



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Statement by Referee of Master's Thesis

The M.H.L. dissertation entitled:

"A Historical Survey of the Jewish Territorial
Organization"

written by Norman Kahan
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for
publication (☒)
cannot be considered for publication (☐)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library (☒)
may not be loaned by the Library (☐)

Ellis Rivkin
(signature of referee)

Ellis Rivkin
(referee)

Feb. 2, 1952
(date)

Recd. 10/78

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE JEWISH
TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION

by

Norman Kahan

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
January, 1951

Referee:
Professor Ellis Rivkin

DEDICATED

with love and reverence to my parents.

to

Rev. Shaina Kahanowitch
Fannie Kahanowitch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	111
Background to ITO	3
The Jewish Territorial Organization	
A. Leaders and Members	25
B. Geographical Commission	36
C. Immigration Problems	38
D. The Galveston Movement	40
Diplomatic Activity	49
ITO and Zionism	63
Socialist-Territorialism	76
Dissolution of ITO and the Reasons for its Failure	81
Territorialism Continues	89
Footnotes	94
Bibliography	99

Summary of the Thesis

"A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE JEWISH TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION"

Territorialism is a nationalist ideology which implies Jewish survival in a land of its own. The Jewish Territorial Organization was formed after the Zionists refused to accept the offer of the British Government of a territory in East Africa in 1905. In this thesis the author discusses all of ITO's activities, which included not only a search for an 'autonomous territory' but also an attempt to regulate the mass Russian emigration. The reasons for ITO's gathering to its colors the leaders of world Jewry as well as the reasons for the failure of this organization form an integral part of this paper. In addition, the author discusses the relationship between ITO and the Zionists and ITO and the Socialist Territorialists during this period of history.

The writer of the thesis was fortunate in having had access to the ITO files, preserved in the General Zionist Archives, Jerusalem. In addition, there was much use made of Jewish publications between 1900 and 1905. There has been relatively little research done in this field since there has been little investigation of the tremendous amount of material that is available in the Israel Zangwill and ITO files of the Zionist Archives.

There have been many attempts since the dissolution of ITO to revive territorialism as a solution to the Jewish problem. Even today, despite the establishment of the State of Israel, there is a territorialist organization in existence, the Jewish

Freeland League. But no territorialist group ever made a greater impact on world Jewry nor attracted as many renowned Jewish leaders throughout the world as did ITO. To ITO's ranks were attracted such men as Israel Zangwill, Jacob Schiff, Lord Rothschild, Paul Nathan, Nachum Syrkin and Max Mandelstamm.

The story of ITO, as revealed in this study, is not only the story of the Jewish problem but it also involves the motives of the World Powers during this period of colonial expansion. While ITO did not succeed in its undertakings and did not capture the imagination of the Jewish people, it did attempt to provide an answer to the question of the day, 'wohin?' It is the story of the East European Jewish migration at the beginning of the 20th Century and how the Western Jews coped with this problem.

Norman Kahan

INTRODUCTION

It has been over twenty five years since the death of Israel Zangwill and yet no one has written a full and comprehensive biography of this great Jewish author and lecturer. There has been no full investigation into the tremendous Zangwill file in the Zionist General Archives in Jerusalem, Israel. Until this had been done, no one can tell the full story of the Jewish Territorial Organization. For the story of ITO is also the story of Israel Zangwill, who was its founder, president and moving spirit.

This movement that played such an important role in Jewish History at the beginning of the Twentieth Century until the first World War, has, itself, never been fully explained. This may be due to the fact that there is little available source material concerning ITO to be found outside of the ITO files in Jerusalem. It may also be explained by the fact that there is usually little interest in unsuccessful movements unless they appeared hundreds of years ago. Yet, despite the fact that ITO died only twenty seven years ago, there is an amazing lack of knowledge concerning this movement that at one time was Zionism's main rival and one that attracted the great Jewish leaders of its time.

There have been several articles on Territorialism. Perhaps the best of these is the excellent historical sketch by Abraham Duker in the Contemporary Jewish Record. This article traces the growth of Jewish Territorialism, in general, up to the days just prior to the second World

War. An excellent thesis on the Diplomatic Negotiations of the Jewish Territorial Organization and the Reasons for their Failure was written by David Marmor, a student of the Hebrew University, who based his material on the archive of ITO that is preserved in the Zionist General Archives in Jerusalem.

Because of the author's interest in Zionism and having had the opportunity of doing some research at the Zionist Archives, it soon became apparent to the writer of the limitless possibilities that this subject offered. Since time would not permit a complete research in the life of Israel Zangwill, which is in itself a life's work; and time would not allow for the fullest investigation in all aspects of ITO's activities, this paper will be devoted to a survey study of the Jewish Territorial Organization.

The material used by the author will be both original source material and secondary sources. The thesis will examine the background of ITO, showing how it developed out of Zionism and a Territorial movement that had been going on, possibly, since the settlement in the territory of Goshen in Egypt during Biblical days. The factors that brought Territorialism to the fore despite the emotional appeal of Zionism will then be discussed. The ITO platform, the leaders and followers that it attracted, will then be considered. Unlike other organizations, the ITO felt that it was possible to deviate from its main activity, and it became a partner in the Galveston Movement, which sought to channel off immigration from New York

and divert it through the port of Galveston to the unsettled areas in the South and West. How ITO succeeded in this undertaking will be the next subject considered. The prime purpose of ITO was, of course, to find a territory. Chapter 3 will deal with this search, showing how the general world conditions played an important role in determining the availability of the territories and how the Geographical Commission interested themselves in finding an immediate solution to the problem of the "wandering Jew." The relationship of Itoism to Zionism and Itoism to the Socialist Territorialist movements is then considered. The final chapters deal with the reasons for the failure of ITO and the future activity of Territorialism following ITO's dissolution.

In preparation for this thesis, I have had the assistance and invaluable help of Mr. Walter Ackerman; Mr. J. Alsberg, and other personnel of the Zionist Archives in Jerusalem; Mrs. Bella Shaefer, of the Hebrew Union College Library; and Dr. Mark Wischnitzer, Yeshiva University, New York. I am indebted to Dr. Jacob Marcus, eminent historian and Director of the American Jewish Archives, for permission to use some of the original source material he has gathered in connection with the Galveston Movement.

I should like to express my deepest appreciation to my teacher and friend, Dr. Ellis Rivkin, who not only showed a constant interest in the subject matter but who also made many invaluable suggestions that were especially

helpful to the writer.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to my devoted wife, Shirley Segal Kahan, of whom it can truly be said: "A woman of valor who can find? for her price is far above rubies."

BACKGROUND TO ITO

The sack of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Second Temple by the Roman Legions of Titus, in the year 70 A.D., marked the end of the Jewish people as an independent nation living in a land of its own. The State of Judaea struggled on some sixty years longer, only to succumb completely after the unsuccessful revolt of Bar Kochba¹ in 134 A.D. The loss of independence and the subsequent dispersal of the Jews gave rise to a deep-rooted desire for the restoration of Israel as a free people, living in its own land again in accordance with its laws and customs.

From the very beginning, this yearning was invested with the sanctity and solemnity of a religious creed. Three times a day the observant Jew turned eastward during his daily prayers and prayed for the end of the dispersion and the return of Israel to its promised land. The lengthy grace recited after meals gave further expression to the pious hopes of a Jerusalem rebuilt and a Zion restored. Twice a year, during the Passover Festival and at the close of the solemn service of the Day of Atonement, each Jew renewed his allegiance to the hopes of the people with the declaration, "Next year in Jerusalem."

The Jewish people were in exile. But central to the life in exile was the idea that some day, by the grace of God, the Messiah would appear and lead them back to the land of their ancestors. Meanwhile, prayers and study and

righteousness might hasten the day of redemption. Evidence of the intensity of this faith in the coming of the Messiah and the day of redemption of Israel in its own land may be found in the enthusiastic receptions given the false Messiahs who appeared during the Middle Ages and after. David Reubini, Shlomo Malcho, Sabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank, each in his own time, inspired a devotion and faith in his followers which only centuries of hope² and prayer could produce.

The hope for the return to Zion permeated Jewish life. The centuries of persecution and suffering only served to strengthen this belief and to make its realization more necessary and vital to the existence of the Jews. Had the Jews experienced a greater measure of tolerance on the part of their rulers and neighbors, it is conceivable that the longing for their national rehabilitation might have abated with the lapse of time. But, the intervals of peace and comfort that they enjoyed were too few, too brief and restricted to exercise more than a local or transient influence. However, it was not until the middle of the 19th century that any practical steps were taken to convert the idea into a reality. The story of modern Zionism in the western world began in the second half of the last century. It came on the tail of almost a century-long attempt to guarantee the Jews of Europe political emancipation and civil equality. Moses Hess, a former colleague of Marx and Engels, was among the first

to realize the futility of these efforts. In 1862, he produced his classic work Rome and Jerusalem, which was in time to become one of the canons of Jewish nationalism. In a scathing criticism of those who supported the idea of emancipation, Hess advocated the restoration of the Jews as a national entity on its ancestral land. Emancipation, even if possible, was undesirable because "the European nations may tolerate us, but they will never respect us," and also because the Jews were a nation and it was "only with the national rebirth that the religious genius of the Jews" would be "endowed with new strength and again be inspired with the prophetic spirit." It was Hess's contention that work should begin immediately towards the establishment of colonies in Palestine.

Even Orthodox Jews manifested spirit of impatience with the traditional reliance upon the arrival of the Messiah. In the same year that saw the publication of Hess's Rome and Jerusalem, Rabbi Hirsch Kalischer, a leader of the Orthodox German Rabbinate, argued in D'rishat Zion that the salvation of the Jews promised by the Prophets could only come in one way--self help. To this end, he advocated the organization of a colonization scheme in Palestine and succeeded in interesting the Alliance Israelite Universelle in his idea to the extent that the organization established an agricultural school, Mikve Yisroel, near Jaffa.

The ideas of Kalischer and Hess found little response however in the minds and hearts of the Jews of western

Europe. In England, also, the far sighted plans of Sir Moses Montefiore for the establishment of Jewish colonies in Palestine met with indifference.

In eastern Europe, however, Jewish hearts were receptive to practical nationalist ideas. The barbaric anti-Jewish program, of Czarist Russia, had made the need of self-help undeniably clear.³ The violent wave of pogroms in 1881 and 1882 gave added impetus to the Zionist idea of a Jewish home in Palestine, where free from fear and hate the Jews could develop a normal creative life. This new impetus found expression in the Biluim, who left Russia to build in Palestine a settlement based on socialist principles, and the growth of Chovevei Zion (Lovers of Zion) Societies all over Russia.⁴ The purpose of the Lovers of Zion was to promote the settlement of Jews in Palestine. Their views were supported by such nationalist writers as Peretz Smolenskin and Moshe Lillienblum. Common to these men was the idea that the future of Israel was to be found only as an independent people settled on its own soil in Palestine and not as a widely dispersed people whose existence was subject to the whims and fancies of hostile governments and peoples.

Perhaps the most powerful arguments for the re-establishment of Israel on its own land was advanced by Dr. Leo Pinsker in his pamphlet, "Auto-Emancipation." Pinsker saw the solution to the Jewish problem in the establishment of a Jewish National Home. "If you do not take advantage of

the fleeting moments of repose, and devise remedies more fundamental than these palliatives with which the incompetent have for centuries vainly tried to relieve our unhappy nation, lasting peace is impossible for you..... the prayer, the only remedy would be the creation of a Jewish nationality, of a people living upon its own soil, the auto-emancipation of the Jew.....the international Jewish question must receive a national solution."⁵

It has been asked why the Jews were not alive to the possibility of colonization when other nations about four hundred years ago started to settle overseas. Why is it that the Jews did not seize the opportunities which were created after the discovery of the New World and the opening of the sea routes to the east ? One answer has already been noted. Before the period of emancipation at the end of the eighteenth century, the Jews were completely dominated by religious and messianic ideals which were centered on Palestine, and which excluded any other territory. Even the restoration of Jews to Palestine was envisaged as a supernatural act proceeded by the appearance of the Redeemer. Moreover, the colonizing nations were, of course, backed by their own governments. It was no accident that the successful colonists were those who belonged to nations which had first attained a higher degree of unity and cohesion. This naturally left out such nations as the Italians and the Germans, who were disunited, as well as the Jews who were scattered over the world.

However, as individuals, the Jews were not unaware of

the opportunities in the New World and elsewhere. There are on record a large number of attempts to alleviate the conditions of the Jews, caused by their dispersion, and settle them upon a territory which would be their very own. As early as the year 1652 a tract of land in the island of Guracao under the authority of the Dutch West India Company, was put at the disposal of Joseph Nunez da Fonesca and others to found a colony for the Jews in that island. The experiment ended in failure. About 1654 a similar project was formed for the settlement in Surinam for Jews who were forced to escape from Brazil upon its reconquest by the Portugese.⁶ A grant was made in 1659 to David Nasi (whom Cecil Roth feels is Joseph Nunez de Fonesca, mentioned above)⁷ authorizing him to found a colony for Jews in Cayenne. In the year 1656, James Harrington, the English political philosopher, advocated in his "Oceana" the return of the Jews to the soil as in Biblical times and their wholesale transportation to Ireland.⁸ "In 1749 Marshall de Saxe, the natural son of August II, the King of Poland, toyed with the idea of establishing a Jewish State in South America with himself as the king. He took a fancy to become a king and on looking around found all the thrones occupied. He cast his eye upon that nation which for seventeen hundred years neither sovereign nor country, which was everywhere dispersed and everywhere a stranger... It is not known how far the Jews cooperated with him, nor was his plan ever adopted, but the project was well known

to the world and his friends joked with him on the subject."⁹

The vast unoccupied stretches of land in America made it a favorite prospect for those who thought that a territory for the Jews would help prove a solution to the homelessness of the Jews. Picciotto, in his Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, relates how the Jews of London had appointed a committee from Bevis Marks to apply to the government for grants of land in Georgia upon which to settle emigrants. The committee was in existence as late as 1745, but nothing was achieved. Again in 1749 a plan for such emigration to Nova Scotia was formulated, without results. In 1819 a pamphlet was published by W.D. Robinson, an American merchant, entitled Memoir addressed to Persons of the Jewish Religion in Europe, on the subject of Emigration and Settlement in the United States of America. In this pamphlet, the author suggested the establishment of a Jewish colony in Mississippi. For years this author was suspected of being a land speculator, although Lee Friedman in his Pilgrims in a New Land feels that this is a Philadelphia merchant who was really interested in this project without
10
thought of profit.

Perhaps the best known experiment in the early part of the Nineteenth Century is that of Mordechai Emmanuel Noah. After a career of journalism Noah was appointed to serve as the U.S. Consul in Tunis. His experiences there made him a "Territorialist." Realizing that a Jewish State in Palestine was impractical at the time, he decided to establish an autonomous Jewish settlement in America. He

selected an island near the city of Buffalo and named it Ararat. In 1825, he published in American and European papers a call to the Jews of the world to settle there. He appointed himself as leader and lawgiver and urged the Jews to abide by his rules and declarations, and at the same time accept the protection of the American flag. The schema was almost universally ridiculed and there was no Jewish response to his appeal. This, however, did not prevent Noah from staging a celebration to lay the cornerstone of the colony. In September, 1926, a procession took place which consisted of clergymen, Federal officials, a small contingent of local soldiers and local negroes. Speeches were made and the band played, but the scheme did not proceed any further.¹¹ In 1843, in the very first issue of The Occident, a Julius Stern had an article which advocated that German Jews should be encouraged to emigrate to the United States and found a colony in some part of the western territory. He visualized that such a colony could ultimately become a state. Isaac Leeser approved of the plan, but he objected to the establishment of a separate state in the Union.¹² There were other plans for the establishment of a territory for Jews in the United States during the different periods of progroms in Europe. As a result of the mass hysteria which gripped Eastern European Jewry in 1881 and 1882 it was only natural for people to think in terms of emigration to America, which maintained an "open door" policy. In

1881 a Moses Schrenzel published a pamphlet in which he urged the establishment of a Jewish State in America. He objected to Palestine because of its poor soil and because he felt that it would be impossible to win over the Turks and the Arabs to such a plan.¹³

It is noteworthy that at its birth political Zionism was territorialist in character. Pinsker, in his Auto-Emancipation, has an open mind on the issue. He suggested that the selection of the appropriate territory should be made by a committee of competent experts. He broke, in a measure, with the religious hope of the restoration as Judaism had always understood it. Such a home is to be sought not necessarily in the Holy Land, but wherever a fitting soil can be found for the homeless people. He argues that it is the God-idea and the Bible that have made Palestine holy, not Jerusalem and the Jordan, and that these ideas can be carried by the Jews into any land in which they may settle.

