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INTRODUCTION

BY

DR. MAX NORDAU

There is nothing vague or hazy about the tenets of Zionism. It is easy to state them clearly and tersely, as follows:

The Jews form not merely a religious community but also a nation.

There are Jews who sever their national bonds and tend towards the dissolution of the people of Israel in their non-Jewish surroundings. But the large majority of Jews, chiefly in Eastern Europe, desire ardently to preserve their Jewish national identity. Zionism has no meaning for Jews who favour the melting-pot theory. It is the ideal of those who feel themselves to belong to a Jewish nation.

These latter are convinced that in order to work out their possibilities of progress in civilization, to develop their character, to realize their hereditary notions of morals, justice, and brotherhood, and to escape the blighting influence of hatred and persecution, they must be redeemed from
their Dispersion, be gathered together, and settle in a country of their own, where they may live a natural life as tillers of the soil.

The only country answering this purpose is Palestine, the historic home of their forefathers, which for nearly two thousand years has never ceased to be the object of their yearning.

Zionism does not pretend to lead back to the Holy Land of their ancestors all the Jews of the globe. The return of those who cling with all their heart to the country of their birth and of their citizenship is out of the question. Only those will set out for the East who feel that there and nowhere else has life moral and material satisfaction and happiness in store for them.

Zionism has not the ambition of founding an independent Jewish State, be it a kingdom or a republic. All it desires is that its adherents should be allowed to immigrate without any restraint into Palestine, to buy there as much land as they can obtain for their money, to enjoy autonomy of local administration, and not to be hampered in their earnest efforts to create culture and prosperity. It goes without saying that Zionist Jews pledge themselves to observe the most scrupulous, most generous loyalty towards the Power under whose sovereignty Palestine is placed.

This is the case for Zionism, fully and sincerely, though shortly, expounded.

The necessity of Zionism, the only practical
scheme for putting an end to twenty centuries of unutterable sufferings of millions of highly gifted human beings artificially kept down in a low state of development, is superabundantly proved by present events. At this moment, some five hundred thousand Jewish soldiers, rather more than less, part of them under the military law of their country, but others from their own free will, fight in the ranks of the armies of all the nations at war, suffer cruel hardships, shed their blood, sacrifice their life, inscribe heroic deeds of arms in the annals of glory, and yet see offending doubt cast on their patriotism, feel themselves surrounded by an atmosphere of suspicion and hostility, hear often the contemptuous words "foreigners" and "cosmopolitans" muttered behind their back or even roughly hurled in their face, not to speak of the atrocities committed against millions of Jewish victims in the war area of Russia. There is only one way of avoiding a recurrence of these horrors, and that is by giving these "foreigners" and "cosmopolitans" a home of their own, which is what Zionism is striving for.

To those inclined to treat our aspirations as a dream, we can show most promising beginnings of Jewish colonization in Palestine, with tens of thousands of acres of beautiful cornfields, vineyards, orange, almond, and olive-groves; with neat, clean, thriving villages, and Hebrew schools, where a generation of bright and healthy children receive an excellent educa-
tion in the sacred language of the Prophets. These colonies, it is true, are at present gravely imperilled by the War. It is our immediate duty to do all in our power in order to pilot them through the gale of the hour. Once peace is re-established, they will convince the world, and even sceptical Jews, of our capacity as agriculturists, wine-growers, and cattle-breeders.

I have confined myself within the limits of prosaic matter-of-fact. I avoid adding even one word about the beauty and loftiness of the Zionist ideal.

Whoever wishes for a future for Judaism and believes in it must realize that nothing can ensure it but Zionism.

MADRID.
EDITORS' PREFACE

It may be affirmed that if, by the chances of history, the idea of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, either by political action or by the growth of Jewish interests, became an accomplished fact, the heart of every Jew who is concerned for the future of his people would rejoice.

It is for the realization of this idea that this volume makes an appeal.

The purpose of Zionism is set out in the following programme adopted at the first Zionist Congress held at Basle in 1897: "Zionism aims to create a publicly recognized, legally secured home for the Jewish people in Palestine." The object is fixed; the means to attain the object and its interpretation may vary, and may (as this volume shows) be conceived differently by different minds.

Zionism does not expect any particular Jews, not even its most devoted adherents, to settle in Palestine. It only seeks to create such conditions, economic as well as moral, as will attract the large enough number of Jews who desire to live in a Jewish atmosphere or to better their social prospects.
Palestine lies in the midst of the highway between East and West. It is still economically one of the few unexploited countries of civilization. It is the only place on earth where the Jew is autochthonous and feels at home.

Zionism is no longer a dream. It is a reality. In the Dispersion it is represented by the worldwide Zionist organization, which contains more declared adherents than all the other Jewish international bodies put together. In Palestine, where Jerusalem is once again Jewish by population, Zionism is represented by nearly fifty Jewish agricultural colonies, to which an illustrious member of the house of Rothschild has devoted a fortune computed at three million pounds sterling. One of the institutions of Zionism, the Jewish National Fund, having a capital of about a quarter of a million sterling, destined for the purchase of land to be permanently owned by the Jewish people, has supporters in every community of Jews throughout the habitable globe, from whom it has been receiving contributions amounting to about £40,000 annually. The Zionist Bank, the Jewish Colonial Trust, Limited, has about 135,000 shareholders. Connected with it is the Anglo-Palestine Company, Limited, which has branches in Jaffa, Jerusalem, Hebron, Haifa, Beyrout, and Safed, and has proved the most potent influence for self-help among the Jewish agriculturists and artisans of Palestine.

In Palestine a new Jewish life has appeared, a
new race come into being. In Judæa, Samaria and Galilee, along the shores of the beautiful lake of Chinnereth (Gennesaret), overlooking the Mediterranean, in the seaports of Jaffa and Haifa, agricultural colonies and urban quarters give indisputable evidence of Jewish capacity for economic and social independence.

The heterogeneous elements of the Jewish population have found a common tongue in the ancient Hebrew language, which in the course of a generation has been able to aspire to be the language of instruction in the Technical College at the foot of Mount Carmel and at the proposed University in the hallowed city of Jerusalem—a University which, but for the War, would have been in existence to-day.

Zionism has, however, not made its appeal to Jews only. It has come to be recognized by the world at large as one of the liberating movements of modern times that deserves sympathetic consideration. It has been widely acknowledged that the Jewish Question is not merely the internal affair of certain countries in which the local Jews are affected, but that, as a disturbing international factor, it urgently calls for solution in the general interests of civilization. Therefore, Zionism has found a welcome among non-Jewish statesmen and publicists. England particularly has been sympathetic towards the Zionist idea, and in 1903, when there was no possibility of English assistance in Palestine, so eminently practical an Empire-builder
as the late Mr. Chamberlain offered to the Zionist organization a part of British East Africa for an autonomous Jewish settlement.

This book has not set itself the task of affording information about Zionist activities. Facts and figures are given in such an excellent publication as "Zionist Work in Palestine," edited by Mr. Israel Cohen (Fisher Unwin). For in these days of European War, when moral and material factors are in the melting-pot, facts and figures are apt to lose their relative values, but principles and aspirations are unchangeable. Thus is Zionism conceived by its exponents.

The great War of Liberation, with its untold Jewish tragedy in Eastern Europe, has come with a new call to Jewish blood. When we hear of the rights of small nations, shall we forget ourselves? The freedom of the Jewish people, not only of Jewish individuals, shall be the expression of Jewish unity. The consensus of Jewish opinion in the free English-speaking world can bring deliverance unto Israel; we bear evidence as to a growing opinion in that world, and appeal for a still wider support within the Jewish community and without in order that the claims of the Jews may be clearly heard in the councils of men and of nations.

West London Zionist Association,
February 5676-1916.
CONTRIBUTORS

Introduction by Dr. Max Nordau.

Rev. Dr. J. Abelson, M.A., D.Litt., Principal Aria College, Portsea, Author of “The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature,” etc.

ACHAD Ha'am.

Bertram B. Benas, B.A., LL.B., President Liverpool Jewish Literary Society.

Herbert Bentwich, LL.B., Grand Commander, Order of Ancient Maccabaeans.

Eliezer Ben Yehudah, Author of “The Hebrew Dictionary.”

Ch. N. Bialik.

Louis D. Brandeis, Chairman Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs, New York.

Dr. Selig Brodetsky, Lecturer in Applied Mathematics, University of Bristol.

Joseph Cowen, President English Zionist Federation, Governor Jewish Colonial Trust, Ltd.

Dr. Harry Friedenwald, President Federation of American Zionists.


Paul Goodman, Hon. Secretary English Zionist Federation, Author of “The Synagogue and the Church,” etc.

Mrs. Paul Goodman, Hon. Sec. English Branch of the Jewish Women's League for Cultural Work in Palestine.

Very Rev. the Chief Rabbi Dr. J. H. Hertz.

CONTRIBUTORS

Rev. Morris Joseph, Senior Minister West London Synagogue of British Jews, Author of "Judaism as Creed and Life," etc.

S. Landman, M.A., Joint Editor of The Zionist.

Rev. S. Levy, M.A., ex-President Jewish Historical Society of England, Author of "Original Virtue," etc.

Arthur D. Lewis, Hon. Sec. West London Zionist Association, Author of "Syndicalism and the General Strike," etc.


Rev. Dr. D. de Sola Pool, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, New York.

Mrs. Redcliffe N. Salaman, Author of "Songs of Exile," etc.

Rev. M. H. Segal, M.A., Minister Newcastle-on-Tyne, Author of "Mishnaic Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic."

Leon Simon, B.A., President London University Zionist Society, Translator of Achad Ha'am's "Selected Essays," etc.

Maurice Simon, M.A., Manchester.

Nahum Sokolow, Member of International Zionist Executive.

Maurice Solomons, Hon. Secretary London University Zionist Society.


S. Tolkowsky, Agricultural Engineer, Jaffa, Palestine.

A. Weiner, M.A., Lecturer in History, University of London, King's College.

Israel Zangwill.
## CONTENTS

| Introduction | Dr. Max Nordau | 5 |
| Editors' Preface | 9 |
| Contributors | 13 |
| I. Herzl | Nahum Sokolow | 17 |
| II. David Wolffsohn: A Memorial Address | The Chief Rabbi |
| III. Surely the People is Grass: A Poem | Ch. N. Bialik |
| IV. A Spiritual Centre | Achad Ha'am | 48 |
| V. One of the Smaller Nations | Rev. Dr. J. Abelson |
| VI. The Renascence of Jewish Aesthetics | Bertram B. Benas |
| VII. England and the Jewish National Movement | Herbert Bentwich | 85 |
| VIII. Zionism and the American Jews | Louis D. Brandeis | 93 |
| IX. The Revival of Hebrew Eliezer Ben Yehudah | 115 |
| X. A Hebrew University in Jerusalem | Dr. S. Brodetsky | 120 |
| XI. Theodor Herzl: Reminiscences | Joseph Cowen | 126 |
| XII. The Unity of Israel Dr. Harry Friedenwald | 131 |
XIII. Women's Work in Palestine . . 138
    Mrs. Paul Goodman

XIV. The New Palestine . Albert M. Hyamson 145

XV. Israel a Nation . Rev. Morris Joseph 150

XVI. The Jewish Colonies in Palestine . 157
    S. Landman

XVII. Zionism and Liberal Judaism Rev. S. Levy 171

XVIII. Conceptions of the State and the Jewish Question . Cyril M. Picciotto 183

XIX. Zionism and Orthodoxy in America 189
    Rev. Dr. D. de Sola Pool

XX. War Time, 1915: A Poem . . 196
    Mrs. Redcliffe N. Salaman

XXI. Zionism and the Future of Judaism 197
    Rev. M. H. Segal

XXII. Modern Hebrew Literature Leon Simon 205

XXIII. Conceptions of Judaism Maurice Simon 214

XXIV. Zionism and Jewish Students in England 219
    Maurice Solomons

XXV. Zionism and Judaism . F. S. Spiers 223

XXVI. The Future of Zionism . Leonard Stein 228

XXVII. Zionism as a Practical Object . . 234
    S. Tolkowsky

XXVIII. Zionism and the Revival of Nationality in Europe . . A. Weiner 244

XXIX. Two Dreamers of the Ghetto . . 253
    Israel Zangwill

XXX. The Jews a Nation . Arthur D. Lewis 257

XXXI. The Spirit of Zionism . Paul Goodman 268

XXXII. Hatikvah. Music arranged by Arthur M.
        Friedlander. English translation by Mrs.
        Redcliffe N. Salaman . . . 281
HERZL

BY

NAHUM SOKOLOW

HERZL appears before us like a wondrous riddle. The fate of this great man might be regarded at first sight as a tragedy, but on considering it more carefully we shall find that in another way it represents a victory.

It is the mission of great men to overcome the sufferings of their time, but, in order that they may fully do this, it is necessary that they should themselves have gone through the whole of these trials. Herzl must, then, have suffered deeply. But, his sufferings could not disturb the classical calm and beauty of his life. At most, an observant eye might have at times perceived in Herzl a slight touch of noble melancholy.

Proud and upright Herzl went his way. He went through this vale of tears doing good. He brought healing, consolation, grace.

We felt a great and vast sorrow, a lamentation without words—the sorrow of our people. We felt a desire for the land of our fathers. It had
woven itself into the life of our dreams. But he alone could powerfully control this spirit, and he wrapped it in a silvery veil woven of the breath of the soil, of air, and of sunshine. He gave to it a form of words and of deeds. He could do it because he was great. What was most prominent in him was his sacred zeal. On whatever intricate paths he went he always remained a complete man. He made for himself a special position in the world, and won over all hearts—his own people and strangers, followers and opponents, honoured him with equal sincerity. His distinguished manner, his never-failing and fine tact, his intellectual observations were the noble weapons with which he fought. Every one was forced to pay unlimited homage to his genius of freedom and of goodness.

Herzl was an aristocrat of the spirit whose virtues went far beyond the gifts of reason. However luminous his intellect might have been, greater than his genius was the warmth of his heart.

He combined all the brilliant qualities of a great leader in the difficult work of organization.

He never failed to comply with a just demand. He asked of life nothing, except an honest name, for he knew that this was much. Every injustice was against the principle of his being; he was a friend to those who were dependent upon him. He demanded nothing that was impossible, and took the good will for the deed. Disputants came to him for a decision, for his feeling for justice
was sure. He was stern with lying, cunning, and slander, inflexible against disloyalty. He was indulgent towards those who erred through weakness, and always ready to open the way to repentance. In society he was considerate of the feelings of others. He never mocked at that which was holy to them. Misfortune was particularly sacred to him. He was never malicious towards those over whom he triumphed. Despotic obstinacy and arrogance were hateful to him. Unconsidered actions he put right. He openly confessed his mistakes. He never revenged himself for any injury, for he believed in eternal justice and final equity. He believed also in eternal justice in the lives of nations. He therefore became the father of modern Zionism.

His life was like a great golden inscription in our thoughts, a pillar which oblivion will never wear away. When his qualities are to be set out, we instinctively write a psalm, like the well-known description in which the divine singer tells of the "Tsaddik," the righteous man of Jewish antiquity.

And when we describe his death, we naturally write a chapter of the Book of Lamentations.

Did he not struggle like a hero, suffer like a sage, and end like a saint?

The way in which he willed had exhausted his giant strength. Heart and brain were always at fever heat. Effort and excitement were limited by no consideration. He was tossed to and fro
between hope and disappointment, joy and embitterment. Always considerate and generous, always thinking nobly, always reliable, without a shadow of self-seeking or vanity. This was a life which could not endure. When the black wings of death were already rustling above his head, the greatness of soul of this chosen man was not lessened, his strength was not weakened. He never ceased to battle and to hope.

He stood heavens high above ordinary men; he stood as if upon a mountain and saw the future; and what he saw he saw with the gleaming eye of genius and not with the eye of petty men, who, like those suffering from jaundice, think they see the whole world yellow.

This great soul did not pass away in a moment in the quiet brilliance of a transient effort. The nearer death came to him the more desperately his life struggled, the deeper and stronger did he strive to find ways and means to reach his ideal. Every day a bright flame rose, every day a new hope gladdened his heart.

The virtues which Herzl held as most sacred and in which his life was mirrored most purely were tenacity and faithfulness. True to his people, true to his land—such was the great harmony which formed the finale of his life.

When stretched upon his death-bed, tortured by pain and sorrow, with a broken heart, a body racked by pain, when Death was already tapping at the window, a light flame pierced from his
half-breaking eyes, the land of his desire smiled to the dying man and unfolded before him a fairy glory. The narrow space stretched itself, the ceiling rounded and vaulted itself like the sky, and the ray which left his dying eye followed the outlines of the beloved land. Thus did he go into eternal glory, to his end, to his home and to peace.

The gleaming footsteps of this noble man, who was taken from us before his time, will never disappear. The name of this glorious departed hero and martyr—we will make no idol of him, for that is alien to the Jewish spirit, but we will make of him a banner.

