LIKE ALL THE NATIONS?

גּוֹי אֶחָד בָּאָרֶץ

A UNIQUE NATION

(2 Samuel VII. 23)

BY

J. L. MAGNES

Herod's Gate

Jerusalem, 1930.

Froidus

97364

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
"Like all the Nations"?	6
Resumé of Mr. Philby's Article	33
An International Enclave	34
A Royal Commission	42
Zionist Politics	45
The Workers of Zion	59
A Preface by Ahad Haam	65

PREFACE

I am issuing this pamphlet in English and in Hebrew *) entirely on my own responsibility, and no organization, institution or body of men is to be held responsible for it.

For more than seven years I have been in Palestine, a witness of some of the noble work done here, and I have done what I could to further this work myself and through others. But all this while and for several years before that, I had been an onlooker at

*) In the Hebrew edition there has also been included an address on "Palestine and the Diaspora" delivered in Jerusalem for the benefit of the Jewish National Fund and published in Hapoel Hazair June 8, 1923, כ"ד ניסן תרפ"ג. In view of much of what is being said about those who are pleading for peace and understanding, the following quotation from that address may not be amiss:

"And Palestine? Here the Jewish People hopes to have its nationalism take root and develop. What will be the character of this nationalism? In their efforts to create a national organism here will the Jews prostrate themselves before the idols of economic imperialism and militarism, as some of the Hasmoneans did in their day, and as the Idumean Herod did in his? Is it possible that one of these days it will be regarded as political treason if some one repeats seriously in the streets of Jerusalem the doctrine of Isaiah: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and shall not learn war any more"? Or if there be Jews in the Land of Israel faithful to the teachings of the Prophets of Israel and who would endeavour to build the ideal conmmonwealth, whereby Jerusalem would be redeemed and Zion be ransomed through righteouness and peace"?

Zionist politics and I have seen things done and left undone which it was hard to pass by in silence. I had, however, participated in previous years so actively in Jewish and Zionist work in America, and my opposition to the war to which I gave free expression gave me such a surfeit of politics, that I had determined to make every effort "to keep out of politics" should I be fortunate enough to carry out the ardent hope of many years to settle in the Holy Land.

I had thought that by devoting myself single-mindedly to the building up of the Hebrew University as a centre of learning and of inspiration, in the idea of which I have believed throughout a generation, it would be possible to leave politics to others.

But recent events have made me realize again all too clearly, what I should have preferred to forget, that, after all, politics means lives and all too often too the determination of moral, social and even religious issues. It was for that reason that I concluded, not without conflict with myself, that it would be necessary for me, as it should be for all of us in these critical times, to contribute my share whatever it was worth to the political discussion. I found this the more imperative because the official attitude on the Arab question appeared to me either intransigent or vague. Not being an official of any organization that is entitled to speak or negotiate in political matters, I have felt and I feel that I could be most helpful by speaking my own mind. This might at least aid in bringing about intelligent discussion and decision in Palestine and elsewhere.

The interest with which my address at the opening of this year's term at the University (November 18th, 1929) and my interviews in the New York Times and the New York Day have been met is proof that speech was necessary. If now I issue this pamphlet it is that the process of clarification may be carried further. It may well be that it is premature for official personages and organizations to speak or to take action. But it is not premature for others to discuss the fundamental and practical problems involved. Indeed, the discussion and the planning as well as action should have been going on for ten years past.

The first article in this pamphlet is published here for the first time and is, in a measure, an answer to some of my critics. It does not pretend to be a full answer, because the elaboration of some points would make this pamphlet too much like a book.

The second article is a reproduction of an interview which appeared in the New York Times, November 24, 1929, as a comment upon an interview published on the same day and prepared by Mr. H. St. J. B. Philby, the author of «The Heart of Arabia», «The Arabian Mandates», and «Arabia of the Wahabis», and formerly Chief British representative in Transjordania, and before that Adviser to the Ministry of the Interior, Mesopotamia. I am inserting also the main points of Mr. Philby's interview.

I have been asked why I attached importance to

Mr. Philby's article which was written before I had met him. It was for these reasons: First, because Mr. Philby knows Arabia and Arabs as but few non-Arabs do. Second, because Mr. Philby is well known for his friendship to the Arab cause, and he has also had the reputation of being unfriendly to Zionism. It seemed to me that a moderate expression of opinion from such a source should be treated seriously. Third, because Mr. Philby is a not unknown member of the British Labour Party, now in power in England. And fourth, because Mr. Philby wrote his article after he had been in conference with not un-important Arab leaders.

I am also publishing a telegram I sent to the New York Day. This was in answer to a telegram from them saying that an interview with me had been published in New York on Nov. 20 making me say I advocated the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration—just the opposite of what I actually did say in the genuine interview published on Nov. 24 in the New York Times. It appears that the Jewish Telegraphic Agency in Jerusalem had made premature use of an advance copy of my Times interview, and had sent what purported to be an interview I had given them. I had given them no interview. Recording this here may also help us realize just how «like all the nations», some scribes of Israel in the Land of Israel have become.

There is also included a letter which appeared in the London Jewish Chronicle on August 26, 1921. This letter was written after the Jaffa riots of May 1921, and

was in answer to a question of some of my friends in America as to why I could not reenter Zionist life. This letter was published a week before the first after-the-war-Zionist Congress was convened at Carlsbad. This letter and a speech delivered on May 20, 1919, reprinted from a volume of my «Wartime Addresses» are being included here in order to show that my present attitude is not new, and that it is the result of a view of life and a conception of the ethical function of Judaism, and does not just spring from tactical or strategic motives. Were I writing the letter and the speech today, I should perhaps have phrased this or that differently or more precisely. But the general idea remains the same: A Palestine where the Jews will be guaranteed as of right and not on sufferance these three things: Immigration, settlement on the land, Hebrew life and culture.

I am also publishing an English translation of the Preface by Ahad Haam to the 1921 edition of his four volumes of Al Parashat Derahim (At the Crossways). I do not know that this has been translated into English or that many who call themselves Ahad Haam's disciples have read this — his political testament — with sufficient care. This humble, strong man's clarity of mind and his ethical idealism would be of decisive importance for us in Palestine today; just as, if I may add one more personal word, would be the powerful mind and ethical personality of Louis Marshall.

Jerusalem, December 5, 1929.

"Like all the Nations"?

The discussion concerning the future political regime in Palestine is now happily beginning take on a more or less objective character and the searching question is being asked as to what we want here. What is our Zionism? What does Palestine mean for us?

As to what we should want here I can answer for myself in almost the same terms that I have been in the habit of using many years:

Immigration.

Settlement on the land.

Hebrew life and culture.

If you can guarantee these for me, I should be willing to yield the Jewish «State», and the Jewish «majority»; and on the other hand I would agree to a Legislative Assembly together with a pemocratic political regime so carefully planned and worked out that the above three fundamentals could not be infringed. Indeed I should be willing to pay almost any price for these three, especially since this price would in my opinion also secure tranquillity and mutual understanding. If the Jews really have an historical connection with Palestine, and what student of history

will deny it, and if the Jewish People is to be in Palestine not on sufferance (as during the days of the Turks) but as of right—a right solemnly recognised by most Governments and by the League of Nations, and also by thinking Arabs, then surely these three rights are elemental and hardly to be contested.

A former Administrator of Palestine reckoned that, with agriculture remaining the chief industry of Palestine, the land within its present political borders could accommodate roughly 3,000,000 people. Others give higher figures. But as for myself, if I could know that in the course of a long, long period a Jewish community of 1,000,000 souls—one third of the population—was possible here, I should be well content. There are now 900,000 people in the country, of whom 160,000 are Jews. Let the colonisers and the students of vital statistics tell us how long a period it will take for Arabs to become 2,000,000 and Jews to become 1,000,000. Surely much longer than a full generation. Why not, therefore, let us try to work out a program for a generation, and let the generation after take care of its own problems? If we could do this, we should perhaps be talking less in abstractions, and even though we differed in our philosophies, all of us ought to be able to work together with a will.

All theory, therefore, all discussion, all programs should, it seems to me, start from some such basis: How can immigration, settlement on the soil, a Hebrew life and culture be secured? Such moot questions as

democracy, self-determination, legislative assembly, the function of the Mandatory and its international obligations, our relations with the Arabs of Palestine and the rest of the Arab world should all be considered from the point of view that, taking into account the Arab increase, the Jews may become, let us say arbitrarily, one third of the total population. This would require enormous efforts and large sums of money. Why talk of «majorities» and «state» when even by the wildest stretch of the imagination we can hardly picture such a thing within an appreciable period, even if Britain and the Arabs and Jewish money-givers were helpfulness itself. Who knows? Perhaps through some miracle in the future the Jews might become a majority. Drought in Palestine leading to emigration of Arabs ? or even the success of Jewish colonisation in Palestine might be so striking that the Arab States or Federation of the future would want Jewish colonising, financial, industrial and cultural aid, and would want to encourage a large Jewish concentration in Palestine for the sake of developing backward parts (and they are legion) of the Arab world? It is pleasing to have such dreams as to the future. But surely no serious practical policy can be built up upon them, and it is a practical policy for the next 10-20-30 years we are after.

The above mentioned three fundamental rights are bound up with practical problems which political wisdom should envisage in all their complications before paying the price required.

Immigration is in the words of the White Paper of 1922 to be permitted in accordance with the economic capacity of the country to absorb it. As a matter of course; but who is to determine the economic capacity of the country and in what manner? This cannot surely be left simply to a legislative body with an Arab majority, and it is therefore necessary not only to reserve the question of immigration constitutionally as being beyond the province of the Legislative to interfere with, but also to become clear as to the machinery that will actually determine the economic capacity of the country. It is not my province in this paper to go into any details of machinery. The best possible expert opinion must be secured, if it has not already been. But this is one of the questions where in my humble judgment the League of Nations, through the Mandates Commission or the International Labour Bureau, or some other expert commission should have a direct say.