There was tremendous enthusiasm in Russia following the appearance of Pinsker's pamphlet and it resulted in the Kattowitz Conference of 1884. Thereafter, the driving force of Jewish nationalism was provided with a center and direction. This conference thus gave rise to further impetus in the creation of additional Jewish agriculture villages in Palestine. However, the high hopes and eager enthusiasm of the Russian Jews met only with disappointment. Over a period of 15 years the movement inaugurated at the Kattowitz Conference produced little that was encouraging.

The settlements created in Palestine had a difficult time and were saved from total failure only by the philanthropic intervention of Baron Edmond de Rothschild. Even worse, the support that the original settlers received from sympathizers in other countries was scant and unpromising.

The advent of Herzl brought a complete transformation. What had hitherto been in practice no more than a religious philanthropic movement then became an organized political movement. Inspired by the gross injustice and the violent anti-Semitic overtones of the Dreyfuss trial, which he attended as an observer for the Neue Freie Press, Herzl published his Judenstaat, which with Hess's Rome and Jerusalem and Pinsker's Auto-Emancipation, formed the cornerstone of Jewish national literature.

Herzl advocated that the Jews must emigrate en masse to a soil upon which they can build a Jewish State. But, this immigration must be different from the ineffectual philanthropy of the Chovevei Zion. His was the idea of a land secured with the tenets of international law and subject to the approval of the interested nations. Herzl, the Western Jew, developed a thesis which was years ahead of the impoverished Russian Zionists. Towards the realization of this idea, Herzl convened the First Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland in 1897. To this Congress, which was later to become the official voice of the Zionist movement, came representatives of European Jewry. The deliberation of the Congress resulted in the Basle Programme, the keynote of all Zionist activity in the fifty

years work that followed and which led eventually to the establishment of the State of Israel. The Basle Programme was the official pronouncement of Zionist aims and aspirations. It stated that the aim of Zionism was to create a home for the Jewish people in Palestine which would be publicly assured and legally secured. Immediately after the Congress, the machinery of the World Zionist Organization was created for the attainment of the expressed goal. With Herzl at the head of the movement, the series of events began that were to lead eventually to the split in the Zionist Organization and the organization of the Jewish Territorial Organization.

Although the organized form of political Zionism had its beginnings in Central Europe, the intellectual and spiritual background as well as the mass support of Zionism came from the Jews in Eastern Europe. This fact played a significant role in the development of Zionism in America and England. Two movements were of particular importance in providing the intellectual milieu for the development of modern Jewish nationalism. Chasidism, a pietistic and mystical religious movement, preached the equality of the lower, uneducated classes and acted as a democratic force in raising their self-esteem. Paralleling Chasidism came the Haskalah (Enlightenment) movement, which touched by the influences of European thought, helped to break down the traditional orthodox structure of Jewish society and opened the way to participation in the general movement of European ideas. The European scene was favorable to the development

of Jewish nationalism. While the impact of the modern theories of nationalism made itself felt among the Jews only comparatively late, it produced a reaction not unlike that found among other European minorities. Zionism succeeded in creating a general re-awakening of Jewish life in all of Europe. Particularly impressive was the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language, a process similar to the rebirth of Gaelic under the guidance of Irish nationalists. Zionism was the result of two set of forces: the internal condition of European Jewry and the external influences of nineteenth century Europe.

By the end of the nineteenth century it was apparent that the Jewish hope for immediate acceptance by the nations of the world was not being realized. Despite the tremendous advances that the Jews had made in western Europe, it was easily noted that there still was not complete equality. From time to time, anti-Semitism manifested itself and to Jews like Herzl the only solution was the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland. Added to this was the difficult situation that confronted the Jews in eastern Europe. In Russia, Roumania, and Galicia could be found more than half of the Jews of the world. Theirs was the most serious factor in the Jewish problem. In the Russian Empire, they were confined to a Pale of Settlement, which formed less than a fifth of European Russia and a little more than a twenty-fifth of the Czar's entire dominions. Those who were permitted to live beyond the Pale were chiefly merchants of the first guild, professional men, and master artisans. But these formed

less than six percent of the five million Jews in the Empire. The Pale, in which the Jews formed one-ninth of the population, would have afforded sufficient scope for their economic activity, but even within its confines the Jews had no freedom of movement. They were herded together in a few hundred towns, where, under the burden of ruinous competition, they made a wretched livelihood as petty traders and artisans. They were cut off from the land, which they could neither buy, rent nor till. They were shut off from Civil Service, and they were restricted in the adoption of the liberal professions. Their children could not form more than ten percent of the pupils in the Government schools, nor more than five percent of the students in the universities. They were deprived of the right to citizenship, but they were forced to discharge its duties since they were compelled to pay taxes and serve in the army. And merely to be able to live unmolested and to attend to their business without hinderance, they had to bribe the police for protection. The culminating terror of their lives consisted in the uncertainty of life itself, for at any moment they could be expelled from their homes or a riot might break out in which they became victims of plunder or massacre.¹⁴

In Roumania, the Jews were treated as foreigners, although they had lived in the land uninterruptedly for 1500 years; and although the independence of the country was recognized by the Treaty of Berlin upon the express condition that it

granted civil equality to its Jewish subjects. Not only had Roumania violated its solemn pledge, but it had enacted oppressive laws against the Jew which made life intolerable. The Jews were not allowed to own land or till it as hired laborers. They had been driven from the rural districts into the towns, only to find that most of the avenues to an honest living had been closed to them. They were excluded from the public service and the learned professions, and they were allowed to engage only in the lowest trades and handicrafts. They were barred from the secondary schools and universities, and their children were permitted in the public schools only after all of the other citizens had been provided for, and then only after paying exorbitant fees. In Galicia, the Jews lived nominally under a constitutional government, but the Austrian forms of anti-Semitism instituted economic programs just as effective as the physical ones in nearby Russia.

Thus, it is not surprising that the nationalism should have taken such a hold on the Eastern European Jewish communities. The situation was the adverse in the Western European communities and in America. Despite the few who felt that there was no future anywhere in the world but in a Jewish Homeland, the great majority of the Jews who were emancipated had any thought of uprooting themselves and establishing a Jewish land. But as more and more Jews began to leave Eastern Europe and migrate to the Western lands in the hope of finding a haven of refuge it soon became apparent that the Jewish Problem was a reality.

"Wohin?" was the question of the day that the Jews had to face.

When Zionism was offered as the solution, it received little support from the Western countries. To Herzl's great astonishment, his personal friends refused to think, at first, that he was in earnest. Der Judenstaat was the subject of adverse criticism from the Jews themselves. Orthodoxy paid little more attention to Herzl than they had to Kalischer. Reform immediately condemned Jewish nationalism, while the assimilated Jews noted that their very emancipation was being threatened. When an English Jewish nationalist declared that the Jews can never feel entirely English nor completely identify themselves with the English nation, the most eminent English Jews, including the Chief Rabbi of England, denounced the assertion. In the words of the Chief Rabbi: "Since the destruction of the Temple and our dispersion we no longer constitute a nation; we are a religious community."¹⁵ The well-known English historian, Lucien Wolfe, looked upon Zionism as a great peril to the Jews, "the natural and abiding ally¹⁶ of anti-Semitism and its most powerful justification." In Germany, Ludwig Geiger said: "Any desire to form together with his co-religionists a people outside of Germany is, not to speak of its impracticality, downright thanklessness toward the nation in whose midst he lives--a chimera; for the German Jew is a German in his national peculiarities, and Zion is for him only the land of the past, not of the future. The withdrawal of citizens'

rights appears to be the necessary consequence of German legislation against Zionism, the only answer that German national conscience can give." ¹⁷

In America, too, the well-integrated German Jews who had settled and was adjusted to the American scene viewed with alarm the idea of a Jewish Homeland. The position was best expressed by G. Poznanski in Charleston who many years before had stated: "America is our Zion, and Washington our Jerusalem." ¹⁸

"When Herzl first conceived the idea of his Judenstaat he still believed that the locale of its realization was unimportant. He considered essential only the creation of a national home for the Jewish people, in which it could develop its forces once more and assume control of its own destiny in freedom and honor." However, after his acquaintanceship with the leaders of the Hovevai Zion, it soon became apparent to him that there was actually only one land that could be considered....the ancient and historic homeland of the Jewish people--Palestine. After visiting that land in 1898, he emotionally became attached to the Land of the Fathers and devoted all of his energies toward accomplishing his--the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland in Palestine. He underestimated considerably the difficulties that were to beset his path. After long and protracted negotiations with the Sultan and his advisors, he began to appreciate the many obstacles that confronted him. Since 1835, David Trietsch, a student of the problem of Jewish migration, had been studying the prospect and propagating the idea of a

Jewish settlement in Cyprus. Since it was located so close to Palestine, and because it was under British control, it was felt that the difficulties that were raised by the Turks in Palestine, could be overcome in negotiations with the friendly British. When new programs broke out in Galicia, Herzl once again turned back to his original idea of a territory in order to solve the terrible situation that was so pressing at the time, and consider the possibility of Palestine as an ultimate aim. The people needed help immediately and Herzl considered asking England for Cyprus, feeling that in time Turkey would be placed in a financial position that they would have to accede to the Jewish demands. However, the East Europeans for whom the program was primarily intended refused to consider any land but Palestine and Herzl did not feel in a position to press this program. Again in 1900 when there was a mass Roumanian migration, in the wake of programs, there was a consideration of Cyprus. Herzl thought to place this plan on the agenda of the World Zionist Congress, but it was so fiercely opposed that the idea never even reached the voting stage. Herzl then began to think of a territory that not even the most zealous Zionist could object to: El Arish in the Sinai Peninsula, between Egypt and Palestine. The British Government showed itself in favor of the idea of an autonomous Jewish settlement in El Arish. Herzl arranged for a scientific survey, and it was reported that the district was suitable enough,

if sufficient water could be diverted from the Nile for irrigation purposes. On that "if" the scheme was destroyed, since the Anglo-Egyptian government declared that so much water could not be spared to irrigate land beyond the boundaries.

In 1903 the programs in Kishineff shocked the Jews the world around. Herzl visited Von Plehve, the Russian Minister of the Interior, whom most Russian Jews regarded as responsible for the programs, in the hope of alleviating the situation. The Russian Minister was quite conciliatory and promised to assist the Jewish emigration societies and even promised to inform the Sultan that Russia was in favor of the Zionist aims. However, this was obviously not enough to alleviate the terrible situation in which East European Jews found themselves and there was constant demand for immediate action by the leaders of world Jewry. At this desperate moment a surprising offer was made to the Zionists. Great Britain, through Joseph Chamberlain, offered a section of British East Africa, known as the Uganda Protectorate, as a territory for Jewish settlement. There a Jewish autonomous community would be set up with a Jewish governor, subject to the general control of Great Britain. Herzl accepted the plan for several reasons. First of all, as he said: "We must give an answer to Kishineff, and this is the only one...We must, in a word, play the politics of the hour." Then, too, he saw in this offer the opportunity to show the Sultan that the Jews were prepared to go elsewhere. Thus, it might cause the

Sultan to recognize the fact that the Jews were quite serious and he would lose the opportunity of gaining all of the monetary advantages a Jewish State in Palestine would bring.

At the Sixth Congress, Herzl broached the idea. The immediate reaction was one of profound emotion. No one had known of the offer, and therefore had not the opportunity of considering the merits of the plan. However, this marked the first time that there had been any real tangible assistance offered to the Zionist organization by a great power. Herzl stressed that this was not the ultimate goal but an emergency measure to rescue the victims of persecution. Max Nordau, who was basically opposed to the plan, nevertheless backed up Herzl's plea with the argument that this was but a "Nachtsyl" -- a temporary shelter for the hundreds of thousands of Jews who were being thrust out of their homes and were looking for a haven.

The opposition soon made itself felt. The Russians, for whom the measure was primarily intended, strongly opposed the idea of a settlement outside of Palestine. A resolution calling for an expedition to investigate the territory was passed by a large majority, but no sooner had the results been announced when the Russian bloc, "the Negatives", left the Congress. Herzl, personally, came to the Russian delegates and pleaded with them not to withdraw from the Congress. The following day the opposition forces

returned to the hall and indicated that their departure was not intended to be a demonstration, but rather was an expression of their profound spiritual shock at the passing of the resolution. The Congress was terminated without further incident, but it was quite obvious that the report on Uganda, which was to be submitted to the Seventh Congress, would have severe repercussions regardless of what its findings were.

At a meeting in Kharkov in 1903, the leaders of the Russian group organized a Central Committee of their own. In a move bordering on almost open rebellion, they demanded that Herzl give them a written promise to relinquish the East African project and in his capacity of leader of the Zionists to engage in no further territorial schemes. A threat was attached that if there were a refusal, all supplies would be withheld from Vienna. When this fact became known there was a great deal of indignation expressed especially in Great Britain, where local English patriotism gave further impetus to the East Africa offer. In the midst of this controversy, the prominent supporter of Herzl, Max Nordau was almost assassinated at a Chanukah ball arranged by the Paris Zionist Society by a youth who cried: "Death to Nordau, the East African."¹⁹ Before any action could be decided upon in regard to the British offer, the Zionist leader, Theodore Herzl died, worn out by the struggles in which he had been the center.

The Survey Commission reported that the 6,000 miles

of the Guas Ngishu Plateau were not suited for agriculture and that it could not provide for the settlement of large numbers of Jews. Thus, the fate of the Uganda offer was almost a foregone conclusion when the Seventh Congress convened. By a large majority the Congress rejected either as an end or a "nachtasyl" settlement anywhere but in Palestine and adjacent lands. The final resolution was:

"The Seventh Zionist Congress declares: The Zionist Organization stands firmly by the fundamental principle of the Basel Program, namely, "The establishment of a legally-secured, publicly-recognized home for the Jewish people in Palestine," and it rejects, either as an end or as a means of colonizing, activity outside Palestine and its adjacent lands. The Congress resolves to thank the British Government for its offer of a territory in British East Africa, for the purpose of establishing there a Jewish settlement with autonomous rights. A commission having been sent out to examine the territory, and having reported thereon, the Congress resolves that the Zionist Organization shall not engage itself further with the proposal. The Congress records with satisfaction the recognition accorded the further good offices of the British Government where available in any manner it may undertake in accordance with the Basel Program. The Seventh Zionist Congress recalls and emphasizes the fact that, according to Article I of the statutes of the Zionist Organization, the Zionist Organization includes those Jews who declare themselves to be in agreement with the Basel Program." 20

The vote in favor of the resolution was by no means unanimous. Israel Zangwill, the gifted writer, who had introduced Herzl to British Jewry and had remained until the end of Herzl's days a true friend, spoke out against the resolution. He was backed by other territorialists who refrained from taking part in the final vote and by

the Poale Zion who refused to participate further in the proceedings of the Congress. These two groups split from the Zionist Organization and formed the nucleus of a movement that was to search for a territory as the immediate solution to the Jewish problem.

