the Balfour Declaration, the British Government were clearly animated by a blend of ideal and material considerations: whilst genuinely willing to help the Jews to achieve their national aspirations and to exercise the self-determination which was emblazoned on the banners of the Allied Powers as the right of the small nations, they certainly also took into account the effect which such a Declaration must produce upon the Jews in other countries, especially America, where sympathy at a critical stage in the war was of considerable value. Indeed, no less an authority than Mr. Lloyd George, who was Prime Minister at the time, told the Palestine Royal Commission in 1937 that the launching of

the Balfour Declaration was "due to propagandist reasons." In the critical situation in which the Allied and Associated Powers were in the autumn of 1917, "it was believed that Jewish sympathies or the reverse would make a substantial difference one way or the other to the Allied cause. In particular Jewish sympathy would confirm the support of American Jewry, and would make it more difficult for Germany to reduce her military commitments and improve her economic position on the eastern front." Mr. Lloyd George also said to the Royal Commission:

"The Zionist leaders gave us a definite promise that, if the Allies committed themselves to give facilities for the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine, they would do their best to rally Jewish sentiment and support throughout the world to the Allied cause. They kept their word."¹

The Declaration was hailed by Jews all over the world with a jubilant and almost frenzied enthusiasm as though it betokened the imminent end of their exile and the veritable fulfilment of Biblical prophecies. It was read during the Sabbath service in countless synagogues and formed the text of many a fervid sermon. Its terms and phrases, which seemed pregnant with promise, were variously commented upon, but all agreed that it marked a turning-point in the destinies of Jewry. The expression "National Home" was unknown in political terminology, but it had been taken from the Basle Programme and therefore needed no definition. As for the two provisos, they were designed to silence the objections in two possible quarters—among the Arabs in Palestine, who might fear a curtailment of their rights, and among the Jews outside Palestine, who might be apprehensive about their own political status in the future. The proviso in regard to the Jews clearly implied that the National Home would be invested with specific political rights of its own, for if it were merely intended that Jews should settle on the same footing as immigrants of any other nation, such a proviso was unnecessary. The Government lost no time in making the Declaration known far and wide and deriving from it the maximum benefit. They carried out a most extensive propaganda campaign through a specially created Jewish Department of the Ministry of Information, which cabled news items to friendly or neutral centres, whence they were immediately transmitted to the capitals of the Central Powers. The Department also

¹ *Report of Palestine Royal Commission* (London, 1937), p. 23.

published a weekly bulletin of Jewish news, giving prominence to Zionist matters, as well as pamphlets and leaflets in various languages on Jewish questions of current interest. Millions of leaflets "were dropped from the air on German and Austrian towns and widely distributed through the Jewish belt from Poland to the Black Sea."¹

The Balfour Declaration was not issued until the approval of the French and Italian Governments was assured, and written confirmation was soon forthcoming. On February 14th, 1918, M. Pichon, then Foreign Minister, sent Mr. Sokolow an official *communiqué* to the effect that there was a complete understanding between the French and British Governments as regards "*la question d'un établissement juif en Palestine.*" On May 9th the Italian Ambassador in London conveyed to the Zionist leaders the assurance of his Government's desire to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of "a Jewish national centre." The endorsement of other Allied Governments followed later: China (December, 1918), Japan (January, 1919), Greece, and Siam. As the United States was not at war with Turkey, the American Government could not formally endorse the Declaration, but President Wilson was naturally pleased with the publication of a pronouncement with whose purpose he had previously expressed agreement. He conveyed his satisfaction later in a letter dated August 31st, 1918, to Rabbi Dr. Stephen Wise, in which he welcomed "the progress made by the Zionist Movement in the United States and in the Allied countries since the Declaration by Mr. Balfour, on behalf of the British Government, of Great Britain's approval of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." American endorsement was again expressed, nearly four years later, when the Palestine Mandate was about to be submitted for approval to the Council of the League of Nations, in a resolution, unanimously adopted by both Houses of the United States Congress, in favour of "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the Holy Places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."²

¹ *Royal Commission Report*, p. 23. See also the author's article in *The New Judaea*, October, 1922.

² Joint Resolution of the 67th Congress, adopted by the Senate on May 3rd and by the House of Representatives on June 30th, 1922, and approved by President Harding on September 21st, 1922.

The impression made by the Declaration upon the Central Powers, who could not fail to be aware of the deep feeling it had aroused among their subjects, moved them to counter-action in the hope of modifying its effect. Only a fortnight after the issue of the Declaration, the Austrian Foreign Minister, Count Czernin, found it politic to give an interview to a German Zionist leader, Dr. Arthur Hantke, and to promise him that his Government would use its influence with the Turks when the war was over. Six weeks later the Turkish Government itself made a statement. The Grand Vizier, Talaat Pasha, gave a long and friendly interview to a Jewish journalist, in which he promised free immigration for Jews into Palestine, liberty of economic opportunity, the possibility of local self-administration, and free development of Jewish culture.¹ He took the precaution, however, of observing that "all immigration must, of course, be kept within the natural limits of the absorptive capacity of the country for the time being," promised to consider all questions after the war with benevolence, and disparagingly referred to the Balfour Declaration as "*une blague*."² This Turkish declaration was officially endorsed on January 5th 1918, by the German Government, through the medium of the Deputy-Secretary of its Foreign Office, who received a small deputation of German Zionists, and discreetly confined himself to a statement welcoming the Turkish assurances, the main points of which he briefly recapitulated. But by that time half of Palestine was in General Allenby's hands, and nobody doubted that the other half would follow.

Now, what was the meaning of the Balfour Declaration? According to the Palestine Royal Commission, who were permitted to examine the records bearing upon the question, "the words 'the establishment in Palestine of a National Home' were the outcome of a compromise between those Ministers who contemplated the establishment of a Jewish State and those who did not."³ The British Government could not commit itself to the establishment of a Jewish State and could only undertake to facilitate the growth of a Home. "It would depend mainly on the zeal and enterprise of the Jews whether the Home could grow big enough to become a State." Mr. Lloyd George stated in evidence:

¹ *Vossische Zeitung*, December 31st, 1917, and *Jüdische Rundschau*, January 4th, 1918.

² The expression "absorptive capacity" curiously anticipated similar phraseology in the White Paper of 1922, which first formulated the restriction of Jewish immigration into Palestine.

³ *Report*, 1937, p. 24.

"The idea was, and this was the interpretation put upon it at the time, that a Jewish State was not to be set up immediately by the Peace Treaty without reference to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants. On the other hand, it was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth."¹

The Royal Commission pointed out that "the Zionist leaders, for their part, recognised that an ultimate Jewish State was not precluded by the terms of the Declaration," and referred to statements by several statesmen in support of this interpretation. "I am persuaded," said President Wilson on March 3rd, 1919, "that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."² General Smuts, who had been a member of the Imperial War Cabinet when the Declaration was published, speaking at Johannesburg on November 3rd, 1919, foretold an increasing stream of Jewish immigration into Palestine and "in generations to come a great Jewish State rising there once more."³ Mr. Winston Churchill envisaged "in our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown which might comprise three or four millions of Jews."⁴ Lord Robert (now Viscount) Cecil, a member of the Cabinet at the time, speaking at a great demonstration in London on December 2nd, 1917, said: "Our wish is that Arabian countries shall be for the Arabs, Armenia for the Armenians, and Judæa for the Jews" And Mr. Herbert Samuel, in a speech in London two years later, on November 2nd, 1919, outlined the policy propounded before the Peace Conference as "the promotion . . . of Jewish immigration and of Jewish land settlement, . . . the active promotion of Jewish cultural development, and the fullest measure of local self-government, in order that with the minimum of delay the country may become a purely self-governing Commonwealth under the auspices of an established Jewish majority."⁵ Leading

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

² David Lloyd George, *The Truth about the Peace Treaties*, Vol. II, p. 1140.

³ *Zionist Bulletin*, December 10th, 1919.

⁴ *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8th, 1920.

⁵ *Zionist Bulletin*, November 5th, 1919.

British newspapers were equally explicit in their comments on the Declaration.¹

The first step taken by the Zionist leaders after the issue of the Balfour Declaration was to obtain the authorisation of the Government for a special Commission to proceed to Palestine. This Zionist Commission, which was headed by Dr. Weizmann, consisted of representatives of the Jews of Great Britain, France, and Italy, and in order to mark its official character it was accompanied by Major W. Ormsby-Gore, M.P. (later Colonial Secretary and now Lord Harlech) as Political Officer on behalf of the Government, who was assisted by Major James de Rothschild, M.P. The inclusion of American representatives at that time was impossible, as America was not at war with Turkey, but the despatch of the American Zionist Medical Unit, in the organising of which American Zionists were then actively engaged, was regarded as a sort of substitute for such inclusion. At a later stage, however, both American and Russian members joined the Commission, whose personnel changed from time to time. Its status was that of "an advisory body to the British authorities in Palestine in all matters relating to Jews, or which may affect the establishment of a National Home for the Jewish people." Its objects were to form a link between the British authorities and the Jewish population, to organise and administer the relief work, to assist in the repatriation of exiled and evacuated persons and in restoring the Jewish colonies, to help the Jewish organisations and institutions to resume their former activities, to aid in establishing friendly relations with the Arabs and other non-Jews, to investigate the possibilities of the further development of the Jewish settlements and of the country in general, and to enquire into the possibility of founding a Jewish University.

The Zionist Commission, which reached Palestine on April 4th, 1918, found itself faced by a formidable task, for the Jews had suffered severely from hunger and disease, and epidemics were still prevalent. The settlements in the south had had their crops and cattle requisitioned, the local currency had greatly depreciated, and business was at a standstill. The northern districts were still cut off, and the Jewish community was not reunited until the

¹ The *Manchester Guardian*, which has always distinguished itself by its staunch support of the Zionist cause, wrote: "What it means is that . . . on the conclusion of peace our deliberate policy will be to encourage in every way in our power Jewish immigration, to give full security, and no doubt a large measure of local autonomy, to the Jewish immigrants, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State." Similarly, *The Spectator* wrote of "a little Jewish State in Palestine," and *The Observer* said: "It is no idle dream which anticipates that by the close of another generation the new Zion may become a State."

Turks had been completely driven out six months later. It was then found that the Jewish population of the whole country had been reduced to about 55,000. The Commission lost no time in getting to work, and was actively assisted by the Palestine Office, which became amalgamated with it in the following October. Thenceforth the Zionist Commission, of which Mr. Ussishkin became the head in the autumn of 1919, was the sole representative in Palestine of the Zionist Organisation in all matters until it was succeeded in September, 1921, by the Zionist Executive elected at the Twelfth Congress. During the first period of its activity, the Commission was able to do little more than administer relief to the Jewish population, maintain relations with the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration, and co-operate in the recruiting of volunteers for the third Jewish battalion. O.E.T.A. took no official note of the Balfour Declaration and made no secret of its antipathy to the Zionist Commission, which consequently found itself hampered in various directions. O.E.T.A. was opposed to the recruiting of Palestinian Jews for another battalion, and the Commission had to exercise considerable pressure to extort its consent. It was even more strongly opposed to the laying of the foundation-stones of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and did not yield until a special instruction from the Foreign Office was received. The simple yet impressive ceremony, presided over by Dr. Weizmann, took place on July 24th, 1918, on Mount Scopus, in the presence of General Allenby, representatives of the French and Italian contingents in the army of liberation, and the religious heads of the Moslem, Anglican, Greek, and Armenian communities. It was a symbolic act of inspiring significance, but seven years elapsed before it was possible for the inauguration of the University to take place.

Even before the arrival of the Zionist Commission, the Jews of Palestine took the first steps towards organising themselves on a representative basis. Soon after the British entered Jerusalem the Jews of the city elected a communal council (*Vaad Hair*). On December 31st, 1917, a conference of a wider character was held at which a Provisional Committee (*Ha-Vaad Hazmani*) was elected to prepare the way for a Jewish Constituent Assembly, and that Committee was re-elected at a further conference held in July, 1918, at which Dr. Weizmann and Major Ormsby-Gore made speeches on the political situation. After the northern districts had also been liberated, a conference of Jewish representatives of the whole country took place, at which Dr. Weizmann and Mr.

Sokolow were appointed to represent the *Yishuv* at the Peace Conference, and a special delegation was chosen to go to London for the purpose of conferring with the Zionist Executive on political matters. But, owing to the attitude of O.E.T.A., it was impossible to convene a Jewish constituent assembly until after the establishment of the civil administration, and thus *Ha-Vaad Hazmani*, of which Dr. Jacob Thon was the Chairman, continued to act as the representative organ of Palestinian Jewry for nearly three years. For it was not until October 7th, 1920, that the meeting took place of the constituent assembly (*Asefath Hanisharim*), attended by 300 deputies, at which the *Vaad Leumi* (National Council) was elected as the official representative of Palestinian Jewry.

As one of the objects of the Zionist Commission was to help in establishing friendly relations with the Arabs, Dr. Weizmann, accompanied by Major Ormsby-Gore, went to Akaba in June, 1918, to meet Emir Feisal, a son of Hussein, the Sherif of Mecca. The latter had revolted against the Turks after a correspondence in 1915 with Sir Henry McMahon, the British High Commissioner in Egypt, who, on behalf of the British Government, had promised independence after the war to those Arab territories that gave active assistance to the Allies. The area within which independence was to be recognised was geographically defined and did not include Palestine,¹ apart from which the Arabs of that country neither revolted nor assisted the Allies.² Feisal fully understood that Palestine was excluded from the promise, for when he came to London in the following winter he signed an agreement on January 3rd, 1919, as the representative of "the Arab State," with Dr. Weizmann as representing Palestine, clearly showing that he regarded this country as reserved for Jewish settlement, and stipulating for the help of the Zionist Organisation in the economic development of "the Arab State." Nearly five weeks later, on February 6th, Feisal appeared as the head of a Hedjaz Delegation before the Peace Conference, at which he is officially reported to have referred to Palestine as follows:

¹ This was first explicitly stated by the British Government in the Churchill White Paper of 1922, and the statement was repeated on numerous occasions subsequently. The exclusion of Palestine was confirmed by Sir Henry McMahon himself in a letter to *The Times*, July 29th, 1937, and was also borne out by T. E. Lawrence in his *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (1935 edition, footnote to p. 276).

² See *Report of Palestine Royal Commission*, p. 22, and Ernest Main, *Palestine at the Crossroads*, p. 82. A study of *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* shows that Colonel T. E. Lawrence's Arabs were desert tribesmen and did not include any Palestine Arabs. According to Bertram Thomas, in his book, *The Arabs* (pp. 302-3), the effective force that took part in the Arab revolt did not exceed 2,600 men, and the total cost to the British Exchequer "is thought to have been in the neighbourhood of £4,000,000 in gold, of which rather more than half came back in purchases of food and clothing."

"Palestine, for its universal character, he left on one side for the mutual consideration of all parties interested. With this exception, he asked for the independence of the Arabic areas enumerated in his memorandum."¹

A week later, on February 13th, the Peace Conference received a Syrian Delegation, the head of which, Chekri Ganem, made a long statement, in which he pleaded for the separate constitution of Syria as a democratic State and made the following reference to Palestine.

"Palestine is incontestably the southern portion of our country. The Zionists claim it. We have suffered too much from sufferings resembling theirs not to throw open to them the doors of Palestine. All those among them who are oppressed in certain retrograde countries are welcome. Let them settle in Palestine, but in an autonomous Palestine, connected with Syria by the sole bond of federation. Will not a Palestine enjoying wide internal autonomy be for them a sufficient guarantee? If they form the majority there, they will be the rulers. If they are in the minority, they will be represented in the Government in proportion to their numbers."²

The Zionist leaders submitted their demands to the Peace Conference in a detailed statement, dated February 3rd, 1919. The main proposals of this document were that (1) "the historic title of the Jewish people to Palestine and the right of the Jews to reconstitute in Palestine their National Home" be recognised, (2) the sovereignty of the country be vested in the League of Nations and the government entrusted to Great Britain as Mandatory of the League, (3) "Palestine shall be placed under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment there of the Jewish National Home, and ultimately render possible the creation of an autonomous Commonwealth," (4) in promoting Jewish immigration and settlement the Mandatory shall "accept the co-operation of a Council representative of the Jews in Palestine and of the world," and (5) there shall be "the fullest freedom of religious worship for all creeds in Palestine" and "no discrimination among the inhabitants with regard to citizenship and civil rights on the grounds of religion or race." This document was signed not only by Mr. Sokolow and Dr. Weizmann, as the heads of the Zionist Organisation, but also by representatives of the Zionists of America and Russia, as well as

¹ David Hunter Miller, *My Diary of the Peace Conference*, Vol. IV, p. 226 (quoted in *The Truth about the Peace Treaties*, by D. Lloyd George, Vol. II, p. 1042).

² *Ibid.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 389-415 (quoted in *The Truth about the Peace Treaties*, Vol. II, p. 1057).

of the Jewish population of Palestine; and it was reinforced by the speeches made by the two Zionist leaders, and by Mr. Ussishkin on behalf of the Jews of Russia, on February 27th, before the Peace Conference, at which Mr. Balfour and Lord Milner were the British representatives. Thereupon Feisal wrote a letter to Professor Felix Frankfurter (now a judge in the United States Supreme Court of Justice), a member of the Zionist Delegation, in the course of which he said: "Our deputation here in Paris is fully acquainted with the proposals submitted yesterday by the Zionist Organisation to the Peace Conference, and we regard them as moderate and proper. We will do our best, in so far as we are concerned, to help them through: we will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home." But Palestine was only one of a multitude of questions with which the victorious Powers had to deal, and more than a year was allowed to elapse before its future was decided upon.

The delay was most unfortunate from the Zionist point of view, as the Military Administration in Palestine adopted an attitude diametrically opposed to that of the Government in London. Throughout the years 1918 and 1919, the Balfour Declaration was neither officially published nor even referred to at any public function. The Military Administration strictly adhered to the *status quo*, and their hostility to Jewish aspirations became so marked and produced such a prejudicial effect upon the Arabs that Mr. Balfour despatched a detailed instruction on August 4th, 1919, to remind them of the Government's policy and of their duty. The instruction stated that "the American and French Governments were equally pledged to support the establishment in Palestine of the Jewish National Home, that this should be emphasised to the Arabs' leaders at every opportunity, that the matter was a *chose jugée*, and that continued agitation would be useless and detrimental."¹ Mr. Balfour's note produced a little improvement, but it was only temporary: the mischief had already gone too far. There was an Arab National Committee in Damascus, which was equally opposed to Syria coming under a French mandate and Palestine under a British one, and at its instigation a gang of Bedouin made an armed attack on March 1st, 1920, upon some isolated Jewish settlements in the extreme north of Palestine, from which French troops had been withdrawn without being replaced by any British force. A heroic fight was put up by Captain Joseph Trumpeldor and his little band of com-

¹ *Political Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organization to the 12th Zionist Congress, 1921.*

rades in defence of Metulla and Tel Hai; but after the leader and six others had been killed both places had to be temporarily abandoned. Six days later the Damascus Committee proclaimed Feisal, who was in the city, King of Syria and Palestine,¹ and thereupon followed anti-Jewish demonstrations in Jerusalem and Jaffa. At the approach of Easter, when thousands of Arabs from all parts of the country assembled in Jerusalem for the traditional Nebi-Musa procession, the unrest increased, but although the military authorities were warned of the probability of an outbreak no effective measures were taken to prevent it. The result was a three days' attack (April 4th-6th) by the Arabs upon the Jews in Jerusalem, in which six Jews and six Arabs were killed; the indignation and discomfiture of the Jews were further increased when the organisers and members of the Jewish self-defence corps were arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment (which, however, were subsequently quashed by the Army Council).

These events precipitated the eagerly awaited decision. On April 24th, 1920, the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference (on which Great Britain was represented by Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Curzon) met at San Remo, and resolved that the Balfour Declaration should be incorporated in the Treaty of Peace with Turkey, and that the Mandate for Palestine should be allotted to Great Britain. The way was thus cleared for the termination of military rule in Palestine, and its replacement by a Civil Administration. "What you want in Palestine," said Mr. Lloyd George to Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow, who were awaiting the decision, "is men who really care for the National Home policy." They were joined by Mr. Herbert Samuel, who was on his way back from Palestine, where he had spent some time at the invitation of General Allenby for the purpose of advising on matters of administration and finance in connection with the future of the country.

An understanding was soon reached that Mr. Samuel, who had shown a keen interest in the Zionist question for some years and had taken part in the framing of the Zionist proposals, should be appointed as the first High Commissioner in Palestine. His appointment was announced shortly afterwards, and on July 1st, 1920, as Sir Herbert Samuel, he landed at Jaffa from a British warship to inaugurate what the Jewish people hoped would be not only a new, but a better era.

¹ Feisal was driven out of Syria by the French in July, 1920, and was made King of Iraq on August 23rd, 1921, by Great Britain, who exercised a Mandate over Iraq until 1952. The Mandate was then converted into a Treaty of Alliance.

CHAPTER VIII

EXPANSION AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE MOVEMENT

THE First World War, which had resulted in giving the Jewish people the right to re-establish itself as a nation in Palestine, unfortunately rendered large sections of it unable to avail themselves of that right or unable to help in its realisation, owing either to political changes or economic conditions. The Jews of Russia, who had previously formed the mainstay of the Zionist movement, were now sundered in two. Those who remained under the rule of Soviet Russia, numbering nearly three millions, were completely severed from any association with the Jews in the rest of the world; at least 100,000 were massacred in the pogroms that raged throughout the Ukraine for two years after the war; and Zionism was proscribed, under penalties of imprisonment and deportation, as a counter-revolutionary movement. On the other hand, those who found themselves within the frontiers of the Polish Republic and who also numbered nearly three millions, were able to engage in Zionist activities with a freedom entirely unknown under the Tsarist régime; but their material plight made it impossible for them for some years to render any appreciable contribution, except in the important respect of man-power, to the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Such was the case also of the much smaller Jewish communities liberated from the Tsarist yoke, those in the newly created States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as well as in the province of Bessarabia annexed by Rumania. Moreover, Jews in Germany and other parts of Central Europe had likewise suffered too seriously from the effects of war to be able to afford any effective service to the national cause. The brunt of the task was thus inevitably shouldered by the Jews of the West, particularly by those in the English-speaking countries.

The Balfour Declaration gave a powerful incentive to the growth of Zionist societies and the creation of new ones in all parts of the world in which Jews were free to profess their adhesion to the Zionist idea. The progress of the movement was naturally most marked in Great Britain and the British Dominions, because Great Britain had accepted the Mandate for Palestine and the imputation of "dual loyalty," which was unfounded and false in regard to Jews anywhere, had also become manifestly absurd in

relation to the Jews in the British Empire. The movement likewise underwent immediate expansion in the United States and other parts of America, as well as in the lands of the Orient and North Africa, in some of which Zionist societies were formed for the first time. In all these different parts of the globe Jews began to look upon the Zionist ideal as capable of achievement in greater or less measure, although many still remained indifferent or opposed. The only countries in which, apart from Soviet Russia, the movement was actually forbidden were Turkey, because Palestine had formerly belonged to the Ottoman Empire, and Iraq, owing to local sympathy with the Palestine Arabs.

Soon after the conclusion of the war, the Zionist leaders took steps to convene a Conference in London for a discussion of the position. It was held in February, 1919, and was attended by delegates from all Allied and neutral countries. Dr. Weizmann, who was elected on the Executive to fill the gap caused by the death of Dr. Tschlenow, as well as in virtue of the leadership to which his services entitled him, and Mr. Nahum Sokolow delivered reports on the political situation in Palestine and on the proposals that had been submitted to the Peace Conference. The delegates thanked them for what they had already achieved and empowered them to continue their efforts. They considered the principal aspects of the formidable tasks to be undertaken in Palestine, and devised plans for such action as had to be taken without delay. They decided upon the establishment of the Central Office of the Organisation in London to take the place of the Zionist Bureau that had existed since July, 1917, and planned it to comprise departments for political matters, organisation, and Palestine, with special sections for agricultural colonisation, financial institutions, immigration, education, and other affairs.¹ They increased the representative character of the Zionist Commission in Palestine, and improved its efficacy by additional appointments. Although delegates from the countries of the Central Powers were unable to attend, the Zionists of those countries took no exception to the decisions adopted.

The Conference also discussed the position of the Jews in the various countries of Central and Eastern Europe, whether newly created, enlarged, or reduced, and the need of measures to be taken to ensure that they would enjoy civil equality. It adopted a resolution urging that the constitutions of these States should

¹ The Central Office was established in March, 1919, in three contiguous houses in Great Russell Street, 75, 76, and 77, the main entrance being at 77.

not only assure their Jewish inhabitants all the rights of citizenship, but also recognise them as members of a nationality and grant them the rights of a national minority. In most of these countries Jewish National Councils had been formed immediately after the war to safeguard the civil status of the Jewish population, and delegations were sent to Paris for the purpose of formulating proposals to the Peace Conference. The Zionist Conference accordingly resolved to send a delegation to Paris in order to organise these delegations as a single body; and there was thus set up, under the leadership of Sokolow and Leo Motzkin, the Committee of Jewish Delegations, which co-operated with the Jewish representative organisations of Western Europe and America in securing minority rights for millions of Jews. These rights (which were also granted to other racial, religious, and linguistic minorities) provided for the Jews to be free to use their language in private or public, including the law-courts; to establish and control at their own expense charitable, religious, and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments; and, in towns where they formed a considerable proportion, to give instruction in their primary schools in their own language and to receive an equitable share of the public funds devoted to educational, religious, or charitable purposes. These and other kindred rights were declared to be obligations of international concern, over the fulfilment of which the League of Nations was expected to watch; but, with the exception of Czechoslovakia and Estonia, they were honoured in most countries more in the breach than in the observance, and owing to the cumbersome procedure of the League it was impossible to make the offending States comply with their undertakings. Thus, the hopes that the Jews had reposed in the Minorities Treaties were largely doomed to frustration.¹

The Conference of 1919 was followed some time later by meetings in London of the old "Actions Committee," but these gatherings were only a prelude to a more important Conference held in London in July, 1920. This was the most representative Zionist gathering since the Congress of 1913, it was attended by over 250 delegates from all parts of the world, and it afforded the first opportunity of a free and full exchange of views on the multifarious questions of policy and method that called for settlement. Mr. Justice Brandeis, who headed a large delegation from the United States, was elected Honorary President of the Zionist

¹ For further details, see the author's *Jewish Life in Modern Times* (1929 edition), Book III, Chap. 2.

Organisation, Dr. Weizmann was made President, and Mr. Sokolow Chairman of the Executive. Three additions were made to the Executive—Mr. Ussishkin, who became head of the Zionist Commission in Palestine, and Mr. Julius Simon (New York) and Mr. Nehemiah de Lieme (The Hague), who were placed in charge of the Central Office, with the exception of the Political Department, which was under the control of Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow.

The Conference, of which Dr. Max Nordau was the Honorary President, adopted a great number of resolutions both on questions of policy and on the measures necessary for the translation of policy into practice. Of cardinal significance was the resolution which stated that "at the moment when the Jewish people is preparing to concentrate its energies on the reconstruction of its historical home, it solemnly declares its determination to live in peace and friendship with the non-Jewish population." On the subject of agricultural settlement in Palestine, a basic factor of the National Home, the Conference declared that "the fundamental principle of Zionist land policy is that all land on which Jewish colonisation takes place should eventually become the common property of the Jewish people." It designated the Jewish National Fund as the organ for carrying out Jewish land policy in town and country, defining its objects as follows: "To use the voluntary contributions received from the Jewish people as a means for making the land of Palestine the common property of the Jewish people; to let the land exclusively on hereditary leasehold and on hereditary building-right; to assist the settlement on their own farms of Jewish agricultural workers; to see that the ground is worked and to combat speculation; and to safeguard Jewish labour." The aim of national colonisation was the settlement of Jewish farmers cultivating the land themselves; only those who had gained experience as agricultural workers in the Diaspora should be assisted to settle; large contiguous areas of cultivation should as far as possible be secured by the Zionist Organisation, even if they required improvement and sanitation; and some settlements should be established as soon as possible, both on irrigated and on non-irrigated soil.

The Conference decided that the urgent question of the regulation of immigration to Palestine should be entrusted to the Central Immigration Office to be established there without delay, and that Palestine Offices should be opened in all countries expected to furnish contingents of young emigrants, who were called

Halutzim (pioneers). These Offices were to be controlled by local committees representative of the various Zionist parties (and composed in proportion to their numbers), and they were to ensure that those selected had received adequate training either as agriculturists or as artisans, that they were able to speak Hebrew, and were physically fit.

A question that provoked considerable controversy between the Executive and a group of the American Zionists concerned the nature of the fund by means of which the great work of colonisation, apart from the acquisition of land, was to be financed. Besides the Jewish National Fund, which was for land-purchase, another fund, called the Preparation Fund, had been created in July, 1917, and its name was subsequently changed to the Palestine Restoration Fund (*Keren Geulah*). The purpose of this fund was to finance the work in London and in Paris (where an office was maintained in connection with the affairs of the Peace Conference), and particularly to defray the activities of the Zionist Commission in Palestine. It had yielded during the first three years of its existence over £600,000, entirely raised by voluntary contributions from Jews in many countries. It was now considered necessary to replace the Restoration Fund, which was regarded as only a temporary system, by a much more substantial and permanent fund, entailing some sacrifice on the part of the contributors. This "immigration and colonisation fund" was named *Keren Hayesod*, or Foundation Fund, and was to be incorporated as an English limited company. The amount to be aimed at, as proposed by the Conference, was £25,000,000, which was to be raised within one year from Jews contributing on the basis of a tithe of their capital and also of their income. At least 20 per cent. of the money collected by the *Keren Hayesod* was to be given to the Jewish National Fund, and of the remainder not more than a third was to be spent on current expenditure for education, social welfare, immigration, and kindred purposes in Palestine, while at least two-thirds were to be "invested in permanent national institutions or economic undertakings." The Administration of the Zionist Organisation of America, under the leadership of Justice Brandeis, was strongly opposed to this proposed application of the funds. They insisted that the donations received should be devoted solely to the communal or public services (such as education, health, and immigration), and that the financing of commercial undertakings should be left to private investors. They objected to what they termed a "commingling of funds" on the ground that the economic enterprises, if dependent

on donation funds, might suffer in the interests of the communal services and would not be directed efficiently. The conference, however, decided that the Keren Hayesod be established and devoted to both categories. Justice Brandeis and his supporters persisted in refusing to co-operate on this basis and to be represented on the Executive of the Zionist Organisation. A majority of the members of the American Organisation, however, disapproved of their attitude, and consequently a new Administration was elected at the Cleveland Convention in June, 1921, which was pledged to support the Executive and the Keren Hayesod.

The London Conference also resolved to appoint a Commission to investigate the financial administration both in London and Jerusalem, and to convene the next Congress not later than in the summer of 1921. The Reorganisation Commission, as it was called, which was intended to placate the American critics, was charged with the task of adjusting the administrative apparatus in London to the Organisation's income and also of overhauling the machinery of the Zionist Commission. It consisted of Messrs. Julius Simon, Nehemiah de Lieme, and Robert Szold (New York), who effected various economies in the Central Office, principally by closing the Palestine Department, whose affairs were transferred to the Zionist Commission. The Central Office was then divided into three main departments: for Political Affairs, Organisation, and Finance, in addition to which there were also the Immigration and the Publicity Departments. The Reorganisation Commission subsequently spent a few months in Palestine, where they revised the budget of the Zionist Commission, but as differences of opinion on matters of principle arose between its members and the Executive, Messrs. Simon and de Lieme resigned from the Executive and Messrs. Joseph Cowen, Vladimir Jabotinsky, and Richard Lichtheim were co-opted to serve until the Congress.

The Twelfth Zionist Congress, which met at Carlsbad in September, 1921, was much larger, more imposing, and more animated than any that had preceded it. The British Ambassador in Prague, Sir George Clerk, attended the festive inaugural session to convey a message of good wishes from his Government and to repeat the terms of the Balfour Declaration, which were received with enthusiastic and prolonged applause.¹ The deliberations were rendered all the more difficult by the great concourse of delegates

¹ All subsequent Congresses were greeted at the opening session by a diplomatic representative of the British Government until 1937. The White Paper of May, 1939, would have made such a formality at the Congress of that year embarrassing for even the most accomplished diplomatist.

present and the limited time within which the business had to be completed, but by transferring the discussion of all technical problems and business details, as well as the drafting of all resolutions, to a number of committees consisting of representatives of all parties, and by continuing some debates until the small hours of the morning, the Congress completed its stupendous labours in a fortnight. There were present 445 elected delegates (besides 67 *ex-officio* delegates), representing 770,000 Shekel-payers (compared with 129,400 Shekel-payers in 1913). The delegates were divided into three main groups: 306 General Zionists, 97 of the Mizrahi, and 38 of the Labour Parties. The General Zionists occupied the centre of the hall, the Mizrahi sat facing the right of the President, and the Labour delegates were on his left—an arrangement observed at all subsequent Congresses, although from 1923 there were additions to the “wings,” as the parties on either side of the centre were called.¹

After prolonged debates in committees and plenary sessions, at which most of the decisions of the London Conference were re-affirmed and amplified, the Congress adopted an elaborate programme of work embracing all phases of the new life in *Eretz Israel* (the Land of Israel) as well as the related activities in the Diaspora. It declared the economic revival of Palestine the most urgent task of the Zionist Organisation and formulated the methods for achieving it. It designated the Jewish National Fund as the organ of Jewish land policy, approved of the large land purchases (62,000 *dunams*) that had recently been made in the Vale of Jezreel at a cost of £282,000, and decided that the Head Office of the Fund should be transferred from The Hague to Jerusalem without delay. It resolved that all recently acquired areas be brought under cultivation forthwith, that incipient settlements be completed, that all necessary steps be taken for the intensification of Jewish agriculture, and that a special Colonisation Department be set up under the direction of a member of the Executive. It endorsed and elaborated the decisions of the London Conference regarding the Central Immigration Office to be established in Palestine and its relations with the Palestine Offices to be set up in the principal lands of emigration as well as in the chief ports of embarkation (Trieste and Constanza); and it undertook to subsidise the occupational training of *Halutzim*, towards which the local Zionist bodies were also required to contribute. It assumed

¹ The Radicals first appeared at the Congress of 1923 and the Revisionists at that of 1925.

the obligation of maintaining and developing all schools in Palestine that accepted the authority of the Zionist Organisation, as well as of disseminating culture and a knowledge of Hebrew among all sections of the Jewish population. It passed a resolution for the observance of Jewish religious law in all institutions sub-ventioned by the Organisation. It decided to encourage private enterprise in commerce and industry, and authorised the increase of the capital of the Anglo-Palestine Company to £1,000,000 and the change of its name to the Anglo-Palestine Bank. It called upon all Jewish scholars, teachers, and writers in the Diaspora to dedicate their energies to the advancement of Hebrew literature and the furtherance of Hebrew as a spoken language, and decided that an official organ be published in Hebrew.

In order to finance all these and other activities for the ensuing year the Congress adopted a budget of £1,506,000, of which £656,000 was to cover the regular Palestine budget (comprising primarily agricultural colonisation, education, sanitation, and immigration), £550,000 was put down for commercial investments (principally credits for house-building and for commercial and industrial undertakings), and £300,000 was to go to the Jewish National Fund. It was an ambitious budget, based upon the estimated income of the Keren Hayesod, the general principles of which, as decided by the London Conference, were approved by the Congress (from which the Brandeis group was absent), though with some modification. The idea of aiming at £25,000,000 within a year, or even five years, was abandoned as impracticable (though confiscations and depredations made later by Hitler among the Jewish communities in Europe showed that it would not have been unattainable). The fixing of contributions to the Keren Hayesod on the basis of the traditional tithe (*maaser*) was retained as an ideal, but the "self-taxation" of most contributors fell short of this. The Keren Hayesod had already been legally incorporated in London on March 23rd, 1921, under the name of "The Erez Israel (Palestine) Foundation Fund Keren Hayesod, Limited," its primary object being described as:

"To do all such acts and things as shall appear to be necessary or expedient for the purpose of carrying out the declaration of His Majesty's Government (commonly known as 'the Balfour Declaration'), incorporated in the Treaty of Sévres, dated 2nd day of November, 1917, as to the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine."

An agreement had been concluded in October, 1920, between the Keren Hayesod and the Keren Kayemeth (Jewish National Fund) as to their respective methods of collection: the latter was to continue raising funds by its customary methods, such as general donations, box collections, gifts of trees, inscriptions in the Golden Book, and bazaars, while the Keren Hayesod agreed not to accept annual contributions below a minimum level fixed for each country. At first the Keren Hayesod undertook to allocate 20 per cent. of its net income to the Keren Kayemeth, but after some time, as its collections did not reach expectations, while those of the Keren Kayemeth increased, this allocation ceased. The total amount raised by the Keren Hayesod in the year October, 1921–September, 1922, was £387,580, and it had also received £227,000 in the six months before then. Consequently, the budgetary arrangements had later to be scaled down.

There were three other important matters that engaged the attention of Congress—the political situation, the constitution of the Zionist Organisation, and the election of a new Executive. The Congress expressed the hope that the Palestine Mandate would soon be confirmed by the League of Nations and that political, administrative, and economic conditions would be speedily created that would secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home. It voiced a solemn protest against the Arab riots that had taken place in Palestine in the preceding May, and formulated its views on the subject of relations with the Arabs in the following resolution:

“With sorrow and indignation, the Jewish people have lived through the recent events in Palestine. The hostile attitude of the Arab population in Palestine, incited by unscrupulous elements to commit deeds of violence, can neither weaken our resolve for the establishment of the Jewish National Home nor our determination to live with the Arab people on terms of concord and mutual respect, and together with them to make the common home into a flourishing commonwealth, the upbuilding of which may assure to each of its peoples an undisturbed national development. The two great Semitic peoples, united of yore by the bonds of common creative civilisation, will not fail in their hour of national regeneration to comprehend the need of combining their vital interests in a common endeavour.

“The Congress calls upon the Executive to redouble its efforts to secure an honourable entente with the Arab people on the

basis of this declaration and in strict accordance with the Balfour Declaration. The Congress emphatically declares that the progress of Jewish colonisation will not affect the rights and needs of the working Arab nation."

The new constitution, which was necessitated by the numerical growth of the Organisation, contained many changes. The name of the executive organ was altered from "Smaller Actions Committee" to Executive, and its membership increased from a maximum of seven to one of fifteen, part of whom must be resident in Palestine. The number of Shekel-payers necessary for the election of a delegate to Congress was raised from 200 to 2,500, although small countries containing at least 1,000 could also return a delegate, and Palestine could elect one for every 1,000 Shekel-payers. The number of members necessary for the recognition of a Separate Union, a body of Zionists subscribing to a definite social, religious, or political principle within the movement (such as the Mizrachi and Poale Zion) was raised from 3,000 to 20,000. The "Actions Committee" was in future to consist of twenty-five members (together with the Executive and one representative each of the Jewish Colonial Trust, the Keren Hayesod, and the Jewish National Fund) and to meet every three months; and in the years in which no Congress was held, there was to be a meeting of the Central Council (formerly termed "Annual Conference") consisting of the "Actions Committee" and representatives of the Federations, the Separate Unions, and the financial institutions.¹ Other members of the Central Council were the Chairman of the Congress Court (a small panel of lawyers for settling disputes between Zionist bodies and between Zionist bodies and individuals, as well as for deciding on the validity of elections to Congress), the Chairman of the Court of Honour (which dealt with disputes between individual Zionists), and the Congress Attorney, who represented the Organisation in the proceedings of these Courts.

The concluding act of the Congress was the election of an Executive of thirteen, headed by Dr. Weizmann as President of the Organisation and Nahum Sokolow as President of the Executive. It was a "coalition" Executive, as it included representatives of all parties. Six of the members (including Ussishkin)

¹ The members of the "Actions Committee" were the statutory holders of the founder shares of the Jewish Colonial Trust. The Central Council was abolished in 1927, after which the "Actions Committee," whose numbers increased and fluctuated, and met every six months, fixed the budget in non-Congress years. The "Actions Committee" was later called "General Council."

were to constitute the Executive in Jerusalem (thus replacing the Zionist Commission) and to take charge of affairs in Palestine. In order to advise on financial matters, there was also elected a Financial and Economic Committee¹ of seven, three of whom had seats, with voting power, on the Executive, and usually attended the meetings in London.

The Organisation was now equipped with all the principal institutions and offices essential for the new era of important and widely ramified activity. The Central Office in London had two main functions—to look after political affairs by keeping in contact with the Colonial Office, and to watch over Zionist activities in all parts of the world—and it was also in constant communication with the Office in Jerusalem for the purpose of mutual information and co-ordinated action. In view of the need of safeguarding Zionist interests in connection with the work of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, to which the British Government was answerable as the Mandatory for Palestine, the Executive later established a special bureau in Geneva, in 1925.² The official organ in English, from July, 1919, was a weekly journal, *The Zionist Bulletin*, which was discontinued after November, 1920; but from September, 1924, the Executive began to issue *The New Judæa*, first as a fortnightly and later as a monthly. The Hebrew organ of the Executive, *Haolam*, which first appeared in Cologne in 1907, and was published from 1908 to 1914 in Vilna (the headquarters of the Russian Zionists), was revived in London in 1919. After two years it was transferred to Berlin, where it was published for sixteen months, but from May, 1924, it again appeared in London, until 1935, when it was transferred to Jerusalem. In addition to these official organs, there were, during the period between the two World Wars, at least one hundred Zionist or pro-Zionist newspapers published in different parts of the world, from New York to Cairo, from Buenos Ayres to Bombay, and from Paris to Johannesburg. Parallel with the expansion of the Organisation, there was an increase of the paid-up capital of the Jewish Colonial Trust, which, within a year after the Twelfth Congress, amounted to £385,000. The share-capital of the Anglo-Palestine Bank amounted to £300,000, almost all of which belonged to the Jewish Colonial Trust.

The Organisation comprised some thousands of societies through-

¹ This Committee was discontinued from 1927.

² The first diplomatic representative in Geneva was Dr. Victor Jacobson, who died in 1934. He was succeeded by Dr. Nahum Goldmann.

out the world, which were either united in federations in countries with a large Jewish population or existed as active units in isolated outposts like Shanghai or Singapore. Relations between the Central Office and this multitude of affiliated constituents were maintained by an ever-growing correspondence in various languages, and also by periodical visits of members of the Executive and officials, who travelled, not only all over Europe, but to all parts of the globe—to South Africa, Australia, and the Far East, to Canada, the United States, and the republics of South America—enlightening all Jewish communities on the aims and ideals of the movement and collecting funds for their realisation.

There were developments, not only among the ranks of the Zionists in general, or the General Zionists, but also among those devoted to some distinguishing principle in the movement, such as the orthodox Mizrachi or the adherents of different shades of Socialism. The latter underwent a variety of changes in their mutual relations. Before 1914 the two main Socialist parties in Palestine (as already described) were the Poale Zion and Hapoel Hatzair. But soon after the creation of the Poale Zion there began to be formed in Eastern Europe another Socialist party, Zeiré Zion ("Youths of Zion"), who based themselves rather upon the lower middle class than the proletariat, and were particularly active in advocating the principle of *Halutzit*—training for pioneering work in Palestine. In 1920 the majority of the Zeiré Zion and Hapoel Hatzair groups in Central and Eastern Europe became amalgamated with the Palestine Hapoel Hatzair under the name of Hitahduth ("Union," i.e. of Jewish Socialist Workers), representing the evolutionary school of Socialism as distinguished from the more radical party of the Poale Zion. Five years later the minority of the Zeiré Zion became amalgamated with the Poale Zion, and in August, 1932, the two amalgamations, the Hitahduth and the Poale Zion-Zeiré Zion, became united in one single body, designated at the time *Ihud* ("Unity"), but since commonly known as the Poale Zion. In 1934 there was formed another Socialist party, Hashomer Hatzair ("The Young Watchman"), which differs from the Poale Zion in more strongly emphasising Marxism and favouring a bi-national State in Palestine.¹ Its views are largely shared by the Left Poale Zion.

Zionism, as a democratic movement, knows no sex distinction, and women can be elected to all positions. Nevertheless, in 1920

¹ The other parties—Radicals, Revisionists, and the Jewish State Party—are dealt with later in connection with the events that brought them into being.

there was established the Women's International Zionist Organisation (commonly called the W.I.Z.O.) for the purpose of making a specific contribution to the National Home—the maintenance of infant welfare centres, girls' training farms, and domestic economy schools. Although not under the authority of the Zionist Executive, the W.I.Z.O. co-operates harmoniously and most usefully in the work in Palestine. Before the Second World War it had a membership of over 80,000 in forty-four countries. In the United States the women Zionists have their own organisation, the "Hadassah," which is affiliated to the World Zionist Organisation. It has 90,000 members in its senior and 20,000 members in its junior section.

There is also an extensive Zionist Youth movement on both sides of the Atlantic, embracing different schools of thought, and including many societies of university students. The leading position before the war was maintained by "Hehalutz" ("The Pioneer"), an organisation (with headquarters in Warsaw) whose members, numbering over 100,000 and distributed over many countries, devoted themselves to technical and cultural preparation for settlement in Palestine.

CHAPTER IX

THE PALESTINE MANDATE

THE appointment of a Jew as the first High Commissioner for Palestine was welcomed as a symbol of greater developments to come. It inspired the hope that the hostility to Jewish national aspirations that had marked the Military Administration would be utterly banished, and that there would no longer be any obstacle to their eventual fulfilment. At an assembly of officials and leading representatives of all sections of the population, held within a week of his arrival, Sir Herbert Samuel declared the purpose of British policy. He read a message from King George V, in which he announced that the Allied and Associated Powers had decided that measures should be adopted "to secure the gradual establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people," and gave an assurance that those measures would not in any way affect the civil and religious rights or diminish the prosperity of the general population of the country. The gratification felt by the Jews at this official promulgation of their national charter¹ was enhanced soon afterwards by an impressive act in a religious setting. On the Sabbath following the Fast of Ab, which commemorates the destruction of the two Temples, the High Commissioner attended the synagogue in the Old City of Jerusalem, and in the presence of the hushed congregation read from the Book of Isaiah the portion traditionally chosen for the day, beginning with the heartening words: "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people." A thrill passed through the worshipping throng, as though the Messianic era were about to dawn. But the enthusiasm of those early days was soon sobered by the disillusionising effects of succeeding events.

The High Commissioner immediately applied himself to the task of organising the Civil Administration and introducing the sorely-needed improvements in a land that had suffered from sloth and stagnation for centuries. He chose as his Chief Secretary Brigadier-General Sir Wyndham Deedes, who was known to be in perfect sympathy with Zionism.² He appointed several other high officials of recognised ability, but retained a good proportion of those who had filled positions in the Military Administration.

¹ The first official mention of the Balfour Declaration in Palestine was made in a speech at Nablus on May 1st, 1920, by General Bols, head of the Military Administration.

² Sir Wyndham Deedes left Palestine in 1923 and was succeeded by Sir Gilbert Clayton.

Unfortunately many of the latter category had had little previous administrative experience and had little or no understanding of or sympathy with the policy that they were required to serve. Some of them made no secret of their views, and their attitude inevitably exercised a prejudicial influence both in their particular spheres of activity and upon the Arabs with whom they came into contact.¹ The few Jews appointed to senior offices were incapable of neutralising that influence, and their number dwindled as time went on. An Advisory Council was established, over which the High Commissioner presided, composed of twelve official and ten non-official members, the latter consisting of four Moslems, three Christians and three Jews. This Council afforded the opportunity of consultations between the Government officials and representatives of the three religious communities, who were able to criticise the drafts of any Ordinances the Government intended enacting and to raise questions to which they desired attention to be directed. There was a spate of legislation relating to transfers of land, immigration, town-planning, road-building, education, public health, co-operative societies, and other matters.

Two important decisions bearing upon the status of the Jews as a nation were taken at an early stage. Hebrew was recognised as an official language as well as English and Arabic. All Government ordinances and official notices were to be published in the three languages; in areas containing a considerable Jewish population the three languages would be used in the local offices and municipalities as well as in Government departments; in Courts of Law and Land Registries of trilingual areas any process and official document would be issued in the language of the person to whom it was addressed; and written and oral pleadings might be conducted in any of the three languages. The other decision concerned the Hebrew equivalent for the name of the country.

¹ Several of these anti-Zionist officials, from 1922 onwards, betrayed their attitude after they left Palestine, in articles contributed to English periodicals in which they scathingly attacked the Balfour Declaration and the ideals and activities of Zionism. A typically pernicious outburst appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* of July, 1925, in which the writer stated: "International Jewry and British crankiness are the forces, which, combining together, were able to impose upon the League of Nations outward responsibility for that iniquitous document known as the Mandate for Palestine." But this diatribe did not prevent the writer, E. T. Richmond, who had left the Secretariat of the Palestine Government, from afterwards receiving a more important post in Palestine as Director of Antiquities. After leaving the Government service, he wrote another article attacking the Mandate policy in the *Nineteenth Century* of February, 1938. See also articles by Colonel Vivian Gabriel in *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1922; Captain C. D. Brunton in the *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1923, and January, 1924; H. St. John Philby, in the *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1925; Thomas Hodgkin, in the *Labour Monthly*, July and November, 1936; and Professor J. Garstang in the *Observer*, September 30th, 1936.

The Jewish members of the Council objected to the Hebrew transliteration of the word "Palestine" on the ground that in Hebrew literature the country was always called "Eretz Israel" (Land of Israel); but the Arab members would not agree to this nomenclature, which, in their view, possessed political significance. The High Commissioner, therefore, decided, as a compromise, that the Hebrew transliteration should be used, followed always by the two initial letters of "Eretz Israel," *Aleph Yod*, and this combination has always been used on the coinage and stamps of Palestine and in all references in official documents.

The Government was concerned not only to promote the economic, social, and cultural progress of the country, but also to establish a certain order in the affairs of the principal religious communities. The Jews required no external incentive to organise themselves, for they had elected a Provisional Committee (*Ha-Vaad Hazman*) soon after the liberation of Jerusalem, but were prevented by the Military Administration from convening a Constituent Assembly. This gathering, *Asefath Hanivharim*, took place on October 7th, 1920, and was attended by 300 delegates, who elected a *Vaad Leumi* (National Council), which was recognised as the official representation of Palestinian Jewry. An important change was now effected in the spiritual leadership. Under the Turkish régime the Chief Rabbi (styled *Haham Bashi*) was always elected by the Sephardic section of the community, which had alone been recognised by the Ottoman Government; but as the Ashkenazim were now more numerous and also becoming more important, it was agreed that they too should have a Chief Rabbi.¹ The two Chief Rabbis were assisted by six associate Rabbis, who formed with them a Rabbinical Council.

The appointment of a head of the Moslem community proved to be of as much concern to the Jews as to the Moslems themselves, for the person elected, although intended to confine himself to religious affairs, became the ambitious leader of Palestinian Arab nationalism and the most aggressive enemy of Zionism. Early in 1921 Kemal Effendi Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem, who had been accepted by the Administration as the head of the Moslem *Ulema* (wise men), died; and as the position of Mayor of Jerusalem was held by a member of the rival family of Nashashibi, it was considered desirable that the vacancy should be filled by a Husseini. The candidate was Haj Amin el-Husseini, a half-brother of the late Mufti, who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca,

¹ The Sephardic Chief Rabbi usually styles himself *Rishon le-Zion* ("First in Zion").

studied at the Azhar University in Cairo, and fought as an artillery officer of the Turkish Army. After the British occupation of Palestine, he held various subordinate positions in Jerusalem and Damascus, and then turned his energies to anti-Zionist agitation. He delivered an inflammatory speech at the time of the Jerusalem riots in 1920, fled to Transjordan, and was sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment *in absentia*; but after receiving an amnesty from the High Commissioner he returned to Jerusalem. A list of three candidates for the office of Mufti had to be submitted to the Government for the selection of a successor, but as Haj Amin el-Husseini, owing to opposition, was the fourth on the list, one of the first three (Nashastibi nominees) was induced by the Government to resign so as to enable him to be included. "Haj Amin was then appointed, but no letter informing him of his nomination as Mufti of Jerusalem was despatched to him, nor was his appointment even gazetted."¹ In the following year the Mufti was elected President of the Supreme Moslem Council "by a mere remnant of the secondary electors of the last electoral college of the Ottoman Parliament," and thus acquired control over large charitable endowments exceeding £100,000 a year and of the Moslem religious courts, as well as the authority to appoint preachers in all the mosques of Palestine.² He steadily consolidated his power, was allowed to continue indefinitely in office unchallenged, and systematically wielded what was virtually an *imperium in imperio* for the purpose of sabotaging the policy of the Mandate.

Another important event in the early part of 1921 that seriously affected the Jewish National Home was the detachment of the territory east of the Jordan from the region within which that Home was to be established. The High Commissioner had been in office only a few days when Feisal was driven from Syria by the French. The land east of the Jordan, which had formerly been governed from Damascus, was consequently left in an undefined state, and the High Commissioner therefore had a few local Arab councils appointed, which were assisted in the task of administration by British officers. Early in 1921 Abdullah, another son of Hussein, King of the Hedjaz, moved into Transjordan with a band of guerrilla Arabs, declaring that he intended to recover Syria, from which his brother had been evicted. Palestine, from the beginning of the year, had been transferred from the care of the Foreign Office to that of the Colonial Office, on the ground that

¹ *Report of Palestine Royal Commission*, pp. 177-81.

² *Ibid.*, p. 177.

the latter had more experience in the ruling of Eastern countries; and in March Mr. Winston Churchill, as Colonial Secretary, went to Cairo, accompanied by T. E. Lawrence, to deal with Transjordan and other affairs of the Near East. Sir Herbert Samuel also attended the conference at Cairo, after which all three went to Jerusalem.¹ Abdullah was then invited to meet Mr. Churchill, who told him that he would be recognised as Emir of Transjordan, provided he did not violate the frontier of Syria, and that he would receive a British adviser and a subvention from Britain. Abdullah accepted the Emirate under these conditions, with the result that the articles in the Mandate relating to the Jewish National Home were subsequently declared to be inapplicable to Transjordan. It was officially explained that this separation of Transjordan was in accordance with the terms of the McMahon pledge, but it is curious that this revelation was first made after Abdullah's incursion and that no intimation to this effect was made at the time of the Balfour Declaration or in the years immediately following. The Jews had believed that their National Home was to be established in the whole of historic Palestine, and this severance of two-thirds of the country caused a rankling sense of disappointment.²

While in Jerusalem Mr. Churchill received an Arab deputation, who demanded the abolition of the principle of the Jewish National Home, the stoppage of Jewish immigration, and the creation of a National Government responsible to a Parliament elected by those who were inhabitants before 1914. The deputation represented an Executive elected by an Arab Congress of Moslem and Christian societies, which had met at Haifa on December 13th, 1920. Mr. Churchill rejected their demands. He declared that it was right that the Jews should have a National Home, reminded the Arabs that they had been liberated from the Turks by the armies of Britain, and said that if the Jews succeeded their success would be of benefit to all the people in the country. He also received a Jewish deputation, who expressed thanks for Britain's acceptance of the Mandate and stressed their desire to promote cordial relations with the Arab nation. But this desire was un-

¹ "Mr. Winston Churchill was entrusted by our harassed Cabinet with the settlement of the Middle East; and in a few weeks, at his Conference in Cairo, he made straight all the tangle, finding solutions fulfilling (I think) our promises in letter and spirit (where humanly possible) without sacrificing any interest of our Empire or any interest of the people concerned. So we were quit of the wartime Eastern adventure, with clean hands, but three years too late to earn the gratitude which peoples, if not states, can pay." Footnote to p. 276 of *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (1935 edition).

² *Report of Palestine Royal Commission*, p. 38.

fortunately not reciprocated. On May 1st and following days there were violent attacks by Arabs upon Jews in Jaffa and neighbouring Jewish colonies, in which the total casualties amounted to 95 killed—48 Arabs and 47 Jews—and 219 wounded, of whom 73 were Arabs and 146 Jews (most of the Arab casualties being due to action by the British troops). Many of the culprits were sentenced to imprisonment, a few to long terms. The immediate result of this second outbreak of savagery was a temporary suspension of Jewish immigration, which dealt a further blow at Jewish hopes. The Commission of Inquiry, under the chairmanship of the Chief Justice of Palestine, Sir Thomas Haycraft, which was appointed to investigate the disorders, found that the fundamental cause was a feeling among the Arabs of discontent and hostility to the Jews, "due to political and economic causes, and connected with Jewish immigration, and with their conception of Zionist policy as derived from Jewish exponents." The Commission also stated that "the racial strife was begun by Arabs," and that "the police were, with few exceptions, half-trained and inefficient, in many cases indifferent, and in some cases leaders of or participators in violence." A fine of £6,000 was imposed upon the Arab ring-leaders, and improvements were made in the maintenance of law and order. A Palestine Gendarmerie was created, a semi-military, semi-police force, to which was added a third civil force of British gendarmes, recruited in England, largely from the Royal Irish Constabulary. After the arrival of this force there was no further disorder in the country for some years, and the military garrison was gradually reduced from 4,000 men to one battalion.

In order to reassure the Arabs, the High Commissioner addressed a meeting of leading citizens on June 3rd, to explain that the policy of the Jewish National Home did not mean that Britain proposed to set up a Jewish government over an Arab majority. But the Arabs were not satisfied. They sent a delegation to London—the first of several during the next eighteen years—for the purpose of a direct approach to the British Government. The delegates conducted protracted conversations with the heads of the Colonial Office, in which they reiterated their demands, and they were encouraged by certain London newspapers, which clamoured for Britain's abandonment of all interest in Palestine and Iraq on the alleged ground that these countries formed a burden on the British taxpayer. The Government rejected the Arab demands and offered to replace the Advisory Council by a Legislative Council composed of an elected majority of twelve

members, including two Jews, and ten official members. But the Arabs refused this proposal because, as they said, the two Jewish members would vote with the Government members on all matters concerning the Jewish National Home, and Jewish policy would thus be imposed upon them. They also rejected the basis of the Mandate as far as it involved recognition of a Jewish National Home, and as their efforts proved fruitless they returned to Palestine for further consultation with their committee. They were back in England, however, in the autumn to resume their siege of the Colonial Office, and developed their propaganda during the first half of 1922 with the aid of a section of the Press to such effect that the question of abandoning the Mandate was raised in both Houses of Parliament.

The first debate took place on June 21st, 1922, in the House of Lords, several members of which were among the most prominent opponents of the Government's policy. Lord Balfour, who had just passed to the Upper House, made an eloquent and forceful speech in favour of the cause with which his name was permanently identified. He refuted the suggestion that the conception of the Jewish National Home was contrary to the principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations, or that it involved domination over the Arabs or spoliation of their lands. He dwelt on the age-long persecution of the Jews by Christendom, lauded their intellectual achievements in the centuries of dispersion, urged that a message be sent "to every land where the Jewish race has been scattered that Christendom is not oblivious to their fate and is not unmindful of the service they have rendered to the great religions of the world," and pleaded that they be given "every opportunity to develop in peace and quietness under British rule those great gifts which hitherto they have been compelled only to bring to fruition in countries which know not their language, and belong not to their race." But his eloquence was wasted upon most of his hearers. The House of Lords adopted the motion for postponing acceptance of the Mandate by 60 to 29, but fortunately its decision was of no practical effect.

Immediately after this debate, the British Government published its "Correspondence with the Palestine Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organisation" concerning the proposed constitution of Palestine and the interpretation of the Balfour Declaration. The letters between the Colonial Office and the Arab Delegation consisted mainly of an argumentation about the McMahon pledges and the respective claims of the Arabs and the Jews. The Colonial

Office rejected the Arab demands for an abandonment of its policy, but, on the other hand, its letter to the Zionist Organisation, and above all, the statement accompanying it, showed that the persistent agitation of the Arabs and their friends had not been without effect. For the statement contained a detailed exposition and definition of British policy in Palestine, which was very far removed from the early glosses on the Balfour Declaration.¹ The Interim Report of the Palestine Administration for July 1st, 1920-June 30th, 1921, had contained the following passages:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government contemplates the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish race throughout the world in relation to Palestine, combined with a full protection of the rights of the existing population. . . . The Zionism that is practicable is the Zionism that fulfils this essential condition. There must be satisfaction of that sentiment regarding Palestine—a worthy and ennobling sentiment—which, in increasing degree, animates the Jewries of the world. The aspirations of these fourteen millions of people also have a right to be considered."