Settlement on the soil involves, among other things, the purchase of land. This is a particularly complicated question in every Oriental country, and in the old Turkish lands not less so than elsewhere. Grave charges are made against the Jews as having driven peasants from the soil. I do not pretend to final knowledge in this matter. But I have tried to inform myself, although I know that without speaking Arabic to Fellaheen themselves, the information one gets is about as correct as third or fourth hand information usually is. There seems

to be no doubt that a small number of Fellaheen families have suffered hardship. But this was not because the Jews paid low prices for the land. On the contrary they have paid in many cases extravagant prices, and this is probably one of the causes of the high cost of living in Palestine. It is the absentee Effendi landlord who has pocketed the money, with little or nothing for the dispossessed Fellaheen. I am told that in the vast majority of instances the Jewish purchasers have compensated the Fellaheen in money or in other land beyond the price paid to the absentee Effendi. Moreover the law formerly stipulated that no sale of land occupied by an agricultural tenant was valid unless provision was made for the retention of land somewhere in Palestine sufficient for his living. The new ordinance of August, 1929 provides that an agricultural tenant cannot be dispossessed except after notice of over a year, and he is entitled to compensation to be established by a Board, and to additional compensation amounting to a year's rental if he had occupied the land for at least five years. The reverse side of the picture should not be omitted. It is that many an Arab village is poverty stricken not only because they are in an infertile or difficult farming region, but because they are half enslaved to an absentee Effendi landlord or to Arab usurers, both Christian and Moslem.

The situation of the Fellaheen is one of the cardinal problems of the country. Here is a field for a great constructive program in which both Jews and

Arabs should combine. The country can never be prosperous and happy with the Arab peasants half-serfs. I know there are some who think that if the Arab peasant rises in the scale, the Jews will have no more chance; and not all Arab Effendis are altogether keen about having the kindly but easily inflamed fellah freed from his burden of ignorance and debt. But if the Jewish position here is dependent upon keeping the fellah down, the Jew has no right here. It is however not true in fact that the fellah must be kept down. The higher he rises in the scale, the greater will be his consuming and producing power, and the greater therefore the agricultural, industrial and labour turnover for the whole country. The higher in the agricultural scale he rises, the less will his need be of large numbers of dunams farmed primitively for the needs of one family. With better and more intensive methods he will need less land for his subsistence, and as a consequence there will be more land for new settlement. If he rises in the cultural scale, he will be less easily inflamed by such gross lies as to Jewish designs on the mosque and he will be the harder to arouse to massacre and plunder. Is it not the case everywhere that with the rise in the economic and cultural scale of oppressed elements in the population, the general welfare is served? It is the general welfare that we are after.

This question of the land therefore requires thoroughgoing study and careful and just handling, and here too restrictions must be placed upon the power

of the Legislative Assembly; and the League of Nations, through the International Labour Bureau or otherwise, should be concerned with the land question in an active way and not merely in the capacity of a receiver of reports.

One would have thought that the equal official rights of the Hebrew language in all schools and governmental departments would be recognised as a matter of course. But I have been amazed to find that among some Arab leaders this is one of the chief stumbling-blocks. They are ready to show all honour to the Hebrew language. But they want the one official language to be Arabic. This would be for them the symbol of the Arab National State or Government. But if the theory advanced in these pages be true, that the Holy Land is no place for an Arab National State or Government, or for a Jewish National State or Government, but for a bi-national country with a Mandate as nearly permanent as possible held by Great Britain from the League of Nations, it should be clear that the official and equal status of the Hebrew language must also be removed constitutionally from the competence of the Legislative Assembly to interfere with. It is not sufficient for the genuine revival of the Hebrew language and culture, for Hebrew to be taught in the schools alone. It must permeate life. No more can a Jewish spiritual and intellectual Center be created if we have a Hebrew University alone. The University must be based on a community living an Hebraic life, both

through its participation in Government and in its agriculture, industry and labour.

I have not thought it essential to mention here such self-understood and non-controversial ponits as the complete freedom of religious practice and belief, and the equality of every individual before the law. Nor have I included such controversial points as the fate of advanced social and labour legislation, and the political status of woman.

If a political regime can be worked out either through a constitution or through a treaty or in some other binding and international way, that can safeguard the three rights above outlined, then I am heartily in favour of including within this regime, but by no means as the whole of it, a Legislative Assembly in which the two nationalities shall participate upon the basis of a carefully worked out system of suffrage.

It is right in morals — insofar as political forms have anything to do with morals at all — that the people of this and every other country should have a voice in their own government; and it is not possible, even though it were desirable, to maintain the present status quo — an absolutist colonial regime. It is not possible, because the British Government is making or has made political concessions in Egypt, Iraq and India, even in wild Transjordan, and the French Government has been doing the same in Syria. Why then not Palestine? Because the Jews are here? The Jewish concience will not bear this for long. It must recognise,

sooner rather than later and from good will rather than through compulsion, that the inhabitants of this country, both Arabs and Jews, have not only the right but the duty to participate, in equitable and practical ways, in the government of their common Home-land.

I am asked, must we do that now? My answer is: Yes, now, and the pity is that we did not do it before Hebron and Safed. Now, because it is right that it be done, and the sooner the right thing is done the better, practically speaking, all round. We must pay bitterly for our fault of not having proposed and done this long since. The blame rests on each of us. Mea culpa.

And as the reward for the butcheries of Hebron and Safed, you ask me? But I would repeat what I said at the University: »We must face this problem, not because of the pogroms but despite them, not as a result of violence, but as an attempt to remove excuses for violence, not because of pressure from without but because of spiritual pressure from within ourselves.« — Yet, let us not deceive ourselves — over our head hangs the sword. What a terrible thing it is to have to yield to violence. But have we as men and women responsible for each others' lives and for our work and hopes here any choice? Is not the world pagan — whatever high-sounding religious names it gives itself? Is it not a world of force and is it not against such a world that Israel with his body and his spirit has been destined all along to bear testimony? The Eastern peoples

have learned that the most effective argument with the Western world is force and violence. Heaven forbid that Israel take up arms against such a world with the weapons of that world.

And with those men — Arab and English — who are directly or indirectly responsible for the shedding of the innocent blood of our brothers and sisters? Yes — if necessary for our brothers' and sisters' sake, and for the peace of Zion — even with them. Israel's question always is, and whether we want it or not, will always be: Are m y o w n hands clean of blood? Not, Are his hands clean? Have I done h i m wrong? Not, Has he done me wrong? That he has done us wrong we know, and resent, and suffer from in our own flesh and blood. Shall we therefore refrain from giving him what he has a right to ask? Look about us. Governments at war brand each other as criminals and declare that they will never, never negotiate. Yet the time comes when they sit down together and negotiate. Let at least Israel not be hypocritical and self-righteous. This simple Jew who has come to the Holy Land with clean hands and a pure heart is of more importance to me than all my pride and honour, and all my political calculations and theories. What matters to me is that he and I and our People get a chance to live and to work here, and to make the Holy Land and the Holy City sacred again through our labour and our life.

The argument is adduced by men struggling sincerely with the constitutional problem, that although

we Jews are devoted democrats and liberals and internationalists and even pacifists elsewhere, it is not possible, much to our regret, under present circumstances for us to yield on the constitutional question until the Jewish community is much stronger and until the Arabs have been through a period of political education, beginning with the municipalities, over a considerable period — 10 — 15 — 20 years.

As to the latter point, I think no one will deny the great need of political education in the country. The incompetence and corruption of many of the Municipalities are not particularly encouraging to those advocating representative government. But the way to train a people in self-government is to place responsibility upon it, not to withhold self-government from it. This placing of responsibilty should take place cautiously and gradually, and for that reason much care must be taken to safeguard all Jewish and minority rights and international obligations. Nor need the political forms adopted ape dogmatically or mechanically those of other lands. But a beginning has to be made all along the line from the municipalities through the Legislative Assembly and such other legislative and executive organs of government as are required and devised. The life of this unhappy country will be much saner and much less hysterical the sooner its population can exercise its political energies in legitimate and practical and constructive ways. It would bring men and parties out into the open instead of as today

giving the extremist his chance to work in the dark. It will give some of the younger men their opportunity, and it will show the moderate the way of assuming responsibilities. It may realign parties along other than nationalistic lines, cutting through present groupings and bringing together into one party those Jews aud Arabs who have common economic and social interests. The more the nationalist extremist, who works in the dark, can stir up passion, the more expense and trouble he can cause, the more he can embitter the lives of the mandatory representatives and of the moderates among the Arabs and the Jews, the greater is his chance of landing eventually on top. There are of course dangers in all political and in all democratic institutions. I have no illusions about the magnitude of the ditfi culties here· But it is of much greater danger to let the old sore rankle and form into an abscess again. The best excuse both for home and for foreign comsumption that the extremist now has, is the truth, namely, that the people have no share in their own government. I suppose no experiment in democracy was ever made except that there was controversy between those who said the people were not «ripe» and those who said, trust the people and thus make them ripe.

But the objection to a legislative assembly at the present time goes much deeper than that. The argument makes an important distinction between the basic nature of the Arab and the Jewish communities.

For the Arab peoples, so the argument runs, this is but a small province in the great Arab world, and for this reason is not of vital and decisive importance for the Arab Nation. Palestine is, to be sure, of vital and decisive importance for the Palestinian Arabs who happen to live here. But it is not the Homeland, the source and origin of the Arab Nation. Without Palestine, the Arab Nation would still have its millions of Arabs on genuine Arab territories that cover vast stretches of the globe. Therefore, although the Jews recognise the full and equal claims of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine to an equal share in all rights and duties attaching to the land, nevertheless the Arab on his side ought to recognise the fact that the Jews have no other Homeland, no other territorial centre, and that if they are deprived of the right of free settlement and life here by a legislative assembly whose majority was Arab, this sole fatherland would be taken from them and this would be an historical crime. It would mean, so some declare, that the Jewish people is doomed to perish, because, in their view, the one chance of Jewish survival is a large Jewish concentration in Palestine. The distinction is therefore made between the right of the Jewish People or Nation to Palestine and the right of the Arab inhabitants. Inasmuch as a People or Nation with historical connections with the Land is of greater consequence than a mere community of inhabitants who have their historical center elsewhere, this fact should balance the advantage which the Arab

inhabitants have by reason of their greater number. In other words, the two groups should be regarded as equals, the deeper claim of the Jewish Nation offsetting the actual Arab majority.