THE JEWISH TERRITORIAL ORGANIZATION

A. Leaders and Members

Under the dynamic leadership of Israel Zangwill, the Jewish Territorial Organization, popularly known as ITO, was organized. Zangwill explained that the aim of the movement was to meet the vital needs of the masses of the Jewish people. The Russian Jews were coming to the realization that there was little hope for them in Russia itself and consequently were migrating to other lands. This tremendous migration was beginning to overflow into the Western countries. England and America, who were bearing the brunt of this vast migration, were becoming alarmed and calling a halt to this rising immigration. Meeting at Berne, ITO used as the basis for its organization the difference of opinion concerning the acceptance of the British East African territory and adopted the following platform:

To procure a territory upon an autonomous basis for the Jews who cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they already live. To achieve this end, the organization proposes to unite all Jews who are in agreement with this object; to enter into relations with governments and public and private institutions; and to create financial institutions, labor bureaus, and other instruments that may be found necessary. 1

But the Chamberlain offer which had caused the split in the Zionist organization was soon withdrawn. Not only were the British disappointed with the Zionist reaction but it finally dawned upon them that it was possible to utilize this land for British colonization. Then, too, Sir Harry Johnston, who was then British Special Commissioner in

Uganda objected to Uganda being used for autonomous colonization. Johnston felt that the divided government would cause many difficulties. He did, however, point out that those Jews who wished to settle there would be welcome. Thus, on September 16, 1905 the Colonial Secretary, Alfred Lyttleton, wrote to Zangwill that on receiving

official notification of the decision of the Zionist Congress not to proceed further with the matter of Zionist settlement in East Africa, I informed the Commissioner for the East African Protectorate that the land which had been proposed for the settlement need not be reserved any longer. 2

The program advocated by the Jewish Territorial Organization immediately caught the imagination of Jews the world over. Branches were organized in Russia, England, America, Germany, Belgium, Hungary, Austria, France, Roumania, South Africa and Australia. Delegates from all of these countries were represented on the International Council.

ITO attracted to its ranks some of the greatest leaders of world Jewry. Besides having the advantage of Israel Zangwill's leadership and prestige, the ITO cause was materially assisted when Professor Max Mandelstamm dropped out of the Zionist organization because of his sympathy for the territorial cause. Mandelstamm was one of the most respected leaders of Russian Jewry. It was often reported that Theodore Herzl considered this well-known oculist as being the most likely candidate for the presidency of the Jewish State,

whenever it would be established. Mandelstamm had been a member of the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization and one of the twelve trustees designated to conduct the Zionist movement in Russia. He was outspoken in his view that Russian Jews should leave the country and migrate to America as long as no Jewish State was in existence. A close friend of Herzl, Mandelstamm was one of the few Russians who had favored the Uganda proposal. Because of his leadership, within a period of a year there were over 150 branches of the Jewish Territorial Organization organized throughout the Russian Empire.

But not only Zionists were attracted to the Jewish Territorial Organization. There were many non-Zionists who felt that Zionism was but a visionary idea and that territorialism offered a more realistic approach to the question of "Wohin ?" There were also many anti-Zionists who joined the movement, possibly because they felt that ITO was a weapon to be used against the extreme nationalism of Zionism; possibly because of the fear that the mass migration of Russian Jews into the Western countries was disturbing the status quo of those Jews who had integrated or assimilated, that the influx of these "different" Jews might cause anti-Semitism; possibly because they felt that here was a fine opportunity of advancing the colonization and the imperialistic schemes of their country; or possibly because they felt that Itoism was the solution

to the persecution of East European Jewry. Many of the non-Zionists and anti-Zionists who joined the Jewish Territorial Organization did so with reservations, particularly because of the " autonomy " clause that was in the ITO platform. The exact meaning of the term " autonomy " was a bone of contention among the members. Among the anti-Zionists who was concerned with this question was the famous English historian, Lucien Wolf, who had previously warned world Jewry of the " Zionist Peril. " ³ In his letter to Zangwill accepting membership in the Jewish Territorial Organization, Wolf wrote:

As a Zionist you no doubt hope and believe that an autonomous Jewish colony on the lines we have discussed may make for the eventual establishment of an independent Jewish State in Palestine. I would not entertain such a hope if I thought it practicable, for I am still convinced that we Jews have outgrown this uninational stage of our history and that we have far larger destinies to fulfil in our Dispersion, nor do I believe it practicable for I see no prospect of its fulfilment in the tendencies of European politics and in the political situation in Asia Minor.... Autonomy is, of course, the leading idea of your scheme, but as I understand you, in a form free from the dangers I apprehended.... You are perfectly willing that such a colony should fulfil all the conditions of political evolution by which the overseas dependencies of the Crown have hitherto progressed towards self government and that in political and municipal respects it should be assimilate to the existing colonies. Such a colony would be politically Jewish only through the preponderance of its Jewish population. It would have no established Church, no religious tests or disabilities, but it would be free to make holiday and other municipal arrangements to suit the peculiar circumstances of its colonies, while due exceptions would be granted to the strangers within its gates. British law alone would be recognized and administered, and in all political matters the secular arm would be supreme. To the language question we need not attach much importance- with the examples of Canada and Switzerland before us we can leave it to solve itself. On one point, however, you lay great stress.

You desire that from the Lieutenant-Governor, or Governor, as the class may be- should, if possible, be a Jew. I see no objection to this, provided a competent and willing co-religionist could be found in the British, Colonial or Indian Service. 4

In Zangwill's reply, he wrote:

In regard to the political aspect of the colony we should be amply content to follow the general development of British colonies, inasmuch as an English colony enjoys a considerable margin for non-English internal legislation, so that New Zealand, for example, has been able to adopt female franchise, which is as yet unknown to the British constitution.... Spiritual genius of our race.... will again be inspired to contribute to civilization's sociological improvement suited to these latter days. 5

At the first meeting of the International Council in England a letter was received from Dr. Paul Nathan, of Berlin, the leader of the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden, expressing his warm sympathy with the efforts of ITO. The Russian millionaires, Brodski and Halperin announced their adhesion to the ITO program and signed promises of financial assistance. All of these men were in the anti-Zionist camp, but had decided to throw in their lot with ITO. Among the non-Zionists that ITO attracted were the leaders of American Jewry- Cyrus Sulzberger, a former vice president of the Federation of American Zionists; Oscar Strauss; Joseph Fels; Daniel Guggenheim; and Judge Mayer Sulzberger. The attitude of the man who was to become the future Secretary of Labor and Commerce as well as a future Ambassador to Turkey, Oscar Strauss was expressed in an interview in London:

I have been asked whether I am an Itoist, Zionist or whether I am one of those who believe that the Jewish problem must be settled in Russia. My answer is that I am an American, but under the sub-structure of my Americanism there pulsates my

Jewish heart.... regarding the Russian immigration:
' In the meantime I must say that as an American
and as a Jew that if the immigration could be
arrested for five years it would be of the greatest
advantage to those who are there now. For just as
the Russian Pale was made intolerable as more and
more people were driven in it, so as to take the
bread out of the mouths of those who are already
there, so in a degree is the condition we find in
New York. Therefore it becomes our duty to look
further and to look out for new centers of coloniz-
ation. ' Of course, in our efforts to obtain action
on their part we would not be good Americans or
good Englishmen if we asked our country to do that
which international relations would not admit,
because first and foremost we are Americans and
Englishmen, and our duties to our Governments come
first. 6

Despite the general acceptance by the non-Zionists and the
anti-Zionists of the Jewish Territorial Organization when
the organization was first formed, there were still some
who felt that even this " watered-down nationalism " was
dangerous. Sir Samuel Montagu, Claude Montefiore, Stuart
M. Samuel and Lord Rothschild, who later joined ITO,
issued a statement to the press objecting to the creation of
a " ghetto state " and attacked both the Zionists and the
Territorialists. Montagu sent a cable to Jacob Schiff in
America:

Manifest mildly protesting against Jewish State.
Signed Rothschild and other leaders by special
request Liberal Government. Can do no harm. 7

Schiff read this message at a general meeting of the Relief
Committee of Temple Emanuel and before the press. However,
the ITO under Zangwill's leadership and assisted by the
prestige and membership of Arthur Cohen, a member of the
British Privy Council, made a sharp reply. The Territorialists
were well represented by influential Englishmen and even

Chaim Weizmann comments that Lucien Wolf was considered by the Foreign Office as the spokesman of the Jews and one " who knew how to handle the Foreign Office. " ⁹

It was obvious that the Itoists felt that not only would they be solving the Jewish problem by their activities but that they were also helping their country by providing colonization in those unsettled areas of the British Empire. In the words of Lucien Wolf:

The ITO wished to send their immigrants into a British colony and the British colonies were hungering for white men.... So far as autonomy was concerned, it was, in the British colony, not a question of concession, but one of the ordinary political evolutions of the colony, if they peopled it and became the predominant population they would get autonomy automatically. ¹⁰

But before any thought of autonomy could be considered, it was of course necessary that a territory be found. Since the British East African offer had been withdrawn, it was now necessary for ITO to find some land where there was a possibility of Jewish colonization. Zangwill was, however, insistent that the colony was not just to be a colony. On this basis, Zangwill attacked ICA (Jewish Colonization Society) as having been unsuccessful despite its huge outlay of money. They have only proved, according to Zangwill, that the Jews could till the soil. Although they had succeeded in establishing several colonies in Argentina, there was no " autonomous basis " and the Jewish agricultural settlements were scattered, each colony being quite a distance from one another. It lacked the magnet of a political future and the sons of most of the colonists too often succumbed to the " charms of Buenos Aires. " ¹¹

Itoland was not for all Jews. The territory was primarily for those Jews who " cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they at present live. " The spokesman for the ITO movement, Israel Zangwill, pointed out that no Jews would be invited to leave their home. He further emphasized that after the progroms in Russia in 1906, nearly 200,000 people had already left the country. Jews were constantly leaving Roumania and Galicia, and even in Palestine itself there was a steady emigration. The money spent by the Jews in this endless emigration far exceeded a million pounds a year (nearly five million dollars) and this was almost enough to finance a small state. In addition there always existed the possibility that the very countries to which the Jews were fleeing could at any time close their gates and thus the Jews would have no place to go. Strangely enough, the only place closed to Jewish immigration at this time was Palestine, although individual Jews did enter the land. However, even when the Jew entered a land, there was no assurance that his lot would be well. If he were discriminated against, pending the period of his probation, he was completely without protection. " If the alien Japanese be injured in America and all Japan is up in arms. But who is behind the alien Jew scattered in Argentina and Canada ? Do you think his native Russia would send a battleship to Montreal or Buenos Ayres ? " ¹² Then, too, even those who had been formally accepted into the land could not observe their religion. Time and time again, it

was emphasized by Zangwill, that the Jews could not under the economic conditions that existed in England and in America keep the Sabbath in the Jewish tradition. Even in these Western countries there was the constant threat of anti-Semitism. According to Zangwill the Jewish emigration was not the ordinary economic problem. It was necessary for the Jews to have a homeland. It was a territory, and the Territorialists deplored the fact that the Zionists spent so much time with nationalistic speeches, debates, clubs, branches, picnics and dances. A territory did not exclude the possibility of Palestine, but it was emphasized by the Territorialists that they could not consent to tie the fate of the Jewish people to a territory whose acquisition was so uncertain. To bolster the argument against Palestine, Zangwill said: " Those who say that Palestine should be the territory have never faced the economic problems that would arise from the pouring of the Jewish masses into that tiny country, which already possesses 700,000 inhabitants, over a half a million of them Arabs, and Germans and Turks and priests and missionaries. Listen, for example, to a letter which I received early this year from a young colonist in the famous Palestine Colony of Rischon-le-Zion, near Jaffa:

A number of young people have worked for years in the colonies here and know the work thoroughly, but wish to leave, ask you whether it is possible for them to be settled anywhere in the world, where they can obtain a piece of land of their own. Recently, agents from the Brazilian Government were here, who took the names of many of these, but as we could not get sufficient guarantees we could come to no arrangement. Many industrious hands who would create a flourishing colony in Galveston are here wasting their strength uselessly.

This letter does not prove that it is impossible to find work for those industrious colonists in Palestine, since Palestine is capable of much economic improvement, but it does show plainly that no land, however endeared by sentiment, is able to retain, much less to attract, the Jewish masses, unless they earn their bread there. And it shows the danger that lies before us if we allow Jewish politics to be run by impractical fanatics, and especially by fanatics who have not the slightest intention of emigrating themselves to their Holy Land. Unless the territory we select is one that the masses will really go to and can work and earn their living in, we shall simply prove ourselves fanatic dreamers. " ¹³ Zangwill further stated that the ITO was not interested in settling the people in the populated areas, such as England. The only territories that would be considered would be those in empty or comparatively unpopulated countries.

The primary reasons that were offered by ITO for the necessity of a territory for the Jewish emigrants was that in their own homeland it would be possible to observe the Sabbath and that it would offer a solution to the problem of anti-Semitism. In order to insure the success of such a project, it was necessary to have autonomy, if only local autonomy, but nothing less than this. In order to accomplish this goal, the Jewish Territorial Organization set up a Geographical Commission and in conjunction with it a Department for the Regulation of Emigration. Israel Zangwill assumed the

the leadership of these activities, in addition to being the president of the International Jewish Territorial Organization. Some of the most important leaders in world Jewry were chosen to serve on the Geographical Commission. Among them were: Dr. Mandelstamm, Russia; James Simon and Dr. Paul Nathan, leaders of German Jewry and prominent in the work of the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden; Oscar Strauss, the U.S. Secretary of Labor and Commerce; and the prominent English figure, Lord Rothschild. Leopold Rothschild, who was a bitter anti-Zionist, was chosen to serve as the treasurer. The British section of the Commission was given the task of making a study of the whole field of political possibility and to recommend to the International Council the course of action to follow. In addition to the Geographical Commission, there were individual members of ITO who devoted their time and energy in an investigation of the possible areas of settlement throughout the world. One of the most interesting of these was Joseph Fels, of Fels-Naptha Soap fame, who became interested in the activities of ITO and who devoted his time, energy and his money in trying to help the organization accomplish its goal. Fels was a follower of Henry George and the "single tax school of thought." His support of ITO was conditioned with the idea that the land tenure be in accordance with the principles of Henry George. His wife, Mary Fels, comments in his biography, that "His rebuff was possibly due to the fact that some of the prominent supporters of the ITO were of the great

Jewish landlord class in England, which made it difficult for the movement to be entirely democratic."¹⁴ But be that as it may, Fels was quite active in exploring the possibilities of settlement in the South American lands and Mexico, as we shall discuss later.

B. Geographical Commission

The activities of the Geographical Commission in particular and the Jewish Territorial Organization in general were very much conditioned by what was taking place in the countries of the individual members. As has been pointed out previously, each member was very conscious of what advantage their own particular countries might have in case of any large settlement in an uninhabited and strategic section of the world. No member would propose the settlement of Jews in any locality if it would work against the interest of their country. This was, after all, a period of great rivalry among the Great Powers who were engaged in a full-fledged diplomatic war in regards to the available colonies. This was highlighted by the weakness and the gradual breakup of the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan had feared the possibility of British or German expansion, under the guise of Zionism, and had therefore resisted the tempting proposals of the late Herzl. However, now that the Ottoman Empire seemed to be on the verge of disintegration, there was an increasing hope that Jewish settlement in the Middle East might soon become a reality.

There was another consideration to be faced by the

members of the Geographical Commission. Like at no other time, the Jews were leaving Eastern Europe and their arrival in England and America was causing internal dissention. In England this manifested itself in the Aliens Act and in America the cry was going up "close the Northern Ports." But, fortunately for the Jews, this was also a period of fear for the "Russian Bear" and thus there was much sympathy for anyone fleeing from this land of oppression and persecution. Therefore, though there were increased signs of resistance to the mass immigration that was taking place, there was no immediate attempt to keep out East European Jews...although it was quite obvious that the unrestricted immigration would soon be halted. Thus, ITO was confronted with two main problems: how to regulate the mass migration of East European Jews and finding a haven of refuge for them. The problem could of course be solved if a territory could be found, but it was necessary to have faithful patriots of rival empires on one commission. Not only was it their collective task to discover a suitable land, but it was also necessary from their individual stand-points that this territory, settled by Jews, not be a threat to their respective countries. In Morocco, the French, backed by the British, was competing with the Germans and from 1905 to 1911 there was a constant threat of war. In the Middle East, Germany attempted the Bagdad Railway project, which was to be a line from Berlin to Bagdad. Great Britain fearing any threat to India, and

Russia having the fear of being cut off from the East joined together in 1907 and signed the British-Russian Entente. Thus, the two traditional enemies became friends in order to stop this move which threatened the two of
15
them.