Not only in the remembrance of posterity, but also in our own actions the spirit of Herzl must survive, because it is the spirit of his people. This spirit was the heritage which he received, and which he was to hand on when he was gathered unto his fathers.

What Herzl gave was an historical necessity. It would be impossible artificially to graft something on to a people which is strange to it. Gifted men are many steps, geniuses great distances, in advance of the masses. They see or feel that which is coming, and so are able to make a path in which the masses may walk securely, so that strength and time are spared to all. Without leaders there can be no progress.

The people have, therefore, good ground to honour their great men, but, at the same time, the
latter must be grateful to their people. If the harmony between both is complete, then there is progress. When we see harmony in its most beautiful form realized in Zionism, it should fill us with joy and confidence. Great men are able to lead their people only in one direction, that towards which the eyes of all are directed. "All" does not mean the whole mass of commonplace people at any one period. The commonplace people may remain stuck in their pettiness, in their Philistine narrowness and in their huckstering spirit. In every nation these men suffer from too much prudence, from fixity of habit, and from narrowness of view. "All" in a nation—that means all generations, all times, all countries, all sections of the people which have serious views of life, heroic courage, a wide outlook, and a capacity for enthusiasm. This "all" remained true to the nation, for they were the Jewish nation. To them Herzl was a leader, for he felt for them, because he felt in which direction their impulse was directed. He lifted them out of their slow development far ahead towards their aim and place. Thus Herzl was not an originator, and yet he was a mighty pathfinder.

What marked Herzl was his ecstasy in the original sense of this word: ἐκ (out of) στασις (the condition)—out of the condition of habitual moderation and mediocrity, out of the life of every day, out of the everyday of life. Ecstasy produces a cleansing of the soul, a stirring of the organism, is in itself an awakener of life, a steeling for a
people. Out of the strong devotion of the soul an idealism springs forth, the desire for martyrdom, the desire to bring ourselves as a sacrifice to the highest and holiest.

I do not intend to analyse Herzl entirely. I dare not approach the riddle, for it is sacred to me. Yet, it is not difficult to recognize what was the centre of Herzl's being. I observed him for years. This head, which in the younger years of Herzl stood out with free and open brow, with luxuriant raven-black hair, powerful in its strong, firm features, later on became glorified, more concentrated, more Jewish. Its effect upon the attentive observer became deeper. In his earlier life the beauty of his head showed itself by its movement and excitement, by the brilliance of the mental world within it. Later on, when the rushing storms of time had passed over his face, another beauty appeared, the picturesque and contemplative and thinking power in this head; no longer his violent force, but his power of work. He was no longer a drawing-room "lion," but a sage, a Jewish sage with prophetic dignity and sanctity. One thing this mighty head with great deep eyes said immutably: it spoke of his ruling quality—an unbreakable will. This will had set itself one task. It is no exaggeration to say that the purpose which Herzl had determined upon can be stated thus: "It is impossible to unite the scattered and broken Jewish nation, but I will do it."

It seemed impossible. The nation was split
up in matters of religion, class, culture, and of country. The contrasts were so great that it was impossible to overcome them; they were not even in contact with one another. In some circles the very idea of a people was not tolerated, the land of their ancestors a mere legend. The few friends of Zion certainly had called forth a revolution among the people. The majority, however, knew nothing of it. The world at large had not even heard of the idea of a Jewish nation.

Herzl did everything. He created a Jewish platform, the Congress. He brought together those Jews who were true to the feeling of their nationality; he got them to contribute large sums of money for Zionism, and founded financial instruments; the very want of a locally concentrated Jewry became in his hands an advantage. The whole world became the theatre of his activity, leading him to create a centre in the future.

This is set down in a few lines, but to know truly how it happened and what an amount of genius and self-sacrifice this work involved is only possible to him who saw the whole development of it, to one who lived in it day by day. He spun golden dreams round the grey reality. These dreams filled him with devotion and an immovable faith. He was uplifted by the majesty of the idea of justice. He was, however, at the same time quiet, firm, and strong, like a block of marble. This was the magnet that drew irresistibly hundreds of thousands under its spell. What were
the things that worked upon Herzl? If we penetrate into the depths of Zionism and have a feeling for psychology, we shall discover the elements of this enthusiasm. There is the springing forth of a noble self-consciousness—I mean, of a collective self-consciousness, which flows from the remembrance of a great past. What an extraordinarily precious possession is this past! Some part of it is always alive, a truly living reality. Our present receives its glory and its warmth through what it reawakens. The present only becomes quite conscious of itself when it contains the substance of that which has disappeared. Such is the power of the protest against thousands of years of injustice. Such is the intoxication of liberty. To free ourselves from the circumstances through which we feel ourselves oppressed and imprisoned—that is the intoxication of Nature. We go back to our holy Mother Earth, back from the old and from the modern ghetto; to obtain from the earth and from ourselves all that they can yield, and again to bring out of industry, science, and art all that they everywhere create: occupied with these tasks, the energies rise so much that, once cowardice and mental subservience are overcome, all that seemed insurmountable to the soul is as nothing. That is the intoxication of heroism. Out of the accustomed tracks back into what was once one's own land, to show what a Jew can do and suffer. This increases virility to an inconceivable degree. And when one possesses the gigantic
stimulating effect which Herzl had over the masses, and can so inspire men and bind them together, there arises the intoxication of brotherhood and of social life. Then one becomes a part of a whole, united by the feeling of a people, bound together through an organization, together in pain and joy; egoism flees, the man is lost in the many, the many are as one.

This is Zionism. This is the highest that Herzl has created. This was not a means: by itself it was a great achievement. Rough testing cannot find out what it was. Cold, calculating, intellectually lazy, comfortable, short-sighted, and too-clever Philistinism constantly chews over the same childish questions—whether ten or only one million Jews could settle in Palestine, whether the soil is or is not fertile, whether the mountains can be afforested or whether they must remain bare. The poor Philistines! They would like a ready-made land brought to them on a plate. And they cannot understand that if this were done it would be nothing—even though the land were clothed with fertility, showed a first-rate budget, were surveyed and mapped out. To ten million or one million Jews it would still be nothing, if these Jews were not uplifted within themselves, had not been united with and grown into their ancient race, had not grown above the commonplace, the level of mere routine.

This is only possible if their national being is
made manifest once more, so that they rejoice in it, if they determine to bring their individual gifts to the highest, to a complete development, and disdain to lose their personality and, unwept and unsung, to be lost in the mass of others.

It is necessary to trace these inner springs into their depths in order to realize how imagination can become force and dream a reality.

This Zionism could only have been created by a poet. And Herzl was a poet. His soul could probe the depths of time. He united in himself all that his people had sung, wept, and prayed for.

It was a lyric of a peculiarly delicate texture. A contemplation, a silent reflection, interrupted by sudden and rhythmic flashes of the soul—an immeasurable melancholy, a seeking with yearning, anxious fingers over a harp of pain reaching up into the heavens, and then, as if with a storm, coming no man knows whence, there is heard a loud cry, half a note of victory, half a cutting cry of fear and pain, in order to repress the hidden torture. Often there resounds a devotional, terribly painful, profoundly Jewish hymn of the soul, reminiscent of the Psalms of old.

Herzl the journalist, the feuilletoniste, the dramatist, the subtle essayist, had always gentleness, amiability, geniality—Jewish qualities. But there was in his work also a certain superficiality. There was a light note in it: it was the poetry of life—I might almost say poetical journalism. That
which passed in his body, in his blood, his nerves, what he observed or experienced, entered immediately into his soul and created there a rhythm of successive and dissolving pictures. Life gave him ever new material for creation. He looked at it with the eye of the artist, looked at it lightly, and rejoiced at its poetry. Even the painful or tragic which he saw or experienced gave him some joy. He felt a certain pride that he was thus superior to life, and could, like a god, reproduce in words what most men could only suffer dumbly.

Zionism, however, deepened his creative power. It came to him like a thunderstorm out of a clear sky, like a frost over a smiling landscape, like hail over a harvest-field—and also like an emancipation. It was then that he recognized that in essence his life must be different from what it had been. And yet his past was not thrown away. His whole previous life, with all its sad and sweet experiences, all his love, his ambition, his knowledge of the world and of its marvels, were necessary to make him afterwards fully understand and enjoy the unique and the true—not that which he was to learn but that which was in his blood, the Jewish-human, his people, its fate, its sufferings and hopes.

The biography of Herzl as an individual man is a fairly indifferent matter for his work, which alone is of importance to us. Besides, to pry into the secrets of the private life of a man as great as Herzl would be a vulgar proceeding. The
external life of a great personality, its fate and tragedy, may be of interest to a public which loves to hear anecdotes and tittle-tattle about any one who has been placed at the head of a people. But the whole outer life of a leader of men has little in common with his inner experiences.

This outer life of Herzl developed under the influence of many more or less tragic circumstances and events, like that of every human being. The whole external life of Herzl has no meaning compared with the holy mission that he was called upon to fulfil: to bring forth in all its unsuspected power the genius of the Jewish national life in which he lived and had his being.

This is to be found not merely in Herzl's actions but also in such of his writings and speeches as deal with Zionism, as well as in his later general works. For, like his head, so also his muse became in course of years, and of inner revelations, ever greater, deeper, more sincere—that is, more Jewish.

Who mourned about his people's fate more than he? Who hoped and struggled like he?

High over the darkness of despair, over the sea of tears and blood, over the torn, weeping willows which surround the graveyards, there raises itself, proudly and threateningly, the Spirit of the people, which waits for its resurrection.

Behold, behold the grave did not allow itself to be closed! Without measure and end the earth, soiled with the holy blood of martyrs, is thrown
over the grave, but it still remains open. The cover of the coffin moves and trembles as if it contains a loving, deeply moving giant's heart.

The pain-tortured soul of Herzl conjured up before his eyes the flaming vision of beloved Palestine as if it came out of the grave, draped in the full purple of life, a home, a peaceful hearth.

And out of the grave rose all who fell by the walls of Zion and those who made fruitful the mountains of Judæa; out of the sepulchres came forth the judges, the kings, the prophets, and at their head moved the spirit of the people in triumphant majesty.

Because Herzl saw this, because he felt it, because he was surrounded by the distant glory of a mighty Divinity, he could write and speak as he wrote and spoke on Zionism. For he was a prophet of our time. But it was not only poetry and prophecy. Herzl saw the whole of life.

Was Herzl a nationalist?

The assimilationists who deal in words grasp at the absurd fraud of identifying Jewish national loyalty with the nationalism of other peoples: that is to say, they try to confuse the modest, peaceable, humanitarian, harmless, just, purely self-defensive attitude of an old, small, martyr people with that aggressive exaggeration, with that profitless orgy of hate and thirst for conquest which in political jargon goes under the name of "nationalism." A more grotesque irony than this confusion of ideas could not be conceived.
Herzl's idea of nationalism was the application of international law to the Jewish Question. His ideal was a peaceable and free activity of the Jewish people in unison with, and at the side of, all other peoples. He was an adherent of endæmonism, of the endeavour after happiness by a noble enjoyment of life, the result of a joyous fulfilment of duty. His national idealism, like that of all other Zionists, was crowned by humanism, humanism within and without the Jewish people. His programme for the future contained the noblest political and social postulates. He attempted to bring about an understanding between intellectualism and energy, out of which were to have grown great opportunities for education, hygiene, social life, and many other fields of activity. In his brave demands in the political and social realms he brought together democracy and at the same time the recognition of private enterprise, free competition combined with social politics and publicly owned undertakings. He gave at times clear expression and pregnant development to these ideas.

Indeed, when we think of Herzl, we ought to forget all that was accidental in his life. It is only fitting to bow in deep humility before that holy revelation of the national soul for which Herzl was but a symbol. I repeat, Herzl was a messenger which the soul of the people had called to proclaim its greatness, power, and will. For what is Zionism? Certainly, in its essence and aim, it is
Palestine; but at the same time it is all that is strongest, deepest, most vital in the Judaism of the whole world. It is a system of thoughts and feelings, which enables even the Jew degraded by exile to free himself from his inner slavery by the nobility of his efforts, the creation of higher ideas, of heroic endeavour. Hence it comes about that Herzl was an astonishing example of a great magnate, who needed no more than to throw away with full hands the immeasurable riches which the soul of the people had gathered in the course of thousands of years. Inspired sentiments, self-respect, self-confidence, remembrances which warm the heart, which burst into flames and flash out of the depths of the soul, victorious cries of the spirit, the yearning that now rumbles in the heart of the people like a thunderstorm and now, flowing serenely in the blue of the sky, pours itself out and flows from one end to another, and now again, wildly rushing in the brain, bathes the pictures, hidden in it from the beginning, with light, conjures them forth, embodies them, reforms them, and makes them appear with a new beauty, a new strength.

The Jewish pathos, which we need so much—yes, so endlessly much—the will and the word, saving, flaming, the shining forehead of Moses, the burning coal on Isaiah's lips, the golden harp of David, the cry of Mattathias the Hasmonæan, the Zionide of Judah Halevy—yes, the Word, the "Shem," which the High Rabbi Löw of Prague
laid in the mouth of the clay figure, the "Golem"—call me a visionary, if you will, but I maintain that this is the greatness without which we are but dust.

Therefore, Herzl is the limitless ruler of our hearts; his spirit is in every picture and movement of our thought; it is in every uprising and echoing of our feeling; it is our strength of desire, which tears open graves and with furious hand strikes on the doorposts of heaven.

Nothing is more repulsive to us than to carry on the cult of a person. But our cult is not that of a person; it is that of a folk-soul. I never did regard Herzl as a person, but as the embodied might of something impersonal, as the instrument of some power which grasped us all and kept us firmly under its spell.

And now one more thought towards appreciation of Herzl's lifework from the point of view of so-called realistic politics. I repeat: this for me is not the main matter; it is a consequence, effect, product. But, all the same, I will touch on it.

In the camp of our opponents it is said: "Yes, Herzl had great words, but only little deeds followed the great words."

I agree, there were only small deeds after the great words. But, honestly, what deeds followed the words of his opponents?

Two conceptions, two tendencies stand opposing each other—Zionism and Emancipation—that which
nature commands, that which a thousand years of history confirm, the duty which runs parallel with the whole modern politics of the world, that of national self-help and—trust in humanity.

I ask the sober, the practical: What deeds has Emancipation achieved for the whole of our people since the beginning of Zionism? What has it done? What hopes, which it awakened, has it in the slightest degree, even as "small deeds," carried out? To what has it brought us? What has it achieved in Russia? What in Galicia? What in Roumania? We all demand emancipation, Zionists as well as non-Zionists. It is the obvious demand of individual existence! But emancipation which puts itself forward as a programme—yes, as the only programme—what has it been able to achieve? It does not want the enthusiasm of the masses, or genius, or heroism, or poetry; it only wishes to be useful. This "practical" point of view is entirely wrong; but, for the sake of argument, let us accept this point of view for an instant and ask for the useful achievement on which it lays so much stress. What has it gained?

Since 1897—the beginning of modern Zionism—an avalanche of pogroms has fallen, beginning with Kishinev. What protection did Emancipation and humanity offer there? The pogroms in the years 1905-6 were not a mere avalanche, they were a deluge. And what has since happened and what is now happening? Where is now the much-praised humanity?
The Jewish mission to the world! I ask, Where is now this mission for the conversion of the world? What has it effected? What has it protected? The assimilationist preachers, particularly in Germany, preach and write vastly on this mission. Where is its influence? Where its disciples?

And what are the effects of this movement among ourselves? Which multitudes has it organized? Which young people has it won for us? Where has it spread the knowledge of Hebrew? Where has it opposed indifference, half-heartedness, characterlessness?

There was another hope of the emancipationists: cosmopolitan Socialism. This was to solve the Jewish problem as a class problem. There were to be no nations any more! We were to triumph with the disinherited. This movement took a large part of our best forces. Here was the tragedy. On the outbreak of the War, the cosmopolitan Socialists of other nations found themselves in the air, but they could fall again on to the ground. In spite of all theories, the Germans have remained German, and the Frenchmen French, even though they may call themselves cosmopolitans; for, in spite of all, they have ground on which they could fall. The Jews among the Socialists also found themselves in the air, but they have no ground on which they could fall. To speak in the terms of modern aviation, this balloon could not land.
Fix your eyes on the abyss!

We are, therefore, satisfied to meet the reproach of "small deeds" cast at us. Herzl also achieved deeds. Here we have again the miracle of the Jewish national soul, the synthesis of idea and practice. With sober conception and holding strictly to the actual facts, we may say that Herzl has created a Congress, has called into being banks and the National Fund, which have successfully furthered the colonization of Palestine. He wished to do far more; but we could not so quickly follow his eagle's flight. We chose the more exhausting way, fastening our interest on the slow ascent, on the lengthening chain of partial achievements. Nevertheless, we have here the highly promising beginning of a colonization of Palestine; we have the rebirth of a Jewish civilization and language; we have a world-wide Zionist organization; we have its institutions, needing completion, but also capable of development.

Now, I ask, on which side were the illusions and Utopias?