Although I cannot agree with all the premises in this argument, as I hope to show, it does contain a deep truth. It is a fact that cannot be denied that the Jewish People has and can have no other historical center than the Land of Israel, and it is a fact that Palestine is of much less importance in every way to the Arab Nation than Syria with Damascus, Iraq with Bagdad, the Nejd—the source of Arab vitality — and the Hedjaz with Mecca and Medina. The Arabs of Palestine are probably the descendants of all the myriad conquerors and conquered who have ruled and passed through and tilled this land. Moreover, this is a land sacred to three religions, which is not true of other Arab lands. And, quite frankly, has there ever been such a yearning known to history as the century long yearning of Israel for this sacred soil? Was there ever another people that turned three times a day in its prayers over hundreds, now almost thousands of years, from all points of the compass towards the land from which it was exiled? Was it not a Hebrew singer who said: «If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth»?

Let us grant therefore the peculiar and profound and exceptional connection of this Jewish People sui generis with this Land sui generis. But is this a suffi-

cient reason to withhold a Legislative Assembly until the Jews become at least as numerous as the Arabs? This is not logical, because the very hypothesis above described would, if its acceptance could be secured, make the Jewish People and the Arab community equals now, at this very moment, despite the disparity in their numbers. Why therefore wait with political concessions until the Jews are in the position not only of being a favoured nation in relation to Palestine as their sole homeland, but of being a numerical majority as well?

I am no expert in political science, nor have I the responsibility of having to decide as to the practicability or workability of this or any other proposal for the new governmental structure. I have gone through fourteen different projects, and an expert commission should be charged with digesting this and all the available material and, in consultation with all parties, making its recommendations. If however I may interject a personal predilection in this connection it would be for the creation of two Houses, the Lower Chamber elected by the whole population, which would give a large Arab majority, and an Upper Chamber, to be elected or appointed upon the basis of the equality of the three nationalities, Jewish, Arab, British. This is similar to the United States where the Senate is composed of two representatives of each State of the Union, large or small, populous or sparsely peopled, thereby expressing the equal rights of the states constituting the Union, whereas

the House of Representatives represents the individuals of the population as individuals.

But my point here is, that whatever be the scheme adopted, there is no validity in the reasons of those who, holding the theory of two equal nationalities, would do nothing now and would under all circumstances retain the present status quo. They ought to say, and this is what I should say with them, that because of the intense and peculiar relationship of the scattered Jewish People to Palestine, every possible care should be exercised to safeguard the rights and privileges of the Jewish People in any constitutional changes that may be made. The discussion should really be not on w h e t h e r this should be done, but rather on h o w to exercise this care, and w h a t safeguards to devise, and w h a t constitutional changes to recommend in order that for the Jews there may be guaranted the rights of immigration, of settlement on the Land, and of a Hebrew culture.

Without contesting the validity of the point that the Jews have a very special relationship to Palestine, I would subject some of the premises above outlined to a brief examination; and I do this because it is here perhaps, that I seem to differ from so many Zionists, and why some of my friends say that, although I live in Zion, I am not a Zionist at all. I wonder where the ecclesiastic authority as to who is and who is not a Zionist rests. At any rate the company of the banned is varied and long, and, if I remember right, it at times

even includes some of the Faithful themselves. Bu perhaps these friends are right. It may not be «Zionism» But even they will admit that it is the undying, tradi ional «Hibbat Zion», the Love of Zion.

Whether through temperament or other circum stances, I do not at all believe, and I think the facts ar all against believing that without Palestine the Jewish People is dying out or is doomed to destruction. On the contrary it is growing stronger; and what is more it should grow stronger, for, Palestine without communities in the Dispersion would be bereft of much of its significance as a spirital center for the Judaism of the world. To me it seems that there are three chief elements in Jewish life, in the following order of importance:-The living Jewish People-now some 16,000,000; the Torah, in the broadest sense of this term, i. e. all our literature and documents and history, as also the great religious and ethical and social ideals the Torah contains for use and development in the present and the future; and third, the Land of Israel. My view is that the People and the Torah can exist and be creative as they have existed and have been creative without the Land; that however the Land is one of the chief means, if not the chief means, of revivifying and deepening the People and the Torah.

The living Jewish People is primary. It is the livlng carrier and vessel of Judaism, the Jewish spirit. It has used even its Exile for spreading light and learning. Palestine can help this people to understand itself, to give an acco-

unt of itself, to an intensification of its culture, a deepening of its philosophy, a renewal of its religion. Palestine can help this People perform its great ethical mission as a national-international entity. But this eternal and far-flung People does not need a Jewish State for the purpose of maintaining its very existence. The Jewish community throughout the world is a wondrous and paradoxical organism. It participates in the life of many nations, yet inspite of numberless predictions in the past and the present, it is not absorbed by them. It is patriotic in every land, yet it is international, cosmopolitan. Palestine cannot «solve the Jewish problem» of the Jewish people. Wherever there are Jews there is the Jewish problem. It is part of the Jewish destiny to face this problem and make it mean something of good for mankind. Nor are the Jews dying out despite their weaknesses, their mixed marriages, their ignorance of Judaism and the deterioration that has laid hold of many a limb. I see them in America growing healthier and stronger in numbers and intellectual power. Their hearts respond generously to every Jewish call. They are multiplying their communities, their synagogues, schools, societies, libraries, unions. They are acquiring economic indcpendence, and their sons and daughters are getting what the universities and colleges can give them. They are ignorant of Judaism. But they are asking eagerly, mostly in vain, to know what Judaism is. Perhaps it is not the fault of the teachers that the answer takes so long in coming. Judaism

is a complex phenomenon. It is and it is not religion, philosophy, ethics, politics, ceremonies, life. The answer as to what it is and may mean to a new generation cannot come over night. This is a day of ferment throughout the world, also within Judaism. The materials are there and are in the hands of the Potter. Palestine can perhaps help fashion this more than any one factor. But it is the living Jewish People everywhere that Palestine must serve. It is a People of useful citizens permeating the life of hundreds of communities, and yet giving evidence of the changelessness of that mystic phenomenon — their continued existence as a body set apart and separate. They are scattered, yet are one; they are unorganised, yet held together through spiritual bonds more subtle than through organisation. One sees this People in all the lands of its exile continuing to yield out of its body individuals of mind and spirit in the arts and sciences, and common soldiers in societies whose goal is the betterment of our human lot. The Dispersion of this People, the Diaspora, is a marvellous instrumentality for the fulfillment of its function as a teacher. The Dispersion is an irrevocable, historical fact, and Palestine can be a means of making this fact into an even greater blessing.

Unfortunately one hears most of that Zionism which is not born of a positive, hopeful relationship towards the tremendous, unique fact of the Diaspora but of despair. It is a Zionism that loathes the «Ghetto» (which it identifies with the Dispersion), and that

is so in despair of the future of Diaspora Judaism and that in its own way loves Jews and Judaism so passionately, that the further existence of Jews and Judaism is thought impossible if the present day Palestine be not made ready to act as saviour.

Palestine is the center of this organism, but by no means all of it. The Dispersion and Palestine are both required for the fullest development of the Jewish People. This peculiar People could not be content with either, alone. This sui generis organism which we call the Jewish People has need of these all-embracing, complicated forms — an intensive center and a great periphery. The complete salvation and working power of Judaism is dependent upon both together.

But if I have thus exalted the Diaspora what is Palestine to us? It is the Land of Israel, our Holy Land. It is holy for us in a practical and a mystic sense. Its holiness attracts our old and our young, the religious and the non-religious from far away places, and they want to work its soil, and build up an ethical community, and thereby make the land still more sacred. Its very landscape and colour help every child and simple man among us to understand our classic literature and our history. It helps us as through no other means to lay bare our very soul, to get down deep into the sources of our being, as they are recorded for us and as we feel and apprehend them among these hills and valleys and deserts, and among these peoples, wild yet related.— The sources of our being, history? Does history really

mean so much? The individual does without it, but the community is a Beduin camp without it. If we want to live, the more intensive must be our apprehension of our history and literature. Palestine served Israel in exile for centuries in this regard even though it was but a far off ideal. Palestine as a reality is itself the very scroll on which our history is written and spread out for us.

Three great things this poor little land has already given Israel in two generations. Hebrew has become a living possession and has thus restored to us and our children the sources of our history and our mind, and has thus given us the medium again for classic, permanent Jewish expression. The second great thing is the return of Jews to the soil, not only for the sake of a living from the soil but also for the sake of their love of this particular soil and its indissoluble connection with the body of the Jewish People. Third, the brave attempt on the part of city-bred, school-bred young Jews—moderns of the modern—to work out in life, in the cities and on the land, a synthesis between the radicalism of their social outlook and their ancestral Judaism. It is problems of the same nature that a whole world in travail is laboring to solve; and among Jewry no more splendid attempt at a synthesis has been made than here, in every day life and not in theory alone.

The beginnings of all of this, and much more than the beginning were made under the Turks; and Palestine is of such moment to us that it is capable

of giving us much even though our community here be poor and small. I have indicated above that I do not want it to be poor and small. But poor and small and faithful to Judaism, rather than large and powerful like all the nations.

It is in derogation of the actual importance of the living Jewish People and of Judaism to place them on one side of the scale and have it balanced by the relatively unimportant Arab community of Palestine. The true parallels and balancing forces are Jews and Judaism on the one side, and the Arab peoples and even all of Islam on the other. In this way you get a truer perspective of the whole and you increase the significance of Palestine as being that point where in this new day Judaism meets Islam again throughout all its confines, as once they met centuries back to the ultimate enrichment of human culture.

Our theories may differ as to the purposes Palestine may or may not serve. But there is no question that it is now serving as a testing ground, a dangerous frontier land for the lovers of peace in Israel. Much of the theory of Zionism has been concerned with making the Jews into a «normal» nation in Palestine «like the gentiles of the lands and the families of the earth». The desire for power and conquest seems to be normal to many human beings and groups, and we being the ruled everywhere, must here rule; being the minority everywhere, we must here be in the majority. There is the Wille zur Macht, the State, the army, the fron-

tiers... We have been in Exile; now we are to be masters in our own Home. We are to have a Fatherland, and we are to encourage the feelings of pride, honour, glory that are part of the paraphernalia of the ordinary nationalistic patriotism. In the face of such danger one thinks of the dignity and originality of that passage in the liturgy which praises the Lord of all things that «our portion is not like theirs and our lot not like all their multitude».