C. Immigration Problems

The most pressing problem that the Territorialists faced was that of regulating the emigration. Arriving at the conclusion that no land should be chosen unless it met all of the necessary qualifications and stung by the repeated charge that ITO was a movement of words rather than of action, it was decided that until the time that a suitable territory could be found, ITO would help regulate the emigration out of Russia. Despite the fact that other Jewish organizations such as ICA, the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden, and the B'nai Brith were all concerning themselves with Jewish immigration problems, it was apparent that there was a serious need of some regulation.

Due to the Aliens Act in England, there was a steady decline in the number of Jews entering the British Isles. Although England had been second to the United States in receiving immigrants at the end of the 19th century, only a third of the Jewish newcomers remained. And even of those who remained, there was a feeling of being unwanted. They were accused of competing with British labor, of overcrowding the London East End and even that

they constituted a high percentage of criminals in their midst. Following the Boer War, when there was serious unemployment these Jews were the natural scapegoats. Thus, it is not too surprising that the Alien's Act was passed in 1906 that made it rather difficult for any Jew without any money to settle in England. No provision was made for people escaping religious or political persecution.

From 1901 to 1914 over a million and a half Jews fled Russia, Roumania and Galicia, with 84% of them arriving in the United States, nearly 6% going to Canada and 5.5% whose goal was Argentina. Those who left for Argentina were, on the whole, taken care of by ICA, who had established Jewish colonies there.¹⁶ But the other immigrants went forth on their own, without guidance or organized assistance. It was indeed a hazardous journey, since without any knowledge of the languages, conditions or circumstances in the various countries, it was relatively simple for these immigrants to be swindled and cheated. All too often they were forced to return to their port of embarkation after having lost all of their possessions. There was a tremendous competition between steamship companies, with such a lucrative trade being in the offing, and many of the agents fleeced the immigrants to such an extent that quite a few of them arrived in the American ports completely penniless. In addition to the Hilfsverein and ICA, who did a great deal to regulate immigration, ITO set up the Kiev Emigration Society under the chairmanship of
¹⁷
Max Mandelstamm. This organization not only sought to

help the immigrants en route, but also to help them in the countries which they proposed to settle. An Information Bureau was established and it successfully negotiated with the different steamship companies in obtaining a cheaper rate for the immigrants. Branch offices of the Information Bureau were set up in the major Russian cities. ITO also cooperated with the St. Petersburg Information Center, which was the main agency for emigration work in Russia. Established by ICA, this bureau had complete information for anyone desiring to leave Russia.

Q. The Galveston Movement

The country most naturally concerned with the tremendous immigration that was taking place at this time was the United States. About a hundred thousand immigrants were arriving yearly. There was a constant agitation that the immigration be curbed. Legislation became more and more stringent. First, there were provisions against defectives and undesirables. The Act of 1907 created an immigration commission to make a full inquiry into the problems of this immigration that appeared to be flooding the country. This resulted in a report that was released in 1910 that recommended strong restrictions.¹⁸ Most of the Jews who came from Eastern Europe settled on the Atlantic Seaboard with New York City absorbing 70 % of them. It was only natural for these Jews to wish to settle in New York City since there was immediate employment awaiting them in the rapidly expanding clothing industry. The clothing trade needed men badly and many of the immigrants were able to receive work as soon as they arrived.

The, too, many of these Jews, were Sabbath observers, and in this trade they were able to worship on the Jewish Sabbath. Certainly an equally important factor was that there was safety in numbers. Not knowing the language of the land nor the manners and customs of its inhabitants, it was much simpler to live in an all-Jewish neighborhood-- a Jewish ghetto--where they could continue to speak the language of their birthplace or the more common medium of Yiddish.
19

Naturally, this massing of Jews in one area caused a serious problem. It is true that a few Jews traveled inland to Cleveland, St. Louis, Chicago and Cincinnati, where there was a nice-sized Jewish community, but there was no migration to the western United States where there was a small population and where there was the need of a greater population. In contrast, the Atlantic Seaboard was becoming overcrowded. Attempts were made by different Jewish agencies to urge the immigrants to move westward, but all in vain. There was a fear in traveling into the unknown. For many of the immigrants, there was the problem of maintaining Kosher, which was difficult in smaller communities and in the west that had hitherto been a stronghold of Reform Judaism. In 1901 there was organized the Industrial Removal Society which attempted to alleviate the situation. "Orders for employment were obtained by traveling agents, who established connections with local Jewish organizations, especially outside of the big cities along the Atlantic

Seaboard; the Bnai Brith lodges set up local committees charged with procuring orders for employment; a New York bureau was set up to handle requests from the traveling agents and the local committees, and to select suitable individuals among the immigrants." Yet despite considerable efforts on its part, 94% of the Jews still remained on the Atlantic Coast "and their natural rate of increase outpaced the number of those transferred."²⁰

It became apparent to American leadership that once the Jews arrived in the Northern cities, it would be difficult to have them move on inland. Therefore, it was suggested that if the Jews were sent to ports in the less populated areas of the United States, there was a greater chance of them remaining in those areas. In 1906 the suggestion was made by the commissioner-general of immigration and a supporter of the Industrial Removal Office plan, Frank Sargent, to the well-known philanthropist and perhaps the leading Jewish figure in America, Jacob Schiff, that congestion in the Eastern cities might be relieved if the European Jews were diverted to the ports on the Gulf of Mexico. The Jewish Territorial Organization, with its Kiev Emigration Society, had arrived at the same conclusion and also urged Schiff to assist in further such a plan. It was only natural that the ITO join in this program since they were concerned with immediate solutions, and all of its members could be agreed on such a project. Then, too, Cyrus Sulzberger, who was the American delegate

to the International Council of ITO, was also the president of the Industrial Removal Society. The project became known as the Galveston Plan, since the city of Galveston, Texas became the port that was decided upon as the entry port for the new Jewish immigrants.²¹

The Jewish Territorial Organization was entrusted with the task of publicizing the project, gathering the immigrants and arranging for their route and passage. The cost of the work was to be met by funds collected in Europe, but it was made plain by Jacob Schiff that the ITO organization need not expect further allegiance from these immigrants once they had reached the shores of America. As he wrote to Cyrus Sulzberger:

"The I.T.O. may have the glory of initiating this immigration in Europe, but when these immigrants once arrive at our shores, they must owe moral obligation to no one except the United States Government." ²²

Jacob Schiff, while he never formally associated himself with the Jewish Territorial Organization because of the "autonomous clause" in their platform was on the fringe of the movement and did offer financial assistance from time to time, as shall be discussed later. In connection with the Galveston Movement, Schiff was the main financial backer and gave the munificent sum of a half million dollars to further the plan. In connection with Jacob Schiff, Zangwill said:

"Schiff is so little against ITO that he sent me a long cable over a year ago, when I was forming my Geographical Commission, agreeing to be one of the Commissioners for deciding upon the land of refuge, if I would remove the

words "autonomous basis." This I naturally refused, but my refusal was far from exhausting the possibilities of cooperation between my friend, Mr. Schiff, and myself." 23

With Galveston selected as the port of debarkation, there was a Jewish Immigration Bureau set up in New York with a branch in Galveston. Morris Waldman, a prominent social worker who had been active in the Industrial Removal Society program was appointed as the general agent in Galveston, to organize the work there. Jacob Schiff became chairman of the Bureau and another Industrial Removal worker, David Bressler became the honorary secretary. Continuing along the same lines of the Industrial Removal Society program, negotiations were conducted with the Bnai Brith, which was quite active in the West and South and to which belonged the most prominent Jews in the different local communities. One of the most valuable additions to the program was the active interest and participation of the Galveston rabbi-- Henry Cohen. The rabbi was quite interested in the activities of the Jewish Territorial Organization and thus knew of Zangwill's interest in the project when it was first proposed. There had been a continuous correspondence between Zangwill and Cohen concerning this matter and Henry Cohen promised Morris Waldman that the Rabbi of Galveston would personally meet every boat loaded with Jewish immigrants that docked in Galveston. "Rabbi Cohen became so completely an integral factor in the work of the Jewish Immigrants' Information Bureau that the people of Galveston, Zangwill in England, and the office of Jacob Schiff in

New York came to think of the Galveston and of the movement in terms of him, although a staff of competent social workers continued to be employed." ²⁴ Rabbi Cohen became so involved in the movement that at times he expended his own money. After a while the rabbi's personal budget was so impaired by his interest in the work that he wrote a letter of resignation. There was a tremendous furore and even the Immigration Inspector of the Port of Galveston, Alfred Hampton, wrote that the severance of Henry Cohen's connection with this work might seriously impede any further work that the Bureau might seek to accomplish in the future. It was arranged that no financial burden be caused to Rabbi Cohen in connection with this activity. Zangwill wrote to Cohen:

"Your kindness retailed in many a letter to Russia will be of the greatest benefit in inducing emigrants to prefer the new route. If only our German friends had been equally careful to accord a brotherly treatment to the wanderers, their number by now would have been greater." ²⁵

In their work in Europe, ITO worked intimately with the Hilfsverein and the Kiev Emigration Society. The latter group and ITO hoped that a concentrated Jewish settlement in Texas or in one of the sparsely settled Western states might bring about a future great Jewish Colony. On the other hand, Schiff was not interested in anything but seeing to it that the Jews were deflected from the Eastern cities into the south or southwest. The first batch of immigrants arrived on July 1, 1907. There were 66 men,

6 women and 15 children. It marked the beginning of an important experiment in the handling of Jewish immigration²⁶ in the United States.

The first group was quickly absorbed. Many were skilled workers and they were directed to cities where they were needed. Since the law forbade the hiring of immigrants prior to their arrival in the States, the Galveston Office could not set up an employment bureau, nor could they deal directly with industrial firms. The plan was to have the Jewish communities assume the responsibility of finding employment for the new immigrants. After the financial panic in 1907, the work slackened and ITO closed the year with something less than 900 immigrants to its credit. After a long layoff, the work was taken up again in April, 1909. For the first time, there was even a semblance of cooperation with the Russian Government who legalized the work in a restricted sense. The organization was informed that it must restrict its activity only to emigration and not concern itself with the other aspects of ITO. However, while things were brighter for ITO in Russia, obstacles beset its path in the United States. There had been growing agitation, in general, concerning the mass immigration. Among the strongest foes to the liberal immigration laws were the labor unions who felt that the new immigrants were²⁷ severe competition. Naturally, this criticism became strongest during periods of depression. In June, 1910, the Department of Commerce and Labor issued instructions ordering the deportation of all immigrants who received assistance.

Those immigrants who entered through the Galveston port had a greater chance of being deported than those who arrived at the Atlantic seaports. It was felt that these immigrants had been receiving help from ITO which was in violation of the Contract Labor Law. This charge was vigorously denied by the leaders of the Galveston Movement and Jacob Schiff wrote to the Department of Commerce and Labor:

"The damage done by reason of the now hostile attitude of the Department is already very great, and if this attitude results in the entire breakdown of the Galveston Movement, it will end all efforts to deflect immigration from New York and the North Atlantic Seaport towns, which, I repeat, is the sole purpose of the work which is being done in Galveston. It is very certain that for such a breakdown of the effort to relieve the congestion in eastern centers the administration of President Taft will be held responsible by a considerable section of the American people, and because of this, I am sending a copy of this communication to the President for such consideration, if any, as he may himself desire to give to this not unimportant subject." 28

Later he wrote to Zangwill:

"Personally, I am not discouraged. Great and far-reaching movements like the one we have in hand can seldom be worked out without difficulties of some sort, and I still feel that, with God's help, we shall overcome the obstacles which are being placed in our way." 29

Backed by the American Jewish Committee and the National Liberal Immigration League, the leaders of the Galveston Movement kept the doors of Galveston open. "By 1912 more than 5,000 immigrants had come to Galveston and had been forwarded to the interior, at a cost of \$150,000. A few months before the outbreak of World War I, the total number

of immigrants brought to Galveston reached the figure of 10,000." ³⁰ With the outbreak of the war, all immigration, of course, ceased. "Schiff looked forward to a renewal of the work on a comprehensive scale, not only at Galveston but at New Orleans and on the Pacific Coast," ³¹ as soon as the war had been concluded.

There were those who questioned if the Galveston Movement was not the best solution of the Jewish Problem and if it was necessary for ITO to become involved with territorial prospects. But Zangwill constantly stressed that this was not the goal of ITO but rather an additional activity until the goal could be accomplished. It was a second best solution, since it was obvious that anti-Semitism and the question of Sabbath observance would not be solved by the migration to America. Zangwill felt that Jewish prosperity in America would remove all Jewish feeling from its Jews. Like Herzl, he felt that only with anti-Semitism was there any hope for the Jews in the Western lands to see that the hope for Jews lay in their possessing a homeland. Therefore, in conjunction with the work of regulating immigration, the ITO from the time of its inception began to look for a territory.

DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITY

At the very outset, the Jewish Territorial Organization let it be known that while they were searching for a territory, that there would be no attempt to stimulate or to encourage emigration. This territory would only be for those who wished to go there. Naturally, the first territory to be viewed was that of British East Africa. But¹ as it has previously been noted, the offer was withdrawn. Feeling at the beginning that the territory should be within the British Empire, it was thought that possibly other districts in the vicinity of Uganda might be considered. But due to unsettled conditions ITO was cautioned to delay any action by one of the members of the Geographical Commission. There was much thought given to Morocco. However, during the year 1904 Britain had concluded a treaty with France and in exchange for British freedom in Egypt, England backed the special interests of France in Morocco. Germany was also interested in Morocco and in 1905 the Kaiser visited the Sultan of Morocco and assured the ruler of Germany's interest in the independence of the² country. Perhaps it is no wonder that James Simon, the German member of the Commission, was so interested in the project that he offered 250 pounds towards its investigation by ITO. However, while the whole Commission was in agreement over its possibilities, it was decided to delay further action until there were more definite signs of peace in North Africa. Considering first of all the British

Empire, the Geographical Commission next began negotiations with Canada, Western Australia and New Zealand. All of these places were seeking additional settlers, were sparsely populated and fitted in to ITO's scheme of things. In regards to these dominions, Zangwill relates:

"I am well aware that a Jewish colony in Australia or Canada could never reach the measure of autonomy possible in a possession like East Africa. But under the general laws of the Dominions a new State could easily be carved out from the vast area of unoccupied territory. Canada and Australia are Continents that have the misfortune or the modesty to mistake themselves for countries. They apply to three million square miles conceptions that would be narrow for three thousand. But three million square miles of homogeneous humanity have never yet afflicted our planet." 3

It is related by Zangwill "that Lord Strathcona jumped up on a chair to point out to him on a wall-map the territory he thought the Canadian Government would allot to ITO." 4

An interview was arranged with Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Canadian Premier. At this meeting Zangwill was informed:

"You are ten years too late. Ten years ago we were begging for immigrants and would gladly have given you a tract under local autonomy to be developed into one of the States of a federal Canada. Now we have all the immigration we need and will give land only to the individual." 5

In Australia, through the good offices of Alexander Marks the attempt was made to obtain a million acres. However, the old question of autonomy reared its ugly head and it was primarily on this issue that no arrangement could be reached. Concerning this, Zangwill wrote:

"We are quite satisfied with local autonomy. What we really want is elbow room. We do not desire to solve the problem for a few thousand but to build a possible future for our whole

people. Australia will fight hard against such a proposition, but it has to choose between a black population or a Jewish white population. Jews can safeguard the future as a white territory. Thus we are in a position to dictate our own terms. A great mistake of the Jews is to allow other people to profit by our pioneer labor.... We want no hypocritical pity, no tolerance but a fair bargain profitable to both. Our utmost hopes would be that in the far future there should be a Jewish province in Australia--perhaps even a Jewish State, as not the least valuable member of the Australian Federation." 6

Correspondence was carried on with Sir Alfred Deakin, the Premier, and with Sir Newton Moore regarding Western Australia without any tangible results. When Sir Alfred Deakin did suggest for possible investigation on the part of ITO the Northern Territory of Australia it was turned down by Zangwill as being "a derelict tropical desert." Negotiations continued on with the Australian Government throughout the history of ITO.

Again attempts were made for settlement in North Africa and among the most insistent and enthusiastic supporters was Paul Nathan, of the Hilfsverein. There was also much correspondence concerning the settlement in Dutch Guinea, but there was no serious consideration in regard to that territory.