Yes, our Herzl was a genius, rich in deeds. Never did he live so powerfully and pulsatingly, as he now lives; never did his fame and power so resound as they now do; and perhaps never did we have such cause for entire self-confidence and steady courage as to the future as now, when a whole world bows before what was and is immortal in Herzl—the national idea.

He went from us like the setting of the fading
sun whose day is ended. But he lives in us more than ever, just as we may only perceive on earth the light of very distant stars when these stars have already passed away.
Ingratitude towards our great dead, say the Rabbis, is an unpardonable sin. Whenever an individual or a people is too tardy or indolent worthily to mourn its dead, that individual or people does not deserve to continue in life. For this reason, therefore, it is proper for us, even in these distracting times, amid the din of battle and the clash of arms, to assemble in mourning for a great Jewish leader who has been taken from us. For, as these same teachers tell us, "whoever sheds tears at the death of a good man (אומ נשי), the Holy One counts these tears and preserves them among His choicest treasures." And in mourning the loss of David Wolffsohn, we indeed mourn the loss of an אומ נשי. He was familiarly known among his friends as "der gute Wolffsohn"—selfless, the man with a "good eye," always willing

* Preached at the David Wolffsohn Memorial Service at the Great Synagogue, London, on October 2, 1914.
to see and acknowledge with readiness the good in others. In his case we may well translate by "Jewish gentleman"—genial, kindly, with nothing mean or unmanly clinging to his being.

But he was not only known as "der gute Wolffsohn": he was also known as "der kluge Wolffsohn." He had an uncommon amount of common sense. He was a self-made man, and from the humblest poverty he had risen to independence. He was thus not only a mensch, he was a mensch as well. And our Rabbis tell us, "Every one should feel the loss of a wise man as if one near of kin were torn from his side."

In the bitter struggles of his early years he had learned the truth of the Talmudic saying: "The man who is dependent for his living upon the whim or the charity of others, that man's life cannot be called life" (Bezah 32A). With the progress of years he saw that this sad truth had, alas! a far wider application than to the individual. When a people is dependent for its life upon the whim or the charity of other peoples, there indeed is a tragedy. Woe to that nation—maimed and fettered—that waits for an Adoni Bezek (Judges i. 7) to throw it some crumbs from his table! Young David Wolffsohn came under the influence of the Chovevi Zion movement and of Dr. Rülf; and later we find him an enthusiastic admirer of the author of "Autoemanzipation" and
of Dr. Herzl. No wonder, therefore, that when Dr. Herzl departed this life, this man was chosen as the one most fitted to carry on the burden of the new Jewish movement. Like Herzl, he took large “Imperial” views of the Jewish problem, he, too, realizing that the Jewish Question could not be settled parochially. He saw that Salonika, Roumania, Russia, formed really one problem; and that in many a country for generations, perhaps centuries, Jacob would have cause bitterly to exclaim: "With Laban, no matter what I do or become, I am still a רָעָה (an alien)."

There is a great deal of misunderstanding of this attitude of David Wolffsohn, of its logical consequences, and of the organization which is the result of this attitude. Some of the best of Jewish people fear that there is a necessary conflict between it and the absolute loyalty that the Jew owes to his native land. However, I really believe that this misunderstanding will now considerably diminish, if not disappear altogether. This War raging over the entire world will prove a great emancipator even in this direction. It will, among other things, lead to a more correct understanding and conception of patriotism. For there are two conceptions of patriotism—one the British conception and one which may be called the un-British conception. The un-British conception believes in uniformity. All peoples that do not belong to the dominant stock of a country must be ruthlessly crushed; the inhabitants of any one
land must all think alike, believe alike; they must be of the same blood and speak the same language. This is the mediaeval theory, translated into practice by Ferdinand and Isabella. This also was the old Russian ideal; and Poles, Jews, Finns, Armenians, Tartars were, in the Russia that is passing, crushed under the Juggernaut-car of "Russification." Not so the British ideal. Great Britain respects the personality of each and every one of the racial groups found within the borders of its world-wide dominion. Loyalty to your ethnic group, it holds, does not interfere with your patriotism to the Empire. Nay, Great Britain fosters the linguistic heritage, and the national individuality even, of the French-Canadian, the Welshman, and the Boer; and encourages them all—Irish, Hindoo, Afrikander, Canadian, or Australasian—to develop along their own racial and national lines.

And recently Great Britain has shown herself the champion of all "little nations," even of those who are not members of her Imperial household. Even the "little peoples," she holds, have a right to a place in the sun. And one of her great statesmen has proclaimed, "If we had stood by when two little nations were being crushed, our shame would have rung down the everlasting ages." Must not such an utterance—and the whole attitude of which it is the result—convince every fair-minded man that it cannot be unpatriotic to refuse to stand by and see a large portion of your own little people being crushed?
When all Jews will at last have realized that true patriotism—British patriotism—is not Moloch-worship to demand from any one the purposeless sacrifice of what is dearest and holiest, all Jews will honour the memory of David Wolffsohn. The masses of our people here and elsewhere will always think of him in Goethe's classical words: "Denn er war unser." Verily, David Wolffsohn felt the woe of his people, and consecrated his best years towards the definitive amelioration of Israel's lot. He was a Jewish statesman—who worked for Jews!
SURELY THE PEOPLE IS GRASS
(ACHEN CHATSIR HA'AM)

BY
CH. N. BIALIK

Because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it:—surely the people is grass.—ISAIAH xl. 7.

SURELY the people is grass, now do they fade like a blossom;
Surely the people is slain—it is slain with a slaughter unending.

Lo! when the voice of their God thunders about them for ever,
This is a people that moves not, a people that stirs not nor trembles.

Nor do they rise like a lion, nor like a young lion waken,
Nor at the voice do they tremble, never a man of them stirreth.

Nay, and the hearts of the people thrill not with gladness together,
When from the eastward and westward, calling from ocean to ocean,
Eager to make themselves known as seed of the God that is living—
Sons of their own come flocking, drawn from afar at His summons.

Nor do they reach forth the hand, questioning all of their welfare,
All that have called on His name, all that are blameless and faithful.

Now in a tumult of folly, of people surrounding their idols,
Quelled is the message of God, silenced the might of His thunder.

Deep in the heart of the foolish, with evil and shame and reviling,
Scorned is the word of the Lord, set as a mark for derision.

Surely the people wither, full of their vileness and venom,
Yea, from the foot to the head, all of it rotten and worthless;

Seeing they raised not a man from their midst in the day of their anguish,
One that was mighty in works, living, whose heart should impel him;
SURELY THE PEOPLE IS GRASS

One in whose heart should burn a spark to enkindle
   the life-blood;
One from whose brow a flame should light up
   the path of the people;

One who would treasure the name of his God and
   the name of the nation
Far over wealth of gold, more than the falsehood
   of idols.

Lifting of heart would be his, truth in its fullness
   and power,
Hate of his people's portion, their life of scorn-
   ing and bondage;

Pity as great as the sea, compassion as wide as
   their ruin,
Wide as his people's weakness, strong as the weight
   of the burden;

These would surge in his heart, surge and rage
   like the ocean;
These would burn like a fire, burn in the blood
   till it kindle.

These would thunder with joy, by day and by
   night unceasing,
"Rise ye and serve! and work! for the hand
   of our God is with us."
Surely the people perish, they breathe but shame and scolding.
None of their works have foundation; law is there none in their doings.

Ages of endless wandering, exile too vast for endurance,
Turned all the heart of them backward; counsel has died from the people.

Taught of the rod and the lash, can they perceive now their anguish—
Shame and pain of the spirit—aught but the thrall of the body?

Have they the heart to care for other than care of the moment,
Men that are lost in the darkness, deep in the pit of the exile?

Can they now lift up their soul to the day or be prophets of morning,
Draw out their hope to the end, send on the word to the future?

Never will these awake, except that the scourge awake them;
Never will these arise, with only the ruin to rouse them.
Dried is the leaf from the tree, the hyssop is blown to the whirlwind; Waste is the vine and the flower decayed—can the dew now revive them?

Yea, when the trumpet sounds, when the banner at last is uplifted, Then shall the dead arise? even the dead awaken?

*(Translated from the Hebrew by Nina Salaman.)*
IV.

A SPIRITUAL CENTRE

BY

ACHAD HA'AM

It has been observed that if men always remembered the true meaning of every word that they use or hear, disputes would be infinitely rarer. The truth of this remark is known by experience to anybody who happens to have promulgated some idea which the contemporary "reading public" did not like, and to have had his "heresy" exposed by the literary mouthpieces of that public. The hapless creature's first feeling is one of incredulity and astonishment. How, he thinks, is it possible so to pervert things, so completely to confuse ideas and to advance arguments which so fail to touch the point? He puts it down to the malevolence of his opponents, believes that they are purposely twisting his words, and complains bitterly to that same reading public in the name of truth and fairness. But later, when he finds that complaint is unavailing, and that the same thing happens time after time, so that malevolence alone cannot be respon-

1 The original Hebrew article appeared in Hashiloach, vol. xvi. No. 2 (1907).
sible—then he is driven to the conclusion that there must be some more universal explanation of what he has experienced. The explanation is that the connection between a word and the idea contained in it is not so strong in the human mind as to make it impossible for a man to hear or to utter a word without immediately having a full and exact conception of the associated idea. Hence, when a man hears an opinion which runs counter to his way of thinking, he is apt unconsciously to grasp the novel opinion in an incorrect form: he will change the meaning of this or that word until it becomes not difficult for him to refute the opinion by unsound arguments, in which again one word or another is used incorrectly. And all this counterfeiting is done by the thinking apparatus automatically, without the knowledge of its owner, by virtue of its inherent tendency to work at any given moment in accordance with the dominant requirements of the subliminal self at that moment.

I doubt whether there is any contemporary Jewish writer who is more familiar with this experience than myself. Were I to count up all the disputes with which, for my sins, our literature has been enriched—most of them simply glaring instances of the phenomenon in question—the account would be long indeed. But I wish here to adduce only one instance of a dispute which began fifteen years ago and has continued to this very day.

1 i.e. in 1892.
Fifteen years ago there appeared for the first time an idea that afterwards occasioned endless expenditure of ink. "In Palestine," I wrote, "we can and should found for ourselves a *spiritual centre of our nationality.*" My literary experience was not yet extensive, and I overlooked this important consideration: that in putting before the public an idea which does not accord with the general view, one must not merely put it in a logically clear and definite form, but must also reckon with the psychology of the reader—with that mental apparatus which combines unrelated words and ideas according to the requirements of its owner—and must try one's utmost to avoid any word or expression which might afford an opening for this process of combination. I confess now that in view of this psychological factor I ought to have felt that the formula "a spiritual centre of our nationality" would afford a good opportunity to those who wished to misunderstand, although from the point of view of logic it is sufficiently clear and is well adapted to the idea which it contains.

"Centre" is, of course, a relative term. Just as "father" is inconceivable without children, so is "centre" inconceivable without "circumference"; and just as a father is a father only in relation to his children, and is merely So-and-so in relation to the rest of mankind, so a centre is a centre only in relation to its own circumference, whereas in relation to all that lies outside the circumference it is merely a point with no special
importance. When we use the word "centre," metaphorically, in connection with the phenomena of human society, it necessarily connotes a similar idea: what we mean is that a particular spot or thing exerts influence on a certain social circumference, which is bound up with and dependent on it, and that in relation to this circumference it is a centre. But since social life is a complex of many different departments, there are very few centres which are universal in their function—that is, which influence equally all sides of the life of the circumference. The relation between the centre and the circumference is usually limited to one or more departments of life, outside which they are not interdependent. Thus a given circumference may have many centres, each of which is a centre only for one specific purpose. When, therefore, the word "centre" is used to express a social conception, it is accompanied almost always—except where the context makes it unnecessary—by an epithet which indicates its character. We speak of a literary centre, an artistic centre, a commercial centre, and so on, meaning thereby that in this or that department of life the centre in question has a circumference which is under its influence and is dependent on it, but that in other departments the one does not exert nor the other receive influence, and the relation of centre and circumference does not exist.

Bearing well in mind this definition, which is familiar enough, and applying it to the phrase
quoted above—"in Palestine we can and should found for ourselves a spiritual centre of our nationality"—we shall find that the phrase can only be interpreted as follows:—

"A centre of our nationality" implies that there is a national circumference, which, like every circumference, is much larger than the centre. That is to say, the speaker sees the majority of his people, in the future as in the past, scattered over all the world, but no longer broken up into a number of disconnected parts, because one part—the one in Palestine—will be a centre for them all, and will unite them all into a single, complete circumference. When all the scattered limbs of the national body feel the beating of the national heart, restored to life in the home of its vitality, they too will once again draw near one to another and welcome the inrush of living blood that will flow from the heart.

"Spiritual" means that this relation of centre and circumference between Palestine and the lands of the diaspora will be limited of necessity to the spiritual side of life. The influence of the centre will strengthen the national consciousness in the diaspora, will wipe out the spiritual taint of galuth, and will fill our spiritual life with a national content which will be true and natural, not like the artificial content with which we now fill up the void. But outside the spiritual side of life, in all those economic and political relations which depend first and foremost on the conditions of the immediate environment, and are created by that environment
and reflect its character—while it is true that in all those relations the effect of the spiritual changes (such as the strengthening of national unity and increased energy in the struggle for existence) will show itself to some extent, yet essentially and fundamentally these departments of life in the diaspora will not be bound up with the life of the centre, and the most vivid imagination cannot picture to us how economic and political influence will radiate from Palestine through all the length and breadth of the diaspora, which is co-extensive with the globe, in such manner and to such degree as would entitle us to say, without inexact use of language, that Palestine is the centre of our people in these departments also.

Now, at the time when I first used the phrase under discussion I knew beforehand that I should excite the wrath of the Chovevi Zion (in those days it was they who held the field). But looking, as I did, solely at the logical side, I was sure that the brunt of their anger would fall on the word "centre"; for the use of that word involved a negation of the idea of a return of the whole people to Palestine, and so clipped the wings of those fantastic hopes which even then, in the days before the first Basle Congress, were proclaimed as heralding the end of the galuth and a complete and absolute solution of the Jewish problem in all its aspects. The epithet "spiritual" seemed to me so simple and clear, as a necessary logical consequence of the assumption involved in the word
"centre," that it never remotely entered my mind that here might be the stumbling-block, and that I ought at once to file a declaration to the effect that, although the centre would be spiritual in its influence on the circumference, yet in itself it would be a place like other places, where men were compounded of body and soul, and needed food and clothing, and that for this reason the centre would have to concern itself with material questions and to work out an economic system suited to its requirements, and could not exist without farmers, labourers, craftsmen, and merchants. When a man uses, for example, the expression "literary centre," does it occur to him to explain that he does not mean a place where there is no eating or drinking, no business or handicraft, but simply a number of men sitting and writing books and drinking in the radiance of their own literary talent? Imagine, then, my surprise when I found that my critics paid no attention to the word "centre," but poured out all the vials of their wrath on the epithet "spiritual," as though it contained all that was new and strange in the idea: as who should say, "A spiritual and not a material centre? Can such a thing be?"

But my amazement soon died away when I remembered the "psychological apparatus." It was bound to fasten on some word or other in order to make my unpopular theory appear absurd; and since the word "centre," if the critics dwelt on it and led the minds of their readers to analyse its
meaning, was calculated not to serve that end, but, on the contrary, to make it clear where the absurdity really lay, they found it best to give "spiritual" all the emphasis. "A spiritual centre! Now do you understand what these people want? They care nothing for a material settlement, for colonies, factories, commerce: they want only to settle in Palestine a dozen batlanim, whose business shall be spiritual nationality."

Great indeed is the power of psychology. This interpretation spread abroad, was accepted, and remains to this day a matter of course. Even those Zionists who have not got their knowledge of my views from the pamphlet literature which has flooded the world in recent years, but have read them in the original—even they are certain that that is what spiritual Zionism means. It has availed them nothing to read immediately afterwards, in the same article, that the spiritual centre must be "a true miniature of the people of Israel," and that in the centre there will appear once more "the genuine type of a Jew, whether it be a Rabbi or a scholar or a writer, a farmer or a craftsman or a business man." It has availed nothing, because psychological factors dominate not only the person judging, but also his memory.