The question is, can we establish our life here not upon the basis of force and power, but upon that of human solidarity and understanding?

We are told that when we become the majority we shall then show how just and generous a people in power can be. That is like the man who says that he will do anything and everything to get rich, so that he may do good with the money thus accumulated. Sometimes he never grows rich – he fails. And if he does grow rich under those circumstances his power of doing good has been atrophied from long lack of use. In other words, it is not only the end which for Israel must be desirable, but what is of equal importance the means must be conceived and brought forth in cleanliness. If as a minority we insist upon keeping the other man from achieving just aims, and if we keep him from this with the aid of bayonets, we must not be surprised if we are attacked and what is worse if moral degeneration sets in amongst us.

The anti-semite has accused us of being democrats

and liberals and radicals everywhere on the ground that we are not deeply rooted in any soil. He has charged us with having no conservative instincts because we have no real hearth and home, boundaries and property of our ancestors to defend. We are spectators, onlookers, by standers, he says. We have always answered, that should we have the opportunity of exercising statecraft on our own soil, we would as participant and not as bystander uphold our prophetic traditions.

Now, here we are, and it seems to be harder for us as a minority than we had pictured it as a majority. It is as though Providence itself was putting us to the test. We the great democrats of the world are trying to find every kind of reason to justify the denial of even the beginning of democracy to ourselves and others. I am afraid of this demoralisation. For the Jewish People no high end will ever justify low means. We have been nurtured too long in the Rabbinic tradition for that. This may be disappointing to some. It may even excite the contempt of those two Englishmen and that Jew who told me not so long ago that, as the history of all conquest and colonisation shows, the only possible hope of success is frankly to espouse the Joshua method. Perhaps so. At least I do not believe it, and I know that plain Jews everywhere and the plain Jews who have come here to live and work do not believe it. But if it be so, the Jewish People, thank God, will never be successful

conquerors and colonisers. Neither the hostile world nor their own soul will let them.

I have no illusions about the Jews here becoming a Quaker community. That would be too good to be true. Nor do I see the possibility in Palestine or elsewhere of doing without adequate police protection. This ought to be given everywhere by any government worthy of the name; and if a future government be as helpless as this, we might have to take measures which all the world should know about. What I am driving at is to distinguish between two policies. The one maintains that we can establish a Jewish Home here through the suppression of the political aspirations of the Arabs, and therefore a Home necessarily established on bayonets over a long period – a policy which I think bound to fail because of the violence against us it would occasion, and because good opinion in Britian and tne consience of the Jewish People itself would revolt against it. The other policy holds that we can establish a Home here only if we are true to ourselves as democrats and internationalists, thus being just and helpful to others, and that we ask for the protection of life and property the while we are eagerly and intelligently and sincerely at work to find a modus vivendi et operandi with our neighbours. The world — not in Palestine alone – may be bent upon violence and bloodshed. But will not my opponent agree that there is a better chance of averting this tendency to bloodshed, if we make every possible effort politically as well as in

other ways to work hand in hand—as teachers, helpers, friends—with this awakening Arab world?

You ask me do I want to quit? No, I do not. The Jew will not abandon the Land of Israel. He cannot abandon it. I have said that Palestine is of value by and of itself — its rocks, its hills, its ruins, its beauty — and that it is of value to Judaism even if our community here be small and poor. I am afraid the first of the quitters will be those who say it is useless except we be in the majority. But I also know that we can not establish our work as it should be established if it be against the determined will of the Arab world, and if we have not the good will of the «good European» world on our side. Palestine means so much in the Jewish scheme of things that I am sure that if the experiment fails, Heaven forbid, this time (due as always partly «to our own sins») there will be another time. But I do not want it to fail, and the only way it can succeed, so it seems to me, and that success is worth having, is if we overcome all obstacles through all the weapons of civilisation except bayonets: spiritual, intellectual, social, cultural, financial, economic, medical..... brotherly, friendly weapons. The Jew may have to be prepared to face for a further period the hostility of a section of Arabs and of English and others. Provided our own attitude is just and fair we should face that opposition and not abandon the struggle. Our goal must be to have our enterprise rest upon the conviction of all concerned that it is right and just,

Palestine is holy to the Jew in that his attitude towards this Land is necessarily different from his attitude towards any other land. He may have to live in other lands upon the support of bayonets, but that may well be something which he, as a Jew, cannot help. But when he goes voluntarily as a Jew to repeople his own Jewish Homeland, it is by an act of will, of faith, of free choice, and he should not either will or believe in or want a Jewish Home that can be maintained in the long run only against the violent opposition of the Arab and Moslem peoples. The fact is that they are here in their overwhelming numbers in this part of the world, and whereas it may have been in accord with Israelitic needs in the time of Joshua to conquer the land and maintain their position in it with the sword, this is not in accord with the desire of plain Jews or with the long ethical tradition of Judaism that has not ceased developing to this day.

Resumé of Mr. Philby's Article

New-York Times Nov. 24 1929

I.
1. Retention of the Balfour Declaration.
2. Retention of the Mandate.
3. Freedom of immigration subject to the capacity of the country to absorb immigrants.
4. Developing the Jewish national culture.
5. Settlement of Jews on the soil.
6. Continuance of the Jewish Agency.

II.
1. A national government of democratic republican complexion.
2. Every element in the population to have equal rights and representation on the basis of its numbers.
3. The special rights and interests of Jews and other minorities to be protected through the right of veto of the British High Commissioner in any legislative or other governmental action considered prejudicial to such interests.
4. High Commissioner to retain direct command and administration of the military forces, and be responsible for public security.

AN INTERNATIONAL ENCLAVE

New York Times Nov. 24, 1929

I am glad of the opportunity of commenting on Mr. Philby's statement, and I should say with all emphasis that I am speaking for myself alone, and not for any organization.

The statement of Mr. Philby is a great advance upon what is usually put forward as the Arab case in Palestine. If one were to compare this statement with the intransigent nationalistic attitude of the Arab Delegation as expressed in the Churchill-Samuel White Paper of June, 1922, it is apparent that much has been learned, fortunately, since that time.

Whereas then it was said that the »Balfour Declaration can not be accepted as a basis for discussion», now Mr. Philby sensibly declares that «no solution can be regarded as practical which postulates the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration«. Whereas then the mandatory idea, with its great international background, was reduced to making the Mandatory merely an »Assisting Power» for the immediate creation of an Arab independent government, Mr. Philby says that no practical solution can envisage »the abandonment of her mandatory position by Great Britain«. Finally, as far as

the Jewish position is concerned, Mr. Philby grants, what the Arab Delegation of 1922 refused to admit, that in any constitutional and legislative scheme, the High Commissioner, representing the League of Nations and the Mandatory, is to have wide powers, including the responsibility for the maintenance of security, something which the Jewish community, especially after the recent riots, must be fully guaranteed, and the right of veto, in order that international obligations may be met and the rights of minorities safeguarded; and he grants what has heretofore been resolutely contested, that »freedom of immigration subject to the capacity of the country to absorb immigrants might be stipulated as a condition precedent to the establishment of such a government; and the Arabs would certainly raise no objection even to the continuance of the present Jewish Agency to watch over and protect the interests of the Jews«.

Men of good will should be grateful to Mr. Philby for thus formulating so much of the case. For, it ought to be clear that it is impossible for Great Britain, the principal Allied and Associated Powers and the League of Nations to abandon international declarations which they have made so often and with so much solemnity. Even those who felt, like myself, that the form of the Balfour Declaration was a handicap rather than a help, because of its lack of clarity and more especially because it emphasized unduly the Jewish relationship to Palestine, rather than emphasizing

the nature of Palestine itself as an international Holy Land, can not wish to see international good faith discredited as it would be should this Declaration be nullified. From the point of view of international decency, if for no other reason, this is undesirable, »unthinkable«, to quote Mr. Philby. It is necessary, of course, to strip the Balfour Declaration of the extravagant meaning which the British Government permitted to be given it when it was issued; and the Declaration was thus stripped in a series of interpretations, most notably in the Churchill-Samuel White Paper of June, 1922, which was accepted formally and officially by the Zionist Organization as the basis of its policy. Unfortunately that organization has done all too little to carry this policy into effect or to educate the Jewish public as to its implications. Many good Jews are still under the impression that Palestine was "awarded" to the Jews. But this interpretation of 1922 put an end practically to what Mr. Philby calls "the political Zionist dream of ultimate domination of the Holy Land". What the Balfour Declaration gives the Jews after being thus whittled down is nothing more and nothing less than, in the words of the White Paper, that "the Jewish People is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance". This is a great thing – basing the historical connection of the Jewish People with Palestine upon a generally accepted international dictum; and this is, to my mind, no more than the Jews need have in order to enable them to make a home in Palestine of the kind that

Ahad Haam pictured, a spiritual and intellectual Centre for Judaism and the Jewish people, rooted in agriculture, industry and all kinds of labour.

Mr. Philby continues to the other side of the picture—the Arab. He says that "no solution is really feasible which ignores the unquestionable moral and legal rights of the Arabs". Here again he is right, and the only question is what these moral and legal rights of the Arabs are.

Mr. Philby cites the promises made to the Arabs through Sir Henry MacMahon in 1915 as the legal ground for the Arab demand for the "cancellation of the Balfour Declaration, the relinquishment of the Mandate, and the establishment of an independent national government in Palestine". In the White Paper of 1922 the British Government has declared that "it is not the case, that during the War His Majesty's Government gave an undertaking that an independent national government should be at once established in Palestine". It is not unthinkable that governments in war time should, unfortunately, make contradictory promises and declarations, and it is high time that this controversy be cleared up. This could perhaps be done through the appointment of a committee of historians—an Englishman, an Arab, a Jew—to go through the Arab Archives at the Foreign Office, and to publish authenticated and annotated texts of the fundamental documents, in some such way as is being done with other diplomatic archives in various countries, including England.