But the language used in the Churchill White Paper, as the new document was called (because it was under the authority of Mr. Churchill as Colonial Secretary), was quite different. It dismissed any expectation that Palestine was to become "as Jewish as England is English"¹ as impracticable. It dispelled the fear of the Arabs regarding "the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language or culture in Palestine." It drew attention to the fact that the Balfour Declaration did not "contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a Home should be founded *in* Palestine." It pointed out that the Zionist Executive "has not desired to possess, and does not possess, any share in the general administration of the country," and that its special position under the draft Mandate "relates to the measures to be taken in Palestine affecting the Jewish population, and contemplates that the Organisation may assist in the general development of the country, but

¹ According to Mr. Norman Bentwich, Attorney-General of Palestine, 1922-31, the statement "was compiled in close consultation with Sir Herbert Samuel." It was commonly reported in well-informed circles in London at the time that the statement was drafted by Sir Herbert Samuel.

² The expression used by Dr. Weizmann in reply to a question put to him by Mr. Lansing, the American representative, at the meeting of the Peace Conference on February 27th, 1919.

does not entitle it to share in any degree in its government." Then came the crucial paragraph about the Jews in Palestine:

"This community has its own political organs; an elected assembly for the direction of its domestic concerns; elected councils in the towns; and an organisation for the control of its schools. It has its elected Chief Rabbinate and Rabbinical Council for the direction of its religious affairs. Its business is conducted in Hebrew as a vernacular language, and a Hebrew Press serves its needs. It has its distinctive intellectual life and displays considerable economic activity. This community, then, with its town and country population, its political, religious and social organisations, its own language, its own customs, its own life, has in fact 'national' characteristics. When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish National Home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognised to rest upon ancient historic connection."

For the fulfilment of this policy Jewish immigration must continue, but "this immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals," and "the immigrants should not be a burden upon the people of Palestine as a whole." It was the intention of the Government to foster by gradual stages the establishment of a full measure of self-government in Palestine; and it was pointed out that the Administration had already transferred to a Supreme Council elected by the Moslem community of Palestine the entire control of Moslem religious endowments and of the Moslem religious courts. The White Paper also contained a letter from the Colonial Office to the Zionist Organisation, requesting it to give "a formal assurance" that it accepted the

policy set out in the statement and was prepared to conduct its own activities in conformity therewith, and a reply from Dr Weizmann embodying a resolution of the Zionist Executive that contained the required assurance. The Executive gave this assurance with no little reluctance, and, indeed, after much deliberation and under a feeling of constraint, as they considered the interpretation of the Balfour Declaration to be an abridgment of the aspirations which they had believed the Jewish people would be allowed to achieve. They were not alone in their views, for no sooner was the White Paper published than it was assailed by the severest criticism throughout the Jewish world as a whittling-down of the promise of November 2nd, 1917. The Government, however, were glad to have the Organisation's reply, especially after the barren talks with the Arabs, and in the debate on the Colonial Vote that took place in the House of Commons on July 6th they were able to defeat the opponents of their Palestinian policy by 292 votes to 35.

The White Paper and the parliamentary debates served as a prelude to the passing of the Mandate instrument by the Council of the League of Nations which took place at a meeting in London on July 24th, 1922. The delay was due to a number of causes: discussions between the Government and the Zionist Organisation on various articles of the Mandate, removing certain apprehensions of the Vatican regarding the rights in the Holy Places, negotiations on the matter with the United States Government, delay in concluding the peace treaty with Turkey, and difficulties in connection with the French Mandate for Syria. At the meeting of the Council a representative of Italy required some modification in the text of the Mandate for Syria, and as the British Government did not desire any further postponement in regard to the Palestine Mandate, the Council agreed to pass the two Mandates on condition that they should come into full operation simultaneously only after the outstanding questions between France and Italy were settled. It took more than a year before this settlement was reached, and the two Mandates came into force on September 29th, 1923.

The Mandate, as approved by the Council of the League, was the result of three years' discussion between the Government and the Zionist Organisation, during which various drafts were made, amended, and revised. In its final form the Mandate, in a preamble, recites (a) the decision of the principal Allied Powers, in order to give effect to Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to entrust the Administration of Palestine to a Mandatory selected

by the Powers, (b) the terms of the Balfour Declaration and a statement that "recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine, and to the grounds for reconstituting their National Home in that country," and (c) the selection of His Britannic Majesty as the Mandatory and his acceptance of the Mandate on behalf of the League of Nations. The body of the Mandate consists of twenty-eight articles,¹ of which those relating to the establishment of the Jewish National Home are as follows:

Art. 2. "The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine irrespective of race and religion."

Art. 4. "The Zionist Organisation shall be recognised as an appropriate Jewish Agency for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration in matters affecting the Jewish National Home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and to assist and take part in the development of the country, and shall take steps to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the National Home."

Art. 6. "The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish Agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes."

Art. 7. A nationality law shall be enacted, including provisions to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up permanent residence in the country.

Art. 11. The Administration may arrange with the Jewish Agency to construct or operate upon equitable terms any public works or services and to develop any natural resources of the country, the profits to be distributed by such Agency not to exceed a reasonable rate of interest on the capital.

Art. 22. "English, Arabic, and Hebrew shall be the official languages of Palestine. . . ."

¹ Articles 7, 11, 22, and 23, are summarised or abridged. For complete text of the Mandate, see Appendix II.

Art. 23. "The holy days of the respective communities in Palestine shall be recognised as legal days of rest for the members of such communities."

The two passages in the text of the Mandate that had formed the subject of the most frequent discussion were the part of the preamble dealing with the connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the middle part of Article 2. There were at least six successive drafts of the former, in the first of which the expression "historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine" was used, only to disappear and then reappear in the following versions, and to be retained in the final draft. The changes that were made in Article 2 were far more important and eventually proved of fateful significance. That article was originally composed as an amplification of the Balfour Declaration, and the previous alternative drafts of the middle part read as follows: (a) "secure the establishment there of the Jewish National Home and ultimately render possible the creation of an autonomous Commonwealth"; and (b) "secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the development of a self-governing Commonwealth." Draft (b) was provisionally agreed upon between the Zionist Organisation and the Political Section of the British Peace Delegation at the beginning of 1919. It was obviously intended to mean that the Jewish National Home was to develop into a self-governing commonwealth, even though the term "commonwealth" was not qualified by the word "Jewish."¹ But over three years elapsed before the final text of the Mandate was fixed, and by then the promise held out concerning the ultimate status of the Jewish National Home was whittled down to "the development of self-governing institutions." This phrase was subsequently advanced in support of the Arab demand for an independent Palestine, to which the British Government gave way in the White Paper of 1939.

The Mandate was implemented by means of the Palestine Order-in-Council, which was signed by King George V on August 10th, 1922, and brought into operation on September 1st. This document, which incorporates the obligation of the Mandatory to put the Balfour Declaration into effect, contains the Constitution of Palestine and defines the different parts of the Government, the Executive, the Legislature, and the Judiciary.

¹ See *Political Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation to the 12th Zionist Congress, 1921.*

It enacted the replacement of the Advisory Council by a Legislative Council, which was to consist of twenty-two members, in addition to the High Commissioner, of whom ten should be official and twelve unofficial members. Of the unofficial members there were to be eight Moslems, two Jews, and two Christians. The Palestine Administration issued regulations for the election of the unofficial members, but, while the Jews complied with them, the great majority of the Arabs abstained, and the election was therefore abandoned. Anxious to secure the co-operation of the Arabs, the Government proposed the creation of a new Advisory Council, but with a majority of non-official members, the composition to be the High Commissioner, ten official members, and eight Moslems, two Christian Arabs, and two Jews. But only four of the Arabs invited to serve were willing to act, and the scheme had therefore to be dropped. The Government then made a third attempt to enlist Arab co-operation in the administration of public affairs by offering to establish an Arab Agency which should occupy a position analogous to that accorded to the Jewish Agency, but the Arabs rejected this proposal too. The legislative as well as the executive functions had therefore to be exercised entirely by the High Commissioner and officers of the Administration; but public criticism of the measures proposed could be made by representations after the publication of Bills in the *Government Gazette*.

The Mandatory was required by the Mandate to make an annual report to the Council of the League of Nations as to the measures taken to carry out its provisions. The Permanent Mandates Commission (consisting of representatives of a number of Governments) was appointed to examine this report and first dealt with Palestine at its meeting in October, 1924. From that year the British Government has rendered an annual report to the League on the progress in Palestine and the steps it has taken to carry out its obligations, and representatives of the Government (from London and Jerusalem) have attended the meeting of the Mandates Commission in Geneva to give any verbal explanations that were necessary and often been subjected to severe cross-examination. The Zionist Organisation (from 1930 the Jewish Agency) has made an annual report upon the development of the Jewish National Home, which has been transmitted by the British Government to the Mandates Commission, and the report was usually accompanied by a covering letter from the President, containing observations on any acts of omission or commission on

the part of the Mandatory that called for criticism. As the procedure of the Mandates Commission allowed any section of the population in Palestine to present complaints to the League through the Mandatory against the Administration, advantage was taken of this opportunity on various occasions both by the Arab Executive Committee and by the super-orthodox Agudath Israel Organisation, which was anti-Zionist in outlook.

The close interest taken by both the people and the Government of the United States in the fortunes of the Holy Land found public and official expression. In September, 1922, the American Congress passed a joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives in favour of the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Although not a party to the grant of the Mandate, the United States gave formal assent to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain in a Convention with the British Government, which was ratified in 1925. This instrument provided for the application to American subjects of the rights accorded to other foreigners in the mandated territory and also permitted them freely to establish and maintain there educational, philanthropic, and religious institutions.

The most notable event in Sir Herbert Samuel's last year of office was the inauguration of the Hebrew University by Lord Balfour on April 1st, 1925. The impressive and picturesque ceremony was held in an open-air amphitheatre in the grounds of the University, in the presence of an assembly of 7,000, and was attended by a numerous array of distinguished scholars and scientists who had come to represent many leading universities in different parts of the world. The veteran statesman, who was already in the evening of his days, said that the occasion marked a notable epoch in the history of the people who had made the little land of Palestine a seed-ground of religions, paid a tribute to the originality of eminent Jewish thinkers, and dwelt on the fact that the establishment of the Jewish National Home involved great questions of human, intellectual, and national development. After the conclusion of the ceremony, which sent a thrill throughout the Jewish world, Lord Balfour visited the principal cities and made a journey through the Jewish agricultural settlements of the coastal plain, the Valley of Esdraelon, and the district of Galilee. He delivered several remarkable addresses and was everywhere acclaimed with joyous enthusiasm by the settlers, especially at Balfouria, the village founded in his name in the Valley of Esdraelon by an American Jewish corporation. He then passed

into Syria, but owing to a hostile demonstration of Arabs in Damascus he had to be taken to a ship that was waiting in Beyrout Harbour.

When Sir Herbert Samuel terminated his period of office at the end of June, 1925, he issued a report on his five years' administration, in which he was able to survey with satisfaction the progress that had taken place. There had been a gradual pacification of the country. Public security had improved, and the courts of law had won the confidence of the people. The Government not only showed a surplus in its finances, but had paid for the purchase of the Jaffa-Jerusalem Railway, as well as the first instalment of the annuity due in respect of the pre-war Ottoman Debt. There had been considerable improvements in communications, as well as in the port, telegraph, and telephone services. Much work had been done in afforestation; commerce had grown; public health had advanced; and the Arabs had been provided with nearly 200 schools. Of great benefit to the country in general had been the supply of electric power by Mr. Pinhas Rutenberg, a Russo-Jewish electrical engineer, who had been granted two concessions. The smaller one was for the utilisation of the water of the River Auja near Jaffa, for which a company had been formed with a capital of £100,000: a power-station had been constructed at Tel-Aviv, which began working in June, 1923. The larger concession, which was for harnessing the waters of the upper Jordan and its tributary, the Yarmuk, needed a company with a capital of not less than £1,000,000. The necessary initial subscription of £200,000 had already been made, and the first hydro-electric power-station was soon to be erected.

With regard to the Jewish National Home, Sir Herbert Samuel was able to point to the extensive progress it had made. The Jewish population had doubled from 55,000 at the end of 1918, to 103,000, mainly by immigration, and the area of agricultural land owned by Jews had likewise been doubled. Urban developments had also been striking, for the Jews in Tel-Aviv had increased from 2,000 to 30,000, and those in Haifa from 2,000 to 8,000. The Zionist Executive, in paying a tribute to the first High Commissioner, referred to "occasional differences of opinion" between them "on various practical questions relative to the establishment of the Jewish National Home." Perhaps the most serious was in connection with the article of the Mandate that requires the Administration to "encourage . . . close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not

required for public purposes." There was a large area (over 100,000 acres) of such State lands between the southern end of the Sea of Galilee and Beisan, a considerable part of which, it was hoped, would be made available for Jewish settlement. But it was allotted in such generous measure to a number of Arabs who were squatters on a part of it, and who preferred claims that could not be checked, that there was no land left after the demarcation. The disappointment of the Jews was profound, and they were by no means silent about a justified grievance. Their only consolation was that they were afterwards able to acquire some of this land at enhanced prices, as the Arabs had been given more than they needed and were unable to pay the requisite fees. But despite the differences due to this and other matters, the Zionist Executive placed on record "their deep appreciation of the patience and courtesy with which their representations were invariably received by Sir Herbert Samuel, and the serious and sympathetic consideration which he never failed to accord them, and, above all, of his unflinching devotion to the welfare of Palestine and its people."¹

The appointment of Field-Marshal Lord Plumer as the next High Commissioner caused a certain disillusionment among the Jews, as many of them had believed that the position would again be given to one of their own people. It produced a temporary elation among the Arabs, who thought that it betokened a change of policy for their particular benefit. But it was not long before they both revised their views: the Arabs, when they found that there was to be no change, and the Jews, when they began to experience the sympathy, concern, and sense of justice that Lord Plumer invariably applied to all his tasks. He made it clear from the very outset that he was bent upon developing the economic resources of the country and that its interests could best be served by security of life and property and by confidence in the integrity of the Administration. He also made it clear that he would not tolerate any flouting of his authority. When some Arab leaders, resentful of French policy in Syria, asked for permission to hold a demonstration in Jerusalem, they were told that they could go to Syria and demonstrate there. And on another occasion when some Arabs complained that the flag of the Jewish regiment (which had fought in Palestine in 1918) was to be borne in ceremony to the Hurva Synagogue and deposited there, and said that they could not be responsible for public order if this took place, the martial High Commissioner curtly informed them that he did

¹ *Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation to the 14th Zionist Congress, 1925.*

not expect them to be responsible, since he was responsible.

The three years' administration of Lord Plumer was marked by a number of important legislative measures and administrative changes. The Citizenship Order-in-Council, which made provision for Palestinian nationality (and which had been drafted under his predecessor), was at last issued in the autumn of 1925. It enacted that any person could acquire citizenship who had lived in the country for two years, had a knowledge of one of the official languages, and intended to remain there permanently; but no compulsion was brought to bear upon Jews to avail themselves of this law.⁴ As a logical development, a law for municipal elections was made in 1926, which prescribed that only Palestinian citizens could vote or be elected, subject to their paying a certain amount of Government land-tax or municipal rates; and that in municipalities of mixed population a fair proportion of members of the different sections should be elected. The first elections for municipal councils were held early in 1927, and from that time the Government exercised a large measure of financial supervision to prevent municipal bodies falling into debt.

The most important administrative change was in connection with the police and defence forces in Palestine and Transjordan. Impressed by the tranquillity of the country, which was mainly due to his own presence, Lord Plumer decided to achieve greater unity and simplicity in the organisation of the forces of security, and thus relieve the British tax-payer of the greater part of the small contribution that he still made to the cost of defence in Palestine. The Palestinian Police was reconstructed as the sole Civil Force, the British and the Palestinian Gendarmerie were disbanded, and a regular military force, called the Transjordan Frontier Force, entirely independent of the Palestinian Police, was created for service along the eastern frontiers. This reduction of the forces, although welcomed as a good sign, was a serious mistake, as was proved by the troubles in 1929.

The interests of the agricultural population were furthered, not only by the steady development of agricultural productivity, particularly in regard to citrus cultivation. A law was passed for the protection of agricultural tenants from summary eviction by landlords. Such tenants had previously been liable to be turned out at any time, but the new ordinance required that they should be given a full year's notice before they could be removed from

⁴ The number of Jews in Palestine with Palestinian nationality in January, 1944, was 242,000.

the land; and if they were removed they might secure compensation for improvements, and, in the case of long tenure, additional compensation for eviction. Various reliefs were granted in respect both of tithes and of taxes on house and land property in urban areas. Both Jews and Arabs benefited by a bequest of £100,000 from Sir Ellis Kadoorie, a Jewish philanthropist of Hong Kong, as the money was devoted in equal parts to the establishment of an agricultural school for each of them. Lord Plumer showed concern for the economic welfare of the population in many ways. He both issued ordinances for giving workmen compensation for accidents, for the protection of women and children employed in industry, and for the fencing of dangerous machinery; and he relieved unemployment in 1927 by ordering the construction of roads and the drainage of the Kishon marshes near Haifa. He also evinced much solicitude at the time of the earthquakes in July, 1927, which caused considerable destruction and loss of life, by giving aid to the sufferers, who were mainly Arabs. The country quickly recovered from the disasters, and it was a sign of economic progress that the Palestine Loan of £4,500,000 was floated in the following autumn. Over £1,500,000 had to be repaid immediately on account of the railway, roads, and other works left in Palestine by the British Army; but so healthy were the finances of the country that a sum of £800,000 was available to pay off Palestine's share of the Ottoman Debt. A further evidence of progress was the introduction at the same time of the Palestinian coinage, which at last replaced the Egyptian currency.

Throughout Lord Plumer's term of office the Arabs manifested commendable restraint and indulged in little concerted political action. But in the summer of 1928 there was held a Palestinian Arab Congress, in which all parties were represented; and the Executive Committee handed the retiring High Commissioner as a parting gift a memorandum embodying the unanimous resolution of the Congress, demanding the establishment of parliamentary government in Palestine. He took only formal note of this demand, which was repeated at intervals, and with increasing insistence, during the following decade.

CHAPTER X

BUILDING THE NATIONAL HOME, 1919-29

THE Mandate requires that the Mandatory shall place Palestine under such conditions "as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home," but the actual establishment is the work of the Jewish people. To this task the Zionist Organisation has devoted itself with all its energies and resources, on an ever-increasing scale, and with the material aid provided by supporters and sympathisers in all parts of the world. The work has been and is being carried out primarily under the guidance and direction of the Palestine Zionist Executive (merged, from 1929, into the Executive of the Jewish Agency) by means of an elaborate administrative apparatus. This consists of separate departments for political affairs, immigration, labour, agricultural colonisation, and trade and industry. There were also departments for education and public health until 1932, when these services were transferred to the jurisdiction of the *Vaad Leumi*. In accordance with Article 4 of the Mandate, members of the Executive have consultations from time to time with the High Commissioner and other high officials of the Palestine Administration on current questions of importance; and there is always a regular interchange of correspondence between the Executive in Jerusalem and their colleagues in London, in addition to exchange of visits from one city to the other, in order to ensure co-ordination of policy and harmonious co-operation in all activities.

The two basic factors in the creation of the Jewish National Home are immigration and land. According to Article 6 of the Mandate, the Administration is required to "facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions," and to "encourage . . . close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes." The Administration has interpreted the former obligation by enacting various ordinances from time to time for the strict regulation of immigration in accordance with what it deems to be the economic requirements of the country. As for the land factor, the total cultivable area of State domain that it has given to the Jews, during a period of twenty-three years, is only 17,400 *dunams* (or 4,350 acres),¹ and this land cannot be used for close settlement, as it consists of small and

¹ Four *dunams* equal 1 acre.

scattered tracts. In glaring contrast to this is the area of 350,000 *dunams* received by the Arabs.¹ All land has, therefore, to be bought by the Jewish National Fund.

Shortly after the Civil Administration was instituted, an Immigration Ordinance was issued in September, 1920, authorising the Zionist Organisation to introduce into the country 16,500 immigrants per annum, on condition that it was responsible for their maintenance for one year. About 10,000 Jews were admitted in the first twelve months, but as the ordinance was found unsatisfactory the High Commissioner issued new regulations on June 3rd, 1921, for the admission of a number of categories, the chief of which were persons of independent means who intended to settle in the country permanently, professional men who intended following their vocations, persons with definite prospects of employment, persons of religious occupation with assured means of maintenance, and small tradesmen and artisans with a capital of £500. Apart from tourists and returning residents, all other applications for admission were referred by the local British consuls to the Immigration Department of the Palestine Government, which decided in each case. After the publication of the White Paper of 1922, which laid down the rule that immigration must not exceed the economic capacity of the country to absorb new arrivals, the Government adopted the system of granting permits to groups of artisans and labourers selected by the various Palestine Offices. The number of permits was fixed every three months by the Government after negotiations with the Zionist Executive, who then distributed them among the Palestine Offices. As experience showed that these regulations were unsatisfactory, a new Immigration Ordinance was issued in 1925, which contained a number of improvements. The special position of the Zionist Organisation was recognised by clauses defining the rights and functions of the Zionist Executive in regard to the labour schedule, which was drawn up for a six-monthly instead of a three-monthly period, and was based upon an estimate of the different kinds of labour required for new works to be undertaken. The ordinance of 1925 prescribed that persons of independent means must have at least £500, and the Government officials administered their regulations so rigorously that even in cases where this sum was forthcoming, the intervention of the Executive was often necessary. The ordinance was supplemented by further regulations in 1926

¹ *The Jewish National Fund: Its History, Functions, and Activity*, by Adolf Boehm and Adolf Pollak (Jerusalem, 1939), p. 37.

and again amended in 1927, since when it has provided for the admission of the following categories:

- A. (i) Persons in possession of not less than £1,000, and their families.
- (ii) Professional men in possession of not less than £500.
- (iii) Skilled artisans in possession of not less than £250.
- (iv) Persons with an assured income of £4 per month.
- B. (i) Orphans destined for institutions in Palestine.
- (ii) Persons of religious occupation whose maintenance is assured.
- (iii) Students whose maintenance is assured.
- C. Persons who have a definite prospect of employment.
- D. Dependent relatives of residents in Palestine who are in a position to maintain them.

This ordinance has substantially governed the admission of Jews to the present time, while the regulations regarding the categories A. (ii) and A. (iii) have been applied with particular rigour and occasionally suspended for periods of varying length. The category that has formed the subject of the most frequent discussions and most serious differences between the Administration and the Zionist Executive is that of the workers with a definite prospect of employment, as the estimates drawn up by the Executive, no matter how detailed and carefully compiled and factually justified, have invariably been greatly reduced by the Administration. This niggardly policy of the Government has often produced a shortage of Jewish labour, which has seriously hampered economic development and caused a drift of Jewish workers from rural settlements to the towns in search of better-paid employment.

The Jews who have settled in Palestine have come from all parts of the world. They have been drawn in the largest number, naturally enough, from regions of political intolerance or economic depression, such as Eastern and Central Europe and the Yemen, but they have also migrated from lands as varied and as remote from one another as Siberia and South Africa, Canada and Argentina, Morocco and Persia, England and the United States. Indeed, it would be difficult to name a single country that is not represented in the variegated Jewry of Palestine. The younger element predominated in the so-called Third *Aliyah* (wave of immigration) of 1920-2. Soon after the First World War societies

of *Halutzim* (Pioneers) sprang up in Poland and other parts of Eastern and Central Europe for the purpose of giving their members, young men and women, a training either in agriculture or in some manual craft and a knowledge of Hebrew as a spoken tongue.¹ The movement had begun in Russia, largely in response to the infectious enthusiasm of Trumpeldor, and hundreds of young Jews from that country braved all kinds of perils in their adventurous journeys to Palestine. Many were university students, who broke off their academic career in order to engage in the laborious toil of rebuilding their ancestral home; and all were medically examined to ensure their physical fitness before receiving immigration permits from the local Palestine Office. Such offices, whose business it was to help and advise emigrants from the time of their selection, existed, not only in most of the capitals of the European continent, the largest being those in Warsaw, Vienna, Berlin, and Bucharest, but also in many provincial cities, such as Cracow, Lwow, Czernowitz, and Galatz, and the embarkation ports of Constanza and Trieste. Upon their arrival in Palestine, the newcomers were welcomed by officials of the Zionist Immigration Department, lodged and fed in hostels, and looked after until they could be directed to an agricultural settlement or found employment in their respective trades. The Immigration Department paid the fees demanded by the Government in respect of each arrival, £1 for landing and 10s. for quarantine, and also granted loans for the payment of rent during the initial period, as well as for the purchase of tools and goods and for travelling expenses to the settler's destination.

The number of Jewish immigrants rose steadily during the first five years of the Civil Administration from 8,223 in 1920 to 34,386 in 1925. The first marked rise, to 13,892, was in 1924, when the fourth *Aliyah* began, containing a large proportion of persons from Poland, some with capital, who were forced to emigrate by the Finance Minister Grabski's anti-Jewish policy. This influx gave a strong impetus to the economic development of Palestine, caused land values to rise, and resulted in extensive building activity, particularly in Tel-Aviv. But after reaching the record total of 1925, not only did the number of immigrants sink to 13,855 in 1926, but more than half of that number left the country. In 1927 there was a further and more serious decline of immigration to 3,034, while the volume of emigration was nearly twice that figure. Not

¹ These societies were united in a federation, *Hahalutz*, which at one time included over 100,000 members. The headquarters were at first in Berlin and afterwards in Warsaw.

until 1928 was there an improvement, when, although there were only 2,175 new arrivals, the number of departures was about the same; and in 1929 there was an appreciable change for the better, as immigration rose to 5,249, while emigration fell to one-third of that number.

The reason for the decline of immigration in the years 1926 to 1928 was a labour depression due to a variety of causes, the chief of which were delays in the arrival of new settlers and the economic crisis in Poland, the country which provided about 40 per cent. of the immigrants. Unfortunately, the half-yearly labour schedules were not issued early enough to enable the recipients of the certificates to reach Palestine in time for the beginning of the working season, and consequently many of them fell a burden upon the labour market. The crisis in Poland—an aftermath of the war—was dominated by a state of inflation, which seriously hit a great number of Jews from that country who had embarked upon building activities in Palestine and found themselves short of the additional capital necessary for the completion of their undertakings. There was a decrease in the immigration of persons with means and an increase in the proportion of those without means, the latter being mainly workmen or dependents of relatives already settled in Palestine. The sudden slump in the building industry also affected many allied trades and the general economic life of Palestinian Jewry. The depression was first noticeable in 1925, and by the following summer it became so serious that the Zionist Executive were obliged to relieve the unemployed by the payment of "doles" and to continue doing so for over a year. By the end of August, 1927, the number of unemployed reached its peak—8,400. The depression was relieved to some extent by a transfer of workers to the agricultural colonies, but it was not until the Government and various municipalities had initiated some public works, principally road-building and drainage, and the Zionist Executive, with special funds provided mainly by Jews in America and England, promoted an extensive programme of works in the spring of 1928, that the "dole" system was abolished and unemployment was reduced to a minimum. From May, 1928, the number of unemployed was below 2,000, and the economic position gradually improved.

The interests of the Jewish workers are looked after mainly by the Labour Department of the Zionist Executive and the *Histadruth Ha-Ovedim* (The General Federation of Jewish Labour), usually called the *Histadruth*. The Labour Department not only devotes

itself to finding employment for the workers in their respective trades, but has also organised industrial training (e.g. in stone quarrying and fishing), furnishes loans for house-building, watches over labour legislation (e.g. compensation for accidents), subsidises labour exchanges, and takes the initiative in settling strikes. The Histadruth,¹ which was founded at a workers' conference in Haifa, in 1920, is a Federation of labour unions and has a very wide range of activities. It was formed by the union of the two parties *Ahduth Ha-Avodah* and *Hapoel Hatzair*, as well as of a number of parallel institutions belonging to them. Its declared purpose was to make Palestine the home of the Jewish people on the basis of Jewish labour, and to further the political, economic, social, and cultural interests of all its members.² Beginning with a membership of 4,500, the Histadruth, whose headquarters were established in Tel-Aviv, gradually acquired an ever-increasing influence in the development of Jewish national life and attained a membership within twenty years of 120,000. It comprises not only a number of trade unions, of which the most important are those of the agricultural and the building workers, but also a very large number of co-operative settlements, several co-operative societies, a workers' sick benefit fund (*Kupath Holim*), a special travelling theatre, *Ohel* ("The Tent"), a youth organisation, and a sports association, *Hapoel* ("The Worker"). Its principal co-operatives are *Hamashbir*, the central wholesale consumers' society, *Tnuvah*, the central marketing co-operative (which controls the sale of the products of the workers' settlements), *Solei Boneh*, the building guild contracting for large-scale works, *Nir*, which owns the property of the labour settlements and helps to found new ones, and *Yakhin*, the co-operative contracting society for agricultural work. It also has its own "Workers' Bank," besides a chain of loan and saving societies, a Labour Fund, an insurance society, an immigration bureau, and labour exchanges. Its cultural activities, to which it also attaches high importance, are under the direction of separate Commissions, which control the schools belonging to its particular system and foster adult education. Recognising the importance of co-operation between Jewish and Arab workers, the Histadruth has helped in the creation of Arab unions as well as of joint unions in undertakings where Jews and Arabs worked together (as in Government and

¹ The full title is *Histadruth Hakehalith Shel Ha-Onedin Ha-Ivrim be-Eretz Israel* (General Federation of the Jewish Workers in Palestine). Its membership in 1944 amounted to 140,000.

² See article by Berl Locker, "Twenty Years of Histadruth," in *The New Judaea*, January, 1941.

municipal services,¹ and in enterprises controlled by foreign non-Jewish capital). There is also a separate organisation of orthodox workers, called *Hapoel Hamizrachi*.

The branch of labour to which Jewish workers primarily devoted themselves was agriculture, since cultivation of the soil was from the very beginning regarded as a fundamental basis of the National Home. The two leading agencies for the establishment of agricultural settlements are the Zionist Organisation and the P.I.C.A. (Palestine Jewish Colonisation Association), a company formed in 1925 to administer the estates of the I.C.A. in Palestine, mainly acquired by Baron Edmond de Rothschild.² The principal districts in which Zionist settlements have been created are the Valley of Jezreel, the Maritime Plain, Upper and Lower Galilee, and Judæa, and the number of Jews settled over a total area of 130,000 *dunams*³ within the first ten years of the British Administration was 6,700, forming over one-fifth of the entire Jewish rural population. By far the most important district is the Valley of Jezreel, commonly called the "Emek" ("Valley"), which extends from the foot of Mount Carmel to the hills of Lower Galilee. Owing to the extensive marshes that existed there and the prevalence of malaria, systematic drainage operations had to be carried out in order to render the land fit for cultivation; and thanks to the labours and perseverance of the *Halutzim*, what was once a barren wilderness was transformed into a fertile and flourishing centre of colonisation. Unlike the privately owned colonies, which, actuated by the profit motive, were mainly devoted to plantations, particularly vines and oranges, the Zionist settlements, concerned with the general interests of the Jewish population, went in largely for mixed farming. This included not only the growing of crops and vegetables, dairy-farming, and the rearing of poultry and cattle, but also fruit plantations, all of which were conducted in accordance with the most advanced methods and yielded results greatly surpassing even the best achieved by Arab farmers. By far the most extensive development took place in the cultivation of citrus fruit (oranges, lemons, and grape-fruit), which increased to large proportions and soon provided the country's most im-

¹ For example, the Railway, Post and Telegraph Workers' Union.

² The Chairman of P.I.C.A. since its establishment has been Mr. James de Rothschild, M.P.

³ The total area held by the Jewish National Fund in 1929 was 270,000 *dunams*. The 130,000 *dunams* included 15,000 *dunams* occupied by settlements belonging to other agencies, but supported by the Zionist Organisation. There was thus an area of 155,000 *dunams* held in reserve.

portant export. Progress in all branches of agriculture was furthered by the advice and information disseminated by the Agricultural Experimental Station at Tel-Aviv.

There are three main types of agricultural settlement—the so-called “colony,” the communal or collective settlement, and the smallholders’ settlement. The distinguishing feature of the “colonies,” which were largely the foundations of Baron de Rothschild and are situated mostly in the coastal plain and Galilee, is that the land is the private property of the settlers. As the early immigrants differed in ability and enjoyed varying fortune, some of them became the owners of larger estates than they and their families could cultivate, while others could barely earn a living; and as the prosperous farmers had a need for hired labour and the number of Jews willing to supply it was quite inadequate, they engaged cheap Arab labour. The consequence of this system, based on the pursuit of profit, was the growth of considerable social disparities in the village community, which were quite out of harmony with the idealism that had originally inspired its founders. A radical change was brought about under the influence of the Zionist Organisation and the Jewish National Fund, for the Jews whom they settled on the soil were primarily actuated by the desire that the land should remain permanently in Jewish possession, and they considered it essential to this end that it should always be cultivated by Jewish labour. They formed groups whose members all belonged to the Histadruth, and each group was allotted by the Jewish National Fund, on a forty-nine years’ lease and at a very moderate rental, only as much land as it could itself cultivate. The settlement was based on four cardinal principles: (1) Jewish national ownership of the soil, (2) “self-labour,” which meant the rigorous exclusion of hired labour, (3) mutual assistance, and (4) co-operative buying and selling. These settlements, many of which were provided by the Keren Hayesod with the money for their buildings, cattle, and general farming equipment, consist of two main types—the *Kvutzah* or collective settlement, and the *Moshav Ovedim* or small-holders’ settlement.

The *Kvutzah* is the collective property of the group and is conducted on strictly co-operative principles. All its members share alike in both the work and its proceeds, but they receive no wages. They eat in a communal hall; sleep either in a family room or in dormitories, according to whether they are married or single; obtain their clothing from the communal store; and receive

a limited weekly allowance for such amenities as cigarettes or a visit to the nearest cinema. Whatever profits are made go into the communal treasury for the maintenance and improvement of the settlement. The young children sleep in a communal dormitory, though in many *kvutzoth* the elder children have a room adjoining that of their parents. The larger *kvutzoth* have their own schools, while the smaller ones build joint schools. They all have a recreation room (which is often the dining-hall) for lectures and concerts; they have a library, for most of the members have intellectual interests; and they meet very frequently to discuss the allocation of tasks and other matters. Only those able to discipline themselves, to deny themselves privacy and personal convenience, and to exercise mutual forbearance, can live amicably in such a form of society; and indeed, only those are admitted who have previously undergone at least a year's training in this mode of life and work in Europe before going to Palestine.¹ Owing to the difficulty experienced by many settlers in accommodating themselves to the rigid discipline of the *Kvutzah*, a modified form of settlement, the *Moshav Ovdim*, was devised, combining the advantages of the colony with those of the co-operative settlement. The first *Moshav* was established in 1921 in Nahalal, in the Vale of Jezreel, and was soon followed by others. In the *Moshav* the settlers have each a small-holding, which is just large enough to be cultivated by one family; they have each a cottage and farm and enjoy the privacy of family life; and, as in the other settlements, they adhere to the principles of "self-labour," mutual assistance, and the joint purchase of requirements and sale of produce.

Apart from the Zionist Organisation (or Jewish Agency) and the P.I.C.A., some smaller companies were also formed for agricultural colonisation, the principal one being *Hanoteah*, which was established

¹ The collective settlements, whose membership ranges from a few score to a few hundred, are combined in four different associations, each of which has its distinctive features. They are *Kibbutz Hamuchad* ("United Collective"), *Kibbutz Artzi Hashomer Hatzair* ("All-Palestine Collective"), *Haver Hakvutzoth* ("League of Communal Groups"), and *Hakibbutz Hadati* ("Religious Collective"). The *Kibbutz Artzi* is the strictest in insisting upon the previous training of its members before admission; those who join one of its constituents come from the same country, where they had worked together, and must all be members of the *Hashomer Hatzair* party. The *Kibbutz Hamuchad*, whose members may belong to different wings of the Labour Party, comprises large *Kvutzoth*, which also contain industries. The *Haver Hakvutzoth* consists of small autonomous groups primarily belonging to the "Gordonia" association. *Hakibbutz Hadati*, which was organised by *Hapoel Hamizrachi*, embraces the settlements conducted in strict accordance with the requirements of religious tradition. A detailed account of these settlements is given in Maurice Pearlman's *Collective Adventures* (Heinemann, 1938).

by a group of Palestinian-born Jews called "Bné Benjamin" ("Sons of Benjamin," the latter being the Hebrew name of Baron Edmond de Rothschild), and the Jaffa Plantations, Limited.

The Jewish National Fund not only bought land for agricultural development, but effected improvements of the soil wherever necessary, as in the case of the Emek, by draining swamps, regulating streams and water-courses, clearing the ground of stones and weeds, and building roads. It carried out needful schemes of afforestation by planting hundreds of thousands of trees in once-wooded areas that had been denuded, so as to check erosion and restore the beauty of the landscape; and it popularised the custom of planting groves and woods in honour of famous persons (like the Herzl and Balfour Forests). It also bought urban and suburban land for the building of residential quarters, as well as large plots for public institutions. One of the largest areas of this kind was a tract of 29,000 *dunams* in the Haifa Bay district, which it acquired in 1925-8. The Keren Hayesod co-operated with the National Fund in agricultural colonisation, inasmuch as it provided the money for everything needed besides land for the creation of settlements. But its sphere was very much larger, as it not only furnished the finance for all the variegated activities—social and economic, political and cultural—of the Zionist Executive, but also participated in important enterprises, such as Rutenberg's electrification scheme and the exploitation of the mineral deposits of the Dead Sea, which have been of great benefit to the general development of the country.

Parallel with the growth of agricultural colonisation there was a notable development in the urban districts, since thousands of Jewish immigrants were skilled in crafts for which employment could only or best be found in the cities. There was a rapid increase of the Jewish population in the four principal cities, Jerusalem, Jaffa, Tel-Aviv, and Haifa, which gave a vigorous stimulus to the building industry. The most striking expansion took place in Tel-Aviv, where the population grew from 2,000 in 1914 to 40,000 in 1929; and the total amount of Jewish capital invested in building in the cities in that year was £1,742,000. Before the British occupation, the only industries in Palestine consisted of the manufacture of wine, soap, and olive-wood articles, but the Jews wrought a remarkable transformation by introducing numerous trades previously unknown in the country. Factories, mills, and workshops multiplied enormously, accompanied by an impressive increase in the diversity of their products, which did not always

depend either upon local demand or upon the requisite materials being locally available. A census of Jewish industries taken in 1926 by the Palestine Zionist Executive showed that there were 558 establishments employing 5,700 persons, comprising the following eight main categories: building materials (including stone and marble quarries, cement, bricks, and floor-tiles), textiles (weaving, knitting, tailoring, embroidery, hat-making, etc.), leather (shoe-making, tanning, and saddlery), wood (furniture, joinery, packing-cases for oranges, carriages, etc.), chemical industry (soap and candles, matches, fertilisers, paints, etc.), paper (printing, engraving, lithography, stationery, and bookbinding), metal industry (machinery, foundries, metal articles for buildings, etc.), and foodstuffs (mills, bakeries, edible oils, dairy products, canned fruits, beer, etc.). There was also a miscellaneous category of twenty-six factories, including such articles as cigarettes, umbrellas and artificial teeth.¹ The factory for artificial teeth, established by an American Jew in Tel-Aviv, was a notable instance of an enterprise based upon imported materials, and the good quality of the products was attested by the fact that they were exported mainly to England. A census carried out four years later, in 1930, showed that the number of Jewish urban enterprises had been quadrupled. There was a total of 2,274, which gave work to 9,362 persons, had an invested capital of nearly £1,000,000 and manufactured products worth over £1,600,000 a year.²

An important part in the development of these industries, and indeed, in making some of them possible, was played by the Palestine Electric Corporation, which operated the concession granted to Mr. Rutenberg for the production of electric power from the Jordan and the Yarmuk. Other leading enterprises were the "Nesher" Cement Works, the "Shemen" Works of the Eastern Oil Industries, Ltd., which manufactured edible oils, soaps, and perfumes, and the large flour mills, "Grands Moulins de Palestine," originally founded by Baron Edmond de Rothschild, all three of which are situated at Haifa. The wine trade, concentrated in the Co-operative Society of the Vine-Growers of Rishon le-Zion and Zichron Jacob, produced in 1929 about 30 million litres of wines and spirits, with a total value of £80,000. All these various industries gave an incentive to the motor transport trade in the form of buses and lorries, which was largely promoted by Jewish

¹ *Report of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission, 1928* (pp. 71-2).

² *Palestine: Report on Immigration, Land Settlement and Development*, by Sir John Hope Simpson, 1930 (p. 107).

enterprise,¹ and also to the holding of industrial exhibitions at Tel-Aviv.

The industrial progress of the country was reflected in the expansion of commerce and the growth of trade relations with other countries. The Jewish banks actively co-operated in these developments. The Anglo-Palestine Bank provided the bulk of discount credit and in some cases financed exports. The Palestine Corporation, a subsidiary company of the Economic Board for Palestine (formed in 1921 by a number of English Jews, with the first Lord Melchett as the first Chairman), participated in the founding of the Palestine Electric Corporation and facilitated the purchase of raw materials; and the Palestine Economic Corporation (created by some American Jews in 1925) provided long-term credits for selected industries. The Central Bank of Co-operative Institutions, Ltd., and the Workers' Bank catered for the workshops organised on a co-operative basis, while the Artisans' Bank and similar credit institutions were concerned with the interests of the artisan class.

The Hebrew school-system, which had come under the control of the Zionist Organisation in 1914, embraced about 80 per cent. of all the Jewish schools in the country, the others belonging to the Alliance Israélite, the Anglo-Jewish Association, and some orthodox organisations (e.g. the old-fashioned Talmud Torah schools). The Zionist Executive undertook the maintenance of the Hebrew schools as naturally as the Government took under its care the Arab schools, for the former were regarded as constituting the fundamental cultural basis of Jewish national life. It was there that the younger generation were not only taught the usual subjects of a school curriculum and given a knowledge of Jewish history and literature, but also inspired with a love of the land of Israel and familiarised with its physical features and natural history. These schools also played no small part in the Hebraisation of the parents and of the Jewish population in general. The Government might have been prepared to maintain them entirely at its own cost, but only on condition that it had complete control over them, as regards both management and curriculum—a condition to which the *Yishuv* could obviously not agree. The Government regarded them at first as private institutions, but, in view of its obligation to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish National Home, it agreed after some years to recognise them as

¹ In 1929 there were already 200 Jewish-owned motor omnibuses employed in the three principal cities.

forming the Jewish national school system and to participate in their support. It began by giving a grant in 1920-1 of £2,600, but after repeated representations by the Zionist Executive, it increased its contribution by stages, and appointed Jewish inspectors of its own to co-operate with those of the Jewish Board of Education (*Vaad Hahinmich*, consisting of representatives of the Executive, the *Vaad Leumi*, and the Teachers' Union). By the year 1928-9, when the Zionist educational network embraced over 220 schools of different kinds, with nearly 20,000 pupils, and had an expenditure of £120,000, the Government had increased its grant to £20,000. The Keren Hayesod contributed £70,000, and the balance was provided by the *Yishuv* (in the form of tuition fees and grants from Jewish town and rural councils) and the P.I.C.A.

The Zionist educational system comprises all grades—kindergarten, elementary, and secondary schools, as well as trade schools and teachers' seminaries. Owing to ideological differences, the schools belong to three different categories—general, Mizrachi, and Labour: a system that has been subjected to much criticism, but for the simplification of which no proposal has yet proved acceptable. Although the general schools included instruction in the Bible and prayer-book, they leave the question of conformity with religious tradition and ritual to the parents, while the Mizrachi insists that religious observance must be taught by the teachers and that the curriculum must include purely religious subjects (e.g. Talmud and Midrash). On the other hand, the schools in the Labour settlements have their own curriculum, as, owing to the labour arrangements, the children are under the care of the teachers for longer periods than in the urban schools and their parents wish them to be brought up in their own ideology. The Mizrachi and Labour schools, therefore, have separate administrative machinery, which, however, is subordinated to the *Vaad Hahinmich*. Students over the age of seventeen, who have passed the leaving examination of a secondary school, are admitted to the Technical Institute at Haifa, where instruction was first confined to a four years' course in building or architecture, followed by a year's practical work, or to the University.

The coping-stone of the educational system is the Hebrew University, which, originally conceived as a centre of research and post-graduate study, began undergraduate teaching a few years after it was opened. Its first faculty, as befitted such an institution in the Holy City, comprised Institutes of Jewish and Oriental Studies and also held general courses in philosophy,

history, and literature; but the University also included a few departments of a Faculty of Science, devoted to mathematics, chemistry, microbiology, and Palestine natural history. The early development of the University was restricted by a shortage of funds, but as this handicap was overcome it gradually expanded into a seat of learning and scientific research, which became the most notable academic centre throughout the Near and Middle East. Subserving the needs of the University and promoting the general intellectual interests of the country is the Jewish National and University Library, which was built up from the library founded in 1902 by a Bialystok physician, Dr. Joseph Chasanowitsch (who used to accept rare books as fees from his patients.)¹ By the year 1929 it contained nearly 250,000 volumes, including valuable incunabula and manuscripts.

The Zionist Executive considered it their duty also to look after the physical welfare of the Jewish population. They set up a Health Council (*Vaad Habriuth*) for the purpose of co-ordinating and supervising all Jewish institutions and organisations concerned with health work and co-operating with the Public Health Department of the Government. The Hadassah Medical Organisation and the *Kupath Holim* were the bodies mainly responsible for the Jewish Health Service, to which the Government made a small grant. The Hadassah Organisation, so-called because it was founded and supported by Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organisation of America, began its activity in Palestine in 1918, some months after the British entry into the country. It established and maintained four hospitals (one each in Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv, Haifa, and Safed), several clinics and laboratories, and a nurses' training school in Jerusalem. It organised an excellent maternity and child hygiene service in most of the large cities and in a number of the bigger villages, covering maternity, infant, pre-school and school hygiene. Its expenditure in 1930 was nearly £110,000, which exceeded the entire amount spent by the Government Health Department. The *Kupath Holim*, the Sick Benefit Society of the Jewish Labour Federation, maintained its own out-patient departments in five cities, provided physicians and nurses for its 18,000 members (besides 12,000 dependents) in fifty-three rural centres, and conducted a central hospital and two convalescent homes. Its budget of £55,000 in 1930 was covered chiefly by membership dues, and partly by contributions from employers and

¹ Dr. Chasanowitsch (1844-1920), who was one of the delegates at the Kattowitz Conference, sent 10,000 volumes to Jerusalem in 1906. He died in a poor-house at Ekaterinograd (now Dniepropetrovsk).

grants from the Jewish Agency and Hadassah. In the absence of a compulsory insurance law, the growth and strength of this society was a tribute to the organising powers and solidarity of the Labour Federation.

Thanks to the systematic efforts of the Hadassah and the *Kupath Holim*, the prevalence of such diseases as tuberculosis, malaria, trachoma, and typhoid, which previously had sorely tried the Jewish (and, still more, the Arab) population, was very considerably reduced, and health conditions were greatly improved. The beneficent results of their activities were shown in the decline of the general mortality rate among Jews from 12.6 per 1,000 in 1924 to 9.6 in 1930 (compared with 29 and 27 respectively among Moslems), and still more strikingly in the fall of infantile mortality among Jews from 105 per 1,000 in 1924 to 69 in 1930 (compared with 199 and 169 respectively among Moslems).¹

We have now surveyed all the main branches of activity—immigration and labour, agriculture and industry, trade and commerce, education and health—that contributed to the building up of the Jewish National Home during the first decade of British administration. These activities, as has already been explained, were all directed and mainly or solely financed by the Zionist Executive (either through the Keren Hayesod or the Jewish National Fund). But while this Executive acted on behalf of those sections of the Jews of the world who identified themselves with the cause of a Jewish Palestine, there was a separate body to represent the Jews of Palestine. This is the *Knesseth Israel* (Congregation of Israel), which absorbed the *Vaad Leumi* that was elected in 1920 and the local *Vaads* that functioned in various Jewish urban and rural districts. The Regulations for the Jewish Community were promulgated as an ordinance in the official *Gazette* dated January 18th, 1928, and were based upon the Religious Communities Ordinance of 1926. The *Knesseth Israel* was the democratically organised Jewish community; but a small minority, the ultra-orthodox organisation, *Agudath Israel* ("League of Israel"), which was far more numerous in Eastern Europe than in Palestine, was allowed by the Government, after lodging protests with the Mandatory and the League of Nations, to contract out and administer its own affairs, its membership at the time being about 10,000. The Mizrahi and other orthodox elements were at first opposed to the suffrage for women, as provided in the draft ordinance, and it was owing to this

¹ *Palestine: A Decade of Development*. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November, 1932. Article, "Public Health in Palestine," by Dr. I. J. Kligler.

opposition that there was such a delay before the law came into force.¹

The communal organisation includes an Elected Assembly (*Asefath Hanivharim*) of seventy-one members—the number of the old Sanhedrin—which is elected by adult suffrage and meets annually, and which, in turn, elects a National Council (*Vaad Leumi*), usually consisting of twenty-three members (representing different Zionist parties and other groups).² The religious side comprises a Rabbinical Council, composed of two Chief Rabbis, one for the Sephardic and the other for the Ashkenazic Jews, and six Rabbinical members (three for each section). This Council exercises authority in religious matters and forms the Rabbinical Tribunal, which has jurisdiction in matters of personal status of members of the community. The Elected Assembly has the power to levy upon its members a tax for education, health, and social welfare, as well as for contributions to the maintenance of the Rabbinical Offices and Rabbis, and the *Vaad Leumi*. In each town or village of any size a *Vaad* or municipal Council is elected, usually by a system of adult suffrage, and the local communities may be authorised to impose fees in respect of the ritual slaughter of animals, licences for the making or selling of unleavened bread, and the grant of certificates in accordance with the law. Such, then, was the general framework of the corporate life of the Jews in Palestine by the end of the first decade of British administration.

¹ The first elections did not take place until January 5th, 1931.

² The full text of the Regulations for the Organisation of the Jewish Community is given in the British Government's *Report on Palestine and Transjordan for 1927 to the League of Nations*, pp. 81–93. *Vaad Leumi* figures as "General Council," a mistranslation (due to political grounds) against which protest was made in vain. See also *Knesseth Israel be-Eretz Israel*, a historical account of the communal organisation and its activities, by Moabé Attias (Jerusalem, 1944). In August, 1944, the Elected Assembly was enlarged to 171 members, who were elected by 202,448 voters (out of a total register of 280,000). The main parties were the Palestine Labour Party, which secured 63 seats, followed by other Labour and Left groups with 30 seats, the Mizrahi with 27, the *Aliyah Hadashah* ("new settlers" from Central Europe) with 18, and General Zionists (A), with an allied Labour group, 7.

CHAPTER XI

EXTENSION OF THE JEWISH AGENCY

IT was realised in responsible Zionist circles, soon after the issue of the Balfour Declaration, that the establishment of the Jewish National Home was bound to prove too formidable a task for the unaided efforts of the Zionist Organisation, and that it would be necessary to enlist the active co-operation, on as large a scale as possible, of Jews who remained outside the Organisation. At the Zionist Conference held in London in July, 1920, a resolution was adopted in favour of the convening of a Jewish World Congress, constituted on a democratic basis, which should be "the authoritative body to speak and act on behalf of the Jewish people in all national affairs." This resolution made no reference to the rebuilding of Palestine as one of the tasks to be undertaken by the suggested World Congress, but a proposal adopted by the Twelfth Zionist Congress, held in September, 1921, was more explicit. It was to the effect that the "Actions Committee" (General Council), in conjunction with the Executive of the American Jewish Congress, the *Vaad Leumi*, and other Jewish democratic organisations, should "take the necessary steps for the convocation of a Jewish World Congress, whose task it shall be to organise all Jewish national forces for the reconstruction of Palestine." But consideration of this proposal was deferred pending the ratification of the Palestine Mandate, which took place on July 24th, 1922.

The Mandate contained specific mention of a "Jewish agency" to co-operate with the Administration of Palestine in the following three articles:

"*Article 4.* An appropriate Jewish Agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.

"The Zionist Organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are, in the opinion of the Mandatory, appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency. It shall take steps, in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government, to secure

the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.

"Article 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions, and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State and waste lands not required for public purposes.

"Article 11. . . . The Administration may arrange with the Jewish agency mentioned in Article 4 to construct or operate upon fair and equitable terms any public works, services, and utilities, and to develop any of the natural resources of the country, in so far as these matters are not directly undertaken by the Administration. . . ."

At a meeting of the Annual Conference held at Carlsbad in August–September, 1922, a resolution was adopted that the Zionist Organisation accepted the rights and duties of the Jewish Agency and also that it was the wish of the Organisation that "the Jewish Agency shall represent the whole Jewish people." The convocation of "a Jewish World Congress for the reconstruction of Eretz Israel" was recognised as the best means of realising this object, and the Executive, as the organ of the Jewish Agency, was instructed to take the preparatory steps towards bringing it about. But the Executive soon realised the impossibility of convening such an assembly for a long time, and therefore decided, in February, 1923, that negotiations should be opened with the representatives of leading Jewish communities and organisations with a view to providing for the participation of those bodies in the Jewish Agency, and to devising the most appropriate methods of constituting the Agency. It was considered appropriate, as Great Britain was the Mandatory, to conduct the first negotiations with representatives of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and of the Anglo-Jewish Association, but discussions with these bodies in 1923 led to no immediate result. Dr. Weizmann, who was from the very beginning the principal and most energetic advocate of the extension of the Agency by the inclusion of non-Zionists, proposed that its controlling organs should be composed in equal numbers of Zionists and non-Zionists. His plan was strongly opposed by a small party headed by Isaac Gruenbaum, one of the leaders of Polish Jewry and a member of the Polish Parliament. This party,

which was called at first the "Democratic Group" and afterwards the Radical Party, insisted that the enlarged Jewish Agency should be based on the results of democratic elections, as its members feared that in a body containing "notables," or persons not in real sympathy with the principles of Zionism, those principles would be flouted. A bitter controversy raged around this question for some years, and formed one of the main features of the four Zionist Congresses held between 1923 and 1929, until agreement was at length achieved.

At the Thirteenth Congress, held at Carlsbad in August, 1923, the opposition to the extension of the Jewish Agency was led by Gruenbaum, but as his Radical Party numbered only twenty-one out of 331 elected delegates, there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the continuation of negotiations with non-Zionists, although with certain safeguards. At this Congress Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow were re-elected President of the Organisation and Chairman of the Executive respectively, and Louis Lipsky (New York), Joseph Cowen (London), and Dr. Max Soloweitchik (Kovno) were elected on the London Executive; but Dr. Soloweitchik resigned a few months later on the Jewish Agency question. A new figure added to the Executive in Jerusalem was Lieutenant-Colonel Frederick Herman Kisch, D.S.O. (1888-1943), who had been appointed head of the Political Department of the Palestine Executive some months previously, and had had a distinguished career in the British Army. Kisch became Chairman of the Palestine Executive, replacing Ussishkin, who was not re-elected on that body. Ussishkin became Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Jewish National Fund, and in that position, which he held until his death eighteen years later, he rendered very valuable services, which bore fruit in the remarkable growth of the Fund and the expansion of land in Jewish possession.

The most important factor in the extension of the Jewish Agency consisted of American Jewry, who were able to make a far more substantial contribution to the development of Palestine than the Jews of any other country. On February 17th, 1924, a "non-partisan conference," to discuss the Agency question, was held in New York under the chairmanship of Mr. Louis Marshall (1856-1929), President of the American Jewish Committee and the recognised leader of American Jewry. The members of the Conference attended in their individual capacities, but they could fairly be said to be representative of a large body of American Jews not hitherto associated with the Zionist movement. Dr.

Weizmann was present and took part in the proceedings. After prolonged discussion, it was agreed to appoint a committee to study the question further and to formulate an appropriate plan whereby American Jews could associate themselves in the Agency; another committee was appointed for the purpose of organising an investment corporation with adequate capital for developing the economic resources of Palestine on an economic basis. At a second "non-partisan conference" held in New York, on March 1st, 1925, under the chairmanship of Mr. Marshall, in which Dr. Weizmann again participated, a committee was elected "to bring about the creation and recognition of a Jewish Agency" on the following basis: that the Zionists and the non-Zionists shall each form 50 per cent. of the Council and of the Executive Committee of the Agency, and that of the non-Zionist members of the Council 40 per cent. shall be representative of American Jewry. As for the proposed investment corporation, it was reported that the Palestine Economic Corporation had been established with an authorised capital of 3,000,000 dollars, and with a board of directors including Mr. Bernard Flexner as President, and Mr. Marshall and Colonel Herbert H. Lehmann as Vice-Presidents.

The results of the negotiations in New York and London were submitted to the Fourteenth Zionist Congress, which met in Vienna in August, 1925. The Congress also had before it a report of the inquiries as to the prospects of non-Zionist participation in the Agency which had been made in a number of other countries, including Germany, Holland, Italy, and Canada. The proposed reorganisation of the Agency was one of the principal subjects of discussion at the Congress, at which the opposition of the Radical Party was reinforced by a new party, the Revisionists, and by some American Zionists. The Revisionist Party was formed in April, 1925, by Vladimir Jabotinsky, who advocated a "revision" of Zionist policy in the sense of a return to Herzl's original conception of a Jewish State.¹ His two basic demands were the restoration of the "Jewish legion" (which he had helped to create in 1917) and a "colonisation régime," by which he meant that the Palestine Administration should itself promote Jewish immi-

¹ Jabotinsky resigned from the Zionist Executive in the course of a meeting of the "Actions Committee" in Berlin, in January, 1923. The ostensible reason was his opposition to Dr. Weizmann's conciliatory attitude to British Palestine policy, although he had himself subscribed to the White Paper of 1922. The immediate cause of his resignation was the demand of the Labour Party that he should appear before a Zionist Committee appointed to investigate the facts relating to his reported negotiations with the notorious General Petlura, the organiser of pogroms in Southern Russia in 1919-21, concerning a Jewish self-defence corps in connection with the Ukrainian army. Jabotinsky did not appear before the Committee.

gration and colonisation. He contended that only in this way could a Jewish majority be achieved on both sides of the Jordan, and as such an objective could be pursued only by a leadership with a strong nationalist consciousness, he was opposed to the extension of the Jewish Agency, which would mean sharing the leadership with "assimilationist notables." Dr. Stephen Wise, as the principal spokesman of a group of American Zionists opposed to the extension of the Jewish Agency, made a vigorous attack upon the Soviet project of a Jewish settlement in the Crimea, which was favoured by Mr. Marshall and his friends, partly because the scheme ran counter to the principles of Jewish nationalism, and partly because an appeal in America for its financial support would affect the response to Zionist funds. On the other hand, Weizmann and the other advocates of the Agency's enlargement argued that it was only by allowing non-Zionists to share in the responsibility for the work in Palestine that the latter could be pledged to share in its prosecution, and also that to quicken the development of the National Home would result in strengthening Zionism itself.

After prolonged debate, the Congress decided in favour of the establishment of a Council of the Jewish Agency consisting of an equal number of Zionists and non-Zionists, provided that the activities of the Agency were conducted on the following "inviolable principles"—namely, (*a*) a continuous increase in the volume of Jewish immigration, (*b*) the redemption of the land as Jewish public property, (*c*) agricultural colonisation based on Jewish labour, and (*d*) the Hebrew language and Hebrew culture. It was also laid down that the method by which the various communities should appoint their representatives should in each case be settled by agreement in accordance with local conditions, and should, so far as possible, take the form of democratic elections; that 40 per cent. of the seats allotted to bodies other than the Zionist Organisation should be reserved for the Jewish community of the United States; and that the President of the Zionist Organisation should be the President of the enlarged Agency.