Three years ago, I remember, after I had published in some journal a protest against the favour-

1 i.e. the article "Dr. Pinsker and his Pamphlet," from which the phrase under discussion is quoted.
2 i.e. in 1904.
able reports about the condition of the Palestinian colonies that were then being spread abroad, for diplomatic purposes, a writer in the camp of the political Zionists became angry with me, and determined to shatter with one blow all my views on Zionism, and so remove a dangerous heresy. This idea he carried out in an elaborate article, which was continued through many numbers of the same journal. The details I have forgotten: they were but the old arguments dished up in different words. But I still remember one thing, which provoked not only a smile but also reflections such as those which are the subject of the present essay. After proving conclusively that material factors are of great importance, and cannot be lightly brushed aside, our author reaches the conclusion that it is for that reason idle to confine our work solely to the foundation of a spiritual centre for our nationality: we must found in Palestine an economic and spiritual centre. It escaped his notice that so soon as he used the word "centre" he became himself a "spiritual Zionist," and in adding the epithet "economic" added exactly nothing. The journal in question appeared in Warsaw, which was also at that time the home of our author; and in order to understand the matter aright he had only to go into the street and ask any intelligent Pole: "What is Warsaw to the Polish people as a whole? Is it a spiritual centre of the nation, or a spiritual and economic centre?" The answer, I think, would have been something like this: "For the Polish
people as a whole this city is certainly a spiritual centre of their nationality. Here the national characteristics find their expression in every department of life, here the national language, literature, and art live and develop; and all this, and what goes with it, influences the spirit of the Poles, binds them, wherever they may be, to the centre, and prevents the spark of nationality in the individual from becoming buried and extinguished. But an *economic* centre of the nation? My good sir! How could Warsaw be an economic centre for all the millions of Poles who are scattered over different lands, and whose economic lives depend on entirely different centres, where Polish economic conditions do not count at all?" I should not have advised our author, after getting an answer of that kind, to ask: "How so? Are there not in Warsaw, besides spiritual things, ever so many factories and shops and other material things, without which it could not develop its spiritual side? And is it not therefore an economic and spiritual centre?" I should not have advised him to ask that question, because I could not guarantee that the intelligent Pole would waste words on such a questioner.

But amongst ourselves "the economic centre" has become a current phrase with many people who on the one hand want to do their duty by the economic side of Zionism (that is *de rigueur* nowadays), and on the other hand cannot achieve the imaginative eagle-flights of "Proletarian Zion-
ism," which promises to create in Palestine a national economic system so healthy and so vast that it will be able to provide room and work for all those Jews who are being more and more completely elbowed out of the best branches of industry in the lands of their exile (that is, for almost ninetenths of the people). Zionists like these, in order to get rid of the difficult question as to the possibility of settling the majority of our people in Palestine, even when their new economic system becomes a fact, consent to accept half the loaf, and want to regard Palestine as merely an economic centre. But herein they escape one snare to fall into a worse: they have got rid of an external problem, which depends on arguments from experience, and are caught instead in an inner contradiction, which mere logic can expose. With the "Proletarian" formula one can still argue: one can demand, for instance, a somewhat clearer explanation of that "internal process" by which the economic system of Palestine will become able to absorb immigration on a scale unparalleled in history: but at all events there is no self-contradiction. Whereas the conception of "an economic centre of the nation," when applied to a people scattered over the whole world, leaves no room

---

1 The name given to a Zionist doctrine based on Marxian Socialism, which had a vogue in Russia, especially among the younger generation, at the time when this article was written. The "internal process" (mentioned later) belongs to the terminology of this doctrine.
for argument or questioning, because its refutation is in itself.

But psychological combinations of this kind are a good sign. They show—in common with other clear signs—that the "centre" as an idea is making headway and is leading to various deductions which could not have been imagined some years ago. And that is the all-important thing. In time the deduction which is involved in the word "spiritual," when rightly understood, will also be drawn, and it will no longer be possible to suppress it by psychological means. True, all this will not do away with the old nonsense about "spiritual Zionism"; on the contrary—and this is even now unmistakably evident—the more the substance of spiritual Zionism prevails, the more will psychology try to distinguish the victorious tendency from its hated name. But what of that? Let the name be beaten, so but the idea prevail!

(Translated from the Hebrew by Leon Simon.)
V

ONE OF THE SMALLER NATIONS

BY

REV. DR. J. ABELSON, M.A., D.LITT.

An ill-wind sometimes blows good. The present European War is an ill-wind to settled civilizations, uprooting and demolishing ever so many of our time-honoured landmarks, creating chaos where comfort formerly was, bringing sorrow, subjection, humiliation to lands, homes, hearts which had hitherto enjoyed all gradations of happiness and contentment. But these calamities carry with them their counterbalancing compensations. There is no wound without its preordained remedy, said the Rabbis. There is a decidedly bright side about the present cataclysm which will certainly and finally eclipse its black side. The War is clearly making for a new union of nations, great and small. More than this. It is setting up a new interpretation as well as a new standard of nationality, giving a new stimulus to the sacrosanct moral principles which go to the making of nationality. The world is getting to see in dead earnest how dishonourable dealing and duplicity on the part of a nation are just as detest-
able as are the same vices when practised by individuals. Nations have rights which dare not be trampled upon by other and more powerful nations. A convergence of interests between nations is better than a divergence. It is a delusion to think that the prosperity of any one people depends on the ruin of another. The more the conjoint effort and co-operation of nations the greater and happier will humanity become. And the individual is perforce brought round to ask himself, What can I do in the way of adding to the moral, intellectual, or industrial assets of my country so as to make the sum-total of human betterment all the greater? There is a general all-round levelling-up of the civic virtues.

Zionism stands for the rights of one of the "smaller nations"—the Jews; and hence it stands to gain considerably from all these new viewpoints. Its essential kernel—the spirit of Jewish nationhood—cannot but become fuller and weightier. The forces working on it from the outside as well as the forces working on it from the inside are likely to be far more favourable to its progress than they have ever hitherto been. By external forces I mean the public opinion of Christendom. By inside forces I mean the trend of general Jewish feeling and criticism. To speak of the former: it is a truism that the most highly enlightened of Christian nations are standing up to support the freedom and integrity of the "smaller nations." The Jew is one of these
"smaller nations." A fine opportunity will assuredly be his for becoming reinstated in the land of his fathers when the time comes for appealing to the victorious Allied Powers who will sit as the arbiters of justice to all the smaller nations. It is perfectly true that the Jew is a Jew, whereas all the "smaller nations" are Christians. A chasm divides him from the others. This makes a big difference. Where the Jew is not openly persecuted he is not inwardly beloved. No lapse of time, no amount of advancing culture seems ever to avail in eradicating the world's inveterate habit of looking askance at him and his fortunes. But granting all this, it is most likely that with the advent of the quieter time the REASON of the world will overcome its BLIND PASSION. The War is sure to have this cleansing effect. Reason will give the world its sense of justice, of proportion, of the fitness of things; the appropriateness of the Jew's claim to Palestine will appeal with success to the untainted INTELLECT of humankind. Passion, bigoted prejudice will be removed out of the way. Reason will enable the world to recognize the good in the Jew and his clean record. The unreasoned passion of the nations who have hitherto had nothing but curses for the Jew will disappear beneath the over-towering waves of sympathy which will be washed from the broad ocean of humanity's bosom towards all the "smaller nations" who assisted in the work of setting the universe free from a yoke
of Prussian serfdom. The Jew did his duty on this latter head. He worked strenuously. He suffered heroically. And one must have a very poor opinion of human nature to think that he will go totally unrecompensed for it.

But if it be true that, as a result of the War, the Jew will no longer be the victim of the social or religious prejudice from which he hitherto suffered the question will naturally crop up, What room will there be for the Zionist programme? Once comfortably ensconced in the lands of his Dispersion, will not the Jew forget Zion? Will not his galuth become quite a sweet thing to him and land him in a condition of unlovely degeneracy? My answer is this: If the Jew must have persecution to keep his Zionism alive, then Zionism is not worth the having. To regard Zionism as nothing more than a mere nostrum for persecution—and such seems to be the view shared by a great many Jews—is one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall the Movement. Zionism is love for the land of the Shekinah and the Holy Spirit, a mystic rapture of the whole Jewish soul in the quest of rediscovering the "Fountain of living waters," a rapture such as an Isaiah felt when he said: "Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city; for henceforth there shall no more come unto thee the uncircumcized and the unclean." To place any lower construction on the movement is to debase, nay, to stultify,
it. After all, the really true Jew must be an idealist. A great many Jews are not idealists. A great many are rank materialists, "frail clay vessels," as Geiger says, "unavailable as instruments for ushering in a spiritually healthy time." Not by them, with all their silver and gold, will Zion ever be built. The War has given a distinct spurt to religious feeling in all the combatant nations. The abounding suffering, disease, death, are making men believe more in Divine things, opening their eyes to the reality of spiritual truths. Good men of all creeds will probably come to look upon the Jewish resettlement in Palestine as a vital part of religion generally. And Jews will thus be at one with the good men of all creeds as regards Palestine. A world at ease, the sword sheathed in the scabbard, sheathed for ever as we hope, can only be a world which sees the Jew at home in the land which is his by ancestral birthright. As for details, by all means let the Christian retain hold of the spots in Jerusalem sanctified for him by the memories of the Founder of his faith. Similarly, let the Mohammedans enjoy the same exclusive rights of access to the parts made holy for them eternally, as they believe. But let the Jew fulfil prophecy by being master of the Land of Prophecy—under certain political safeguards and guarantees, of course. National rearrangements after the War are certain. The Jews, as one of the "smaller"

1 "Judaism and its History," p. 125.
nations,” with a pronounced corporate consciousness of its own, will be recognized as having a title to a “place in the sun.” With the enhanced religious intuitions of the general public, the simplest solution will be to restore Palestine to the Jew, leaving the land free to develop its own resources on the lines dictated by the Hebrew genius incorporated there.

Now for what I have ventured to call the internal forces, the trend of Jewish opinion and criticism after the War. Throughout his Essays (so ably rendered into English by Mr. Leon Simon) Achad Ha‘am speaks with the greatest enthusiasm about the national creative power of the Jew. “We have still within us,” he says in one place, “a perennial spring of living creative power.” And he goes on blaming us for scattering our forces amongst the cultures of other nations and thus dissipating them, instead of concentrating them at a white-heat in a national culture of our own. While Achad Ha‘am seems to me to exaggerate the evils of the side which he opposes, there is nevertheless much truth and force in what he, in the main, contends for. We tend others’ vineyards. We do not tend our own vineyard. We give our genius away to others and do not retain anything like an adequate amount for our own uplifting. But we can learn here—and even from the enemy. If there is one feature in German life which the progress of the War is making the world admire more and more, it is the fact
of the *thoroughness* with which the Germans carry out whatsoever they apply themselves to. The march of events is showing how intense is the need for imitating this thoroughness. I believe that one supreme after-effect of the War will be an intensive attention to education in all its branches, in all its applications to humanity; and I believe that the Jew, inhaling as he must these educational breezes wafted to him from all sides of his Christian environment, will feel the sproutings of new desires to pay more attention than he ever previously did to his own national education, to the revival of Hebrew, to the necessity for giving our young a superior training in the study of Jewish history, thus initiating them into an appreciation of the invaluable treasures of the Jewish spirit generally. Having attained this consummation, we shall be on the sure road to the reconquest of that "perennial spring of living creative power" which was once ours, but of which we have been bereft for a very long time. And one need not be an unduly extreme optimist to believe that we are likely to tend in this direction. We are teaching our children to believe that it was the poison of German materialism that brought about her horrible militarism. Now, to the Jew, the diametrical opposite of materialism is education—education of the soul as well as of the intellect, the education so nobly apostrophized by the old sage in the words: "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of God." To the Jew, educa-
tion is one of the many strands which constitute the texture of religion. A "religionless" education is no education. Education and religion are necessarily and always intertwined. They are almost synonymous, interchangeable terms. An infusion of education conceived from some such standpoint as this—the necessity for which we must perforce recognize as the antidote to the materialism which has engendered the present cataclysm—will mean an infusion of the much-wanted spirituality into our ranks; and this will be the ladder on which we shall rise to a purer and grander realization of our Jewish national consciousness than we have ever yet reached. It is just here that we shall find our salvation, the cause that will save our Jewish soul from going down to the pit. It matters naught whether this "education" be what we, with our inordinately loose terminology, usually label "orthodox," or whether it be "unorthodox." The only thing that matters is that it be spiritual. A Jew can be spiritual even if he be unorthodox. Conversely, an orthodox Jew can be a very pattern of unspirituality. The real implication of the terms requires drastic overhauling. They are survivals of an age gone by, and the things they denote are no longer what they used to be. The dividing wall has been thrown down and the territories have become intermixed and indistinguishable. Until our ecclesiastical authorities turn their attention to the question, giving us a new set of definitions and laying down the necessary hard-and-
fast standards, we are merely playing with shadows. A spiritual Jewry will be one that will refuse to look upon attendance at synagogue, the dispensing of charity, and the solution of "East End problems" as the acme of Jewish religious high-mindedness. Not like these is the portion of Jacob. While retaining these necessary factors of the Jewish life, it will set itself a more ambitious programme. It will "look up to the rock from which it hath been hewn," modelling itself on the exaltedness of the old unadulterated faith of Israel as preached by prophet and psalmist and as lived by the saints and martyrs who preferred losing the world to losing their Jewish soul. To work for this end is to lay the foundation-stone of Israel's regeneration as a people.

The psychological moment for Zionism is certainly now. The world's present adversity is Zion's opportunity. The human mind is riper than it ever was for grasping the true inwardness of the Jew's claim to the land of his fathers. A Judaism with the "National Idea" shining through all its constituent parts, a Judaism shot through with the spirituality of the Hebrew prophet and poet, drawing its vitality, not from an accommodation to non-Jewish conditions but from the storehouse of its own inherent, latent powers and possibilities, which have never yet so far been allowed to run their full gamut—these are our desiderata. Having them, we shall confidently knock at the doors of Zion's citadel. And we shall not knock in vain.
VI

THE RENASCENCE OF JEWISH ÄSTHETICS

BY

BERTRAM B. BENAS, B.A., LL.B.

The art of generalization is often exercised upon Jewry—an exercise not inaptly illustrated by the world's generalization on Jewish art. The world does not readily credit Jewry with the sense of the feeling for beauty or with the sense of the beauty of feeling. While the world has for so long allowed Jewry occasions, but few and far between, to realize freely the nature of joy, it has questioned its recognition of the joy of Nature. But there appears a welcome glimmering of the dawn of the day when human societies which compassed the inversion of Jewry, of Jewish thought, and of Jewish action are envisaging the historic people of Israel in a clearer light.

What Jewry rejected was not the normality of art, but artless abnormality. If Israel has placed social justice in the forefront, it has placed it as the necessary condition for the basis of civilization. But the basis is not the Temple—it is but the foundation of the Temple. And Jewry has never
lacked structure upon structure, reared upon the solid rock of its cult of right. The first book of its historic literature had not reached beyond the tenth verse of its first chapter when the creation there narrated was described as "good." This goodness cannot be regarded as simply utilitarian goodness, but the goodness of an ideal perfection—the perfection of its kind.

The fact that Jewry did not develop the arts in certain forms does not withhold from Jewry the right to be regarded as a people endowed with the artistic spirit. The nations of Europe have devised forms of art unknown to the Far East, and the knowledge now possessed of Far Eastern art shows that the variance in art expression is reciprocated. What is lacking in one sphere of the artistic development of a nation is often counterbalanced by a preponderance of worth in another sphere. Thus the restricted area for the development of the plastic arts in Jewry is compensated by the greater emphasis upon music. Music is the national expression of Jewish feeling. Music is not an appendage but a constituent of its spiritual literature,¹ for music has entwined itself around the Jewish soul from the dawn of Jewish history. It is characteristic that the heroic prototype of Jewry, King David, is a musician, a maker of music.²

¹ Cf. the headings to the Psalms.
² Hazzanuth, the melos of the Jewish ritual, developed the use of representative themes long before the practice became
When the nationhood of Israel ultimately became detached from its territorial nationality, the first concern of the preservers of the Jewish spirit was that centres for the maintenance of the Jewish mentality—the consciousness which had regard for things of the mind rather than things of matter—should be firmly and securely established. And the success of these endeavours—if it could not supply the conditions favourable for the larger development of the artistic tendencies of Jewry in its own land—ensured the continuance of the literary tradition which has given to literature a Judah Halevy in the eleventh and a Bialik in the twentieth century (C.E.). And this very insistence upon literature evolved an art, for the craft of manuscript and of its illumination reached a high degree of perfection at the hands of Jewry.

Rabbinical literature merits an explorer of its æsthetics. A chrestomathy or an anthology is needed to represent the humane learning "in the Talmud told, that book of gems, that book of gold of wonders many and manifold." That the spirit of Bezalel, the symbol of the spirit of art in Jewish life, was handed down unimpaired through the rabbinical tradition is seen by a quotation from the Midrash Shemot. The tribe of Judah, the Midrash says, was in the forefront of the tribes—that of Dan the least. When the Tabernacle was to be built Bezalel, of the tribe the subject of even tentative consideration by the musicians of the Occident.
of Judah, had as his appointed fellow-worker Aholiab of the tribe of Dan—clear token of equality in face of the Divine call. The Jewish artistic genius further developed itself in legend and epigram—in the presentation of romance, of fantasy, of wit, and of wisdom. Both in the narratives of legend and of fact which clustered around the historical figures of the rabbinical personages of Talmudic and of post-Talmudic times, humanity is as strongly emphasized as spirituality. Akiba, famous as a scholar and as a hero, is, like the patriarchs of his people, the subject of a beautiful romance.