But the crux of Mr. Philby's argument, as is the Arab contention from the beginning, lies in what is called an independent national government. Mr. Philby himself qualifies the term "independent" by saying that "the Mandate cannot simply be abandoned". Indeed, I should add that from the international point of view, from the fact that Palestine is a land sui generis sacred to three great religions, it should always be under international control through a mandatory. This is probably the only way of safeguarding international obligations here, and of guaranteeing to all elements of the population—the majority as well as the minorities—their equal rights and privileges, including immigration, settlement on the land. and the living of a free cultural life.

On this account too it seems to me that the High Commissioner, who is to be clothed with such great powers, should, to be sure, be nominated by the Mandatory, but he should be confirmed by the League of Nations in order to emphasize his position not as Administrator so much as the symbol and guarantor of international obligations, rights and duties. Moreover, the Palestinian Government should have much more contact with the League of Nations generally.

But what is meant by the term «national government»? If it means Arab national or if it means Jewish national I am opposed to it. If, however, it means a bi-national government, a Palestinian Government, in which the word Palestine includes all three religions equally, a Palestinian government, moreover, that is more

than a petty autonomous Balkan thing, and that has its great international function to fulfill, i. e. to keep Palestine as the Holy Land, and to help make it into a Home for Jew, Christian and Moslem alike, then I am for it.

I am not unmindful of the risks of such an experiment particularly because of the political immaturity of large parts of the country, and the low state of morals and of education. But if Jew and Arab are to to live together in Palestine, it must be as an act of faith—of faith that they are brother peoples, and that they can rise above their weaknesses and their passions, however difficult this may now seem. And if it is only through an act of faith that living together under such complex conditions is at all thinkable, then the more generous and openhearted Jew and Arab are to one another right now during these times of hatred and distress, the longer they will remember each other in gratitude and friendship. If political concessions are to be made let them be made now with an open hand and ungrudgingly. The Jew must say to the Arab, "We want no political domination by any one", and the Arab must say to the Jew, "We recognize the Jew's full right to be here". Jew and Arab should sit down together and then submit their joint proposals to the Mandatory Power.

I should like the Palestinian nationality to mean that Palestine is no place for an Arab state or a Jewish state, or a British state, but that Palestine is a place

where all together will create an international enclave, an interreligious and an interracial home. If a constitution and a legislative machinery can be worked out with this in view it is everything that I, personally, should desire as far as the Jewish cultural and spiritual centre was concerned. Palestine should not be a place of political "domination" at all on anyone's part. It is of much more importance to mankind than that. It does not "belong" to Jew, Christian or Moslem, but to all of them together, to humanity. It does not belong, even in the narrower sense of that term, to its actual inhabitants, but to Jews and Christians and Moslems everywhere, for whom their brothers in the Holy Land have the privilege of acting as trustees. This making of Palestine the football of politics — Jewish, Arab, European, – ought to be brought to an end. Unless Palestine can be built up upon a high ethical basis it is not worth anyone's having. Let the political issue be settled so that the work of real cooperation along economic, cultural and social lines can begin in earnest. It is one of the high privileges of the present Labor Government in England to bring all its international idealism and all of its political ingenuity to bear in order to make the Holy Land sacred not only to religious bodies, but also to all those whose aim is peace on earth and good will to men.

The Joshua method is not the way for us of entering the Promised Land. The retention of bayonets in the land against the will of the majority of the

population is repugnant to men of good will, and the Eternal People should rather continue its long wait than attempt to establish a Home in the Holy Land, except on terms of understanding and peace.

A ROYAL COMMISSION

23,11,29 Jewday NewYork

Sole condition Times interview they publish in full stop would refer you letter from me London Jewish Chronicle August 26, 1921 and address May 1919 contained volume my Wartime Addresses also article in Day somewhere about 1921 stop Balfour Declaration having been confirmed so often such solemnity must remain and should become basis agreement between Jews and Arabs instead cause quarrel stop interpretation contained in Churchill Samuel White Paper 1922 which was officially accepted by Zionist Organization can serve as basis active constructive policy making Palestine not Jewish State not Arab State but Bi-National country stop this policy recognizes Jewish immigration settlement on Land and Hebrew culture as of right and not on sufferance as essentials development Jewish National Home this in harmony views Ahad Haam in preface 1921 edition his collected works which suggest you translate such policy genuine basis spiritual cultural centre rooted in agriculture industry and labour stop Palestine being Land two peoples three religions its international interreligious interracial and sacred cha-

racter must continue be recognized and emphasized this possible only if Palestine continues very long time perhaps always under League Nations Mandate thus safeguarding international obligations and guaranteeing all elements population their full rights. In any scheme to be drawn up Jewish rights as outlined above must be reserved as among international obligations that cannot be infringed stop working out this unique constitutional problem highly complicated and cannot be done in haste or in hatred stop selected group statesmen international lawyers political scientists should aid stop perhaps also Royal or International Commission should be appointed study problem all aspects stop but Jewish community must also shake off paralysis and start thinking and not leave this to official leaders alone stop intelligent discussion essential because issues involve our very existence here and Palestine too important permit us be hysterical uninformed unprepared stop if after intensive study all factors way can be found gradually carefully introducing appropiate responsible form self government guaranteeing all inhabitants and communities their full rights then I am for this stop if this self government merely mechanical thoughtless imitation western parliaments disregarding sui generis character Palestine including specific Jewish rights as above then I am opposed stop in any event transition from present absolutist colonial regime must be gradual stop main purpose my present efforts is simply that Jewish public be set thinking and educated

to realize that impossible continue as heretofore for all three factors Jews Arabs British and that without honestly scientifically thought-out political economic social educational program situation here untenable stop without this realization Jewish public will suffer disappointment disillusionment stop Jewish Palestine worthwhile only if made possible on highest ethical plane spirit of Judaism repugnant bayonets stop if force necessary over long period the loss outweighs gain almost all my life have believed in cleansing spiritualizing enriching power Palestine for Jews and Judaism but the process of building up Palestine for Jews and Judaism upon the basis of force and against will Arab world will inevitably cause deterioration Jewish community and our cultural spiritual values therefore if we mean our task seriously we must try uplift Arab world through genuine understanding education cooperation economically socially politically while at same time making our own community stronger and greater this possible only if Jewish People will supply large resources stop in any event long arduous process but this only way worth trying and the very effort adds glorious chapter history of eternal people stop the time to begin is now.

ZIONIST POLITICS:

New York, August 26, 1921.

To the Editor of the Jewish Chronicle.

Sir,—It is well to recognise, as the Jewish Chronicle has done, that the era of the Balfour Declaration is at an end, and it is well that the end has come so quickly. War time Zionism was almost exclusively Diplomatic Zionism. This was almost in the nature of the case, and the Zionist Diplomats have achieved amazing diplomatic triumphs. But war-time Zionism aroused swollen expectations among the Jews, just as the war did among other peoples. Palestine was to be presented to the Jews as a political gift, and the Jewish people was to be delivered, bag and baggage, to a single Imperialist Government in return for a political Declaration.

We now learn once again in our long and strange history how precarious are all political declarations, especially in times of war. We should have learned long ago that Jewish politics must be independent politics, sceptical of all political favours, even from the greatest and most unselfish of governments. In the nature of things the Jewish People, because of its minority position in the world and because of its spiritual tradition, cannot

benefit much from political gifts. It has too many enemies, and its soul is so made up that it can benefit, if at all, only from what it achieves through work and sacrifice. The political gifts of the iniquitous war and of the iniquitous peace are a snare and delusion to almost all the recipients. Why not also to the Jewish People?

Now that the illusion and the intoxication of the war and of Diplomatic Zionism are passing away, it is necessary to turn our eyes within and to build upon the inner strength of the Jewish People. This is the only permanent and reliable factor in the whole situation. Herzl was altogether right when he said: If the Jewish People wills it, it can come to pass. Not if anybody else wills it or does not will it. The Jewish People can be master of its own fate.

The war and the Balfour Declaration have left us at least this: That the peoples of the world are no longer strangers to the Palestine aspirations of the Jewish People and, what is of more importance, that the Jews are also no longer unaware of these aspirations.

We must build upon this. The Jews can achieve Palestine as the spiritual Centre of the Jewish People. The Jews are strong enough, rich enough in men, in ability, in money, and they are needful enough of all that Palestine can give to them and to the world. But they cannot achieve Palestine through war or political privilege, through oppression of their neighbours or *Mahyofis* dancing before even the greatest and noblest

of Christian Imperialist Powers. They can achieve Palestine only if they themselves will it, that is, if they are ready to labour for it on equal political terms with others who want it, and to make sacrifices and work hard on the spot for it.

No one can accuse the Jews of injustice and, what is of real importance, the Jews cannot accuse themselves of injustice when they demand from the world the *opportunity to make* of Palestine a Homeland, if they can, through labour and without political privilege or economic oppression. A Jewish Palestine that is just upon the face of it is: Free immigration into Palestine, free land purchase, and free cultural development. This ought to be the right of free people anywhere in the world; certainly the right of Jews in Palestine. This does not mean political favouritism. It does not compel good men to interpret "self-determination" as meaning one thing throughout the world and another thing for Palestine. This simple right means merely the opportunity to labour and to find joy in working out a great ideal justly.

I should like to dwell upon this view more at length because I think an understanding of it may help some to find their courage and their vision again. I shall do this upon the basis of correspondence with the President of the American Zionist Organisation in 1915, and with an unnamed friend in 1920.

It was in part this very issue that led to my resignation from the American Zionist Executive Committee in 1915 and that prompted the Executive to accept the

resignation for the reason, as they then contended, that my views were "no longer in agreement with the Basle programme". I cite this correspondence, not at all to arouse controversy, but in order to show that the issue is not of to-day alone but of yesterday and to-morrow.

This is a quotation from a letter which I sent the Executive on September 2nd, 1915, when America was not yet at war and when the Ottoman State and the Russian Empire were still intact.