The text of the Vienna resolutions was communicated to the Colonial Office, which had been informed from the very beginning of the steps taken for the extension of the Jewish Agency, and the Colonial Office asked for an assurance that it would receive reports of future developments. The situation became unfavourable, however, for any further progress for nearly eighteen months owing to the controversy that resulted from the campaign launched in

the United States by the Joint Distribution Committee (an American Jewish organisation engaged in relief work on an extensive scale in Eastern Europe and other parts of the world) for a 15 million dollar fund to be utilised largely for the purpose of a scheme of Jewish colonisation in Southern Russia. The leading figures in that organisation were largely identical with those in the movement which had led to the convening of the New York non-partisan Conference, and the Russian scheme was regarded with disfavour by many American Zionists. It was not until Dr. Weizmann's arrival in the United States in October, 1926, that the situation began to improve and negotiations with Mr. Marshall and his associates were resumed. An agreement was signed between Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Marshall on January 17th 1927, as to the desirability and feasibility of organising a Jewish Agency in accordance with the terms of the Palestine Mandate and along the general lines of the resolutions of the Vienna Congress. The agreement further provided for the setting up of "an impartial and authoritative Commission for the two-fold purpose of carrying out a detailed survey of the economic resources and possibilities of Palestine, and of framing a long-term programme of constructive work in Palestine for the reorganised Jewish Agency." The immediate result of this agreement was the appointment of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission, consisting of Lord Melchett,¹ Dr. Lee K. Frankel and Mr. Felix Warburg (of New York), and Mr. Oscar Wassermann (of Berlin, a director of the Deutsche Bank). The terms of reference were set forth in a letter addressed to the members of the Commission by Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Marshall on June 1st, 1927. All the members of the Commission visited Palestine in 1927 or 1928, and they were assisted there by a number of expert advisers, who carried out detailed investigations. The principal experts were Sir John Campbell (immigration and settlement), Professor Elwood Mead and Professor J. G. Lipman (agricultural colonisation), Dr. Leo Wolman (labour and co-operative institutions), and Professor Milton Rosenau (public health).

The Fifteenth Zionist Congress, which met at Basle from August 30th to September 11th, 1927, in the interval between the appointment of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission and

¹ Lord Melchett (1868-1930), born Alfred Moritz Mond, was a member of the House of Commons from 1906 to 1928, and a member of the British Government as First Commissioner of Works, 1916-21, and Minister of Health, 1921-2. He was one of Great Britain's leading industrialists, first Chairman of the Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., and founder and first Chairman of the Economic Board for Palestine.

the publication of its report, again discussed the question of the reorganisation of the Jewish Agency at considerable length. The policy laid down by the Congress of 1925 was reaffirmed. Resolutions were adopted expressing the hope that the Agency would represent, on a democratic basis, the principal Jewish communities of the world, especially the *Yishuv* of Eretz Israel, and would include representatives of organised Jewish labour; and the Executive were requested energetically to continue their negotiations with the Jewish communities of the various countries concerned. The Fifteenth Congress was also marked by a very animated and at times bitter debate about the causes of the economic depression then existing in Palestine. A strong desire was expressed to bring about a state of consolidation in the agricultural settlements, to practise rigid economy, and to eliminate party influences from the deliberations of the Executive. A change was therefore made in the composition of the Executive by confining it, for the first time, to General Zionists and excluding representatives of the Mizrahi and Labour. In addition to Weizmann and Sokolow, the Executive elected for London consisted of Dr. M. D. Eder, Louis Lipsky, and Felix Rosenblueth, while the Executive for Palestine consisted of Colonel Kisch, Mr. Harry Sacher, and Miss Henrietta Szold. Dr. Eder resigned in July, 1928, and his place was filled by Professor Selig Brodetsky. The Palestine Executive had a hard struggle to consolidate the settlements on an income that was inadequate to their requirements, but, in the latter part of their term, they experienced the satisfaction of seeing an improvement in the general situation.

Early in June, 1928, the members of the Joint Palestine Survey Commission met in London to consider the findings of their expert advisers, and on June 18th they issued a voluminous report containing a number of important recommendations with regard to the activities of the reorganised Jewish Agency, together with a discussion of the economic resources of Palestine and its possibilities as a field for Jewish colonisation. The Commission criticised the Palestine Government's failure to facilitate "close settlement of Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes," and suggested that the Government should adopt such measures as to render certain lands available for settlement even before its completion of the cadastral survey of the country. It recommended that the Agricultural Colonisation Department of the Zionist Executive should be reorganised and conducted by the Jewish Agency on sound economic principles.

besides Dr. Weizmann and Nahum Sokolow, of the following for London: Lazarus Barth, Professor Brodetsky, Solomon Kaplansky (Labour), Louis Lipsky, Felix Rosenblueth, and Harry Sacher; and the following for Jerusalem, Rabbi Meir Berlin (Mizrachi), Colonel Kisch, Dr. Ruppin, Joseph Sprinzak (Labour), and Miss Henrietta Szold.

No sooner was the Congress over than the scene changed. On the afternoon of Sunday, August 11th, in an atmosphere almost of festivity, Dr. Weizmann opened the constituent meeting of the Council of the enlarged Jewish Agency. The various communities that had agreed to participate were represented by 100 non-Zionist members of the Council, and there was an equal number of Zionist members elected the previous day by the Congress. There were also 300 deputy-members (to fill the places of any members who might leave before the conclusion of the proceedings), as well as 200 Press correspondents and 1,500 visitors. It was a gathering of unique significance, for after seven years of animated discussions and earnest negotiations between people of differing views on both sides of the Atlantic, union had at length been established for the purpose of furthering the rebuilding of Palestine as the land of Israel. It was a demonstration of solidarity far more impressive than the First Zionist Congress held thirty-two years before. The occasion was graced by the presence on the platform of a brilliant array of Jewish notabilities, who had come to declare their faith in the future of their people in its national homeland and their gratification at the historic step now taken to achieve their goal. Side by side with Dr. Weizmann and his veteran colleagues, Sokolow and Ussishkin, sat the first High Commissioner for Palestine, Sir Herbert Samuel, the celebrated scientist, Professor Albert Einstein, the leader of British industry, Lord Melchett, the distinguished French statesman, Leon Blum, the leader of American Jewry, Louis Marshall, the President of the Anglo-Jewish Board of Deputies, Sir Osmond d'Avigdor-Goldsmid, the German financier, Oscar Wassermann, and the famous novelist, Shalom Asch. There were also present representatives of the Swiss Government and of the Mandates Section of the League of Nations to add their good wishes for the success of the new development, and venerable Rabbis from Palestine, Poland and other lands bestowed their blessings.

The proceedings, which lasted four days, were marked by a spirit of concord, and even the Radical Zionists declared that they now submitted to the decision of the majority and would

willingly collaborate. After speeches and debates on the main aspects of the work in Palestine, Dr. Weizmann was elected President of the Jewish Agency, Mr. Louis Marshall was elected Chairman and Lord Melchett Associate-Chairman of the Council, and Mr. Felix Warburg (1871-1937) Chairman of the Administrative Committee. The constitution, which had been previously hammered out by representatives of the Zionist Organisation and of American Jewry, was adopted unanimously and without discussion. Its main features were that the enlarged Jewish Agency should have three governing bodies—a Council of about 200 members, an Administrative Committee of forty, and a small Executive, each body to be composed of an equal number of Zionists and non-Zionists. The Council, corresponding to the Zionist Congress, was to meet once in two years; and the Administrative Committee, corresponding to the Zionist General Council, was to meet (so far as circumstances permitted) once in six months. The President of the Zionist Organisation was always to be President of the Jewish Agency. The Executive was to consist, until September 30th, 1930, of twelve persons, eight Zionists and four non-Zionists, but, after that date, of four Zionists and four non-Zionists.¹ The Executive offices of the Agency were fixed in Jerusalem, but it was provided that "an office of the Agency shall be maintained in London under the direction of the President, in conjunction with such members of the Executive as may be designated by the Council in consultation with the President, and shall be especially charged with the conduct of business between the Mandatory Power and the Agency." The Keren Hayesod was declared to be the main financial instrument of the Agency for the purpose of covering its budget. The Council approved the Palestine budget passed by the Congress, but with the proviso that the Administrative Committee had the right to make changes in regard to matters of detail that might be necessitated by practical requirements.

The organisation and status of the Jewish National Fund and its relations with the Zionist Organisation were left intact, and all lands acquired with funds derived from the Jewish Agency were to be purchased through the medium and in the name of the Jewish National Fund. After the adoption of the constitution followed the ceremonial act of the signing of the document. Weizmann and Sokolow signed on behalf of the Zionist Organisation, and then came twenty representatives of the non-Zionists of nearly as many

¹ The first non-Zionist members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency were Dr. Bernhard Kahn (1929-39), Dr. Maurice B. Hexter (1929-38), Dr. Werner Senator (1929-39), and Mr. Julius Simon (1929-31).

countries.¹ Palestine was included among them, for as the constitution defined "non-Zionist" as "a person associated with the Agency otherwise than in the capacity of a member and representative of the Zionist Organisation," the *Vaad Leumi* elected six members to the non-Zionist section of the Council.

The assumption by the enlarged Jewish Agency of the principal activities connected with the establishment of the Jewish National Home did not, in practice, appreciably diminish the sphere or volume of activity of the Zionist Organisation, as the major part of the burden continued to rest upon it, and it continued to devote itself to Zionist propaganda, the furtherance of Hebrew culture, and the raising of funds. Moreover, all questions that had to be ultimately decided by the Administrative Committee or by the Council of the Agency were first discussed by the Zionist General Council or by the Congress. There was one question, however, upon which the British Government itself had to pronounce: Would the Zionist Organisation, after having yielded its rights to the reconstituted Jewish Agency, be allowed, in the event of a dissolution of the partnership, to resume the status accorded to it in the Palestine Mandate? Immediately after the inaugural meeting of the Council of the Agency, the Zionist Executive, in a letter dated September 16th, 1929, notified the Government of the reconstitution of the Agency and asked the crucial question. Practical recognition of the reformed Agency was immediately accorded both by the Colonial Office and the Government of Palestine, but no formal reply to the letter was sent until nearly a year later. In a communication dated August 6th, 1930, the Colonial Office notified the Executive of the formal recognition of the enlarged Agency, and referred to the question of the possible return to the *status quo* in the following terms:

"In the event of the dissolution of the enlarged Agency, His Majesty's Government, on being notified by the Zionist Organisation that the enlarged Agency has been dissolved, will, provided they are satisfied that its organisation and constitution are at that time appropriate, recognise the Zionist Organisation as the Jewish Agency for the purpose of Article 4 of the Mandate for Palestine, and the Organisation shall in that event be deemed

¹ There were three signatories for the United States (Louis Marshall, Felix Warburg, and Lee K. Frankel), two each for Poland and Rumania, and Sir Osmond d'Avigdor-Goldmid signed for the British Empire, including Great Britain, Northern Ireland and Irish Free State, Canada, and South Africa. Louis Marshall died in Zurich only a few days after the conclusion of the Conference.

to have reverted in all respects to the status which it possessed before the enlargement of the Agency."

The unusual delay in the despatch of this reply was due to a séquence of disastrous events, which began even before the Zurich deliberations had come to a close and which threatened to shatter all the grandiose hopes that had been built upon the memorable assembly.

OUTRAGES, ENQUIRIES, AND CONGRESSES

THE Jews had always hoped that the benefits which their development of Palestine conferred upon the Arabs would naturally result in the process of time in the latter becoming reconciled to the Balfour Declaration. Despite the unprovoked attacks upon them in 1921, they made every effort to live on terms of friendship and goodwill with their Arab neighbours. Not only did they adopt solemn declarations to this effect at Zionist Congresses and on other occasions and reaffirm them in official documents, but they sought to realise them in various spheres of daily life—social, economic, and cultural. Apart from the thousands of Arabs employed in the old Jewish agricultural settlements, hundreds found work in the new industrial undertakings directly due to Zionist enterprise. Arab landowners enriched themselves by selling land to Jews, Arab farmers by disposing of their agricultural produce to them, and Arab landlords by letting houses and other property. Arab patients were welcomed at Jewish hospitals, and Arab students at Jewish technical classes and the Hebrew University Library. But although there were improved relations with some sections of the Arab community, the antagonism of its politicians to the Balfour Declaration continued. For seven years the peace was outwardly preserved, but beneath the surface the Arab Executive bided their time. Soon after the departure of Lord Plumer in the summer of 1928, an incident occurred which, though apparently at first only an affront to Jewish religious sentiment, gradually led to a calamity with far-reaching consequences.

The incident had its origin in the Jewish veneration for the Western Wall, that remnant of the ancient Temple, before which Jews had wept and prayed for many centuries. Unfortunately the Wall was part of the exterior of the Haram al-Sherif, the sacred area containing the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque of El Aksa, the third holiest sanctuary of Islam. On the eve of the Day of Atonement in 1928, in addition to the usual appurtenances of religious worship, including an Ark with the Scrolls of the Law, that were brought to the pavement before the Wall, a temporary canvas screen had been placed against the Wall to divide the male from the female worshippers in accordance with strict

orthodox practice. The screen had been used ten days before, on the Jewish New Year, without any objection being raised by the authorities. But on this occasion the Deputy District-Commissioner of Jerusalem received a complaint on the eve of the holy day from the guardian of the *Wakf* (Moslem charitable endowment) that the screen constituted a transgression of the Moslem rights of property. He therefore ordered that the offending object should be removed and as his instruction was not obeyed by the Jewish beadle, because its execution would have involved a violation of the most sacred day in the Jewish calendar, he had the screen forcibly taken away by a police officer at a solemn moment in the morning service. This act not only shocked and alarmed the throng of devout worshippers, who could not understand how such an outrage could be committed by a British official, but aroused a storm of protest throughout the Jewish world. The Zionist Organisation petitioned the League of Nations to assure the Jews free and undisturbed worship before the Wall, whereupon the Arabs made an appeal to the Moslem world and spread a legend about Jewish designs against the holy places of Islam. In order to emphasise their legal rights, the Arabs built an extension above the northern part of the Wall, ostensibly to screen the women's apartments of the Mufti's house, and they stationed a muezzin on a nearby roof to call to prayer five times a day and thus disturb the Jewish worshippers. The Jews reacted by sending strongly worded petitions to the Government in Jerusalem and London. The outcome was the issue in November, 1928, of a White Paper, which stated that the *status quo* in regard to Jewish worship before the Wall must be maintained: "that the Jewish community have a right of access to the pavement for their devotions, but they may bring to the Wall only those appurtenances of worship which were permitted under the Turkish régime." But the Government omitted to define the appurtenances for which the Jews could claim a prescriptive right.

The arrival of the new High Commissioner, Sir John Chancellor, in November, 1928, seemed to herald a period of peace and quiet, as he displayed much concern for the economic development of the country, and the early months of 1929 witnessed the beginning of such important undertakings as the construction of the Haifa Harbour and the exploitation of the mineral salts of the Dead Sea. The question of the Wall receded from public notice for a brief spell, but early in the summer the Arabs began to open a passage from the Haram to the pavement, so that the place before the

Wall, hitherto a blind alley, would be converted into a thoroughfare. The Jews vehemently protested against this structural alteration, but the Government, after obtaining the advice of the law officers of the Mandatory, allowed it to continue, while warning the Moslem authorities against interfering with Jewish worship. The High Commissioner then went to Geneva, in June, 1929, to render an account to the Permanent Mandates Commission, which was holding its annual enquiry into the work of the Palestine Administration. He presented a hopeful report on the general situation, but urged that it was necessary to give a definite ruling on the question of Jewish rights in regard to the Wall. During the sitting of the Commission the Moslems caused further annoyance by arranging in a room in the Haram area, close to the Jews' praying place, a cacophonous ceremony known as the *Zikr* (the invocation of God accompanied by the beating of drums and cymbals), which made it almost impossible for the worshippers to engage in their devotions. The Government had the nuisance stopped for a few weeks, but the alterations for the opening of the passage continued. Moreover, the Arabs engaged in an inflammatory propaganda, in which they accused the Jews of designs upon the Mosque of Omar itself. The agitation was organised by a "Society for the Protection of the Moslem Holy Places," which provoked the formation of a "Pro-Wailing Wall Committee," but while the Moslem Society was founded and controlled by the Mufti and the Arab Executive in general, the Jewish Committee was discountenanced by the Zionist Executive. The object of the Mufti was to mobilise on a religious issue the public opinion of the Moslems, which he had been unable to arouse on purely political grounds, and at the same time to secure for himself the united support of all sections in the retention of the office of President of the Supreme Moslem Council, to which he had been appointed only for a limited number of years. In such an atmosphere only a spark was needed to cause a conflagration.

August 15th, the day after the conclusion of the Jewish Agency meeting, was the Fast of Ab, commemorating the destruction of the Temple, when it was customary for large numbers of Jews to assemble before the Wall to bewail the glory of the past and to pray for its return. On this solemn anniversary a gathering of Jewish youths of the Revisionist Party, under a heavy police escort, held a demonstration at the Wall, for which they had official permission, raised a Zionist flag, and then dispersed quietly. On the following day a very much larger crowd of Arabs, but with a much smaller

police escort, also engaged in a demonstration at the same place and likewise with official permission; but before they disbanded they destroyed a cabinet containing Jewish prayer-books, burned the books as well as petitions (inserted by the pious in the crevices of the Wall), and attacked and tore the clothes of the Jewish beadle. Passions began to rise, stimulated by an attack upon a young Jew, who, while playing football, was stabbed by an Arab and died two days later. On Friday, August 23rd, the storm broke in full fury.

A crowd of Arab villagers who emerged from the Haram, where they had been addressed by the Mufti, and who were armed with sticks, knives, daggers and firearms, immediately attacked Jews in various parts of Jerusalem. An orgy of savagery, murder, and looting ensued, which spread from the city to a number of small agricultural settlements and even to Haifa, lasting for seven days. Motza, a few miles west of Jerusalem, Artuf in the Judean Hills, Hulda in the foothills, and Beer Tuvia near to Gaza, were laid waste by bands of armed Arabs. The most horrible attack of all was made upon the Jews of Hebron, many of them students at a Talmudical college: of the 500 men, women, and children, over sixty were killed and over fifty seriously wounded. The Government, taken by surprise, were unable to quell the disorders with their greatly reduced forces, so that troops had to be hurried to the scene from Egypt and Malta. A proposal of the Jewish authorities, that a large number of Jews nominated by them should be armed by the Government for the purpose of assisting in the defence of their fellow Jews, was declined, and even Jewish special constables (including British subjects) were disarmed, on the ground that the feelings of the Arabs must not be "further excited." Unfortunately help arrived too late to prevent an attack on the seventh day upon the Jews at Safed, where the mob murdered about twenty men, women and children, and destroyed 120 houses and shops. Altogether the Jewish victims numbered 133 killed and 339 wounded, while of the Arabs—largely as the result of firing by the military and police—116 were killed and 232 wounded. The High Commissioner hastily returned to Palestine, and issued a proclamation in which he strongly condemned the "savage murders perpetrated upon defenceless members of the Jewish population"; and, as the Arabs protested against this language, he published another proclamation a few days later, stating that enquiry would be made into the conduct of both sides.

This week of outrage caused a moral setback in the country,

embittered relations between Jews and Arabs, and undermined confidence in the Government, which was attacked from both sides. It aroused a storm of indignation among the Jews throughout the world, produced a most painful impression upon public opinion in general, and brought upon the British Government a veritable avalanche of scathing criticism. The Jewish people responded to the crisis by contributing over £600,000 to an Emergency Fund, which was expended on relief and reconstruction. The Palestine Administration allocated £100,000 from its own funds in partial payment of compensation to the sufferers, about nine-tenths being given to the Jewish victims and the remainder to innocent Arabs. Conditions of security were immediately improved by increasing both the military and the police forces; the British police were largely distributed in a manner designed for the protection of the Jewish colonies; and the sealed armouries for self-defence, which had been previously given to the colonies by the Government and gradually withdrawn, were now restored.¹ The law courts were busy for months with the trials of over 600 persons accused of crimes in connection with the riots. Of the Arabs 55 were condemned for murder, 17 for attempted murder, 150 for looting and arson, and 219 for minor offences, but only three of the murderers were executed, while the rest were reprieved. Two Jews of Tel-Aviv were convicted of the murder of Arabs, but their sentences, after appeal, were commuted to terms of imprisonment.

The political aftermath was of prolonged duration: there was a succession of official enquiries with a torrent of discussion and controversy that lasted some years, and threatened not only the stability, but the very future of the National Home. On September 6th, 1929, the Foreign Secretary (Arthur Henderson) stated at the meeting of the Council of the League of Nations that the British Government intended to despatch a Commission of Enquiry, whose task would be "limited to the immediate urgency, and would not extend to questions of major policy." Seven days later the Commission was appointed by the Colonial Office "to enquire into the immediate causes which led to the recent outbreak in Palestine and to make recommendations as to the steps necessary to avoid a recurrence." It consisted of Sir Walter Shaw as Chairman and of the following representatives of the three political

¹ After the disorders of May, 1921, the Government furnished outlying Jewish colonies with a stock of rifles and ammunition to be held under seal by the headman, and to be used only in case of emergency. From June, 1924, in consequence of the improved conditions, the arms were gradually withdrawn over a period of years, although they were still in possession of some colonies in August, 1929.

parties: Sir Henry Betterton (Conservative), Mr. Hopkin Morris (Liberal), and Mr. Harry (later Lord) Snell (Labour). In announcing the appointment, the Colonial Secretary, Lord Passfield (formerly Sidney Webb), reaffirmed the statement of the Foreign Secretary that the enquiry was "limited to the immediate emergency" and would not "extend to considerations of major policy."

The Commission held sessions in Jerusalem from October 25th to December 29th, 1929. Unlike the Haycraft Commission of 1921, it sat as a public Court of Enquiry, with power to summon witnesses, to take evidence on oath, and to hear counsel on behalf of the Palestine Government, the Jewish Agency and the Arabs. The Agency was represented by Sir Frank Boyd (now Lord) Merriman, K.C., M.P., assisted by Lord Erleigh (now Marquess of Reading), K.C., and other advocates; the Arabs were represented by an ex-Colonial judge, Mr. Stoker, K.C., with the help of several Arab lawyers; and the interests of the Palestine Government were looked after by Mr. Kenelm Preedy and the Solicitor-General of the Administration (the Attorney-General, Norman Bentwich, being deemed to be precluded as a Jew from taking part). It became evident after some weeks that the Commission was not limiting its enquiry to the terms of reference, and that the Arabs, anxious to divert attention from the acts of murder and pillage, were astutely doing their utmost to concentrate interest upon their alleged economic grievances and their political aspirations. In order, therefore, to prevent the Commission from trespassing beyond its province, Lord Balfour, Mr. Lloyd George, and General Smuts, members of the War Cabinet that was responsible for the Balfour Declaration, published a letter in *The Times* of December 20th, 1929, in which they called attention to the Commission's "limited terms of reference to enquire into specific matters," and urged on the Government that the Commission must be supplemented by "an authoritative Commission" to hold "a searching enquiry into the major questions of policy and administration." In reply to a question in the House of Commons arising out of this letter, the Prime Minister (Ramsay MacDonald) stated on December 23rd that matters of major policy were definitely "outside the terms of reference of the Shaw Commission" and could not be made a part of its report. He amplified this statement in the House of Commons on March 24th, 1930, when he declared that major questions of policy were for the Government to decide and would not be affected by the Shaw Commission's Report.

The "Report of the Commission on the Palestine disturbances of August, 1929"¹ was published on March 31st, 1930. It found that the outbreak in Jerusalem "was from the beginning an attack by Arabs on Jews, for which no excuse in the form of earlier murders by Jews has been established." It did not find that the outbreak was premeditated, although its own narrative of the events pointed to the opposite conclusion. There had been incitement in many districts, in which members of the Moslem hierarchy had taken part; Arab agitators had toured the country in the third week of August and summoned people to Jerusalem; the Chairman of the Arab Executive, Musa Kazim, had been seen in Jaffa on August 16th, 1929, inspecting the printing of anti-Jewish pamphlets; and rumours had been spread among the Arab workmen employed in the Jewish orange-groves at Petah Tikvah and in other centres that the Jews intended to attack the Mosque of Aksa on August 23rd. The majority of the Commission apportioned "a share in the responsibility for the disturbances" to the Mufti of Jerusalem for the part that he took in the formation of societies for the defence of the Moslem holy places, as this movement became "a not unimportant factor in the events which led to the outbreak"; they thought it probable that "individual members of the Arab Executive further exacerbated racial feeling after the disturbances had begun"; and they blamed both Mufti and Executive for failure during the week preceding the riots to make an attempt to control their followers. But they made no reference to the inclusion of the Mufti in the "Black List" of the police, dated August 23rd, 1929, which was published in the Palestine Press. Mr. Snell contributed a long note of Reservations, in which he dissociated himself from the general attitude of his colleagues towards the Palestine problem as well as from some of their criticisms and conclusions. He attributed to the Mufti "a greater share in the responsibility for the disturbance than is attributed to him in the Report," and found it "difficult to believe that the actions of individual members of the Executive were unknown to that body, or, indeed, that those individuals were acting in a purely personal capacity." He also rejected the conclusions of the majority, "acquitting the Moslem religious authorities of all but the slightest blame for the innovations introduced in the neighbourhood of the Wailing Wall."

The Commission dealt leniently with the question of the responsibility of the Palestine Administration. It found nothing wrong in

¹ *Command Paper 3590 of 1930.*

the Government disarming British Jews, although the authorities were unable to afford the Jews adequate protection; and it delicately refrained from mentioning that several of the Jews disarmed had served in the First World War, and that some of them had held the King's Commission. Mr. Snell dissented from the majority, and blamed the Government "for not having issued an official communiqué denying that the Jews had designs on the Moslem holy places." But, although the majority sought to exonerate the Government, they pointed out that the Arab police had proved unreliable and the Intelligence Service inadequate. It was probably out of regard for the feelings of the Government that the Commission refrained from mentioning that during the early days of the riots one of the cries most in use among the Arabs was "The Government is with us!" and also that, in the closing speech on the Jewish side at the Enquiry, Sir Boyd Merriman complained of the antagonistic attitude adopted by the Government counsel towards the Jewish witnesses in contrast to the leniency shown in the cross-examination of the Arab witnesses.

In dealing with the causes of the outbreak, the Commission stated that the fundamental cause was "the Arab feeling of animosity and hostility towards the Jews consequent upon the disappointment of their political and national aspirations and fear for their economic future." In fact, between 1921 and 1929 there had been increasing instances of co-operation and fraternisation between Jews and Arabs; and during the riots many Arabs had declined to take part in the attacks and had even protected Jews exposed to danger. Mr. Snell was very much nearer the truth when he declared that "many of the immediate causes of the riots . . . were of a temporary rather than of a fundamental character, and were due to fears and antipathies, which . . . the Moslem and Arab leaders awakened and fostered for political needs."² The majority of the Commission also included among the immediate causes—in addition to the incidents connected with the Wailing Wall, incendiary propaganda, and exciting Press articles—"the enlargement of the Jewish Agency." It is doubtful whether any of the murderers of Hebron and Safed, where half of the Jewish victims were killed, had ever heard of the Jewish Agency or its enlargement.

The Report made a number of recommendations, some of them urgently necessary, while the others had little or nothing to do with the troubles. Two of the recommendations—namely, the

² *Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929*, p. 172.

appointment of a special Commission to determine the rights and claims in connection with the Wailing Wall and the reorganisation of the police—were promptly acted upon by the British Government. But the other main recommendations justified the worst fears of those who had been anxious that the Commission should not trespass beyond its terms of reference. Despite the repeated assurance given by the Government, the Report dealt with questions of immigration, land, and constitutional development, and culminated in the proposal that the Government should issue a new statement of policy. The majority of the Commission had been impressed by the stories they had heard of an Arab landless proletariat, said to have been caused by Jewish purchases of land, and seemed to suggest that the existence of such a class had also contributed to the outbreak. Yet not a single witness had testified that he represented the "landless proletariat," nor, of all the Arabs accused and found guilty of attacks upon Jews and Jewish property, had a single one been able to urge by way of extenuation that he had been evicted from his holding by a Jew or that he had suffered in any other way through the settlement of Jews. The majority of the Commission recommended that the new statement should contain "a definition in clear and positive terms" of the meaning that the Government attached to the passages in the Mandate providing for "the safeguarding of the rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine." Mr. Snell, who expressly dissociated himself from their view, stated that what was required in Palestine was less a change of policy than a change of mind on the part of the Arab population, who had been encouraged to believe that the Jewish immigrants were a permanent menace to their livelihood and future; and he recommended that any land found to be unexploited should be made available to the Jews.

The uneasiness caused in Zionist circles by the contents of the Report prompted Dr. Weizmann to write a letter to *The Times* (April 3rd, 1930), in the course of which he asked: "Is the policy of the Jewish National Home in Palestine—the policy of the Mandate—to be reaffirmed, encouraged, or arrested? . . . The first word is on policy, and that word is now with Britain, and to Britain and to Britain's leaders the Jews of the world—not only of Palestine—are looking." The answer came the same afternoon from the Prime Minister, who stated in the House of Commons:

"His Majesty's Government will continue to administer Palestine in accordance with the terms of the Mandate as

approved by the League of Nations. That is an international obligation from which there can be no receding. . . . It is the firm resolve of His Majesty's Government to give effect in equal measure to both parts of the [Balfour] Declaration, and to do equal justice to all sections of the population of Palestine. That is a duty from which they will not shrink, and to the discharge of which they will apply all the resources at their command."

But a few weeks later two things happened which seemed scarcely consistent with this statement of policy. On May 6th Sir John Hope Simpson was appointed a Government Commissioner to report on questions of immigration, land settlement and development, and ten days later the Palestine Government ordered the suspension of the bulk of the 3,300 immigration certificates sanctioned under the Labour Schedule approved on May 12th. It was stated that this suspension was a temporary measure, "with a view to ensuring that immigration in the intervening period [i.e. pending the publication of the Commissioner's Report] shall not be such as to endanger the economic future of the country." The Zionist Executive entered an emphatic protest against this action, whereupon the British Government declared that it "was of a purely temporary and provisional character," and that there had been "no cancellation of certificates." On May 27th the Government issued a White Paper¹ containing the text of the statement to be made by its accredited representative at the forthcoming meeting of the Mandates Commission. It set forth that a two-fold duty was imposed on the Mandatory Power by the terms of the Mandate and that the balance had consequently to be held by the Government between two conflicting interests; that in substance the Shaw Commission's Report (including its findings on questions of major policy) was accepted; that the questions of immigration and land transfer were under examination; that no steps could be taken in the direction of self-government unless they were compatible with the requirements of the Mandate; and that a more explicit statement of policy would be issued after the receipt of Sir John Hope Simpson's Report.

The Mandates Commission subjected the Shaw Report to trenchant criticism. It refused to accept the conclusion that the anti-Jewish attack had not been premeditated, and passed strictures upon the Mandatory for its lack of foresight and preparedness. It declared that the "charge against the Palestine Government, that

¹ *Command Paper 3582* (1930).

it has not fulfilled, by actual deeds, the obligation to encourage the establishment of the Jewish National Home, has been notably reinforced by the fact that the Government has shown itself unable to provide the essential conditions for the development of the Jewish National Home—security for persons and property.” The British Government, in its written reply, rebutted the criticism passed upon the findings of the Shaw Commission and repelled the reproaches directed at its policy. It declared that it was not its duty to establish the Jewish National Home, but that it was “the function of the Jews themselves.” It defined its own responsibility as consisting in “placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home . . . and the development of self-governing institutions, and also the safeguarding of the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion,” and it observed that the difficulty in fulfilling the first two objects was further increased by the addition of the third. The tartness of the British rejoinder prompted the *Rapporteur* of the Mandates Commission, M. Procope, at the meeting of the Council of the League in September, 1930, to adopt a more conciliatory tone, and while not receding from the Commission’s position, to emphasise the points of agreement between them. The British Foreign Secretary, in his reply, followed suit: he declared that the obligations laid down by the Mandate in regard to the two sections of the population were of equal weight, that these two obligations were in no sense irreconcilable, and that it was the fixed determination of the British Government that “their policy in Palestine shall be governed by these two fundamental principles.”

The next stage in the battle for the Jewish National Home was waged in connection with the investigations made by Sir John Hope Simpson. He was a former Indian Government official, without any special knowledge of the basic problems underlying the Palestine Mandate or of Palestine itself. He was in the country from May 20th to July 27th, 1930, and his “Report on Immigration, Land Settlement and Development”¹ appeared on the following October 21st, simultaneously with another White Paper, the “Statement of Policy by His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom.”² The Report was a disappointment, as it gave a much lower estimate of the cultivable area of the country than had hitherto been accepted; it implied that Jewish colonisation

¹ *Command Paper* 3686.

² *Command Paper* 3692.

had resulted in the displacement of a large number of Arab peasants; and it declared that, apart from the lands held by the Jews in reserve, there was "with the present methods of Arab cultivation no margin of land available for agricultural settlement by new immigrants." The Jewish Agency Executive in London, after making enquiries of their colleagues in Palestine with a view to the verification of the data on which Sir John Hope Simpson's principal conclusions were based, published a brief analysis of the statistical foundations of this Report,¹ which was later (May 31st) laid before the Mandates Commission.² In this memorandum the Agency challenged him on his facts and contended that his findings were "based on doubtful assumptions, on hastily compiled statistics, and on a misreading of material submitted to him." The Mandates Commission was subsequently assured that the British Government recognised that the facts were in dispute and called for further investigation.

Much more objectionable, however, and indeed alarming, was the accompanying White Paper, which, as it was issued under the authority of Lord Passfield, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, came to be known by his name. This document constituted a disquieting sequel to the Churchill White Paper of 1922, for it went much farther in whittling down the meaning of the Balfour Declaration and the articles of the Mandate. It foreshadowed fresh restrictions in regard to immigration, which would have been a clear departure from the principles laid down in that earlier White Paper. It threatened the Jews with an embargo on further purchases of land, as a result of Sir John Hope Simpson's questionable figures, which had been accepted without any investigation as to their reliability. But, worse still, it commented upon the work of the Jews in Palestine in disparaging terms that were utterly incompatible with the friendly attitude naturally

¹ *The Statistical Bases of Sir John Hope Simpson's Report* (London, 1931). This memorandum showed that Simpson's conclusions were based upon four figures, each of which was of vital importance for a correct appraisal of the situation, and each of which was of doubtful value. By wrongly defining cultivable land as land under cultivation, he cut down the area of cultivable land in Palestine from 12,000,000 to 8,000,000 *dunams* (or 6,500,000 *dunams* without Beersheba); and he reduced the area of cultivable land in the hills by 54 per cent. largely on the basis of an unchecked aerial survey of one-tenth of the hill district. He wrongly estimated that there were 86,980 Arab families dependent upon the land by assuming the very low co-efficient of 5.5 persons per family and ignoring the fact that residents in rural districts included a substantial proportion of persons not dependent on agriculture for a livelihood. He was also incorrect in estimating that 29.4 per cent. of the rural Arab families were landless, and that at least 1.30 *dunams* was required to maintain a peasant family in a decent standard of life (the "lot viable").

² Minutes of the 20th Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission (June, 1931), p. 74.

expected from the Mandatory Power, and entirely omitted to give them credit for the benefits which they had conferred upon Palestine and its people. The effect was to leave Dr. Weizmann, who had always pursued a policy of co-operation with the British Government, no alternative but to resign the Presidency of the Zionist Organisation and of the Jewish Agency, a decision of which he notified the Government on the day of publication of the White Paper. In a letter to Lord Passfield, he pointed out that the White Paper went far towards "denying the rights and sterilising the hopes of the Jewish people in regard to the National Home in Palestine," so far as it was in the power of the Government to do so, and aimed at "crystallising the development of the Jewish National Home at its present stage." Dr. Weizmann's resignation was followed by that of Mr. Felix Warburg from the Chairmanship of the Jewish Agency Administrative Committee, and by that of Lord Melchett from the Chairmanship of the Council.

The Jews were not alone in regarding the White Paper as an infringement of the Mandate. It was denounced by the two surviving members of the War Cabinet, Mr. Lloyd George and General Smuts; it was severely attacked in *The Times* by leading statesmen of all parties, including Lord Hailsham and Sir John (now Lord) Simon, who wrote with the additional authority of eminent jurists; and it formed the subject of a debate in the House of Commons, on November 17th, in which the Zionist standpoint met with general sympathy. The upshot was that the Government agreed to set up a Committee of Cabinet Ministers to discuss the situation with representatives of the Jewish Agency. Dr. Weizmann was requested by the Zionist General Council, which was at the time in session in London, to carry on the duties of his office until the next Congress, and he and other members of the Agency Executive took part in the discussions, over which the Foreign Secretary presided.

The outcome of these discussions, which extended over two months, was the publication on February 13th, 1931, of a statement in the form of a letter from the Prime Minister to Dr. Weizmann. This letter, while not repudiating the White Paper, explained away and negatived its objectionable passages, and was couched throughout in a friendly and reassuring tone. It expressly reaffirmed the Preamble to the Mandate, and recognised that "the Jewish Agency has all along given willing co-operation in carrying out the policy of the Mandate, and that the constructive work done by the Jewish people in Palestine has had beneficent effects on the

development and well-being of the country as a whole." It made it clear that "the obligation to facilitate Jewish immigration and to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land remains a positive obligation of the Mandate." It stated that a careful enquiry would be made into the number of alleged "displaced Arabs" (which had been advanced by the Shaw Commission as one of the contributory causes of the riots), that a comprehensive enquiry would also be made to ascertain "what State and other lands are, or properly can be made, available for close settlement by Jews," and that it was the Government's "definite intention to initiate an active policy of development, which, it is believed, will result in substantial and lasting benefit to both Jews and Arabs." The text of the letter was printed in the Parliamentary Report, embodied in official instructions to the High Commissioner, and communicated to the League of Nations.

In order to give effect to the policy outlined in this letter, the Government appointed Mr. Lewis French in July, 1931, as Director of Development, and instructed him to carry out a systematic enquiry in Palestine and to draw up specific proposals in regard to agricultural development and land settlement. Mr. French was required in particular to prepare a register of "displaced Arabs"¹ and to draw up a scheme for their resettlement, to investigate the methods necessary for carrying out the Government's proposed policy of land development, and also to enquire into the question of providing credits for Arab cultivators and Jewish settlers, and proposals for draining and irrigating land. When his Reports were at length released two years later (on July 14th, 1933) they were found to be on the whole sterile on the constructive side, and ill-advised in their proposals for restrictive legislation. His general conclusion was that there was nothing, for the time being, that the Government could do for the assistance or encouragement of Jewish agricultural development, and that the exploitation of the Beisan and Huleh districts and of the Jordan Valley would not be an economic proposition. The Jewish Agency published its views in a Memorandum, in which it declared that it could not see in the Reports the outline of the scheme contemplated in the Prime Minister's letter, and that "these Reports cannot be accepted as a basis for land and development policy in Palestine in the execution of which the Jewish Agency would find

¹ The term "displaced Arabs" was defined as "such Arabs as can be shown to have been displaced from the lands which they occupied in consequence of the land passing into Jewish hands, and who have not obtained other holdings on which they can establish themselves, or other equally satisfactory occupation."

itself in a position to co-operate." One satisfactory outcome of the enquiry, however, was to establish the fact that over a period of twelve years there were only 664 "displaced Arabs."

As a practical sequel to the Reports of the various Commissions, the British Government, in May, 1934, secured the passing by Parliament of a Bill authorising the Treasury to guarantee the principal and interest of a loan not exceeding £2,000,000, to be raised by the Palestine Government, for the resettlement of displaced Arabs, agricultural credits, public buildings, and various public works. Owing to the accumulated surplus in the possession of the Palestine Government, this loan was not issued, but the Government spent £1,337,339 on account of it by March 31st, 1938. The provision of £250,000 for the resettlement of displaced Arabs was in conformity with an undertaking originally given by the British Government in the course of the Parliamentary debate on Palestine on November 17th, 1930. All the genuinely displaced Arabs who had signified their willingness to take up holdings on Government estates had been accommodated before the end of 1934.¹ The total expenditure incurred on account of the resettlement of these Arabs, up to March 31st, 1938, was only £85,796, that is about one-third of the amount provided.

In addition to the investigations by the Shaw Commission, Sir John Hope Simpson, and Mr. Lewis French, the outrages of 1929 were responsible for four other enquiries relating to the police, co-operative societies, the Administration, and the Wailing Wall respectively. A thorough investigation of the Palestine police was made by Mr. Dowbiggin, Inspector-General of the Police in Ceylon, who drew up proposals for a comprehensive scheme of reorganisation, involving a substantial increase in the proportion of Jews in the police force and an improvement of the conditions of service. In July, 1930, Mr. C. F. Strickland arrived in Palestine "to study the economic position of the *fellaheen* and to instruct officers of the District Administration and the *fellaheen* as to the objects and methods of the working of co-operative credit societies." He showed appreciation both of the progress and the possibilities of the co-operative movement among the Jewish population, and he saw in the usurious methods of the Arab moneylenders and the lamentable indebtedness of the *fellaheen* the main cause of the distressing economic conditions of the latter. Next came a commission consisting of Sir Samuel O'Donnell, K.C.S.I., and Mr. H. Brittain (of the British Treasury) to investigate the general organisation of

¹ *Report of the Palestine Government for 1934*, p. 57.

the Palestine Administration. They received a delegation representing the Jewish Agency and the *Vaad Leumi*, and Colonel Kisch, on behalf of both, made representations on a number of matters, including efficiency in the direction of special Jewish concerns, the adoption of a policy for training and increasing the number of Palestinian officials, the desirability of raising the standard of life for Arab workers and the importance of not reducing the Jewish standard, and the claim of Jewish workers to a fair share of public and municipal works.

Even before the Shaw Commission had concluded its enquiry, it recommended the appointment of a special Commission under Article 14 of the Mandate "to determine the rights and claims in connection with the Western Wall." The Council of the League of Nations accordingly decided on January 14th, 1930, to appoint an International Commission to deal with this question, the members of which were not of British nationality. The Commission consisted of Senator Löfgren, a former Minister of Foreign Affairs in Sweden, as President, Charles Barde, Vice-President of the Court of Appeal in Geneva, and Heer van Kampen, formerly Governor in the Dutch East Indies. The Commission, which began its sessions in Jerusalem on June 19th, 1930, sat for a month, and at its first meeting the President stated that the Commission would prefer that a "voluntary solution" should be found. But as negotiations for an agreement between the Jews and the Arabs proved unsuccessful, the Commission's Report was published by the Government on June 8th, 1931. It confirmed for the most part the findings of the White Paper of 1928. The recognition of the long-standing usage of the Jews to visit the Wall for devotional purposes had been clearly expressed in the documents which the Moslems themselves had produced. The Mandatory must therefore see that the Jews should have access to the Wall for their devotions at all times. The Commission restricted the right of the Jews to bring the Scrolls of the Law to special occasions, and upheld the prohibition against blowing the *Shofar* (ram's horn). On the other hand, the Moslems were forbidden to annoy or interfere with the Jews during their prayers either by the practice of the *Zikr*, by repairing any buildings adjacent to the Wall in such a way as to encroach on the pavement, or by impeding the access of the Jews to the Wall.

The Reports of the Shaw Commission and of Sir John Hope Simpson, as well as the Prime Minister's letter, naturally formed the principal subjects of discussion at the Seventeenth Zionist Congress, which was held at Basle from June 30th to July 15th,

1931, and at the meeting of the Council of the Jewish Agency, which followed immediately afterwards. Both assemblies expressed appreciation of those assurances in the letter that showed the desire of the Mandatory Government to allay the grave misgivings of the Jewish people aroused by the Passfield White Paper, but they noted that the letter was not a complete statement of policy and contained reservations affording grounds for apprehension, and they therefore regarded it as a basis for further discussions of the Jewish Agency with the Mandatory Government. In particular, they drew attention to the continued difficulties attaching to the purchase of land by Jews, to Jewish immigration, and to the employment of Jewish labour on public works in Palestine. On the subject of Jewish-Arab relations, the Council of the Agency again placed on record its earnest desire for the creation of a durable understanding and instructed the Executive "to continue its work for the establishment, under the Mandate, of harmonious relations between Jews and Arabs, based on the acceptance by both parties of the principle that neither is to dominate or be dominated by the other." Dr. Weizmann, who had announced his resignation of the office of President several months before and had been requested by the General Council to continue to discharge his duties until the Congress, delivered an impressive valedictory address, in which he gave a comprehensive survey of his efforts over a period of twelve years to co-operate loyally with the British Government in all matters relating to the Jewish National Home. Mr. Sokolow was the obvious choice as his successor.

The Congress also elected a small coalition Executive consisting of Dr. Chaim Arlosoroff (1899-1933, Labour), Mr. Heschel Farbstein (Mizrachi), and Mr. Emanuel Neumann (of New York), for Jerusalem, and Professor S. Brodetsky and Mr. Berl Locker (Labour) for London. A budget of £366,000. was adopted for the work in Palestine. The Congress was also notable for the fact that the Revisionists, who at the 1925 Congress had only five delegates, now formed the third strongest party with 52, comprising one-fifth of the whole Congress of 254 delegates (the General Zionists having 84, Labour 75, the Mizrachi 35, and the Radicals 8). Jabotinsky and his colleagues not only attacked the policy that had been followed by Weizmann, but also indulged in the severest criticism of the Labour Party and of its activities in Palestine. The Revisionists constituted themselves the extreme Right Wing of the movement and systematically engaged in vehement and often violent opposition to the *Histadruth* and its leaders.

The Eighteenth Zionist Congress, which was held at Prague from August 21st to September 3rd, 1933, was overshadowed by the tragedy of German Jewry, which was sped upon its doleful course by Hitler's advent to power early in that year. The Congress solemnly protested against the policy of disfranchisement and persecution to which the Jews in Germany were subjected, called upon the League of Nations to remedy their wrongs, appealed to nations and Governments to grant asylum to the refugees from oppression, and declared it to be "the duty of the Mandatory Power to open the gates of Palestine for as large an immigration of German Jews as possible and to facilitate their settlement." It was decided to create a Central Bureau for the Settlement of German Jews in Palestine, of which Dr. Weizmann (who was absent from Congress for the first time since 1898) was elected Director. Resolutions were adopted rejecting the French reports and declaring that the decisions of the British Government, which contemplated the resettlement of a certain number of displaced Arabs and changes in the legislation regarding tenants, were in contradiction to the assurances contained in the Prime Minister's letter that the land development scheme would be of equal benefit to displaced Arabs and to Jews. The Congress proclaimed anew the wish of the Jewish people to create friendly relations with the Arabs and requested the Executive to continue its efforts to prepare the way for a collaboration of Jews and Arabs both in Western Palestine and in Transjordan. It also expressed approval of the transfer of the health and education services to the jurisdiction of the *Knesseth Israel*, which had been carried out in the previous year.

The Eighteenth Congress was also deeply agitated by the tragic fate that had overtaken Dr. Arlosoroff, the Labour member of the Executive who had been in charge of its political department in Jerusalem. He was assassinated while taking a walk with his wife on the beach of Tel-Aviv on June 16th, 1933. All the circumstances pointed to his having been the victim of political terrorism. Two young members of the Revisionist Party were arrested and charged with the murder, and one of them, Stavsky, was convicted but afterwards acquitted on appeal. The loss of their popular and talented leader produced intense bitterness in the Labour Party and increased the antagonism between them and the Revisionists, which found an occasional outlet in stormy scenes. Under the ambitious leadership of Jabotinsky, the Revisionists had organised themselves into a World Union, which acted independently of the Zionist Organisation and in opposition to the declared policy of

Congress, while at the same time there existed within the Organisation a recognised Separate Union of Revisionists who were apparently also members of the World Union. The Revisionists made their own representations to Governments and the League of Nations, they boycotted the Zionist funds, and they sought to undermine the authority and prestige of the Organisation to which they owed allegiance. The Congress dealt with this intolerable situation by passing a resolution affirming that in all Zionist questions membership of the Zionist Organisation entailed a duty of discipline in regard to its constitution and regulations, which took precedence over any duty of discipline in relation to any other body. The Revisionists were no longer united among themselves, as a minority of their delegates (7 out of 52) broke away, called themselves "Democratic Revisionists," and created the Jewish State Party under the leadership of Mr. Meir Grossman. Labour for the first time formed the strongest party. With its 138 delegates in a Congress of 318, it secured 40 per cent. of the seats on the new Executive, which consisted of General Zionists and Labour as follows: Nahum Sokolow, President, Professor Brodetsky, Louis Lipsky, Berl Locker (Labour), for London; David Ben-Gurion (Labour), Isaac Gruenbaum,¹ Eliezer Kaplan (Labour), Dr. Arthur Ruppin and Moshe Shertok (Labour), for Jerusalem; and Dr. Victor Jacobson, representative at Geneva. The Palestine budget adopted for £175,000 was the lowest on record, a reflection of the financial as well as of the political depression through which the movement was passing.

The next two years were marked by the loss of several eminent Zionist veterans, notably Leo Motzkin, who had been an indefatigable champion of Jewish rights in Central and Eastern Europe, and a most efficient Chairman of Congress sessions; Hayim Nahman Bialik (1873-1934), the national poet; Dr. Schmarya Levin (1867-1935), the popular propagandist; and Dr. Victor Jacobson, the urbane diplomatist. The interval between the Eighteenth and the Nineteenth Congress also witnessed the withdrawal from the Organisation of the Revisionist Party. In order to counteract the insubordination of Jabotinsky and his followers, and to make as widely known as possible the disciplinary obligation of members of the Organisation, the Executive had a brief clause defining this obligation printed on the Shekel voucher, which every Zionist had to buy to qualify for taking

¹ The Radical Party, of which Gruenbaum was the leader, was dissolved after the 1933 Congress, its members mostly returning to the ranks of the General Zionists.

part in the Congress elections. The first Shekalim bearing this clause appeared in September, 1934, and immediately provoked resentful criticism on the part of the Revisionists. Resolved not to conform with the prescribed regulation, they decided to break away, and on April 25th, 1935, they announced that they had seceded from the Zionist Organisation. The Jewish State Party remained within the Organisation, and some time later Jabotinsky founded the "New Zionist Organisation," which frittered away most of its energy in futile attacks on the parent body.¹

The dreadful plight of German Jewry again threw its lengthening shadow over the Nineteenth Congress, which met at Lucerne from August 20th to September 3rd, 1935. Dr. Weizmann, not being a member of the Executive, was elected President of the Congress, and, thanks to the absence of the Revisionists, the deliberations pursued a relatively smoother course. There were 463 delegates, of whom Labour, with 209, again formed the strongest party. Resolutions were adopted, protesting anew against the persecution in Hitler's Reich, stressing the insecurity of the Jews in other parts of Europe, and demanding a quickening of the tempo in the development of the National Home. The Congress again appealed to the Government to give practical effect to Article 6 of the Mandate, which provided for close settlement by Jews on the land. It also called attention to other grievances: that the scanty immigration schedules granted by the Government resulted in a continued labour shortage and impeded the development of the National Home; that the share of Jewish labour in public and municipal works had been reduced since the last Congress, and that there was an unduly small percentage of Jewish employees in various branches of the Government service;² and that, despite the major importance of the Jewish contribution to the Government's revenue, its grants to the Jewish education and health services remained at a low level. The Congress urged the Government to enable Jews employed in its services and on public works

¹ The members of the "New Zionist Organisation," or Revisionists, as they are still called, systematically boycott the Keren Hayesod, the Jewish National Fund, and all other affiliated institutions of the Zionist Organisation. In 1938 "the Presidency" of the "New Zionist Organisation" submitted a petition to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations for the purpose of depriving the Jewish Agency of its statutory rights and functions. The petition was ignored. Negotiations have been attempted with a view to the Revisionists returning to the Zionist Organisation, but have failed owing to their refusal to promise to conform to its constitution.

² According to the latest available figures, the Palestine Civil Service (in 1937) consisted of a total personnel of 13,571, including 2,458 Jews (16 per cent.) and 10,721 Arabs (68 per cent.), the remainder being British Christians (*Palestine Royal Commission: Memoranda prepared by the Government of Palestine, 1937, p. 140*).

to observe the Jewish Sabbath and holy days as days of rest, and to facilitate the passage by Jewish municipalities and local councils of by-laws for enforcing the public observance of the Sabbath. It reaffirmed the determination of the Jewish people to live in harmony with the Arab population, and declared that Jewish achievements had already been of great benefit to the Arabs, not only in Palestine, but throughout the Near East.

A notable feature of this Congress was the greater use of Hebrew in the discussions than at previous Congresses, owing largely to the instinctive repugnance to speak the language of Israel's declared enemy in a Jewish national assembly. The tragedy of German Jewry was also the cause of a debate revealing an acute difference of opinion on the arrangements that had been made to facilitate the transfer (termed *Haavarah*) of the capital of German Jews wishing to settle in Palestine. An agreement had been concluded in August, 1933, with the German Reichsbank by the Anglo-Palestine Bank and the German Jewish banks of Wassermann and Warburg, whereby emigrants, besides obtaining their first £1,000 in cash (necessary for "capitalist" immigration certificates), were able to deposit the rest of their assets with a clearing-house in Berlin and recover the sterling equivalent from a clearing-house in Palestine, to which local Jewish merchants made their payments for goods imported from Germany, the exporters being paid by the Berlin clearing-house. The *Haavarah* was also used for the transfer to Palestine of funds collected for Jewish national institutions in Palestine, and of remittances for the education and maintenance of children, and for kindred purposes. The agreement was attacked by a number of delegates on the ground that the Zionist Organisation should not enter into relations with any organ of the German Government, but it was strongly defended by others, particularly Labour delegates, on the ground that it was the only means of salvaging the property of thousands of German Jews and thus augmenting the resources of the *Yishuv*, and that it did not bring any fresh money into Germany.¹ The result of the debate was the passing of a resolution that the whole business of the *Haavarah*, in order to keep it within justifiable limits and to prevent abuses, should be placed under the control of the Executive.

The Congress concluded with the re-election as President of the Zionist Organisation of Dr. Weizmann, who thus again became

¹ From April, 1933, until August, 1939, a total of £8,000,000 of Jewish capital was transferred by this arrangement from Germany to Palestine.

President of the Jewish Agency. Sokolow was elected Honorary President of the Organisation and was also given the corresponding office in the Jewish Agency. The general desire for harmonious co-operation was shown in the election of a coalition Executive containing representatives of all but the Jewish State Party. It consisted of three Labour members, David Ben-Gurion, Eliezer Kaplan, and Moshe Shertok; two of Group A of the General Zionists, Professor Brodetsky and Isaac Gruenbaum, and one of Group B, Dr. Fischel Rottenstreich; and one of the Mizrachi, Rabbi J. L. Fishman. In addition, the following were also given seats on the Executive (although with limited voting power): Menahem Ussishkin, as Chairman of the General Council, Dr. Arthur Ruppin, as Director of the Office for Economic Affairs, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, as political representative at Geneva, and Louis Lipsky, as representative of the Executive in America. The improvement in the financial position was reflected in an increased budget of £388,000—more than double the budget of the previous Congress. The Council of the Jewish Agency, which met immediately after, approved the budget and the resolution relating to the work in Palestine, and both Zionists and non-Zionists looked forward to the coming years with hope mingled with no little concern.

CHAPTER XIII

THE ARAB REVOLT

THE question of the development of self-governing institutions in Palestine, as prescribed in Article 2 of the Mandate, which was under consideration by the British Government before the outrages of 1929, was merely postponed, but not abandoned. The Shaw Commission, while admitting that the restoration of order and security must necessarily take priority over proposals for constitutional reform, suggested that radical changes in the constitution were desirable in order to gain the confidence of the Arabs and to facilitate the task of the Administration. But the Permanent Mandates Commission did not agree with this view: it declared that negotiations on this subject with sections of the population openly hostile to the Mandate "would only unduly enhance their prestige, and raise dangerous hopes among their partisans and apprehensions among their opponents."¹ The Jewish Agency had also placed itself on record as opposed to any premature changes in the direction of self-government. The question was reopened, however, by an Arab Delegation who were in London in April and May, 1930, for the purpose of discussions with the Government. The latter then replied that the "sweeping constitutional changes demanded by them were wholly unacceptable, since they would have rendered it impossible for His Majesty's Government to carry out their obligations under the Mandate." Nevertheless, the Passfield White Paper, published in the following October, said: "The time has now come when the important question of the establishment of a measure of self-government in Palestine must, in the interests of the country as a whole, be taken in hand without delay," and it announced that the Government proposed to set up a Legislative Council on the lines of the Constitution drafted in 1922, in which the Arab leaders had declined to co-operate. Dr. Weizmann therefore made it clear to the Government that in the view of the Jewish Agency a Round Table Conference between the Government, the Arabs and the Jewish Agency, and an understanding between the Jews and the Arabs, were necessary preliminaries to any attempts at setting up self-governing institutions.

The question was shelved for a time, during which Sir John

¹ *Minutes of the Seventeenth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, July, 1930.*

Chancellor was succeeded as High Commissioner by Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Wauchope, who took the oath of office on November 19th, 1931. When the latter was in London early in November, 1932, the Executive of the Jewish Agency took the opportunity of expressing to him their view, that it would be most prejudicial to the interests of both Jews and Arabs to raise the question of the Legislative Council afresh, and that they could not advise the Jews of Palestine to take part in a legislature so composed (irrespective of the relative strength of the official element) as to establish or imply the domination of the Jews by the Arabs. Nevertheless, at the meeting of the Mandates Commission on November 10th, 1932, the High Commissioner stated that the intention of the Government as regards the establishment of a Legislative Council remained unchanged and that they would take steps towards its formation when the new Local Government Ordinance had been brought into working order.

Before this stage was reached, however, there was a recurrence of trouble. In March, 1933, the Arab Executive Committee published a manifesto protesting against Jewish immigration and the Jewish purchase of land, and a big meeting that they organised in Jaffa, attended by the Mufti of Jerusalem and by the Mayors of most of the Arab towns, passed resolutions adopting "the principle of non-co-operation" in regard to the "Government, Government Boards, British goods, and Zionist goods." The Arab Press, which became steadily more inflammatory, indulged in such charges as that "a mass immigration of Jews was being allowed and encouraged by Government, so that when the Legislative Council was introduced the Jews would be in a majority." Agitation was fanned throughout the country until the climax was reached in the following October. Despite the Government's prohibition, the Arab Executive held a demonstration in Jerusalem on October 13th, which was followed by an Arab riot in Jaffa on October 27th and by disorders in Nablus, Haifa, and Jerusalem. In all these towns there were attacks on the police, who were compelled to fire in self-defence, and the casualties were one policeman killed and 56 injured, and 26 rioters killed and 187 injured. This outbreak of Arab violence was distinguished by one feature from those that had preceded it. In 1920, 1921, and 1929 the Arabs had attacked the Jews; in 1933 they attacked the Government. When the High Commissioner received a deputation of Arab Mayors on November 14th in connection with the riots, they again urged the establishment of

a Legislative Council, but the Government adhered to their plan to have the new municipal elections first. The Municipal Corporations Ordinance was enacted in 1934 and the elections took place in that year, but the new Municipal Council of Jerusalem was not definitely constituted until April, 1935.