But interest reached a new high when the Geographical Commission manifested an interest in Cyrenaica. As a result of two years study of the territorial possibilities of this little known land, it was decided to investigate this land. It was in a promising location, located within easy distance of Russia and Palestine. There was little know-

ledge of this land because the Turkish Government had placed restrictions on the travel of Europeans through the land's interior. It had been neglected and was populated only by a few nomads. There was much enthusiasm aroused when the project was first announced. Paul Nathan said:

"Cyrenaica is indicated from all quarters as a land suitable for colonization. That other regions suitable for colonization with kindred advantages with regard to climate and fertility exist, is beyond question, but Cyrenaica will always merit preference because of its geographical position, and because in these regions there reigns only a loose suzerainty, and that indeed Turkish...For the emigration from Eastern Europe which, in my opinion, is the emigration which shall be particularly reached at slight expense and in short time. The somewhat loose Turkish suzerainty, moreover, makes it possible to succeed in organizing there such settlements as could be considered peculiarly in accordance with the aim and development of Jewish individuality...The position of Cyrenaica offers, moreover, the advantage that a close connection could be maintained between the colonies on the one hand and European culture and European Judaism on the other. The vicinity of Europe would in a certain measure also supply a defense against outbreak of violence." 7

There were many obstacles to be overcome, however. Turkey was naturally suspicious of any European colonization. Their territory was gradually being swallowed by the Great Powers. Then, too, Italy was at this time also looking for colonies to satisfy the imperialistic desires of the Government. Dr. Slousch and Sir Harry Johnston, former Governor of Uganda who had joined the ITO cause, were chosen to investigate the possibilities. They were primarily concerned with the economic and social conditions that ex-

isted in Tripoli, of which Cyrenaica was an integral part. They were well received by the Governor-General, who told the gentlemen that he was interested in attracting into the province Jewish colonists from Russia. The investigators were urged to explore first the possibilities of the mountainous hinterlands of Tripoli, the regions of Msellata and Djebel. The authorities believed these areas suitable for European colonization and they expressed the belief that in these regions it was possible to obtain the desired concessions. Even if the word "autonomy" was not mentioned for fear of jeopardizing the negotiations, there was to be religious freedom and almost complete self-government. Military protection was promised against Arab marauders, but for the rest the colony was to be left to itself. However, it was of course necessary for the Governor-General to have the project officially endorsed by the authorities in Constantinople. There was a fear of gradual Italian encroachment, and the Turks seemed quite anxious for ITO to move in, even allowing them to open banks immediately in Tripoli and Benghazi.⁸ The offer was not accepted by ITO who were considering the report of Dr. Nahum Slousch. The conclusions of the report were as follows:

- 1) Cyrenaica is a country most suitable for a European population.
- 2) The soil is equally suited for large farming and small farming. It is also suitable for mixed farming and a system of cooperative ownership of land.
- 3) It has an abundant water supply and its climate is extremely healthy and temperate.
- 4) Owing to its geographical situation it is certain of a great commercial and industrial future.

- 5) It is the only country where the question of natives actually does not exist since the population is nomadic and the Government is the safe proprietor of the soil.
- 6) The region of Pentopolis has a hinterland capable of supporting extensive colonies.
- 7) It also has a great Jewish past, and a political and social history capable of appealing to the hearts and feelings of the Jewish masses.
- 8) It is relatively near to Odessa and Galatz.
- 9) All of these factors taken together with the possibility of an understanding with Turkey, and of the goodwill of those Powers by whom the terrible anti-Semitic persecutions are condemned, might and ought to be taken into consideration by the Geographical Commission of the ITO. 9

There were many proposals that the exodus from Russia to Cyrenaica begin immediately even prior to the establishment of the colony in Tripoli since many felt that it was only a matter of time that negotiations would be completed in the light of the Slousch Report. But counsel was cautioned by the Geographical Commission. Lord Rothschild wrote:

"In view of the unsettled state of things in North Africa no steps should be taken in connection with a Jewish project at present." 10

In a like manner, Oscar Straus wrote:

"A thorough preliminary investigation I regard as a sine qua non. It is a tremendous responsibility to ask a people to go to a far-off land--a people who rely on your character and your judgement--without first making that thorough and competent investigation which the importance of the subject and the seriousness of the responsibility not only justify, but demand." 11

It was thus decided to send an Expedition of Inquiry under the leadership of Professor Gregory. In contrast to the report of Dr. Slousch, Gregory reported:

"We found Cyrenaica disappointing in spite of its many attractive features because it is not so unoccupied as we had expected, and its present inhabitants would prove a serious difficulty to its

closer agricultural settlement. We found a country, moreover, less fertile than is reported, for though the soils are excellent, they are very patchy, and the country is better suited for pastoral than agricultural occupation. I was forced to the conclusion that owing to the scarcity of water the country never has supported and probably never will support a dense population." 12

The main difficulty in regards to Cyrenaica seemed to be as Zangwill phrased it: "In the most painfully literal sense of the much abused metaphor, the project did not hold water." 13 Gregory also pointed out that there had been previous attempts by the Turks to settle the land with Cretan and Circassian refugees but these attempts had proven unsuccessful. The soil of the country was sandy and destitute of natural moisture. 14

May 10, 1909 and again on June 13, the Jewish Territorial Organization met to consider the prospects of another territory--Mesopotamia. Zangwill then announced that ITO would bend all of its energies toward the establishment of colonies in the land of the Talmud and the cradle of the race. He hoped that a number of prominent Jewish leaders throughout the world would help to finance the scheme. The sum of forty million dollars was believed necessary for this purpose. 15 Jacob Schiff was one of the first to announce that he moderately favored the plan but he declared that it was ridiculous to consider subsidizing the project by grants of individuals. According to Schiff it was necessary to have government subvention and cooperation of the large international Jewish societies in order to assure its

success. Schiff was quite emphatic that he preferred Mesopotamia to Palestine. He was unalterably opposed to Palestine. Similarly he was opposed to any measure of autonomy, feeling that it was absolutely unnecessary to the success of the project. Schiff preferred that the East European Jews be diverted to Mesopotamia rather than to America because he felt that there were greater opportunities for them in this sparsely settled land. Above all, Schiff stressed, that any form of nationalism would do immense harm to those Jews who were already in Palestine and it would impair the favored position of the Jews in Turkey.¹⁶ Schiff had long been interested in the colonizing of Mesopotamia, but his previous interest was connected with the Bagdad to Cairo Railway. In 1903 Schiff wrote to Ernest Cassel, the well-known English financier:

To me personally, and to many of my prominent co-religionists, the construction of the road is of special interest, as you can see from the enclosed letter of Oscar Straus, who for some years was our Minister at Constantinople. I happened to receive this letter the very day before your last letter came. In this connection I sent you earlier in the week a memorandum by Professor Haupt, a non-Jew, which he prepared about ten years ago, with the idea of presenting it to Baron Hirsch. The latter, however, had too many commitments in Argentina to be able to take up Haupt's proposals. Now that the Bagdad Railway project appears to be a reality, we should like to get the Jewish Colonization Association to consider Haupt's proposals seriously, because it is really necessary that there should be an open door for emigration from Russia and Roumania, so that England and especially America shall not continue to be flooded with emigrants. I know that you have shown great interest in our people, and therefore do not hesitate to try to interest you in the project, even though I am myself not yet in a position to decide whether it is practicable. 17

Schiff also tried to interest Lord Rothschild in this project, but at this time Lord Rothschild was interested in Theodore Herzl's Egyptian colonization scheme.¹⁸

The ITO Scheme was not favorably received by the Jewish people and it was roundly denounced by the Zionists. Zangwill was quite disappointed and in an interview on July 14, 1909 he announced that the organization would probably abandon the Mesopotamia project because of the "incomprehensible ingratitude" with which it has been received by the Jewish press. As a follow-up, Zangwill offered his resignation at the next meeting of the International Council of ITO, feeling that perhaps the group may have more confidence in someone else to carry out the Mesopotamia project.¹⁹ His resignation was refused. During the course of the meeting it seemed apparent that Zangwill had just about abandoned the idea of "autonomy" which had hitherto been the basis of the organization.²⁰ This followed criticism of the use of the word. In an editorial, the leader of the American Itoists, had declared in his American Hebrew weekly that "autonomy" was a useless word. Cyrus Sulzberger depreciated the emphasis that Zangwill had placed on autonomy and suggested that if the Jews acquire a majority, autonomy would automatically follow.²¹ In his memorandum to the Turkish Government, Zangwill did not demand autonomy but merely the condition that the Jews be granted the right of suffrage. Jews should be granted citizenship with the accompanying privilege of regulating

their own affairs. To the majority of the ITO rank and file, this announcement came as a shock, for Zangwill had always been insistent on the need of an "autonomous territory."²²

Following the revolution of 1908, Turkey had become a constitutional monarchy and the control of the State rested in the hands of the Young Turks. In 1909, the Albanians seeking a measure of autonomy to which they thought they were entitled, rose in rebellion. While engaged in this conflict, the Turks suddenly found that their last African province--Tripoli--had been taken over by Italy. The Turkish Government was hardly in a mood to favor the colonization of European Jews in Mesopotamia and the project had to be dropped.²³

Meanwhile, Joseph Fels had, on his own, been looking for a territory in the Western Hemisphere. Fels had visited Diaz, in Mexico, in 1907 to obtain a concession of territory. Diaz was more than willing to facilitate a large immigration of Jewish industrial and commercial workers, but he did not welcome the idea of a special territory upon an agricultural basis. Negotiations were also under way with several South American countries but none progressed past the letter writing stage, although Joseph Fels did personally investigate the possibilities of territorial concessions.²⁴ During the years 1911 and 1912, inquiries were once again made concerning the possibilities in Australia but there was too much internal opposition to a separate state. The Immigration League wrote in dis-

paraging terms of ITO's plans. Even back in 1907, this group denounced Zangwill's scheme as fantastic as Noah's²⁵ scheme had been in America.

The next territory that was given serious consideration was that of Angola. Under the text of a Bill that had been passed by the Portuguese Parliament in 1912, the Portuguese Government had been "authorized to grant concessions of land on the high plateaus of the Province of Angola to Jewish immigrants who shall submit to the stipulations of this law and become naturalized Portuguese by terms of this law."²⁶ The naturalization was to be effected by the payment of only one dollar and the immigrants were to be introduced by one of the established Jewish societies. It was necessary that this group have sufficient funds for the agricultural and industrial working of the concessions. Portuguese was to be the language exclusively taught in the²⁷ schools and to be used in the public services.

Professor Gregory, of the University of Glasgow, who had previously been sent to investigate the territory of Cyrenaica, was appointed to investigate this territory. In his report to ITO, the well-known geologist stated:

"If I were asked by an ordinary Scottish farmer whether I would advise him to go to Angola or to such countries as Canada, Australia, or British East Africa, I would certainly not advise him to go to Angola. But it is owing to the drawbacks of the country that there is a chance of establishing a colony in correspondence with your programme. I have considered the suitability of Angola rather for refugees who wish to escape poverty and ill-treatment in their own countries and wish to remain in a Jewish community. I assume that such refugees would be

willing to work with greater patience than ordinary commercial settlers. I thought this country more hopeful for refugee immigrants than any other class. I see no reason why such settlers should not in time build up a colony for themselves." 28

In regards to the hardships and the patience that seemed to be required, Zangwill commented:

"Nor has it ever been the ITO's view that our colonists are to enjoy either a featherbed or a fire-proof existence. The Jew, if he wishes to obtain a land of his own, cannot be wholly guaranteed from those risks which were cheerfully run-by the founders of every one of those United States to which the Jew now hies himself with such a sense of security." 29

The spadework for this scheme of settlement was done by Wolf Terlo, a former Russian Jew who had settled in Lisbon in 1904 as well as by a native Jew, Alfred Bensaude.³⁰ Portugal had in 1910 become a republic and felt that this colonization would help in creating a more prosperous land. But it was obvious by the conditions imposed that the Portuguese were more interested in a Jewish colony and certainly not in a Jewish State. The Jews were quite skeptical and lukewarm. It was certainly not in keeping with the movement to have the immigrants become Portuguese subjects and to have as their official language the Portuguese tongue. At first negotiations completely broke down, but in 1914 negotiations were resumed once again. As the negotiations dragged on, opposition to an autonomous state in Angola manifested itself in Portugal. The Catholics were opposed to the Jews on religious grounds while the³¹ Portuguese businessmen feared the Jewish competition.

Negotiations for many of these sites continued on through the war. During the first World War, the Mesopotamia plan was again suggested by Herman Landau, an Anglo-Jewish philanthropist, who saw vast commercial possibilities in the scheme, which was to convert Mesopotamia into a world-granary by irrigating it and settling it with Jewish homesteads under the British flag. ³² In 1923, the President of Mexico, Obregon, made an offer of a tract of land in Mexico for the purposes of a Jewish settlement. In connection with this, Zangwill writes:

"Obviously enquiry was needed of the possibility of extraordinary immigration: immigration in the shape of colonization of a specifically allotted territory, safeguarded by special conditions. The first step in such an enquiry was to ascertain the character and climate of the region proposed by President Obregon. Originally, for example, Lower California had been suggested: a Province the Jewish Territorial Organization had rejected nearly 20 years before for its aridity and which was not even free from litigious issues. Mr. Rothenberg (through whom President Obregon made his offer) cabled me that a tract of five million acres in Chinahua had been substituted, free from any necessity either of irrigation or litigation. According to State Documents the Mexican Government was willing to cede large tracts of national land in Chiapas, Tabasco or Quintana, though it frankly advised that superior tracts climatically could be obtained by private purchase. But whatever the region offered it was clearly the business of the American Jewish Congress to have dispatched thither a reliable scientific expedition, and to have published the Report of its experts together with a full statement of the Mexican terms and conditions." ³³

By this time, of course, the Jewish Territorial Organization had practically gone out of business because of the Balfour Declaration in 1917. The Jewish Territorial Organization

thus was unable to find a territory in which a Jewish State could be established, despite many promising prospects. If the land proved to be suitable, the inhabitants of the land were opposed to the Jewish autonomous colonization; if the people were in favor of the Jewish settlement, then the land usually was not considered worthwhile; if the government and the people were in accord concerning the Jewish migration into the country, the ITO Geographical Commission usually counseled caution because of the unstable international situation. When the Balfour Declaration was made public, the ITO which at all times had stated that it was only too happy to support a Jewish State in Palestine, if there was any chance of success, decided once again to rejoin the Zionist Movement and Zangwill, himself, was the first to announce himself in favor of the future State in Palestine. However, the other members of ITO who had previously been opposed to Zionism at the very beginning still maintained this opposition. Unlike Zangwill, such men as Lucien Wolf and Leopold Rothschild did not go over to the Zionist cause. However, Zangwill did bring with him Dr. Nahum Slousch, Sir Meyer Spielman, and James de Rothschild.