"I want equal rights for the Jews, no more and no less, in all parts ot the world, including Palestine. I do not want it said as it has been said that the Jews of Russia, for example, should be denied equal rights in that country in view of the more than equal rights they are supposed to receive in Palestine at the end of the war at the expense of the Ottoman State. I want the Jews of Russia to be on a level with the other peoples of that Empire, and I expect the same equality for the Jewish People in Palestine—no more and no less.

Equal rights for the Jewish People in Palestine must mean that the Jews have the same rights as the other peoples of the Ottoman Empire. Just as the Turkish, the Arabic, the Armenian, and other groups of the Ottoman Empire should have full political rights and full freedom to develop their specific culture, that is, their religion, their language, their school system, so too should the Jewish group in Palestine have the same political rights and the same

cultural freedom. In this the Jewish People would be on the same level as the Moslem, the Christian as the Turkish, the Arabic, the Armenian, and other groups of that Empire.

All that we have a right to ask is, that the Jews be permitted to migrate to and settle in and develop their Jewish economic and cultural life in Palestine freely, just as other peoples of the Empire have the same right ...

The war cannot give Palestine to the Jews; the Turkish Government cannot give Palestine to the Jews. All that the war can give to the Jews, all that the Turkish Government can give to the Jews is free ingress into Palestine, and equal rights as I have described them above... As Zionists we believe that "the air of Palestine maketh wise"; that Jewish cultural values, Jewish religion, the Jewish outlook upon life will in the Holy Land have a natural growth that can fructify Jewish life throughout the world. The war cannot give this to us. All that we can ask of others is, free immigration and equal rights. If, with free immigration and equal rights, we cannot develop a Jewish cultural centre, our faith in the creative power of the Jewish People will have disappointed us. The Jewish people will then have shown that the hundreds of years of wandering and persecution have robbed it of its creative spirit. But I believe, as I know you believe, that given a fair chance, given equal opportunities,

the Jewish People will be able to develop their Jewish cultural centre in the Land of the Fathers."

I wish to quote now from a letter written to a friend just after the San Remo Conference in May 1920. When it was reported that the Balfour Declaration was to be made part of the Turkish Treaty, some Zionist functionary in Jerusalem ordered the Shofar of Messiah to be blown, and high Zionist authorities in America presumed to direct the Synagogues to be opened for the recitation of Psalms. For them Deliverance had come.

"You now have your Mandate, dear friend, and you seem very happy with it, and you ask me why I am not able to share your rejoicing.

"I wish I might, for it would be pleasant to give a lusty 'hedad' with those with whom I had the privilege of working for many years.

"Unfortunately the war has sobered me all too much. Not that I have lost my faith or my hope that Zion will welcome back her children, as the Comforters of our People have always predicted. But the war has given me a horror and a mistrust of all governments quite in line with the traditional Jewish suspicion and loathing of them: אל תתודע לרשות: Become not too intimate with Government. I mistrust the Mandate, the Peace Conference that gave it, and the League of Nations that is to sanction it. I do not want this gift to blind my eyes or to bribe me.

"I do not know the terms of the Mandate or what the Balfour Declaration really means, and as a consequence I cannot judge for myself the ability of the Jewish People to carry out its terms. But whatever its terms, the present state of the world, the dominance of economic imperialism, the precarious condition of the Jews of Eastern and Central Europe, the bewildering problems of the Eastern and the Mohammedan worlds, all make me fear that the Mandate has but very little reality to it, and that Palestine and the Jew are a kind of plaything in the hands of dark, unscrupulous forces, and it is rather pathetic to see the Jews—those great mourners and sufferers of the centuries-rejoicing and parading over the San Remo gift. One congratulatory telegram from Jerusalem was dated: "The First Year of the Redemption." The day before when the conference at San Remo was in doubt as to the status of the Balfour Declaration there was desolation among the Zionists and the Exile had not yet come to an end. But on the day when Messrs. Lloyd George, Millerand, and Nitti decided to incorporate the Balfour Declaration into the Turkish treaty, the Deliverance from Exile had come.

"Is it in truth the Deliverance from Exile for which Jews have prayed and struggled these centuries gone? Is that the way Deliverance comes? Suppose Lloyd George and Millerand and Nitti had said that thing instead of this, would we still be

counting the days of our Exile? I am afraid the Exile of a People does not end by political fiat and that Redemption does not begin with political favouritism. It is only the Exiled People itself that can put an end to its Exile through its inner freedom and inexorable will, and it is only through its own hard day by day labour and unchanging faith that a People can be redeemed. Certainly "the Jewish People with its complex problem" and its anomalous status in the world cannot be redeemed by a vague political decree.

"The growing imperialism and militarism of the world, which will doubtless lead to more devastating wars, can change the meaning of that decree in a twinkling and just as casually as it was granted. And where is the Redemption then?

"For those of us who believed in the necessity of Zion even under the Turks, the need of the Redemption is always clear, regardless of political circumstances. But it is clear, too, that the constant factor in the Redemption is the will, the faith, and the work of the Jewish People itself, and that the political circumstances are merely the accidents which are of more or less importance in accordance as the Jewish People is convinced of its own destiny. Indeed this rejoicing over an equivocal political accident would seem to indicate that the Zionists were not at all sure of the hold of the Zionist idea upon the inner convictions of the Jewish People, and that

it was hoped through hurrah and the usual political claptrap to suggest to the Jewish People that it had wanted Zion all along. I hope that the future is smooth. Otherwise the Mandate Zionists of to day may become the deserters of to-morrow. Naturally those of us who were not frightened by the Turk wil surely not be frightened by the British; and a Mandate with the Balfour Declaration, whatever its nature and by whomsoever exercised, gives the Jews certain opportunities for work which I hope are taken advantage of. But the economic imperialism of the British Empire, or of the United States, or any other imperialism is not to be relied upon. Doubtless, leaders in the Zionist Organisation see these things very clearly, but they are estopped from expressing them for fear of giving offence to their political benefactors. All the more reason, therefore, for others who are organisation outsiders to remind Jews of the old "Put not your trust in Princes," and to convince them that the Redemption and Deliverance either in Zion or elsewhere can only come through their own hard day by day work, and their making common cause with the day by day workers of all other peoples.

"San Remo is the legitimate heir to Versailles Almost every principle of democracy, of self-determination is denied. The fact is that Palestine has five or six times as many Arabs as Jews. You speak of the "historic rights" of the Jews to offset

the claims of the present-day Arab majority. I am aware of the way in which historic rights and strategic rights and economic rights have been manipulated whenever it suited the needs of the conquerors. Yet I, too, believe in the "historic right" of the Jewish People to the Land of Israel. But I mean thereby the free and unhindered opportunity to come into the land, to bring there their workers and peasants, their wealth of money, of brain, of human material, and thus to become in the course of time, if they can, the preponderant element of the population. In other words historic right means: Equal opportunities to Jews, Arabs, Syrians, Moslems, Christains, to live their lives freely and in proportion to their labour of brain and hand to achieve power and the direction of affairs. This is a just principle at which none could cavil. If nevertheless, objection was made to it by Arab or Syrian or Moslem or Christian, the Jewish People would have to maintain such a principle nevertheless as the basis of its Palestine policy, because it is founded not upon major force or upon hypothetical political power granted from without, but upon the ability of the Jewish People through labour to achieve its desired end.

"As it is, I believe you will find that you have gotten no more than this, no more than in justice the Jewish People should have. What I fear is that the Jewish People may get even less than this,

after all the promises and rejoicings, and we shall have neither the advantages of the Balfour Declaration nor the advantage of having been without it. We shall be made thus doubly weak and contemptible. You begin by thinking that the Balfour Declaration confers political primacy upon you and places the bayonets on your side. Because of this you think you can afford to bear, if you must, the resentment of your neighbours which is the inevitable result everywhere of political privilege granted to a minority from without. But what if by any chance of Imperial necessity these political promises are broken and political primacy is withheld from you? You have then achieved only hatred and contempt all around. . . .

"What under the circumstances would I have you do? A very simple thing. Give the Balfour Declaration a Jewish interpretation before someone else gives it the inevitable interpretation which will prick the political bubble of Declaration Zionism as we have gotten to know this Zionism from the official Zionist propaganda. We do not want the Jews to be a privileged class in Palestine, even if this be offered to us. Hasten to declare this before the offer of privilege is withdrawn by others. We want free access to the land, free opportunity to develop it and freedom to live the Jewish life in the broadest sense of this term. Nor do we want political privileges to be conferred upon anyone

else. We want equal rights for everyone, and this to be worked out not in the stereotyped political forms of the West, but in a manner conforming to the new civilisation in whose behalf we wish to people the ancient land. . ."

Recent events have confirmed the burning necessity of giving the Balfour Declaration a "Jewish" interpretation. It is by no means too late, although the handicap under which we start is very great. Honesty is the best Jewish politics. In fact, it is the only possible Jewish politics with some little chance of success. That may be hard on the Jews; and it may not even be politics at all. But so much the worse for the Jews and for politics. If the Jews play honest politics there is no guarantee that they will succeed or that their difficulties will be any the less numerous. But the only possible chance of political success for the Jewish People is to make their ordinary, workaday, political programme so clear and unequivocal and just that the Jewish people themselves will be able to maintain it spiritually in the face of inevitable attack. This is the essence of the matter. No Jewish policy can be predicated upon quick results. Individual Jews may know how to "get rich quick" but not Jewish policy. Jewish policy must be of such a nature that the Jewish People can look it in the face without shame over a long period of years and despite every difficulty. Any Jewish politician who denounces this as mere "idealism" and not practical politics, shows tha the does not know Jewish

life, and that as a politician he has become "assimilated". The one kind of Jewish "Realpolitik" with any chance must be based upon simple justice, because this is the Jewish tradition. Or, if you think this too self-righteous, because this is the only basis upon which a hostile world will let the Jewish People come into its own, if ever, and because this is the only basis upon which the Jewish People can take its stand against a world of enemies and maintain its political programme conscientiously, consecutively and vigorously.

But when once the Jewish people is convinced inwardly of the justice and generousness and reasonableness of its cause, it is the primary duty of leadership to be inexorable and unyielding in the struggle to achieve concrete results. Such a point, for example, is free Jewish immigration into Palestine. There is no right anywhere in the world if the harassed Jews have not the right to enter the Land of Israel and labour to make in their home. This does not mean necessarily that hordes of Jews must be admitted at once if physically the land cannot absorb them without disaster. Palestine is dreadfully poor. But that is one thing, and a point open to argument and adjustment; and another thing is, to restrict Jewish immigration from political, or imperialistic, or nationalistic, or other such motives.