When the question of the Legislative Council was reopened by the Government in the summer of 1934, the representatives of the Jewish Agency again expressed to the High Commissioner their opposition to the proposed constitutional reform on the ground that it was premature. They urged that as the Mandate recognised the historic connection of the Jews with Palestine, anything that tended to subject the country's destiny to the influence of the present majority of the population was contrary to the basic conception of the Mandate. They pointed out that the Mandate invested the Jewish people with a special status in and with regard to Palestine, and that if the Legislative Council were set up under the existing numerical conditions, that special status would implicitly be reduced and the Jews in Palestine would be degraded to the level of a minority. Even if the competence of the proposed Legislature were of limited scope during the first phase, no constitutional guarantees could offer adequate security to Jewish progress in Palestine as long as the Arab leaders maintained uncompromising hostility to the Jewish National Home. The representatives of the Agency expressed the fear that the proposed Legislative Council, so far from assisting in establishing better relations between Jews and Arabs, would merely serve as an instrument for hampering the execution of the Mandate, spreading anti-Zionist propaganda and intensifying racial strife. They made it clear that in view of all these considerations no Jewish participation could be expected in the contemplated reform.

Despite the Jewish Agency's reiterated objections and its fundamental and justified opposition, the Mandatory Power resolved to go ahead. At the end of December, 1935, the High Commissioner announced proposals for the establishment of a Legislative Council on the following basis. It was to consist of 28 members, 12 elected (9 Arabs and 3 Jews), 11 nominated (5 Arabs, 4 Jews, and 2 representatives of the commercial world), and 5 officials, meeting under an impartial president previously unconnected with Palestine. Subject to securing the fulfilment of the international obligations of the British Government (the articles of the Mandate) and the High Commissioner's power to maintain law, order, and good government, the Council was to

have the right to debate all bills introduced by the Government, and to amend and pass them for assent by the High Commissioner; to introduce bills, except money bills, subject to the consent of the High Commissioner; to propose any question of public interest for debate but not to submit any resolution that the High Commissioner thought was likely to endanger public peace; and to ask questions of the Executive relative to the administration of Government. The Jewish leaders rejected the scheme mainly on the ground that the Jews would thereby be relegated to minority status in the land of their National Home, whose development would inevitably be obstructed by a Council, the majority of whose members rejected the Mandate—the fundamental law of the country. The project was debated in the House of Lords on February 26th, 1936, and in the House of Commons on the following March 24th, and in both Houses it was subjected to strong adverse criticism by speakers who demanded its suspension.

The Arab leaders, whose disunion was reflected in the fact that they represented five different parties, were disagreed about the scheme, and they were therefore invited by the Colonial Secretary to send a deputation to London to discuss the matter. But before they could reach an agreement on the composition of the deputation, there began in Jaffa, on April 19th, 1936, a succession of murderous attacks by Arabs upon Jews, which soon spread to all parts of the country and also included violent assaults upon the British military and police. The Arab Higher Committee, consisting of the leaders of the various parties, and headed by the Mufti of Jerusalem, proclaimed a general strike throughout the country and formulated three main demands: (a) the stoppage of Jewish immigration, (b) the prohibition of the sale of land to Jews, and (c) the creation of a "national representative Government." These demands were rejected by the Government.

The campaign of terrorism, in which firearms and bombs were used extensively, began as an anti-Jewish attack and developed into an organised revolt against the Government. Military reinforcements were summoned from Egypt and Malta to restore order, but they proved inadequate. There were widespread acts of murder and other outrages by gangs of armed terrorists, who did not confine themselves to the destruction of Jewish life and property, but also did considerable damage by cutting telegraph and telephone wires, derailing trains, attempting to prevent roads from being used by traffic, and setting fire to the oil pipe-line between Haifa and Iraq. The gravity of the situation increased

owing to the indecision and vacillation displayed by the Government, its leniency and inconsistency in applying the emergency regulations that were specially enacted, its delay in punishing persons caught infringing the law, and the alternation of stern action with official parleying with the leaders. It was officially admitted that there was "propaganda from outside sources," and there was no doubt that the terrorists were assisted not only by mercenaries from over the border (especially from Iraq and Syria), but also by funds and arms from foreign countries. The two countries primarily implicated, though not mentioned at the time, were Germany and Italy. It became necessary for considerable reinforcements to be sent from England, bringing up the number of troops in Palestine to 20,000; but relatively little use was made of these forces, the greater part of which returned later when the situation became easier.

A month after the beginning of the revolt, on May 18th, 1936, the Colonial Secretary announced in the House of Commons that the Government had decided that, as soon as law and order had been re-established, a full inquiry on the spot should be undertaken by a Royal Commission, which would, "without bringing into question the fundamental terms of the Mandate, investigate the causes of unrest and any alleged grievances either of Arabs or of Jews." On July 29th, the personnel of the Royal Commission, under the chairmanship of Earl Peel (a former Secretary of State for India) was announced, together with the following terms of reference:

"To ascertain the underlying causes of the disturbances which broke out in Palestine in the middle of April; to inquire into the manner in which the Mandate of Palestine is being implemented in relation to the obligations of the Mandatory towards the Arabs and the Jews respectively; to ascertain whether, upon a proper construction of the terms of the Mandate, either the Arabs or the Jews have any legitimate grievances upon account of the way in which the Mandate has been or is being implemented; and if the Commission is satisfied that any such grievances are well-founded, to make recommendations for their removal and for the prevention of their recurrence."

The Arab "strike," which continued to consist of murder and destruction, came to an end on October 12th, in response to a manifesto to this effect issued by the Arab Higher Committee, which had received an appeal for this purpose (after prolonged

negotiations instituted by General Nuri Pasha, then Foreign Minister of Iraq) from the rulers of the neighbouring Arab lands. By that time the revolt had resulted in 91 Jews having been killed and 369 wounded, and in the destruction of 200,000 fruit and forest trees, some 17,000 *dunams* of crops, and hundreds of dwelling places, on Jewish land. It had also included over 1,000 attacks upon the police and the troops as well as upon Arabs who refused to co-operate with the terrorists.

The Royal Commission were in Palestine from November 11th, 1936, until January 17th, 1937, during which time they heard evidence from over 113 witnesses, and after their return to London they heard another eight witnesses. Their Report, a volume of 400 pages, which appeared on July 7th, 1937, was the most informative and critical work on the administration of Palestine since the beginning of the British occupation. It was marked by a sympathetic appreciation of Jewish aspirations and achievements. It consisted of a comprehensive and analytical survey of the Palestine problem, an examination of the operation of the Mandate, and proposals for "the possibility of a lasting settlement." In their conclusions, the Commission stated that "the underlying causes of the disturbances, or (as we regard it) the rebellion of 1936, are, first, the desire of the Arabs for national independence; secondly, their antagonism to the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, quickened by their fear of Jewish domination."

The Commission found that most of the Arab grievances (e.g. the failure to develop self-governing institutions, the acquisition of land by Jews, Jewish immigration, the use of Hebrew and English as official languages, the employment of British and Jewish officers and the exclusion of Arabs from the higher posts, and the creation of a large class of landless Arabs) "cannot be regarded as legitimate under the terms of the Mandate." They pointed out that the Arabs had largely benefited by Jewish immigration; that the expansion of Arab industry and agriculture had been considerably financed by imported Jewish capital;¹ that owing to Jewish development and enterprise the employment of Arab labour had increased in urban areas, particularly in ports; that the reclamation and anti-malarial work undertaken in Jewish colonies had benefited all Arabs in the neighbourhood; and that the general beneficial effect of Jewish immigration on Arab welfare was illustrated by

¹ Thanks to the profitable sale of their surplus lands to Jews, the Arabs increased their possession of orange-bearing lands from 22,000 *dunams* in 1922 to 140,000 *dunams* in 1935, representing an augmented value of over £10,000,000.

the fact that the growth in the Arab population was most marked in urban areas affected by Jewish development.¹ On the other hand, they found that the attitude of Arab officials precluded any extension of their employment in the higher posts of the Administration, and stated that "self-governing institutions cannot be developed in the peculiar circumstances of Palestine under the Mandate." They considered that the obligations that Britain had undertaken towards the Arabs and the Jews had proved irreconcilable.

"We cannot—in Palestine as it now is—both concede the Arab claim to self-government and secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home."

As regards the main Jewish grievances, the Commission suggested that "obstructions in the establishment of the National Home owing to dilatory action in dealing with proposals demanding executive action" could be mitigated by departmental decentralisation. They recommended "the careful selection of British officers intended for service in Palestine and a course of special training." On the question of "toleration by the Government of subversive activities," more especially those of the Mufti of Jerusalem, they regarded it as "unfortunate that no steps have been taken to regulate elections for the Supreme Moslem Council, which has developed an *imperium in imperio* with an irremovable President," and stated that "the policy of conciliation, carried to its furthest limits, has failed."² They made a number of recommendations in regard to land, such as measures "to provide land for close settlement by the Jews, and at the same time to safeguard the rights and position of the Arabs," and "limitation of the close settlement upon the land to the plain

¹ Between the two census years of 1922 and 1931 the Arab population of Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Haifa showed increases of 50 per cent. or more, while Bethlehem remained stationary and Gaza suffered a decline.

² Brigadier H. J. Simson, who was on the staff of the military forces sent to suppress the revolt, wrote a book, *British Rule, and Rebellion* (Wm. Blackwood, London, 1937), in which he made a remarkable exposure of the extreme moderation shown by the Palestine Government and of the lack of the necessary co-ordination between the Government, the military authorities, the police, and the judiciary, the effect of which favoured the prolongation of the excesses. He bluntly asserted that "the Palestine Government had a hand in the rebellion because, without that particular Government, there might have been no rebellion, or one so short that H.M. Government would not have been stirred to obtain the appointment of a Royal Commission before it ended." He also stated that the Royal Commission was in a position to throw light (which it omitted to do) "on the long-standing failure of the Administration to disarm the country or at least inflict deterrent penalties on the holders of unlicensed rifles; on the notorious conflict between the Executive and a section of the Judicature; on the circumstances in which armed bands were able to enter Palestine from other countries and, after being finally surrounded, were allowed to withdraw unscathed."

districts"; but they found that "there is no land available for any experiments in close settlement and mixed farming by the Jews except possibly in the vicinity of Jerusalem."

On the question of immigration, the Commission recommended that "immigration should be reviewed, and decided upon political, social, and psychological as well as economic considerations"; "a political 'high level' should be fixed at 12,000 a year for the next five years, to include Jews of every category"; and "the abolition of certain categories dealing with the members of the liberal professions and craftsmen, and the revision of the conditions governing the free entry of capitalists." They also recommended that "steps should be taken to secure the amendment of Article 18 of the Mandate and place the external trade of Palestine upon a fairer basis," and "suggested an early substantial loan for Tel-Aviv." The Commission regarded "failure to ensure public security" as "the most serious as also the best founded of the Jewish complaints." They recommended that "should disorders break out again there should be no hesitation in enforcing martial law throughout the country under undivided military control."

After detailing these various recommendations, the Commission expressed the view that they would not "remove" the grievances nor "prevent their recurrence," that they were "the best palliatives" they could "devise for the disease from which Palestine is suffering," but could not "cure the trouble." In their firm conviction "the disease is so deep-rooted that the only hope of a cure lies in a surgical operation."

They discussed the proposal to divide Palestine into a Jewish and an Arab canton, whereby each would have self-government in regard to social services, land, and immigration, while the central government would retain control over foreign relations, defence, customs, railways, posts and telegraphs, and the like, besides directly administering the holy places of Jerusalem and Bethlehem with the port of Haifa in enclaves. They expressed the view that such a system would involve difficulties of government, finance, and security, and would not satisfy the demands of Arab nationalism or "give the Jews the full freedom they desire to build up their National Home in their own way," while "in the background would remain the old uncertainty as to the future destiny of Palestine."

The Commission therefore proposed a plan of partition on the following main lines:

The present Mandate should terminate, and Palestine should

be divided into three main parts. There should be two sovereign states: (1) a Jewish state mainly in the plains, and (2) an Arab state, including Transjordan, in the hills, with a port at Jaffa; and (3) Great Britain should have a permanent Mandate for Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Nazareth, with a corridor from Jerusalem to the coast, and an enclave near Akaba. Tiberias, Acre and Haifa should remain temporarily under the British Mandate. The Jewish State should comprise the whole of Galilee, the whole of the Valley of Jezreel, the greater part of Beisan, and all the coastal plain from Ras el-Nakura in the north to Beer-Tuvia in the south (an area equal to about one-fifth of Palestine west of the Jordan). Treaties of alliance should be negotiated by the Mandatory with the Government of Transjordan and representatives of the Arabs of Palestine on the one hand, and with the Zionist Organisation on the other. The Mandatory would support any requests for admission to the League of Nations that the Governments of the Arab and the Jewish states might make. The treaties would include strict guarantees for the protection of minorities in each state, as well as financial and other provisions, and there would be military conventions "dealing with the maintenance of naval, military, and air forces, the upkeep and use of ports, roads and railways, the security of the pipe-line, and so forth." The Jewish state should pay a subvention to the Arab state (as the latter would not be self-supporting); the Public Debt of Palestine (about £4,500,000) should be divided between the two states; and the British Treasury should make a grant of £2,000,000 to the Arab state. In view of the very large number of Arabs in the Jewish area and the small number of Jews in the Arab area, the treaties should contain provisions for the transfer of land and the exchange of population, and "in the last resort the exchange would be compulsory."

The Royal Commission made a number of recommendations for the period of transition, such as the prohibition of the purchase of land by Jews within the Arab area or by Arabs within the Jewish area, and territorial restrictions on Jewish immigration instead of the political "high level." They pointed out in conclusion that partition would, on the one hand, give the Arabs their national independence, and, on the other, secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home and relieve it from the possibility of its being subjected in the future to Arab rule, while to both it "offers a prospect of obtaining the inestimable boon of peace."

The Report of the Royal Commission was accompanied by

a Statement of Policy¹ of the British Government declaring that they were "in general agreement with the arguments and conclusions of the Commission" and would take the necessary steps to give effect to the scheme of partition. Meanwhile, any land transactions that might prejudice the scheme were prohibited, and the total Jewish immigration for the eight months' period August, 1937, to March, 1938, was limited to a total of 8,000 persons of all categories. The House of Commons, after a vigorous debate on the question, passed a resolution on July 21st, 1937, that the partition proposals "should be brought before the League of Nations with a view to enabling His Majesty's Government, after adequate inquiry, to present to Parliament a definite scheme."

The Twentieth Zionist Congress, which was held at Zurich from August 3rd to 17th, 1937, and was attended by 484 delegates, devoted a week to an exhaustive discussion of the Commission's Report. Opinions on the question of the proposed Jewish state were keenly divided, the attractions and advantages of the proposed independence being counterbalanced by the smallness of the territory offered and the loss of the major part of Biblical Palestine. Dr. Weizmann severely attacked the Palestine Administration, charging it with responsibility for the disorders and with having forced upon the Royal Commission the belief that the Mandate was unworkable—a thesis that he rejected. While opposed to the Commission's partition scheme, he was in favour of conducting negotiations with the British Government with a view to securing a scheme that would enable the Jews in Palestine to live their own independent national life as the Jews themselves understood the term, and one that would contribute to the solution of the Jewish problem in the different countries. The leading opponent of any kind of partition was Ussishkin, the septuagenarian President of the Congress, who did not think the area offered adequate or the transfer of 300,000 Arabs practicable. He was in favour of a Jewish state, but it must be the whole of Palestine. The principal supporters of a scheme of partition were the General Zionists A and the Labour Party, while the Mizrahi, Hashomer Hatzair (Labour Left Wing), General Zionists B, and the Jewish State Party were the uncompromising opponents of any form of partition. Eventually the following resolution was adopted by a majority of 300 to 158:

"The Congress declares that the scheme of partition put forward by the Royal Commission is unacceptable. The Congress

¹ *Command Paper* 5513.

empowers the Executive to enter into negotiations with a view to ascertaining the precise terms of His Majesty's Government for the proposed establishment of a Jewish State. In such negotiations the Executive shall not commit either itself or the Zionist Organisation, but in the event of the emergence of a definite scheme for the establishment of a Jewish State such scheme shall be brought before a newly elected Congress for consideration and decision."

The Congress rejected the assertion of the Royal Commission that the Mandate had proved unworkable, and demanded its fulfilment; rejected the conclusion of the Commission that the national aspirations of the Jewish people and of the Arabs in Palestine were irreconcilable; reaffirmed the declaration of previous Congresses expressing the readiness of the Jewish people to reach a peaceful settlement with the Arabs of Palestine; condemned the "palliative proposals" of the Commission; and protested against the decision of the Government to fix a political maximum for Jewish immigration of all categories for the next eight months. The retiring Executive was re-elected, the membership of the General Council was limited to 70, and a budget was adopted of £365,000.

At the meeting of the Council of the Jewish Agency, the non-Zionists showed that they were divided on the question of partition just as the Zionists were. The non-Zionists from Eastern Europe, particularly Poland, were mostly in favour of the scheme, primarily because of the urgency of emigration from that region; but the leading spokesmen of the American non-Zionists, notably Mr. Felix Warburg and Dr. Judah L. Magnes (President of the University),¹ offered determined opposition to any form of partition or to a Jewish state. Dr. Magnes urged that negotiations should be entered into with Great Britain, the Arabs, the League of Nations, and the United States for the purpose of considering how a binational state could be set up in an undivided Palestine. Eventually the Council of the Agency endorsed the political resolutions of the Congress. It also directed the Executive to request the British Government "to convene a Conference of the Jews and the Arabs of Palestine with a view to exploring the possibility of making a peaceful settlement between Jews and Arabs in and for an undivided Palestine on the basis of the Balfour Declaration and

¹ Dr. Magnes was one of the promoters of the *Britt Shalom* ("Covenant of Peace") Society in Palestine in 1928, the purpose of which was to aim at effecting a friendly understanding with the Arabs on the basis of a binational state.

the Mandate." The budget adopted by the Congress was confirmed, with a rider to the effect that the Executive and the Keren Hayesod should do their utmost to increase the income to at least £600,000, so as to cover the cost of the consolidation and the security of the newly established settlements.

The Permanent Mandates Commission, which met at Geneva in August and heard explanatory statements on the partition question from the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Ormsby-Gore (now Lord Harlech), adopted conclusions stating that, while "favourable in principle to an examination of a solution involving the partition of Palestine," it was nevertheless "opposed to the idea of the immediate creation of two independent states," and considered that "a prolongation of the period of political apprenticeship constituted by the Mandate would be absolutely essential both to the new Arab state and the new Jewish state." The Council of the League, which was addressed on the question by the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Anthony Eden, adopted a resolution stating that it agreed to the British Government's continuing to study the solution of the problem by partition, and, while pointing out that the Mandate remained in force until such time as it might be otherwise decided, deferred "consideration of the substance of the question until the Council is in a position to deal with it as a whole," and meanwhile reserved its decision. The Assembly of the League (on September 30th) adopted a resolution expressing "its conviction that the problem of Palestine . . . will be equitably settled, account being taken to the fullest possible extent of all the legitimate interests at stake."

No official declaration on the proposals of the Royal Commission was made on the part of the Arabs. On the other hand, the state of peace that had prevailed since October, 1936, came to an end in June, 1937, when the Arabs resumed their acts of terrorism and assassination. The organised campaign became so intensified during the next few months that the Palestine Government was at last impelled, as it announced officially on October 1st, "to institute action against certain persons whose activities have been prejudicial to the maintenance of public security in Palestine, and who must thus be regarded as morally responsible for these events." The Arab Higher Committee and all Arab national committees were declared illegal associations, and five members of the Committee were deported to the Seychelles Islands. The Mufti of Jerusalem was deprived of his office as President of the Supreme Moslem Council and of membership of the General

Wakf Committee (of which he was Chairman), and a fortnight later he escaped in disguise to Beyrout. Many leading Arabs were imprisoned or interned. Nevertheless, the reign of terror, murder, and sabotage continued unabated. The Government therefore established military courts on November 18th with authority to try persons accused of the discharge of firearms, carrying arms or bombs, or committing sabotage or intimidation, and to impose sentence of death in the case of the first two offences. Before these Courts were set up not a single Arab guilty of any of the murders committed since April, 1936, had suffered the death penalty, but now some Arab terrorists were executed. The campaign of violence continued altogether for three years, until the outbreak of the Second World War, by which time it had claimed 5,774 victims, comprising 450 Jews killed and 1,944 wounded, 140 British killed and 476 wounded, and 2,287 Arabs killed and 1,477 wounded. The Arab terrorists had murdered more of their own people who refused to join them than they had of Jews. During the same period over 200,000 trees were destroyed by the Arabs, but 1,000,000 more trees were planted by the Jews—impressive proof that no atrocities, however cruel, widespread, or persistent, could weaken the determination of the Jews to rebuild their National Home.

FROM PARTITION SCHEMES TO WHITE PAPER

THE policy announced by the British Government in July, 1937, in favour of a scheme of partition as recommended by the Royal Commission, which would have resulted in the creation of an independent Jewish State, proved to be short-lived. Sixteen months later the Government abandoned this view, and in May, 1939, they declared that they intended setting up in 1949 what would be tantamount to an Arab state, in which the Jews would be an impotent minority. This fundamental reversal of policy was made in stages.

When Mr. Eden, as Foreign Secretary, spoke to the Council of the League of Nations in September, 1937, he announced that the Mandatory Government intended to appoint "a further special body to visit Palestine, to negotiate with Arabs and Jews" and to submit to the Government "proposals for a detailed scheme of partition." He also stated that "at a later stage, a final and detailed boundary Commission would need to be appointed." After the lapse of three months a further White Paper¹ was published, consisting of a dispatch to the High Commissioner for Palestine dated December 23rd, 1937. This document stated that the Government were in no sense committed to approval of the Royal Commission's partition plan and had not accepted its proposal for the compulsory transfer of Arabs from the Jewish to the Arab area; that further investigations were required for the drawing up of a more precise scheme expressed in greater detail; and that for this purpose a technical Commission would be sent out to Palestine. The task of this body would be to advise as to the provisional boundaries of the proposed Arab and Jewish areas and the new British mandated area, and also to undertake the financial and other inquiries (concerning exchanges of land and population, safeguards for minorities, etc.) suggested by the Royal Commission. It was given "full liberty to suggest modifications of the proposed plan" and, "taking into account any representations of the communities in Palestine and Transjordan," to recommend boundaries that would "(a) afford a reasonable prospect of the eventual establishment, with adequate security, of self-supporting Arab and Jewish States; (b) necessitate the inclusion of the fewest possible Arabs and Arab enterprises in the Jewish area and *vice versa*; and

¹ *Command Paper 5634.*

(c) enable His Majesty's Government to carry out the Mandatory responsibilities, the assumption of which is recommended in the Report of the Royal Commission."

The dispatch stated that if, as a result of investigation, there emerged a scheme of partition "regarded as equitable and practicable" by the Government, it would be referred to the Council of the League for consideration, and, if it were approved, a further period would be required for the establishment of new systems of government and for the negotiation of treaties for the establishment of independent states. It might also be necessary to consider "the suggestion of the Permanent Mandates Commission that the Arab and Jewish areas should be administered temporarily under a system of 'cantonisation' or under separate Mandates." The Partition Commission were appointed on February 28th, 1938, with Sir John Woodhead as Chairman, a day before Sir Arthur Wauchope was succeeded as High Commissioner by Sir Harold MacMichael. The Commission arrived in Palestine two months later, and stayed there for three months. Their Report was published on November 9th, 1938, together with a summary of their conclusions, and accompanied by a statement of the Government's decision.

The Commission unanimously advised against the adoption of the scheme of partition (called Plan A) outlined by the Royal Commission, on the ground of its impracticability. They found that if the fewest possible Arabs were to be included in the Jewish area, the Jewish State could not be a large one; that it could not contain areas sufficiently extensive, fertile, and well-situated, to be capable of intensive economic development and of dense and rapid settlement; that Galilee should not be included, as the population was almost entirely Arab and the Arabs would resist inclusion by force; and that the Royal Commission's recommendation for a direct subvention from the Jewish State to the Arab State was impracticable.

The Commission also examined two other schemes, described as Plans B and C. One member preferred Plan B, which was Plan A with the exclusion from the proposed Jewish State of Galilee and the small and predominantly Arab area at its southern extremity. Two other members thought that the best scheme under the terms of reference was Plan C, which divided Palestine into three parts: (a) a northern part (including Galilee and Haifa) to be retained under Mandate; (b) a southern part (the Negev) to be retained under Mandate; and (c) a central part to be divided into

an Arab state, a Jewish state, and a Jerusalem enclave. A fourth member, while arguing that Plan C was the best that could be devised under the terms of reference, regarded both plans as impracticable. The Commission pointed out that under either plan, while the budget of the Jewish state was likely to show a substantial surplus, the budgets of the Arab state (including Transjordan) and of the mandated territories were likely to show substantial deficits. They thought that on economic grounds a customs union between the proposed states and the mandated territories was essential, and that any such scheme would be inconsistent with the grant of fiscal independence to the new states. They concluded, therefore, that on a strict interpretation of their terms of reference, they had no alternative but to report that they were "unable to recommend boundaries for the proposed areas which will afford a reasonable prospect of the eventual establishment of self-supporting Arab and Jewish states."

The Government, in their accompanying statement, declared that, after careful study of the Partition Commission's Report, they had reached the conclusion that the political, administrative, and financial difficulties involved in the proposal to create independent Arab and Jewish states inside Palestine were so great that this solution of the problem was impracticable. They had, therefore, decided to make a determined effort to promote an understanding between the Arabs and the Jews (which, it may be observed, they had neglected to do during the previous twenty years). They proposed immediately to invite representatives of the Palestinian Arabs and of neighbouring states on the one hand, and of the Jewish Agency on the other, and to confer with them as soon as possible in London regarding future policy, including the question of immigration into Palestine. As regards the representation of the Palestinian Arabs, the Government reserved the right to exclude "those leaders whom they regarded as responsible for the campaign of assassination and violence."

The Jewish Agency also published a statement, in which they pointed out that the majority of the Commission seemed to have disregarded the international obligation of the Mandatory Power to the Jewish people to facilitate the re-establishment of their National Home in Palestine; that the Commission had devised a "Jewish state" comprising an area of less than one-twentieth of the whole of Western Palestine, from which the greater part of Jewish land holdings and the most important areas of Jewish colonisation were excluded; and that, so far as the rest of Western

Palestine was concerned, they had abolished the Balfour Declaration and the Jewish National Home provisions of the Mandate. They also recalled the fact that the request made by the Jewish Agency to the British Government after the publication of the Royal Commission's Report, to convene a Jewish-Arab Conference for the purpose of promoting an understanding between the two peoples, was at that time refused; and they viewed with grave apprehension the proposal to invite the neighbouring Arab states, who had no special status in regard to Palestine and therefore no claim to take part in such a discussion.

The Conference convened by the Government ostensibly for the purpose of bringing about a Jewish-Arab understanding took place in London at St. James's Palace, and lasted from February 8th to March 17th, 1939. The Jewish side was represented by the Executive of the Jewish Agency and by leading Jewish personalities, both Zionist and non-Zionist, widely representative of the Jews of the British Empire, the United States, and other countries. The Palestinian Arab delegates and their advisers included three members who had been interned in the Seychelles Islands and a fourth who had escaped deportation with them, although the Government had previously announced that it reserved the right to exclude from the Conference "those leaders whom they regarded as responsible for the campaign of assassination and violence." These delegates all belonged to the following of the fugitive ex-Mufti of Jerusalem. There were also three delegates of the moderate National Defence Party, but they played only a minor and passive part. The Arab states represented were Egypt, Saudi-Arabia, Iraq, the Yemen, and Transjordan. The Government were represented by the Colonial Secretary (Mr. Malcolm MacDonald), the Foreign Secretary (Viscount Halifax), and the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (Mr. R. A. Butler). The Arab delegates refused to meet the Jewish delegates, although the latter were willing to meet the others (and had one informal meeting with the representatives of the Arab states), so that the Government conducted Conferences with the two sides separately. As these talks led to no agreement, they were broken off, and on March 15th the Government submitted a series of proposals to both parties in the hope that they would be accepted. These proposals were rejected by the Executive of the Jewish Agency and by the other Jewish delegates as a violation of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate. They were likewise rejected by the Arab delegates as falling short of their demands.

Two months later, on May 17th, the Government published a White Paper,¹ in which they set forth the policy that they proposed to carry out. In general it was identical with the proposals that had been submitted to the Conferences. It declared that the objective of the British Government was "the establishment within ten years of an independent Palestine state in such treaty relations with the United Kingdom as will provide satisfactorily for the commercial and strategic requirements of both countries in the future," and that this proposal would involve consultation with the Council of the League of Nations with a view to the termination of the Mandate. There would be a transitional period during which the people of Palestine would be given an increasing part in the government of the country; Arabs and Jews would be in charge of departments approximately in proportion to their populations, with British advisers; the Executive Council would be converted later into a Council of Ministers; and machinery would be provided for an elective legislature, if public opinion were in favour of such a development. Adequate provision would have to be made for the security of, and freedom of access to, the holy places, the protection of the interests and property of the various religious bodies, the protection of the different communities in Palestine in accordance with the obligations of the British Government to both Jews and Arabs, and "the special position in Palestine of the Jewish National Home." But if at the end of ten years circumstances required the postponement of the establishment of the independent state, the Government would "consult with representatives of the people of Palestine, the Council of the League of Nations, and the neighbouring Arab states before deciding on such a postponement."

On the question of immigration the White Paper stated "that fear of indefinite Jewish immigration is widespread amongst the Arab population, and that this fear has made possible disturbances which have given a serious setback to economic progress." In fact, the economic progress was predominantly due to Jewish immigration. The White Paper therefore proposed that during the next five years Jewish immigration would be at a rate which, if economic absorptive capacity permitted, would bring the Jewish population up to approximately one-third of the total population. This would allow of the admission of some 75,000 immigrants (including 25,000 refugees) over the next five years, and before each periodic decision was taken Jewish and Arab representatives would be

¹ *Command Paper 6019.*

consulted. After the five years, no further Jewish immigration would be permitted unless the Arabs acquiesced in it.

The Jewish Agency immediately published an official statement, in which they declared that the White Paper was a denial of the right of the Jewish people to reconstitute their National Home in their ancestral country, that it was a surrender to Arab terrorism, that it robbed the Jews of their last hope in the darkest hour of their history, and that they would never submit to the closing against them of the gates of Palestine or let their National Home be converted into a Ghetto. No doubt was felt in Zionist and Jewish Agency circles or indeed by any well-informed and unprejudiced person, that the principal motive that inspired the proposals of the White Paper was the Government's fear that the Arabs, who had been aided and abetted in their revolt by Germany and Italy, might side with these Powers in the war that seemed to be approaching, and that the Government were bent upon appeasing them. The ex-Mufti's Party rejected the White Paper, but it was accepted by the Arab moderates (National Defence Party), one of whom was promptly murdered by an Arab terrorist.

The White Paper was severely criticised in both Houses of Parliament by members of all parties, particularly by two former Colonial Secretaries, Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Amery. Mr. Churchill stigmatised the document as "a plain breach of a solemn obligation" and "another Munich,"¹ and Mr. Amery said that he could never hold up his head if he voted for it. The White Paper was adopted on May 23rd by the comparatively small majority of 89 in a House of Commons (consisting of 615 members) in which the Government normally counted on an assured majority of 220. About 100 of the Government's supporters abstained from voting, while 22 (including Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery) voted with the Opposition.

The document was then submitted to the Permanent Mandates Commission in June for examination, with a view to a report being made to the Council of the League of Nations on the question of its compatibility with the Mandate. After a four days' session the Commission unanimously rejected it, declaring that "the policy set out in the White Paper was not in accordance with the interpretation which, in agreement with the Mandatory Power and the Council, the Commission had always placed upon the

¹ An allusion to the agreement made at Munich in September, 1938, between Mr. Neville Chamberlain, as British Prime Minister, and Hitler, whereby Czechoslovakia was compelled to cede the Sudetenland to Germany.

Palestine Mandate." The Commission also considered whether the Mandate "might not perhaps be open to a new interpretation which . . . would be sufficiently flexible for the policy of the White Paper not to appear at variance with it," and the majority declared that they "did not feel able to state that the policy of the White Paper was in conformity with the Mandate, any contrary conclusion appearing to them to be ruled out by the very terms of the Mandate and by the fundamental intentions of its authors." The minority (the representatives of France, Great Britain and Portugal) considered that "existing circumstances would justify the policy of the White Paper, provided the Council did not oppose it." Owing to the outbreak of the Second World War there was no meeting of the Council to consider the Commission's report, and it was therefore believed that, in consequence of the nature of this report, and as the Government had failed to obtain legal sanction for their proposals, no steps would be taken to carry them out. Nevertheless, the Government immediately began to apply the White Paper in respect of Jewish immigration into Palestine. They issued a reduced schedule for the months from May to September, 1939, and after Germany's devastating invasion of Poland, from which tens of thousands of Jewish refugees fled to neighbouring countries, it was further announced that the schedule until March, 1940, provided only for the admission of 300 non-Jews and excluded Jews altogether.

The Twenty-first Zionist Congress, which assembled at Geneva from August 16th to 24th, was held under the shadow of the approaching war. It was attended by 529 delegates, a record number, reflecting both the unusually momentous character of the deliberations and the consciousness that the fortunes of the movement were hidden in the grim uncertainties of the future. Dr. Weizmann, in his inaugural address, painted a sombre picture of the suffering and destruction that had already been wrought among the Jewish people by the Nazi terror, and of the futile efforts of the Evian Conference, convened by President Roosevelt, to devise any measure of relief. The Jewish Agency had submitted to the Conference a plan for the absorption of 100,000 refugees in Palestine on a constructive basis within a relatively short time, but it was thwarted by the very Government whose special duty it was under the Mandate to facilitate the immigration and close settlement of Jews in Palestine. He arraigned the British Government in bitter and searing words, such as he had never used before. He accused it of a lack of practical sympathy and of an "attempt

to undo a great historic act" at the very moment when the Jewish people was faced by the most appalling and tragic crisis in its history. He said:

"In this solemn hour I am reluctantly compelled to say that the British Government has gone back on its promises. It is not easy for me—above all for me—to have to say it. But I would be disloyal to my people, and faithless to the memory of the great men no longer with us in our struggle for freedom and justice, if I did not state from this tribune before the whole world that a grave injustice is being done to us. I must raise my voice in the strongest possible protest. We have not deserved this treatment. . . . An international obligation to the Jews in regard to a sacred land, undertaken before the whole civilised world, cannot be unilaterally destroyed, least of all by a nation like Great Britain, which has always striven, and still strives, to maintain respect for law, for treaties, for moral principles, for good faith in international relations. Yet in its new policy the present British Government has taken upon itself not only to go back upon its promise of support, but actually to try to bring to a standstill the great historic process of the return of Israel and the rebuilding of Palestine, which began long before the country came under British rule. . . . The Government may itself be the victim of an illusion, the illusion that you can counter force by further force, directed not against the aggressors but against the victims. . . . We must and shall defend our lives, our rights, our work, with all the strength at our disposal. . . . Whatever may happen to-day, to-morrow, or in the near future, the work our pioneers have achieved will live and grow, and remain a permanent source of strength and courage to this and future generations."

After an anxious week of earnest discussion, in which all aspects of the events and activities of the past two years were critically reviewed, and the representatives of all parties emphatically expressed their opposition to the Government's proposals, the Congress adopted a series of resolutions embodying its conclusions. It rejected the policy of the White Paper "as violating the rights of the Jewish people and repudiating the obligation towards them entered into by Great Britain in the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, and endorsed by the civilised nations of the world." It declared that "the Jewish people will not acquiesce in the reduction of its status in Palestine to that of a minority, nor in

the subjection of the Jewish National Home to Arab rule." It reaffirmed "the inalienable right of the Jewish people, exercised without interruption throughout the centuries of the Dispersion, to return to Palestine, whert the only real and permanent solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness is to be found." It declared that the new policy of the Government with regard to immigration and land was "a complete reversal of the Mandatory obligations to facilitate Jewish immigration and to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land," and that "the obligations were undertaken towards the Jewish people as a whole and not towards the Jews of Palestine alone." It protested against the suspension of Jewish immigration during the ensuing six months, thus depriving Jews under the Nazi tyranny of their only means of escape, and declared that the responsibility for the consequences of that policy lay upon the Government alone. It welcomed the unanimous conclusion of the Mandates Commission that the White Paper was not in accordance with the Mandate. It reaffirmed the resolve of the Jewish people to establish relations of mutual goodwill and co-operation with the Arabs of Palestine and of the neighbouring Arab countries, and instructed the Executive to explore the possibilities of such co-operation.

Owing to the gradual darkening of the political horizon as the discussions proceeded, the Congress had to be curtailed. A budget was adopted of £720,000 (of which the Keren Hayesod was expected to provide £600,000 and the Central Bureau for the Settlement of German Jews £100,000), and the retiring Executive were re-elected. In the concluding session, on Thursday night, August 24th, Dr. Weizmann, who spoke with great emotion, said that he hoped that they would all survive the coming conflict and that their work would continue. Above and beyond their grievances there were higher interests that were common to them and the Western democracies. "Their concern is ours," he said, "their fight is our fight. To our friends from Palestine, I wish a successful journey. To our friends from Poland, I hope they won't share the fate of their fellow Jews in the neighbouring countries." Ussishkin, who, as President of the Congress, closed the proceedings, also dwelt on the world catastrophe that was about to break out and on the fate that was awaiting the Jews in the lands of Central and Eastern Europe as well as those in Palestine. He hoped that the Jews of Poland would not have to suffer too much in the disaster that threatened. In the time-honoured Hebrew phrase, he bade them all "Go in peace." The

entire assembly of delegates and visitors then rose and fervently sang "Hatikvah," and with mutual good wishes that they would meet again in better times they streamed out of the Congress building after midnight to hasten back to their homes in all parts of the globe.

Despite the outbreak of war, which soon brought desolation, slavery, and death to hundreds of thousands of Jews in Poland and in other parts of Eastern Europe, the British Government, although intensely preoccupied with graver concerns, did not relax from the prosecution of the White Paper policy. In a letter to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, they stated that they were of opinion that their action was in no way inconsistent with the provisions of the Mandate, although the Mandates Commission had unanimously adopted a declaration to the contrary effect. But they thought it right to inform the members of the Council of the position "in case any member of the Council should wish to ask that the Council should be convened to discuss it." The members of the Council naturally understood that the suggestion was merely a matter of form, and there were no replies. Thereupon the Government forbade any Jewish immigration into Palestine for six months, until the end of March, 1940, on the ground that there had been a large influx of illegal immigrants. But these were all fugitives from barbarous persecution, who could find no asylum except in the Jewish National Home, the land where they had been assured by the White Paper of 1922 that they were "as of right and not on sufferance." Not content with this embargo, despite the increasing anxieties of the war, and although the White Paper was devoid of any legal validity, the Government next proceeded to enact a law to limit the sale and transfer of land in Palestine to Jews to only a tiny part of the country.

On February 28th, 1940, the Government promulgated the Land Transfers Regulations,¹ whereby the country west of the Jordan was divided into three zones, in which land sales from Arabs to Jews should be restricted, prohibited, or remain free respectively. Zone A, in which the transfer of land to a person other than a Palestinian Arab was prohibited save in exceptional cases, included "the hill country as a whole, together with certain areas in Gaza or Beersheba sub-districts where the land available is already insufficient for the support of the existing population." Zone B included the plains of Esdraelon and Jezreel, Eastern Galilee, the maritime plain between Haifa and Tantura and

¹ *Command Paper* 6180.

between the southern boundary of the Ramleh sub-district and Beer Tuvia, and the southern portion of the Beersheba sub-district (the Negev). Within Zone B transfers of land might be sanctioned if they could be shown to be for the purpose of consolidating, extending or facilitating the irrigation of holdings already in possession of the transferee or of his community, the land to be transferred being contiguous to such holdings; or for the purpose of enabling land held in undivided shares by transferor and transferee to be parcellated; or in furtherance of some special scheme of development in the joint interest of both Arabs and Jews of which the Government approved. The parts in which there were to be no restrictions included all municipal areas, the Haifa industrial zone, and the maritime plain between Tantura and the southern boundary of Ramleh sub-district. These Regulations, although first issued on February 28th, 1940, were deemed to have come into force on May 18th, 1939.

The significance of this enactment can be appreciated by examining the comparative areas represented by the different zones. Of the 6,717,250 acres of Western Palestine (exclusive of lakes) only 335,750 acres, or just under 5 per cent., is in the "free zone," about 64 per cent. is in the prohibited zone, and about 31 per cent. in the restricted zone. In the prohibited zone the area of Jewish land is 81,500 acres, but this figure includes the 19,000 acres of the Palestine Potash Company concession, which is not available for agricultural purposes, while most of the remainder lies in the plain of the prohibited zone. In the actual hill country, with the exception of the three settlements in the corner of Northern Galilee, and a few more round Jerusalem, the Jews have practically no land. In the restricted zone there are 132,250 acres of Jewish land; and of the 1,960,250 acres in this zone not in Jewish possession, 1,700,000 acres constitute the southern Negev, which is to-day arid and as yet unexplored. Finally, the "free zone" contains 172,000 acres of Jewish land and 163,750 acres of Arab land, and it is these 163,750 acres (or 2.6 per cent. of the area of Western Palestine not in Jewish possession) that constitute the margin of possible Jewish land acquisition free from administrative restrictions; but there are to-day 48,500 Arabs on that land.

If we compare the 5 per cent. of the area of Western Palestine in which the Jews are free to acquire land with the extent of the territory contemplated or understood by the Balfour Declaration, we shall have a true measure of the whittling down of that historic

promise and likewise of the bitter disillusion of the Jewish people. For, as the Palestine Royal Commission testified in their report (p. 38), the area in which the Jewish National Home was to be established was originally understood to be "the whole of historic Palestine," which includes Transjordan, and it was the definite intention of the Government to establish a Jewish state (p. 24). Thus, the vision of a Jewish state on both sides of the Jordan was reduced to a "Pale of Settlement" only one-sixtieth of the original area.

The practical reason advanced for the new regulations was that "if land sales remain unrestricted there is likely to arise a 'landless Arab' problem of such dimensions that it will be extremely difficult to find any solution to it." When the regulations were debated in the House of Commons on March 6th, 1940, the Colonial Secretary (Mr. Malcolm MacDonald) was asked whether he had any figures of Arabs rendered landless by Jewish purchases, and he readily admitted: "We have not any statistics." The only detailed inquiry into the facts was made in 1931-2, when it was ascertained that 664 Arabs, mostly tenants, had been displaced during the twelve years in which the Jews had purchased 115,000 acres. Of these displaced Arabs only about 100 availed themselves of the opportunity of resettlement offered by the Palestine Government, and, according to the Government's Report for 1937, about fifty of these families "deserted the settlement and are engaged, for the most part, in other than agricultural work." The Government subsequently passed a Tenants' Protective Ordinance to prevent further displacements. Moreover, no data have ever been adduced to show that peasant proprietors are being dispossessed. The fact is that the Arabs—even those loud in their complaints that the Jews are buying up the country—sell land that they can spare, and with the proceeds they develop the remainder. In soliciting Parliament's approval for the new policy, the Colonial Secretary said that it was necessary "to enable us to mobilise our forces to prosecute to a victorious conclusion the war against Nazi Germany." This seemed to suggest that as soon as the Land Regulations were passed, hundreds of thousands of Arabs would flock to fight for the Allies. The reaction of the Arabs, apart from an insignificant number, was a policy of deliberate passivity.

The new policy has prevented the Jews from applying their capital and industry to the development of any part of Palestine beyond a tiny area. It has struck equally at the Arabs, who have been denied one of the surest means to improve their surplus land.

It was publicly admitted by the Arab Delegation at the St. James's Palace Conferences in 1939 that there were some 19 million *dunams* (about $4\frac{1}{4}$ million acres) of land in Western Palestine, out of a total of 27 million *dunams* (about $6\frac{3}{4}$ million acres), which were not cultivated by the Arabs and could not be cultivated by them. The greater part of this land has thus been condemned to remain waste. Moreover, the new regulations were a violation of Article 6 of the Mandate, which requires that the Administration shall encourage close settlement by Jews on the land, and likewise of Article 15, which prescribes that "no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion, or language." It is, indeed, ironical that whereas the Jew may buy land in all countries save those under Nazi domination or influence, he is forbidden to buy any in 95 per cent. of the land of his internationally guaranteed National Home, and that the prohibition was imposed at a time when his people were being subjected to unparalleled persecution over so wide an area in Europe. It seemed as though the Balfour Declaration, which was acclaimed as one of the noblest products of the First World War, had found its nadir in the Second.

PROGRESS IN THE NATIONAL HOME

THE Jewish National Home continued on its course of progress despite all the obstacles that it had to encounter. Neither Arab outrages, nor inquiry commissions, nor the rigidity of the Administration, succeeded either in preventing the influx of Jewish settlers, or in retarding social, economic, and cultural developments. Of all the difficulties that had to be overcome the most deliberate and persistent were those placed by the Government in the way of immigration. Instead of facilitating the admission of new settlers, as expressly required by the Mandate, the Government, either by special ordinances or by bureaucratic practice, devised obstructions to the return of the Jews to their ancestral land. The half-yearly labour schedule formed a regular subject of controversy: the carefully compiled estimate of the Jewish Agency, based on the ascertainable needs of labour, was invariably challenged by the Government and drastically reduced. From April, 1930, the screw was also turned in regard to persons of the capitalist category: £1,000 was then fixed as the necessary minimum, after having in practice been required for a considerable time, instead of £500, the amount prescribed in the original ordinance. Two years later the Government agreed to accept the lower figure as a minimum for certain occupations only, on condition that the settlement of a person with that amount did not lead to undue competition in the pursuit that he proposed to enter, and that his capital was sufficient to assure him a reasonable prospect of success—provisos that were interpreted very strictly. Difficulties were also raised in regard to members of the liberal professions and skilled craftsmen, who were required to possess £500 and £250 respectively, and from 1937 these categories were cancelled. Moreover, increasing severity was applied in the interpretation of the term "dependents," so that Jewish settlers who were fully able to support their parents or other near relatives were not allowed to secure their admission.

In 1937 the Palestine Government definitely departed from the principle of regulating immigration according to the economic absorptive capacity, and adopted the principle of the "political high level." Spokesmen of the Mandatory Government declared both in London and in Geneva that this was "a purely temporary

and arbitrary measure," but it nevertheless became the law of the land. In August, 1937, a new Ordinance was enacted, which gave power to the High Commissioner temporarily to prescribe the maximum aggregate number of immigrants during any specified period, as well as to prescribe categories of immigrants and the maximum number of persons to be admitted in any category. But from March 31st, 1939, when the persecution of the Jews in Europe was increasing both in intensity and in geographical range, the Immigration Ordinance of 1937 was made valid for any period. The Jewish Agency promptly challenged the legality of this action and requested the British Government to submit it to the judgment of the Permanent Court of Justice at The Hague, but the request was refused.

The trend of Jewish immigration after 1929 reflected the fluctuations in the attitude of the Administration, the disorders in the country, and the extension of Nazi oppression. In both years 1930 and 1931 the total was below 5,000, but in 1932 when the Fifth *Aliyah* began, it rose to 9,550, and in the next few years it steadily mounted—to 30,327 in 1933, to 42,359 in 1934, and to 61,854 in 1935. This last year witnessed the peak of immigration, and thereafter the total declined from 29,727 in 1936 to 16,405 in 1939.¹ The composition of the influx displayed various changes from 1933, the year of the beginning of the Nazi terror. Before that date the Jews from Poland had formed an average of nearly 40 per cent. of the total, but from then the unenviable place of primacy was occupied by the Jews of Germany and Austria. Immigrants from these two countries had formed less than 2 per cent. of the total in 1922, but in 1937 they amounted to 36 per cent., and in 1938 to 52 per cent., while those from Poland, who were over 30 per cent. in 1922, declined from 36 per cent. in 1937 to 27 per cent. in the following year. The swelling exodus from Germany brought to recollection that when Herzl proposed holding his first Congress in 1897 in Munich, there were angry protests by many German Rabbis and communal leaders on the ground that such an assembly on German soil would throw doubt upon the loyalty of German Jewry: now the children and grandchildren of those protestants considered themselves fortunate that the purpose of that Congress had not been thwarted. Over 65,000 Jews from Germany and Austria have settled in Palestine since 1933.

Not only has there been a change in the relative proportion of

¹ In 1939 there were also 11,156 uncertificated immigrants. See Appendix III.

Jews from different countries, but there has also been a variation in the proportions of different categories. In the twenty years from October, 1919, to September, 1939, the immigrants of the labour category formed 50 per cent. of the total and those of the capitalist category 17 per cent., but in the years from 1934 to 1937 both of these categories were much below the average, the former declining from 25 to 16 per cent. and the latter from 11 to 10 per cent. In 1935, the peak year of immigration, the total in the capitalist category was 6,398, but the number declined in the following years to 2,606 in 1939. On the other hand, from the beginning of the Nazi oppression dependents (despite the rigorous regulations), persons engaged in religious occupations, and students formed a rising proportion. The importance of rescuing the younger generation, in many cases where the parents could not or were not allowed to escape from their persecutors, or where the parents no longer existed, led to the creation in 1933 of a new section of immigration, called "Youth *Aliyah*." The Government issued special certificates for boys and girls entering educational institutions on the basis of guarantees given by the *Vaad Leumi* to schools under its jurisdiction, as well as for children of both sexes placed in agricultural villages. The total number of these juvenile immigrants, many of whom had adventurous and perilous journeys, is about 12,000, and the organisation involved in their transfer and the supervision of their settlement have been the charge of that veteran worker, Miss Henrietta Szold, who has displayed exemplary energy and devotion.

There is still another category of immigrants, those who, fleeing from persecution, have entered the country without certificates, and in most cases at great personal risk. They are officially designated "illegal immigrants," but they base their right to return to their ancestral homeland on the grounds of justice and humanity, recognised by the oft-quoted passage in the Churchill White Paper, which assured the Jews that they were in Palestine as "of right and not on sufferance." As they have all been economically absorbed, it cannot be said that their entrance has violated the principle of not exceeding the absorptive capacity of the country. Nevertheless, the Government has invariably taken into account their estimated number from time to time by making a corresponding deduction in fixing the periodical schedule. On the other hand, there has been an illegal immigration of Arabs from the adjoining territories of Syria and Transjordan, especially from the Hauran, which cannot be justified on the ground of

persecution or ancestral connection, and which has been due solely to the economic attractions of Palestine created by Jewish activity.¹

The total number of Jewish immigrants into Palestine from October, 1919, to September, 1939, was 326,000,² and during the first five years of the Second World War there have been rather over 50,000, so that we can assume that since the beginning of 1919 the aggregate Jewish immigration has amounted to about 376,000.³ It has been primarily owing to immigration that the population of Palestine has increased at a rate unparalleled in any other part of the world. It has been calculated that of the total increase of Jews by 300,000 in the period from 1922 to 1936, only 19 per cent. (57,000) were due to natural increase and 81 per cent. (243,000) to immigration, while in the same period the non-Jews increased by 351,000, of whom 77 per cent. (272,000) were due to natural increase and 23 per cent. (79,000) to immigration.⁴ The Jewish population is now estimated at 530,000, forming over 31 per cent. of the total population (1,700,000). It has more than trebled since 1929, when it was 160,000, and is nearly ten times as large as at the end of 1918, when it stood at 55,000. One-third of Palestinian Jewry is concentrated in Tel-Aviv, which, with a population of 183,000, including 27,500 in an adjoining suburb of Jaffa, has grown at a phenomenal rate, for in 1914 it had only 2,000 inhabitants, by 1929 it had 40,000, and ten years later 150,000. Tel-Aviv is the only all-Jewish city in the world, and all its public services—from the magistracy and police to transport and scavenging—are in the hands of Jews.⁵ The next largest Jewish communities are those of Jerusalem, where there are 90,000 Jews (61 per cent. of the total), and Haifa, where there are 71,000 (60 per cent. of the total). About one-fourth of the *Yishuv* lives in the rural districts. Owing to the comparatively large immigration in the years before 1939, building was very active

¹ The Palestine Royal Commission (*Report*, pp. 289-92) estimated that unauthorised Jewish settlers had risen in the two years 1932-3 to 22,400. They gave 2,500 as the figure of Hauranis illegally in the country, but, according to a writer in the *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society* (October, 1936), the number of illegal Arab immigrants in 1934 was over 20,000. From 1939 to 1942 the number of Jews who entered Palestine without certificates was 18,090.

² See *Two Decades of Keren Hayesod*, by A. Ulitzur (Jerusalem, 1940), p. 37.

³ According to a report published by the Statistical Department of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, the total number of Jewish immigrants from 1919 to the end of 1942 was 358,903.

⁴ *Economic Survey of Palestine*, by David Horowitz and Rita Hinden (Tel-Aviv, 1938), p. 22.

⁵ The expenditure of the Tel-Aviv Municipality has now reached £1,369,000 a year.

both in town and country, as many as 12,000 Jewish workers being employed in that industry and allied trades. The amount of Jewish capital invested in building in 1935 was £7,000,000, and during the next three years a further £9,000,000 was devoted to the same purpose.

The progress of the National Home has been notably marked by an increase in the amount of land in Jewish ownership, in the expansion of industrial and commercial activity, and in the growth of the educational and health services. The extent of land in Jewish possession, all acquired by purchase, now amounts to 1,690,000 *dunams*, which is equivalent to 6 per cent. of the total area of Western Palestine (26,158,000 *dunams*). Of this Jewish land 720,000 *dunams* are the property of the Jewish National Fund: the largest tracts are in the Valley of Jezreel (182,500 *dunams*) and in Judæa (108,500 *dunams*), while smaller areas are in the Plain of Sharon (80,500), the Jordan Valley (69,000), and Samaria (31,000). The greatest changes in the landscape of the country have been wrought by the Jewish National Fund, with the aid of the Keren Hayesod, in the Valley of Jezreel and the Plain of Sharon, where land belonging to absentee Arab landlords, which was formerly a wilderness, has been transformed into a fruitful and smiling countryside. Changes almost of equal importance have been made in the Kabbara Marshes and the Plain of Athlit, thanks to the developments carried out by the P.I.C.A., which has leased the land from the Government. Of the total area in Jewish possession, 170,000 *dunams* represent concessions, the most important consisting of 57,000 *dunams* in the Huleh Valley, acquired in 1934 by the Palestine Land Development Company, and of this tract 15,000 *dunams*, after being drained at the expense of the Company, are to be set aside without payment for local Arab *fellaheen*. Experts are divided as to the amount of land in Palestine that is cultivable, but Dr. Arthur Ruppin, an authority who devoted over thirty years to the agricultural development of the country, calculated that one-half of the total area is cultivable,¹ which means that the land in Jewish possession amounts to 12 per cent. of the cultivable area. Friends of the Arabs have accused the Jews of acquiring the best soil in the country, but, if it is the best, it has been rendered so by Jewish industry, capital, and scientific methods, as the land was previously regarded as barren and derelict. The cultivators of the soil are by no means confined to the labour class, as many middle-class Jews, with

¹ Ruppin, *The Jewish Fate and Future*, p. 334.

capital of their own, especially from Germany and Poland, have invested their money in farms, which they manage themselves, and they have also been assisted by the Keren Hayesod. Fortunately, Jewish perseverance succeeded in discovering water resources in a number of places, and in an abundance exceeding the anticipation of many experts. Another notable improvement in the landscape has been the reforestation of the country. The Jewish National Fund has planted over 3,500,000 trees in thirty-two localities, and thus altered the appearance of the hill-country in Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee, where attractive vistas of green terraces have replaced the bare expanses of former times.

No more striking testimony to Jewish zeal and energy could be afforded than the material progress made both during the violent disorders that troubled the country from 1936 to 1939, and during the years of war that followed. In the former period Jewish land-purchases amounted to 83,000 *dunams* (70,000 acquired by the Jewish National Fund), while in the first five years of the war the National Fund bought another 240,000 *dunams*. Nor was there any cessation in the founding of new settlements. Owing to the risk of Arab attacks, if these had been established by the former normal methods, which occupied at least some weeks, it was necessary to create a new settlement within twelve hours, between dawn and dusk. This feat was accomplished by a brilliant combination of organisation, co-operation and speed: the new settlers, accompanied by comrades from neighbouring settlements and by Jewish supernumerary police, arrived on the chosen spot at the break of dawn with lorries laden with all the manifold requisite materials in pre-fabricated form, and such was the energy and co-ordination displayed that by sunset the settlement was complete within its stockade, and a tall water-tower flashed an electric signal across the valley to the nearest villages that the work was done. Within the first five years of the war nearly forty new settlements were founded, and now the total number of agricultural settlements approaches 300.

The progress of Jewish agriculture has been marked by an increase of produce and the diminution of the size of individual holdings, thanks to experimentation and the systematic application of scientific methods. The success achieved is particularly notable when compared with Arab records. On many Jewish farms the milk yield of a cow is nearly ten times as great as that of a cow on an Arab farm, which is 600 litres a year; the laying capacity of a hen is thrice as great as that of one on an Arab farm; and,

thanks to irrigation, a field, instead of giving only one crop, yields five to six crops of forage or two to three crops of vegetables. Before 1914 the average size of a Jewish holding was 240 *dunams*, but this was gradually diminished to 100 *dunams*, and in later periods, in districts where the land could be irrigated, it was reduced still further to 20 *dunams*.

The most extensive development has taken place in the growing of citrus fruit. Between 1919 and 1939 the area under orange cultivation increased from 30,000 to 300,000 *dunams*, of which 160,000 belonged to Jewish settlers, who also introduced the growing of grape-fruit and lemons. The citrus crop of 1938-9 was a record, amounting to 18 million cases. This fruit once formed nearly 80 per cent. of the country's exports, and about two-thirds of the annual crop went to Great Britain; but owing to the war and the difficulties of shipping the amount grown had to be greatly reduced and the cultivators have had to be helped with Government loans. The crop in 1941-2 was only 6½ million cases, and in 1942-3 it fell to 5 millions. The area covered by vineyards and fruit orchards increased during the years 1934-9 from 400,000 to 870,000 *dunams*. The expansion took place largely on Arab holdings, thanks to active encouragement by the Government in distributing free saplings to *fellaheen* and providing expert advice, a form of assistance from which Jewish farming benefits very little. The area of vegetable cultivation by Jewish farmers was nearly 3,500 *dunams* in 1935-6, but owing to the Arab disorders and boycott during the next three years that area was nearly trebled, and, since the war, it has been extended still further to 17,000 *dunams*.

At the end of 1942 there were close on 14,000 milch-cows in Jewish possession, the productive capacity of which reached 50 million litres of milk for the year. The number of dairy cattle had by then increased to 27,400, and the number of sheep to nearly 32,000. The Jewish settlements also have 654,000 head of poultry, producing nearly 100,000,000 eggs, and over 15,000 bee-hives (forming over 70 per cent. of the total). The aggregate sales of agricultural and dairy produce by the Jewish Co-operative Society, "Tnuvah," amounted in 1941-42 to £2,100,000, compared with £210,000 in 1933-4—that is, an increase of ten times within eight years.

There have also been striking developments in the field of industry, thanks largely to the immigration of industrialists, scientists, inventors, engineers, and trained craftsmen from Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, who brought with them not only

capital and technical skill, but also, in many cases, patent processes and the requisite plant. These victims of Hitlerism have proved a boon to the Holy Land, which is the only country in the Near and Middle East where certain articles can be manufactured. Among the industries introduced in recent years are cinema films and iron safes, automobile bodies and armoured cars, refrigerators and water-sprinklers, boats and agricultural machinery, plate and window glass, buttons and rubber, electrical, scientific and precision instruments, lenses for binoculars, steel and alloys, heavy and fine chemicals, diamond polishing and zincography. The diamond-polishing trade has been created by refugees from Antwerp and Amsterdam and employs over 4,000 people in works established at Tel-Aviv, Nethaniah and other centres. There are now altogether 7,000 Jewish factories, workshops, and other industrial establishments, which employ over 50,000 persons and have an annual output worth £40,000,000—one-fourth of which is for war purposes. The dominating part that the Jews play in Palestine's industry is attested by the fact that they have provided 90 per cent. of its capital and supply 85 per cent. of its labour.