Throughout the succeeding centuries the idealistic spirit was preserved by the insistence upon things of the mind, upon their superiority over things of matter. "To the Jew of the Middle Ages, the highest ambition and ideal was, not to be rich, but to be counted among the learned in the community. . . . When the mediæval Jews were thrown back upon themselves, this devotion to scholarship was intensified, and made the Jews a nation of literati."  

While synagogues have been institutions of Jewry from very early times, the Synagogue became the more characteristic institution in Jewry during and since detachment from the Temple. The place of the Synagogue in Jewish life has profoundly affected the existence of Jewish idealism. When the Synagogue was regarded as the centre of

Jewish life, its aspect as a centre connoted a circle of Jewishness with a circumference of Jewish activity in radial relation to that centre. But since the current era of civic emancipation in the Occident, with the varying degrees of social assimilation which followed in its train, the Synagogue has become to many that to which the word "centre" has no accurate application. To many the Synagogue, rather than the centre of a circle of Jewish life and Jewish living, has become the oasis in a desert of un-Jewish life and un-Jewish living. Such circumstances do not necessarily imply a lessening of the Jewishness in the Synagogue—they point to a scarcity of the Jewishness out of the Synagogue. The curious consequence is that in the Occident, instead of the Synagogue being absorbed in Jewry, Jewry is now absorbed in the Synagogue, at least nominally. Instead of latitudinarianism producing the recognition of a sense of secular detachment, the foundation of a Jewish ecclesiasticism has followed, so that there arises a sphere of Jewish people incapable of thinking of anything Jewish except in terms of the Synagogue, while the Jewry of old appeared incapable of thinking of the Synagogue except in terms of Jewish life. Similar conditions to those obtaining in olden times are to be found in the areas where either civic emancipation or social assimilation, or both, have not reached the degree current in the Occident, and it is precisely from these areas that the creative capacity for
the progress of the renascence of Jewish idealism derives much of its support; for there, to think, is to think Jewishly, to think of things Jewish in terms of life, not merely in relation to a rare festival or an occasional Sabbath.

Sacred art is art limited, unless the faith inspires the whole life; a people cannot bind its creative spirit within the limits of ecclesiastical ornamentation, unless that is an expression, not of a unit but of the unity of life. Schechter, in the Preface to his "Studies in Judaism." (Second Series), describes the reduction of Jewish nationhood to the dimensions of a sect as historically unsound. Referring to one of his essays, he observes that it is "mostly devoted to the social life of the Jews and tries to show how little such generalities as the common conception of the conversion of a nation into a Church answer the real facts. The Synagogue became a part of the nation, not the nation a part of the Synagogue." Schechter is considering the place of the Synagogue in Jewish life in the light of its early history—not in its metamorphosis into the Jewish counterpart of the ecclesiastical establishments of sectarian denominations.

So long as the creative faculty of Jewish idealism was limited by external causes the source yet remained unimpaired, but when the creative faculty became limited by internal causes, its gradual impairment was certain. For where there is a Jewish life as a whole, its oppression from without may
limit the free exercise of the faculty, but where there is but a fragmentary Jewish life, vanishing into infinity, there may be freedom of exercise, but subject and object become narrower in Jewish range in conformity with the fragmentary Jewish life, and instead of Jewish artists and idealists there are artists and idealists who happen to be Jews. The exuberant energies in idealism of the Jewries of the mediæval era are recounted in Dr. Israel Abrahams's "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages." In these periods there were Jewish contributions to the common stock of civilization, of which civilization made use, if it did not always accord recognition. But the modern era of civic emancipation, with the dilution of Jewish identity which followed, has produced almost exactly the opposite of the ideal held by the more spiritually minded of those who profess belief in that lessening or negation of Jewish inconsciousness generally known as "assimilation." Those who hold to this view regard the existence of Jewry in Diaspora as an essential for what they denominate the "Jewish Mission," and they justify the persistence of Jewry by their belief in the continuing necessity of a Jewish contribution to human culture. The realities, however, bear no relation to their ideals; for the progress of this "assimilation" may allow of the possibility of a contribution of Jews, a very different thing from a Jewish contribution, to the common stock of the civilization of mankind. When the contribution ceases to be Jewish, the
substratum of the mission is taken away—it is indistinguishable from the general culture of humanity, and the particularism of independence on the basis of the "mission" seems to be without a prop of support. Ghetto idealism derived its inspiration from a living present based on the past. The National Renascence derives its inspiration from a living present based on the future, but unhistoric assimilation which has detached itself from the past and looks but to an amorphous future deprives itself of the force necessary for a current vitality.

The assimilative tendencies produce some curious phenomena. In the Western non-Latin world the environing ecclesiastical systems concentrate upon the weekly day of service; and the Jewries who assimilate, assimilate the concentration, at least in its negative form, not by relegating their Jewishness to the Sabbath, but by excluding it from the weekday workaday world. In the Eastern and Latin countries of Europe, and the lands deriving their general culture directly therefrom, where the dominant ecclesiastical systems diffuse their ministrations over the week and emphasize them upon more numerous festal and ferial occasions, the Jewries who assimilate tend to assimilate more to that secularism which exists in those countries to a considerable extent. Thus where the ecclesiastical system colours the life to a degree more akin to the Jewish, the assimilative Jewry assimilates, not the range of the ecclesias-
ticism but the spirit of the secularism, and where the ecclesiastical system is more limited in its sphere of exercise, the assimilative Jewry assimilates its negative characteristics. The result is that in each case the Jewry that assimilates fastens upon the demarcation between the secular and the spiritual in a manner wholly without relation to the Jewish consciousness, so that Jewishness becomes relegated to matters of ritual and liturgy, which in too many instances are further relegated to the sphere of unpractised traditions. This is no extreme picture of un-Jewish life in the later nineteenth century when the Jewish entity became impaired in both spheres, in one by the assimilation of latitudinarianism, in the other by sheer secularism.

Just at this period when Jewry was assailed from within by assimilation towards that without, there dawned a Jewish Renascence, "the Jewish Renascence of our day, a vital happening, an essential of our very existence, and one of those miraculous appearances which the weaving of the scheme of things has made ready at the moment needed."¹ The Renascence finds expression in the Jewish National Movement, which is both its effect and its cause. The Renascence and the National Movement derive qualities of permanence from each other. That the Renascence is wider than the National Movement is due to the fact that there

¹ "A Jewish Renascence," by the present writer, the *Jewish Review*, January 1913.
are generally to be found more who will subscribe to an idea than to the organization which secures its furtherance.

What has the Jewish Renascence done for Jewry? It has turned Jewry back upon itself—it is the cogito-ergo sum of Jewish nationhood. The National Movement has hidden Jewry to recall, in the words of Juvenal, e caelo descendit γνῶθι, σεαυτόν figendum et memori tractandum pectore. The whole of Jewry is not devoted to the Synagogue, not even the most assimilated. Thus as Jewry the whole is greater than the Synagogue the part, so does a return to Jewry herald a greater pilgrimage. It is a pilgrimage towards the Temple of Jewish Nationhood. It is a spiritual renascence, for while it includes the Synagogue it does not end there. The Jewish home has been rediscovered, it presents itself as a thing of beauty. Its pictures, its tapestries, its woodwork, come from Bezalel, from Bezalel risen again in the minds, hearts, and hands of a young Jewry working at bench with tool, at easel with brush, at spindle and loom in the ancient homeland—in the land of Israel. The language spoken is the Hebrew language, Hebrew ever living, once again alive; Hebrew uttered in the real tonality of the Orient, freed from the enunciation of tongues unakin. The songs sung are Songs of Zion. A circle is formed in the home, or from it, and herein some of the literature of Hebraism is read and discussed. Most probably the discussion is in Hebrew.
The participants are spiritually at one with their ancestors, emphasizing the length and the splendour of the intellectual heritage to which they are heirs.

And the Renascence has rediscovered the beauty of Jewish ritual. It has turned the artists of Jewry towards their own people, and they have painted the soul of the body wrapped in the Talith at prayer and praise, the waving of the Lulab, the ecstasy of the Shema. "Aliens at prayer," not aliens to prayer. The Tephillin, the Kiddush, the Habdalah, the Seder, all come with a new appeal, the renewed appeal of the old meaning. The Sabbath lights, kindled in symbolic ceremony, express the radiant beauty of a Jewish Sabbath Eve. The Succah is all sweetness, the Hoshana has its own wistful charm. And this Art and these artists are the first-fruits of the seeds sown in Palestine. Many have their easels in the Diaspora, but their hearts are in the ancient homeland. "It is through the movements which appeal to sense perception that the Renascence of Jewish intellectuality is most likely to be realized among those who have depart-

1 The Phylacteries, the Sanctification, the Benediction ceremony at the close of Sabbath and Festivals, the Order of Service for the Home on the first two nights of Passover.

2 The Tabernacle.

3 A people capable of celebrating a אסתר והשנה לאלים (New Year for Trees) must possess a real happiness in Nature. The revived appreciation of the Festival is characteristic of the effect of the Jewish National Movement. Jewry, as on Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, is bidden to recall its natural, national life.
mentalized their Jewry into a sect. To be brought back to Jewish spirituality they must be brought back to Jewish humanity. The roadway to the spirituality of Hebraism is through the gateway of Humanism. This is not the secularization of life. It is the Hebraisation of life.”¹ The Jewish liturgy itself speaks of the bliss of those who call the days of rest and of festival a delight.²

The Jewish days of celebration are not the discovery of the Renascence, they have been rediscovered from the obliterations of reforming “restorers.”³ The Jewish Calendar reappears in its historic light—typical of the spiritual consciousness of Jewish Nationhood. It would seem that there are those who think it not impossible to distil out of existence the Jewishness even of the Hebrew Scriptures. Happily, not only the Scriptures but the Talmud and the Midrash have been rediscovered as Jewry’s heritage. A Hebrew poet of the Renascence has helped to remind Jewry that the rabbinical writings are not only “Rabbinics,” they are of the literature of Hebraism.⁴ The Sabbath is a Jewish national institution—so national that while many nations have endeavoured to assimilate it they have succeeded in producing a Friday and

¹ “A Jewish Renascence,” supra.
² See also Nehemiah viii. 10; Deut. xviii. 14.
³ See the Address “‘Renaissance’ and ‘Culture’ and their Jewish Applications,” by the Very Rev. the Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz.
⁴ See the “Sepher Haggadah,” ed. by Rabnitzki and Bialik.
a Sunday, partial days of rest or days of partial rest, but days that are admittedly not in kind, as not in date, the שבת, the Sabbath, the seventh day of the nationhood which possessed a sanction for labour and a sanction for leisure.1

Through the Renascence, the restoration of the Synagogue can be achieved. Not merely a restoration of the Synagogue to its place, but a restoration of the place of the Synagogue. Already the Renascence, in detaching the poetry of Jewish liturgy to re-attach it to Jewish literature, has rediscovered the splendour of the Jewish service. It has shown that there is something Jewish to say and something Jewish to say it in.

"Whatever may happen," says Achad Ha'am, "the Bezalel has already become the source of a spiritual influence which makes itself felt in lands far distant from Palestine. Who can tell how many estranged hearts have been brought back to their people in greater or less degree by the beautiful carpets and ornaments of the Bezalel!" 2 The whole movement of which the Bezalel is the prototype and symbol has wrought its best in that which it has achieved for those of Jewry מורים Latvia פאריס outside the ancient Homeland. The Bezalel idea may be regarded as a נ舟山 לרצים זכרונ (a memorial

1 These are instances of the assimilation of Jewish institutions, not the assimilation by Jewish institutions; neither process can be regarded as satisfactory.
of the departure from Egypt), the Egyptian darkness of the spirit of "Galuth" (exile). Each may reply to the scoffer who asks: "What mean you by this Bezalel?" "This is what Bezalel has wrought for me, дол for me, and not for you."

Achad Ha'am points out with great cogency that humanity at large suffers to some extent from the dispersion of our cultural forces, and therefore our staunchest champions of humanity have a perfect right to share unhesitatingly in our concern at this dispersion. . . . We need not . . . answer those who ask what humanity loses by our loss; it is rather for them to explain to us what humanity gains by our loss."

To show that Herzl had the idealistic aspect of Palestine never out of sight, it is only necessary to refer to the work in which the great leader unfolded his aims and the methods by which they were to be brought about. In his "Jewish State," which has as its sub-title "An attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question," he repeatedly refers to the imaginative powers of Palestine and the idealizing potency of a Jewish Resettlement. "We shall not dwell in mud huts," Herzl observes. "We shall build newer and more beautiful houses

2 "A Jewish Renascence," supra.
and possess them in safety... we shall not sacrifice our beloved customs, we shall find them again.”

And now we can ask ourselves, To what is it that we can set our hands to carry on the work of the past in the present for the future? Let us try, not only to bring the Jewish people back to the Ancient Homeland, but the Ancient Homeland back to the Jewish people. Let the beauty of the land of Israel come before our eyes, let us have near us and around us the products of our people produced in their historic home, let us allow its life to enter into the lives of every one of us. And we cannot be insensible to its claim, charm, and inspiration. The speaking message of Jewish pictures to Jewish hearts, the touching melodies of our tradition and those which the genius of our people have brought forth—these all have their place in our lives. The Hebrew language is music to the ears of those who love the sounds of its telling speech. We who have had the whole life of the land brought before us can keep it ever with us.¹ Those who look back to its representa-

¹ In 1912 (5672) a series of Jewish Palestine Exhibitions were held in England, and their success pointed to the inauguration of a Jewish Renascence, of which they appear to have been both a cause and an effect; but their influence has been limited to a considerable extent, so far as enduring interest is concerned, to those who were hitherto sympathetic to the idea of Israel as a nation, Israel’s ancient homeland as the Land of Israel.
tion with joy can still realize the sweet savour of the citrons and the olive-wood, the happy Hebrew spirit which everywhere prevailed, the spirit of Bezalel, the Jewish artist who built us the Tabernacle in the Wilderness. The Tabernacle of Bezalel has spread throughout the world, a Tabernacle of Peace, of Happiness, of Hope, a Jewish Renascence, harbinger of the voice that shall say to Jerusalem, "Thou shalt be built and to the Temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isa. xlv. 28).
VII

ENGLAND AND THE JEWISH NATIONAL MOVEMENT

BY

HERBERT BENTWICH, LL.B.

If England is not the birthplace of modern Zionism, it can at least be claimed for it that it is the appropriate home of the Movement. Cromwell's invitation to Manasseh ben Israel, which led to the securing of "a legally recognized home" for Jews in England, was motived and defended on biblical grounds, and the hope of bringing about the restoration of the ancient people to their own land was the basis of the whole scheme of the Resettlement.

That idea may have become overlaid by the development of other interests, in the generations which followed; but it never wholly vanished, and its survival is to be noted in the call which came to Moses Montefiore when, already a man of middle age, he cut himself adrift from the pursuits of commerce, in which he had become prosperous, and turned his face to the cradle of his race, to which thenceforth his best thoughts and energies
were devoted. From 1825, when he proceeded on his first pilgrimage to the Holy Land, to the completion of his self-imposed mission to Jerusalem at the end of 1874, when he was already in his ninetieth year, there was half a century of continuous effort directed to the attainment of the great ideal which formed the inspiration of his life—the revival of the ancient glories of his people in the land of their fathers.

The enthusiasm and zeal for this sacred cause which filled the great champion of Israel spread its influence far and wide, and when he died, ten years after his last pilgrimage, the groundwork of the Jewish revival had been securely established. During that ten years George Eliot had produced her inspiring picture of the Jewish race taking on again the character of a nationality, Oliphant had published his schemes for the settlement of the fertile lands of Gilead by those who were fleeing from the lands of persecution, and Kitchener with Conder had laid the foundations of a permanent British interest in Judæa by their pioneer work in the Western Survey.

It is something more than a coincidence that in 1885, the year which closed Sir Moses Montefiore's grand record, the first steps were taken for the formation of a society for the promotion of the national idea in Jewry which afterwards developed into the Association of Lovers of Zion, or "Chovevi Zion," spreading its branches to all parts of the world. The English association, which adopted
for its first object "the fostering of the National Idea in Israel," was prominent, not so much for its colonizing work, which was far exceeded in other countries where the need for emigration made itself more felt, as for its successful political propaganda. Under the enthusiastic leadership first of Elim d'Avigdor and then of Colonel Albert Goldsmid, the whole of Anglo-Jewry was stirred to interest, if not to activity, in the realization of the great ideal. Mass meetings in support of it were held everywhere in the metropolis and the provinces, under the presidency of men of light and leading in the community like Sir Julian Goldsmid, Sir John Simon, and Sir Edward Sassoon; and the heads of the clergy, Dr. Hermann Adler, Dr. Albert Löwy, and Simeon Singer, joined in the plea for this latter-day fulfilment of the ancient prophecies. At one great meeting, presided over by Sir Samuel Montagu (then Member of Parliament for Whitechapel), a petition to the Sultan was adopted for presentation to Lord Rosebery for transmission through the Foreign Office to the Porte. At another mass meeting, a year later, a still more determined effort was made under the same auspices, Sir Samuel Montagu declaring that, "not only would Jews be assisted in colonizing Palestine, but practical shape would be given to their aspiration for the restoration of the Jewish kingdom." A monster petition was presented to Lord Rothschild, "chief among the remnant of Israel," to be transmitted to Constan-
tinople by Lord Salisbury, who had then succeeded to the office of Foreign Secretary. An edict of the Sultan recognizing the right of Jews to own soil in Palestine followed on these efforts. But colonizing work was a slow process, and after some seven years (1890-7) of rather fitful agitation the interest in the Chovevi Zion began to flag.