Zionists must not imagine that Palestine is a thing all by itself, and that it is immune from the influences that affect the rest of the world. Just as the creation of a National Home in Palestine does not mean Jewish

withdrawal from participation in the world's affairs, so Palestine itself cannot escape the political, social, and spiritual struggles of the Western and the Eastern worlds. In this maelstrom the Jewish People cannot hope to arrive at any port except through simple justice. The injustice of the world to the Jews cannot be used politically as an excuse for the Jews to do injustice. This may be hard, but until it is learned Jewish politics is doomed to disillusionment and failure.

THE WORKERS OF ZION

Address of behalf of

THE LIBERATION FUND OF THE POALE ZION

Manhattan Opera House, New York

May 31, 1919.

The purposes of the Liberation Fund for Palestine including as they do plans for coöperative colonization, coöperative industrial undertakings, courses for workingmen and other enterprises that progressive, Jewish workers may be expected to have in mind, must commend themselves to every one, be he a member of your organization or not.

It is not my purpose to discourse upon the particulars of this program. What I want to say is that Jewish life has great need of the Poale Zion, that Palestine now needs the Workers of Zion as it needs its very lifebreath.

This is a day of the freeing of peoples. The Jewish people among them is to be freed. But in this day of the freeing of peoples there is at least as much need as there was yesterday of democratic, liberty-loving, forward-looking men and women. The peoples

are being freed, so it would appear, by a Peace Conference that seems to know but very little of what freedom means.

The new Jewish Palestine begins under a great disadvantage. Palestine is, so they say, to be "given" to the Jewish people. To my mind, no Peace Conference has the right to give any land to any people, even though it be the Land of Israel to the People Israel. If self determination be a true principle for other peoples' it is just as true for the Jewish people, here, there, and everywhere. If democracy means something for the oppressed peoples of the world, it must mean just that thing for the Jewish people. As I look at it, the Peace Conference has no more right to give Palestine to the Jewish people than it has to give, let us say, Tyrol to Italy, or certain parts of Germany to Poland, or other territories to other peoples, except upon the principle of self determination. If we are to be true democrats, we must be true democrats in Jewish life as well. Our new beginnings in Palestine are burdened by this gift.

We stand over against the great Arab democracies as interlopers, as a people seeking favors at the hands of the powerful governments, of the imperialist forces of the world. This is a handicap that the Jewish people in Palestine will have to contend with for at least a generation, and it is to the workers of Palestine, to the democratic and liberal and radical forces of the Jewish people that we must look for an entente cordiale, to

be established between the Jews of the land and the other peoples there. It must be the workers who, by a process of education, of frankness, of patience, of devotion to democracy wherever it may be, who are not wiling for the Jewish people to be the tail to any imperialist kite; it is to the Jewish workers we must look to convince the Arab peoples, themselves struggling for freedom and liberty and independence, that we Jews want nothing for ourselves that we are not wiling to give to every one, be it to the least, be it to the greatest of the peoples. The Poale Zion, the Workers of Zion, are therefore needed in this coming generation of great conflicts between Eastern and Western civilizations, between great religious movements, such as Pan-Islam and Pan-Judaism, and Pan-Christianity. In all this process of freeing the peoples of the Near East, the Middle East, the Far East, it is the Workers of Zion to whom we Jews must look to carry forward this genuine conception of freedom, of liberty, which seeks no petty political favor, no patronization from the great or the powerful of the world, but which would seek for the Jews as for all peoples the right to determine their own destiny in the land of the fathers or wherever they my be.

Palestine needs the Workers of Zion furthermore in order that Zion may be made for the Workers of Zion a fit place to dwell in.

The Zionist Organization of America, at its Piltsburg conference a year ago, adopted an economic and political program that is worthy of a great people such as ours.

It is now the function of the Poale Zion, the Workers of Zion, to see to it that this program, so beautifully worded, is carried into effect. It would seem to be a characteristic of the new day of free democracies that what we say with our lips we are not always ready to carry into action with our hands and our hearts and our minds. The Workers of Zion must hold those strictly to account who have given voice to this forward-looking program. It is all very well to be a real estate proprietor in Brownsville and suck out of the people whatever can be sucked out, and at the some time offer lip service to this beautiful program for Palestine far away. What the Workers ot Zion must see to is, that this program is regarded in earnest, that they give their lives, their arms, their spirits to its realization, that they become an integral part of the great development to which the beauteous land of our fathers looks forward. When in England they pass through a great crisis such as the present, the Government invites into conference representatives of the organized employers and of the organized employees and creates what is to be known as an industrial conference The Workers of Zion are needed now at the very beginning as an integral part of the new economic organism. Palestine itself is a beauteous, but a small land. Some economic theories that may be possible of realization in more developed countries may be impossible of realization in the same way in Palestine. The organized workers of the land must be made at least an equal partner

with the organized employers and organized capital, and with such government and other forces as may be permitted to develop in the course of the years.

The Workers of Zion are needed, finally, in Palestine in order that they may contribute of their free spirit to the new Jewish culture of the land. The Poale Zion are making an interesting, a radical experiment. On the one hand they are nationalists, on the other hand they are radicals. There is an essential contradiction between chauvinistic nationalism and radicalism. It becomes one of the prime functions of the Poale Zion to show the essential harmony between a broad, liberal Jewish nationalism and their deep radicalism, in the contributions they make to the rising Jewish culture of the new Jewish land. There is the further contradistinction between religion on the one hand and radicalism on the other. Whether or not the Poale Zion call their devoted work by the name of religion, to my mind that which they are to contribute through the pouring out of their mind and their heart will be material for the Jewish religion of to-morrow, just as the continued study ofTorah and of our tradition by the traditionally religious continues to provide the traditional material which is to be woven into the new religion, the religion of to-morrow. Those Jews who live in the Jewish life of the past, who love the Torah, who are devoted to all the piety, thc mysticism, the hopes of the tradition of our fathers, must in the course of time work side by side with those radical Jews who

are imbued with the magic of the new life, with the hopes of new and freer peoples in order that the enriched culture of to-morrow may overcome, if it be possible at all, the contradistinction between religion and radicalism, between religion and nationalism. It is thus that there may be created a complete, harmonious life such as we would wish our people to live.

May our bondage be shaken off! May we have the merit to be led into our heritage erect, with high hearts, honoring the truth as we see it, devoted to justice not only for ourselves, but for other men as well. May there be a rebirth, a liberation of creative forces among the Jewish workers of the world, in order that the liberation, the revival in the land of Israel may be carried through in cleanness, in sanctification, and not in fraud, and not in oppression, and not in hypocrisy, and not by receiving favors and patronage from the great and the powerful. To-day others govern the world. To-morow may it be the workers of the world who govern the world.

(Translation)

PREFACE
"AT THE CROSS WAYS"
by AHAD HAAM

New Edition, Berlin, 1921. (Jüdischer Verlag)

The four volumes of this work are to be issued anew. This would indicate that they are still wanted, although life and its needs have changed greatly since these essays were written and many of the problems that troubled me and my generation have disappeared. I did not expect to be worthy of this in my old age, more especially now that our national problem and in particular the revival in Palestine — with which this work has been concerned—have been given by the World War an entirely different turn which no one of us could have foreseen. There are to be sure voices which

While this pamphlet was in press, I learned that Ahad Haam's Preface, with the exception of the first two paragraphs, had been translated into English by Mr. Leon Simon in his book, pp. XIII—XXIII, "Ten Essays on Zionism and Judaism by Achad Haam", Routledge, 1922. It was possible to take advantage of Mr. Simon's translation here and there, but I regret exeedingly that it was not possible to place before the reader the full text of Mr. Simon's clear and precise rendering.

proclaim grandiloquently and triumphantly: «Admit, now, that there were "prophets" among us who foresaw coming events and whose vision led them to prepare for the great day to come». But I wonder if such cries can really make an impression. All of us are witnesses of how suddenly the world-catastrophe came, and there had arisen no "prophet" in Israel or among the nations who really foresaw the impending calamity and who had deliberately prepared himself for its coming or who had directed his activities to meet the new situation.

However that be, I feel the deep need of prefacing this new edition with at least a few general remarks concerning the extent to which my views on questions that have concerned me all my life may have been modified. The terrible storm has uprooted many old "truths" and has forced every thinking person to test his innermost convictions and his attitude towards himself, his people and mankind generally. But my fortune would have it that I should take severely ill—the storm itself was chiefly responsible—and thus be deprived of the opportunity of considering carefully with open eyes aud ears what has been happening in the world at large and in our own Jewish world. I need therefore hardly say that I have been unable to gather and work up the necessary material or to place it before the reader in proper literary form. It is possible, that this being the case, I should have kept silent; the more so because I have been silent for a long time for other

reasons. But I must confess that it would be most difficult for me to stand aside and to see this book the chief work of my life, reappear after its disappearance from the book market, without my accompanying it on its way with at least a few words. These words cannot explain my views on all of our present problems, but they can nevertheless show the main trend of my thoughts, as also the main "problem" that I should want these volumes really to solve.

When I returned from Palestine in 1912 and published my essay, "Summa Summarum" and brought upon myself resentment in several quarters, I wrote a brief explanatory "Supplement" to that essay, and I wish to recall some of the words which seem to me to be appropriate:

"There must be some natural connection as of cause and effect between every goal and the means to be employed for the attainment of that goal. We must have an answer to the question: How is this particular goal to be attained through these means? As long as this causal connection does not exist and as long as we have no other answer to the question except vague phrases such as: "Perhaps.... Who knows?.... Times change...." just so long may we have pleasing hopes and afar off ideal, but not a practical aim which can serve as the basis of a practical policy. For, every practical policy must be based upon a clear idea (whether intellectual or imaginative) of a causal chain connecting different activities and leading them to the appointed goal.—And should you say:

"Who can foretell the future? Perhaps unforeseen things will happen to change the face of reality?" Yes, it is possible. But it is not possible that this should serve as the basis of a practical policy for present day activity. It is but a vision of some distant future".