Industrial development has been greatly furthered by the electrification scheme introduced by Pinhas Rutenberg, in 1923, by harnessing the waters of the Jordan and the Yarmuk. There is a hydro-electric power-house near the junction of these rivers, and other power-houses have been erected at Haifa and Tel-Aviv. The entire system, which is operated by the Palestine Electric Corporation,¹ has a total generating capacity of 72,000 horse-power, and the number of kw.h. units sold increased from 5½ millions in 1930 to nearly 150 millions in 1943. Another industry of far-reaching importance is the extraction of the mineral deposits of the Dead Sea, originally conceived before the First World War by Mr. M. Novomeysky, and conducted by him (for some years in conjunction with the late Major Tulloch) for Palestine Potash, Ltd. There are two plants, one at the northern and the other at the southern end of the lake, and they are capable of producing over 100,000 tons of potash per annum, and other salts in proportion. The amount exported in 1939 consisted of 63,500 tons of potash and 590 tons of bromine, of the value of £427,000. The Dead Sea is estimated to hold in solution 2,000 million tons of potash, enough to supply the world's requirements at the present rate for

¹ This company, of which Viscount Samuel is Chairman, has an authorised capital of over £4,000,000, of which £2,752,000 is paid up.

5,000 years. It is the only source within the confines of the British Empire that yields this mineral salt, as well as magnesium chloride and anhydrous carnallite, and these products occupy the second place in the list of Palestine's exports.

Commerce has received a powerful impetus from the Jewish resettlement, and in consequence most of the leading banks, shipping companies, and insurance companies of Europe, America, and other parts of the world have branches or agencies at Tel-Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem. The opening of the harbour at Haifa in October, 1933, was an inevitable result of this development, and the importance of the city was further enhanced by its being made one of the terminal points of the Iraq oil pipe-line. The construction of a jetty and lighter port at Tel-Aviv was rendered necessary by the temporary closing of the Jaffa harbour by the Arab general strike in 1936. The Tel-Aviv port is an achievement due exclusively to Jewish enterprise, capital and labour: it cost over £200,000, and more than 1,000 Jewish workers (largely stevedores from Salonika) were in regular employment before the Second World War (besides 2,000 in other harbours). The port was officially declared open on February 23rd, 1938, for the landing of passengers, and by the end of the year the amount of cargo loaded and unloaded was nearly 300,000 tons. The commercial importance of Tel-Aviv was first signalled by the industrial exhibitions, which began to be held there in 1929. Limited originally to 7,000 square metres, the exhibition was extended by 1936 to 130,000 square metres, the participants included twenty governments and nearly 3,000 exhibitors from fifty countries, and the value of the sales exceeded £500,000. The Foreign Trade Institute, founded in 1938 by the Jewish Agency in collaboration with the Palestine Manufacturers' Association and the Anglo-Palestine Bank, has promoted trade with various countries, especially those of the Near and Middle East, India, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United States. The tourist traffic has been greatly furthered by Jews, who have built hotels in Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, and other places, besides establishing health resorts at Tiberias (sulphur springs) and by the Dead Sea.

One of the most noteworthy developments in the years before the Second World War was the increasing part taken by the *Yishuv* in marine affairs. A special section of the Labour Department of the Jewish Agency Executive was formed for the purpose of consolidating the position of the Jews in the ports, promoting shipping, training seamen, and fostering the fishing trade.

A steadily growing number of Jews are employed as stevedores, porters, and boatmen. Jewish shipping is still in an elementary stage, but it has developed since 1939, when there were two companies, one of which used to conduct a passenger and freight service between Palestine and Rumania, and the other carried on coastal traffic with adjoining countries. The sea as a career is making an increasing appeal to the Jewish youth, and training has been conducted by the Zebulun Seafaring Society, *Hapoel*, the Sea Scouts, and particularly by the Nautical School opened in 1938 as a department of the Haifa Technical Institute. There are Jewish shipyards at Tel-Aviv and Haifa, where lighters, passenger-launches, and fishing boats are built; and in response to the needs of the Tel-Aviv port a group of men have specialised in diving. The Jewish fishing industry is making satisfactory progress, thanks partly to the fishermen who migrated from Salonika, and partly to others who learned the craft at places as varied as Gdynia (Poland) and Civita Vecchia (near Rome). There are four main branches: deep-sea fishing off Haifa, coastal fishing off Athlit and Tel-Aviv, lake-fishing in the Lakes Tiberias and Huleh, and carp-breeding in creeks in the Beisan Valley. The total catches increased from 132 tons in 1939-40 to 858 tons in 1943-4, and now form about a fourth of the total fishing of the country.

An outstanding feature of Jewish economic life in Palestine (as already indicated in Chapter X) consists of the co-operative movement, which embraces over one-third of the Jewish population. Palestine thus ranks among the world's most progressive co-operative communities. Every member of the General Federation of Jewish Labour belongs simultaneously to the "General Co-operative Association of Jewish Labour in Palestine, Limited," which forms the legal body comprising hundreds of agricultural settlements and industrial producers' and service co-operatives, besides a Workers' Bank, credit co-operatives, consumers' co-operatives, contracting offices, a marketing co-operative, and other institutions. The remarkable progress made by the co-operative movement is shown by the fact that between 1932 and 1940 the business transacted by its economic institutions expanded from £1,000,000 to £6,500,000. The agricultural settlements are served by two important co-operative societies, *Tnuvah*, which markets about 70 per cent. of the total Jewish agricultural produce and had a turnover of £2,100,000 in 1942, and *Nir*, which fosters co-operative settlement on the land and has capital reserves exceeding £480,000. The principal consumers' co-operative, *Hamashbir*, which was initiated during the First World

War and co-operates with the English Co-operative Wholesale Society, comprises 95 societies and has a turnover of more than £1,285,000. In the sphere of industry and transport there are (a) groups of producers' co-operatives (relating particularly to the metal, boot, building, carpentry, and bakery trades) with over £573,000 capital and £1,000,000 assets; (b) motor-transport co-operatives operating 80 per cent. of the Jewish omnibus and truck services, which link up the various settlements and cities and provide convenient communications with Syria, Iraq, Egypt, and the rest of the Middle East; (c) the maritime association, *Nachshon*, including stevedores, fishermen, and sailors or the boats of the association, which helped to build the port of Tel-Aviv and invests in cargo and fishing boats; and (d) the central society for co-operative contracting, *Solel Boneh*, the largest organisation of its kind in the Near and Middle East, which possesses the biggest iron foundry in Palestine, besides glass works and stone quarries, and carried out industrial and public works in 1943 to the value of £1,800,000.

According to a special investigation made by the Statistical Department of the Jewish Agency in the middle of 1942, there were then 508,000 Jews in Palestine, of whom 45 per cent. were wage-earners, as follows:

<i>Category</i>	<i>No. gainfully employed</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Agriculture	32,800	15'4
Industry and crafts	49,600	23'3
Transport and communications	7,400	3'5
Building and public works (including 13,500 workers in military camps)	23,900	11'3
Trade	23,500	11'0
Liberal professions	16,500	7'8
Clerical professions, Civil Service, and religious occupations	23,000	10'8
Domestic service	17,600	8'3
Finance and investments	7,300	3'4
Various vocations	4,300	2'0
Jewish settlement police and general police	6,900	3'2
	<u>212,800</u>	<u>100'0</u>

Early in 1943 there were over 20,000 Jewish volunteers in the British Army.

The principal financial instrument of the Jewish Agency for the development of Palestine is the Keren Hayesod (Foundation Fund), which since its establishment has raised over £12,000,000 by means of voluntary contributions from Jews in all parts of the world. Within the first twenty years of its activity it expended a total of £9,477,000, which was divided among the following purposes:

	£	Percentage
Agricultural colonisation . . .	2,944,000	31·6
Education and culture . . .	1,706,000	18·0
Immigration and training . . .	1,115,000	11·8
Public works and housing. . .	1,027,000	10·8
National organisation and security . . .	885,000	9·3
Urban settlement, trade and industry and investments	747,000	7·9
Administration and other expenses . . .	624,000	6·6
Health and social services.	379,000	4·0

For the year 1944-5 the Jewish Agency (including the Zionist Organisation) adopted a budget of £2,100,000 for all purposes, including £120,000 from the Jewish National Fund for new settlements. This Fund has now raised a total of over £7,000,000, which has been devoted mainly to land purchase and afforestation.

Apart from the Keren Hayesod¹ and the National Fund, large sums have also been expended in Palestine since 1918 by the following leading institutions and funds associated with the Zionist Organisation or the Jewish Agency: the Hadassah Medical Organisation, the Palestine Restoration Fund, the Hebrew University, the Women's International Zionist Organisation, the Emergency Fund, and the Central Bureau for the Settlement of German Jews in Palestine. The total expenditure of all these organisations and institutions (including the Keren Hayesod and the National Fund) up to September, 1944, was over £26,000,000.

The Women's International Zionist Organisation (commonly called the W.I.Z.O.) has covered an ever-widening sphere of useful service in Palestine, upon which it has spent over £500,000 in the first twenty-three years of its career. It has devoted itself to two main tasks—the training of women and girls for productive work and the creating of social services for the well-being of mothers and children. In pursuance of this programme, which

¹ In 1934 the Keren Hayesod obtained from Lloyds Bank a loan of £500,000 (the Anglo-Palestine Bank providing £50,000), the greater part of which has been repaid. In 1938 it obtained a second loan of £175,000 from Lloyds Bank, which has been fully repaid. In December, 1943, it received a further loan of £300,000 from the same bank, guaranteed by the Jewish Agency.

fulfils so essential a part in the healthy development of the *Yishuv*, it has established 13 training institutions (including agricultural schools and training farms, and schools for domestic science and the training of children's nurses), and 137 child welfare and social service institutions (including kindergarten, crèches, milk distribution centres, country holiday homes, clothing centres, and refugee hostels). It also provides intensive vocational training courses in towns, and conducts a scheme whereby travelling teachers visit settlements throughout the country to give instruction in housekeeping, gardening, vegetable-growing, and poultry rearing. The W.I.Z.O. is supported by its affiliated federations in over forty countries (many new ones having sprung up in South America and elsewhere to replace those in Europe swept away by the war), and its executive committee in London works in close collaboration with a committee in Jerusalem.

The first Jewish bank, the Jewish Colonial Trust, had a paid-up capital of over £395,000 when its business was taken over at the beginning of 1934 by its subsidiary company, the Anglo-Palestine Bank, and it was converted into a Holding Company. The Anglo-Palestine Bank, whose head office is in Tel-Aviv (with thirteen branches in Palestine and one in London), has an authorised capital of £1,000,000, of which £860,854 is paid up, and a reserve fund of £218,000. It holds a controlling interest in the General Mortgage Bank of Palestine, Ltd., which has a paid-up capital of £475,000. The Jewish Agricultural Bank was established in March, 1936, for the assistance of Jewish farmers, with the co-operation of the Anglo-Palestine Bank and of the Jewish Agency, and operates as a branch of the former. The Jewish Workers' Bank, of which the Anglo-Palestine Bank holds the preference shares, had a paid-up share capital, at the end of 1942, of £232,000, and deposits totalling £800,000, and it advanced loans amounting to over £700,000 to agricultural settlements, co-operative societies, and other bodies associated with the *Histadruth* (the General Federation of Jewish Labour).

The other main bodies actively participating in the work of reconstruction are (as mentioned in Chapter X) the P.I.C.A., the Palestine Economic Corporation, and the Economic Board for Palestine, and there are many Jews with means who have settled in Palestine on their own and are engaged in private enterprise. The Palestine Economic Corporation, founded by American Jews, has contributed to the growth of basic industries through substantial investments, and has made credit available to farmers,

city workers, small business-men and manufacturers, to enable them to become economically independent. The Corporation operates through the following subsidiaries: (1) Central Bank of Co-operative Institutions (over £3,600,000 advanced in loans to 180 societies); (2) Palestine Mortgage and Credit Bank (£260,000 issued in mortgage loans); (3) Palestine Water Company, founded in 1932 to supply water for irrigation and domestic use at low costs, and operating 16 plants; (4) Bayside Land Corporation, formed in 1928 to hold and develop along modern town-planning lines the large tract of land in the Haifa Bay district, purchased by the Palestine Economic Corporation; and (5) the Loan Bank, for granting small loans to artisans, shopkeepers, and small manufacturers. The Palestine Economic Corporation also has investments in Palestine Potash, Palestine Electric Corporation, Palestine Hotels, and other concerns. The Economic Board for Palestine operates through the Palestine Corporation, Limited, which has a paid-up capital of £515,000, partly invested in commercial and industrial undertakings and partly used for loans secured by debentures, mortgages, or other securities.

The measure of progress hitherto attained has been governed mainly by the extent of the man-power and of the financial resources available. The total amount of Jewish capital brought into the country from the beginning of the British occupation until to-day can be moderately estimated at over £120,000,000, one-third of which was introduced during the years 1935-41. Both the Jewish population and the amount of its capital would certainly have been larger had the Administration pursued a more liberal immigration policy and had it not made the possession of at least £1,000 the requisite qualification for the admission of settlers of the "independent means" category. All the economic, educational, and other activities and services of the Jewish Agency and the *Vaad Leumi* are financed almost entirely out of voluntary funds provided by the Jewish people.

In addition to the £1,600,000 a year furnished by the Keren Hayesod, the Jewish National Fund, and other national funds (the Hadassah, the University, and the W.I.Z.O.), the *Yishuv* itself, through the taxation imposed by the *Vaad Leumi* and the Jewish Local Councils, expends about £2,170,000 a year on various public services. Of the latter sum, in 1941-2, the *Yishuv* spent £750,000 on education, an equal amount on health, and £500,000 on social services, relief and welfare. Towards the total of £2,170,000 for these three main public services, the Government

made grants aggregating only £95,000, viz. £56,000 for education, £24,000 for social welfare, and £15,000 for health services. These grants are small in relation to the Government's income, which amounted in 1941-2 to £7,379,000,¹ in relation to the Jewish ratio of the population, and, above all, in relation to the Jewish contribution to the Government's revenue, for, although the Jews form only one-third of the population, they provide over two-thirds (70 per cent.) of that revenue. On the other hand, thanks to the economic progress resulting from Jewish effort, the Government has accumulated a relatively large surplus, which amounted to £6,500,000 before the outbreak of the Arab revolt in 1936, and was reduced by the cost of suppressing it, and by expenditure on public works, to £5,266,073 on March 1st, 1942.²

The day is long past when it could be said that the Jews in Palestine are dependent for their development or for the development of the country upon their brethren in other lands. For the total amount which they provide, in the form of Government taxation and municipal rates, of *Vaad Leumi* taxation and contributions to Jewish national funds, falls hardly short of £6,500,000 per annum, which is little less than the Government's own annual budget. The benefits of Jewish progress are by no means confined to the Government, but have also flowed over in various ways to the Arabs. It has already been noted that the growth of the Arab population has been most marked in those districts where the greatest advance has been made in Jewish settlement, and lowest where there are few or no Jews. Before the First World War there was a steady emigration of Arabs from Palestine to oversea countries, whereas Jewish economic developments have attracted an influx of Arabs from the neighbouring regions. Arab land-owners and farmers have become richer by the sale to Jews of their surplus lands and of agricultural produce, and many Arab workers have found employment in Jewish undertakings. Moreover, Arabs in general have gained by learning the modern agricultural methods introduced by the Jews, and likewise benefited by the hygienic improvements effected by the drainage and irrigation carried out by Jewish bodies. There has thus been a rise in the Arab standard of living in comparison both with former years and with the conditions of the Arabs in other countries.

¹ Of this amount £6,250,000 was provided by the revenue from the country, the rest consisting of grants-in-aid from the British Government.

² There was a decline in imports from £15,434,000 in 1937 to £14,633,000 in 1939, and a decline in exports from £5,819,000 to £5,177,000 in the same period. Bank deposits at the end of 1943 stood at about £50,000,000, of which the Anglo-Palestine Bank alone had £25,000,000.

CHAPTER XVI

NATIONAL LIFE IN EVOLUTION

JEWISH life in Palestine has now acquired all the multiple facets of a highly organised national community. The rebuilding of the ancient homeland is marked not only by unparalleled progress in the main spheres of economic activity, but also by ceaseless and creative effort in the intellectual and spiritual domains. The maxim that "man doth not live by bread alone" could hardly be illustrated more vividly than by a survey of the labours of the Jews in Palestine in the varied fields of education and culture, of literature and journalism, of music and drama, of science and art. And the diversity of their national renaissance is reflected further in manifold developments in their social, political, and religious life, as well as in their public health system and their sport. The fullness and complexity of their new world far surpasses the vision of any of the heroic pioneers, who, with their sweat and blood, laid the foundations of the modern *Yishuv*. The bulk of it is the product of the last twenty-five years, for before the First World War the Jews were too intensely engrossed in the task of wresting a frugal livelihood from the long-neglected soil, and also too few in number, to be able to give much thought to other interests; but even then, as in all previous ages, they cultivated their spiritual heritage with unwavering devotion. The fruits of culture now visible are the result of the work, the zeal, and the inspiration, of the sons and daughters of Israel from many lands, but chiefly of those from Central and Eastern Europe.

The outstanding achievement in the cultural sphere is the revival of Hebrew as a living tongue. It is a cardinal feature of the national renaissance, a vital bond linking the people of the new with their forefathers of the ancient Judæa. Not that Hebrew was ever dead, or merely a medium of prayer, throughout the long centuries of dispersion, for it continued to be the language of the scholar and the author, in which Rabbis conducted their learned correspondence, and philosophers and historians, poets and satirists, wrote their books. In mediæval Spain, in eighteenth-century Germany and Galicia, and in nineteenth-century Russia and Lithuania, there appeared a host of Hebrew works in verse and prose, composed in a tongue that in all essentials was the same as that of the chroniclers, the psalmists, and the prophets of the

Bible. But the return to Palestine has given to the ancient speech a new and vigorous life entirely undreamt of before, for it has become the principal medium of intercourse of the Jews throughout the country. It is the only vehicle through which Jews from so many different lands can communicate with one another: it is the language of the school and the home, of the shop and the bank, of the mart and the field, of the lecture-room and the concert-hall, of the theatre and the Press. It has been developed and amplified to respond to all the latest needs of modern civilisation and scientific progress, and has been fashioned into a flexible instrument of modern thought. Its vocabulary has grown under the impetus of daily needs and been enriched under the careful direction of a "Language Board" (*Vaad Halashon*), founded in 1889 by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, and consisting of scholars and experts, who coin whatever fresh mintings are wanted on the basis of existing Hebrew roots and publish them in a quarterly journal. Even those who are slow to learn the language must be influenced and helped by the daily broadcasts of the Palestine Broadcasting Station, which, heralding its announcements with "Jerusalem calling!", devotes rather less than one-third of its time to Hebrew.

The basis of cultural life consists of the schools, which have increased in number and variety from year to year. The *Vaad Leumi*, which controls the organised educational system of the *Yishuv*, has under its direction 483 schools, with over 66,700 pupils and 2,600 teachers. The general schools contain 55·3 per cent. of the pupils, while those of Labour have 22 and those of the Mizrachi have 21·7 per cent.¹ Labour, owing to its settlements being widely scattered, has the largest number of schools, 218, but their average size is much smaller than that of the 181 general or of the Mizrachi establishments. The *Vaad Leumi* educational network includes twenty-five secondary schools, five teachers' colleges and five trade schools; and it comprises 75 per cent. of the Jewish school population, which numbers 88,000 altogether. The total expenditure of Palestine Jewry on elementary and secondary education in 1941-2 was about £750,000, towards which the Government contributed £56,000 (as against £215,000 for Arab schools).² Every endeavour is made to provide the pupils with an education suitable to the conditions of the country, with which they are familiarised by

¹ For an account of the three categories of schools, see Chap. X.

² The amount spent on *Vaad Leumi* schools was £518,000, the remainder being the expenditure on those of the *Agudath Israel*, the Anglo-Jewish Association, the "Alliance Israélite," and other (mainly religious) schools.

being taken by their teachers on rambles to places of Biblical interest. Their physical welfare, too, is looked after. The school in the towns are visited by medical officers of the Hadassah Medical Organisation, and those in the villages by local doctors; and the children are given daily a glass of milk. There are clubs for the students of many secondary schools, and holiday camps are held in the summer.

Training in agriculture is provided at a number of special schools, of which the oldest is that founded by the "Alliance Israélite" at Mikveh Israel. The W.I.Z.O. maintains agricultural schools at Nahalal and Ayanoth, and a German Jewish association maintains a school at Ben-Shemen largely for youthful refugees from Nazi persecution. The Jewish Farmers' Association has a school of its own at Pardess Hannah, and there is a training farm at Talpioth, outside Jerusalem. Thanks to a bequest left by Sir Ellis Kadoorie, of Hong-Kong, the Palestine Government built and maintains the Kadoorie Agricultural School at Mount Tabor (and also a similar school elsewhere for the Arabs). And, finally, there are some girls' farms and other places where the Jewish youth can be taught how to become farmers.

The central establishment for technical education is the Haifa Technical Institute, which was greatly enlarged in consequence of the increased influx of Jewish youth from Germany, Poland, and other parts of Europe from 1933. It embraces a Technical College (with departments of civil engineering, industrial engineering, and architecture), a Technical High School, and a Nautical School. It has a highly qualified staff, including many experienced technologists exiled by Hitler; it is well equipped with laboratories; and its examinations are conducted under the supervision and with the participation of officials of the Government Departments of Public Works and Education and of other extra-mural examiners. There were 550 students in 1939, but the number has diminished owing to a large proportion volunteering for service in the British forces. Another branch of technical instruction is represented by the Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts, which, after having passed through a period of decline, entered upon a new era of useful activity after the influx from Germany and provides competent training in manual crafts involving a feeling for form and beauty.

The crowning feature of the educational system is the Hebrew University at Jerusalem, which is a great institution of research and learning. It has developed from two small research institutes

to two complete faculties—one of the Humanities and the other of the Natural and Mathematical Sciences, and it confers degrees. The Faculty of Humanities includes departments of philosophy, history, education, Classical and Romance languages, and the English language and literature. The chair in the last subject was founded with funds raised by the Anglo-Jewish community as a memorial to Sir Moses Montefiore (with the aid of the British Council), and the first professor entered upon his duties in 1943. The other faculty embraces Institutes of Microbiology, Biology, Hygiene, Botany, Zoology, and Mathematics. There is also a Department of Agriculture, at which a five years' course is given partly in Jerusalem and partly in the laboratories of the Agricultural Experimental Station and of the Daniel Sieff Research Institute at Rehovoth. The Sieff Institute, the creation of English Zionists, is particularly concerned with research into the resources of Palestine. Its director is Dr. Weizmann, and most of its workers are exiled scientists from Germany. Attached to the University, and likewise situated on Mount Scopus, is a great Medical Centre, the joint foundation of the Hadassah Organisation and the University. It comprises, in addition to a new University Hospital, departments of Parasitology and Hygiene, Pathological Physiology and Anatomy, research laboratories for cancer and hormones, and the Henrietta Szold School for Nurses. The main purpose of this Medical Centre is to afford opportunities for research, and to enable young doctors to continue their specialisation, particularly in local diseases. Some of the University teachers have already made notable contributions to the knowledge of the Middle East. Professor Saul Adler, head of the Department of Microbiology, has conducted fruitful researches into certain diseases in the Mediterranean region on behalf of the Royal Society of England; and the Department of Hygiene, under expert direction, has won both praise and material support from the League of Nations Health Organisation for its work in combating malaria, and from the British Empire Marketing Board for its study of human and animal nutrition.

The growth of the University, over which Dr. Judah L. Magnes (formerly a Rabbi in New York) has presided for many years, first as Chancellor and then as President, has been considerably stimulated by the persecution of Jews in Europe, and its staff is adorned by the names of many famous scholars and scientists. Since the first year of the Nazi terror, when a gradual exodus of Jewish professors and students began from the universities in

Central and Eastern Europe, the seat of learning on Mount Scopus has become a refuge for the Jewish intellect and a citadel of Jewish culture; and in consequence of the destruction of all academies of Jewish learning on the Continent, its importance as an intellectual centre of Judaism is enhanced beyond all anticipation. By 1940 the University staff had increased to nearly 150 professors, lecturers, and research assistants, and it had 1,200 students, but these numbers (especially of the students) have been very greatly reduced owing to the war. The annual budget, which now exceeds £120,000, is largely covered by voluntary contributions from Jews in many countries, particularly America; the Jews of Palestine are giving increasing support; and a small grant is received from the Government.

The Institute of Jewish Studies and the Institute of Arabic and Oriental Studies, which formed the nucleus of the University, both cover a wide range of learning. In the former are taught all branches of Jewish lore, all aspects and periods of Jewish literature, philosophy, and history; and the latter is perhaps the best-equipped institution of the kind. The Royal Commission, which reported on Palestine in 1937, stated that the University "on the fringe of Asia maintains the highest standards of western scholarship," and "has made a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the Near East and, particularly, of Arab life and culture." The translation of the Koran into Hebrew and an anthology of classical Arabic poetry are among the outstanding achievements of the University. Its most important contributions to Jewish knowledge include Professor Joseph Klausner's history of modern Hebrew literature, Professor Gerhard Scholem's researches into Jewish mysticism, and Professor Torczyner's studies in Hebrew philology and his interpretation of the writings on the potsherd Letters of Lachish. Moreover, the University Press has rendered a valuable service by publishing a library of philosophical classics in modern Hebrew.

Two important adjuncts of the University are the Jewish National Library and the Museum of Archæology. The Library, containing over 400,000 volumes in all languages, especially Hebrew, is the largest collection in the Near and Middle East. It has been built up mainly from gifts of Jews and non-Jews, Governments and learned societies, in all parts of the world. It possesses many precious manuscripts, including the original treatise on Relativity presented by Einstein; a goodly collection of Hebrew "incunabula"; and a collection of autograph letters of famous Jews of many centuries.

The Museum is planned to house a complete record of Jewish history throughout the ages.

Jewish scholarship is fostered not only by the Institutes of the University but also by other agencies, particularly the Bialik Foundation and the Rabbi Kook Institute. The Bialik Foundation, which was created to perpetuate the memory of the national poet, is devoted to the publication or support of literary and scientific works of national and cultural importance. It is controlled by a Board of Governors consisting of representatives of the Jewish Agency Executive, the Hebrew Authors' Association, the Hebrew University, the Hebrew Language Board, and the Keren Hayesod. It has already issued a number of notable works, including histories of Judaism, of Zionism, and of the *Yishuv*, anthologies of Jewish legends and folklore, books on psychology and æsthetics, and translations of standard works, like Professor Eddington's *Nature of the Physical World* and H. A. L. Fisher's *History of Europe*. It publishes every year a miscellany in memory of Bialik entitled *Kneseth*, containing literary and scientific contributions, poetry, and research in the works of the poet, which ranks as the outstanding annual publication in the field of Hebrew literature. It helps the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society to issue its works, supports several literary periodicals, and gives grants to the Rabbi Kook Institute, to the Culture Department of the *Vaad Leumi*, and to excavations of Jewish interest. It also looks after the Bezalel Museum, which has a large collection of Jewish art treasures and ritual articles. The Kook Institute, founded in memory of a former Chief Rabbi of Palestine, concentrates primarily upon the publication of works of religious interest, both ancient and modern, and issues a literary monthly, *Sinai*.

In no sphere of intellectual labour is there such an abundance of creative activity as in that of literature, where all sorts of writers—novelists and poets, philosophers, historians, and essayists—are giving birth to a variety of works of imagination, criticism, and scholarship. Palestine has become the most important and prolific centre for the production of Hebrew letters at the present day, and for its size it probably contains more authors and journalists than any other national community on earth. Activity in this domain began long before the British occupation, although only in a limited measure. Eliezer Ben-Yehuda had already embarked upon his monumental dictionary of the Hebrew language, and that wayward poet, Naphtali Herz Imber (1856-1909), author of *Hatikvah*, had, during his six years' sojourn in the Holy Land

(1882-8), composed a number of poems, of which the best known are the *Mishmar Ha-Yarden* ("The Watch on the Jordan") and *Hinmalet Haharah* ("Escape to the Hills"), the latter an appeal to the Jews in Europe to hasten to Mount Zion before the ground under their feet became too hot. But the literary efflorescence did not begin until after the establishment of the Mandatory régime.

The dominant figure in the period between the two World Wars was Hayim Nahman Bialik (1873-1934), the greatest Hebrew poet of modern times, who had achieved world-wide fame by the wealth and brilliance of his works before he settled in Tel-Aviv in 1921. Acknowledged as the poet laureate of his people from the day when, in his *In the City of Slaughter*, he scourged them for their failure to defend themselves in the Kishinev pogrom of 1903, he kindled in them a sense of pride in their past and the will to live on as a nation. He was a lord of language, in whose skilled hand Hebrew was a very flexible instrument, capable of expressing the most subtle thoughts and airy fancies. Unlike the Psalmist, he sang the songs of Zion in a strange land, his native Russia, but after returning to his ancestral homeland his muse, except on a few rare occasions, was silent. Yet he exercised his intellectual gifts and the powers of his personality in other stimulating and inspiring ways. He became a publisher by profession and took a leading part in the social and cultural life of the *Yishuv*. He was guide, teacher, and prophet. He devoted much industry to unearthing the treasures of the Jewish mind from the lore of the past, especially the homiletical and ethical portions of the Talmud, and representing them in an attractive anthology, *Sefer Ha-aggadah*. He also produced some fine translations of European classics, such as *Don Quixote* and Schiller's *William Tell*. His memory has been honoured by the conversion of his house into a Bialik Museum, containing a collection of his books, manuscripts, photographs, and various personal possessions, which serves as a literary shrine.

Second in importance in the literary world came Saul Tchernichowski (1875-1943), also a native of Russia, who had likewise achieved great fame as a Hebrew poet before he made his home in Tel-Aviv in 1930. But he was unlike Bialik in his choice of themes, for to him the tragic aspect of Jewish life made only a secondary appeal. His favourite subjects were the beauties of Nature and the delights of love: he drank of Hellenic as of other springs; and in one of his early poems he apostrophised Apollo. But, despite what critics regarded as a pagan outlook (though he drew

from the same fount as the author of *The Song of Songs*), he also composed some songs of Zion and greatly enriched Hebrew letters with brilliant translations of famous works from seven languages. Chief among them are Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Sophocles' *Œdipus, Rex*, Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs*, and the Finnish epic, *Kalewala*. Tchernichowski was also a writer of short stories, essayist, and playwright. Educated for the medical profession, he had practised in Russia and Germany before devoting himself to the calling in Palestine; and he compiled Hebrew dictionaries of medicine and anatomy as well as one of botany. In his honour the Tel-Aviv Municipality founded the Tchernichowski Prizes that are awarded annually for the best Hebrew translations of classical works.

Of the host of other creative writers it must suffice to select a few of the more prominent. Jacob Cohen, like Bialik and Tchernichowski, had also achieved a reputation as a poet before settling in Palestine. Jacob Fichman is one of the finest Hebrew poets and essayists of the day. Of the small band of women writers, who have mostly composed lyrics, the most gifted was Rachel (1890-1931), who published three small volumes of verse expressing love for the soil and landscape of the Land of Israel, tinged with sadness due to her premonition of an early death. Among prose writers, Joseph Hayim Brenner (1881-1921) was a realistic novelist, whose works suggest the influence of Dostoievski and Gorki. He joined the ranks of Labour and worked for a time on the soil; he edited various periodicals; and he was a victim of the Arab disorders in 1921. Other important novelists are S. I. Agnon, who describes Jewish life in Galicia and in Palestine in several masterly novels and short stories, Yehuda Burla, who draws his themes from the life of the Sephardic community, G. Shofman, a brilliant short story writer, H. Hazaz, and A. Barash. Moses Smilansky has written stories describing the life of the Jewish settlers and their Arab neighbours. Apart from original works there is a great and growing multitude of Hebrew translations covering all branches of literature and including all the leading authors of the present and the past.

Activity in the field of journalism is no less vigorous than in that of literature. There are seven Hebrew dailies which represent different political or social outlooks. The newspaper with the largest circulation is the *Davar* ("Word"), which is the organ of the General Federation of Jewish Labour and voices the views of Social Democracy. It has two editions daily, and maintains a high literary standard and a good news service. The middle-class element read *Haaretz* ("The Land"), which represents a liberal

standpoint on political and social matters and counts several of the leading Hebraists of the country among its contributors. Both papers have a circulation of between 30,000 and 40,000. *Hazman* ("The Time") and *Haboker* ("The Morning") are the papers of Group A and Group B of the General Zionists respectively, the former being closer to Labour and the other tending more to the Right. A fifth paper, *Hamashkif* ("The Spectator") is the bold mouthpiece of the Revisionists; the Mizrahi party has an organ called *Hatzofeh* ("The Observer"), and the Left-wing "Hashomer Hatzair" has *Mishmar* ("Guardian"). There is only one English daily, the *Palestine Post*, which is owned and edited by Jews: it observes a high standard as regards articles and accuracy of news, and aims at fostering good relations between all sections of the country.

The number of weekly, monthly, and other periodicals in Hebrew is legion. Some years before the Second World War the total had already reached 300. Every religious section, every political group, and every professional association have their own journal: the Mizrahi and the "Agudath Israel," the various shades of Labour, the doctors and lawyers, the engineers and architects, the teachers and farmers, the lovers of drama and the devotees of music. *Hapoel Hatzair*, the oldest weekly, is the organ of the Palestine Labour Party. *Haalam*, the organ of the Zionist Organisation, was transferred from London to Jerusalem in 1935. The Hebrew University is responsible for two periodicals, one dealing with books and bibliography, and the other containing original contributions from the professors. The Jewish Archaeological Society publishes a bi-monthly journal of its transactions; and the Jewish Medical Association issues a quarterly containing original scientific contributions. There are also an English weekly, the *Palestine Review*, covering all aspects of Jewish life in Palestine, and an English monthly, *The Palestine and Near East Magazine*, devoted mainly to economic matters. In addition to its multifarious Press, Palestine has two Jewish news agencies, one of them, "Palcor," under the control of the Jewish Agency Executive, and the other, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

The creative and artistic spirit of the Jew has found expression not only in literature, but also in drama, music, and art. Owing to the comparative youth of the *Yishuv* and the limited possibilities of patronage, there has been relatively little activity in the plastic arts, although a number of painters and a few sculptors have found inspiring themes in the new Judæa. Several painters from the

Diaspora—notably Abel Pann, Leo Blum, Ruben, Newman, Gliksberg, and Steinhardt—have produced striking works marked by the rich colouring of the Palestinian scene, some of which have been exhibited in the leading galleries of many countries. But in the other forms of art the developments have been more profuse. The two principal theatrical companies are “Habimah” and the “Ohel.” “Habimah,” which came into existence in Moscow in 1917, consists of players who owed their first training to Vachtangor, of Stanislawsky’s Moscow Art Theatre, and migrated to Palestine when they realised that there was no future for the Hebrew drama in Russia. They have devoted years to attaining perfection in their particular parts, and can vie with the best European companies in the excellence of their acting. In the course of twenty-four years, “Habimah” has produced some seventy plays, about half drawn from Hebrew and Yiddish dramatic literature, and the other half from general European literature, thus showing that it aims at a broad human appeal. Shakespeare and Molière, Shaw and Ibsen, Chekhov and Capek, have all been presented on its stage. Jewish authors from Europe now settled in Palestine have also had plays produced, notably *David Reubeni*, by Max Brod, formerly of Prague, who is the company’s dramatic adviser. During the last few years three original plays by Palestinian writers have met with success: *Jerusalem and Rome* (dealing with the life of Flavius Josephus), by Nathan Bistrizky, and *Michal, the daughter of Saul* and *This Land*, by Ashman. *This Land*, which depicts the life and struggles of the early pioneers in the country, has had over 100 performances.

The “Ohel” Labour Theatre at first concentrated on Biblical themes, but it also stages Hebraised versions of modern works, with a preference for such playwrights as Gorki and Capek. Both companies, which are organised on a co-operative basis, tour throughout the country, the “Ohel” players visiting as many agricultural villages as possible. In addition, there are a comedy theatre, “Matateh” (“Broom”), which deals in a spirit of satire with any social or political question of the day, and the “Opera Amamit,” which produces operettas.

The Jewish love for music led to the opening of a musical school in Tel-Aviv before 1914, but notable developments did not begin until after the British occupation. A Musical Conservatoire was established in Jerusalem and societies for the promotion of concerts were formed, not only in that city, but also in Tel-Aviv and Haifa. A powerful stimulus was given by the arrival of many brilliant musicians—conductors and instrumentalists—from Nazi-controlled

countries, as well as by the visits of such famous Jewish artists as Gabrilovitch, Rubinstein, and Heifetz, who gave performances in aid of furthering the cultivation of music. The presence of so much talent suggested to Bronislav Hubermann the desirability of organising a Symphony Orchestra, and his efforts met with such success that the first concerts of this orchestra were given in the winter of 1936, with Toscanini as the conductor and Hubermann as the leading violinist. The Palestine Symphony Orchestra, which has also been conducted by other famous visitors, has an ideal and inspiring setting for its performances in the open-air amphitheatre of the Hebrew University. It has now established a reputation as the finest musical ensemble throughout the Near and Middle East, and indeed far beyond, and it has often given successful concerts in Egypt and Syria. Other Jewish musicians have formed a String Quartette under a former leader of the Budapest Quartette, and a Chamber Orchestra, which is a regular part of the Palestine broadcasting system. For some years there was also a Hebrew Opera Company, conducted by a former operatic director from Russia. It produced operas of the Italian and Russian schools, as well as an original Hebrew opera written in Palestine by the Russian Jewish composer, Rosovsky, but the company was unable to exist without a subvention and was dissolved. It has since been succeeded by two other companies.

The happiness of the younger generation at the return to their ancient homeland has found expression in song and dance. A number of Hebrew poems have been set to music and are sung with gusto by the workers on the land, in the factory, and at the forge. One of their favourites, based on a poem in the Passover liturgy, is *God will rebuild Galilee*. Many of their songs proclaim the dignity of labour; others express love for the new Judæa, and others, again, thankfulness for the wanderers' return to the homeland. Some revolve round the figure of Elijah, the legendary forerunner of the Messiah; and another, sung to a lilting melody, with a rapid repetition of the final strophe, embodies the ethical teaching of Hillel:

*"If I am not for myself, who will be for me?
If I am only for myself, what am I?
And if not now, when?"*

The natural impulse to dance for joy on touching the ancestral soil has given birth to the *Hora*, which is danced by a group clasp-

ing crossed hands together in a circle and whirling round at a gradually increasing tempo to a tune that is lustily sung by both dancers and onlookers.

The energy displayed in all these fields of cultural expression is paralleled by the efforts in the sphere of social and physical welfare, for one of the cardinal tenets of the *Yishuv* is *mens sana in corpore sano*. Three main bodies (as already mentioned)¹ have combined in concerting the necessary measures for ensuring the good health of the Jewish population and fighting disease—the Hadassah Organisation, the *Kupath Holim* (the Sick Fund of the Jewish Labour Federation), and the Health Department of the *Vaad Leumi*. These three, together with the Tel-Aviv Municipality, are represented on the *Vaad Habriuth*, the Health Council, which acts as the central co-ordinating authority. There are Jewish hospitals, well equipped, in all the larger centres of Jewish population, the principal one being that of the Medical Centre on Mount Scopus (the Hadassah-Rothschild-University Hospital) built and planned on the most up-to-date scientific lines, and including a school of nursing and a post-graduate medical school. The Hadassah Organisation has five hospitals, besides urban clinics, pathological, radium, and X-ray institutes, laboratories, health welfare centres (largely due to the generosity of the late Nathan Straus of New York), and a school hygiene department, upon all of which it spends about £100,000 a year. The *Kupath Holim*, which has a paying membership of 112,000, has an annual budget of £500,000, operates in 165 centres, and benefits 250,000 persons. It employs a staff of 1,000, its hospitals have a daily total of 700 patients, and its clinics, dispensaries and infant welfare stations are visited by 10,000 patients daily. Its headquarters are in Tel-Aviv and its central hospital is in the Emek. Special measures are taken jointly for the suppression of malaria, tuberculosis, paratyphoid, and other contagious diseases, with satisfactory results. Between 1934 and 1938 new cases of malaria among members of the Sick Fund declined from 23 to 9·7 per 1,000, and the total cases of enteric fever from 429 to 336. There is also a Red Cross organisation, called the Red Shield of David (*Magen David Adom*), comprising central stations in the cities and the chief settlements, and a network of first-aid stations throughout the country. The total expenditure of the *Yishuv* on health work is £750,000 a year, towards which the Government gives a grant of £15,000. Owing largely to the flight from the Nazi terror, there is an

¹ See Chap. X.

abundance of doctors, and the interests of the profession are looked after by the Jewish Medical Association.

The land has produced a new Jewish type, robust, muscular, fearless, and without a trace of the Ghetto bend. Physical fitness of the young is fostered by organised sport, which has been a means of furthering friendly relations with the Arabs, as there have been football matches between Jewish and Arab teams. The Scout movement too enjoys much popularity, embracing troops not only of Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, but also of Sea Scouts, Land Scouts, and Religious Scouts. Before the riots of 1936-9, there was a popular athletic festival at Tel-Aviv, the "Maccabiad," modelled after the Olympic Games, to which Jewish athletes from many countries went to compete in fraternal rivalry with the sons and daughters of the new Judæa.

The *Yishuv* is made up of elements from so many different lands, and the successive waves of immigration during the past twenty-five years have been characterised by such contrasts, that it is as yet impossible to expect a homogeneous national community. Even though the majority were drawn to Palestine by Zionist sentiment (for there is a minority—many of them refugees from Hitlerism—who went there primarily as to a haven of safety), and even though Hebrew is the predominant medium of intercourse, the influence and traditions, the customs and conventions in which they were brought up cannot be effaced or moulded to a common pattern within a generation. The division is particularly sharp between the Jews from Europe and other Western countries and those from Oriental climes, particularly the Yemenites. The latter are mostly poor, they are not accustomed to secular education, they have the Eastern view of the position of women, and they drift into unskilled trades. In Jerusalem, for instance, a large proportion of those employed as street porters, shoeblacks, domestic servants, newspaper boys, and the followers of other humble occupations, belong to the Oriental communities, and it will take time before they rise to a higher social level. The *Histadruth* has realised the necessity of ironing out these differences, for in its Workers' Youth movement, *Ha-Noar Haoved*, it provides a common form of education for the children of all communities. In some seventeen *kibbutzim* Yemenites and other Orientals, German and Polish youth, all work and live together on a basis of equality and cordial understanding. Most of the Jews from Eastern Europe who settled in the country before 1933 feel themselves members of the *Yishuv*, but a large number of those who arrived later have not

yet become integrated in the general community. The latter have formed a new type of organisation, based on the country of their origin. There are about a score of such unions from as many different countries, and they serve some useful purpose. They provide loan funds for their members to set them up in business, they help them to learn Hebrew, they facilitate the securing of immigration certificates for their relatives abroad, and they furnish a meeting place for social intercourse. These organisations are a product of the solidarity uniting immigrants from the same country, and might be expected to dissolve in time after their members become endenized in the *Yishuv*. Yet the union of German and Austrian settlers has not limited itself to a social programme: it has constituted itself as a new party, the *Aliyah Hadashah* ("New Immigration"), with the addition of immigrants from Czechoslovakia, and thus increased the already existing parties.

The multiplicity of political parties, a familiar feature of Jewish communities in Eastern Europe (as of many countries on the Continent) before the war, reveals the presence of internal divisions in the *Yishuv* despite its common fundamental basis. The parties are by no means confined to those of the Zionist movement—Labour of various shades, the orthodox Mizrachi, the General or Central Zionists of two different groups, and the Jewish State Party. In Municipal, local council, and *Kehillah* elections there are also candidates representing local economic interests, such as the Farmers' Association and property-owners (in addition occasionally to the *Agudath Israel* and the so-called "New Zionist Organisation"). The largest political party is that of Labour, called the *Mapai*,¹ which has gained in importance as the rebuilding of the National Home advanced and the *Histadruth* grew. It stands for a close identification of the task of reconstructing Palestine as the homeland of the Jewish people with the creation of a Jewish working class as the basis of a regenerated nation. The other Labour groups, somewhat more to the Left, are *Hashomer Hatzair* and the Left Poale Zion, both of which emphasise Marxist principles. But despite these internal differences of Right and Left, of bourgeois and worker, which are inevitable in any modern community, all are agreed upon the essentials of Jewish national life.

Nor is there uniformity in the matter of religious observance any more than in the rest of Jewry. There is, indeed, no funda-

¹ From the initials of *Miflageth Poale Israel Eretz* ("Party of the Workers of the Land of Israel"). Its English name is the Palestine Labour Party.

mental difference on questions of principle, but there are gradations in regard to ritual conformity. There are thousands belonging to the orthodox and even super-orthodox school, who are most punctilious in the performance of all the minutiae of the *Shulchan Arukh* (the code of religious law); a larger proportion are more modern in outlook; and there are numbers who are frankly secularist. But Jewish tradition is held in general respect even on the part of those who are not observant themselves, and in no other country in the world can Judaism be lived and practised with a stricter fulfilment of Biblical commands and Talmudic prescriptions. So much of the Jewish religion is based upon life and events in ancient Judaea, and so many of its precepts and practices were designed to help in the struggle to achieve the new Judaea, that many of those who have actively shared in the struggle have a different conception of Judaism from that usually associated with the Synagogue. For them it is not a matter of creed and dogma, but a way of life, and one that can best be lived in a revived Judaea. They hold that *laborare est orare*, and their view has been supported by a high orthodox authority. When the late Chief Rabbi Kook was once asked to take action against some young workers who had infringed the religious law, he replied by recalling the immunity enjoyed by the workers in the Holy City in olden times. The High Priest could enter the holy of holies in the Temple only on the Day of Atonement and after making the most elaborate preparations, but the builders and masons could enter it at any time to carry out repairs to the fabric. The workers of to-day were repairing breaches in the House of Israel, and even though they departed from the law they must not be treated as transgressors.

There is no lack of synagogues in the cities, or in most of the larger villages, or in several of the smaller ones. The important part played by the Mizrachi is a guarantee of the observance of religious tradition in the institutions and establishments dependent upon Jewish public funds. The Executive of the Jewish Agency has given grants to Talmudical academies and to Rabbis, it has assisted in the establishment of places of worship and other religious institutions, and it has facilitated the provision of *kasher* food for supernumerary police and soldiers. The Sabbath and the Jewish festivals are observed as days of rest in all centres of Jewish population: all places of business are closed and traffic is suspended. In no city in the world is there such a general atmosphere of Sabbath repose and calm as in Tel-Aviv. The Sabbath has received

a new content in the form of a weekly gathering initiated by the poet Bialik, under the name of *Oneg Shabbat* ("Joy of Sabbath"), at which he spoke on some theme of historical or literary interest; and these gatherings, at which readings are given from the Hebrew classics and national songs are sung, have become popular, not only throughout Palestine, but also in many lands of the Diaspora. The three "pilgrim" festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles attract large holiday assemblies in Jerusalem. Some festivals have taken on a new form of celebration based partly upon ancient tradition, and acquired an importance that they hardly enjoyed in the Diaspora. Pentecost, the season of the harvesting of the first ripe fruits, is the occasion of a joyous procession particularly in Haifa, where delegations from agricultural villages in the *Emek* appear with the fruits of their labour in carts adorned with garlands. Purim is celebrated by a public carnival in Tel-Aviv, in which many Arabs too have taken part. On the Feast of Hanukah the Menorah (eight-branched candelabrum), symbol of the deliverance of Judaism from the Syrians' fell designs, is carried aloft in a public procession. And the New Year for the Trees (in February), which has become a mere memory for the rest of the world, has been resurrected as a holiday for schoolchildren, when, accompanied by teachers and parents, they fare forth to the countryside to plant new trees.

Thus are the historic days of old given new life and meaning in their ancient setting. They are some of the bones of Judaism which, as in the Valley of Ezekiel's vision, have taken on new flesh and strength. And as for the spirit, embodied pre-eminently in the principle of social righteousness, which was the constant theme of the Prophets and the recurring refrain of the Psalmists, that too has risen again as the guiding motive-force of the Judaism of the new Judæa.

ZIONISM IN THE DIASPORA

ZIONISM has now become an integral element in Jewish life. Frowned upon at first by the majority of Jewry, severely opposed by wealthy and influential sections, and treated with frigid indifference by vast numbers, it has now, after nearly fifty years, achieved a position that is impregnable. Its triumphant progress has been due partly to the astonishing achievements in Palestine, which have won the admiration even of former sceptics, and partly to the deplorable deterioration of the Jewish position in Europe. At the time when it was thought in some quarters that the idea of tolerance was spreading and that the Jews in lands of reaction and oppression would inevitably profit thereby, it was perhaps natural—although mistaken—for some Jewish leaders to continue attacking Zionism for fear lest it might impede that desirable consummation. Now that hopes in the growth of tolerance have been drowned in the blood-baths organised by Hitler's hordes of executioners, it is realised that any speculations regarding the future welfare of the Jews cannot be based upon an early improvement in the political scene, and that Palestine must assume the leading place in any such considerations. The acceptance of this conclusion, at least as far as the Jewish world is concerned, is bound to impart increased vigour to the Zionist movement.

In the summer of 1939 the Zionist Organisation comprised Territorial Federations in nearly forty countries in all parts of the world. These Federations, each consisting of many local branch societies, existed in almost every State in Europe, with the exception of Germany, Dantzig, and Italy, where the movement had been suppressed by the Nazi and Fascist tyrannies. In addition to the Federations, there were numerous societies and local groups in several lands, where the smallness of the Jewish population and geographical conditions made the existence of federations impracticable. These regions included Egypt, India, the Straits Settlements, as well as places in Central America and in the Far East. Apart from the Federations and the "unfederated" societies, which consisted of General Zionists, there were also five Separate Unions based (with one exception) on a distinctive political or religious principle. These were (1) the Mizrachi, with headquarters in Jerusalem and 16 territorial branches, (2) the Union of Poale

Zion-Hitahduth, with headquarters in Tel-Aviv and 18 territorial branches, (3) Hashomer Hatzair, with headquarters at Merhaviah, and 16 territorial branches, and (4) the Jewish State Party, with headquarters in Tel-Aviv, and 16 territorial branches. The branches of these four Separate Unions exist on both sides of the Atlantic. The fifth, the Order of Ancient Maccabeans, a friendly benefit organisation in England, has no distinguishing principle, and is affiliated to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain. In many countries there are also Federations of Women Zionists, Associations of Zionist Students, and an organised youth movement. There are three countries in which Zionism has been banned: Russia, where the movement was proscribed on the alleged ground of its being a counter-revolutionary agency; Turkey, where the Government would not tolerate activity on behalf of a former part of the Ottoman Empire; and Iraq, where the Arabs are hostile to the policy of the Palestine Mandate.

The activities of Zionist societies vary according to the political and cultural conditions of the country, but they possess many features in common, whether they are in the East or in the West. They hold frequent meetings for propaganda purposes, foster a knowledge of Zionist history, promote Hebrew-speaking circles, and organise collections for the Keren Hayesod, the Jewish National Fund, and other Zionist funds. They hold periodical conferences for the discussion of questions of policy, as well as occasional *Oneg Shabbat* gatherings for talks on Jewish subjects and the singing of Hebrew songs. They encourage their members to evince a personal interest in Palestine by visiting it and buying land, even if they cannot settle there. They honour the memory of Herzl by having his portrait in a place of honour in their meeting-place, and by holding a public gathering or a synagogue service on the anniversary of his death, at which an address is delivered on his work. They strive to play a useful and important part in the local community, in accordance with the policy enunciated by the founder from the very beginning, that Zionists should "conquer the community." They seek to enlighten their non-Jewish neighbours on the aims of their movement and the achievements in Palestine, and to win the practical support of politicians and other public personalities, who are always welcome on their platforms. The members of the societies derive their information about the latest developments from the organ published by the head office of their Federation, which is a medium for the expression and exchange of views as well as for the dissemination of news. The Federation office is

a centre of industry, in regular communication, not only with all its affiliated societies, but also with the headquarters of the World Zionist Organisation in London and Jerusalem. It is responsible for the general course of Zionist activity in its particular territory, supplies speakers for its branches, and issues pamphlets and other publications. It provides news about Zionist matters to the national Press, keeps a watchful eye on the newspapers, and does its best to correct misrepresentations about conditions in Palestine. In times of emergency it organises special conferences and public meetings, at which resolutions are adopted that are transmitted to the British Government. In many countries the Federation Office has a special department for dealing with emigration to Palestine, or it co-operates with the local offices of the Separate Unions in the administration of a bureau for this purpose.

Every year there is an organised campaign for the sale of the Shekel, which every avowed Zionist must buy as proof of his acceptance of the Basle Programme, and which forms the principal source of income of the Zionist Executive. The payment of the Shekel (which varies in amount according to the economic conditions of each country, but does not exceed half a crown per head) entitles the holder (if he is at least eighteen) to vote for a delegate and (provided he is over twenty-four and has also contributed in the past year to the Keren Hayesod and the Jewish National Fund) to be elected as a delegate to the Congress, which normally takes place every two years. The Shekel campaign is attended by intense activity in the months immediately preceding a Congress, as all Federations and Separate Unions are anxious to secure as large a representation as possible. The Shekel sale in a Congress year is therefore much larger than in a non-Congress year: in the years before the war it was about three times as large. The total number of Shekalim sold in 1938-9 was 1,052,377. If we exclude the Jews of the countries where the movement is forbidden, and estimate the pre-war Jewish population in the rest of the world at 12,000,000, we see that the active members of the Zionist Organisation formed about 8 per cent. The actual proportion, in terms of the adult population, was, of course, much higher, and, even so, it did not include large numbers of sympathisers and supporters who did not consider it necessary to take the Shekel as a mark of their adhesion.

The movement has undergone serious changes in many countries, especially on the European Continent, where its main forces once flourished. The Jewish national consciousness has always been felt

most intensely and expressed most vigorously in Eastern Europe. It was fostered in the compact Jewish communities that were concentrated there for centuries, nurtured by the spiritual and intellectual traditions that survived through the ages, and stimulated by the goad of oppression. Thus it was that throughout the time of Herzl Russia provided the largest proportion of his followers, even though he was a Westerner and the Jewish subjects of the Tsar were Easterners. The propagation of Zionism was tolerated at times and persecuted at others, according to the caprice of local authorities or a hint from the central Government; but organisation was hardly necessary for the spread of the idea among the masses: it was immanent among them. Even though there were serious obstacles in the way of creating societies and arranging conferences, means were found for the distribution of Shekalim and for carrying on various branches of Zionist work. At the Congresses that followed the death of Herzl, just as at those held during his lifetime, the delegates from Russia formed at least a third of the total number. They played an important, and often a decisive part in the proceedings, and far more Russian was spoken than English. Throughout the decade that elapsed between the death of the founder and the beginning of the First World War, the Russian Zionists formed the backbone of the movement and figured at the head of all lists of contributions to Zionist funds. After that war a complete transformation took place in Eastern Europe. Zionism was strictly forbidden and ruthlessly persecuted in Soviet Russia, but it was fostered with greater zeal and energy than before in those westerly regions of the Muscovite Empire that became independent and in which Jews acquired political emancipation.

During the two decades between the two World Wars Zionism was a much more vital and active force in a large part of Eastern Europe than in any other region of the world—except the land in which it was being realised. It penetrated deeply into all manifestations and ramifications of Jewish life. In Poland, Lithuania, and Latvia, and to a less extent in Rumania (though almost to an equal extent in Bessarabia, which had been annexed by Rumania), every Jew belonged to some party or other: he was either a Zionist, an Agudist, a "Folkist,"¹ a Socialist, a "Bundist,"² or an Assimilationist. There was a ceaseless struggle between these

¹ The "Folkists" (from German *Volk*) were Jewish nationalists who advocated a form of cultural autonomy in the Diaspora.

² The "Bund" was the Jewish Socialist Party of Russia, Poland, and Lithuania, founded in Vilna in 1897. It has always adopted an anti-Zionist attitude.

parties, each striving for the supremacy of its own principles and for a decisive and dominating influence in Jewish affairs, and each supported by a spirited Press. Polish Jewry in particular had a multitude of papers—dailies, weeklies, and monthlies—of which a goodly proportion supported the Zionist cause (each party having its own organ). The activity of the Zionists was not confined to membership of a society and the support of Zionist funds, but took the form of a constant fight for the recognition of the Jewish nationality and all its implications, especially for the recognition of the rights of the Jews as a national minority in the lands of which they were citizens. The Zionists took up a determined stand within the Jewish community for the purpose of ensuring the maintenance of schools on a Jewish national basis, with Hebrew as the medium of instruction, and the appointment of Rabbis who were Zionists. They also carried the fight into the general community and sought election to municipal councils and to Parliament on a purely Zionist platform. Their efforts were crowned with much success in both spheres. At one time there were fifteen Zionists in the Polish *Sejm*, and there were also Zionist members in the Parliaments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Rumania, besides Zionist Senators in Poland and Rumania.

In the cultural domain the Zionists in Eastern Europe made great headway with the establishment of schools in which Hebrew was the medium of instruction, despite the opposition of the Bundists and "Folkists," who maintained that Yiddish was the only legitimate language of the Jewish people, and also the opposition of the Agudists, who objected to the use of the Biblical tongue for secular purposes. In Poland the Hebrew system, called *Tarbut* ("culture"), comprised over 140 schools with 16,600 pupils, while the Yiddish system had 95 schools with 11,800 pupils. The *Tarbut* system also prevailed in Lithuania (where 75 per cent. of all the Jewish schoolchildren attended 150 Hebrew schools), Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia (mainly in Carpatho-Ruthenia). The inevitable result of the prevalence of Jewish national education was that the younger generation were conscious and intelligent Zionists before they left school, and there was a great abundance of Youth organisations of different parties. Many youths joined branches of *Hehalutz*, in which they received an intellectual, moral, and technical training for settlement in Palestine, and formed the bulk of the picked workers who went out to build up the National Home. In Rumania Zionist sentiment varied in intensity according to district, for the

State consisted of Old Rumania, Transylvania, Bukovina, and Bessarabia, each with its own cultural influences. The three annexed territories all returned Zionist deputies to Parliament, who were thus able regularly to confer with the leading Zionists in Bucharest. The Jews in Bulgaria enjoyed the distinction of being the only community that imposed an annual tax on its members as a contribution to the Keren Hayesod.

In contrast to this pulsating activity in various parts of Eastern Europe was the enforced sterility in Soviet Russia, where Zionism was persecuted as a "counter-revolutionary movement" and "an agency of British imperialism." The hostility emanated from the *Jevsektzia*, the Jewish Department of the Commissariat of Nationalities, which had control over Jewish affairs and largely consisted of former Bundists. The teaching of Hebrew was forbidden and the printing of Hebrew books suppressed. From 1922 there began a systematic campaign of oppression. Zionists were arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment in special political jails, called *polit-isolators*, or banished to lonely places in inclement regions in Northern Russia, Siberia, or Turkestan. At least a few thousand Jews have suffered and starved for their loyalty to the Zionist idea, and many have died in captivity. Despite the danger of discovery, some tens of thousands continued to carry on Zionist propaganda and to learn Hebrew in secret. For a time there were even two *Hehalutz* organisations, one tolerated and the other illegal, which had agricultural farms for training purposes; but first the illegal and then the other farms were liquidated. The Soviet Government must have convinced itself by now that Zionism is not a counter-revolutionary movement, since it does not impinge upon local political conditions; and it must have likewise realised, in the light of Jewish criticism of British policy in Palestine, that it is not an agency of British imperialism. Since the war between Germany and Russia there has been a growth of friendly relations between the *Yishuv* and the Soviet authorities, thanks to the gift of motor ambulances and other important war requisites from the Jews of Palestine to the Russian Army Command, and thanks also to visits of official Russian representatives to Jewish settlements and institutions in Palestine. It is, therefore, to be hoped that there will soon be a fundamental revision of the Russian Government's attitude to the Zionist movement, just as there has been in regard to religious worship.