ITO AND ZIONISM

Herzl's death did not ease the friction that existed in the Zionist Organization because of the Uganda proposal. The Seventh Zionist Congress was really divided into three groups--the political Zionists, the followers of Herzl, who believed that no settlement projects should be initiated in Palestine before the Charter had been obtained; the practical Zionists, who were interested in immediate work being carried out in Palestine in cooperation with Baron de Rothschild and the ICA; and the Territorialists, who felt that as long as Palestine was not immediately available, it was incumbent upon the organization to seek another territory until Palestine might be available. The first group, which was headed by Wolffsohn, Herzl's successor and Max Nordau, assumed control over the Congress after Herzl's death. In Nordau's words: "Colonization without definite guarantees is a phantom, castles in the air built by Luftmenschen."¹ The "practical" Zionists, on the other hand, had been Herzl's opponents from the outset and were composed of the Russian Jews who had walked out of the Sixth Congress in protest against the Uganda venture. The Territorialist position was explained at the Seventh Congress by Israel Zangwill who said: "An autonomous colony, even outside of Palestine, was already more than half the Basle programme. To be able to live their own life as a nation after eighteen centuries of homelessness, who would deny its helpfulness?"²

A battle royal ensued at the Seventh Congress, with

each group expounding its ideas. The Practicals demanded that an investigating committee also be sent to Palestine. A conciliation was effected between the "Politicals" and the "Practicals" in order to save the Zionist Movement, but the Territorialists left the Congress. Zangwill's parting words in the Congress Hall were bitter: "Herzl told me that the Seventh Congress will be the last Congress, and I hope that it will be so."³

The battle had begun! From the time of the Seventh Zionist Congress until the issuance of the Balfour Declaration there was a conflict between ITO and the Zionist Organization. However, many individuals retained their membership in the Zionist Movement and at the same time belonged to the Jewish Territorial Organization. When the split was effected, even Herzl's chief supporter, Max Nordau wrote to Zangwill:

I maintain that one can be a Territorialist and a Zionist at the same time. Territorialism aiming only at immediate relief, while Zionism strives for the final solution of the Jewish problem, which in my opinion can be found only in Palestine. I wish you Godspeed with all my heart! 4

There were many other "politicals" who thought twice about the possibility of a territory. David Wolffsohn, one of Herzl's closest friends and his successor as head of world Zionism, visited Uganda in 1906 and raved about its possibilities for settlement. He asserted that while "it is forbidden to say so in public" it was indeed a land that was flowing with milk and honey.⁵

Under the leadership of Dr. Max Mandelstamm the movement became very popular in Russia as one that was seeking an immediate solution to their difficulties. The Western Zionists who had backed Herzl in his Uganda proposal flocked to Zangwill's colors. In England the Zionists were severely weakened by ITO, which also attracted a considerable and influential section of the Anglo-Jewish community which had hitherto stood aloof or even hostile to Zionist aspirations in Palestine. In America, Cyrus Sulzberger, the former vice-president of the Federation of American Zionists organized the Jewish Territorial Organization of America, which not only included American Jewish non-Zionist leaders like Mayer Sulzberger, Oscar Straus and Daniel Guggenheim but also such prominent Zionists as Dr. S. Solis Cohen who wrote in 1906:

As I have found no conflict between American citizenship and Zionism, so I find no conflict between continued adherence to Zionism and participation in the work of ITO. 6

When Theodore Herzl had decided to visit England in order to propogate his ideas, he was commended by Max Nordau to visit Israel Zangwill. When he arrived in London on November 21, 1895 he had a rather difficult time conversing with Zangwill since Herzl was not too familiar with the English language. However, Zangwill was completely captivated by Herzl's personality. Although Zangwill was not completely convinced of Herzl's arguments, he did arrange for Herzl to meet some of the most important personages in England and he used his offices to obtain for Herzl an invitation to

speak at a banquet of the Maccabeans Club. It was the first group to hear Herzl's ideas. His message made such an impact on English Jewry that he immediately converted such men as Sir Samuel Montagu, the banker, Rabbi Singer and Col. Goldsmith. It also paved the way for the warm friendship that existed from that time on and until his death between Herzl and Zangwill.⁷ Zangwill came to the First Zionist Congress merely as a spectator, but was drawn into the strong current that it produced.⁸ When Zangwill participated in one of the early Congresses though he was not a delegate and his status was challenged, Herzl who was then presiding remarked: "When we have a genius in our midst, we will not take into consideration the usual political formalities."⁹ He was a disciple of Herzl up to the Sixth Congress, although following this event he complained that the great Zionist leader paid too much attention to the Russian Zionists who had caused such a clamor. Zangwill's brilliant pen wrote many impassioned praises of Palestine and of the possibility of settlement under Jewish leadership. Zangwill continuously spoke out against the leaders of the Alliance Israelite Universelle and the Jewish Colonization Association, which was spending millions in their futile attempts to settle Jews on a soil outside of Palestine. It was Zangwill who coined the phrase: "Give the country without a people to the people without a country."

Despite his withdrawal from the Zionist Organization,

Zangwill at first spoke well of Zionism, and maintained that it was possible for one to become an Itoist and at the same time remain a Zionist. It was his constant contention that he was not opposed to Palestine, but that since it was unattainable it was ridiculous for the Zionists to divert all of their attentions and energies in that one direction when the immediate need of the Jews could be solved with any other suitable territory. The Zionists in turn retorted that one could not be a Zionist and an Itoist at the same time. Heresy trials were held by the Zionists and the question was constantly brought up as to the attitude the Zionists should take to the Itoists in their ranks.¹⁰ This was especially noticeable in England and in America, where the Zionist groups had never been overly powerful and where it was felt that if the territorialists were allowed to remain in the organization, it was even possible that they would ultimately control the groups.¹¹ The strength of the Territorialists was accentuated by the constant struggle for power within the Zionist groups by the "practicals" and "politicals." The extremists were keeping Zionism weak, and the Territorialists could not be taken lightly. Territorialists in the Zionist Organization delivered long speeches propogating their ideas. It was no wonder that Zangwill proclaimed: "The Zionists only have a programme. We territorialists have a plan of work."¹²

There were many Zionists who tried to bring about a reconciliation. The loss of the beloved Dr. Mandelstamm,

whom Herzl in his novel Altneuland portrayed as the first President of the New Commonwealth, was a distinct blow to the Zionist cause.¹³ "Even Katzenelson thought it essential to find a modus vivendi with the Territorialists, because he believed that if the Territorialists were not brought back--even in the form of an independent Federation--¹⁴ the movement must inevitably flounder."

Zionism was undergoing a difficult period. The Russian Zionists, at odds with the "political" Zionists who were leading the Zionist Movement were not sending in their Shekel payments and this was the largest territorial Federation.¹⁵ Zionism was meeting opposition on all sides, since it now had to contend with the territorialists as well as the anti-Zionists and the established Jewish Colonization Association. "In the United States the Zionists' Federation had an annual income of about \$3,000 from its Shekel-payers. Considering that ardent Zionists enroll their children, relatives, and friends, it has been estimated that hardly more than 6,000 adult Jews consider it worthwhile to spend 25 cents a year for the movement. Compared with several Jewish fraternal societies with memberships of over 100,000, and with literary societies having thousands of members, the Zionists play no role in the life of the Jew in this country. In England the reports of the Zionist Federation show a similar state of affairs. The membership has always been comparatively small and of late decreasing."¹⁶ This report was five years after

the Zionist split.

Wolffsohn, aware of the inherent dangers, appealed to Mandelstamm, and through him to Zangwill but to no avail.¹⁷ As time went on, the bitterness became deeper. The Zionists scorned the Itoists as men of talk but no action. The ITO was labeled a "one man" organization and that if Zangwill was to leave it, the organization would fall apart. The Itoists however claimed that they were carrying out the true spirit of Herzl, which the Zionists had failed to do.

When the Zionists in England heard that the prominent Jewish paper, the London Jewish Chronicle, was for sale at the end of 1906 they immediately considered purchasing the weekly. The Jewish World had hitherto been a sounding board for the Territorialists and this seemed an excellent opportunity for the Zionists. In a letter from L.J. Greenberg to Jacobus Kann, dated December 4, 1906, he wrote:

I heard yesterday the Jewish Chronicle is in the market for sale, and today I saw the proprietor and asked him if he would be willing to sell it to me. Of course, I need not tell you what me in this regard means. I have an idea that it would be a most excellent thing if our Movement could have the paper, assuming the price asked is not exorbitant, and will show a fair return on the outlay. There is no necessity to point out to you the extreme value to Zionism in having such an organ, not only so far as England is concerned, but because I believe the future of our Movement is largely dependent upon this country. Personally, I am, as you may gather, very much in favor of the plan in principle. I would of course propose to continue the paper as a general organ, but the policy of the paper would be ours. 18

Kann and Wolffsohn were in favor of the purchase, but the Russian opposition raised such a furore over the Zionist purchase of a paper rather than using the money for practical purposes in Palestine that Kann, Wolffsohn, Greenberg, Cowen and Katzenelsohn met and decided to furnish the money themselves.¹⁹ Leopold Greenberg was made the editor of the paper. Chaim Weizmann remarks that when he came to England, Leopold Greenberg was his enemy because of Weizmann's opposition to the Uganda proposal and that Greenberg did all he could to keep Weizmann out of the Zionist movement in England. It is also possible that Greenberg still smarted over the Russian Zionists' reaction to the purchase of the Jewish Chronicle.²⁰

The same year, while the controversy raged between the Zionists and Territorialists in England, where the Territorialists were particularly entrenched, Oscar Straus came over from America in attempt to reconcile the differences and to ease the conflict that was becoming more and more bitter. At this conference which was joined by the Jewish Colonization Association, it was decided to work together to find a land of refuge. Agreement was reached that Palestine and the surrounding area should be the first area explored, but the ICA group refused to go along with the condition that called for local self-government. Tension eased considerably after that. However, the conference also showed that while the groups had much in common, the Zionists still would not consider any other territory but in Palestine and its vicinity and the Itoists were

bound and determined to find a land that would be immediately available.
21

But perhaps the straw that broke the camel's back' was Zangwill's decision to bring court action against the Jewish Colonial Trust's seeking to alter its Memorandum of Association to restrict its objects to Palestine, Syria and the adjoining countries. The Jewish Colonial Trust was the first Zionist bank, which Herzl had organized back in 1898. Zangwill pressed his claim as an interested Zionist while his opponents charged that he was involved in this action because he served a rival party. Zangwill said that the Trust was founded primarily for colonization, for the realization of Herzl's book The Jewish State. He emphasized that at the time of this book the land had not been determined. Colonization would be undertaken wherever it would be of service to the German people. Zangwill further pointed out that at one time a majority of the Zionist Congress had been in favor of East Africa. In his plea, Zangwill said:

The Petitioners accuse me of belonging to a rival organization, but if this were so I should be only too glad to leave them to their present impotence. In the face of the pressing need of our people, rivalry, except in bringing help, would be criminal. My deepest desire is to see the majority and the minority united in the work of colonization. We cannot have two rival schemes of national colonization going on at the same time. I do not want the Territorial Organization to work except with the Zionist movement. I want the whole Jewish people to work together. Only I cannot admit that if Palestine and its neighborhood continue indefinitely closed, we are to continue indefinitely idle. 22

In conclusion, Zangwill requested that the Zionist movement not be allowed to cut themselves off from that rich field of colonization possibilities; and to save the Jewish Colonial Trust from suicide. He said that while he had no hope of getting any money from the Zionists they must not rob themselves of their own potentialities. Zangwill gained his point and the Court of Chancery refused permission to change the Memorandum of Association. The Jewish Colonial Trust was ordered to pay the costs of the action, which were fairly heavy. Zangwill did not gloat over his victory. Rather, he said that it was a Zionist victory since the money could now be used for cooperation with the Jewish Territorial Organization.²³ But Zangwill was not to realize this hope. Immediately after the verdict was made, the Smaller Actions Committee of the Zionist Organization met and decided that if the Memorandum of Association must not be changed, there is nothing to prevent them from adding to it and the result was that the Bank's funds continued to be applied to Palestine, Syria²⁴ and the adjoining countries.

While in England, Wolffsohn vigorously attacked the ITO at a large public meeting:

You must not involve Herzl's name and seek to destroy his work. Herzl's practical achievement is the Zionist Organization, it is the Zionist institutions, it is the Zionist Congress. Whoever fights our institutions does not respect the decisions of the Congress, harms our Movement....We have Herzl's legacy. It belongs to official Zionism and no other.²⁵

In 1909 the Jewish Territorial Organization was blamed for

the trouble that split the English Zionist Federation wide open. Dr. Moses Gaster, the "practical" Zionist had never seen eye to eye with Joseph Cowen and Leopold Greenberg, the "political" Zionist. When Greenberg was elected vice president of the organization over Herbert Bentwich, who was backed by Gaster, the Sephardic Haham resigned and the Federation was split wide open. In addition, the Order of Ancient Maccabeans seceded from the Federation and claimed recognition as an independent body.²⁶ Wolffsohn's friends approached him again, including the banker, Jacobus Kann and urged him to try and bring Zangwill back into the Movement. Wolffsohn regarded Zangwill a traitor to the Movement and could not understand why there was so much insistence on the part of his friends to reconcile their differences with Zangwill. "He wrote an almost angry letter to Kann insisting that there must on no account be any reconciliation with Zangwill."²⁷

Meanwhile accusations and counter-accusations were hurled by Zionists and Zangwill. Time and again, Zangwill indicated that the Zionists were hurting the ITO cause as they negotiated for Palestine. In a letter to the Ottoman Jews, Zangwill urged them to cultivate a local nationalism of their own--a Judaeo-Ottoman nationalism. He characterized Zionism as being "Zionless Zionism" and urged the Ottoman Jews to have nothing to do with this cause.²⁸ His charge of Zionism being a 'dead movement' was severely attacked by Shmarya Levy and Israel Cohen, of the Zionist Organization.²⁹ In a later article written by Zangwill,

entitled "Mr. Zangwill Takes Stock" the ITO leader wrote:

Negatively the general Jewish situation has grown still blacker in those five years. The necessity for an ITOLand has become as clear, even to the philanthropist, as the impossibility of Palestine to the honest Zionist. 30

In return, Wolffsohn attacked Zangwill by stating at a London meeting:

Zangwill's advice is too difficult to follow, because he has changed his opinion so often and has lost faith in the Jewish people and its future. 31

As time went on and the Itoists did not agree on a program, there was less and less opposition manifested against the Territorialists. Every time a prospect for a territory was mentioned, Zangwill indicated that there were many Zionists who were interested in cooperating in the proposed territory. But when the Mesopotamia project was considered and the Zionists were asked to join in, there was always a sarcastic refusal to cooperate. ³² Zionism to the Zionists, especially after the split meant Palestine and although individual members thought this program too narrow and limited, the Zionist Organization maintained their position throughout.

The World War halted the activity of both the Zionist Organization and the Jewish Territorial Organization. But it was the Zionists who made real headway after so many years of conflict and confusion. On November 2, 1917, in a letter addressed by Lord Balfour, the Foreign Secretary, to Lord Rothschild, president of the English Zionist Federation, the following historic declaration was

materialism to be the principle factor in history, and the history of the world to be the history of struggle of class against class. Yet, besides this struggle of the classes, they maintained that there is distinguishable another kind of struggle for interests common to all classes of the various groups of people, called Nationalists. Moreover, this latter development is assuming such forms which tend not only to assume the existence of each individual as such, but also to safeguard his interests as a member of the nation to which he belongs. In other words, it assumes such forms as tend toward safeguarding the existence of the different nationalities and their national and cultural values, which have been created by all classes commonly. Taking this national-socialistic view, the Poale Zion Territorialists did not arrive at their territorialism from the theory of the proletarianization but from the economic-national point of view. Their center need not be Palestine, they maintained, for it was absurd to speak of a historical claim on Palestine, a claim that was justified neither from the legal point of view, since Palestine was politically controlled by others, nor from the socialistic point of view, because it was economically in the hands of others.

The Sejmists were formed upon the principles of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries. In their nationalism they were in complete accord with the Minsk group. However, they laid more stress on a program for the Jews in Russia. This party advocated national autonomy for Russian Jewry, which would be controlled by an elected central body, the

Sejm. This Sejm would serve as the parliament to decide on Jewish national affairs. With the Sejm controlling the material and spiritual resources of Russian Jewry, it would be in a position to decide whether the Jews should strive towards a territory of their own or should remain a separate cultural body in the Diaspora.

The point of view of the Socialist Zionists was purely Marxistic. They emphasized historic materialism, but they went even further. It was their contention that the Jewish proletariat had a special problem of its own that could not be solved by the emancipation of the Jews. To them, the problem lay deeper than the political inequality of the Jews. In order to become constructive and assist in the building up of the future social state, it was necessary for the Jewish proletariat to live under conditions of a national economy of his own, which was only possible in a territory where the Jews would form a majority. Territorialism was then for the Jewish proletariat not the maximum but the minimum of its demands; it was not an end in itself but a means by which to reach a normal proletarianization and thus attain to the highest aim of the proletariat--Socialism. Thus it was only natural that this group would join the Territorialist movement.