The publication by Theodor Herzl of his brochure, "A Jewish State," in 1896, marked a new epoch in the Movement. Viewing the problem as a statesman from its political or economic, rather than its religious or philanthropic side, he turned at once to England, with its free platform, its sympathy for striving nationalities, and, above all, its constant friendliness to the Jews. "From the first moment I entered the Movement," he wrote, "my eyes were directed towards England because I saw that by reason of the general situation of things there was the Archimedean point where the lever could be applied." His first approaches were to the coterie of professional men who had taken to themselves the national title of "Maccabæans" in the hope that they would help him to form the "Society of Jews" which was the nucleus of his scheme. Though his expectations were not fulfilled, a sympathetic interest was aroused, which found its expression in the "Maccabæan Pilgrimage" of the following year, a party of twenty, made up of members and their friends, going out to visit the holy places,
and bringing back with them a rich store of experiences and impressions which served to revive the fading English interest in the Movement.

The full effect of this was shown in the Clerkenwell Conference of 1898, "the first Parliament ever called from the mass of English Jews," when 150 delegates, representing 10,000 members of the Chovevi Zion and other Jewish national societies, adopted as their first resolution:

That the nationalist idea is an essential and integral part of the Zionist Movement, and that it is the duty of all Jews to unite in order to secure a legally safeguarded resettlement of the Jewish nation in Palestine.

That resolution was an endorsement as emphatic as it was clear of the basic principle of Zionism already proclaimed at the first Basle Congress, and it led directly to the identification of English Zionism, which had threatened to sink into the small channels of colonizing activity, with the world Movement.

From that time forth England stood in the foreground of all the activities directed to the organization, and equipment on a firm basis, of the Jewish national forces—the material forces as well as those of the spirit, to which it had already so largely contributed by the revival of the national consciousness. "Develop the feeling of nationality," said Wordsworth, who was statesman as well as poet, "and when it has ripened it will of itself produce liberty," and the lesson had not been lost
on the leaders of the "Young Israel" party in Anglo-Jewry. Herzl recognized that, to use his own words, "the Englishmen were the right men to realize the Zionist idea." And so it came to pass that the venue of the fourth International Congress (held in 1900) was moved from Basle to London, that in the following year the great leader came again to announce, in an address delivered at St. Martin's Town Hall, the offer of a charter from the Sultan on financial conditions, for which he desired to enlist the community's support, and that in 1902 he came as the representative of his people to give evidence before the Aliens' Commission, directed to the removal of the evil at the source instead of dealing with its results at the outlet.

If the fear of Jewish nationalism proved too strong for Herzl's efforts in the governing circles of the community, he was rewarded by securing the unqualified sympathy and ungrudging support of the English statesmen and leaders of thought to whom his appeal was next directly addressed. Failing a satisfactory arrangement with the Sultan, a pied à terre for a Jewish national settlement was offered by the English Government at El Arish, on the boundaries of Egypt and Palestine; and when this was found unsuitable for lack of water for a settlement, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the Minister for the Colonies, proposed the alternative of a concession of lands on an autonomous basis in Uganda. The offer, though it was received
with gratitude as an earnest of English sympathies with the Jewish national Movement, was resisted by the stalwarts among the Zionists, among whom were found the bulk of the party in England itself. The great-hearted Herzl welcomed the opposition as an indication of the firm and unshakable hold which the basic principles of Zionism had taken of the Jewish masses. But the incident was productive of a temporary schism in the party, headed by an English leader, Israel Zangwill, who formed a small organization of his own—the Ito—which, characteristically enough, considering its author, proclaimed a new Zionism with Zion left out. The organization made no deep impression, and left no enduring mark, on the national Movement either in England or any other country.

In the ten years which have elapsed since Herzl's lamented death the energies of Zionists everywhere have been directed to the development of the great institutions which he established—all as English corporations—to be the financial instruments of Zionism, and to the securing of a firm foundation for the colonizing and cultural organizations in the Holy Land itself. The great War which has come on the Western world has not left Palestine outside the orbit of its devastating influences, and it may be that there the final Armageddon will be fought. Whatever happens, the cultural values which we have created will not, and cannot, be destroyed. The national consciousness has been
revived, and the Jewish Renaissance in which we have been privileged to take part will remain a factor in the settlement of the world's problems when the War which will determine for generations to come the fate of the little, as well as of the great, nations will have been brought to an end.
ZIONISM AND THE AMERICAN JEWS

BY

LOUIS D. BRANDEIS

The suffering of the Jews due to injustices continuing throughout nearly twenty centuries is the greatest tragedy in history. Never was the aggregate of such suffering larger than to-day. Never were the injustices more glaring. Yet the present is pre-eminently a time for hopefulness. The current of world thought is at last preparing the way for our attaining justice. The War is developing opportunities which may make possible the solution of the Jewish Problem. But to avail ourselves of these opportunities we must understand both them and ourselves. We must recognize and accept facts. We must consider our course with statesmanlike calm. We must pursue resolutely the course we shall decide upon, and be ever ready to make the sacrifices which a great cause demands. Thus only can liberty be 'won.

For us the Jewish Problem means this: How can we secure for Jews, wherever they may live,

1 From "The Jewish Problem: How to Solve it."
the same rights and opportunities enjoyed by non-Jews? How can we secure for the world the full contribution which Jews can make, if unhampered by artificial limitations?

The problem has two aspects: that of the individual Jew, and that of Jews collectively. Obviously, no individual should be subjected anywhere, by reason of the fact that he is a Jew, to a denial of any common right or opportunity enjoyed by non-Jews. But Jews collectively should likewise enjoy the same right and opportunity to live and develop as do other groups of people. This right of development on the part of the group is essential to the full enjoyment of rights by the individual. For the individual is dependent for his development (and his happiness) in large part upon the development of the group of which he forms a part. We can scarcely conceive of an individual German or Frenchman living and developing without some relation to the contemporary German or French life and culture. And since death is not a solution of the problem of life, the solution of the Jewish Problem necessarily involves the continued existence of the Jews as Jews.

Councils of Rabbis and others have undertaken at times to prescribe by definition that only those shall be deemed Jews who professedly adhere to the orthodox or reformed faith. But in the connection in which we are considering the term, it is not in the power of any single body of Jews
—or indeed of all Jews collectively—to establish the effective definition. The meaning of the word "Jewish" in the term "Jewish Problem" must be accepted as co-extensive with the disabilities which it is our problem to remove. It is the non-Jews who create the disabilities, and in so doing give definition to the term "Jew." Those disabilities extend substantially to all of Jewish blood. The disabilities do not end with a renunciation of faith, however sincere. They do not end with the elimination, however complete, of external Jewish mannerisms. The disabilities do not end ordinarily until the Jewish blood has been so thoroughly diluted by repeated intermarriages as to result in practically obliterating the Jew.

And we Jews, by our own acts, give a like definition to the term "Jew." When men and women of Jewish blood suffer—because of that fact, and even if they suffer from quite different causes—our sympathy and our help go out to them instinctively in whatever country they may live and without inquiring into the shades of their belief or unbelief. When those of Jewish blood exhibit moral or intellectual superiority, genius, or special talent, we feel pride in them, even if they have abjured the faith, like Spinoza, Marx, Disraeli, or Heine. Despite the meditations of pundits or the decrees of councils, our own instincts and acts, and those of others, have defined for us the term "Jew."

Half a century ago the belief was still general that Jewish disabilities would disappear before
growing Liberalism. When religious toleration was proclaimed, the solution of the Jewish Problem seemed in sight. When the so-called rights of man became widely recognized, and the equal right of all citizens to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness began to be enacted into positive law, the complete emancipation of the Jew seemed at hand. The concrete gains through Liberalism were indeed large. Equality before the law was established throughout the Western hemisphere. The Ghetto walls crumbled; the ball and chain of restraint were removed in Central and Western Europe. Compared with the cruel discrimination to which Jews are now subjected in Russia and Roumania, their advanced condition in other parts of Europe seems almost ideal.

But anti-Jewish prejudice was not exterminated even in those countries of Europe in which the triumph of civil liberty and democracy extended fully to Jews "the rights of man." The anti-Semitic movement arose in Germany a year after the granting of universal suffrage. It broke out violently in France, and culminated in the Dreyfus case, a century after the French Revolution had brought "emancipation." It expressed itself in England through the Aliens Act, within a few years after the last of Jewish disabilities had been there removed by law. And in the United States the Saratoga incident reminded us, long ago, that there, too, we have a Jewish Question.

The disease is universal and endemic. There
is, of course, a wide difference between the Russian disabilities, with their Pale of Settlement, their denial of opportunity for education and choice of occupation, and their recurrent pogroms, and the German disabilities curbing university, bureaucratic, and military careers. There is a wide difference also between these German disabilities and the mere social disabilities of other lands. But some of those now suffering from the severe disabilities imposed by Russia and Roumania are descendants of men and women who in centuries before our modern Liberalism enjoyed both legal and social equality in Spain and Southern France. The manifestations of the Jewish Problem vary in the different countries, and at different periods in the same country, according to the prevailing degree of enlightenment and other pertinent conditions. Yet the differences, however wide, are merely in degree and not in kind. The Jewish Problem is single and universal. But it is not necessarily eternal. It may be solved.

Why is it that Liberalism has failed to eliminate the anti-Jewish prejudice? It is because the Liberal movement has not yet brought full liberty. Enlightened countries grant to the individual equality before the law; but they fail still to recognize the equality of whole peoples or nationalities. We seek to protect as individuals those constituting a minority; but we fail to realize that protection cannot be complete unless group equality also is recognized.
Deeply imbedded in every people is the desire for full development—the longing, as Mazzini phrased it, "to elaborate and express their idea, to contribute their stone also to the pyramid of history." Nationality, like democracy, has been one of the potent forces making for man's advance during the past hundred years. The assertion of nationality has infused whole peoples with hope, manhood, and self-respect. It has ennobled and made purposeful millions of lives. It offered them a future, and in doing so revived and capitalized all that was valuable in their past. The assertion of nationality raised Ireland from the slough of despondency. It roused Southern Slavs to heroic deeds. It created gallant Belgium. It freed Greece. It gave us united Italy. It manifested itself even among free peoples—like the Welsh, who had no grievance, but who gave expression to their nationality through the revival of the old Cymric tongue. Each of these peoples developed because, as Mazzini said, they were enabled to proclaim "to the world that they also live, think, love, and labour for the benefit of all."

In the past it has been generally assumed that the full development of one people necessarily involved its domination over others. Strong nationalities are apt to become convinced that by such domination only does civilization advance. Strong nationalities assume their own superiority, and come to believe that they possess the divine right to subject other peoples to their sway. Soon the
belief in the existence of such a right becomes converted into a conviction that a duty exists to enforce it. Wars of aggrandizement follow as a natural result of this belief.

W. Allison Philips recently defined nationality as "an extensive aggregate of persons, conscious of a community of sentiments, experiences, or qualities which make them feel themselves a distinct people." And he adds: "If we examine the composition of the several nationalities, we find these elements: race, language, religion, common habitat, common conditions, mode of life and manners, political association. The elements are, however, never all present at the same time, and none of them is essential..." "A common habitat and common conditions are doubtless powerful influences at times in determining nationality; but what part do they play in that of the Jews or the Greeks or the Irish in dispersion?"

See how this high authority assumes without question that the Jews are, despite their dispersion, a distinct nationality; and he groups us with the Greeks or the Irish—two other peoples of marked individuality. Can it be doubted that we Jews—aggregating fourteen million people, are "an extensive aggregate of persons," that we are "conscious of a community of sentiments, experiences, and qualities which make us feel ourselves a distinct people," whether we admit it or not?

It is no answer to this evidence of nationality to declare that the Jews are not an absolutely pure
race. There has, of course, been some intermixture of foreign blood in the three thousand years which constitute our historic period. But, owing to persecution and prejudice, the intermarriages with non-Jews which occurred have resulted merely in taking away many from the Jewish community. Intermarriage has brought few additions. Therefore the percentage of foreign blood in the Jews of to-day is very low. Probably no important European race is as pure.

But common race is only one of the elements which determine nationality. Conscious community of sentiments, common experiences, common qualities are equally, perhaps more, important. Religion, traditions, and customs bound us together though scattered throughout the world. The similarity of experiences tended to produce similarity of qualities and community of sentiments. Common suffering so intensified the feeling of brotherhood as to overcome largely all the influences making for diversification. The segregation of the Jews was so general, so complete, and so long continued as to intensify our "peculiarities" and make them almost ineradicable.

We recognize that with each child the aim of education should be to develop his own individuality, not to make him an imitator, not to assimilate him to others. Shall we fail to recognize this truth when applied to whole peoples? And what people in the world has shown greater individuality than the Jews? Has any a nobler past? Does any
possess common ideas better worth expressing? Has any marked traits worthier of development? Of all the peoples in the world those of two tiny States stand pre-eminent as contributors to our present civilization—the Greeks and the Jews. The Jews gave to the world its three greatest religions, reverence for law, and the highest conceptions of morality. Never before has the value of our contribution been so generally recognized. Our teaching of brotherhood and righteousness has, under the name of democracy and social justice, become the twentieth century striving of America and of Western Europe. Our conception of law is embodied in the American Constitutions, which proclaim this to be a "government of laws and not of men." And for the triumph of our other great teaching, the doctrine of Peace, this cruel War is paving the way.

While every other people is striving for development by asserting its nationality, and a great War is making clear the value of small nations, shall we voluntarily yield to anti-Semitism, and instead of solving our "problem," end it by ignoble suicide? Surely this is no time for Jews to despair. Let us make clear to the world that we too are a nationality clamouring for equal rights, to life and to self-expression. That this should be our course has been recently expressed by high non-Jewish authority. Thus Seton-Watson, speaking of the probable results of the War, said:—

"There are good grounds for hoping that it
[the War] will also give a new and healthy impetus to Jewish national policy, grant freer play to their splendid qualities, and enable them to shake off the false shame which has led men who ought to be proud of their Jewish race to assume so many alien disguises, and to accuse of anti-Semitism those who refuse to be deceived by mere appearances. It is high time that the Jews should realize that few things do more to foster anti-Semitic feeling than this very tendency to sail under false colours and conceal their true identity. The Zionists and the orthodox Jewish Nationalists have long ago won the respect and admiration of the world. No race has ever defied assimilation so stubbornly and so successfully; and the modern tendency of individual Jews to repudiate what is one of their chief glories suggests an almost comic resolve to fight against the course of nature."

Standing upon this broad foundation of nationality, Zionism aims to give it full development. Let us bear clearly in mind what Zionism is, or rather what it is not.

It is not a movement to remove all the Jews of the world compulsorily to Palestine. In the first place there are fourteen million Jews, and Palestine would not accommodate more than one-fifth of that number. In the second place, it is not a movement to compel any one to go to Palestine. It is essentially a movement to give to the Jew more, not less, freedom; it aims to enable the Jews to exercise the same right now exercised
by practically every other people in the world—to live at their option either in the land of their fathers or in some other country; a right which members of small nations as well as of large—which Irish, Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian, or Belgian, may now exercise as fully as Germans or English.

Zionism seeks to establish in Palestine, for such Jews as choose to go and remain there, and for their descendants, a legally secured home, where they may live together and lead a Jewish life; where they may expect ultimately to constitute a majority of the population, and may look forward to what we should call Home Rule. The Zionists seek to establish this home in Palestine because they are convinced that the undying longing of Jews for Palestine is a fact of deepest significance; that it is a manifestation in the struggle for existence by an ancient people which had established its right to live—a people whose three thousand years of civilization has produced a faith, culture, and individuality which enable them to contribute largely in the future, as they had in the past, to the advance of civilization; and that it is not a right merely, but a duty of the Jewish nationality to survive and develop. They believe that there only can Jewish life be fully protected from the forces of disintegration; that there alone can the Jewish spirit reach its full and natural development; and that by securing for those Jews who wish to settle in Palestine the opportunity to do so, not only those Jews but all other Jews will be
benefited, and that the long perplexing Jewish Problem will at last find solution.

They believe that to accomplish this it is not necessary that the Jewish population of Palestine be large as compared with the whole number of Jews in the world; for throughout centuries when the Jewish influence was greatest—during the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman Empires—only a relatively small part of the Jews lived in Palestine; and only a small part of the Jews returned from Babylon when the Temple was rebuilt.