The political and economic conditions in Austria and Germany after the First World War gave a powerful impetus to the Zionist

cause. Although the headquarters of the movement had been situated first in one and then in the other country for a period of seventeen years, and some of its best leaders had come from there, it had failed to win the adhesion of any but a small minority in either territory. But from 1919, when it was realised that the expected blessings of political emancipation were not likely to materialise, organised opposition to Zionism gradually became weaker and the number of adherents steadily rose. The growth of rabid anti-Semitism, in the form propagated in Austria by the *Hakenkreuzler* and in Germany by the National Socialists, compelled an increasing number of Jews to look upon Zionism as affording a solution, not only for the problem of the Jews in Eastern Europe, but also for their own problem; and as soon as Hitler came into power there began a wave of migration to Palestine (as also to many other countries), which quickly assumed swelling dimensions. Even before the Nazi Revolution enthusiasm for the Land of Israel had found expression in the increasing popularity of Zionist Student societies, under such names as "Maccabi" and "Hasmonea," in the establishment of a large number of training centres where the Jewish youth were prepared for the new life in that country, in the increasing study of Hebrew as a living language, and in a vigorous Press. Zionist students displayed the Jewish national colours, blue and white, when rowing on the Spree and on the Danube; and the Viennese football team, with its Hebrew name, *Hakoah* ("Strength"), proved its mettle by beating first-class British players. At one time there were no fewer than a dozen Zionist papers and periodicals in Austria, including a popular daily, the *Wiener Morgen-Zeitung*, and a scholarly monthly, *Palästina*, which contained contributions from experts. For a brief period, too, there was a Zionist deputy in the Austrian Parliament.

The most important journal in Central Europe was the *Jüdische Rundschau*, which appeared in Berlin, first as a weekly and then as a bi-weekly, and which maintained a high standard in its leading articles and other features. The importance and the circulation of this paper grew enormously when the Nazi terror suppressed all national papers in Jewish ownership or under Jewish control and forbade all Jewish writers to contribute to any papers except those exclusively devoted to Jewish affairs. The *Jüdische Rundschau* then welcomed many of these ostracised journalists to its pages, which it doubled so as to include special articles dealing not only with Zionist politics and Palestine, but also with literature and the

arts. It was this paper which set a superb example of moral courage in making a stand for Jewish dignity in those evil years when the German Government did its utmost to blacken and humiliate the Jewish name. It helped to strengthen and stiffen Jewish morale; and when the decree was issued for Jews to wear the yellow badge, it displayed on its front page in bold letters the watch-word: "Wear it with pride!" In fortunate contrast to the conditions in those German lands, the Jews in Czechoslovakia were spared the horrors of Jew-baiting until the Nazi invasion, but that did not diminish their attachment to the Zionist cause. They were encouraged by the Government to declare their Jewish nationality in the filling up of census forms in 1930, with the result that over 52 per cent. so described themselves. Moreover, two Zionist deputies were returned to the Parliament in Prague, where they were recognised as representing the Jewish national party. In Hungary, owing to the opposition by both the "Magyars of the Jewish faith" and the ultra-orthodox, the Zionist Federation was not legalised by the Government until 1927.

In most of the other countries of the Continent, there were also centres of Zionist activity, though on a lesser scale, due to the smaller Jewish population and the better political conditions. In France the native Jews were largely apathetic, but the populous immigrant colony in Paris maintained several societies that displayed much zeal and energy. Paris was important, however, because it was the home of a few notable figures who rendered conspicuous services to the cause: there lived that princely lover of Palestine, Baron Edmond de Rothschild, who gave generous help to the settlements and the institutions of the *Yishuv* in many a crisis; Max Nordau and Alexander Marmorek, the eloquent lieutenants of Herzl and the vigilant custodians of his political legacy; and Leo Motzkin, Chairman of the Zionist General Council and President of the Council for the Rights of Jewish Minorities (previously the Committee of Jewish Delegations), which was subsidised by the Zionist Organisation. Paris was also the seat of an influential society of friends of the Jewish National Home, called "France-Palestine," which had a former Cabinet Minister, Senator Justin Godart, as President, and included Leon Blum among the statesmen, scholars, and writers who formed its Committee. Neither Holland nor Belgium could equal France in political importance, but they had a more robust Zionist Federation; and Switzerland and Italy also made useful contributions to the cause. Mussolini was for many years an avowed

friend of the Zionist movement, until his imperialistic ambitions made him jealous of the British Mandate and he joined with Hitler in fanning the flames of Arab unrest. In Yugoslavia and Greece (especially Salonika) in the south, as well as in the northern lands of Norway and Sweden, Finland and Denmark, there were also active centres, while the Jewish communities of both Lisbon and Luxembourg likewise maintained a lively attachment to the cause.

Zionism in Great Britain has made steady and increasing progress in the past twenty-five years, and has benefited by the fact that the headquarters of the movement and the seat of the Mandatory Power are in London. The character of its followers has inevitably changed with the passage of years, for while English-born Jews formed only a small minority in the period before the First World War, they now constitute the predominant element. Zionist sentiment has now acquired a strong hold upon nearly all sections of the Anglo-Jewish community, and there is no longer any appreciable opposition. Those polemical adversaries, Lucien Wolf and Laurie Magnus, have left no spiritual successors. In the days of Herzl, the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hermann Adler, stigmatised Zionism as "an egregious blunder," and many Rabbis under his jurisdiction took their cue from him. Now no preacher utters a word against the Zionist ideal. The example set by the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Joseph H. Hertz (who was an eloquent spokesman of the cause even when the communal leaders were strongly opposed), has had a salutary influence upon the Jewish clergy. Even the Rabbi of the Liberal Synagogue in London, although hostile to the principles of Zionism, does not preach against them, and is an active supporter of the Hebrew University. The progress made is shown by the large number of London synagogues and of Jewish friendly societies that have become constituent bodies of the English Federation and by the supplementary activities of various other organisations—the Mizrachi, the Poale Zion, the Jewish State Party, the Federation of Women Zionists, the Jewish National Fund Commission, the University Zionist Federation and the Association of Young Zionists. The Poale Zion have a political office in London, maintain friendly relations with the British Labour Party, and send delegates to this Party's annual conferences. No better index of the advance of the movement could be found than the fact that the Board of Deputies of British Jews, which once contained only a minority of Zionists, now has an undoubted majority, and that its President (Professor

S. Brodetsky) is a member of the Zionist Executive. Other indications consist of the increasing interest of Jewish schools in Hebrew as a living language, the frequency of lectures in Hebrew, and the success of the *Habonim* organisation in promoting Jewish national ideals among the younger generation. And still another illustration is provided by the fact that some years before the Second World War a training farm was established in the south of England (in memory of Dr. M. D. Eder) to enable Jewish youths and girls to be prepared for agricultural life in Palestine, and its first trainees have been installed in a *Kibbutz* of their own (together with some young workers from Baltic countries) in the Huleh area of Palestine.

The Zionist Federation of Great Britain has rendered very valuable services to the movement in general, since the days of the Balfour Declaration, in the political field. It has provided Weizmann, Sokolow, and other leaders with a platform from which they could address, not only the local community and other Jewries, but the world in general. It has performed an important task (which needs continued renewal) in educating the public opinion of the country in general in regard to the meaning of Zionism and its value to British interests in the Near East. It keeps in touch with Members of Parliament, a number of whom of all parties have formed a special Palestine Committee, so as to endeavour to ensure that British policy in Palestine shall be in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Mandate. And whenever an emergency arises, it organises a deputation to the Colonial Secretary to make whatever representations may be necessary.

The story of activity in other parts of the British Empire is neither so varied nor so momentous, but there are two countries that present an excellent record of valuable work—South Africa and Canada. The small Jewish community of South Africa has for years enjoyed the distinction of contributing the highest amount per head to the principal Zionist funds. It owes this eminent position, not to the inordinate wealth of the contributors, for they are probably not richer than the Jews in other British territories or in the United States, but to the Jewish national consciousness and the spirit of self-sacrifice that have been fostered in them in an intensive degree. Consisting to a large extent of immigrants from Lithuania and their children, the Jews in South Africa have built up a Federation that may be regarded as a model, with branches extending from Cape Town to Nairobi. Stimulated

by the occasional visits of leaders from Europe and Palestine, they lay stress upon Jewish national education as well as upon fund-raising. The official organ, *The Zionist Record*, is a popular weekly, and other Jewish papers also support the cause. The esteem in which the movement is held in the Union is due in no small measure to the staunch championship it has received from Field-Marshal Smuts, who has been a loyal friend of the cause since the days of the Balfour Declaration, which he, as a member of the Cabinet, helped to launch.

In Canada the Zionist Organisation embraces a far-flung network of societies extending from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific, under the direction of the head office in Montreal, and with regional offices in Toronto and Winnipeg. Zionist work is also carried on by Hadassah (the women's organisation) and the Federation of Young Judæa, each of which has over a hundred branches in all parts of the Dominion, as well as by the Zionist Order Habonim, which has numerous lodges. All Jewish centres are periodically visited by travelling speakers, and occasionally there are tours by leaders from London, Jerusalem, and New York, not only for raising of funds, but also for educational purposes. The cause is well served by the Press, for, in addition to the official monthly organ, *The Canadian Zionist*, there are several Anglo-Jewish weeklies and Yiddish dailies, which all actively support it. There are indeed no non-Zionists in the country. The enthusiasm of Canadian Jewry has found particular expression in generous contributions to the Jewish National Fund, while the women have distinguished themselves by maintaining the Girls' Agricultural School at Nahalal and some social welfare institutions in Palestine.

In Australia and New Zealand, too, despite the vast distances separating them from the great centres of Jewish life, there are several Zionist societies, which are invigorated from time to time by the visits of speakers from Europe and Palestine.¹ The societies in Australia are united in a Federation, of which the late General Sir John Monash was Honorary President, and delegates from New Zealand have attended conferences in Sydney. Societies also flourished for many years in Singapore and in Shanghai, and in the latter city there appeared a monthly journal, *Israel's Messenger*, which had a long and useful career.

¹ The author was the first emissary of the Zionist Executive, in 1920, to the Jewish communities of Australia and New Zealand, and also to those in the Far East, Singapore, Java, and India. The story of his tour is related in *The Journal of a Jewish Traveller* (John Lane, 1925).

The Zionist Organisation in the United States, thanks to a Jewish population of nearly five millions, is by far the largest and most important constituent body of the World Organisation. As in many other countries, it does not cover the whole field of Zionist work, as there are other active organisations, notably the Hadassah (the women's organisation), the Young Judæa, Avukah (a union of students' societies), and Massada (a youth organisation). The Zionist Organisation has two official organs, *The New Palestine*, an English weekly, and *Dos Yiddische Folk*, a fortnightly in Yiddish, while each of the other bodies also has its own paper. Moreover, the Zionist parties, particularly the Poale Zion and the Mizrachi, likewise have large organisations, with their own organs. In addition to the Zionist Press in English and Yiddish, there is a Hebrew weekly, *Hadoar*. Propaganda is energetically conducted by public meetings, lectures, the issue of publications, and the display of films of life in Palestine, while the help of the radio is also frequently invoked. The movement has made considerable strides since the beginning of the First World War, when, owing to the inevitable rupture of the Zionist world, a Provisional Committee for Zionist affairs was set up in New York under the chairmanship of Justice Louis D. Brandeis. The importance of American Jewry was recognised at the time when the text of the Balfour Declaration was under discussion, by the submission of the draft to Dr. Stephen S. Wise and other Zionist leaders for their views, and that recognition has continued in a steadily increasing measure.

American Jewry is called upon to provide, and does provide, a large proportion of the funds annually required by the Keren Hayesod, the Jewish National Fund, the Hebrew University, and other institutions in Palestine. Since the extension of the Jewish Agency, which could never have been accomplished without its co-operation, it has given enhanced support both moral and material, to the development of the National Home; and it has always been represented in the Executive both of the Zionist Organisation and of the Jewish Agency. Despite the distance separating them, relations have always been close between the headquarters in London and Jerusalem and the Zionist leadership in the United States, and there has hardly been a year when members or representatives of the World Executive, including Dr. Weizmann, have not visited that country for propaganda, political or financial purposes. These relations have been greatly furthered by the New York office of the "Palcor" Agency, which receives Zionist and other news by cable from London and

Jerusalem and disseminates it widely among the national Press. During the present war distinguished Zionist speakers from the United States have visited Great Britain and taken a leading part in successful fund-raising campaigns.

Upon the outbreak of the Second World War an Emergency Committee of Zionist Affairs was set up in New York to watch over the political interests of the movement; and, in view of the part that the American Government was expected to play in the problems of reconstruction and resettlement after the war, a political bureau was opened by the World Executive in Washington in 1943. The position occupied by American Zionism was reflected in the holding in May, 1942, of the All-Zionist Conference, which passed the resolution defining Zionist policy as consisting in the establishment of "a Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new democratic world"—the resolution adopted six months later by the Small Committee of the Zionist General Council in Jerusalem as embodying the decision of the supreme organs of the movement in war-time. The ascendancy that Zionism has won in American Jewish life is due to the devoted labours of a succession of able and distinguished leaders and to the destruction of European Jewry. Its acceptance as the policy best calculated to serve the truest interests of the Jewish people, especially in the tragic situation created by the War, was strikingly illustrated by the American Jewish Conference of 500 delegates representing all sections of the community, held in New York in September, 1943, when the demand for a Jewish Commonwealth was acclaimed by an all but unanimous assembly—only four voting against it. Sympathy with Zionist aims has been repeatedly expressed by successive Presidents of the Republic—from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin D. Roosevelt—and by several leading State Legislatures; but there is still a band of Jewish opponents—small but wealthy—who are doing what they can to thwart the consummation of the Jewish national ideal owing to their groundless fear that their civic status might be affected.

South of the United States there is also much activity, although less extensive and of more recent origin. The movement has been introduced into Mexico by Jewish immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe and occupies an important position in communal life. By far the leading centre of Zionist activity in South America is in Buenos Aires, as Argentina contains about 70 per cent. of the half-million Jews now settled in that sub-continent. The Argentine Federation has a large central office in the capital, with considerably

over 100 branches throughout the country; there is a flourishing branch of the W.I.Z.O., likewise with numerous societies; and the Mizrachi, too, has secured a foothold. The cause is vigorously promoted by the Jewish Press, which comprises papers in Spanish, Yiddish, and Hebrew, and the general Press, especially *La Nacion*, is sympathetic. Unfortunately the once friendly attitude of the Government has been affected by the pressure of Nazi influence, with the result that the display of the Zionist flag is forbidden, even in Jewish schools and synagogues. An embargo was also placed upon the Yiddish and Hebrew Press in October, 1943, but in consequence of President Roosevelt's denunciation of this pro-Nazi measure it was soon withdrawn. Argentina was chosen by Baron de Hirsch as the land in which he hoped that the problem of Russian Jewry would be solved by the creation of agricultural colonies. It is, therefore, relevant to note, not only that his object proved impracticable, but also that the beneficiaries of his philanthropy manifest no little enthusiasm for the Land of Israel. In Brazil the position is the reverse of that obtaining in Argentina, for although Zionist activity is forbidden, as a form of xenophobia, the display of the Zionist flag in synagogues is permitted as a religious symbol and the singing of *Hatikvah* is allowed as a religious hymn. The Jewish community in Chile is very much smaller than that of Argentina or Brazil, but its national consciousness finds more vigorous expression culturally. There are also very active Zionist centres in Uruguay and Peru, but the work in Ecuador and Colombia is on a smaller scale. In all these vast regions of South America progress is impeded by the huge distances separating many communities from the larger centres of Jewish population, but the lesson of Zionism has been impressed upon all by the influx of refugees from Nazi persecution, and it is reinforced periodically by the visits of emissaries from Palestine.

The cultivation of the Jewish national consciousness in the lands of the Orient is relatively easy, for the Jews in those regions have throughout the centuries maintained their traditions and customs intact and remained loyal to the faith of their forefathers in a far greater degree than their brethren in the Occident. The Jews in Morocco, for instance, do not regard themselves as Moroccans of the Jewish faith; and similarly in China, where the residence of Jews is comparatively recent (if we leave out of account the now defunct colony of Kai-Feng-Fu), one never hears of a "Chinaman of the Jewish persuasion." Throughout the East the Jews who are natives of the East look upon themselves as members of the

Jewish nation, and, for the most part, need no propaganda addresses to revive their national spirit. But the extent to which they actively participate in Zionist work depends upon their material conditions and also upon the political environment. In the north of Africa the liveliest Zionist centre for many years was in Tunisia, where there were societies in all the larger communities, and there was a Zionist paper published at Sfax. Progress in Morocco was rendered difficult by the attitude of the authorities, but nevertheless steady work was carried on. In Tripolitania the societies were under the general direction of the Italian Federation, and had to close down when Mussolini suppressed the parent body. In Egypt there are societies in both Cairo and Alexandria, whose union is prevented by friendly rivalry, and their proximity to Palestine gives them the advantage of occasional addresses from prominent Zionists passing through the country. In both Iraq and Syria it has not been possible to make appreciable headway owing to the hostility of Arab politicians to the Jewish National Home, but Zionist funds have received generous gifts from friends in Baghdad. Little progress, too, has so far been made in Persia, owing to the attitude of the Government; but in India there is an active centre in the large Jewish community of Bombay, and minor support in the smaller one of Calcutta.

The principal workers in all these varied regions throughout the world meet together at the Zionist Congress, which assembles in normal times every two years. It is by far the most important event in the Diaspora, attended, not only by a few hundred delegates, but also by many hundreds of visitors and journalists. The Congress is held primarily to afford the Executive an opportunity of submitting reports on its labours, to furnish the delegates with the opportunity of discussing those reports, and to frame decisions and to hammer out policies for the immediate future. In the course of its long career, the Congress has developed its own machinery and forms of parliamentary procedure, designed to cope with a multitude of questions that must be disposed of within about a fortnight. The difficulty of compressing its deliberations within so short a space of time, and of satisfying delegates, some of whom have to travel thousands of miles to make a speech, is such as would tax the ingenuity of any but the experienced *Præsidium* that presides over the proceedings. Much of the business is transacted in a number of committees, which deal with politics, Palestine immigration, agricultural settlement, trade and industry, education,

health, finance, and other questions. These committees, which are composed of delegates of the various parties in proportions corresponding to the composition of the entire Congress, formulate the resolutions that are submitted to plenary sessions of the Congress for adoption. Since each party is anxious to secure a relatively strong position both in Congress and committees, there is a credentials committee to scrutinise and decide upon the validity of any delegate's election that may be challenged, while, in serious cases, the judgment of the Congress Court consisting of lawyers is invoked. Apart from the committees devoted to specific questions, there is also a standing committee called *Permanenz Ausschuss* or *Havaadah Hamathmedeth*, formed on the same basis as the others, whose function is to act as the steering organ in the often difficult and occasionally critical course of the Congress discussions, and above all to prepare a list of nominations for the new Executive and the General Council which will be assured adoption. So voluminous is the business that has to be completed within the limited time available that night sessions are an invariable feature. The proceedings are reported in an official gazette that appears daily, and some months later a complete stenographic record is published.

The Congress is the occasion for numerous other meetings and conferences of all kinds. The members of the London and Jerusalem Executives (with their New York colleague) meet frequently; the General Council assembles both before and after the Congress; and as soon as this is over there is a gathering of the Council of the Jewish Agency, followed by one of its Administrative Committee. The delegations from the different countries hold private meetings to discuss particular questions, and the parties likewise confer to decide on points of policy. Moreover, all the important institutions and organisations of the movement, such as the Keren Hayesod, the Jewish National Fund, the Jewish Colonial Trust, and the Board of Governors of the Hebrew University, also hold meetings; and various associations, like those of *Tarbut* (Hebrew-speaking societies), of Hebrew authors, and of Jewish doctors also take advantage of the opportunity. Apart from all these gatherings, there are other functions and arrangements to claim the interest of the delegates and of the multitude of visitors and journalists—an exhibition of Jewish art, the display of a Palestine film, bookstalls with all sorts of works in various languages on the Jewish renaissance, a concert of Jewish music, and (if the local conditions are favourable) an athletic festival.

In short, all the multifarious phases and facets of the movement—political and economic, social and cultural, financial and organisational—find their reflection within the ample orbit of the Congress. It is a vast clearing-house for the exchange of thoughts and ideas on Jewish problems, for the testing of plans and the weighing of schemes; it enables Jews from the remotest lands of the Diaspora to get to know and understand one another, and to learn of the quality of their brethren from Eretz Israel; it deepens and strengthens the feeling of national solidarity; and it furnishes a wealth of information, impressions, and inspiration, that has a stimulating and fructifying influence for many a long day thereafter.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR

THE Second World War has had the profoundest effects upon the Zionist world, which have varied markedly in character according to regional conditions. Throughout Nazi-occupied Europe, where Hitler has ruthlessly pursued his anti-Jewish campaign of deportation, enslavement, and extermination, all Zionist institutions and activities, together with all Jewish communal life, have been utterly destroyed. In the few neutral countries, such as Switzerland and Sweden, a certain amount of activity has been maintained in the face of serious difficulties. In all free areas of the world, however, and particularly in all English-speaking lands, the movement has developed a strength, both moral and material, far exceeding the progress made in any equivalent period before the war. The realisation that upon the aims and efforts of Zionism will largely depend the satisfactory healing of the Jewish tragedy when the vast conflict is over has given a tremendous impetus to all Zionist bodies able to carry on their work and evoked an unprecedented financial response. But more momentous than all these effects has been the development in Palestine itself. There the *Yishuv* has risen to the full height of its national responsibilities in what is the greatest crisis of the Jewish people as in that of the world in general. It has made very substantial contributions to the Allied war effort in the military, economic, scientific, and technical fields; it has enlarged and strengthened the fabric of the National Home; and it has played a leading part in the desperate endeavours for the rescue of the imperilled Jews in Europe.

Even before the war began and only a few days after the Congress in Geneva was over, Dr. Weizmann wrote the following letter on August 29th, 1939, to the British Prime Minister, Mr. Neville Chamberlain:

“In this hour of supreme crisis, the consciousness that the Jews have a contribution to make to the defence of sacred values impels me to write this letter. I wish to confirm, in the most explicit manner, the declaration which I and my colleagues have made during the last months, and especially in the last week: that the Jews ‘stand by Great Britain and will fight on the side of the democracies.’

“Our urgent desire is to give effect to these declarations. We

wish to do so in a way entirely consonant with the general scheme of British action, and therefore would place ourselves, in matters big and small, under the co-ordinating direction of His Majesty's Government. The Jewish Agency is ready to enter into immediate arrangements for utilising Jewish man-power, technical ability, resources, etc. The Jewish Agency has recently had differences in the political field with the Mandatory Power. We would like these differences to give way before the greater and more pressing necessities of the time.

"We ask you to accept this declaration in the spirit in which it is made."

The Prime Minister replied on September 2nd as follows:

"I should like to express my warm appreciation of the contents of your letter of 29th August, and the spirit which prompted it. It is true that differences of opinion exist between the Mandatory Power and the Jewish Agency as regards policy in Palestine, but I gladly accept the assurance contained in your letter. I note with pleasure that in this time of supreme emergency, when those things which we hold dear are at stake, Britain can rely upon the whole-hearted co-operation of the Jewish Agency. You will not expect me to say more at this stage than that your public-spirited assurances are welcome and will be kept in mind."

This exchange of letters was not followed by any step on the part of the British Government to avail itself of Dr. Weizmann's offer. But independently of this correspondence, the Executives of the Jewish Agency and of the *Vaad Leumi* held a joint meeting in Jerusalem on September 3rd, at which they decided to carry out a registration of volunteers for national service during the period of the emergency. The result of the registration was that 85,781 Jewish men and 50,262 women, between the ages of eighteen and fifty, volunteered for national service, either within the Jewish community or at the disposal of the British military authorities in Palestine. Despite this evidence of eagerness on the part of the Jews to serve not only in defence of their National Home, but in general support of the Allied cause, the military authorities were at first slow to avail themselves of their co-operation.

The immediate effect of the outbreak of war was to bring to an end the Arab disorders that had afflicted Palestine for over three years and to silence all political controversy. On the other hand, economic interests brought about a certain co-operation between Arabs and Jews in the steps taken to secure Government help,

particularly in the important citrus industry, and friendly relations developed also in other spheres. Owing to the difficulties of shipping and the consequently greatly reduced export of citrus fruits, a heavy loss was inflicted upon the growers, who had to abandon many of their groves, and the loss was only partly mitigated by the subsidies and loans provided by the Government and certain banks. There was also a serious slump in the building industry owing to the reduction of immigration and of imported capital and the lack of raw materials, but this was later offset by the impetus given to various manufacturing industries, especially by military requirements.

Whatever anxieties the Jews in Palestine experienced in the early period of the war, they were moved far more deeply by the tragic fate that overtook thousands of Jewish refugees from Nazi oppression who sought asylum in their National Home, but were not admitted because the Government, ignoring their exceptional plight, declared them to be illegal immigrants. At the beginning of September, 1939, a ship that reached the coast of Palestine, crowded with such victims of the Nazi terror, was fired on by the coastal police and three of them were killed. In March, 1940, the *Darien* reached Palestine with 800 refugees, the majority of whom had escaped from the massacres in Bucharest and other cities in Rumania, and carrying on board the survivors of another refugee vessel, the *Salvador*, which had sunk in the Sea of Marmora with the loss of over 200 lives; but on landing, all of them were interned. In November, 1940, more than 1,770 Jews, who had fled from Nazi-occupied lands, reached Haifa on two vessels, the *Pacific* and the *Milos*, and, as they were without permits, they, together with over 100 refugees from another vessel, were transferred to the *Patria* for the purpose of being deported to a British colony. The official communiqué broadcast from Jerusalem on November 20th stated: "The ultimate disposal of the immigrants would be deferred for consideration until the end of the war, but it is not proposed that they shall remain in the same British colony where they are to be sent or go to Palestine." The *Patria*, with 1,900 persons on board, exploded in the harbour, and 257 refugees lost their lives, yet the High Commissioner declared that the survivors should be deported; but owing to public protests in England and America the order was rescinded and the refugees were allowed to remain in Palestine. About the same time the *Atlantic* brought 1,750 refugees, who, after being landed for internment, were deported to Mauritius Island.

A year later there was a much worse calamity that stirred what was still left of the civilised world. In December, 1941, a small weather-beaten vessel, the *Struma*, brought 769 Jewish refugees from the pogroms in Rumania to the approaches of Istanbul and was unable to proceed further. The Turkish authorities would not allow them to land without an assurance that another country would admit them, and the Jewish Agency tried to obtain such an assurance in vain. The *Struma* was then compelled to put to sea, and broke up, on February 24th, 1942, with the loss of all on board except one. The exclusion of all these fugitives from persecution from the land where their people had been told that they were "as of right and not on sufferance" was justified by the Palestine Government on the ground that their admission would constitute a violation of the regulations. But even the White Paper of 1939, which had never been sanctioned by the League of Nations, provided for the admission of 25,000 refugees within five years; and besides, numbers of non-Jews (Poles, Greeks, and Yugoslavs) were allowed to enter, and rightly so, without question.

Despite the widespread bitterness engendered by this callous attitude to their homeless kinsfolk, the Jews in Palestine did not relax in the least in their eagerness to help the military authorities. During the first year of the war only a limited number of Jewish and Arab volunteers were accepted for the service corps, and two Auxiliary Military Pioneer Corps were formed, in which the Jews outnumbered the Arabs by about three to one. The first batch of men of this corps distinguished themselves during the great battle in Flanders and North France, took part in covering the retreat of the second British Expeditionary Force from St. Malo, were among the last to leave for England, and then participated in the defence of the southern coast in the Battle of Britain. When most of the ground personnel of the Royal Air Force in Egypt had to be transferred in the summer of 1940 to Britain, their places were filled by 1,500 qualified Jewish mechanics from Palestine. Not until September, 1940 (after Italy came into the war) were the Jews given the opportunity of joining the combatant ranks. It was then decided to form fourteen military companies, seven Jewish and seven Arab, the recruitment to be on a basis of strict equality of numbers; but this principle had to be relaxed, as Arab reluctance was a brake upon Jewish volunteering. The Executive of the Jewish Agency, together with that of the *Vaad Leumi* and other organised sections of the *Yishuv*, opened a Central Recruiting Office and called upon all able-bodied Jews to do their duty.

There was a prompt response, so much so that at times the military authorities were unable to cope with the rush of Jewish volunteers, many of whom had to wait for an opportunity to join up.

While recruiting was going on in Palestine, Dr. Weizmann was endeavouring to secure the assent of the British Government to the raising of a Jewish Fighting Force. Following up his letter to the Prime Minister, he made an offer on December 1st, 1939, of a Jewish Division, which would serve wherever required. It was intended that such a force should officially represent the Jewish people in a war that had first been launched against themselves, and that they should fight under their own flag. In September, 1940, the Government agreed to the formation of a Jewish Division in the West, consisting of Jewish volunteers from America and other free countries, including a number of Palestinians. But six months later consideration of the offer was postponed on the alleged ground of lack of equipment; and in August, 1941, it was definitely declined on the alleged ground of new technical difficulties. As any such difficulties could have been overcome, it was generally understood that the rejection was mainly due to political reasons—to the fear that a Jewish fighting force might have aroused the resentment of the Arabs, who were distinguished for their passive attitude to the war, and to the additional fear that the exploits of such a force might be later advanced in support of Jewish claims at the peace settlement. After many months of continued agitation for a Jewish Fighting Force, conducted on both sides of the Atlantic and supported in the British Dominions, the Government announced on August 7th, 1942, their decision (1) to create a Palestine Regiment consisting of separate Jewish and Arab infantry battalions for general service in the Middle East; (2) to expand the Palestine Volunteer Force (open only to British and Palestinian subjects) to a maximum of 2,000; and (3) to complete the establishment of the Jewish Rural Special Police by the enrolment of 2,500 additional recruits, requisite training staff and co-ordination officers, arms and equipment to be provided by the Commander-in-Chief, Middle East.

By the end of August, 1944, there were 23,500 Palestinian Jewish volunteers (including 2,886 women in the Auxiliary Territorial Service), as against 8,000 Arabs, in various units of the British defence forces. There were nearly 4,000 in the infantry and as many in the Royal Army Service Corps, over 3,000 in the Pioneer Corps and nearly that number in the Royal Engineers, over

2,100 in the R.A.F., 1,050 in the Royal Navy, over 600 in the Royal Artillery, and over 500 in the Port Operating Company. The vast majority of these men and women were serving in sixty Jewish units. These units were originally under the command of British officers and non-commissioned officers, but an increasing number of Jews were subsequently appointed as N.C.Os. and later as officers, until there was a total of 300 Jewish officers. In addition to the Jews in the fighting ranks, a large number joined the police forces. There were 5,840 in the Supernumerary Police, about 800 in the regular Police Force, and about 16,000 in the Special Police, receiving part-time military training.¹

This considerable contribution to the various defence services has entailed a financial burden upon the rest of the *Yishuv*. As Palestinian Jewish soldiers are paid only two-thirds of British rates of pay, and their wives and children receive allowances on the same scale, the Jewish Agency, apart from taking political steps to remedy the situation, set up a Jewish Soldiers' Welfare Committee to aid soldiers' families and provide comforts for the troops. Later, in conjunction with the *Vaad Leumi*, it created the War Services Fund to conduct welfare activities among soldiers' families, provide comforts for soldiers and supernumerary police, participate in the budget for security, and centralise the financial aid of the *Yishuv* for refugees. It has raised £1,500,000, of which £400,000 has been spent on the rescue of Jews from Europe.

The Jewish soldiers of Palestine have done service on all the fronts in the Near and Middle East—from Egypt to Tunisia, in Abyssinia and Eritrea, in Greece, in Syria, and in Italy. Their gallant conduct has evoked praise from all their commanding officers; but unfortunately they receive no credit for individual exploits in official announcements, which always use the geographical term "Palestinian," without any indication as to whether Jews or Arabs are meant. General Wavell has stated, with regard to the first campaigns in North Africa, that "they performed fine work, pre-eminently at Sidi Barrani, Sollum, Fort Capuzzo, Bardia, and Tobruk." In the fighting on the Egyptian frontier in 1942, Palestinian Jewish units of the Royal Engineers and of the Transport Companies played an important part in carrying troops to the forward battle areas, in the construction of fortified strong points at El Alamein, and in the laying of minefields. Magnificent work was done by Jewish drivers, upon whose courage, promptness, and precision the supply of vital material for the advanced

¹ See footnote on the Jewish Brigade Group on p. 292.

troops depended. One Jewish water-tank company performed an exemplary service in carrying 500,000 gallons of water to the front lines across the trackless wastes of the Western Desert, day and night, for months without pause. The men were sometimes under fire from enemy air and ground forces, but they persevered without flinching. The first Camouflage Company of the Eighth Army, consisting mainly of Palestinian Jews, was mentioned in despatches by General Montgomery and praised by Mr. Winston Churchill in a review of the Army's victorious advance. Brigadier Frederick H. Kisch, C.B.E., D.S.O., Chief Engineer of the Eighth Army (a former Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive in Jerusalem) was killed in the march towards Sousse, in Tunisia, in April, 1943. In Eritrea the Palestinians distinguished themselves in the battle for Keren. Some 300 of them (three-fifths Jews), thanks to their toughness and daring, were selected for dangerous service in Abyssinia. They operated in so-called "suicide squads," demolished enemy fortifications night after night, and brought back valuable information.

In Greece there were many Palestinian Jews with the R.A.F., the Royal Engineers, and the Pioneer Corps, whose bravery earned the praise of General Wavell and of Air Marshal d'Albiac. Several hundreds were with the last 7,000 R.A.F. men to leave Greece after successfully covering the retreat in the final days of the evacuation, and afterwards many fought in Crete. But, unfortunately, 1,444 Palestinians were among the 10,000 British troops missing in Greece and Crete, and of that total 1,023 were Jews and the rest Arabs. When the campaign in Syria began, fifty young Jewish settlers with an intimate knowledge of the district near its Palestinian frontier were chosen to accompany the Australian vanguard, to whom they rendered valuable services as guides and behind the enemy lines.¹ The Palestinian contingent helped the Allied forces in recapturing Kuneitra, the key position on the main road from Safed to Damascus. One Jewish group, which, under the command of a British officer, undertook a particularly daring task, was completely wiped out.² General Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, who was in charge of the expedition,

¹ In 1941, before the British invasion of Syria, the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el Husseini, fled from his refuge in Beyrout to Baghdad, where he conspired with the Iraqi Premier, Rashid Ali el-Khailani, in plotting an abortive pro-Nazi rising. These two, with other pro-German Arabs, then escaped to Teheran, whence they later flew to Italy and Germany, where the ex-Mufti became an anti-British propagandist on the air.

² *The Times*, March 4th, 1943.

afterwards stated that "he much appreciated the assistance rendered by Jews in this campaign."

Considerable help has also been given by Jews in regard to transport and public works. In consequence of the presence of large numbers of soldiers stationed in Palestine, and of others there on leave, the Executive of the Jewish Agency formed a Central Transport Committee, which brought about the creation of a central freight transport co-operative, "Ta'un," comprising a fleet of 850 trucks. Drivers from the transport co-operatives and the settlements joined the various transport units, while a special transport unit was recruited, consisting of Jewish drivers with their own vehicles. The Committee also arranged training courses for mechanics and produced manuals in Hebrew on the automobile engine. The construction of military camps, hospitals, fortifications, and roads has been greatly facilitated by the existence of a large Jewish labour force, skilled in all branches of building, together with the necessary staff of engineers, technicians, and foremen. The fortification works in the north of Palestine, which were necessary before the British troops advanced into Syria, were constructed by 8,000 to 10,000 Jewish workers employed day and night.

Palestine Jews have also rendered very useful services at sea. The youths trained at the various Jewish maritime institutions at Tel-Aviv and Haifa were among the first to volunteer when motor-boat crews were raised for the R.A.F., and they are serving at R.A.F. wartime stations all over the Middle East. A number of skilled Jewish mechanics have joined the British Navy, and their ability, devotion and diligence have earned them the appreciation of their commanding officers. At least twelve Jews have received commissions in the Navy. The *Yishuv* has its own small fleet, of which seven ships were lost through enemy action and other causes, while eight ships, belonging to companies serving under the Ministry of War Transport, are still left. Moreover, Jewish companies have shown much initiative in developing coastal shipping with sailing boats. Since the beginning of the war they have acquired seventeen sailing boats, most of them equipped with motors, which have done valuable work in keeping up the sea traffic between Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Cyprus and Turkey. Five of these boats were lost through enemy action and two were sunk in a storm.

Not less important are the contributions made in various branches of the economic field. Soon after the outbreak of war the Executive

of the Jewish Agency set up an Economic Council to mobilise fresh resources for agricultural and industrial developments. During the first two years a sum of £2,000,000 was spent mainly for these purposes, so as to increase the food production of the country and expand industries useful for war needs. Since the end of 1939 the Jewish National Fund has acquired another 240,000 *dunams*, part of which has been put under cultivation; large-scale reclamation and draining work has been carried out in the Haifa Bay, the Beisan Valley, and the Huleh area; and wells have been bored and water supplies installed in several settlements in the Haifa Bay district. Nearly forty new agricultural settlements have been created and some old-established ones extended. New cultures have been introduced, such as soya beans, ground nuts, Australian and Moroccan soft wheat; and the irrigated area devoted to mixed farming has been considerably increased. Sheep-breeding has been expanded, and the output of dairy produce, vegetables, and other agricultural products has risen substantially.¹ Before the war the Jewish farms were producing 6 per cent. of the country's wheat yield, 4 per cent. of its oats, and 7 per cent. of durra and other grains; in 1943 they were producing 24 per cent. of the wheat, 17 per cent. of the oats, and 9 per cent. of the durra and other grains. It is significant of this agricultural expansion that most of the village settlements have begun to repay their loans to the Keren Haycsod, the sum of nearly £90,000 having been repaid by the spring of 1943.

In the field of industry, there is an even more impressive picture. Of the 2,000 factories and workshops² owned by Jews, a large number are engaged in the manufacture of war materials. Many have been enlarged, and over 400 new factories and workshops have been built, mainly by refugees from Germany and other Nazi-oppressed countries, who have brought with them not only technical experience and knowledge of patent processes, but also in many cases their own mechanical equipment. The large number of metal, electrical, timber, textile, leather, cement, and chemical works are mainly devoted to war requirements. In the case of many factories there was a rapid transition from peace-time to war production; and Jewish concerns are able to supply many machines, machine tools, and machine parts, as well as a wide

¹ Between July, 1939, and the end of 1942 the dairy cattle in Jewish settlements increased from 16,477 to 27,408, the sheep from 12,000 to 31,575, the laying hens from 405,000 to 654,000, and vegetable production by 50 per cent.

² The total number of Jewish industrial establishments is about 7,000, of which about 5,000 are engaged in handicrafts.

range of spare parts for vehicles. There are, moreover, a large food industry, which furnishes all kinds of supplies for the Army, and a growing pharmaceutical industry. Palestine's synthetic drugs, sera and vaccines are also available for the Army; while the provision of electric light and power, and the supply of potash, bromine, and other chemicals from the Dead Sea are invaluable. The extent of the industrial advance from 1939 to 1942 is shown by the increase of the value of production from about £12,000,000 to £40,000,000, while the number engaged in industry has risen from 19,000 to over 50,000. The extent to which industry is working for the war effort is evidenced by the fact that whereas in 1940 the total value of military orders was only £1,000,000, it increased in 1943 to £12,000,000.

The Jews have also made important scientific and technical contributions to the war effort. The laboratories and scientific staff of the Hebrew University and the Haifa Technical Institute have been placed at the disposal of the military authorities. At the University special courses on parasitology and tropical medicine have been held for the medical officers of the British and Australian forces, and the Parasitology Department has provided sera for the prevention and cure of typhoid and other tropical diseases. A new and more economical technique for fighting typhus has been perfected by a group of Jewish scientists, mainly German refugees, and offered to the British Government for use in the Middle East. The University, in conjunction with the Hadassah Hospital and Medical Centre, has also arranged courses in war surgery and camp sanitation for military physicians. Its Meteorological Department has supplied the Army Command with air data for weather reports covering the entire area between the Caucasus Mountains and Lower Egypt, and its Physiological Laboratory is producing vitamins and hormones for local pharmaceutical firms to satisfy the needs of both the civilian population and the troops. The Technical Institute is co-operating with the Royal Engineers in the testing of building and constructional materials and in discovering suitable local substitutes for materials that cannot be imported owing to the war. Its electrical laboratories prepare and repair instruments and motors for the Army and Navy as well as for industries supplying war materials. The Daniel Sieff Research Institute at Rehovoth is producing acetone and butyl alcohol by fermentation, both important war chemicals. It has also established a pharmaceutical factory for the production of certain drugs, such as synthetic anti-malarials and hypnotics, which are badly needed

owing to the lack of quinine, formerly obtained from the East Indies.

While the *Yishuv* was putting forth every effort in furtherance of the Allied cause, its numbers were being slowly increased by immigration despite all the difficulties and dangers of travel created by the spreading of the war. New routes had to be devised and traversed to circumvent the obstacles. Jewish refugees from Poland who had escaped to Russia had at first to make their way to Shanghai in order to reach Palestine, and later many travelled by a roundabout route through Cape Town and East Africa. Negotiations were conducted by the Jewish Agency with the Governments of Soviet Russia and Turkey for transit visas to enable the refugees to pass through those countries. During the first five years of the war about 50,000 Jewish refugees reached Palestine, most of them originating from Europe. Their value to the country may be judged from the fact that 30 per cent. of them were members of the Youth *Aliyah*, 30 per cent. were in the capitalist category (each possessing £1,000 or more), and 25 per cent. were workers. The remainder were dependants of Palestinian residents, Rabbis, with their families, and others. One contingent of refugees aroused an exceptional degree of pathetic interest: it consisted of 800 children, mainly from Poland and Germany, and many of them orphans, whose toilsome journey had led from Russia to Teheran, and thence (owing to Iraq's refusal to grant transit) through the Arabian and Red Seas. After prolonged negotiations conducted by the Government for the exchange of Palestinian residents in Axis countries against German citizens in Palestine, two groups of women and children reached Palestine, the first in December, 1941, and the second in November, 1942. A number of other women and children, totalling 700, who were not Palestinian citizens, were also rescued from Europe and brought to their National Home. The Jewish Agency's Immigration Department introduced an orderly system for the emigration of Yemenite Jews from Aden, and made repeated efforts to secure the departure of Jews, particularly of children, from the Balkan countries, Hungary, Vichy France, and the Iberian Peninsula. But owing to the hostility of the German Government and its grip over its satellites, these efforts met with scant success.

The Agency's Immigration Department rendered a further service in enabling members of the tens of thousands of Jewish families who had escaped from Poland to Russia, to get into touch with one another. In order to trace the addresses of these refugees and to enable them to communicate with relatives and friends in

Palestine, the Department opened an Information Office, which registered over 20,000 addresses. It also despatched over 10,000 parcels of food and other forms of relief to the refugees in Russia. And in addition to these acts of humanity, the Executive of the Jewish Agency, together with the *Vaad Leumi*, played a leading and conspicuous part in the efforts to direct the attention of the United Nations to the tragic plight of the Jews who were the object of Germany's sadistic campaign of extermination. The Jews in Palestine had to a large extent come from the lands in which orgies of Nazi savagery were raging; many of them still had relations or friends in the Polish ghettos that had been turned into shambles; and it was therefore but natural that they should be stirred more deeply than any other Jewish community and also be the most insistent and clamant in demanding that the British and American Governments should undertake immediate attempts at rescue.

In addition to the anxiety about the fate of their kinsfolk in the European inferno, which weighed heavily upon the *Yishuv*, they were not a little disturbed about their own future. The White Paper of appeasement hovered over them like a spectre, and indications and incidents accumulated that emphasised its menace. The authorities exercised a rigorous censorship, which was governed not by considerations of the country's security against the enemy, but by their resolve to stifle any discussion about future policy. On March 23rd, 1943, the High Commissioner broadcast a speech on post-war reconstruction in Palestine, which was definitely based upon the assumption that the White Paper was to prevail. His address produced a feeling of profound disquiet among the Jews, because it utterly ignored the vital part that they, in common with Jews throughout the world, believed and wished that the country should play in the post-war settlement of the Jewish question. This uneasiness was intensified a few months later by slanderous attacks made upon them in the course of two trials at the Military Court in Jerusalem. In the first trial in August, at which two British soldiers, with criminal records, had been sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment each for smuggling arms and ammunition into Palestine, the counsel for their defence, a British officer, sought to extenuate their guilt by indulging in sweeping accusations against the Jewish people, the *Yishuv*, the Jewish Agency and its Chairman, and the Jewish soldiers serving with the British Forces in the Middle East. This tirade of defamation was even surpassed in the second trial, in which two

Jews were sentenced to seven and ten years' imprisonment respectively on the charge of arms smuggling, and in which the principal witnesses were the British soldiers convicted in the first case. The Prosecutor repeated the aspersions made in the first trial, and included the *Haganah*, the *Histadruth*, and the *Solel Boneh* in his fantastic diatribe. He alleged the existence of "a powerful, sinister organisation," whose aim was the possession of unlimited arms, "whose policy and objects" were "in direct conflict with those of the United Nations," and who "with watchful cunning" awaited "the opportunity to sabotage the war effort." He said that the Jews in Palestine began to take an interest in the war only when Rommel stood at El Alamein (October, 1942), and that Jews in the British Forces were "a canker in the military organism in the Middle East." This astonishing tissue of falsehood and calumny was denounced at an extraordinary meeting of the Elected Assembly (*Asefath Hanivharim*), at which the Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive, David Ben-Gurion, stigmatised it as a political manoeuvre for the purpose of discrediting and even provoking the *Yishuv*, and of thus ensuring the enforcement of the White Paper. He declared that the sentences on the Jews, in the light of all the evidence available, were a miscarriage of justice. He pointed out that there had been many trials for the stealing of arms in the Middle East, in most of which Arabs had been involved, but never before had such publicity been given to the proceedings. Only a few months before, a British soldier had been tried for selling stolen arms to an Arab, but the Arab had not been allowed to appear in court. In the case of the proceedings against the two Jews, every effort had been made to secure world-wide publicity, and American correspondents in Cairo had been invited to come to Jerusalem. As for the *Haganah*, Ben-Gurion declared that this Jewish self-defence organisation, the existence of which had been known to the authorities for years, would continue to be maintained, not for any aggression, but for the sole purpose of the defence of the *Yishuv*, since they could not depend upon any other power.¹

¹ The Palestine Royal Commission (Report, p. 201) stated: "If there is one grievance which the Jews have undoubted right to prefer it is the absence of security. . . . Our review has shown that the steps taken at intervals by the Palestine Administration to strengthen their security services, . . . to guarantee to the Jews 'quiet enjoyment' of their National Home, have more than once proved ineffectual. And not unnaturally we heard grave doubts expressed as to the future." At a meeting of the Mandates Commission, on August 2nd, 1937, the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Ormsby-Gore (now Lord Harlech), paid a tribute to the self-restraint exercised by the Jews in the face of Arab aggression and said: "We cannot deny, and we see no reason to deny, that the Jews themselves have already organised . . . the *Haganah*."

The spirit of anti-Jewish hostility displayed in these arms trials was vented further in the prosecution of a Palestinian Jew, Eliahu Sacharoff, who had a licence to carry a revolver. He was charged with possessing two bullets, and was sentenced by the Jerusalem Military Court to seven years' imprisonment. In the same week an Arab was charged with having a British military rifle and eighty-six bullets, and was sentenced to only six months' imprisonment; and a couple of weeks later another Arab, convicted of possessing a British rifle and thirty rounds of ammunition, received a sentence of only five months' imprisonment. The prosecuting authorities exercised their prerogative of bringing these two cases before magistrates' courts, where only light penalties could be imposed. The indignation aroused among the *Yishuv* by this flagrant discrimination had scarcely had time to cool when they were subjected to a further act of provocation. On November 16th British police, together with Indian troops and personnel of the Polish Provost, carried out a search of Ramath Hakovesh, a collective settlement in the Valley of Sharon. The police fired two shots, wounded a settler, who died a few days later, and arrested thirty-five settlers. The Government issued a communiqué stating that the search was the result of reports that "certain deserters from the Polish Army were harboured at Ramath Hakovesh, and, moreover, that at this settlement there was a training camp of a unit of an illegal organisation, and that illegal arms were concealed there." The only outcome of the search, in the vague terms of the official statement, was that "certain military equipment was found in a camp within the perimeter of the settlement." Two Hebrew newspapers were suspended on account of their reports, whereupon the rest of the Hebrew Press failed to appear as a demonstration of solidarity.

Mass meetings were then held at Tel-Aviv, Haifa, and Ramath Hakovesh, at which the speakers strongly protested against what was evidently a campaign against the *Haganah*, and demanded an inquiry into the latest incident and the release of the arrested settlers. These men were liberated after some days without any charge being brought against them. Early in December seven settlers from Huldah were charged before a Military Court in Jerusalem with the illegal possession of bombs and cartridges. Their counsel pleaded that these arms were solely for defence, as many of their comrades had been killed in Arab disorders, and the *koutzah* had had to be rebuilt three times. Two settlers, who pleaded guilty, declined the suggestion of the Court to disclose the origin of the arms and thus obtain a lighter sentence, on the

ground that they were not criminals and that what they had done was necessary for the defence of their settlement. The Court sentenced the seven men to terms of imprisonment ranging from two to six years.

Thus, twenty-six years after the Jewish people had acclaimed the Balfour Declaration as the Charter for the reconstitution of their National Home, those who had been the most active in its establishment were harried and traduced by official representatives of the Power responsible for the fulfilment of the Declaration. It was a situation that was a mockery of all principles of honour and justice, due apparently to the desire to create a combination of circumstances favourable to the maintenance of the White Paper policy. It was a situation utterly lacking in reason and consistency, for the Jews were the only people in the Near and Middle East who had from the very start volunteered to fight in the war for civilisation,¹ and they were now besmirched and subjected to discrimination in order to please the Arabs, who had refrained from helping in the struggle, but wished to benefit by its victory. It was the fruit of the policy of appeasement, which might have been condoned in 1939 on the ground of expediency, but had no justification whatever after four years of war. The *Tishuv* refused to bow to that policy or to give up any of the aspirations by which they had been upborne through all the toil and travail of a quarter of a century. Their sons had fought and bled on many fronts for the triumph of liberty and the defence of their ancestral land. They were resolved to face the future undaunted, confident that the exasperations and humiliations to which they had been exposed would pass like an evil dream, and that, when all the bloodshed was over, and reason and justice returned to their own, their cause would prevail.

¹ On September 19th, 1944, the British Government announced that they had decided to accede to the request of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, that a Jewish Brigade Group should be formed to take part in active operations; that the infantry brigade would be based on the Jewish battalions of the Palestine Regiment and that ancillary units, based on existing Palestinian units, would join the infantry brigade; and that the Jewish Agency had been invited to co-operate in the realisation of the scheme. On September 28th the Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill) stated in the House of Commons: "It seems to me indeed appropriate that a special Jewish unit, a special unit of that race which has suffered indescribable torments from the Nazis, should be represented as a distinct formation among the forces gathered for their final overthrow, and I have no doubt they will not only take part in the struggle, but also in the occupation which will follow." The military authorities approved of the flag of the Jewish Brigade Group—two horizontal blue stripes, divided by a white stripe, with a blue Shield of David in the centre; and of a blue-white-blue shoulder flash, with the Shield of David in gold, accompanied by the designation, "Jewish Brigade Group," and the initials of the Hebrew equivalent (*Hatnah Yehudith Lahemeth*—Jewish Fighting Formation).

PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE

THE policy of the Mandatory Power in Palestine, in the sixth year of the war, is still governed by the instrument born of the fear of war—the White Paper of May, 1939. This document enacted that the Jews shall be limited to one-third of the total population, that after five years no further Jewish immigration shall be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine acquiesce,¹ that no further transfers of Arab land to Jews shall be allowed in certain areas, and that at the end of ten years there shall be set up an independent Palestine State, in which the Arabs will be assured of a two-thirds majority. When the White Paper was submitted to the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations for approval, without which its proposals possessed no legal validity, it was unanimously declared to be inconsistent with the Mandate; and owing to the outbreak of war it was never considered by the Council of the League. But although it thus lacked the requisite sanction, the British Government rigorously enforced its provision in regard to immigration, and that too at a time when, owing to persecution in Europe, a relaxation of the restrictions should have been dictated by considerations of humanity. Moreover, in February, 1940, the Government issued new regulations for the sale and transfer of land, the effect of which was to limit to only one-twentieth of Western Palestine the area within which Jews were free to acquire land without any restriction. Thus, racial discrimination was applied against the Jews in a country under British rule at the very time when the United Nations were fighting to suppress racial discrimination among other evils in Europe; and the country was that of the Jewish National Home.

When the White Paper was first published, the Executive of the Jewish Agency issued a statement, in which they stressed that its effect was to deny to the Jewish people the right to reconstitute their National Home in their ancestral country, that it would put

¹ On November 10th, 1943, the Colonial Secretary, Colonel Oliver Stanley, announced in the House of Commons that of the total number of 75,000 Jews to be admitted into Palestine under the provisions of the White Paper, 43,922 had entered up to September 30th, 1943, and that there would be no time-limit for the admission of the remainder. On October 5th, 1944, he informed the Jewish Agency that permission had been given to use 10,300 immigration certificates remaining under the White Paper for Jews coming from liberated or non-enemy countries, to be distributed at the rate of 1,500 monthly.

the Jewish population at the mercy of the Arab majority, and that the Jews would never submit to "the closing against them of the gates of Palestine, or let their National Home be converted into a Ghetto." They declared: "It is in the darkest hour of Jewish history that the British Government propose to deprive the Jews of their last hope and to close their road back to their homeland." Since that statement was issued, what was the darkest hour then has become very much darker still owing to the unparalleled tragedy that has overtaken the Jews in Europe; and, in consequence, the determination of the Jewish people to resist the White Paper policy has increased tenfold. Hundreds of thousands of Jews have been deported from all parts of Nazi-occupied Europe to Poland and neighbouring regions; some three to four millions are estimated to have been slaughtered in conditions of the most revolting barbarity; and vast numbers have been reduced to slavery and starvation in ghettos and concentration camps, where torture is the order of the day. Repeated appeals to the Governments of the United Nations to rescue all who could still be saved were answered by denunciation of the Nazi criminals, by assurances of the deepest sympathy with their victims, by an official Anglo-American conference at Bermuda in the spring of 1943, and by the creation, on the part of the United States Government, of a War Refugees Board to help in carrying out the work of deliverance. Moreover, the British and American Governments announced that none who participated in acts of savagery against the Jews would go unpunished, and President Roosevelt appealed to the free peoples of Europe and Asia to grant asylum to refugees. So far as is generally known, however, the practical results achieved have been very small. The chief consolation that has been offered is that salvation will come when the war is over, and that all efforts must be directed towards hastening this end.

When the war is over the great problem of salvage will have to be undertaken, and in the solution of that problem Palestine will have to play its proper part. How many Jews will survive Hitler's campaign of extermination it is impossible to estimate, for that will largely depend upon the duration of the conflict. Some of the survivors, at least those who have been deported or fled from Western Europe, will probably want to return to their homes, where, it may reasonably be expected, they will be assured conditions of safety by the restored Governments. But those who have been deported from Central or other parts of Europe will hardly be disposed to go back to countries reeking with the venom of

Nazism, and where there will be little probability of security and comfort, or of the prospects of a decent livelihood. Even those who have not been deported have been robbed and reduced to beggary.

In the post-war settlement conditions may be imposed upon Germany and all her satellites, and may be accepted by other States, which will be designed to ensure that Jews shall enjoy complete civil equality and that they shall not be subjected to any legal or bureaucratic discrimination on racial or religious grounds. The minority rights embodied in over a dozen peace treaties after the First World War may be revised and improved and placed under the more vigilant supervision of a reorganised League or of a new international authority that may take its place. All sorts of assurances may be given to the Jews that they will thenceforth be able to live in peace and in the enjoyment of President Roosevelt's four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Financial reparations from some international fund may also be provided to enable them to build up a new existence. One thing, however, is certain: hundreds of thousands of Jews will want to flee from Europe at the very earliest opportunity in order to shake off the effects of the ghastly nightmare from which they will have suffered too long, and to find a home in a land where they will feel sure of being treated as human beings.

Now what lands will be open to them? At the Evian Conference held in the summer of 1938, over thirty Governments were assembled in earnest discussion for the purpose of finding territories where the victims of Hitler's fury could be welcomed, but the result of their deliberations showed that they had little to offer beyond sympathy. Various tentative proposals were made for the admission of a few thousand Jews in one or two countries, but in the end they dwindled to nothing of consequence. If that was all that was offered before the war, when conditions were comparatively stable, what likelihood is there that more will be forthcoming after it, when most countries will undergo the upheaval of adjusting themselves to peace-time occupations? Will there be a welcome in any of them for destitute refugees in desperate search of work when organised precautions will be taken to ensure that returning soldiers can immediately recover their former jobs? All hopes of alleviating the immeasurable misery of European Jewry that may be based upon optimistic answers to these questions are foredoomed to pitiful disillusion.

Suggestions have been repeatedly made from time to time that

large Jewish colonies, embracing tens of thousands of persons, can be established in some country overseas, in South America, in Africa, or in Australia. Indeed, the Jewish Territorial Organisation, under the dynamic leadership of Israel Zangwill, scoured the globe for nearly ten years before the First World War in order to discover a suitable territory for this purpose, but all in vain. And if those endeavours, conducted with the active co-operation of colonial explorers and distinguished scientists, at a time when the world was at peace and free from economic disturbances, proved sterile, what prospect is there that, if they were now resumed in a world racked with political strife, economically exhausted, and poisoned with race-hatred, they would be more successful? Various British sympathisers have suggested that there is ample room within the vast confines of the British Empire for the "tribe of the wandering foot," but not a single concrete and feasible scheme has yet been worked out for the settlement even of ten thousand Jews in some definite area in a particular territory. Fifty years ago Baron de Hirsch believed that he could solve, or at least alleviate, the Jewish problem by transplanting Jewish masses from Russia to the Argentine. He transported only a few thousand, for the country made no general appeal, and now the original settlers, their children, and all who have followed them, are suffering from the Nazi-inspired anti-Semitic policy of the Government, from which many are seeking to escape by emigration. What countless homeless and State-less Jews who survive the Hitlerite scourge will want, will be to go to a country where they will be free from fear of further persecution, where they will be able to live as Jews and human beings, and where they will not be subject to the caprice or malice of a non-Jewish majority. The only land where they hope to find, and are entitled to expect, these conditions is their own ancestral country.

Palestine will thus make a powerful appeal to great numbers of Jews as the only land that will satisfy their longings and requirements. It is the only country with a large, public-spirited Jewish community, that has had sixty years' experience of colonisation and is ready and eager to receive new settlers. But if it is to play its proper part in schemes of post-war reconstruction it is essential that the White Paper be revoked. Such a step would not involve any legal difficulties, for the White Paper itself is illegal, and its abolition would be a return to legality. Nor would it be the first time that the Mandatory Power rescinded an obnoxious statement of policy, for the Passfield White Paper of 1930, which also con-

tained proposals that were a flagrant infringement of the letter and spirit of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate, was virtually revoked a few months later by a letter from the Prime Minister to the President of the Jewish Agency. The abolition of the White Paper should certainly not meet with any opposition on the part of leading members of the present National Government, for they denounced it and voted against it when it was submitted to the House of Commons. Mr. Winston Churchill stigmatised it as "a plain breach of a solemn obligation," as "another Munich," and as a "lamentable act of default." Mr. Amery said that he could never hold up his head if he voted for it. Mr. Herbert Morrison called it a "cynical breach of pledges given to the Jews and the world, including America" and a "breach of British honour," and he warned the Chamberlain Government that "this document will not be automatically binding upon their successors in office, whatever the circumstances of the time may be." If those were the views and sentiments of these ministers, as they were of several distinguished colleagues at the time of appeasement, it is surely inconceivable that they will now be different after years of war to slay the vampire of appeasement. Nobody had any doubt at the time of its publication that the White Paper was deliberately designed to placate the Arabs and to ensure that, in the threatening conflict, they should not side with the Axis Powers who had aided and abetted them in their revolt. Mr. Churchill put it very bluntly: "We are now asked to submit--and this is what rankles most with me--to an agitation which is fed with foreign money and ceaselessly inflamed by Nazi and by Fascist propaganda." And just as the humiliating Munich Agreement was formally repudiated by the British Government at the request of the Czechoslovak Government, so should its lineal successor, the White Paper of 1939, be repudiated at the request of the Jewish people, at whose expense it was enacted.