Abour two years after these words were published the World War broke out, and with it, "There happened things unforeseen which changed the face of reality". Our life too was caught up in the complex of world events and reality for us has taken on a new aspect. There is much to say, and much has already been said for and against, in the Diaspora and in Palestine as to the nature of these new aspects. But, as already mentioned, I am not now able to make a comprehensive statement, and I wish only to say a few words about one of the chief features of our new situation, namely, the prospect of enlarged activities in Palestine because of the well known Declaration of the British Government, which was ratified recently by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference and which has thus been converted from being merely the promise of one Government into an international obligation. This Declaration has provided a new basis for a practical policy for the present and for large future activities which hitherto were merely the subject of speeches and essays without any real basis in the present. But at the same time the Declaration has given new wings to the imagination of those already accustomed to building castles in the air, without reckoning with reality on earth below;

and this is, I fancy, one of the reasons why my essays still are in demand, though much of what is in them no longer corresponds to present day reality. It is not so much the content that matters here, as the method in accordance with which I have tried to consider current questions from time to time. I have tried to draw conclusions not upon the basis of some vague and and cloudy "Who knows ?..." but upon the basis of actual present reality or of such future reality as might be inferred from actual conditions. There is need to reiterate this method now. The "miracle" has happened: that which was far from being a reality only a short time back has now become partly real. Those who have waited for miracles all along now think themselves justified and they demand that their method be continued in accordance with the perverted principle that if a thing like this happens once under abnormal conditions, it is possible that it will happen again, and that we can therefore build up our world as we please without bothering with present realities, relying upon a repetition of the miracle when we need it. The Jewish maxim says: "A successful mistake is none the less a mistake". A method of work foreign to reality and relying upon abnormal happenings to make reality over for its benefit is mistaken even if it achieves one success. If it continues to rely upon chance which does sometimes intervene in the normal course of events and to act upon this basis, it is bound to fail despite its previous triumph.

All the details of the course of the diplomatic "conversations" in London leading to the Declaration have not yet been published. But the time has come to reveal one "secret" which will enable the reader to understand the real meaning of the Declaration.

"To facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish People"—this is the text of the promise which the British Government has made to us. But this was not the text which was proposed to it by the Zionist representatives. They wished to have it read: "The re-constitution of Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish People". When the happy hour arrived for the signing and sealing of the Declaratlon by the Government, it was found to contain the first text in place of the second. That is to say, the suggestion was deleted that we are to "re"-establish our "old" National Home and instead of the words "the reconstitution of Palestine as the national home" it read: "The establishment in Palestine of a National Home". Understanding persons realized at once the meaning of this. But others thought that there was merely a stylistic change without any particular significance. They therefore tried several times thereafter, whenever opportunity presented in their dealings with the Government, to transcribe the promise into their wording as though nothing had been changed. But every time they found in the Government answer a repetition of the text as contained in the Declaration, proving thereby, that here was no casual phrase that you might formulate this

way or that, but that the promise was really limited to this fomula, to this and nothing more.

I wonder if it is necessary to waste words in explaining the difference between the two formulations. Had the British Government adopted the version proposed to it: That Palestine be re-constituted as the National Home of the Jewish People, the promise could have been interpreted as meaning, that the present inhabited country would once again be turned over to the Jewish people upon the ground of its historic right, and that the Jewish people would build its waste places and govern it in the future and manage the affairs of the country in its own way without taking into account the consent or non-consent of the present inhabitants. This reestablishment would merely be the renewal of the ancient right of the Jews, which abrogates the right of the present inhabitants, who had established their national home wrongly in a land that was not theirs. But the British Government, as it said expressly in the Declaration itself, did not want to promise anything that would injure the present inhabitants of Palestine. It therefore changed the Zionist formula and gave it a more restricted form. Apparently the Government thinks that a people which comes in the name alone of the moral force of its historic right to build its national home in a land now populated by others and which has no strong army or powerful fleet "to prove the justice of its cause",—that such a people should get no more than what it really and justly should

have and not what world conquerors might apportion to themselves by armed force or by reason of a variety of "rights" devised to cover up their forceful acts. Indeed the historic right of a people in relation to a country inhabited by others can mean nothing but the right to return and to settle on the ancestral soil, to till it and to develop its resources without hindrance. If the inhabitants complain that strangers have come to exploit the land and its people, historic right comes and confounds them: No, in this land they are not strangers but the descendants of the former masters of the country and immediately that they return and settle upon the soil it is as if they were born here. And not for the settlers as individuals alone, but also for the whole community as a People, seeing that it is returning and bringing into the land a portion of its national resources -- men, capital, cultural institutions, etc — it becomes their national home again and they have the right to enlarge and improve this home in so far as they can. Yet this historic right does not invalidate the right of the rest of the land's inhabitants, who have a genuine right to the land due to generations of residence and work upon it. For them too this country is a national home and they have the right to develop their national potentialities to the uttermost. This, therefore, makes Palestine into a common possession of different peoples, each endeavoring to establish here its national home, and under such circumstances it is impossible that the national home of either of them should be complete and contain

everything included in this conception. If you build your home not on an empty field, but in a place where there are other homes and inhabitants, you are master only as far as the gate of your home. There, within, you can arrange things as you choose, but beyond the gate all the inhabitants are partners, and the general administration must be arranged from the point of view of the common good. Thus "national homes" of different people in the same country can claim national freedom for themselves only in internal affairs, while the conduct of the common interests of the country is to be entrusted to all the "house holders" together, provided the relations between them and their cultural status qualify them for this. Otherwise this task is to be entrusted to an outside trustee who shall see to it that no ones rights are infringed.

When therefore the British Government promised to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish People, and not, as was proposed to it, the re-constitution of Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish People, its intention was twofold: 1. the recognition of the historic right of the Jewish People to establish its National Home in Palestine, the British Government promising to aid in this, and 2) the denial of any right to deprive the present inhabitants of their rights and of making the Jewish people the sole ruler of the country. The National Home of the Jewish people must be built of the free available material still to be

found in the country and of the material which the Jews bring in from without or which they create through their work, and this without demolishing the National Home of the other inhabitants. Inasmuch as the two homes are along side of one another and it is hardly possible that there be no disputes and conflicts of interest, particularly during the initial period of the building of the Jewish National Home, of which not even the foundation stones have as yet been properly laid, the promise necessarily carries with it, though this is not stated specifically, the appointment of a trustee over the two homes, i. e. over the whole country, for the purpose of securing, that the possessor of the historic right, while not injuring the actual inhabitants in their internal affairs, should not himself encounter obstacles placed in his way by his neighbour who is at present the stronger. In the course of time, when the new National Home acquires its roof and is able not less than its neighbor to depend upon rights resulting from the life and the labour of its own large population it will then be possible to raise the question if the time has not come to turn over the government of the country to the householders themselves upon the basis of an agreement to conduct their common affairs justly and fairly, in accordance with the needs of each of them and the value of the efforts of each for the revival and development of the country.

This, and no more, is, so it seems to me, what

it is possible to find in the British Declaration, and this and no more is what our leaders and writers should have told the people, so that no more should be imagined than what is really there and so that the people do not relapse into despair and lose their belief in the whole enterprise.

But do not all of us know how the Declaration was interpreted when it was published and how much of exaggeration has been read into it by spokesmen and writers from that day to this? The Jewish People heard and believed that the end of the Exile had come and that in but a little while Palestine would become "The Jewish State". Also the Arab people, which we have regarded from the beginning of our colonization as non-existent, heard and believed that the Jews were coming to dispossess them from their soil and to do with it what they chose. All this naturally occasioned controversy and bitterness on both sides and contributed in large measure to that state of affairs which was revealed in all its ugliness in the events at Jerusalem last Passover.*) From these events together with others

*) The reader will permit me to remind him that 29 years ago when I returned from my first trip to Palestine, I called attention to the gross blunder that had taken root among us, in thinking the Arab inhabitants of Palestine "wild men of the desert" "who do not see or understand what is going on about them", whereas as a matter of fact "the Arabs see and understand, particularly the city inhabitants, what we are doing and what we desire in the land. But they are silent aud pretend not to know, because they see no danger in our present activities for their own future. Let the time but

that preceded them, we should have learned how long is the road from a promise on paper to its realization in fact, and how many the obstacles, not easily to be removed, which are still in our path. But, so it seems, we have learned nothing, and only a few days after the Jerusalem events, when the British promise was ratified at San Remo, we began once again to blow the Shofar of Messiah and to announce "the Redemption", etc. This ratification of the promise, as I said above, lifted the promise to the level of an international obligation, and from this point of view there is no doubt of its great value. But nothing was added to the essence of the matter, and the earlier formulation of the promise remains without any modification whatsoever. We have already seen above what its real interpretation is. But because of its brevity and its vagueness, it allows room to those who so desire—as experience in Palestine has shown—to restrict its meaning much more, almost to nothingness. Everything depends on the good will of the "trustee", who was charged at San Remo with carrying the promise into effect. Had we considered facts as they are, we should have restrained our feelings and have waited a bit to see how the written document is to be interpreted in practice.

I have perhaps drawn this matter out unduly because it is fundamental to all the rest. But in truth there are now before us difficult, internal

come when our own life in the country so develops that the people of the country feel our pressure more or less, they will not then so easily relinquish their hold" ("Truth from Palestine". At the Cross Ways I, 28).

problems that require an answer without delay, and the solutions we hear from time to time are as far removed from reality as is heaven from earth. It will not be long before these fanciful proposals, which are attractive to be sure, will be compelled to give way to actual work and it will be our task to show in practice how far we have the material and moral strength to establish the national home which it has been granted us to establish in Palestine.

And at so great and difficult an hour, I stand before my readers, perhaps for the last time, at the threshold of this book, and I repeat my old warning, on which the majority of the essays in this collection are but a commentary:

Do not hasten the End, so long as the actual conditions without which it cannot come have not been created, and, having regard to actual conditions, let not the work that is possible at any given moment be too small in your eyes, even though it bring not Messiah today or tomorrow...

London 4 Sivan 5980. May 21,1929