Since the destruction of the Temple, nearly two thousand years ago, the longing for Palestine has been ever present with the Jew. It was the hope of a return to the land of his fathers that buoyed up the Jew amidst persecution, and for the realization of which the devout ever prayed. Until a generation ago this was a hope merely—a wish piously prayed for, but not worked for. The Zionist movement is idealistic, but it is also essentially practical. It seeks to realize that hope, to make the dream of a Jewish life in a Jewish land come true as other great dreams of the world have been realized—by men working with devotion, intelligence, and self-sacrifice. It was thus that the dream of Italian independence and unity, after centuries of vain hope, came true through the efforts of Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour; that the dream of Greek, of Bulgarian, and of Serbian independence became facts; that the dream of Home Rule in Ireland has just been realized.
The rebirth of the Jewish nation is no longer a mere dream. It is in process of accomplishment in a most practical way, and the story is a wonderful one. A generation ago a few Jewish emigrants from Russia and from Roumania, instead of proceeding Westward to hospitable America, where they might easily have secured material prosperity, turned Eastward for the purpose of settling in the land of their fathers.

To the worldly wise these efforts at colonization appeared very foolish. Nature and man presented obstacles in Palestine which appeared almost insuperable; and the colonists were, in fact, ill-equipped for their task, save in their spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice. The land, harassed by centuries of misrule, was treeless and apparently sterile, and it was infested with malaria. The Government offered them no security, either as to life or property. The colonists themselves were not only unfamiliar with the character of the country, but were ignorant of the farmer's life which they proposed to lead, for the Jews of Russia and Roumania had been generally denied the opportunity of owning or working land. Furthermore, these colonists were not inured to the physical hardships to which the life of a pioneer is necessarily subjected. To these hardships and to malaria many succumbed. Those who survived were long confronted with failure. But at last success came. Within a generation these Jewish Pilgrim Fathers, and those who followed them, have
succeeded in establishing these two fundamental propositions:—

First: That Palestine is fit for the modern Jew.
Second: That the modern Jew is fit for Palestine.

Nearly fifty self-governing Jewish colonies attest to this remarkable achievement.

This land, treeless a generation ago, supposed to be sterile and hopelessly arid, has been shown to have been treeless and sterile only because of man’s misrule. It has been shown to be capable of becoming again a land “flowing with milk and honey.” Oranges and grapes, olives and almonds, wheat and other cereals are now growing there in profusion.

This material development has been attended by a spiritual and social development no less extraordinary—a development in education, in health, and in social order, and in the character and habits of the population. Perhaps the most extraordinary achievement of Jewish nationalism is the revival of the Hebrew language, which has again become a language of the common intercourse of men. The Hebrew tongue, called a dead language for nearly two thousand years, has, in the Jewish colonies and in Jerusalem, become again the living mother-tongue. The effect of this common language in unifying the Jews is, of course, great; for the Jews of Palestine came literally from all the lands of the earth, each speaking, except for the use of Yiddish, the language of the country
from which he came, and remaining, in the main, almost a stranger to the others. But the effect of the renaissance of the Hebrew tongue is far greater than that of unifying the Jews. It is a potent factor in reviving the essentially Jewish spirit.

Our Jewish Pilgrim Fathers have laid the foundation. It remains for us to build the superstructure.

Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his State and of his city, for being loyal to his family and to his profession or trade, for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish-American who contributed towards advancing Home Rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

Note what Seton-Watson says:—

"America is full of nationalities which, while accepting with enthusiasm their new American citizenship, nevertheless look to some centre in the Old World as the source and inspiration of their national culture and traditions. The most typical instance is the feeling of the American Jew for Palestine which may well become a focus
for his *declassé* kinsmen in other parts of the world."

There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American. Not since the destruction of the Temple have the Jews in spirit and in ideals been so fully in harmony with the noblest aspirations of the country in which they lived.

America's fundamental law seeks to make real the brotherhood of man. That brotherhood became the Jewish fundamental law more than twenty-five hundred years ago. America's insistent demand in the twentieth century is for social justice. That also has been the Jews' striving for ages. Their affliction as well as their religion has prepared the Jews for effective democracy. Persecution broadened their sympathies; it trained them in patient endurance, in self-control, and in sacrifice. It made them think as well as suffer. It deepened the passion for righteousness.

Indeed, loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist. For only through the ennobling effect of its strivings can we develop the best that is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance. The Jewish spirit, so long preserved, the character developed by so many centuries of sacrifice, should be preserved and developed further, so that in America as elsewhere the sons of the race may
in future live lives and do deeds worthy of their ancestors.

But we have also an immediate and more pressing duty in the performance of which Zionism alone seems capable of affording effective aid. We must protect America and ourselves from demoralization, which has to some extent already set in among American Jews. The cause of this demoralization is clear. It results, in large part, from the fact that in our land of liberty all the restraints by which the Jews were protected in their ghettos were removed and a new generation left without necessary moral and spiritual support. And is it not equally clear what the only possible remedy is? It is the laborious task of inculcating self-respect—a task which can be accomplished only by restoring the ties of the Jew to the noble past of his race, and by making him realize the possibilities of a no less glorious future. The sole bulwark against demoralization is to develop in each new generation of Jews in America the sense of *noblesse oblige*. That spirit can be developed in those who regard their race as destined to live and to live with a bright future. That spirit can best be developed by actively participating in some way in furthering the ideals of the Jewish renaissance; and this can be done effectively only through furthering the Zionist movement.

In the Jewish colonies of Palestine there are no Jewish criminals, because every one, old and young alike, is led to feel the glory of his race
and his obligation to carry forward its ideals. The new Palestinian Jewry produces instead of criminals great scientists like Aaron Aaronsohn, the discoverer of wild wheat; great pedagogues like David Yellin; craftsmen like Boris Schatz, the founder of the Bezalel; intrepid Shomerim, the Jewish guards of peace, who watch in the night against marauders and doers of violent deeds.

And the Zionist movement has brought like inspiration to the Jews in the Diaspora, as Steed has shown in this striking passage from "The Habsburg Monarchy":—

"To minds like these Zionism came with the force of an evangel. To be a Jew and to be proud of it; to glory in the power and pertinacity of the race, its traditions, its triumphs, its sufferings, its resistance to persecution; to look the world frankly in the face and to enjoy the luxury of moral and intellectual honesty; to feel pride in belonging to the people that gave Christendom its divinities, that taught half the world monotheism, whose ideas have permeated civilization as never the ideas of a race before it, whose genius fashioned the whole mechanism of modern commerce, and whose artists, actors, singers, and writers have filled a larger place in the cultured universe than those of any other people. This, or something like this, was the train of thought fired in youthful Jewish minds by the Zionist spark. Its effect upon the Jewish students of Austrian universities was immediate
and striking. Until then they had been despised and often ill-treated. They had wormed their way into appointments and into the free professions by dint of pliancy, mock humility, mental acuteness, and clandestine protection. If struck or spat upon by 'Aryan' students, they rarely ventured to return the blow or the insult. But Zionism gave them courage. They formed associations, and learned athletic drill and fencing. Insult was requited with insult, and presently the best fencers of the fighting German corps found that Zionist students could gash cheeks quite as effectually as any Teuton, and that the Jews were in a fair way to become the best swordsmen of the university. To-day the purple cap of the Zionist is as respected as that of any academical association.

"This moral influence of Zionism is not confined to university students. It is quite as noticeable among the mass of the younger Jews outside, who also find in it a reason to raise their heads, and, taking their stand upon the past, to gaze straightforwardly into the future."

Since the Jewish problem is single and universal, the Jews of every country should strive for its solution. But the duty resting upon us of America is especially insistent. We number about three millions, which is more than one-fifth of all the Jews in the world—a number larger than that comprised within any other country, except the Russian Empire. We are representative of all the Jews in the world; for we are composed of immigrants
or descendants of immigrants coming from every other country or district. We include persons from every section of society and of every shade of religious belief. We are ourselves free from civil or political disabilities, and are relatively prosperous. Our fellow-Americans are infused with a high and generous spirit, which insures approval of our struggle to ennoble, liberate, and otherwise improve the condition of an important part of the human race; and their innate manliness makes them sympathize particularly with our efforts at self-help. America's detachment from the Old World problem relieves us from suspicions and embarrassments frequently attending the activities of Jews of rival European countries. And a conflict between American interests or ambitions and Jewish aims is not conceivable. Our loyalty to America can never be questioned.

Let us therefore lead—earnestly, courageously, and joyously—in the struggle for liberation. Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, or shade of belief, is necessarily a member. Let us insist that the struggle for liberty shall not cease until equality of opportunity is accorded to nationalities as to individuals. Let us insist also that full equality of opportunity cannot be obtained by Jews until we, like members of other nationalities, shall have the option of living elsewhere or of returning to the land of our forefathers.
The fulfilment of these aspirations is clearly demanded in the interest of mankind, as well as in justice to the Jews. They cannot fail of attainment if we are united and true to ourselves. But we must be united, not only in spirit but in action. To this end we must organize. Organize, in the first place, so that the world may have proof of the extent and the intensity of our desire for liberty. Organize, in the second place, so that our resources may become known and be made available. But in mobilizing our forces it will not be for war. The whole world longs for the solution of the Jewish Problem. We have but to lead the way, and we may be sure of ample co-operation from non-Jews. In order to lead the way we need, not arms but men—men with those qualities for which Jews should be peculiarly fitted by reason of their religion and life; men of courage, of high intelligence, of faith and public spirit, of indomitable will and ready self-sacrifice; men who will both think and do, who will devote high abilities to shaping our course, and to overcoming the many obstacles which must from time to time arise. And we need other, many, many other men—officers commissioned and non-commissioned, and common soldiers in the cause of liberty, who will give of their effort and resources, as occasion may demand, in unfailing and ever-strengthening support of the measures which may be adopted. Organization, thorough and complete, can alone develop such leaders and the necessary support.
Organize, organize, organize, until every Jew must stand up and be counted—counted with us, or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people.
IX

THE REVIVAL OF HEBREW

BY

ELIEZER BEN YEHUDAH

Among the many miracles of Jewish history the revival of the Hebrew language in our day will stand out for generations as the greatest and most wonderful.

It is about two thousand years since our language ceased to be a spoken tongue. After the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, when Nebuzaradan had exiled the rulers and leading men, the small and weak remnant of the poorer population which was left in Judæa could not successfully resist the rival language of Hebrew, Aramaic, which in those days was very widely spoken and was the language of government and commerce for the whole of the Eastern world. This Aramaic language, so closely akin and similar to Hebrew, began little by little to supersede it, first in Galilee, which is near to Syria and where the Assyrians had settled an alien population after the overthrow of the Kingdom of Israel, but later also in Judæa. That great nationalist Nehemiah, finding that the
children of foreign mothers could not speak Hebrew, attempted, in his zeal for the national language, to avert the danger by which it was suddenly threatened. But alas! the same zeal was not shown by those who came after him; and, thanks to the indifference of the leading men, Aramaic began to ousted Hebrew as the language of speech, first among the masses, and then gradually among the rulers and learned men also, until at last Hebrew as a spoken tongue was driven from its last refuge, the Beth-Hamidrash and the Yeshibah, and thenceforth became a literary language only.

For about six hundred years Hebrew struggled for its life as a spoken language, but in vain. Its guardians treacherously neglected it, and adopted the language of every country to which they were exiled. Hebrew became for the people a sacred tongue, used for religious purposes—for study of the Torah, for prayers, hymns, and lamentations; and also for the things of the mind—for philosophy and science, for poetry, for formal letters, and so forth. Its use was confined to writing. Only occasionally, when Jews from different countries met together, they spoke Hebrew, not from choice but of necessity, because it was the only language that they had in common; and a few pious men, scrupulously observant of the law, stammered Hebrew phrases on Sabbaths and festivals, so as not to violate the sanctity of the day with profane speech.
Such was the fate of Hebrew for two thousand years.

But suddenly—a miracle!

The spark of hope for a national restoration on the ancestral land, long smothered beneath the dust of exile, suddenly sprang up and became a sacred flame in the hearts of thousands of our people; and at the same time there arose an ardent desire to revive Hebrew as the speech of the people. Those who dreamed of a national revival saw the splendid vision of the Hebrew nation as it was in the days of its early glory—that nation which gave the world "the Book" that has become the sacred book of all humanity.

In a short time we saw in the new Jewish settlement in Palestine a phenomenon hitherto unknown in the history of any nation. A language which none had spoken for many centuries came to life again and became a language of speech, of life, for a large community of men, women, and children; a language of conversation for young men and women, for children at school, for boys and girls playing in the streets of Jerusalem and the cities of Judæa and the colonies of Galilee; a language of business, of trade, of learned discussions, of public speeches; a living language, heard in the street and the market, in the field and the vineyard, in the threshing-floor and the wine-press.

After two thousand years there echoed once more in the air of Palestine the sweet sounds of the
language of David and Solomon, of Isaiah and Jeremiah, of the Shulamite and her lover on the mountains of Bether and in the vineyards of En-Gedi.

And with the nation's language the nation's soul, too, began to revive.

One of the great Semitic scholars of our day, Professor F. Hommel, has written in his book "The Semitic Peoples":—

"Is it not an anomaly in national development that a nation like the Jews has, on the one hand, kept itself racially purer than all other civilized peoples, but on the other hand, living scattered over the whole earth, has adopted the language of every country in which it has settled, and so, by giving up its own Semitic idiom, has inevitably lost with its language its soul and the noblest sides of its character?"

But the young Hebrew-speaking generation in Palestine has already given practical proof that in it is renewed the great soul of Israel, with all its ancient strength and splendour. It is a warm and generous soul, ready to make any sacrifice unhesitatingly for the nation. To see this young generation at the time of the struggle for Hebrew, two years ago, was to realize for the first time the greatness and sublimity of the revival of a national soul. Walking then in the streets of Jerusalem amid the throng of this young generation, youths and girls and schoolchildren, hearing their voices and seeing their tears and the fire of enthusiasm
in their eyes, one could imagine, as never before, what a Hebrew generation is and what our people may hope and expect from it.

If not for the terrible War, there is no doubt that in a few years this miracle would have been completed: the whole of the Jewish community in Palestine, great and small, men and women, would have become a Hebrew community, speaking only Hebrew; and the Hebrew language would once more have borne noble fruit, as in the days of Isaiah and the other prophets, who are the glory of our race.

But alas! Suddenly this awful and accursed War has fallen on the civilized world; the whole universe is shaken, the edifice of human life totters—and the Hebrew renaissance of our people in its ancestral land feels the shock.

Yet, in common with all the free nations which are fighting for justice and political liberty, we, too, hope that force will be overcome, that the vision which the great Hebrew prophet gave to the world in the Hebrew tongue will be fulfilled—the vision of peace among all the nations—and that the miracle of the Hebrew revival will be established and completed speedily in our days.

Second year of the War,
Seventh month of my exile in New York.
No nation's destinies have been so much identified with moral and intellectual ideals as those of the Jews. Each great political or economic event in the life of the Jewish people has been the signal for the coming to light of spiritual values, enriching the nation at the same time as adding to the mental and moral treasures of humanity. The founding of the Hebrew race by Abraham's migration to Canaan was the occasion of the establishment of the religion of Unity. The departure from Egypt, the first act that symbolized Jewish national independence, was followed by the formulation of Judaism as a moral code, the ethical system to which civilized humanity is striving to attain. The political disturbances in the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and the struggles of the Jewish nation to uphold its independence against the aggression of Assyria, gave birth to the prophetic ideal of the brotherhood of man and the reign of universal peace. The return to Palestine
led to the literary and administrative activities of Ezra, and the founding of the Great Assembly. The desperate struggle against Greek military and moral aggression culminated in the development of the Rabbinism of the Pharisees. The fall of Jerusalem and the conquest of Judæa by the Romans was the occasion of the establishment of the great schools of rabbinical learning, and the conquest of Europe by the religion of One God.

The present European War is apparently one in which Jewry, as such, can and does play no part. Yet he who has learnt to interpret aright the signs of the times will readily see that this is far from being the case. I do not mean that our people is collectively concerned in the rights and wrongs of the quarrel that is being settled by appeal to the shell and the torpedo. The Jews of each belligerent country share the convictions of righteousness that characterize both sides in this great struggle. The rôle of Jewry in the European crisis is the one assigned to us from days of yore—to bear the brunt of invasion and counter-invasion in a manner unparalleled in the annals of civilized humanity, to suffer as no nation has ever had to suffer. Yet the sufferings of Jewry cannot be meaningless and without omen for the future.

For we are beginning to awake to the anomalousness of our position. We are beginning to realize the tragedy of our Dispersion, that has caused brother to lift his hand against brother, and that has rent the House of Israel into warring factions,
fighting the battles of Europe with so little prospect of benefiting by the outcome of the struggle.

Jewry must see, and assuredly does now see, that we must make provision for the future if our race is not to suffer extinction. We must unite, concentrate upon one object—the ultimate deliverance of our people, and its independence of the good offices of charitable neighbours. The founding of a Jewish spiritual and intellectual centre in the land of our fathers is the ideal that, from having been the dream of a small minority, has become the accepted future policy of every Jew anxious to ensure the survival of his people.