In the course of the conferences with the Jewish and the Arab delegates at St. James's Palace early in 1939, a distinguished member of the Government was reported to have said: "There are times when questions of justice must give way to considerations of expediency." If there were such times, they are now past. It was for justice that the Jewish people asked for hundreds of years, but it was denied it. Instead, in one country after another, it was condemned to persecution, outlawry, and expulsion, while throughout its tribulations it cherished its national ideal as the instrument of its preservation. And when at last it

received the Balfour Declaration it regarded this as ample, if belated, amends for all its sufferings; and by utilising its opportunities efficiently it has brought blessings to all the inhabitants of Palestine and benefits to the Government itself. Now the promise contained in the Declaration is imperilled by the White Paper, and therefore the Jewish people demands that this document be scrapped.

The situation now reached makes it necessary to emphasise afresh the principal reason why Great Britain was entrusted with the Mandate for Palestine. The question was dealt with by the Royal Commission, who said that of the specific obligations imposed on the Mandatory and the Administration, they regarded four as of major importance: (1) the obligations with reference to the Jewish National Home, (2) the obligation to safeguard the rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine and in particular those of non-Jews, (3) the obligation to develop self-governing institutions and encourage local autonomy, and (4) the obligations undertaken with regard to the Holy Places. After commenting upon the relative scope of these different obligations, the Royal Commission concluded: "Unquestionably, however, the primary purpose of the Mandate, *as expressed in its preamble and its articles*, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home."¹ This view was enunciated much earlier, although in somewhat different terms, on behalf of the Mandatory Government itself. For at the meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission held in October, 1925, the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Ormsby-Gore (now Lord Harlech) said: "The Commission should remember that it was, after all, the Balfour Declaration which was the reason why the British Government was now administering Palestine,"² and there can surely be no question that the specific reason for the Declaration was the promise to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish National Home. The time envisaged for the fulfilment of this promise was not limited either when the Declaration was issued, or when the Mandate was conferred, or when it was ratified. Nor is there any article in the Mandate that empowers the Mandatory to declare unilaterally when it has discharged its trust. There is no article setting forth the conditions in which the Mandate may be terminated, but there is one that definitely precludes the Mandatory from changing or modifying its terms. Article 27 reads:

¹ *Palestine Royal Commission Report*, pp. 38-9. The italics are in the original.

² Minutes of the Seventh Session, 1925, VI, *G.P.M.*, 328, p. 111.

"The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate."

The provisions of the White Paper undoubtedly constitute a fundamental modification, and they are therefore a violation of the Mandate. They are also in gross contradiction to the policy of the British Government as clearly defined in the very first Report issued by the first High Commissioner, for in that Report we read:

"The policy of His Majesty's Government contemplates the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish race throughout the world in relation to Palestine, combined with a full protection of the rights of the existing population."¹

Those "legitimate aspirations" are the same now as they were in 1921, but they have acquired a far greater importance owing to the events of recent years, and the need for their satisfaction is far more imperative. The Mandatory clearly cannot continue to retain its trust unless it endeavours to satisfy those aspirations. The position that would arise if it failed to do so was once expounded, cogently and candidly, by Mr. Winston Churchill. In his devastating criticism of the Passfield White Paper (which was by no means so revolutionary as the later one), he said, in the House of Commons, on November 2nd, 1930:

"No one could claim that the British nation is bound for all time, irrespective of events or of their own physical and moral strength, to pursue the policy of establishment of the Jewish National Home. But from the moment that we recognise and proclaim that we have departed from these undertakings and are regarding the Zionist cause as a mere inconvenient incident in the Colonial Office administration of Palestine, we are bound to return our Mandate to the League of Nations and forgo the strategic, moral, and material advantages arising from the British control of, and association with, the Holy Land."

It is unlikely that Great Britain will return the Mandate, least of all while Mr. Churchill is at the head of the Government. It may, therefore, be reasonably expected, despite present indications in Palestine to the contrary, that when the war is over she will adjust her methods and principles of administration to accord with her obligations. Such a reversion to the only legitimate policy may, perhaps, again provoke protests, or some-

¹ *An Interim Report on the Civil Administration of Palestine, during the Period 1st July, 1920-30th June, 1921.* London, 1921.

thing more violent, from the Arabs: but if that should be the case it would be the duty of the Government to act with greater energy and determination, and with greater singleness of mind, than it did before the war. For much of the trouble that afflicted Palestine from the year 1929 onwards was due to the unfortunate fluctuations and vacillations of policy, giving the Arabs ground, when fomenting disorders, to circulate the slogan: "The Government is with us!" The leader and inciter of the Arabs during the whole inter-war period was the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini, and since he fled at the earliest opportunity after the outbreak of war to the Axis camp, it may reasonably be presumed that he will never be allowed to return to Palestine (unless he is brought back as a war criminal). But the demands of the ex-Mufti for an independent Arab Palestine may be raised afresh by his followers, some of whom, interned in Rhodesia for reasons of security, may be permitted to go back when the war is over. It is therefore necessary to consider the only three alternatives if and when the Mandate is to come to an end, for some day it will presumably come to an end, as it cannot go on for ever. These alternatives are that Palestine shall become an Arab State, or a binational State, or a Jewish State.

The claim that Palestine should become an Arab State is based upon the ground that Arabs have lived there for thirteen hundred years and form the majority of the population. The Arabs in Palestine were independent for rather less than one-third of that period, from the seventh to the eleventh century, but even then they never had self-government, as Palestine for a long time formed the southern part of Syria and was subject to foreign Arab rulers. They cannot therefore invoke on their behalf the clause in the Atlantic Charter relating to "sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them," since they never enjoyed such rights. There is, indeed, some doubt as to whether, strictly speaking, they are Arabs at all, for the British Foreign Office Handbook on *Syria and Palestine*¹ states: "The people west of the Jordan are not Arabs, but only Arabic-speaking." If they are Arabs, then they are part of the great Arab people which already has its own independent States in Arabia: and if they are Syrians, they form part of the people which has its own Syrian State. Moreover, a recent writer has shown, on the basis of numerous authorities from mediæval times, that there never was a substantial Arab population in Palestine

¹ London, 1920.

until the middle of the nineteenth century. He maintains that the immigration of genuine Arabs into the country began only in 1882, the very year in which Jewish colonisation began, and that 75 per cent. of the Arab population are either immigrants themselves or the descendants of persons who entered the country during the last hundred years, and mostly during the last sixty.¹ Palestine has never been a centre of Arab culture. During the greater part of their connection with the country, the Arabs have not produced any outstanding achievement in art or learning, with the sole exception of the Mosque of Omar, and that was built, not by Arabs, but by Greek architects and artificers. The recognised centres of Arab culture have always been Baghdad, Cairo, and Damascus; and Mecca and Medina have always ranked higher in Islam than Jerusalem. The degree of the Arabs' attachment to Palestine can be assessed by the measure of their resistance to their conquerors in the past or to any potential conquerors. They did not fight for the freedom of Palestine in the last war, but owed it to British forces, with which Jewish battalions co-operated; and, but for a small number, they have not fought for it in the present war.

Palestine as an Arab State would mean a catastrophe for the Jews, to which the Royal Commission thought it necessary to call serious attention. Referring to the Jews, the Commission stated: "Convinced as they are that an Arab Government would mean the frustration of all their efforts and ideals, that it would convert the National Home into one more cramped and dangerous Ghetto, it seems only too probable that they would fight rather than submit to Arab rule. And to repress a Jewish rebellion against British policy would be as unpleasant a task as the repression of Arab rebellion has been."² Guarantees, apparently quite adequate, might be offered that the Jews would be able to enjoy the usual minority rights or the rights that they have in their National Home at present. But no paper guarantees, however cautiously or alluringly phrased, would either afford reliable security against discrimination or compensate for the loss of national hopes. Their value would soon depreciate and disappear. The Jews in Palestine have already had more than one taste of Arab intolerance. Their brethren in Iraq have also been the victims of pogroms on more than one occasion—in October, 1936, and in May, 1941: on the latter occasion, when the treacherous Raschid Ali attempted his

¹ *Justice for My People*, by Ernst Frankenstein. Nicholson & Watson, London, 1943.

² *Palestine Royal Commission Report*, p. 142.

rising on the side of Germany against Britain, 120 Jews were killed, 150 were seriously injured, and over 14,500 persons suffered from the looting of homes and businesses. Besides, there was the previous episode of the massacre of Assyrian Christians in Iraq. So much, therefore, for guaranteed protection under Arab rule.

Opinions differ somewhat as to the nature of the constitution of Palestine as a bi-national State. Such a State is favoured by a small group of Jewish intellectuals and by the Hashomer Hatzair party, but while the former are prepared to make far-reaching compromises with regard to limitations on Jewish immigration the latter demands free Jewish immigration regulated entirely by the Jewish Agency, in whom the development of the natural resources of the country should be vested. If Jewish immigration were free from all restriction, the Jews would eventually become a majority and thus constitute a Jewish State. On the other hand, some regard bi-nationalism as implying parity in government and legislation, and others as also implying equality in numbers and land possession. Such a system is bound to lead to a permanent deadlock, and that too on the most vital questions affecting the future of the Jewish people. There would be further complications if some sort of union or Federation of Arab States, as advocated by some of their spokesmen, were created, for then the Arabs of a bi-national Palestine might wish to join it, while the Jews might consider it inimical to their interest to do so. It has, indeed, been argued that such a union, which would make the Arabs of Palestine feel fortified politically and help them economically, would also reconcile them to a large Jewish immigration, since the resultant Jewish community would still be a minority in the much larger Arab community. But there is no certainty of such a development; there is even a risk that Palestine might come under the sway of the other Arab States, or, if Great Britain should at some time in the future completely disinterest herself, become the prey of their rivalry. In short, a bi-national State would contain the seeds of future trouble and put the Jews into a far more disadvantageous position than they hold under the Mandate. The Arabs have attained and are attaining statehood in vast areas at their disposal. The Jewish people has a right to achieve a similar status in Palestine.

The idea of a Jewish State is by no means new, for its realisation was envisaged by the Cabinet responsible for the framing of the Balfour Declaration. The Royal Commission quoted the views of a number of British statesmen and of President Wilson, all

of whom "spoke or wrote in terms that could only mean that they contemplated the eventual establishment of a Jewish State."¹ Even when the White Paper of 1922 appeared with a definition of the National Home that caused the most profound disappointment among the Jewish people, there was, wrote the Commission, "nothing in it to prohibit the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State, and Mr. Churchill himself has told us in evidence that no such prohibition was intended."² In advancing a claim, therefore, to a State of their own, the Jews would simply be conforming to the expectation and intentions of those who laid the foundations of British policy in Palestine. The British Government lauded the advantages of a Jewish State when they made their ephemeral offer in 1937, but the State they proposed was too puny to survive. The Zionist aspiration is that not a fraction but the whole of Palestine shall become the Jewish State.

The Jews base their claim to such a State upon their uninterrupted connection with Palestine for over three thousand years, and upon the fact that the only national polity they ever had existed in that country. They base it upon the original implication of the Balfour Declaration, upon the achievements they have wrought in Palestine, upon the position they hold in the civilised world, and upon the contributions they can yet make to the progress of humanity. Are they alone among the nations of the earth to have no land in which they can fully develop their national existence without being "cribbed, cabined, and confined" by the laws of another nation? Are they alone among the nations to be denied the right of self-determination, and above all in the land which they alone endowed with its eternal fame? But for the Jews and for what they wrought in Palestine, the country would not have become the Holy Land, and it would mean little more to the world than some obscure portion of Asia. Their need of a State of their own has now become more urgent than ever before, for, after a sojourn of nineteen hundred years in Europe, during which they have experienced innumerable vicissitudes, they have been subjected to a war of extermination without parallel in history. They wish to be as safe in future from the changing caprices of a Government that may be friendly one moment and intolerant the next, as from the unchanging hostility of a tyrannical oppressor. They wish to be masters in their own home—in their own National Home. They wish to be able to enter it freely, without challenge or scrutiny, without restrictions as to

¹ *Palestine Royal Commission Report*, pp. 24-5.

² *Ibid.*, p. 33.

time or numbers, and without stipulation as to means. To them Palestine is everything, for without it they can have no assured national existence. To the Arabs it means nothing more than less than 1 per cent. of all the immense Arabic-speaking territories in Asia, which may yet take centuries to develop. The Arabs did little in the First World War to regain their freedom, and much less in the Second to retain it. Can they who have known so little suffering and possess six States in Asia alone, not allow the Jews, whose sufferings have been immeasurable and who have no other land, "that small notch"—as the late Lord Balfour called it—needed for their national salvation? Of one thing the Arabs may be sure—that any of their people who would live in a Jewish State would be treated not only with justice but with friendship and goodwill, for such a State will be based on the lofty ethical principles of the Prophets, who enjoined equality of treatment for all, whether "sojourner or stranger." There would naturally be the most scrupulous respect for the rights and susceptibilities of the Arabs in regard to their religion, language, and culture, and they would exercise their civil and political rights on a footing of equality with all other citizens. There would be no need for any of them to transfer their homes to the neighbouring lands of Iraq and Transjordan, although these are both sparsely populated and crying out for additional man-power to develop their vast neglected regions.

The policy of the Zionist Organisation regarding the future has been laid down in a resolution, which was submitted by the Executive of the Jewish Agency to the Small Committee of the Zionist General Council, the supreme authority in the movement since the war. This resolution, which was adopted at a meeting of the Committee in Jerusalem on November 10th, 1942, is as follows:

"The Small Committee of the Zionist General Council endorses the Zionist political line as defined by its representatives at the All-Zionist Conference in America in May, 1942, which lays down that the new world order that will follow victory cannot be established on foundations of peace, justice, and equality unless the problem of Jewish homelessness is finally solved. The Conference urges that the gates of Palestine be opened, that the Jewish Agency be vested with the control of immigration into Palestine and with the necessary authority for the upbuilding of the country, including the development

of its unoccupied and uncultivated lands; and that Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new democratic world."

This resolution¹ was adopted by twenty-one out of the twenty-five members, the minority consisting of the three representatives of the "Hashomer Hatzair" and one of the Left Poale-Zion. It has been endorsed by the Zionists in Great Britain, in all British Dominions, and in all other free countries, and upon its realisation depends the future of the Jewish National Home and the destiny of vast numbers of the Jewish people. The resolution does not indicate the time when it is desired that Palestine shall be established as a Jewish Commonwealth, for there must be a transitional period after the war. The appropriate time will clearly be when the Jews form the majority, and to attain that position immigration must be under the control of the Jewish Agency.

How many Jews could eventually be settled in Palestine cannot be determined in advance with mathematical accuracy, any more than anybody could have forecast that Tel-Aviv, which had only 2,000 Jews in 1914, would have nearly 200,000 thirty years later. There are at present over half-a-million Jews living on about 12 per cent. of the cultivable soil (or on about 6 per cent. of the total area) of Western Palestine, and if only a large scheme of irrigation of the Jordan Valley were carried out, if the hill districts were ameliorated and terraced, if areas regarded as uncultivable were reclaimed, and if agriculture in all parts were intensified, then, apart from the unknown potentialities of the vast uninhabited region of the Negev, experts are agreed that the present extent of agricultural colonisation could be increased several times over. There are, moreover, as the amazing progress made by Jews in the last twenty years has shown, enormous industrial possibilities, which are by no means dependent upon the raw materials locally available; and whatever money may be needed for large reconstruction schemes after the war could be provided, apart from Jewish private capital and national funds, by international loans. Towards the end of the period of the Second Temple Palestine had a population of five millions,² and a leading American expert on soil conservation, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, who recently made a careful investigation of the soil of Palestine and of the possibilities of its absorptive capacity,

¹ This resolution is sometimes referred to as the Biltmore Programme, as the Conference at which it was first adopted was held at the Biltmore Hotel in New York.

² Jean Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*, Vol. I, p. 210.

has come to the conclusion that, if an extensive scheme for the reclamation of the Jordan Valley were carried out, the country could in time absorb four millions in addition to the present population.¹ There can therefore be little doubt that Palestine could make a very substantial contribution to the solution of the Jewish problem. This could not be accomplished all of a sudden, or in a year or two: it represents a long-term programme, which, given the necessary conditions, could certainly be carried out with the united support of the Jewish people. It would not mean the termination of the connection between Palestine and Britain, for their relations could be readjusted on the basis of the Jewish State becoming a Dominion within the British Commonwealth of Nations² or on some other basis. Indeed, it requires little prescience to foretell that considerations of imperial strategy will ensure the continuance of Great Britain's active interest in the security of the country, although others of the United Nations may also take part in its administration after the war.

The Jewish question has engaged the attention of international Government conferences on various occasions during the past century and more, but it has been dealt with only in the form of piecemeal solutions and patchwork arrangements, which have proved but ephemeral. The greatest tragedy that has overwhelmed the Jewish people since its dispersion calls for a more comprehensive, more fundamental, and more durable solution—one based on historic justice and legitimate national aspirations, and not only upon the principles of civil and political equality, which can be abolished overnight. The remnant of Israel in Europe must be saved, and the welfare of the largest number can be best assured in their ancestral home. Millions of Jews living happily in lands of freedom and justice may not need to avail themselves of this scheme of salvation, but their moral and material support are essential to its success, and this success will greatly contribute to their own ultimate preservation. For all Israel are brethren: all are bound together in a common bond of collective responsibility, and no section can repudiate in the crucial hour the ideal that has inspired and upborne generation after generation throughout the ages. When the evil forces now ravaging the world are at length crushed and destroyed, all nations that have suffered will look forward to the enjoyment of

¹ Dr. Lowdermilk's scheme is fully described in his book, *Palestine: Land of Promise*.

² This idea was first suggested in 1928 by the late Colonel Josiah (afterwards Lord) Wedgwood, who founded in its support the short-lived "Seventh Dominion League."

peace and liberty in their respective countries. The people of Israel too, far more sorely tried and more numerous martyred than all others, yearn for peace and liberty, and when they regain that long-awaited boon in the land of their fathers their dream of the centuries will be fulfilled.

APPENDIX I
THE FEISAL-WEIZMANN AGREEMENT
OF JANUARY 3RD, 1919

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE EMIR FEISAL, representing and acting on behalf of the Arab Kingdom of Hedjaz, and DR. CHAIM WEIZMANN, representing and acting on behalf of the Zionist Organisation,

mindful of the racial kinship and ancient bonds existing between the Arabs and the Jewish people, and realising that the surest means of working out the consummation of their national aspirations is through the closest possible collaboration in the development of the Arab State and Palestine, and being desirous further of confirming the good understanding which exists between them,

have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

The Arab State and Palestine in all their relations and undertakings shall be controlled by the most cordial goodwill and understanding, and to this end Arab and Jewish duly accredited agents shall be established and maintained in the respective territories.

ARTICLE II

Immediately following the completion of the deliberations of the Peace Conference, the definite boundaries between the Arab State and Palestine shall be determined by a Commission to be agreed upon by the parties hereto.

ARTICLE III

In the establishment of the Constitution and Administration of Palestine all such measures shall be adopted as will afford the fullest guarantees for carrying into effect the British Government's Declaration of November 2nd, 1917.

ARTICLE IV

All necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale, and as quickly as possible to settle Jewish immigrants upon the land through closer settlement and intensive cultivation of the soil. In taking such measures the Arab peasant and tenant farmers shall be protected in their rights, and shall be assisted in forwarding their economic development.

ARTICLE V

No regulation nor law shall be made prohibiting or interfering in any way with the free exercise of religion; and, further, the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall for ever be allowed. No religious test shall ever be required for the exercise of civil and political rights.

ARTICLE VI

The Mohammedan Holy Places shall be under Mohammedan control.

ARTICLE VII

The Zionist Organisation proposes to send to Palestine a Commission of experts to make a survey of the economic possibilities of the country, and to report upon the best means for its development. The Zionist Organisation will place the aforementioned Commission at the disposal of the Arab State for the purpose of a survey of the economic possibilities of the Arab State and to report upon the best means for its development. The Zionist Organisation will use its best efforts to assist the Arab State in providing the means for developing the natural resources and economic possibilities thereof.

ARTICLE VIII

The parties hereto agree to act in complete accord and harmony on all matters embraced herein before the Peace Congress.

ARTICLE IX

Any matters of dispute which may arise between the contracting parties shall be referred to the British Government for arbitration.

Given under our hand at

London, England, the

third day of January,

One Thousand Nine

Hundred and Nineteen,

CHAIM WEIZMANN.

FEISAL IBN HUSSEIN.

(Translation from the Arabic.)

RESERVATION BY THE EMIR FEISAL:

If the Arabs are established as I have asked in my manifesto of January 4th addressed to the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, I will carry out what is written in this agreement.

If changes are made, I cannot be answerable for failing to carry out this agreement.

APPENDIX II

MANDATE FOR PALESTINE

THE Council of the League of Nations:

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have agreed, for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to entrust to a Mandatory selected by the said Powers the administration of the territory of Palestine, which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire, within such boundaries as may be fixed by them; and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the Mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on November 2nd, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said Powers, in favour of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and

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

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have selected His Britannic Majesty as the Mandatory for Palestine; and

Whereas the mandate in respect of Palestine has been formulated in the following terms and submitted to the Council of the League for approval; and

Whereas His Britannic Majesty has accepted the mandate in respect of Palestine and undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations in conformity with the following provisions; and

Whereas by the afore-mentioned Article 22 (paragraph 8) it is provided that the degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory, not having been previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, shall be explicitly defined by the Council of the League of Nations;

Confirming the said mandate, defines its terms as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Mandatory shall have full powers of legislation and of administration, save as they may be limited by the terms of this mandate.

ARTICLE 2

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

ARTICLE 3

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

ARTICLE 4

An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.

The Zionist organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.

ARTICLE 5

The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of, the Government of any foreign Power.

ARTICLE 6

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

ARTICLE 7

The Administration of Palestine shall be responsible for enacting a nationality law. There shall be included in this law provisions framed so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine.

ARTICLE 8

The privileges and immunities of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, shall not be applicable in Palestine.

Unless the Powers whose nationals enjoyed the afore-mentioned privileges and immunities on August 1st, 1914, shall have previously renounced the right to their re-establishment, or shall have agreed to their non-application for a specified period, these privileges and immunities shall, at the expiration of the mandate, be immediately re-established in their entirety or with such modifications as may have been agreed upon between the Powers concerned.

ARTICLE 9

The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that the judicial system established in Palestine shall assure to foreigners, as well as to natives, a complete guarantee of their rights.

Respect for the personal status of the various peoples and communities and for their religious interests shall be fully guaranteed. In particular, the control and administration of Wakfs shall be exercised in accordance with religious law and the disposition of the founders.

ARTICLE 10

Pending the making of special extradition agreements relating to Palestine, the extradition treaties in force between the Mandatory and other foreign Powers shall apply to Palestine.

ARTICLE 11

The Administration of Palestine shall take all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the community in connection with the development of the country, and subject to any international obligations accepted by the Mandatory, shall have full power to provide for public ownership or control of any of the natural resources of the country or of the public works, services and utilities established or to be established therein. It shall introduce a land system appropriate to the needs of the country, having regard, among other things, to the desirability of promoting the close settlement and intensive cultivation of the land.

The Administration may arrange with the Jewish agency mentioned in Article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and utilities, and to develop any

of the natural resources of the country, in so far as these matters are not directly undertaken by the Administration. Any such arrangements shall provide that no profits distributed by such agency, directly or indirectly, shall exceed a reasonable rate of interest on the capital, and any further profits shall be utilised by it for the benefit of the country in a manner approved by the Administration.

ARTICLE 12

The Mandatory shall be entrusted with the control of the foreign relations of Palestine and the right to issue exequaturs to consuls appointed by foreign Powers. He shall also be entitled to afford diplomatic and consular protection to citizens of Palestine when outside its territorial limits.

ARTICLE 13

All responsibility in connection with the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, including that of preserving existing rights and of securing free access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites and the free exercise of worship, while ensuring the requirements of public order and decorum, is assumed by the Mandatory, who shall be responsible solely to the League of Nations in all matters connected therewith, provided that nothing in this article shall prevent the Mandatory from entering into such arrangements as he may deem reasonable with the Administration for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this article into effect; and provided also that nothing in this mandate shall be construed as conferring upon the Mandatory authority to interfere with the fabric or the management of purely Moslem sacred shrines, the immunities of which are guaranteed.

ARTICLE 14

A special Commission shall be appointed by the Mandatory to study, define and determine the rights and claims in connection with the Holy Places and the rights and claims relating to the different religious communities in Palestine. The method of nomination, the composition and the functions of this Commission shall be submitted to the Council of the League for its approval, and the Commission shall not be appointed or enter upon its functions without the approval of the Council.

ARTICLE 15

The Mandatory shall see that complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, are ensured to all. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief.

The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language, while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Administration may impose, shall not be denied or impaired.

ARTICLE 16

The Mandatory shall be responsible for exercising such supervision over religious or eleemysonary bodies of all faiths in Palestine as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government. Subject to such supervision, no measures shall be taken in Palestine to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of such bodies or to discriminate against any representative or member of them on the ground of his religion or nationality.

ARTICLE 17

The Administration of Palestine may organise on a voluntary basis the forces necessary for the preservation of peace and order, and also for the defence of the country, subject, however, to the supervision of the Mandatory, but shall not use them for purposes other than those above specified save with the consent of the Mandatory. Except for such purposes, no military, naval or air forces shall be raised or maintained by the Administration of Palestine.

Nothing in this article shall preclude the Administration of Palestine from contributing to the cost of the maintenance of the forces of the Mandatory in Palestine.

The Mandatory shall be entitled at all times to use the roads, railways and ports of Palestine for the movement of armed forces and the carriage of fuel and supplies.

ARTICLE 18

The Mandatory shall see that there is no discrimination in Palestine against the nationals of any State Member of the League of Nations (including companies incorporated under its laws) as

compared with those of the Mandatory or of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft. Similarly, there shall be no discrimination in Palestine against goods originating in or destined for any of the said States, and there shall be freedom of transit under equitable conditions across the mandated area.

Subject as aforesaid and to the other provisions of this mandate, the Administration of Palestine may, on the advice of the Mandatory, impose such taxes and Customs duties as it may consider necessary, and take such steps as it may think best to promote the development of the natural resources of the country and to safeguard the interests of the population. It may also, on the advice of the Mandatory, conclude a special Customs agreement with any State the territory of which in 1914 was wholly included in Asiatic Turkey or Arabia.

ARTICLE 19

The Mandatory shall adhere on behalf of the Administration of Palestine to any general international conventions already existing, or which may be concluded hereafter with the approval of the League of Nations, respecting the slave traffic, the traffic in arms and ammunition, or the traffic in drugs, or relating to commercial equality, freedom of transit and navigation, aerial navigation and postal, telegraphic and wireless communication or literary, artistic or industrial property.

ARTICLE 20

The Mandatory shall co-operate on behalf of the Administration of Palestine, so far as religious, social and other conditions may permit, in the execution of any common policy adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating disease, including diseases of plants and animals.

ARTICLE 21

The Mandatory shall secure the enactment within twelve months from this date, and shall ensure the execution of a Law of Antiquities based on the following rules. This law shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of excavations and archæological research to the nationals of all States Members of the League of Nations.

(1) "Antiquity" means any construction or any product of human activity earlier than the year 1700 A.D.

(2) The law for the protection of antiquities shall proceed by encouragement rather than by threat.

Any person who, having discovered an antiquity without being furnished with the authorisation referred to in paragraph 5, reports the same to an official of the competent Department, shall be rewarded according to the value of the discovery.

(3) No antiquity may be disposed of except to the competent Department, unless this Department renounces the acquisition of any such antiquity.

No antiquity may leave the country without an export licence from the said Department.

(4) Any person who maliciously or negligently destroys or damages an antiquity shall be liable to a penalty to be fixed.

(5) No clearing of ground or digging with the object of finding antiquities shall be permitted, under penalty of fine, except to persons authorised by the competent Department.

(6) Equitable terms shall be fixed for expropriation, temporary or permanent, of lands which might be of historical or archaeological interest.

(7) Authorisation to excavate shall only be granted to persons who show sufficient guarantees of archaeological experience. The Administration of Palestine shall not, in granting these authorisations, act in such a way as to exclude scholars of any nation without good grounds.

(8) The proceeds of excavations may be divided between the excavator and the competent Department in a proportion fixed by that Department. If division seems impossible for scientific reasons, the excavator shall receive a fair indemnity in lieu of a part of the find.

ARTICLE 22

English, Arabic and Hebrew shall be the official languages of Palestine. Any statement or inscription in Arabic on stamps or money in Palestine shall be repeated in Hebrew and any statement or inscription in Hebrew shall be repeated in Arabic.

ARTICLE 23

The Administration of Palestine shall recognise the holy days of the respective communities in Palestine as legal days of rest for the members of such communities.

ARTICLE 24

The Mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report to the satisfaction of the Council as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of the mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ARTICLE 25

In the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, the Mandatory shall be entitled, with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations, to postpone or withhold application of such provisions of this mandate as he may consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions, and to make such provision for the administration of the territories as he may consider suitable for those conditions, provided that no action shall be taken which is inconsistent with the provisions of Articles 15, 16 and 18.

ARTICLE 26

The Mandatory agrees that, if any dispute whatever should arise between the Mandatory and another Member of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or the application of the provisions of the mandate, such dispute, if it cannot be settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 27

The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate.

ARTICLE 28

In the event of the termination of the mandate hereby conferred upon the Mandatory, the Council of the League of Nations shall make such arrangements as may be deemed necessary for safeguarding in perpetuity, under guarantee of the League, the rights secured by Articles 13 and 14, and shall use its influence for securing, under the guarantee of the League, that the Government of Palestine will fully honour the financial obligations legitimately incurred by the Administration of Palestine during the period of the mandate, including the rights of public servants to pensions or gratuities.

The present instrument shall be deposited in original in the archives of the League of Nations and certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to all Members of the League.

Done at London the twenty-fourth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

ARTICLE 25 OF THE PALESTINE MANDATE MEMORANDUM BY THE BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE

Approved by the Council on September 16th, 1922¹

Article 25 of the Mandate for Palestine provides as follows:

"In the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, the Mandatory shall be entitled, with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations, to postpone or withhold application of such provisions of this Mandate as he may consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions, and to make such provision for the administration of the territories as he may consider suitable to those conditions, provided no action shall be taken which is inconsistent with the provisions of Articles 15, 16 and 18."

2. In pursuance of the provisions of this article, His Majesty's Government invite the Council to pass the following resolution:

"The following provisions of the Mandate for Palestine are not applicable to the territory known as Transjordan, which comprises all territory lying to the east of a line drawn from a point two miles west of the town of Akaba on the Gulf of that name up to the centre of the Wady Araba, Dead Sea and River Jordan to its junction with the River Yarmuk: thence up to the centre of that river to the Syrian frontier."

Preamble—Recitals 2 and 3.

Article 2. The words, "placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home, as laid down in the Preamble, and."

Article 4.

Article 6.

¹ See Minutes of the Twenty-first Session of the Council, *Official Journal*, November 1922, p. 1,188.

Article 7. The sentence, "there shall be included in this law provisions framed so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine."

Article 11. The second sentence of the first paragraph and the second paragraph.

Article 13.

Article 14.

Article 22.

Article 23.

In the application of the Mandate to Transjordan, the action which, in Palestine, is taken by the Administration of the latter country will be taken by the Administration of Transjordan under the general supervision of the Mandate.

3. His Majesty's Government accept full responsibility as Mandatory for Transjordan, and undertake that such provision as may be made for the administration of that territory in accordance with Article 25 of the Mandate shall be in no way inconsistent with those provisions of the Mandate which are not by this resolution declared inapplicable.

APPENDIX III

(a) JEWISH IMMIGRATION INTO PALESTINE, 1919-1942

According to Jewish Agency and Palestine Government Records

Year	Poland	Russia	Germany	Rumania	Great Britain	Rest of Europe	U.S.A.	Rest of America	Asia	Africa	Stat- less	Un- specified	Jewish Agency		Government Authorized Travelers	Grand Total	
													Total Immigrants	Unac- counted			
1919	—	608	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,096	—	—	1,096	
1920	2,052	2,202	175	321	57	1,289	163	79	255	108	—	1,071	1,073	—	—	8,283	
1921	1,800	3,781	185	454	27	789	259	22	146	84	—	843	8,291	—	—	8,294	
1922	2,681	2,626	39	295	73	623	199	8	385	27	—	863	8,685	—	—	8,689	
1923	2,175	2,948	71	361	13	687	89	19	431	11	—	1,314	8,963	82	—	8,175	
1924	5,670	2,974	180	431	24	1,444	102	13	1,880	88	—	29	12,005	987	—	12,992	
1925	17,115	7,790	362	1,701	80	3,304	331	30	1,886	63	—	633	23,173	1,231	—	24,404	
1926	7,608	1,918	71	1,693	65	1,918	184	20	1,686	21	—	297	12,244	611	—	13,855	
1927	688	508	5	191	11	154	27	4	380	1	—	46	2,320	714	—	3,034	
1928	292	317	6	24	8	40	37	9	25	—	—	19	781	107	—	8,175	
1929	1,978	595	43	293	12	363	89	6	583	—	—	100	3,913	140	—	4,944	
1930	5,368	485	47	289	13	372	182	6	393	—	—	72	4,121	115	—	4,944	
1931	1,070	357	42	190	10	260	171	14	181	—	—	61	1,908	138	—	4,975	
1932	2,987	119	153	377	30	679	491	21	528	5	—	81	5,480	313	—	6,533	
1933	12,679	408	5,750	1,374	85	3,958	1,063	30	1,421	36	—	282	27,289	573	—	29,787	
1934	16,430	578	6,092	1,751	158	5,749	1,028	172	2,038	71	—	868	30,619	1,625	—	32,244	
1935	21,407	448	5,164	3,010	275	8,902	1,402	277	3,425	106	—	965	55,407	2,643	—	61,051	
1936	12,939	585	8,757	1,803	130	3,076	245	64	1,035	34	—	267	26,976	824	—	29,727	
1937	8,578	269	2,665	236	73	872	103	21	1,037	11	—	130	9,441	413	—	10,450	
1938	8,246	62	2,887	454	15	2,322	61	8	612	12	—	134	11,222	219	—	12,868	
1939	1,899	12	8,757	337	45	2,757	28	3	1,860	6	—	42	11,666	251	—	12,961	
1940	1,113	8	1,036	681	2	855	5	3	1,269	—	—	53	4,191	333	—	4,894	
1941	441	6	1,174	733	—	507	—	—	1,343	—	—	53	3,412	2,230	—	5,846	
1942	567	7	35	80	5	101	—	7	689	5	—	15	1,407	780	—	3,038	
	182,903	20,487	86,354	16,135	1,165	41,191	6,382	888	31,029	692	6,031	8,482	303,641	19,090	8,833	29,337	368,911

(b) JEWISH IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION

Extract from the Palestine Government Report to the League of Nations for 1938

The recorded volume of Jewish immigration and emigration in 1938 and previous years is as follows:

<i>Year:</i>	<i>Jewish persons registered as immigrants</i>	<i>Jewish persons recorded as leaving permanently</i>
1920-4	42,784 ¹	5,476 ²
1925-9	57,022	18,501
1930-4	91,258	2,345
1935	61,854	396
1936	29,727	773
1937	10,536	889
1938	12,868	1,095
Total	<u>306,049</u>	<u>29,475</u>

NOTE.—There is a small discrepancy between the Jewish Agency's and the Palestine Government's grand total for the period to the end of 1938 owing to data known to the one body not being available to the other, but it may have become less or disappeared in the Government's subsequent records.

¹ The records begin in September, 1920.

² No figures are available for Jewish emigration in 1920, 1921, 1932, 1933 and 1934. The census in 1931 revealed that the actual number of Jewish emigrants was larger than that shown in the migration records.

APPENDIX IV

THE JEWISH POPULATION OF PALESTINE

ACCORDING to a careful estimate made by the Statistical Department of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, the Jewish population in Palestine at the end of 1942 amounted to 517,000. This estimate was based on (a) the net Jewish immigration (i.e. the surplus of immigration over emigration) and the natural increase of the Jews (the excess of births over deaths) since the official census of 1931, and (b) the enumeration of the Jewish population in all urban and rural districts carried out by the Department in recent years. The number of non-Jews in Palestine at the end of 1942 amounted to about 1,140,000 (including 992,000 Moslems, 127,000 Christians, and 13,000 Druses). According to this calculation the Jews, at the end of 1942, formed 31·3 per cent. of the total population. The numerical increase of the Jews in the course of twenty years is shown by the following table:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Total population</i>	<i>Number of Jews</i>	<i>Jewish percentage</i>
1922	752,000	89,000	11·1
1931	1,033,300	174,600	16·9
1942	1,657,000	517,000	31·3

Of the 517,000 Jews, 340,000 (65·8 per cent.) lived in 6 cities, 45,500 (8·8 per cent.) in 22 urban settlements (Kiriath Hayim, Kiriath Motzkin, Nethaniah, etc.), and 113,000 (21·8 per cent.) in 241 villages and small settlements, including large villages like Rehovoth and Rishon le-Zion and small ones like Nahalal and Ein-Harod. Up to the end of 1942, 20,000 Jews had volunteered for military service, but 1,500 were discharged.

ANNUAL RATE OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS
PER 1,000 OF SETTLED POPULATION, 1922-42

<i>Year</i>	<i>Moslems</i>	<i>Birth-rate</i>		
		<i>Jews</i>	<i>Christians</i>	
1922-5 average	50·09	34·81	36·37	
1926-30 "	53·45	34·29	38·55	
1931-5 "	50·24	30·33	35·84	
1934	46·56	30·21	33·55	
1935	52·54	30·80	35·61	
1936	53·14	29·74	36·34	
1937	49·74	26·67	33·55	
Average, 1922-37	51·15	32·21	36·47	
1938	47·25	26·26	34·35	
1939	46·42	23·02	31·31	
1940	47·42	23·72	31·11	
1941	49·42	20·67	29·06	
1942	—	23·98	—	

<i>Year</i>	<i>Moslems</i>	<i>Death-rate</i>		<i>Christians</i>
		<i>Jews</i>		
1922-25 average	26.83	19.62		16.13
1926-30 "	28.31	11.66		17.01
1931-5 "	25.34	9.32		15.04
1934	26.68	9.53		16.25
1935	23.46	8.58		13.99
1936	19.97	8.82		12.63
1937	24.82	7.78		13.01
Average, 1922-37	26.14	10.78		15.89
1938	18.71	8.11		12.51
1939	17.38	7.57		11.53
1940	24.74	8.18		12.21
1941	21.40	7.89		11.09
1942	—	8.17		—

**ANNUAL RATE OF NATURAL INCREASE
PER 1,000 OF SETTLED POPULATION, 1922-42**

<i>Year</i>	<i>Moslems</i>	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Christians</i>
1922-5 average	23.26	21.19	20.24
1926-30 "	25.14	22.63	20.64
1931-5 "	24.90	21.01	20.80
1934	19.88	20.68	17.30
1935	29.08	22.22	21.62
1936	33.17	20.92	23.71
1937	24.92	18.89	19.64
Average, 1922-37	25.01	21.43	20.58
1938	28.54	18.15	21.84
1939	29.04	15.45	19.78
1940	22.68	15.54	18.90
1941	27.82	12.76	17.97
1942	—	15.21	—

It will be observed that the natural increase of the Jews is much below that of the Moslems. According to their respective rates in 1941, the Moslems receive an addition of 26,700 a year by natural increase, and the Jews only 6,200, a difference of over 20,000. This difference has to be made good by immigration before the Jews can increase their proportion of the total population.

APPENDIX V

ARAB TERRITORIES AND PALESTINE

IN a memorable speech that the late Lord Balfour delivered at the Royal Albert Hall in London, on July 12th, 1920, he dwelt on the vast Arab territories that had been liberated by the Allied Powers and referred to Palestine as "that small notch—for it is no more than that geographically, whatever it may be historically," which he hoped that the Arabs would not grudge "being given to the people who for all these hundreds of years have been separated from it." Lord Balfour's appeal was addressed to the Arabs of the territories that were under Turkish domination or suzerainty before the First World War. There are other extensive Arab territories stretching over the whole of North Africa—Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripolitania and Egypt.

It is almost impossible to give exact figures of the area and the population of the principal Arab countries formerly under Turkish rule, as no reliable land survey or census has ever been taken. The following data may be accepted as approximately correct:

	<i>Approximate Area in Square Miles</i>	<i>Approximate Population</i>
Syria (including Lebanon, Jebel Druze, Latakia)	58,000	3,600,000
Iraq	116,000	2,860,000
Saudi Arabia	900,000	4,500,000
Yemen	75,000	3,500,000
Transjordan	35,000	300,000
Total	1,184,000	14,760,000
Western Palestine	10,500	. In 1942 1,657,000 (1,140,000 Arabs 517,000 Jews.)

It will thus be seen that the area of Palestine of the Mandate is equal to less than 1 per cent. of the Arab territories liberated in 1918.

APPENDIX VI

ZIONIST CONGRESSES AND PARTY REPRESENTATION

DELEGATES

No. of Congress	Date	Place	Shekel Payers	General Zionists	Mizrachi	Labour	Radicals	Revisionists	Others	Total
XII	1921	Carlsbad	778,487	376	95	41	—	—	—	512
XIII	1923	Carlsbad	569,779	165	76	69	21	—	—	331
XIV	1925	Vienna	631,801	177	55	59	15	5	—	311
XV	1927	Basle	419,000	151	46	63	11	10	—	281
XVI	1929	Zurich	393,220	145	51	81	12	21	—	310
XVII	1931	Basle	423,533	A B 25 59	35	75	8	52	—	254
XVIII	1933	Prague	682,689	74	39	138	15	45	—	318
XIX	1935	Lucerne	975,929	A B 81 47	66	209	—	11	49	463
XX	1937	Zurich	930,106	116 40	73	204	—	9	42	484
XXI	1939	Geneva	1,416,280	143 28	65	216	13	8	54	527

Revisionists State Party
7

Jewish State Party

Left Poale Zion

The total number of delegates at the Congresses from 1921 to 1929 includes the members of the Zionist General Council (whose numbers rose from 42 to 68), but after 1929 the numbers represent only delegates elected by Shekel-Payers. In 1933 the Revisionists split into two sections: the minority (under the leadership of Meir Grossmann) was at first called "Democratic Revisionists" and afterwards adopted the name of "Jewish State Party." The "Others" included delegates who preferred to act independently or who found it expedient to conceal their identity or party affiliation owing to the political conditions of the country from which they came (e.g. Nazi Germany). Since 1931 each delegate had to represent a minimum of 3,000 Shekel-Payers, but a country with a small Jewish population that was unable to dispose of 3,000 Shekalim was entitled to one delegate if it remitted not less than 1,500. Palestine enjoyed the privilege of returning one delegate for every 1,500 Shekalim until the Congress of 1939. The question whether that privilege should be continued was discussed at that Congress and then referred to the General Council for decision.

APPENDIX VII

PRONOUNCEMENTS ON A JEWISH COMMONWEALTH

(i) *Great Britain*

AT the Annual Conference of the British Labour Party, held in London, in December, 1944, Mr. C. R. Attlee, M.P., on behalf of the National Executive of the Party, moved a special resolution welcoming the Executive's statement on international post-war policy, which was adopted. It contained the following paragraph on Palestine:

"Here we have halted half way, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a 'Jewish National Home' unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tinyland in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. Here, too, in Palestine surely is a case, on human grounds and to promote a stable settlement, for transfer of population. Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organised and generously financed. The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales. Indeed, we should re-examine also the possibility of extending the present Palestian boundaries, by agreement with Egypt, Syria, or Transjordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support both of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestinian policy."

(B) The Board of Deputies of British Jews, the representative organisation of the Jews in Great Britain, at a meeting held in London on November 5th, 1944, adopted the following declaration of policy on Palestine:

"(a) The Board of Deputies of British Jews looks to His Majesty's Government to secure that the United Nations, in laying down the policies governing the post-war settlement, declare that undivided Palestine be designated to become, after an agreed period of

transitional government, a Jewish State or Commonwealth. All Jews who wish to make their home in Palestine shall have the right of entry, settlement and citizenship in accordance with its laws, it being provided that nationality of the Jewish State or Commonwealth shall be confined to its own citizens, and shall not, in the terms of the Balfour Declaration, prejudice 'the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.'

"(b) That, having regard to the traditional sympathy of the British people with the ideals and aspirations of the Jews in relation to Palestine and Great Britain's historic role in creating the Jewish National Home, the Board hopes that the Jewish State or Commonwealth may find an appropriate and legally secured place within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

"(c) That the Constitution of the Jewish State or Commonwealth shall guarantee the equality of rights of all citizens of Palestine irrespective of race, religion or language, and this equality shall be secured by international guarantee.

"(d) That, during the transitional period, before the full establishment of the Jewish State or Commonwealth, the Jewish Agency, recognised under the Mandate as the authorised representative of the Jewish people in relation to Palestine, be vested with authority to direct and regulate immigration into Palestine, to develop to the maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of the country and to utilise the uncultivated and unoccupied lands for Jewish colonisation and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

"(e) That within the general scheme of post-war reconstruction the United Nations should take into account the needs of the Jewish people and, upon the cessation of hostilities and the liberation of the European territories, provide facilities for the speedy transfer to Palestine of the Jewish survivors of Nazi persecution who may wish to settle in Palestine, and grant, for this purpose, appropriate financial and other help.

"(f) That the rights of the respective religious authorities with regard to the Holy Places shall be internationally guaranteed."

(ii) *United States of America*

(A) On the eve of the election for the Presidency of the United States of America that took place in November, 1944, both the Democratic and the Republican candidates made pronouncements in favour of a Jewish Commonwealth.

President Roosevelt addressed his statement to Senator Wagner, asking him to convey it to the 47th Annual Convention of the Zionist Organisation of America, which met on October 14th, 1944, at Atlantic City. The President wrote:

“Knowing that you will attend the Z.O.A. Convention, I ask you to convey to the delegates my cordial greetings. Please express my satisfaction that in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the Four Freedoms, the Democratic Party has included the following plank in its platform: We favour the opening of Palestine for unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonisation and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth. Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means to effectuate this policy as soon as practicable. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a democratic Jewish Commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people will give their support to this aim, and, if re-elected, I shall help to bring about its realisation.”

Governor Dewey's statement was as follows:

“I heartily endorse the Palestine plank in the Republican Party platform. Again I repeat what I previously stated to the great leader of the American Zionist Movement and distinguished American, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, that I am for the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth in accordance with the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of the Republican Congress in 1922. I have also stated to Dr. Silver that, in order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jews driven from their homes by tyranny, I favour the opening of Palestine to their unlimited immigration and land ownership. The American people have time and again declared themselves in favour of these principles. The Republican Party has at all times been the traditional friend of the movement. As President, I would use my best offices to have our Government working together with Great Britain to achieve this great objective for a people that have suffered so much and deserve so much at the hands of mankind.”

(B) At the American Jewish Conference, which was held in New York from August 29th to September 2nd, 1943, and which was attended by 500 delegates, of whom one-fourth represented

nation-wide organisations and the other three-fourths were elected by Jewish communities throughout the United States, the most important resolution adopted was one demanding the creation of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. This resolution, which was carried by an overwhelming majority (only four delegates voting against and two bodies abstaining), recited the tragic position of Jewry due to Nazi barbarity, recalled the issue of the Balfour Declaration and the grant to Great Britain of the Mandate for Palestine, summarised the progress achieved in Palestine, pilloried the White Paper of 1939, and continued as follows:

“The American Jewish Conference, meeting at a time when the policies of the peace are in the making, and conscious of its historic responsibility and of its position as representative of American Jewry and spokesman for the silenced Jewish communities of Europe, calls for the loyal and faithful fulfilment of the covenant entered into between the nations of the world and the Jewish people. We call for the fulfilment of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate for Palestine, whose intent and underlying purpose, based on the ‘historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine,’ was to reconstitute Palestine as the Jewish Commonwealth.

“We demand the immediate withdrawal, in its entirety, of the Palestine White Paper of May, 1939, with its unwarranted restrictions on Jewish immigration and land settlement. The White Paper is a violation of the rights accorded to the Jewish people under the Mandate for Palestine. It was characterised by Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons as a breach and a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations refused to recognise its legality or its moral validity.

“The Conference demands that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration and that the Jewish Agency, recognised under the Mandate as the authorised representative of the Jewish people, be vested with authority to direct and regulate immigration into Palestine, to develop to the maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of the country, and to utilise its uncultivated and unoccupied lands for Jewish colonisation and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

“The measures here urged constitute the essential prerequisites for the attainment of a Jewish majority and for the

recreation of the Jewish Commonwealth. In the pursuit of its objective of a Jewish Commonwealth, the Jewish people has steadfastly held before it the ideals which shall integrate Jewish Palestine within the new democratic world structure. The Jewish people pledges itself to scrupulous regard for, and preservation of, the religious, linguistic and cultural rights of the Arab population of Palestine, and to the civil and religious equality of all its inhabitants before the law. The inviolability of the Holy Places of the various religions shall be guaranteed.

“The Jewish people reaffirms its readiness and desire for full co-operation with its Arab neighbours in Palestine, and in the work of its own national redemption welcomes the economic and political development of the Arab peoples of the Near East.

“On the basis, both of the part it has played in the history of civilisation and of its present achievement in Palestine, the Jewish people believes that the Jewish Commonwealth to be established will represent another fundamental contribution to the social and political ideals of the world. It will finally answer the agonised cry of the most martyred of peoples and enable it to take its rightful place in that progressive order of mankind which, we pray, may issue from the present struggle.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE following are the principal sources that have been consulted in the preparation of this work:

PART I

- Gelber, N. M., *Zur Vorgeschichte des Zionismus: Judenstaatsprojekte in den Jahren 1695-1845*. Vienna, 1927.
- Goldberg, Isaac, *Major Noah: American Jewish Pioneer* (Mordecai Manuel Noah). Philadelphia, 1941.
- Hess, Moses, *Jüdische Schriften* (edited by Th. Zlocisti). Berlin, 1905.
— *Rom und Jerusalem*. 2nd edition. With Foreword by Max Bodenheimer. Leipzig, 1899.
- Hyamson, Albert M., *British Projects for the Restoration of the Jews*. British Palestine Committee, London, 1917.
- Jewish Agency for Palestine, *The Historical Connection of the Jewish People with Palestine*. Memorandum submitted to the Palestine Royal Commission, Jerusalem, 1936.
- Juster, Jean, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*. Paris, 1914.
- Kobler, Franz, articles on "Napoleon and the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine" in *The New Judæa*, September-December, 1940, and February, 1941.
- Krauss, Samuel, *Vier Jahrtausende jüdischen Palästinas*. Frankfurt, 1922.
- Loewe, Louis, *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*. London, 1890.
- Luncz, A. M., *Jerusalem* (a Hebrew annual, of which Vols. 2 and 3 contain a history of the Jews in Palestine from 1267 to about 1600). Jerusalem.
- Pinsker, Leon, "*Autoemanzipation!*" 3rd edition. With Foreword by Ahad Ha'am. Berlin, 1920. English translation by D. S. Blondheim, 2nd edition. New York, 1916.
- Schechter, S., *Studies in Judaism*, 2nd series (containing article "Safed in the Sixteenth Century"). London, 1908.
- Sokolow, Nahum, *History of Zionism (1600-1918)*, 2 vols. London, 1919.
- Wilhelm, Kurt (translated and edited by), *Wege nach Zion* (descriptions of journeys by Jewish travellers to, and letters from, Palestine, from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries). Berlin, 1935.
- Zionism*. Handbooks prepared under the direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office, London, 1920.

PART II

- Ahad Ha'am, *Selected Essays* (translated by Leon Simon). Philadelphia, 1912.
- *Ten Essays on Zionism and Judaism* (translated by Leon Simon). London, 1922.
- Boehm, Adolf, *Die Zionistische Bewegung*, Vol. I (to 1918). Vienna, 1935.
- Cohen, Israel (edited by), *Zionist Work in Palestine*. London, 1911.
- *The German Attack on the Hebrew Schools in Palestine*. London, 1918.
- Cohn, Emil Bernhard, *David Wolffsohn: Herzl's Nachfolger*. Amsterdam, 1939.
- Friedemann, Adolf, *Das Leben Theodor Herzls*. Berlin, 1914.
- Gottheil, Richard, *Zionism*. Philadelphia, 1914.
- Haas, Jacob de, *Theodor Herzl*. New York, 1927.
- Herzl, Theodor, *Zionistische Schriften*. Berlin, 1923.
- *Tagebücher*, 3 vols. Berlin, 1923.
- *Altneuland*. Leipzig, 1902.
- *The Jewish State*, 3rd edition (translated by Sylvic d'Avigdor, revised by Israel Cohen). London, 1936.
- Klausner, Joseph, *Menahem Ussishkin: His Life and Work*. Jerusalem, 1942.
- Nawratzki, Curt, *Das neue jüdische Palästina*. Berlin, 1919.
- Nordau, Max, *Zionistische Schriften*. Cologne, 1909.
- Robinson, Abraham, *David Wolffsohn*. Berlin, 1921.
- Ruppin, Arthur, *Three Decades of Palestine* (article, "The Picture in 1907"). Jerusalem, 1936.
- Simon, Leon, *Studies in Jewish Nationalism*. London, 1920.
- Sokolow, Nahum, *Hibbath Zion*. Jerusalem, 1934.
- Weisgal, Meyer W. (edited by), *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial* (contains articles by many writers on the life and the literary and political work of Herzl, as well as on Zionist developments after Herzl). Zionist Organisation of America, New York, 1929.
- Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch*. (A small cyclopædia containing articles on all aspects of Zionism, on Palestine, and on kindred subjects.) Berlin, 1908.
- Zionist Organisation publications:
- Stenographic Reports of Zionist Congresses*, 1897 to 1913.
- Die Welt*, official organ, 1897 to 1914.

PART III

- Annals of the American Academy of Political Science: *Palestine: A Decade of Development*. Philadelphia, 1932.
- Antonius, George, *The Arab Awakening*. London, 1938.
- Attias, Moshe, *Knesseth Israel be-Eretz Israel*. Jerusalem, 1944.
- Balfour, Lord, *Speeches on Zionism* (edited by Israel Cohen). London, 1928.
- Baratz, Joseph, *Dagania* (Palestine's first collective village). Jerusalem, 1931.
- Ben-Gurion, David, *Palestine in the Post-War World* (pamphlet). London, 1942.
- Bentwich, Norman, *England in Palestine*. London, 1932.
- *Fulfilment in the Promised Land*. London, 1938.
- *Judea Lives Again*. London, 1944.
- *Jewish Youth Comes Home*. London, 1944.
- Boehm, Adolf, *Die Zionistische Bewegung*, Vol. II (1918–25). Vienna, 1936.
- and Adolf Pollak, *The Jewish National Fund*. Jerusalem, 1939.
- Bonné, Alfred, *Palästina, Land und Wirtschaft*. Leipzig, 1932.
- British Government Publications:
- An Interim Report on the Civil Administration of Palestine during the period 1st July, 1920–30th June, 1921*. London, 1921.
- Reports of the Commission of Inquiry with Correspondence relating to the disturbances in Palestine in May, 1921*. 1921.
- Report on Palestine Administration, July, 1920–December, 1921*. London, 1922.
- Report on Palestine Administration, 1922 and 1923*.
- Report of the High Commissioner on the Administration of Palestine, 1920–1925*. 1925.
- Annual Reports on Palestine and Transjordan to the Council of the League of Nations, 1923–1938*.
- Palestine: Correspondence with the Palestine Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organisation*. June, 1922.
- Palestine: Proposed Formation of an Arab Agency*. November, 1923.
- Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting the rights of the Governments of the two countries and their respective nationals in Palestine*. 1925.
- The Western or Wailing Wall in Jerusalem*. Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1928.
- Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929*. London, March, 1930.

- Palestine: Statement of Policy by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.* October, 1930.
- Palestine: Statement with regard to British Policy.* May, 1930.
- Palestine: Report on Immigration, Land Settlement, and Development.* By Sir John Hope Simpson, C.I.E. October, 1930.
- Proposed New Constitution for Palestine.* March, 1936.
- Palestine Royal Commission: Report.* July, 1937.
- Policy in Palestine: Despatch dated 23rd December, 1937, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the High Commissioner for Palestine.* January, 1938.
- Palestine Partition Commission: Report.* October, 1938.
- Correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon and the Sherif Hussein of Mecca, July, 1915-March, 1916.* 1939.
- Statements made on behalf of His Majesty's Government during the Year 1918 in regard to the Future Status of Certain Parts of the Ottoman Empire* (containing messages to King Hussein, to seven Arab leaders in Cairo, and to Emir Feisal). 1939.
- Palestine: Statement of Policy.* May, 1939.
- Cohen, Israel, *The Journal of a Jewish Traveller.* London, 1925.
- *Britain's Nameless Ally.* London, 1942.
- *The Jews in the War.* 2nd edition. London, 1943.
- Dugdale, Blanche, *Arthur James Balfour, first Earl of Balfour.* London, 1936.
- Farago, Ladislas, *Palestine on the Eve.* London, 1936.
- Frankenstein, Ernst, *Justice for My People* (containing forceful arguments in support of the Jewish legal, political, and moral claims to Palestine). London, 1943.
- Goodman, Paul, *Zionism in England.* London, 1929.
- (edited by), *The Jewish National Home.* London, 1943.
- Granovsky, Abraham, *Land Problems in Palestine.* London, 1926.
- *Land Policy in Palestine.* New York, 1940.
- Graves, Philip, *Palestine: The Land of Three Faiths.* London, 1923.
- Haas, Jacob de, *Louis D. Brandeis.* New York, 1926.
- Herrmann, Hugo, *Palästinakunde.* Vienna, 1935.
- Holdheim, Gerhard, *Zionistisches Handbuch.* Berlin, 1923.
- Horowitz, David and Rita Hinden, *Economic Survey of Palestine* (with special reference to 1936 and 1937). Tel-Aviv, 1938.
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir, *Die jüdische Legion im Weltkrieg.* Berlin, 1930.
- *The Jewish War Front.* London, 1940.

Jewish Agency Publications:

- Memorandum on the Development of the Jewish National Home*, submitted (annually) by the Jewish Agency for Palestine to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations for the information of the Permanent Mandates Commission, 1924 to 1939.
- Report to the Council of the Jewish Agency* (biennial), 1931 to 1939.
- Memorandum on the "Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929,"* by Leonard Stein. May, 1930.
- The Development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine: Memorandum* submitted to His Majesty's Government by the Jewish Agency for Palestine. May, 1930.
- Memorandum on the Western Wall*, submitted to the Special Commission of the League of Nations on behalf of the Rabbinate, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the Jewish Community of Palestine (Knesseth Israel), and the Central Agudath Israel of Palestine, June, 1930.
- Palestine: Land Settlement, Urban Development and Immigration.* Memorandum submitted to Sir John Hope Simpson, Special Commissioner of H.M. Government. July, 1930.
- The Palestine White Paper of October, 1930.* Memorandum by Leonard Stein. November, 1930.
- The Statistical Bases of Sir John Hope Simpson's Report on Immigration, Land Settlement, and Development in Palestine.* May, 1931.
- Agricultural Development and Land Settlement in Palestine: Observations by the Jewish Agency on Mr. Lewis French's Reports.* 1933.
- Memorandum submitted to the Palestine Royal Commission on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.* November, 1936.
- Documents relating to the McMahon Letters.* March, 1939.
- Documents relating to the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate.* May, 1939.
- The Jewish Case against the Palestine White Paper.* June, 1939.
- Documents and Correspondence relating to Palestine, August, 1939, to March, 1940.* (Palestine Land Transfers Regulations, the Palestine White Paper before the Permanent Mandates Commission, the Jewish People and the War.) March, 1940.
- Joint Palestine Survey Commission: Reports of the Experts submitted to the Joint Palestine Survey Commission.** Boston, 1929.
- Kisch, Brigadier Fredk. H., Palestine Diary.** London, 1938.