These different groups were current in Russia. However, their influence also permeated America where many of the refugees had brought along with them many of the political ideas of their former homeland. In the main, the

American Socialist Territorialists belonged to the Minsk school, but they did give their support, on the whole, to the Socialist Zionists, which were the strongest of the three groups and which was assuming the leadership of the Socialist-Territorialist Movement. At the first conference in 1906 the group decided:

Jewish migration must transform itself into colonization, which, on account of its collective nature, will proceed in the direction of Jewish mass concentration on a free territory. This process of emigration and colonization creates, in its development, a real basis for the formation of a Jewish Society. 2

Besides Russia and America, the Socialist Territorialists became quite active in Poland and Lithuania. It formed more than a hundred local chapters and had over 10,000 members with its influence extending over a much larger number of workingmen. To further its cause, the Socialist-Territorialists published two papers: "Das Neue Leben" and "Das Yiddische Arbeitwort". At a later conference when the question of autonomy was raised, it was decided that "the formula of autonomy is unsuitable and scarcely likely to further our program." 3 The S.S. faction preferred that the autonomous concept be dropped from its program. They defined as necessary for the realization of territorialism merely a minimum of rights upon a continuous territory, which would guarantee the settlement and the concentration of the great Jewish masses. It was their desire that the minimum guarantee be political economic freedom, freedom to colonize in great masses upon a unified plan. They stressed that the emphasis should be

laid not upon the political but the economic and pre-eminently social side of the territorialist goal.

In America there was quite a contrast between the three branches of ITO that met on rare occasions and the Jewish Socialist Territorialist Labor Party of America, who were quite active. While ITO was centered in New York, Baltimore and Philadelphia, the Socialist Territorialists had thirty chapters and twenty-five smaller groups scattered throughout the United States and Canada. In 1907 the Socialist Territorialists published a monthly magazine, "Das Folk," which was written in Yiddish. This was edited by the opponent of Marxian economic socialism, Nahum Syrkin, who seemed to shift back and forth from Zionism to Territorialism and back to Zionism. To Syrkin, Socialism meant the latest stage in man's fight for spiritual and human freedom. He had a radical distaste for the galut life. Syrkin's ideas later contributed to the development of the non-Marxian Labor Zionism. Later in 1912, the Socialist Territorialists organized a weekly paper, "Die Folk's Shtime".

Despite the desire of the Socialists to cooperate with the Jewish Territorial Organization, there was no close relationships between the two groups. This was most graphically emphasized when the American Socialist-Territorialists asked Zangwill to send them a message of encouragement at their convention during the year 1909. Concerning this request, the leader of the Jewish Territorial Organization wrote to the Socialist-Territorialists:

While thanking you for your cabled congratulation to the ITO Council and wishing you in return success for the Convention you have called for September in Philadelphia, allow me to point out that your party has never been affiliated with ours and therefore it is beyond my province to comply with your request to send a message to your Convention that should encourage and help you to reinforce your ranks. Indeed I must confess that I see little use in a reinforcement of your ranks, except to a view of active and immediate work. The experience of the ITO has shown that there is no real work for territorial branches to do pending the actual initiation of a colonizing scheme, for we neither possess nor wish to possess the music of Hatikvah to cover up emptiness, mislead the sentimental and drown the voice of criticism. The existence, therefore, of a Socialist-Territorialist Labor Party in the air is an absurdity, seeing that we have neither a territory to occupy nor an administration to socialize, nor any practical labor to do. If encouraged by your request, I venture to give you a piece of advice; it is that you abandon that large sphere of inactivity known as party, and concentrate upon a piece of practical work. Such work might take the shape of the foundation of a model pioneer colony on a small scale in which your principles might find expression, and which would not clash with, but, on the contrary, help forward, that large colonization, which the ITO has in view. Should you make this colony in Mesopotamia, where abundant land is to be had cheap, where you could commercialize, it would also serve as an experimental test of the possibilities of that country and of our colonists. Or, if you wish to act nearer home and at a smaller distance from your base of energy, then make the colony in the United States, many states of which are practically undeveloped and unpopulated. Should your nucleus prove prosperous, you have nearly two million Jews within the States to exercise its attraction upon, and as these Jews are already safely inside, no immigration bill can interfere with your operations. I will send you in the next mail a report which we have made upon two American states, but there must be many other regions in which large colonization is possible. 4

This letter from Israel Zangwill was completely unexpected and it struck the Socialist-Territorialists like a thunderbolt. In a reply letter to Zangwill, the secretary wrote that he was surprised to receive such a letter. It had been taken for granted that there was a relationship between

the two groups. ⁵ In reply to this letter from the Socialist-Territorialists, Zangwill again pointed out that he saw no reason for the Socialist-Territorialists to continue to exist as a Party. ⁶

Despite this letter exchange and the views of Israel Zangwill, the activity of the Socialist-Territorialists continued. Like the Zionists they continued to have meetings, clubs and speeches. However, as time went on and the prospects of a territory seemed dimmer and dimmer, the group diminished in size, and more and more of its members were lost to the Poale Zion Zionist group. This process took place throughout the world, wherever the Socialist-Territorialists had organized. Like ITO, the majority of its members dropped the territorialist cause when the Balfour Declaration seemed to herald the immediate realization of their territorialist goal. During the first World War, however, there were some who joined with the Sejmists in forming the United Jewish Labor Party, which played a vital role in the establishing of Jewish national autonomy in the Ukraine in 1917 and 1918, and later in helping toward the creation of a Jewish autonomous state in Biro-Bidjan.

DISSOLUTION OF ITO AND THE REASONS FOR ITS FAILURE

On June 12, 1925 the Jewish Territorial Organization Council met at the home of Meyer Spielman and decided to dissolve itself as an organization. The resolution was made by Israel Zangwill, the founder, president and the prime mover of the ITO. Zangwill explained that since the Balfour Declaration had made it possible that Palestine might become a Jewish State, he preferred that the ITO suspend its activities. Zangwill pointed out that he was not satisfied with the Zionist negotiations with the British and that even if Palestine were opened up to Jewish immigration, it could only absorb a few hundred thousand Jews. However, in light of the Balfour Declaration and the fact that even if there were other territorial possibilities there would be such a fanatical resistance on the part of the Zionists and their sympathizers there would be no possibility of its success. Israel Zangwill further stated that despite the fact that Palestine might become a Jewish State there was still a need for a territory at that time in light of world conditions. He mentioned that even such Zionists as Nathan Straus and Stephen Wise had emphasized the need of additional settlements for Jews; and that Paul Nathan was interested in colonization in Eastern Russia as an immediate solution for those Jews who were still feeling the brunt of anti-Semitism in Europe. Zangwill concluded with the fact that his doctors had informed him that it was absolutely necessary for him to cut down on his activities

and that under no circumstances could he continue to lead the Jewish Territorial Organization. However, Zangwill did signify his willingness to serve under another leader if the group chose to continue its activities.

This resolution of dissolution that Zangwill proposed caused quite a discussion and several of the ITO leaders insisted that ITO continue its activities. A T.B. Herwald, of Manchester, declared that though he was also a Zionist as well as an Itoist, he felt that it would be a crime against the Jewish people to wind up the activities of the Jewish Territorial Organization. Herwald referred to the pre-war proposition of the Honduras Government which had offered to settle 10,000 Jewish immigrants in a colony to be called " Palestina " with free grants to each settler of 62½ to 125 acres, and said that it would be politically better than those conditions which then prevailed in Palestine.

The vice president of ITO, Meyer Spielman, pointed out that without a figurehead like Zangwill, who carried so much prestige, it would be useless to continue the activities of ITO. Spielman proposed that Zangwill's resolution be adopted and that they wind up their activities. He expressed the feeling that ITO might be revived later and perhaps best by way of the United States.

This latter opinion carried the day and ITO wound up its activities. At this meeting Zangwill predicted that the pressure of tragic forces would perpetually bring to the surface the territorial solution to the Jewish Problem, and later years proved Zangwill to be a prophet. During periods

of stress that resulted in a mass exodus of oppressed Jews, the territorial solution was again proposed when Palestine still could not open its gates to the wanderer and the fugitive.¹

Why did the Jewish Territorial Organization, with the support of some of the greatest leaders in world Jewry at the beginning of the Twentieth Century and marking among its friends the wealthiest Jewish philanthropists, fail to succeed in finding a Jewish Homeland outside of Palestine? Certainly when their search began, there were better prospects for a Territorial solution than the Zionist solution. Since it is always the custom for historians to dismiss those movements that had no success and were eventually dissolved with only a line or two concerning the reasons for their failure, no one has really concerned himself with the reasons for ITO's failure. Joseph Heller, in his excellent book The Zionist Idea explains the failure of Territorialism because "it approaches the Jewish national problem from a purely positivistic and rationalistic point of view; and disregards the deeper spiritual forces which have molded our national history."² But even the most fervent Zionist must admit that Zionism has not, in modern times, been a movement of all of the Jewish people or even the majority of them. The assistance that was rendered to the Zionist cause toward the establishment of the State of Israel was primarily philanthropic on the part of the majority of world Jewry. The distress of the concentration camp Jews caused world Jewry to support a Homeland, but the majority of world Jewry have never

considered this as being the answer to the ultimate fulfillment of the Jewish problem. Certainly if there were an unsettled territory during Hitler's time that the Jew could have gone to, the Jews of the world would have thought in terms of Territorialism. Thus, it is not only the fact that Territorialism did not have the emotional appeal that caused it to fail. This can only explain why it was not more popular among the Jews during the beginning of the Twentieth Century.

Part of the answer for ITO's failure lies in the organization itself. ITO was made up of many different elements, each pulling in his own direction. There were those who were primarily interested in securing a territory, others were interested in diverting immigration from England and America to any other source, other maintained that the solution lie in the Jews attempting to solve their problems within Russia itself until the territory could be discovered. In the group there were autonomists and anti-autonomists, Zionists and anti-Zionists. This was also a period of colonial conflicts. Each man, in the words of Oscar Straus, was primarily an American or Englishman or whatever country he belonged to, and there was nothing one could do that might hinder his country. Thus Paul Nathan, the German, was subject to suspicion as furthering the interests of Germany; Lord Rothschild and Lucien Wolf, who had ready access to the British Foreign Office, were subject to the charge of furthering

English Imperialism; and Oscar Straus, the American who became Ambassador to Turkey during periods of negotiation and was also Secretary of Commerce and Labor, would certainly be interested in America's welfare. When ITO was interested in Angola it was suspected of furthering German imperialistic aims. At the very beginning of the ITO Movement, Zangwill and Lucien Wolf were quite open in stating that this cause would also serve England's cause. One might very well ask why such a figure as Oscar Straus didn't use his good offices when he was the Ambassador to Turkey to help in acquiring one of the many territories that were available?

Another factor contributing to ITO's failure was the fact that ITO was Zangwill. This movement completely evolved around one man and his particular feelings. Thus, the Territorialist cause was only a truly strong force in England, where Zangwill resided. In America, where there were three chapters, there was hardly ever a meeting despite the fact that the ITO had attracted to its ranks some of the leaders of American Jewry. Even Cyrus Sulzberger, the president of American ITO, rarely published any news about ITO's activities in his paper, the American Hebrew. Yet there wasn't an issue of the paper that did not have much space devoted to Zionism. Between negotiations for lands to settle, ITO just didn't have anything to report. Thus, while one finds a tremendous amount of opposition to the Zionist cause, there is hardly

any attention paid to ITO despite its leadership. Except for the Socialist Territorialists, no one had any reason to be excited over Territorialism. As a matter of fact, even those who were opposed to ITO's conception of autonomy and were certainly opposed to Zionism, were only too willing to support ITO when it dealt with regulating emigration from Russia. ITO posed as no threat to the security and well being of those who feared a Jewish State.

In regard to ITO's failure to secure a territory the following should be noted. "The Jewish Territorial Organization and its political activities was the first serious and practical attempt to solve the problem of the landless people in some place other than its historic fatherland."³ It carried on its negotiations through men like Zangwill, Lucien Wolf, Paul Nathan and Lord Rothschild, all of whom had connections with the foreign offices of their respective countries. These negotiations were based on the following two principle foundations: The necessity of solving the Jewish problem by finding a territory and the fact that it was understood that the country which would own the territory would stand to reap considerable benefit from the concentration of an aporeciable number of Jews in one of its colonies. Thus, the Jewish Territorial Organization sought territories where there was no Jewish problem such as South America, Australia, Portugal and Canada or in one of the uninhabited British colonies. The opposition of the countries approached to the ITO plan is well illustrated by David Marmor who wrote: "the territorialist

plan of territorialist concentration and a certain measure of autonomy was opposed to the very existence of the modern state, which aimed at the concentration of legislative powers and at a national and cultural consolidation." ⁴

In addition there was of course the normal fears that would be aroused by such a Jewish territory as envisaged by ITO--the fear on the part of labor and management toward competition, opposition of the Christian Church, the dislike of the unlike, the fear of the small or weak State that the Jews were but forerunners of an imperialistic drive of one of the larger powers and the unwillingness of the ruling group to disturb the status quo.

But the very nature of the failure of ITO caused it to be revived again. It had not failed because it had the opportunity of settling a territory. It had failed because no territory had been found suitable or had been tried. Therefore when the same problem arose in later years the same solution was attempted. Territorialism has been called a failure because ITO failed, and yet one wonders in the light of what happened to six million Jews while the gates of Palestine were closed, whether an Itoland might not have been in the words of Max Nordau a "Nachtaeyl" until the State of Israel was established. One might argue that Territorialism failed in the 1930's but the same opportunities were not there. Cyrenaica was taken over by Italy and settlers were sent there after ITO had dismissed it; Mesopotamia is today called Iraq,

which reaps a fortune from its oil wells and only recently expelled Jews. Lower California, which was considered unsuitable for settlement is a prosperous section of the United States. With the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, the ITO Movement was doomed, but perhaps the Itoists at the last meeting in 1925 who wanted to continue the group were not too wrong...Perhaps ITO dissolved a bit too soon.

TERRITORIALISM CONTINUES

Territorialism as a solution for Jewish survival reappeared soon after the dissolution of the ITO. It gained a great deal of prestige when the Soviet Government proposed the settlement of Jewish colonists in Crimea in 1924. The sponsors of this proposed settlement hoped that there would be 12,000 settlers there by 1932. At the outset about 9,000 families joined the colony but the group became smaller and smaller and by 1932 only 4,000 families were left. Further colonization was abandoned in light of the attempt to set up an autonomous Jewish republic in Biro Bidjan. The Jews were to have the same local autonomy granted to the other small republics in the USSR. The quota was set for 100,000 Jews but there was even talk of a million settlers. Communists and anti-Zionists attacked any talk of settlement in Palestine and a campaign was begun throughout the world to help in the establishment of the Jewish Republic. The Yiddishists saw in Biro Bidjan the solution of the survival of the Yiddish language and culture. In May, 1934 the republic was proclaimed amidst much fanfare. But the hopes and the aspirations of a great Jewish State in Biro Bidjan were never realized. Ten years after the Soviet's declaration of its intention to create an autonomous state for Jewish settlement, there were only 19,000 settlers. Jewish philanthropic societies, throughout the world, saw in this scheme a solution to the problems confronting the oppressed and impoverished Polish and Roumanian Jews. It was

the hope of these organizations that the USSR would allow these persecuted Jews to settle in Biro Bid'jan. The Soviets, however, refused to open the gates of the country to the Jewish immigrants. The Soviet Government did promise in 1935 to admit a thousand families from foreign countries. But even this promise failed to attract any new settlers to Biro Bid'jan.¹

In The Jews in the Soviet Union, Solomon Schwarz concludes his excellent chapter on Biro Bid'jan by stating " Jewish immigration to Birobidzhan may be resumed again, but it is scarcely conceivable that the Jewish Autonomous Province will ever become a center of Jewish cultural life. "²

The upheaval caused by the Nazis in Germany and the steady deterioration of the Jewish population in Eastern Europe again brought the question of territorialism to the fore. Territorialists were again organized in Germany, Poland, France, England and America. A world conference was held in July of 1935 and these territorialist groups organized themselves into the Freeland League for Jewish Territorial Colonization. This organization was headed by the Sephardic Haham, Dr. Moses Gaster, one of the oldest Zionist leaders and a former president of the English Zionist Organization. The Freeland League gathered to its ranks all of the former Itoists who were still living as well as Zionists and Christians, who were interested in solving the problem of the many refugees who were leaving Germany.³ The question of a haven of refuge was raised once again. Immigration to

Palestine was limited and it was only natural that the territorial solution should once again be proposed. While the Zionists were skeptical about the chances of success that the Territorialists might have, they did not oppose or attack this organization.⁴ At one time, it was feared that a successful experiment of territorialism might ruin the plans for a future state in Palestine. However, there was no fear of competition now. All Jews were anxious to alleviate the disasterous condition that existed in Germany. Any haven of refuge would be acceptable. In 1936, Poland displayed an interest in Madagascar as an outlet for its surplus Jewish population, but the matter was later dropped.⁵ The British Government announced in 1938 that 10,000 square miles in British Guiana would be available for refugees from Nazi oppression. A commission was sent out to investigate the territory and it was found to be unsuitable for colonization. In July, 1941 the Colonial Secretary, Lord Moyne, admitted that he was not impressed with the prospects of settling Jewish victims of persecution in British Guiana.⁶ During the war it seemed as if every Republic in Central and South America were considered for possible Jewish colonization.⁷ But since no territory was available many of the Jews who could have left Europe before the great catastrophe were forced to remain behind and to suffer the consequences.