- Klausner, Joseph, *History of Modern Hebrew Literature*. Translated by Canon H. Danby. London, 1932.
- *Menahem Ussishkin*. London, 1944.
- League of Nations: Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes*. 1924-1939.
- Levensohn, Lotta, *Outline of Zionist History*. New York, 1941.
- Lipsky, Louis, *Thirty Years of American Zionism*. New York, 1928.
- Lloyd George, David, *The Truth about the Peace Treaties*. 2 vols. London, 1938.
- Locker, Berl, *Palestine and the Jewish Future* (pamphlet). London, 1942.
- Lowdermilk, Walter C., *Palestine, Land of Promise*. London, 1944.
- Luke, Harry Charles, and Edward Keith Roach (edited by), *The Handbook of Palestine and Transjordan*. London, 1930.
- Maclean, the Very Rev. Dr. Norman, *His Terrible Swift Sword*. (A scathing criticism of British Policy in Palestine.) London, 1942.
- Main, Ernest, *Palestine at the Crossroads*. (A searching criticism of the Arab claims to Palestine by an authority on Middle Eastern affairs.) London, 1937.
- Miller, David Hunter, *My Diary of the Peace Conference*. Privately printed. 1924-6.
- Nordau, Anna and Maxa, *Max Nordau*. New York, 1943.
- Oliphant, Laurence, *The Land of Gilead*. London, 1880.
- *Letters from Haifa*. London, 1885.
- Palestine Government, *Report on Agricultural Development and Land Settlement in Palestine*, by Lewis French, Director of Development. London, 1931.
- Patterson, John H., *With the Zionists in Gallipoli*. London, 1916.
- *With the Judeans in the Palestine Campaign*. London, 1922.
- Pearlman, Maurice, *Collective Adventure*. London, 1938.
- Preuss, Walter, *Die jüdische Arbeiter-Bewegung in Palästina*. Vienna, 1936.
- Rappoport, Angelo S., *Palestine, To-day and To-morrow*. London, 1936.
- Revusky, Abraham, *The Jews in Palestine*. New York, 1935.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1939*. London, 1939.
- Ruppin, Arthur, *Agricultural Colonisation in Palestine*. London, 1926.

- Ruppin, Arthur, *The Jews in the Modern World*. London, 1938.
 ——— *Three Decades of Palestine*. Jerusalem, 1936.
 ——— *The Jewish Fate and Future*. London, 1940.
- Sereni, Enzo, and R. E. Ashery (edited by), *Jews and Arabs in Palestine*. New York, 1936.
- Sidebotham, Herbert, *England and Palestine*. London, 1918.
 ——— *Great Britain and Palestine*. London, 1937.
- Simson, H. J., *British Rule, and Rebellion*. (A well-informed and searching criticism of British methods in dealing with the Arab revolt of 1936.) London, 1937.
- Spiegel, Shalom, *Hebrew Re-born*. London, 1930.
- Stein, Leonard, *Zionism*. 2nd edition. London, 1932.
- Storrs, Sir Ronald, *Orientalisms*. Definitive edition. London, 1943.
- Stoyanovsky, J., *The Mandate for Palestine*. London, 1928.
- Temperley, H. M. V., *History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, Vol. VI. London, 1924.
- Thomas, Bertram, *The Arabs*. London, 1937.
- Toynbee, A. J., *Survey of International Affairs*. 1925, 1930, 1934, 1936, 1937.
- Ulitzur, A., *Two Decades of Keren Hayesod, 1921-1940*. Jerusalem, 1940.
- United States Government Publication: *Mandate for Palestine, prepared in the Division of Near Eastern Affairs*. Washington, 1927.
- Waters, M. P., *Mufti over the Middle East*. London, 1942.
- Wedgwood, Josiah C., *The Seventh Dominion*. London, 1928.
- Weizmann, Chaim, *Palestine's Role in the Solution of the Jewish Problem* (pamphlet). London, 1942.
- Wise, Stephen, and J. de Haas, *The Great Betrayal*. New York, 1930.
- Zionist Organisation Publications:
Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation to Zionist Congresses, 1921 to 1939.
Stenographic Reports of Zionist Congresses, XIIth to XXIst.
 Official organs: *The New Judæa* (London) and *Haolam* (Jerusalem).

Other valuable sources of information are articles in the *Jewish Encyclopædia* ("Zionism" and "Palestine"), in *Juedisches Lexicon* ("Zionismus," "Palæstina," and biographies of leading Zionists), and in *Palestine*, the organ of the British Palestine Committee (published from January, 1917, to July, 1924, and from February, 1936, to May, 1940).

INDEX

- AARONSON, Aaron, 100**
 Sara, 104
Abdalla, 41
Abdul Hamid, Sultan, 76, 77, 79, 89
Abdul Medjid, Sultan, 41, 47
Abdullah, Emir, 138-9
 Absorptive capacity, economic, 143, 221
Abu Isa, 39
Abulafia, Abraham, 39
Abyssinia, 283
Achmed el-Djezzar, 41
Acre, 34, 41, 44, 109
 "Actions Committee," 73, 81, 124, 131
Adams, President John, 48
Adler, Chief Rabbi Hermann, 87, 269
 Chief Rabbi Nathan, 48
 Professor Saul, 248
Administration (of Palestine), 147, 153, 188-9
Administrative Committee (Jewish Agency), 179, 180, 276
Advisory Council, 136, 140, 147
Afforestation, 100, 162, 216, 235
Africa, 275
Afula, 99
Aga, Ibrahim, 38
 Othman, 38
Agnon, S. L., 252
Agricultural Bank, 242
Agricultural Experiment Station, 100, 160, 248
Agricultural schools, 152, 247
Agricultural settlements, 59-60, 65, 93-4, 99-100, 159; types of, 160; progress of, 235, 239; population of, 151, 233
Agudath Israel, 148, 167, 246, 258, 265
Ahad Ha-am, 63-4, 71, 76, 102, 110
Ahduth, 98
Ahduth Ha-Avodah, 158
 "Ahissaf," 64
Ahuzath Bayith, 96
Ahuzoth, 100, 103
Air Force, Jews in, 283-5
Akaba, 118, 212
Akiba, Rabbi, 39
Alexander II, 58
Alexandria, 275
Al-Harizi, 35
Alien Immigration Commission, 77
Aliyah (wave of immigration): First, 59; Second, 95; Third, 155; Fourth, 156; Fifth, 231
Aliyah, Youth, 232
Aliyah Hadashah, 158
Allenby, General, 105-6, 114, 117, 121
Alliance Israélite, 51, 87, 88, 101, 164, 245
Alroy, David, 39, 45
Alshech, R. Moses, 38
Altmeuland, 78
American Jewish Conference, 273, 327-8
American Jewry and Jewish Agency, 171-9
American Zionist Medical Unit, 116
Amsterdam, 237
Anatolia, 77
Anglo-Jewish Association, 88, 109, 110, 164, 170, 240
Anglo-Levantine Banking Company, 89
Angola, 84
Anglo-Palestine Bank, 95, 96, 100, 104, 129, 132, 164, 202, 241, 242, 244
Anti-Semitism, 61, 68, 72, 77, 267
Arab Agency, 147
Arab Congress, 130, 152
Arab Delegations, 139, 140, 141, 204, 220, 229
Arab Executive, 148, 180, 205
Arab Higher Committee, 207, 215
Arab National Committee, 120
Arab Parties, 207, 220, 222
Arab Press, 205
Arabs, invasion of Palestine, 30-32; attitude of, 24, 275; political demands of, 139-141, 146, 150, 152, 204, 209-10, 300-1; relations with Jews, 182 seq., 189, 279; "displaced," 195-6; "landless," 228; illegal immigration of, 232-3; benefits from Jewish progress, 244; federation of, 302; territories of, 324
Archaeological Society, 253
Argentina, 69, 155, 273-4, 296
Arlosoroff, Dr. Ch., 198, 199
Armenia, 115
Armouries, sealed, 186
Arms trials, 289-92
Art, 254, 276
Artisans' Bank, 164
Artuf, 65, 185
Ascalon, 34
Asch, Shalom, 178
Asefath Hanushirim, 118, 137, 168, 290
Ashkenazim, 37, 38, 42, 66, 71, 137, 168
Ashman, 254
Assimilation, 20, 54-5, 70
Assyrian Christians, 302
Athletes, 257
Athlit, 100, 104, 234, 239
Atlantic (ship), 280
Atlantic Charter, 300
Attacks, by Arabs, 121, 130, 138, 140, 185, 205, 207-8, 215-6, 252, 257, 279, 301
Attias, Moshe, 168
Auja, River, 149
Aurora, L., 89

- Australia, 74, 271
 Austria, 61, 86, 87, 267
Auto-Emancipation, 18, 55-6, 68
 Avigdor, Elim d', 62
 Avigdor-Goldsmid, Sir O. d', 178
 Avukah, 272
 Ayanoth, 247
 Ayubides, 35
 Azhar University, 138
- BABYLON**, 32
 Baden, Grand Duke of, 71, 76
 Baghdad, 32, 275, 284, 301
 Balfour, Lord, 108, 109, 111, 113, 120, 141, 148, 187, 304, 324
 Balfour Declaration, 24, 25, 47, 110-13, 120, 122, 127, 135, 139, 141-2, 144, 145-6, 182, 187, 193, 220, 224, 227, 229, 270, 271, 292, 297-8, 303
 Balfour Forest, 162
 Balfouria, 148
 Banks, 238, 242-3; bank deposits, 244
 Bar Kochba, 28, 39
 Barash, A., 252
 Barth, Lazarus, 178
 Basle, 71, 89, 91, 197
 Basic Programme, 73, 84, 90, 112
 Bayside Land Corporation, 243
 Bedouin, 37, 51, 59, 120
 Beersheba, 226, 227
 Beer Tuvia, 185, 212, 227
 Beisan, 150, 195, 212, 239, 286
 Belgium, 268
 Belkind, 104
 Ben-Gurion, D., 200, 203, 290
 Benjamin of Tudela, 34
 Ben-Shemen, 96, 100, 247
 Bentwich, Norman, 142, 187
 Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer, 55, 101, 246, 250
 Berab, R. Jacob, 37
 Berlin, 62, 105, 132, 156, 176, 177
 Berlin, Rabbi Meir, 178
 Berlin, Treaty of, 22, 61
 Bermuda Conference, 294
 Berne, 62
 Bernstein, Z. Hirsch, 62
 Bertie, Lord, 107
 Bessarabia, 122
 Beth Alfa, 29
 Bethlehem, 34
 Bettertom, Sir Henry, 187
 Beyrout, 34, 149, 216
 Bezalel, 96, 247
 Bezalel Museum, 250
 Bialik, H. N., 200, 251, 260
 Bialik Foundation, 250
 Bialik Museum, 251
 Bialystok, 58, 64
 Bibars, 33
 Bicheno, James, 45
 Biltmore Programme, 305
 "Bilu," 59, 62, 94
- Binational state, 214, 302
 Bir Jacob, 34
 Birnbaum, Nathan, 61-2
 Bistrizky, N., 254
 "Black Cabinet," 87
 Bluestone, Joseph, 62
 Blum, Leo, 254
 Blum, Leon, 178, 268
 "Bné Benjamin," 162
 "Bné Moshe," 64
 Board of Deputies, 47, 49, 109-10, 170, 177, 269
 Bodenheimer, Dr. Max, 86
 Bokhara, 37, 66
 Bols, General, 135
 Bombay, 275
 Borochow, Ber, 98
 Brandeis, Justice L. D., 109, 111, 124, 126-7, 272
 Brazil, 274
 Breaner, J. H., 252
 Brigade Group, Jewish, 292
 British Dominions, 122
 British Empire Marketing Board, 248
 Broadcasts, 247
 Brod, Max, 254
 Brodetsky, Professor S., 175, 178, 198, 200, 203, 269-70
 Brunton, C. D., 136
 Brussels Conference, 88
 Bucarest, 61, 156
 Buchanan, Sir George, 107
 Budgets (of Zionist Organisation and Jewish Agency), 129, 177, 200, 203, 214-5, 225, 241
 Buenos Aires, 273
 Building industry, 157, 162, 233-4, 280
 Bulgaria, Jews of, 65, 265, 266
 Bundist, 264, 265
 Burla, Yehuda, 252
 Butler, R. A., 220
 Byron, 45
 Byzantines, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31
- CABBALISTS**, 34, 36, 38, 39
 Casarea, 29, 31
 Cairo, 32 (Genizah), 35, 138, 139, 275, 301
 Calcutta, 275
 Campbell, Sir John, 174
 Canada, 153, 270, 271; Zionist Organisation of, 74, 271
 Cantons, 211, 218
 Cape Town, 270
 Capernaum, 29
 Capital, Jewish, 162, 249
 Capitulations, 42
 Carlsbad, 127
 Carmel Wine Company, 65
 Carpatho-Ruthenia, 265
 Caucasus, 66
 Cazalet, Sir Edward, 49, 59
 Cecil, Viscount (Robert), 115

- Central Bank of Co-operative Institutions, 164, 243
- Central Bureau for German Jews, 199, 225, 241
- Central Council, 131
- Central Office of Zionist Organisation, 74, 85, 91, 92, 105, 123, 125, 127, 132
- Chamberlain, Joseph, 78-9
- Chamberlain, Neville, 222, 278-9
- Chancellor, Sir John, 183, 205
- Chasanowitch, Joseph, 166
- Charter (for Palestine), 76, 77, 84, 90
- Chazars, 33
- Chekri Ganem, 119
- Chemical deposits, 237, 287
- Chicago, 62
- Child welfare, 242
- Chile, 274
- China, 274
- Chmicinski, 39
- Chosroes II, 30
- Churchill, Colonel Charles, 47
- Churchill, Winston, 25, 115, 139, 141, 222, 284, 292, 297, 299, 303, 327
- Citizenship Order-in-Council, 151
- Citrus fruit, 236; citrus industry, 280
- Civil Service, 201
- Clayton, Sir Gilbert, 135
- Clerk, Sir George, 127
- Cleveland Convention, 127
- Close settlement, 195, 210, 229
- Cohen, Jacob, 252
- Cohen, Sir Leonard L., 110
- Coinage, 152
- Collecting-boxes, 38
- Collective settlements, 160-1
- Cologne, 85, 92, 132
- Colombia, 274
- Colonial Office, 138, 141, 143, 173, 180, 186
- Colonial Secretary, 207, 208, 215, 222, 228, 270, 290, 293, 298
- Commerce, 238
- Commissions of Inquiry: Haycraft, 140; Shaw, 186-190; Dowbiggin, Strickland, O'Donnell, 156; Western Wall, 197; Royal Commission, 208-19
- Committee of Jewish Delegations, 124
- Commonwealth, Jewish, 115, 119, 146, 305, 327-8
- Community organisation, 167
- Compensation, workmen's, 152, 158
- Concessions, 149
- Conder, Colonel C. R., 49
- Conferences, Zionist, in 1919, 123-4; in 1920, 124-7, 169; at St. James's Palace, 220
- Congress, Zionist:
 - First (1897), 19, 71-4
 - Second (1898), 75-6
 - Third (1899), 76
 - Fourth (1900), 76
 - Fifth (1901), 76-7
 - Sixth (1903), 80-81
 - Seventh (1905), 85-5
 - Eighth (1907), 90-91
 - Ninth (1909), 90-91
 - Tenth (1911), 91-2
 - Eleventh (1913), 92, 103
 - Twelfth (1921), 127-31
 - Thirteenth (1923), 171
 - Fourteenth (1925), 172-3
 - Fifteenth (1927), 174-5
 - Sixteenth (1929), 177-8
 - Seventeenth (1931), 197-8
 - Eighteenth (1933), 199-200
 - Nineteenth (1935), 201-3
 - Twentieth (1937), 213-4
 - Twenty-First (1939), 223, 6
- Congress Attorney, 131; Court, 131; elections, 263; machinery and procedure, 275-6; party representation, 325; Presidency, 91, 201, 225
- Constantinople, 59, 60, 71, 76, 78, 80, 83, 90
- Constanza, 156
- Constitution of Zionist Organisation, 73-4, 77, 131
- Constitutional reforms. See Legislative Council.
- Consulates, 42
- Co-operative farms, 99; settlements, 158, 160-1; societies, 158, 239
- Copenhagen Bureau, 105
- Coupland, Professor R., 21
- Court of Honour, 131
- Covenant of League of Nations, 141, 144
- Cowen, Joseph, 78, 127, 171
- Cracow, 156
- Crafts, 247
- Crinea, 173
- Cromer, Lord, 79
- Cromwell, 43
- Crusaders, 27, 32, 33, 35, 39
- Cultural questions, 76
- Cultural Zionism, 64
- Curzon, Lord, 121
- Cyprus, 78
- Cyrenaica, 84
- Czechoslovakia, 124, 265, 268
- Czernin, Count, 114
- Czernowitz, 70, 87, 88, 156
- DAIRY-FARMING, 236, 286
- Damascus, 32, 35, 41, 52 (blood accusation), 104, 120, 121, 138, 149, 284, 301
- Dancing (*Hora*), 255
- Davar*, 252
- Dead Sea, 29, 162; mineral salts of, 183, 237, 287
- Deedes, Sir Wyndham, 135
- Defence, cost of (in Palestine), 151
- Degania, 97-99
- Delegates to Congress, 326
- "Democratic Zionist Fraction," 76
- Deportations, 215, 220

- Diamond polishing, 237
 Diaspora, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 43, 64, 72, 128
 Diseases, 167
 Disorders, disturbances. See Attacks.
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 30, 45
 Diving, 239
 Djernal Pasha, 103
 Djezzar, 41
 "Doles," 157
 Dome of the Rock, 182
 Dominion, Jewish State as British, 306
 Dowbiggin, Inspector-General, 196
 Drainage, 152, 157, 159, 162, 286
 Drama, 254
 Dreyfus Affair, 22, 67
Drishath Zion, 51, 53
 Drugs, synthetic, 287
 Druses, 41
 Druskenik, 61
 "Dual nationality," 21, 122
 Dühring, Eugen, 67
 Duma, 87
 Dunant, Jean H., 50
- EARTHQUAKES, 41, 152
 East Africa project, 79-82, 83-4, 108
 Economic Board for Palestine, 164, 174 (footnote), 243
 Ecuador, 274
 Eddington, Professor, 250
 Eden, Anthony, 215, 217
 Eder, M. D., 84, 175, 270
Edinburgh Review, 136
 Education, 243-4, 246
 Eger, R. Akiba, 51
 Egypt, 35, 37, 104, 105, 185, 207, 220, 252, 275, 283
 Egyptian Government, 79
 Ein Ganim, 94
 Ein-Zethim, 65
 Einstein, Professor Albert, 178, 249
 Ekron, 60
 El Alamein, 290
 El Arish, 79
 Elected Assembly, 168
 Electric power-stations, 149, 237
 Elegies, 33
 Elijah, 255
 Elijah, Gaon Rabbi, 41
 Eliot, George, 46
 Emeq, 256, 260. See also Valley of Jezreel.
 Emigration, 58, 84, 88
 Enclaves, 211-2, 219
 Engels, Friedrich, 51
 England, Hovevê Zion societies, 62; Zionist Federation, 74, 75; Zionist activities, 269
 "Enlightenment" (*Haskalah*), 17, 53
 "Eretz Israel," 137
 Eritrea, 283, 284
 Esdracjon, Valley of, 148
 Estonia, 122, 124
 Estori Farhi, 95
 Evelina de Rothschild School, 101
 Evian Conference, 223, 295
 Eviction of tenants, 151
 Executive (Zionist, Jewish Agency), in London: 131, 171, 175, 178, 198, 200; in Jerusalem, 132, 149, 153, 167, 171, 175, 178, 198, 200, 203
 Exhibitions, 164, 238
 Exploration Society, Jewish Palestine, 250
 "Ezra" Society, 62, 94, 97
- FACTORIES, 162-3, 237, 286
 Farbstein, H., 198
 Farhi, Haim, 41
 Farmers' Association, 247, 258
 Farming, 93, 99; kinds of, 139; farm products, 286
 Federations, Zionist, 262
 Federation of Jewish Labour, General. See *Histadruth*.
 Feinberg, Joseph, 59, 60
 Feisal, Emir, 109, 118, 120, 121, 138
 Feiwel, Berthold, 76, 86
 Fellaheen, 196, 234, 236
 Fichman, Jacob, 252
 Fighting Force, Jewish, 282
 Financial and Economic Committee, 132
 Financial institutions, 241
 Finch, Sir Henry, 43
 Finin, Joseph, 58
 Fisher, H. A. L., 250
 Fishing trade, 238-9
 Fishman, Rabbi J. L., 203
 Flag, Zionist, 184, 274, 282, 292
 Flexner, Bernard, 172
 "Folkists," 264, 265
 Foreign Office, 138
 Foreign Trade Institute, 238
 France, 22, 33, 35, 36, 50, 62, 268
 Francis I, 40
 Frankel, Lee K., 174, 180
 Frankfort, 40
 Frankfurter, Justice Felix, 120
 Frankl, Ludwig A., 66
 Freiburg, 83
 French, Lewis, 195-6; reports of, 199
 French Government, 119, 138; French Mandate, 144
 French Revolution, 67
 Friedemann, Adolf, 80
- GABRIEL, COLONEL VIRVIAN, 136
 Gabrilowitsch, 255
 Galatz, 156
 Galicia, 22, 87, 88
 Galilee, 28, 30, 33, 35, 59, 65, 93, 159, 218
 Sea of, 150

- Gallipoli, 105
 Galveston, 84
 Garstang, Professor J., 136
 Gaster, Dr. M., 61, 108
 Gawler, Colonel George, 47-8
 Gaza, 100, 226
 Gederah, 60
 Geiger, Abraham, 17
 Ludwig, 86
 Gendarmerie, 140, 151
 General Council, 131, 276
 General Federation of Jewish Labour. See *Histadruth*.
 General Mortgage Bank, 242
 General Zionists, 128, 198, 200, 203, 213, 261
 Geneva, 62, 147, 184
 Geneva Bureau, 132, 200, 203
 Georgians, 66
 German Government, 114; implicated in Arab revolt, 208, 222, 297
 Germany, 33, 35, 122; persecution of Jews, 199, 201, 231; immigrants from, 231-2; growth of Zionism, 267
 "Geulah," 96
 Ginsberg, Asher. See *Ahad Ha-am*.
 Ginsberg, Mondecai A., 54
 Girl Guides, 257
 Godard, Justin, 268
 Golden Book, 190
 Goldmann, Dr. Nahum, 132, 203
 Goldsmid, Colonel Albert, 62
 Goodman, Paul, 43
 Gordon, Aaron David, 98
 Gordon, David, 54
 Gordon, Mrs. F. A., 81
 Gordon, Jehuda L., 54
 Gottheil, Rabbi Gustav, 62
 Professor Richard, 62
 Gralski, Minister, 156
 Graetz, Heinrich, 53
 Graz, 70
 Greece, 269, 284
 Greenberg, L. J., 78, 79, 85
 Grey, Sir Edward, 107
 Grossmann, Meir, 200, 326
 Gruenbaum, Isaac, 170, 171, 200, 203
 Gruenberg, Abraham, 61
 Gruenhut, Dr. L., 37
 Gutmacher, Rabbi Elijah, 51

Haaretz, 252
Haavarah, 202
Habimah, 254
Haboker, 253
Habonim, 270
Hadaad Pasha, 109
 Hadassah, 134
 Hadassah Medical Organisation, 166-7, 241, 247, 256
Hadoar, 272
 Haganah, 290-1
 Hague, The, 90
 Haham Bashi, 49, 137
 Haifa, 102, 109, 140, 158, 163, 185, 205, 207, 227, 233 (Jewish population), 237
 Haifa harbour, 183, 238
 Hailsham, Lord, 194
 Hazaz, H., 252
 "Hakoah," 267
 Halifax, Viscount, 220
Halkah, 38, 42, 63, 96
Halutzim, 126, 128, 155, 159
Halutzit, 133
Hammegid, 54
Hamashtif, 253
 "Hamashtir," 158, 239
 Hamburg, 90
Hamelitz, 55, 63
 "Hano'eah," 161
 Hantke, Dr. A., 91, 114
Hanukah, 260
 "Ha-Olel," 158
Hansau, 132, 253
Ha-Peles, 87
Ha-Poel, 158
 "Hapoel Hamizrachi," 150
 "Hapoel Hatzair," 97, 8, 133, 158
 Haram al-Sherif, 182-3
 Harbours, 238
 Harding, President, 119
Hastahar, 55
Hashiloah, 64
 "Hashomer," 99, 104
 Hashomer Hatzair, 133, 213, 258, 262, 302, 305
 Hasklism, 40, 41, 42
Haskalah, 53-5
 Hassid, Jchudah, 40
Hatikvah, 49, 74, 226, 250, 274
Hatzefrah, 86
Hatzefeh, 253
 Hauran, 232; Hauranis, 233
 Haycraft, Sir Thomas, 140, 187
Huzman, 253
 Health organisations, 166; resorts, 238; services, 244, 256
 Hebrew Authors' Association, 250
 Hebrew language, 54, 55, 75, 91, 92, 101-2, 129, 136, 143, 176, 202, 245, 270, 276
 Hebrew literature, 245
 Hebrew University, 117, 148, 247-8. See also University of Jerusalem.
 Hebron, 40, 41, 42, 185
 Hechler, Rev. W., 71, 78
 Hederah, 65
 Hedjaz, 198
 Hedjaz Delegation, 118
 "Hehalutz," 134, 156, 263, 266
 Heifetz, J., 255
 Helsingfors Conference, 87
 Henderson, Arthur, 186
 Hertz, J. H., Chief Rabbi, 110, 269

- Herzl, Theodor, early years, 67; *The Jewish State*, 68-70; convenes First Congress, 71-3; political negotiations, 76-80; memorial gatherings, 262
- Herzl Forest, 100, 162
- Herzl "Gymnasium," 95, 101
- Hess, Moses, 18, 52-3, 68
- Hexter, M. B., 179
- Hibbath Zion*, 50, 54, 58-66, 70, 74
- High Commissioners, 121, 150
- Hildeheimer, Rabbi Israel, 51
- "Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden," 88, 101-2
- Hillel, 256
- Hinden, Rita, 233
- Hirsch, Baron M. de, 69, 274, 296
- "Histadruth," 157-8, 198, 239, 242, 258, 290
- "Hitahduth," 133
- "Hitahduth Olim," 258
- Hitler, 25, 199, 201, 222, 247, 269, 278, 294, 295
- Hodgkin, Thomas, 136
- Holdheim, R. Samuel, 17
- Holiday camps, 247
- Holland, 268
- Hollingsworth, Arthur, 48
- Holy Cities, 42
- Holy Places, 144, 189, 180, 298, 328
- Hora*, 255
- Horowitz, David, 233
- Horowitz, R. Isaiah ha-Levi, 39
- Hospitals, 166, 256
- Hotels, 238
- House of Commons, of Lords. See Parliament.
- "Hovevé Zion," 58-66, 93-4
- Hubermann, B., 255
- Hulda, 100, 186, 291
- Hulch, 195, 234, 299, 270, 286
- Hungary, 38 (medieval); Zionist activity, 268
- Hurva Synagogue, 150
- Hussein, King, 109, 138
- Hussein, Haj Amin el, 137-8. See also Mufti of Jerusalem.
- Hussein, Kemal Effendi, 197
- Hydro-electric power stations, 149
- "I.C.A." See Jewish Colonisation Association.
- Imber, Naphtali H., 49, 74, 250
- Immigration (into Palestine), organisation of, 125, 128, 156; suspension of, 140, 191, 225, 226; official regulation of, 143, 153-7, 230-2; Royal Commission's proposals, 211; 1939 White Paper proposals, 221, 223, 293; "illegal," 226, 291-3; categories of immigrants, 232; in war-time, 288; statistics of, 320-1
- Immigration Ordinances, 154-5
- Incunabula, 249
- India, 275
- Industrial exhibitions, 238
- Industries, 162-3; census of, 163; kinds of, 237, 240; in war, 286-7
- Information Office, 289
- Institute of Jewish Studies, 165, 249
- Iraq, 121, 123, 207, 208, 209, 220, 238, 262, 275, 284, 301, 302, 304
- Irish Constabulary, Royal, 140
- Israel's Messenger*, 271
- Italian Government, 113; implicated in Arab revolt, 208, 222, 297
- Italy, 37, 144, 268, 281
- "I.T.O." See Jewish Territorial Organisation.
- JABNEH, 28, 32
- Jabatinsky, V., 105, 127, 172, 198, 200, 201
- Jacobson, Victor, 62, 76, 89, 91, 104, 105, 132, 200
- Jaffa, 34, 59, 101, 121, 140
- Jaffa Plantations, 162
- Jannai, 33
- Jassy, 61
- Jastrow, R. Marcus, 62
- Jerusalem, Roman conquest of, 28; 29, 34 (12th cent.), 35 (13th cent.), 36 (15th-16th cents.), 38 (16th cent.), 40 (18th cent.), 42 (19th cent.); Mayor of, 137; disorders, 205; Jewish population, 233
- Jews True*, Ls. 89
- Jewish Agency, extension of, 168-181, 272; Council of, 214, 276; Executive of, 253, 285-6; Administrative Committee, 276
- Jewish Brigade Group, 292
- Jewish Colonial Trust, 75, 77, 81, 82, 89, 92, 93, 131, 132, 242
- Jewish Colonisation Association, 69, 79, 88, 93
- Jewish Commonwealth, 115, 146, 273, 305
- Jewish National Fund, 73; establishment of, 77, 82; in Cologne, 86; capital in 1914, 91; activities of, 95-7; Head Office, 105; objects of, 125; relations with Keren Hayesod, 126, 130; transfer to Jerusalem, 128; area owned in 1929, 159; principles of, 160; relation to Jewish Agency, 176, 179; area owned in 1944, 234; afforestation, 235; total income, 241; land acquisitions during Second World War, 286
- Jewish Regiment, 105, 150
- Jewish State, The* (book), 68-70
- Jewish State, implied in Balfour Declaration, 114-5, 228; Royal Commission's proposals, 211-5; arguments in favour of, 302-6
- Jewish State Party, 200-1, 203, 213, 262

- Jewish Territorial Organisation, 84, 88, 296
 Jezreel, Valley of, 99, 103, 128, 159, 226, 234
 Johannesburg, 115, 132
 Joint Distribution Committee, 174
 Joint Palestine Survey Commission, 174-6
 Jonathan ha-Kohen, 35
 Jordan, 149
 Jordan Valley scheme, 305-6
 José ben José, 33
 Journalism, 252-3
 "Judicans," 105
 Judah ha-Levi, 33, 34
Jüdische Rundschau, 267
Jüdischer Verlag, 86, 92
 Julian the Apostate, 29
 Juster, Jean, 305
- KABBARA MARSHES, 234
 "Kadimah," 55, 61, 70
 Kadoorie, Sir Ellis, 152, 247
 Kadoorie Agricultural School, 247
 Kahn, Dr. Bernhard, 179
 Kahn, Grand Rabbin Zadok, 62
 Kaiser, Alfred, 83
 Kalischer, Hirsch, 18, 50-1, 53
 Kann, Jacobus, 75, 85, 91, 105
 Kaplan, Eliezer, 200, 203
 Kaplansky, S., 178
 Karaites, 32
 Karni, Judah, 252
 Karo, R. Joseph, 38
 Katra, 69
 Kattowitz Conference, 60, 166 (footnote)
 "Keren Geulah," 126
 Keren Hayesod, 126-7, 129, 160, 162, 165, 179, 234, 235, 241, 243, 286
 Keren Kayemeth. See Jewish National Fund.
 Kfar Saba, 94
 Kharkov, 59, 81
Kibbush Avodah, 95
 Kibbutzim, 161
 Kindergarten schools, 101
 Kinnereth, 97, 100
 Kisch, Fredk. H., 171, 175, 178, 197, 284
 Kishinev, 79, 251
 Kishon Marshes, 152
 Klausner, Professor J., 249
 Kligler, Dr. J. J., 167 (footnote)
 "Kneseth Israel," 167-8, 199
 Kobler, Dr. F., 43, 44
 Kohan-Bernstein, Dr. J., 85
Kolelim, 42
 Kook, Chief Rabbi, 259
 Kook Institute, 250
 Koran, 249
 Kocasmians, 35
- Kremenetzky, J., 86
Kupath Holm, 158, 166-7, 256-7
Krutzah, Kautzoth, 99, 160-1, 176
- LABORATORIES, 287
 Labour depression, 157
 Labour exchanges, 158
 Labour parties, 128, 198, 213, 258-9
 Lachish, Letters of, 249
 Laharanne, Ernest, 50, 53
 Lamdan, Isaac, 252
 Lancel Teachers' Seminary, 101
 Land, in Jewish possession, 159, 227, 234; cultivable, 193, 234; size of Jewish holding, 236
 Land policy, 125, 160
 Land Transfers Regulations, 226-9, 293
 Lands, State, 150, 153-4, 175, 195
 Langallerie, Marquis de, 43
 Language Board, 246, 250
 Language Conflict, 101-2
 Languages (in Palestine), 101
 Lansdowne, Lord, 76, 79
 Latvia, 122, 265
 Lawrence, T. E., 118, 139
 Lazarus, Emma, 63
 League of Nations, 124, 130, 141, 144, 145, 147, 167, 173, 186, 192, 200, 212, 213, 215, 221, 226
 Lebanon, 38
 Lebensohn, Abraham, 54
 Legislative Council, 140, 147, 204-7
 Lehman, Herbert H., 172
 Lemmlein, Asher, 39
 Leszansky, 104
 Levanda, Judah L., 58
 Levant, 37
 Levin, Shmarya, 62, 87, 91, 102, 104, 200
 Levinsohn, Isaac Beer, 54
 Levontin, David, 59
 Library, Jewish National and University, 166, 182, 249
 Lichtheim, Richard, 127
 Lieme, Nehemiah de, 125, 127
 Ligne, Prince de, 43
 Lilienblum, M. L., 55, 61
 "Lilith," 254
 Lipman, Professor J. G., 174
 Lippe, N. K., 61
 Lipsky, Louis, 171, 175, 178, 200, 203
 Lisbon, 269
 Literature, 250-2
 Lithuania, 122, 245
 Liturgy, 15-6
 Lloyd George, David, 106-8, 111-2, 119, 121, 187, 194
 Lloyds Bank, 241
 Loans (for Palestine), 152, 196
 Locker, Berl, 198, 200
 Loewe, Heinrich, 62
 Löfgren, Senator, 197
 London, Congress in, 76

- Lot usable*, 193
 Louis XIV, 43
 Lourie, Dr. Hayim, 51
 "Lovers of Zion," 18, 19
 Lowdermilk, W. C., 305-6
 Ludd, 29
 Lueger, Karl, 67
 Luria, R. Isaac, 38, 39
 Lurie, Joseph, 62
 Luxembourg, 269
- Maaser*, 129
 Maccabeans, 69
 "Maccabiad," 257
 MacDonald, Malcolm, 220; White Paper, 221-9
 MacDonald, Ramsay (Prime Minister), 187, 190
 MacMichael, Sir Harold, 218
 "Maghrebiim," 37
 Magnus, Dr. J. L., 214, 248
 Magnus, Laurie, 269
 Magnus, Sir Philip, 110
 Maimonides, 35
 Main, Ernest, 118
 Malaria, 256
 Malcolm, James A., 108-9
 Malta, 185, 207
 Mamelukes, 35
 Manchester, 62, 106, 108
Manchester Guardian, 106, 108, 109, 116
 Mandate (Palestine), 121, 144-8, 206, 215, 224, 310-9; its primary purpose, 298; modification of, 299
 Mandates Commission, 24, 132, 147-8, 184, 191-3, 201, 204, 215, 218, 222-3, 226, 290, 293, 298
 Mandatory, obligations of, 298
 Mandelstam, Max, 58, 78, 84
 Manufacturers' Association, 238
 "Mapai," 258
 Mapu, A., 54
 Marine affairs, 238
 Marmorek, Dr. A., 78, 85, 90, 268
 Marranos, 37
 Marshall, Louis, 171, 172, 174, 176, 178, 179, 180
 Marx, Karl, 52
Maskilim, 54
 Massorettes, 32
 "Matateh," 254
 Mauritius Island, 280
 Mayer, L., 45
 Mayerowitch, Rev. H., 74
 Mayors, Arab, 205
 McMahon, Sir Henry, 118
 McMahon pledges, 139, 141
 Mead, Professor Elwood, 174
 Mecca, 137, 301
 Medical Association, 253, 257
 Medical Centre, 248, 256, 287
 Medical services, 166, 247
 Medical Unit, American Zionist, 116
 Medina, 301
 Mehemet Ali, 41, 46, 47
 Meir, R. Jacob, 90
 Melchett, Lord (the first), 164, 174, 178, 179, 194
 Mendel, Rabbi (of Vitebsk), 41
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 54
 Mendes, Rabbi Pereira, 62
 Meshavia, 99
 Merriman, Lord (Boyd), 187
 Mesopotamia, 77
 "Messengers of Zion," 36, 40
 Messiah, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 33, 38, 39, 40, 43, 51, 70, 255
 Metullah, 65, 121
 Mexico, 273
 Midrash, 29
 Mikveh Israel, 51-2, 247
 Military Administration, 117-8, 135, 137
 Military courts, 216; trials, 289-90, 291
 Military services (of Jews), 282-5
 Millenarrians, 43
 Miller, David Hunter, 119
 Milner, Lord, 110, 120
 Mills, 162-3
 Ministry of Information, 112
 Minorities, protection of, 212
 Minority rights, 124; Treaties, 124, 295, 301
Mishmar, 253
 Mishnah, 29
 "Mission of Israel," 17, 64, 70
 Mitford, E. L., 48
Mithnagginim, 41, 42
 Mizrahi, 86, 128, 133, 165, 167, 213, 253, 259, 260, 272
 Mohammed ibn Faruch, 38
 Mohilever, R. Samuel, 58, 60, 64
 Molcho, Solomon, 39
 Monash, Sir John, 271
 Mongols, 27, 35
 Montagu, Edwin S., 111
 Montefiore, Claude, 87, 110
 Montefiore, Sir Moses, 46-9, 51, 60, 248
 Montgomery, Field Marshal, 284
 "Moriscos," 37
 Moroccans, 66, 155
 Morocco, 274
 Morris, Hopkin, 187
 Morrison, Herbert, 297
 Mortality rate, 167
 Mortgage and Credit Bank, 243
 Moscow, 254
 Moser, Jacob, 95
 Moses of Crete, 39
Moshav Ovdim, 160-1, 176
 Moslem Council, Supreme, 198, 143, 184, 210, 215
 Moslem courts, 138, 143
 Moslems, 137
 Mosque of El Aksa, 182
 Mosque of Omar, 31, 184, 301
 Motor transport, 240

- Motza, 65, 185
 Motzkin, Leo, 62, 76, 88, 90, 105, 124, 200
 Mount Scopus, 117, 248, 256
 Mount Tabor, 247
 Mufti of Jerusalem, 137-8, 183, 184, 185, 188, 205, 207, 210, 215, 220, 222, 284, 300
 Munich, 71, 231; Agreement, 222, 297
 Municipal Corporations Ordinance, 206
 Municipal elections, 151
 Musa Kazim, 188
 Museum of Archaeology, 249
 Music, Musical Conservatoire, 254
 Mussolini, 268, 275
- NABLUS**, 135, 205
 "Nachshon," 240
 Nahalal, 161, 247, 271
 Nahmanides, 35
 Nairobi, 75, 270
 Napoleon, 18, 44
 Nashashibi, 137-8
Nasi, 28, 39
 Nation, Jews as, 20-22
 National Councils, Jewish, 124
 Nationality, meanings of, 21; Jewish, 143; Palestinian, 151
 Natural increase, 233, 323
 Naturalisation, 151
 Nautical school, 239, 247
 Navy, Jews in, 283, 285
 Naxos, Joseph, Duke of, 38
 Nazi terror, 231, 248, 257, 261, 268, 270, 280, 289, 293-6
 Nebi Musa, 121
 Negev, 227, 305
 Neshar Cement Works, 163
 Nethaniah, 237
 Netter, Charles, 51
Neue Freie Presse, 69, 71
 Neumann, Emanuel, 198
New Judea, The, 132
 New York, 62, 104, 273
 New Zealand, 74, 271
 "New Zionist Organisation," 201, 258
 Newspapers, 252-3
Nineteenth Century, 136
 "Nir," 158, 239
 Noah, Mordecai M., 18, 48
Noar Haoved, 257
 Nordau, Max, 69, 72, 80, 83, 90, 92, 125, 268
 Novelists, 250
 Novomcysky, M., 237
 Nuri Pasha, 209
 Nurses, School for, 248
- OBADIAH OF BERTINORO**, 36
Observer, 116, 136
 Occupations, census of, 240
- Occupied Enemy Territory Administration, 117-8
 Odessa, 55, 58, 59, 61, 63
 Odessa Committee, 62, 63, 64, 66, 93, 94
 O'Donnell, Sir Samuel, 195
 Officials (in Palestine), 136, 201, 210
 "Ohel" theatre, 254
 Oil pipe-line, 207, 238
 Oliphant, Laurence, 49, 55, 59, 60
 Olympic Games, 257
 Omar, Caliph, 30, 31
 Omar ed-Dahr, 40
 Omar, Mosque of, 184
Omer Shabbat, 260, 262
 Opera, operettas, 255
 Oppenheimer, Franz, 85, 91, 99
 Orange cultivation, 236
 Order of Ancient Maccabees, 262
 Order-in-Council, Palestine, 146
 Organisation, Zionist, 73, 5, 82, 131
 Orient, 274
 Ormsby-Gore, W. (Lord Harlech), 116, 117, 118, 215, 290, 298
 Ottoman Debt, 149, 152
 Ottoman Government, 23, 72, 77, 90, 137
 Outrages, Arab. See Attacks.
 Oxford, Lord, 107
- PAINTERS**, 254
 "Palcor," 253, 272
 Palestine Corporation, 164
 Palestine Economic Corporation, 172, 242-3
 Palestine Electric Corporation, 163, 164, 237, 243
 Palestine Foundation Fund. See Keren Hayesod.
 Palestine Jewish Colonisation Association (P.J.C.A.), 159, 161, 234, 242
 Palestine Land Development Co., 91, 96, 234
Palestine and Near East Magazine, 253
 Palestine Office (Jaffa), 91, 96, 103, 104, 117
Palestine Post, 253
 Palestine Potash, Ltd., 237
Palestine Review, 253
 Palestine Royal Commission, 111, 114, 208-15
 Palestine Water Company, 243
 Palmerston, Lord, 46-7, 108
 Pann, Abel, 253
 Pardes Hannah, 247
 Paris, 62, 68, 77, 109, 126, 268
 Parliament, debates in, (1922), 141, 144; (1930), 299; (1936), 207; (1937), 213; (1939), 222; (1940), 228
 Parliamentary Palestine Committee, 270
 Parliaments, Zionists in, 87-8, 265-6, 267, 268
 Parties, in *Asefath Hamiharim*, 168, 258
 Partition Commission, 218-9

- Partition schemes, 211, 217-9
 Passfield, Lord, 187, 193-4
Patria, 280
 Patterson, Colonel J. H., 105
 Paulli, Oligier, 43
 Peace Conference, 115, 118-21, 124, 126, 142
 Pearlman, Maurice, 161
 Peel, Earl, 208
 Pekiin, 28, 41
 Periodicals, 253
 Perlman. See Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer.
Permanent Ausschuss, 276
 Persia, 37, 275; Jews of, 66, 155
 Persians, 27, 30, 32
 Peru, 274
Pershim, 41
 Petah Tikvah, 59
 Petahya of Ratisbon, 34
 Petlura, General, 172
 Petrie, Sir Flinders, 31
 Pharmaceutical products, 287
 Philadelphia, 62
 Philby, H. St. J., 136
 P.I.C.A. See Palestine Jewish Colonisation Association.
 Pichon, M., 113
 Pilgrimages, 16, 29 (footnote).
 Pineles, Samuel, 61
 Pinsker, Leon, 18, 55, 58, 60, 61, 68
 Simha, 55
 Plehve, Von, 79, 80, 81, 89
 Plumer, Lord, 150-2, 182
 Poale Zion, 86, 97-8, 133, 258, 261-2, 269, 272, 305
 Poets, 251-2
 Pogroms, 50, 58, 63, 79, 80, 88, 95, 122, 172, 301
 Poland, 37, 38 (medieval); 122, 155, 156, 157, 225-6, 231, 265
 Police forces, 151, 186, 196, 283
 Political "high level," 211-2, 214
 Political parties, 258
 "Political" Zionists, 85, 90-92
 Pope Benedict XIV, 109
 Pope Pius X, 81
 Population, Jewish, of Palestine, 66, 100, 117, 149, 162, 233, 305, 322-3
 "Porinah," 100
 Ports, 238, 240
 Potash Company, 227, 237, 243
 "Practical" Zionists, 85, 90-92
 Praguc, 199
 Preedy, Kenelm, 187
 Preparation Fund, 126
 Press, Zionist, 132, 274; in Palestine, 252-3
 Prime Minister's (Ramsay MacDonald's) Letter, 194-5, 199, 297
 Printing-press, 38
 Procope, M., 192
 Propaganda, 74, 78, 92
 Proselytisation, 17
Protest-Rabbins, 70
 Provence, 37
 Psalmists, 16
 Pseudo-Messiah, 39-40, 43
 Public services, 243
 Purim, 260

Quarterly Review, 46
 "Quest of Zion," 51

 RABBINICAL ACADEMIES, 30
 Rabbinical Council, 137, 143, 168
 Rabbis, attitude to Zionism, 19-20, 51, 70, 71, 75, 231; pilgrims to Palestine, 35
 Rabbis, Chief, of Palestine, 137, 168
 Rabinowitz, Saul P., 58, 60
 Rachel, 252
 Radicals, 128, 171, 172, 177, 178, 200
 Railway (Jaffa-Jerusalem), 149
 Ramath Hakovsh, 291
 Rameh, 227
 Rashid Ali el-Khilani, 284, 301
 Rates, municipal, 244
 Reading, Lord (first), 107; Marquess of, 187
 Reclamation of land, 286
 Recruiting, 281
 Red Shield of David, 256
 Reform Jews, 71, 87; Reform Judaism, 17
 Refugees, 223, 237, 274, 280, 286, 287, 288, 294-6; refugee ships, 280-1
 Rehovoth, 248, 287
 Reines, R. Isaac, 86
 Relativity, Treatise on, 249
 Relief work, 174
 Religion, as basic element in Zionism, 15-17; observance of, 129, 259-60
 Reorganisation Commission, 127
 Rescue of Jews, 288-9
 Research Institute, Daniel Sieff, 248, 287
 Restoration Fund, 126, 241
 Reubeni, David, 39, 43
 Revenue, of Palestine Government, 244
 Revisionists, 128, 172, 177, 184, 198, 199-201, 226
 Richmond, E. T., 136
 Riots. See Attacks.
 Rishon le-Zion, 59, 60, 65, 163
 Romans, 27, 28
 Rome, 81, 109
Rome and Jerusalem, 52, 68
 Roosevelt, President, 223, 273, 274, 294, 295
 Rosenau, Professor Milton, 174
 Rosenblueth, Felix, 175, 179
 Rosh Pinah, 59
 Rosovsky, 255
 Rothschild, Baron Amschel M., 51
 Rothschild, Baron Edmond de, 19, 60, 65-6, 71, 93, 103, 107, 159, 160, 162, 163, 268
 Rothschild, James de, 116, 159

- Rothschild, Lord (first), 77
 Rothschild, Lord (Walter), 111
 Rottenstreich, F., 203
 Round Table Conference, 204, 220
 Royal Commission, 208-13, 290, 298
 Royal Society of England, 248
 Rubinstein, 235
 Rueli, R. Isaac, 31
 Ruhama, 100
 Rumania, persecution in, 22, 70; Jews of, 59; *Hibbath Zion* movement, 61; Zionist activity, 265; refugees from, 280-1
 Ruppin, Arthur, 66, 91, 92, 94, 96, 104, 178, 200, 203, 234
 Russia, Tsarist: persecution in, 18, 22, 58, 70; prohibition of Zionism, 79, 88-9, 264; Zionists of, 80-1, 87, 122
 Russia, Soviet: 122, 264; *Habuzim* of, 136; banning of Zionism, 262, 266
 Rutenberg, P., 149, 162, 163, 237

 SABBATAI ZEVI, 39, 40
 Sabbath observance, 260
 Sacharoff, E., 291
 Sacher, Harry, 175, 178
 Sacrifices, revival of, 51
 Safed, 37 (16th cent.), 39, 40, 41, 42, 185
 Sailors, 239, 240
 Saladin, Sultan, 35
 Salonika, 90, 239, 269
 Salvador, Joseph, 18, 30
 Samaria, 59, 65
 Samarin, 59, 60
 Samucl, Viscount (Herbert), 106-7, 115, 121; as High Commissioner, 135-150
 Samuel, Sir Stuart, 110
 Sanhedrin, 28, 32, 36
 San Remo, 121
 Saudi-Arabia, 220
 Sazonoff, M., 107
 Schapira, Professor H., 73
 Scholem, Gerhard, 249
 Schools, Arab, 149
 Schools, Hebrew, 64, 95, 101, 164; Government grant to, 165, 244; types of, 165, 246
 Schulman, Calman, 54
 Scott, C. P., 106
 Scouts, 257
 Sea Scouts, 239
 Security measures, 290
 Sedjera, 93-99
 Self-defence organisation, 290
 Self-government, 143, 146, 191, 204-5, 210, 211, 298
 "Self-labour," 98, 160, 161
 Selim I, 37
 Selim II, 38
 Senator, Werner, 179
 Separate Unions, 131, 261-2, 263
 Sephardim, 37, 38, 42, 66, 71, 137, 168
 Serenus of Syria, 39
 Seychelles Islands, 215, 220
 Seyin, 265
 Shaftesbury, Lord, 18, 46, 108
 Shakespeare, 254
 Shalom, Abraham, 40
 Shanghai, 193, 271
 Sharon, Plain of, 234
 Shaw, Sir Walter, 186
 Sheep-breeding, 286
 Shekel, 74, 89, 91, 263; disciplinary clause, 200-201
 Shekel-payers, 128, 131, 325-6
 Shemen Works, 163
 Shertok, Moshe, 200, 203
 Shipping, 239; shipping companies, 238-9, 285
 Shofman, G., 232
Shuchan Aruch, 38, 259
 Siberia, 155
 Sick Benefit Fund, 158, 166
 Sidebotham, Herbert, 108
 Sidon, 34
 Simon, Lord (Sir John), 194
 Simon, Julius, 125, 127, 179
 Simpson, Sir J. Hlop, 163, 191-3
 Simson ben Abraham, 35
 Simson, Brigadier H. J., 210
Sinai, 250
 Sinai Peninsula, 78, 79
 Singapore, 75, 133, 271
 Smallholders' settlements, 160-1
 Smilansky, M., 252
 Smolenskin, Perez, 54, 55, 61
 Smuts, General, 115, 187, 194, 271
 Smyrna, 39
 Snell, Lord (Harry), 187, 188-190
 Socialism, Socialist parties, 86, 97-9, 133
 Sokolow, Nahum, 86, 91, 92, 107, 109-10, 113, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 131, 171, 178, 179, 198, 200, 203, 270
 Soldiers, Palestinian Jewish, 282-5
 "Solel Boneh," 158, 240, 290
 Solowitchik, Max, 171
 Songs, 255-6, 262
 "Sons of Moses," 64
 Soskin, S. E., 85
 South Africa, 74, 155, 270
 South America, 273-4
 Soviet Government, 266
Spectator, 116
 Sprinzak, J., 178
 St. James's Palace, 220, 297
 Stanislavsky, 254
 Stanley, Colonel Oliver, 293
 State, Jewish, 114-5
 Stavsky, 199
 Stoker, W. H., K.C., 187
 Stolypin, M., 89
 Strickland, C. F., 196
 Strikes, 158
Struma, 281
 Students' societies, 59, 61, 62, 262, 267
 Suez Canal, 108

- "Suicide squads," 284
 Sulaiman, 38
 Sweden, 278
 Switzerland, 62, 268, 278
 Sykes, Sir Mark, 108-9
 Sykes-Picot Agreement, 109
 Symphony Orchestra, 255
 Synagogues, 259
 "Synthetic Zionism," 106
 Syria, 77, 120, 121, 138, 139, 144, 149, 150, 208, 255, 275, 284, 285, 300
 Syrian Delegation, 119
 Syrkin, Dr. N., 84
 Szold, Rabbi Benjamin, 62
 Szold, Miss Henrietta, 62, 175, 178, 232
 Szold, Robert, 127
- TALAA PASHA, 114
 Tahnud, 16, 29, 31, 35
 Talmud Torah schools, 164
 Talmudical academics, 259
 Talmudists, 34
 Talpioth, 247
 Tamerlane, 35
Tancred, 45
Tarbut, 265, 276
 Taxation, 244
 Taxes, 151-2
 T'chernichowski, S., 251
 Teachers' Union, 101, 165
 Technical Institute, 102, 165, 239, 247, 287
 Teheran, 284, 288
 Tel-Aviv, 96, 103, 104, 149, 156, 158, 162, 164, 211, 233, 237, 238, 239, 259, 305
 Tel-Aviv Municipality, 233, 252, 256
 Tel Hai, 121
 Temple, 16, 28, 29, 31, 36, 45, 184, 259
 Tenants' Protective Ordinance, 228
 Territorial Federations, 261
 "Territorialists," 84, 87
 Terrorism, Arab, 207-8, 215-6
 Theatres, 158
 Theodosius II, 29
 Thomas, Bertram, 118
 Thou, Jacob, 104, 118
 Tiberias, 28, 29, 32, 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 238
 Tiberias, Lake, 239
Times, *The*, 46, 108, 109, 187, 190, 194
 Tithes, 152
 Titus, 28
 "Tnuvah," 158, 236, 239
 Tolerance, 22
 Torczyner, Professor, 249
 Toscanini, 255
 Tourist traffic, 238
 Touro, Judah, 49
 Tower of David, 34
 Trade, foreign, 211
 Trade unions, 158, 239
 Traditional Judaism, 20
 Translations, 252
- Transport trade, 163; military transport, 285
 Transjordan, 28, 29, 35, 49, 105, 138-9, 212, 217, 220, 228, 304
 Transjordan Frontier Force, 151
 Trees, planting of, 216
 Trieste, 156
 Tripolitania, 275
 Trumpeldor, Joseph, 105, 120, 156
 Tschlenow, Dr. Y., 92, 102, 105, 107, 123
 Tuberculosis, 256
 Tulloch, Major, 237
 Tunis, 41; Tunisia, 275, 283
 Turks, 27, 32, 35, 41, 117; Young Turks, 89
 Turkey, 123; Sultan of, 71; banning of Zionism, 262; Government of, 59, 70, 90, 103, 114, 144, 281
 "Tushiyah," 64
 ТУТ, 34
- UGANDA, 80
 Ukraine, 122
 Ulema, 137
 Um es-Schert, 106
 Unemployment, 152, 157
 United States, Hovev Zion societies, 62; Zionist Organisation, 74, 272; Poale Zion, 86; Provisional Executive in First World War, 104; influence on Balfour Declaration, 111-3; expansion of Zionist movement, 123; Government, 113, 120, 144, 148; Congress resolution, 113, 148; Convention with Great Britain, 148; Zionist activities, 272; Government action in aid of refugees, 294
 University of Jerusalem, 49, 73, 76, 92, 117, 148 (inauguration), 165, 241, 247-8, 269, 287
 University Press, 249
 Urban developments, 162-3
 Uruguay, 274
 Usha, 28
 Ussishkin, M., Chairman of Odessa Committee, 61, 66; opposition to East Africa scheme, 81, 83; member of Zionist Executive, 85; founds Teachers' Union, 101; head of Zionist Commission, 117; at Peace Conference, 120; member of Zionist Executive, 125, 131; Chairman of Jewish National Fund, 171; at Jewish Agency inaugural session, 178; Chairman of General Council, 203; opposes partition, 213; closing speech at 1939 Congress, 225
- Vaad Hahinnuch*, 165
Vaad Hair, 117

- Vaad Halashon*, 246
Vaad Hatarbuth, 158
Vaad Ha'mani, 117-8, 137
Vaad Leumi, 118, 137, 153, 167-8, 197, 243, 246, 279, 281, 283
 Valley of Esdraelon, 148
 Valley of Jezreel, 99, 103, 161, 256
 Vambéry, Arminius, 77
 Vatican, 144
 Vegetable cultivation, 236
 Venice, 37, 38
 Vespasian, 28
 Viborg Manifesto, 87
 Vienna, 62, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 81, 85, 92, 156
 Vilna, 58, 61, 80, 86, 87, 132
 Vine-growing, 65, 163
 Vital, Haim, 38, 40
 Vocational training, 242
 Volunteers, registration of, 279
 248; visits to United States, 272; letter to Prime Minister Chamberlain, 278-9; negotiations for Jewish Fighting Force, 282
 Wellington, 75
 Wells, Loring of, 286
Welt. Dic., 71, 92
 Wertheimer, Wolf, 40
 Western Desert, 284
 Western Wall, 29, 31, 182, 5, 190, 197
 White Papers: Churchill (1922), 141-4, 172, 232, 303; on Western Wall, 183; on Shaw Commission's Report, 187; Lord Passfield's (on Hope Simpson's Report, 1939), 192-3, 204, 206, 299; on partition, 213; on Technical Commission for partition, 217; MacDonald's (1939) on termination of Mandate, 221, 9, 281, 289, 292, 293, 296-7, 327-8
 Wilbuschewitz, N., 83
 William II (German Emperor), 76
 William III (of England), 43
 Wilson, Sir Henry Maitland, 284
 Wilson, President, 111, 113, 115, 273, 303
 Winaver, M., 86
 Wine-cellars, 65
 Wine-trade, 163
 Winnipeg, 75
 Wise, Rabbi Aaron, 62
 Wise, Dr. Stephen, 62, 113, 173, 272
 Witherby, Thomas, 45
 Witte, M., 80
 Wolf, Lucien, 87, 269
 Wolffsohn, David, 75, 78, 85, 91, 92
 Wohman, Dr. Leo, 174
 Women Zionists, 262
 Women's International Zionist Organisation, 134, 241, 2, 247, 274
 Woodhead, Sir John, 218
 Workers' Bank, 158, 164, 242
 Workers' Youth Movement, 258
 Workshops, 237, 285
 World Congress, 169-70

Yaklin, 158
 Yarmuk, 149, 163
 Yemen, 37, 155, 220
 Yemenites, 66, 93, 257-8, 288
Yesod Hamaalah, 59
 Yiddish, 54, 75, 265, 274
Yizkor, 99
 Youth *Aliyah*, 232, 247, 288
 Youth movement, 134

 ZANGWILL, ISRAEL, 69, 83, 84, 85, 296
 Zebulun Seafaring Society, 239

Zederbaum, Alexander, 55
 "Zeiré Zion," 133
 Zichron, Jacob, 60, 100, 104, 163
 Zikr, 184, 197
 Zion Mule Corps, 105
 "Zioné Zion," 83, 84

INDEX

Zionism, origin of term, 62; Cultural or
 Spiritual, 64; "Synthetic," 106
Zionist Bulletin, 132
 Zionist Commission, 116-7, 123, 126
 Zurich, 177, 180, 181, 213