The Freeland League, like ITO, failed to find a territory. The leadership of this group was assumed by a Dr. A. Steinberg, who investigated the possibilities of opening up the Kimberly

in Northwest Australia to Jewish colonization. Like Zangwill before him, Steinberg played on the fears of the "yellow peril".⁸ But he, too, failed to convince the Australians that the Jews would be able to withstand the conditions that prevailed in this territory. The Australians signified that the Jews would find the conditions too severe and might then migrate to the cities.

Strangely enough, the Freeland League for Territorial Colonization still exists today despite the creation of the State of Israel. It was Shmarya Levin, the famous Zionist, who said, "The only service that the Territorial Movement did for the Jews was that several leaders became good geographers."⁹ This is not a fair nor kind statement. Israel Zangwill and his followers were not merely interested in finding what territories existed in the world. While one might question the motives of many of these Territorialists, no one can doubt that there was an earnest attempt to aid the oppressed and homeless Jew. The true Territorialist was not opposed to Zionism because the Zionists wanted Palestine to become the Jewish State. When Palestine was declared by the Balfour Declaration to be the future Homeland of the Jewish people, Zangwill and his followers joined wholeheartedly in trying to make this territory their Itoland. When the prospects of attaining this goal became dimmer, there was an attempt to find any territory that would be a haven of refuge. The ITO sought an immediate solution and not a hope for the future. To this end the true Territorialist was

devoted. Like the Zionists, the Territorialists were Jews who were concerned with the fate and destiny of the Jewish people. There appears to be no need today for the Freeland League for Jewish Colonization since the State of Israel has been established. Israel has opened its gates to the wandering and oppressed Jew. The hopes of Hess, Pinsker, and Herzl have been realized. The hopes of Israel Zangwill have also been realized. There is an Itoland, far greater than Zangwill could have ever dreamed of. But in the words of the immortal Herzl " If you will it, it is no dream ".

FOOTNOTES

Background to ITO

1. Cohen, Israel, The Zionist Movement, London, 1945, P.15
2. Ibid.
3. Elbogen, Ismar, A Century of Jewish Life, Philadelphia, 1946, pp. 200-223
4. "Biluin"--a name taken from a Biblical phrase (Isaiah 2,5): Bays Yaakov L'chu v'naylocho-- "O House of Jacob, come ye and let us go."
5. Pinsker, Leo, Road to Freedom, Translation by Dr. D.S. Blondheim, New York, 1944, pp. 74-106
6. Duker, Abraham, "Jewish Territorialism; An Historical Sketch," Contemporary Jewish Record, New York, 1939, p.16
7. Ibid.
8. Ben-Jacob, Jeremiah, The Jewish Struggle, London, 1942, p. 75
9. Ibid.
10. Friedman, Lee, Pilgrims in a New Land, New York, 1948, pp. 238-243
11. Goldberg, Israel, Major Noah, Philadelphia, 1936
See also "The First American Zionist", Maccabean, New York, 1908
12. Friedman, op. cit., pp.238-243
13. Duker, op. cit., pp. 18-19
14. Cohen, Israel, The Zionist Movement: Its Aims and Achievements, London, 1912, pp. 5-7
15. Fishberg, Maurice, The Jews, New York, 1911
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Elbogen, op. cit., p. 349
19. Bein, Alexander, Theodore Herzl, Translated from the German by Maurice Samuel, Philadelphia, 1948. See also Gottheil, Richard, Zionism, Philadelphia, 1914; Levensohn, Lotta, Outline of Zionist History, New York, 1941
20. Gottheil, op. cit., pp. 135-136

The Jewish Territorial Organization

1. Gottheil, op. cit., p. 137
2. Leftwich, Joseph, What Will Happen to the Jews, London, 1936, p. 184
3. Wolf, Lucien, "The Zionist Peril," Jewish Quarterly Review, London, 1905
4. "Lucien Wolf and Mr. Zangwill Clasp Hands," The Menorah, New York, 1906
5. Ibid.
6. American Hebrew, New York, 1906, p. 196
7. The Maccabean, New York, 1906, p. 119
8. Ibid.

9. Weizmann, Chaim, Trial and Error, New York, 1949, p.157
10. "First Convention of English Itoists," Menorah, 1906, p. 341
11. Simon, Maurice, Speeches, Articles and Letters of Israel Zangwill, London, 1937, pp. 234-261
12. Ibid.
13. Zangwill, Israel, "Be Fruitful and Multiply," ITO Leaflet No. 3, London, 1909, p. 8
14. Fels, Mary, Joseph Fels, New York, 1916
15. Marmor, David, The Diplomatic Negotiations of the Jewish Territorial Organization and the Reasons for their Failure, Jerusalem, 1945. See also Schevill, Ferdinand, A History of Europe, pp. 612-622; pp. 626-630; pp. 639-645
16. Wischnitzer, Mark, To Dwell in Safety, Philadelphia, 1948, Chapter 4
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid. See also Masserman and Baker, The Jews Come to America, pp. 226-230; pp. 238-243
19. Masserman and Baker, op. cit., op. 249-250
20. Wischnitzer, op. cit., pp. 125-126. See also Bressler, David, Industrial Removal Office, New York, 1903
21. Waldman, Morris, "The Galveston Movement," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, New York, 1926. See also Zangwill, Israel, "The ITO and its New Activity," The Menorah, New York, 1907
22. Adler, Cyrus, Jacob Schiff: His Life and Letters, Vol. II, New York, 1929, p. 100
23. Jewish Chronicle, London, January 12, 1908
24. Nathan, Ann and Cohen, Harry, The Man Who Stayed in Texas, New York, 1941, p. 201
25. Ibid. The writer also used photostatic copies of letters sent by Rabbi Henry Cohen to Israel Zangwill regarding his financial loss due to his activity with the Galveston Movement. There were additional letters sent by Jacob Schiff and Morris Waldman concerning this matter and expressing their dismay over Rabbi Cohen's resignation. These letters have been acquired by Dr. Jacob Marcus, Director of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.
26. American Jewish Yearbook, 1907-1908, New York, pp. 538-539
27. Wischnitzer, op. cit., p. 129. See also Waldman, op. cit.,
28. Adler, op. cit., p. 109
29. Ibid.
30. Op. cit., p. 114

Diplomatic Activity of ITO

1. Leftwich, op. cit., p. 184
2. Schevill, op. cit., pp. 636-645
3. Leftwich, op. cit., p. 199
4. op. cit., p. 198

5. Ibid.
6. Jewish Chronicle, June 21, 1907, p. 17
7. Simon, Maurice, op. cit., p. 296
8. op. cit., p. 301
9. Report of Dr. Nahum Slousch in the ITO Files, Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, Israel
10. Simon, Maurice, op. cit., p. 303
11. Ibid.
12. Gregory, J.W., Report on the Work of the Commission sent out by the Jewish Territorial Organization under the auspices of the Governor-General of Tripoli to examine the Territory proposed for the purpose of Jewish Settlement in Cyrenaica, 1909. The preface to this report is by Israel Zangwill. This report may be found in the ITO Files, Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, Israel.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. American Jewish Yearbook, 1909-1910, New York, pp. 97-9. See also Jewish Chronicle, May 28, 1909, p. 27
16. Jewish Chronicle, May 28, 1909, p. 27
17. Adler, op. cit., pp. 93-94
18. Ibid.
19. American Hebrew, July, 1909, p. 296
20. Ibid.
21. op. cit., p. 124
22. op. cit., p. 296
23. Schevill, op. cit., pp. 644-645; Marmor, op. cit.
24. Leftwich, op. cit., pp. 175-176; Fels, op. cit.
25. Jewish Chronicle, June 21, 1907, p. 17. Here we find that the paper is reporting what had been printed in the Australian World, official organ of the Immigration League.
26. Leftwich, op. cit., p. 194
27. Gregory, J.W., Report on the Work of the Commission sent out by the Jewish Territorial Organization under the auspices of the Portuguese Government to examine the territory proposed for the purpose of a Jewish Settlement in Angola, London, 1913
28. Ibid.
29. Leftwich, op. cit., p. 195
30. Wischnitzer, op. cit., p. 137
31. Marmor, op. cit.
32. American Hebrew, April, 1917
33. Leftwich, op. cit., p. 176

ITO and Zionism

1. Levensohn, op. cit., p. 45
2. Cohn, Emil Bernhard, David Woffsohn, Philadelphia, 1944 p. 146
3. op. cit., p. 147
4. Leftwich, op. cit., p. 185

5. Reiss, Ephraim Cohn, Mezichronot Ish Yerushalayim, Palestine, 1936, Part II, p. 34
6. Leftwich, op. cit., v. 186
7. Bein, op. cit., p. 157
8. Gottheil, op. cit., p. 138
9. Weizmann, op. cit., p. 160
10. Goodman, Paul, Zionism in England, London, 1929, p. 24
See also The Menorah, 1906-1907, p. 45, where the Federation of American Zionists decided, after a bitter dispute among its members, that "no person known to be a member of a Territorialist organization be eligible to membership in the Executive Committee of the Federation."
11. Ibid.
12. Cohn, op. cit., p. 158
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. op. cit., p. 159
16. Fishberg, op. cit., p. 497
17. Cohn, op. cit., p. 160
18. op. cit., pp. 182-183. See also The Menorah, 1907, pp. 30-31
19. Ibid.
20. Weizmann, op. cit., p. 89
21. American Hebrew, 1906, p. 220
22. Simon, Maurice, op. cit., p. 280
23. op. cit., v. 281. See also Jewish Chronicle, July 19 and 26, 1907
24. Cohn, op. cit., pp. 198-199
25. Ibid.
26. op. cit., p. 201. See also Goodman, Zionism in England
27. Ibid.
28. American Hebrew, November, 1910, p. 405
29. op. cit., p. 406
30. Ibid.
31. op. cit., May, 1910, p. 17
32. American Jewish Yearbook, 1909-1910, p. 98
33. Levensohn, op. cit., p. 64
34. Simon, Maurice, op. cit., p. 331. See also Jewish Chronicle, December 7, 1917

Socialist-Territorialism

1. Waldstein, A.S., "Radical Movements in Zionism," The Maccabean, New York, 1906, chapter 13. See also Heller, Joseph, The Zionist Idea, chapter 13; Tartakower, Aryeh, "Jewish Socialist Parties," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. IX; and Duker, op. cit.
2. Waldstein, op. cit., p. 84
3. American Hebrew, May, 1907, p. 681
4. op. cit., November, 1909, p. 602
5. Jewish Chronicle, December 10, 1909, p. 29
6. op. cit., December 14, 1909, p. 34

Dissolution of ITO and Reasons for its Failure

1. "Jewish Territorial Organization--Its Activities Ended," Jewish Chronicle, June 12, 1925
2. Heller, op. cit., p. 87
3. Marmor, op. cit.
4. Ibid.

Territorialism Continues

1. Duker, op. cit.; Ben-Jacob, op. cit., p. 80; Leftwich, op. cit., pp. 136-162
2. Schwarz, Solomon. M., The Jews in the Soviet Union, New York, 1951, p. 190
3. Duker, op. cit.
4. Ben-Jacob, op. cit., p. 81
5. op. cit., pp. 81-82
6. Duker, op. cit.
7. Ben-Jacob, op. cit., pp. 82-83
8. op. cit., p. 83

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Cyrus, Jacob Schiff: His Life and Letters, New York, 1929
- American Hebrew, New York, 1905-1915
- American Jewish Yearbook, Philadelphia, 1905-1926
- Bein, Alexander, Theodore Herzl, Translated from German by Maurice Samuel, Philadelphia, 1948
- Ben-Jacob, Jeremiah, The Jewish Struggle, London, 1942
- Bentwich, Norman, Solomon Schechter, Philadelphia, 1939
- Bressler, David, Industrial Removal Office, New York, 1903
- Cohen, Israel, The Zionist Movement: Its Aims and Achievements, London, 1912
- Cohen, Israel, The Zionist Movement, London, 1945
- Cohn, Emil Bernhard, David Wolffsohn, Philadelphia, 1944
- Dubnow, S.M., History of the Jews in Russia and Poland, 3 Vols., Philadelphia, 1946
- Duker, Abraham, "Jewish Territorialism: An Historical Sketch," Contemporary Jewish Record, New York, 1939
- Elbogen, Ismar, A Century of Jewish Life, Philadelphia, 1946
- Fels, Mary, Joseph Fels, New York, 1916
- Fishberg, Maurice, The Jews, New York, 1911
- Friedman, Lee M., Pilgrims in a New Land, New York, 1948
- Goldberg, Israel, Major Noah, Philadelphia, 1936
- Goodman, Paul, Zionism in England, London, 1929
- Gottheil, Richard, Zionism, Philadelphia, 1914
- Graetz, Henrich, History of the Jews, Volumes 4 and 5, Philadelphia, 1941
- Gregory, J.W., Report on the Work of the Commission sent out by the Jewish Territorial Organization under the auspices of the Governor-General of Tripoli to examine the Territory proposed for the purpose of Jewish Settlement in Cyrenaica, London, 1909

- Gregory, J.W., Report on the Work of the Commission sent out by the Jewish Territorial Organization under the auspices of the Portuguese Government to examine the territory proposed for the purpose of a Jewish Settlement in Angola, London, 1913
- Heller, Joseph, The Zionist Idea, New York, 1949
- Jewish Chronicle, London, 1905-1915, 1925-1926
- Jewish World, London, 1905-1910
- Leftwich, Joseph, What Will Happen to the Jews, London, 1936
- Levensohn, Lotta, Outline of Zionist History, New York, 1941
- Maccabean, New York, 1905-1912
- Marmor, David, The Diplomatic Negotiations of the Jewish Territorial Organization and the Reasons for their Failure, Jerusalem, 1945
- Masserman and Baker, The Jews Come to America, New York, 1932
- Menorah, New York, 1905-1907
- Nathan, Ann and Cohen, Harry, The Man Who Stayed in Texas, New York, 1941
- Pinsker, Leo, Road to Freedom, Translated by Dr. D.S. Blondheim, New York, 1944
- Reiss, Ephraim Cohn, Mezichronot Ish Yerushalayim, Palestine, 1936
- Schevill, Ferdinand, A History of Europe, New York, 1941
- Schwarz, Solomon, The Jews of the Soviet Union, New York, 1951
- Simon, Maurice, Speeches, Articles and Letters of Israel Zangwill, London, 1937
- Sokolow, Nachum, History of Zionism, 2 Vols., London, 1919
- Tartakower, Aryeh, "Jewish Socialist Parties," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 9, New York, 1943
- The Jewish Yearbook, London, 1905-1909
- Waldman, Morris, "The Galveston Movement," Jewish Social Service Quarterly Review, New York, 1926
- Waldstein, A.S., "Radical Movements in Zionism," Maccabean, New York, 1906

- Weizmann, Chaim, Trial and Error, New York, 1949
- Wiernik, Peter, History of Jews in America, New York, 1912
- Wischnitzer, Mark, To Dwell in Safety, Philadelphia, 1948
- Wolf, Lucien, "The Zionist Peril," Jewish Quarterly Review,
London, 1905
- Zangwill, Israel, "Be Fruitful and Multiply," ITO Leaflet
No. 3, London, 1909
- Zangwill, Israel, "ITO and its New Activity," Menorah,
New York, 1907