And amidst the vast projects that the acceptance of the policy of a return to Palestine must entail, there is one that stands out with peculiar appropriateness, as symbolizing the distinctive feature of Jewish destiny. The founding of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem is a scheme that commends itself to Jews, not only because such an institution would provide the scientific and technical knowledge that is required to assure the success of the Jewish colonization of Palestine, but more particularly because it would visualize the constant and loyal adherence of Jewry to moral and intellectual values. A Hebrew University would mean the re-establishment of the Great Assembly, the resuscitation of the schools of Palestine and Mesopotamia, the revival in modern garb of the rabbinical dynasties, with whose destinies the
history of the Jewish people was identified for a thousand years.

A Hebrew University would fulfil many duties and perform many tasks that are already long overdue. The development of the Hebrew language, its adaptation to the sociological, scientific, and technological requirements of the age, its expansion so as to serve Jewry in the expression of all its needs and aspirations, the adding to the old stock of words and phrases of new ones rendered essential by the conditions of modern life—all this has had the effect of endangering the purity of the tongue and the spirit of its idiomatic constructions. The Hebrew University would act as an Academy, exercising a general supervision over the work of expansion, and directing the evolution of a modern living tongue out of what has become the language of prayer and the object of archaeological research. The University of Jerusalem would perform the task of rendering Hebrew the really national medium of intellectual exchange.

To a Hebrew University would be assigned the duty of encouraging and directing the study of our national literature, the investigation of the religious, ethical, and philosophical riches that are still dormant in the rabbinical writings and traditions of two thousand years, the systematizing in a modern form of the huge code of legal doctrine that forms the basis of our traditional ceremonial.

The University would superintend the application
of the processes and results of modern medical, scientific, and technical knowledge to the development of a healthy and lasting settlement of Jews on their hereditary soil. It would organize general education in all its stages. It would equip our youth with that knowledge and appreciation of scientific principles that constitutes the strength of the modern State. It would devote its energies to the evolution of a sane and equitable social system, so that the future Jewish Commonwealth may become a veritable model society, based upon the recognition of the principle of equal opportunity for all, and upheld by the common and voluntary devotion of all citizens to the interests of the State.

And there is yet one function, perhaps nobler than any so far enumerated, which would fall to the lot of the University of Jerusalem. It would participate in the general intellectual progress of the world. The Jewish cultural centre would concentrate the efforts and achievements of the Jewish genius, thus enabling it to contribute its due portion to human progress.

Many people commit the fallacy of confusing the results of scientific research with the trains of thought and the logical processes involved in the attaining of these results. They assert that there cannot be such a thing as Jewish science, for all knowledge is universal, and separatism in research is impossible, and would be harmful if at all conceivable. This is, however, a misin-
terpretation of the true functions of scientific research. The great investigator evolves an idea, a train of reasoning, a process of investigation which is purely personal, and bears upon it the stamp of his original genius. The results of his work are impersonal and general in their application. This is true. But the essence of his achievement lies in the spark of originality which gave birth to the consequent results. In the sense of results there cannot be a Jewish science, just as in this sense there is no English or French or German science. But viewed from the standpoint of methodology, the science of a nation is its own peculiar possession, the reflex of its own peculiar genius, just as each individual investigator gives in the method he originates a reflex of the type of mind he possesses.

The founding of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem would be a repetition of the process noted at the beginning of this article. The present sufferings of Jewry would be signalized by the emergence of a beacon of light to Israel and to the nations of the world. The sufferings of Egypt led to the promulgation of the Jewish moral code; the sufferings of Judæa under Rome led to the development of Rabbinism and the spread of the monotheistic religions; the sufferings of Poland and Galicia will culminate in the emancipation of the Jewish mind and in the re-establishment of the Jewish genius.
Although I had spoken to Herzl at the 1897 and 1898 Congresses, it was not until 1899—the first time I attended Congress as a delegate—that I really got into touch with him. I remember that hot summer night as if it were yesterday, when as one of the members of the Organization Committee appointed by Congress to draw up a new statute of organization, I found myself one of about half a dozen others in one of the noisy, hot ante-rooms of the Basle Casino at ten o'clock at night discussing in several languages various abstruse new points of organization. There we were worrying over every wretched little detail when the door suddenly opened and in burst Herzl. "Gentlemen," said he, "I must have your proposals to submit to Congress at its opening session to-morrow morning, so kindly finish them tonight." Automatically, without a moment's thought, I remember throwing off my coat and in shirt-sleeves saying to my colleagues, "Come
along, you chaps, let us buckle to it." That motion—the throwing off of the coat—I was afterwards told won me Herzl's instantaneous regard, and it is my proudest thought that I retained it till the end. Herzl never spared himself in his devotion to and work for the cause. And the least sign of energy for it in others at once received his recognition. From that day until his death I became more and more closely associated with him, and all I know of Zionism was learned at his feet. Never have I known him free from thinking, and thinking of the movement of which he was the master and slave. In all sorts of places and conditions, at all times and under all circumstances, awake or asleep—I remember on the voyage from Constanza to Constantinople when we shared the same cabin his calling to me in the middle of the night about some point connected with our visit to the Porte—at the theatre, on the river, hill-climbing in the Tyrol, or driving in the Champs Elysées, always, always, "What can we do to get us nearer our goal?" It was no unusual thing for him to have four or five or more schemes going at one time—not all of us knew all of them—so that if one avenue were closed another might be opened, and no scheme was ever so impossible but that he would try it. Emperors, statesmen, thinkers—all were sought to be impressed into our service: Cecil Rhodes and Kaiser Wilhelm, Carnegie and the Pope, de Plehve and King Edward, Joseph Chamberlain and the
Grand Duke of Baden, the Bishop of Ripon and the King of Italy, Abdul Hamid and Lord Rothschild, the Poet Laureate and Jacob Schiff.

Here is one scene in the visit on which I accompanied Herzl to Constantinople. The Pera Palace Hotel, just after the luncheon hour, and we are sitting in the smoking-lounge, accompanied by one of those mysterious half-diplomatist, half-courtier, and wholly unknown persons with whom Constantinople at the period of which I am writing seemed to abound. Conversation turns upon the life of Constantinople, and our polyglot visitor says, repeating one of Constantinople's jokes: "You know, they say in Constantinople that whenever three persons are found together here one of them is sure to be a spy." And my undiplomatic retort, "I wonder who is the spy among us three." A smart kick under the table is Herzl's warning. That was not the only kick I earned from Herzl on this visit. The next day or so we had been bidden to the palace. A royal carriage had been sent for us, and off we drove, our every movement watched and noted by some of the innumerable spies of the Sultan. At the entrance to the Yildiz the guard presented arms, and here was Herzl arriving as indeed a veritable ambassador. Inside the Yildiz, we were quickly driven to the house of the Master of Ceremonies, and from here, after some presentations were made, Herzl, accompanied by Ibrahim Bey and an interpreter, walked over to the Sultan's apartments. He had gone
to say that it was not possible for him to entertain certain suggestions that were made to him, and nothing but Palestine would content the Zionists. During his absence I had time to look around the grounds, where enormously tall Turks, carrying on their heads great dishes of all kinds of food wrapped around in white cloths, were the chief features of the landscape. It was a bit of the Arabian Nights walking about in the twentieth century in broad daylight. Some of the younger officials with whom I conversed were equally certain I was trying to do some Arabian Nights' trick on them when I spoke of such everyday London sights as the then new Twopenny Tube, with its lifts and suchlike modern developments.

When Herzl returned lunch was immediately served. We sat on rather low cushions, somewhat higher than the Turkish guests, and Ibrahim broke off a piece of his bread and gave it to us. Then a great dish of rice—the other ingredients remain an unknown quantity to me to this day—was set before us, and we were bidden to help ourselves. The strangeness and novelty of the thing made it difficult for me to see how I was to get anything to eat. But Ibrahim soon solved that. With his hand—a very clean hand—he reached into the dish and deposited a goodly serving on my plate. A kick—a warning kick—from Herzl bade me eat it at once and as if this were the ordinary procedure at the luncheon-table.

The same Herzl could not pass a shoeblack in
Constantinople, a schnorrer in Vienna, or a beggar in the Strand without giving him a coin and a kind word.

Rich or poor, mighty or insignificant, Jew or Gentile, old or young—to every one he seemed instinctively to do the right thing and to show that he also understood and sympathized with them. His heart was as big as his head—and that was the brainiest and best I have ever known.

To thousands who have never known him he must appear as a legend. To those who had the happiness and honour of knowing him he seems—when we compare him with others we know—to be equally legendary. But he was, that we know; nay, he is, as long as his influence remains, and that increases day by day—

He was a man, take him for all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again.
THE UNITY OF ISRAEL

by

Dr. Harry Friedenwald

Through the centuries we have spoken of our people as an "Am Echad" and prayed that all Israel be united in fellowship—"Chaberim Kol Yisrael." The non-Jewish world regards the cohesion of the Jewish people as characteristic and sometimes criticizes it as clannishness. Yet we know that this is a fiction. Everywhere there is disunity and disruption manifest among the Jews; and they are divided, not only into social groups, not only by the lines of cleavage between the wealthy and the poor, the employer and the employee, the givers of charity and the recipients of charity, not only by every variety of religious belief and unbelief, but even more by the countries of their ancestry, by the provinces and the cities where they or their parents were born! This has no reference to the enmities resulting from the present War.

What is the cause of these antipathies? Those founded on differences in social class are easily
understood, for they are the outgrowth of the struggle for existence, and in human affairs such struggles arouse bitter feeling and animosity.

But what are the causes of distrust and dislike between Jews hailing from different lands? Perhaps it is that they have acquired certain qualities and peculiarities of their neighbours; their mode of dress and of life is different, their views are different, their manners are different, their languages are different, and, as at the Tower of Babel, they fail to understand each other, to appreciate each other's qualities and virtues.

Lack of understanding and lack of appreciation when mutual lead to distrust. Nurture this into a tradition, and you have the group antipathies witnessed everywhere in greater or less degree.

It may be pertinently asked, Why should there be unity? What is there to lead to unity, granted that it is desirable, if for no better reason than that each is surely for his brother?

Is fellow-suffering alone sufficient as a binding and unifying force? Perhaps, if all Jews were suffering equally and in the same manner. But this is not the case. The Jews of all countries do not suffer in the same manner, do not suffer equally; and when suffering is one-sided it may arouse pity, it may call forth the healing balm, but it does not unite. It alone does not bind closer. We pity a stricken animal, but this does not make it our brother!

The force which draws together is of a different
quality. The essential factor it must possess to bind firmly is community of interest. The sense of dependence one upon another is not sufficiently felt; race ties alone have not the power. Something higher, something more powerful is needed. It must be a force produced by a common interest and based upon a common interdependence. Such an interest must be high and lofty if it is to gain the adherence of varied classes whose interests otherwise are conflicting.

What has furnished that common interest among the Jews since the Dispersion? Many will answer, their common religious belief. But it was not simply faith in certain theological doctrines! It was not articles of faith! It was a deeply religious force, the consciousness of a common brotherhood, serving their God as their fathers had done, and buoyed up by the promise and the hope of their future restoration to their own land. This trust was universal. It looked forward to a reunion of all Jews on the ancestral land, and this served as a bond of union. It was only when this hope flagged that the binding force grew weak and loosened.

In modern times the upheaval produced by the French Revolution and by the Emancipation of the Jews introduced new theories into Jewish life; and the hope of a restoration was scorned. False notions of patriotism led to renouncing those Jewish hopes which had been fundamental; the fear of being misunder-
stood and the temptations of the Emancipation led Jacob to reject his birthright. The need for a substitute was felt and was found. If the hope for restoration was repudiated, then the Dispersion was to be regarded as final, and if final, then desirable; so a virtue was made of necessity, a blessing of a curse!

The Dispersion had been looked upon for centuries as a cruel exile, for the ending of which we had prayed daily, unceasingly. The Dispersion was commemorated in annual solemn fast and lamentation. All this was changed. The Dispersion was the mission, the ultimate purpose of God to disseminate the doctrine of monotheism among the nations; or, as it was at times translated into non-theological and sociological terms, Israel was to act as a leaven, as a body of suffering humanity protesting against injustice and wrong.

All efforts were toward further emancipation; but emancipation from the very varying degrees of persecution and discrimination and prejudice could not in itself be an ideal, uniting all; and the theory of the suffering body acting as a leaven, while it might serve as an answer to a student examining the conditions objectively, could hardly be accepted by those, who were suffering, with satisfaction or with joyous immolation. The theological ideal of a mission for disseminating monotheism suffered from the inherent weakness of that sort of faith which Mark Twain had discredited as "believing what you know isn't true." It may
have served eloquent preachers, but it has never and nowhere been accepted by Jews with fervent faith, nor has the non-Jewish world ever regarded it seriously.

No Jew or group of Jews has been inspired by this idea, to go out to the non-Jewish world and preach in accordance with this mission; even where efforts have been made to send missionaries to "orphan colonies" of Jews, like those in China, they were met by Jews with frigid unsympathy.

For two generations we have been juggling with this mission, and Jewish sentiment, Jewish enthusiasm, Jewish unity and solidarity have been threatened with extinction. Jewish life presented all the evidence of an existence, without purpose, without aim, without ideals.

Such were the conditions when Zionism arose. It was a movement which was based on the recognition of Jewish nationality, and aimed by practical means and collective effort to bring about the restoration. Its ideal was, not a surrender of our heritage of ages, but a determination to hold it aloft. Its purpose was to restore Israel to Palestine and to restore Palestine to the Jews, to enable Israel to live its life under normal conditions. It was imbued with the assurance that Israel possessed the inherent ability to live a Jewish life and develop on Jewish lines, and produce what would again be recognized by all the world as the creation of Jewish life and Jewish genius. The illusions of unpatriotism disappeared before
this clearer vision, the false hopes based upon mistaken and opportunist theories of a Jewish mission of Dispersion collapsed, and before the eyes of Jew and Gentile there arose the vision of the national regeneration of a great and historic people on its ancestral soil.

This was an ideal which was worthy of the service and the sacrifice of its best sons and daughters! It filled them with enthusiasm and with hope. Its action was like the power in the magnet; it directed all the individual factors into one united effort. And like the hidden power in the magnet, so this force is concealed from those who are incapable of looking higher than to materialistic advantage. The masses of the poor, whose lives are consumed in ceaseless, grinding toil, may appear unaffected, but many are those to whom this is their solace, their hope, and their recompense. The wealthy, whose comforts of life have lured them away from the suffering of their people and who find in material comfort a substitute for spiritual satisfaction, have for the most part been indifferent to the appeal of Zionism. The power of the magnet is not felt by gold! The newly rich, blinded in the intoxication of unaccustomed enjoyments, are unaffected by the magic wand of Zionism. But the "Intelligentsia," the element from among whom the seekers of high ideals are found, those to whom Judaism means, not a burden and a curse but a proud heritage—they were the men and women
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in all communities and in all lands who enlisted under its standard. With united purpose and effort they have shown a power which has thrilled the whole of Jewry and has aroused even the most indifferent.

Reaction was bound to set in. The old theorists, still dazed by their dreams of emancipation, have not yet awakened to the realities, and look with terror at the courageous Jew who openly and loudly proclaims his national aspirations and ambitions in the re-establishment of the Jews in their ancient home. And the Jew who places his Judaism in the background in order to emphasize his loyalty and patriotism is alarmed, for he sees that his fictions are in danger. But the Jew who knows no higher duty than to be true to himself, who knows that to deny his Jewish national hopes is a historic lie which carries with it the vision of death, who feels within himself the unity of all Israel—that Jew is happy and proud to bring his sacrifices to the altar of Zionism and to serve in preparing for the future glory of his people.

Thus Zionism has entered as a new force into Jewish life, has brought together men and women of all classes and all stations and all countries by the power of a great ideal, and it is Zionism which will again bring forth the UNITY OF ISRAEL.
XIII

WOMEN'S WORK:

THE JEWISH WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR CULTURAL WORK IN PALESTINE

BY

ROMANA GOODMAN

In the dim, distant past, when the world seemed to live at peace, there had, in the course of a few years, grown up an international Jewish women's organization for the improvement of the social and economic status of Jewish womanhood in Palestine, which gave rich promise for the future.

It was at The Hague, in 1907, during one of those remarkable confluences of Jewish men and women of all lands which are always brought together by a Zionist Congress, that the idea of such an organization assumed definite shape, under the title of Verband Jüdischer Frauen für Kulturarbeit in Palästina (The Jewish Women's League for Cultural Work in Palestine).

It is significant that it was under Zionist auspices that the first organization of Jewish women of an international character was brought into being. Whereas the raison d'être of the various Jewish
women's societies is their local sphere of activity, the new body brought together all Jewish women—as wide apart as Siberia and the Argentine—for a common task. From local interests affecting their personal surroundings, Jewish women were raised to a wider outlook on Jewish life, and their share in the sum-total of the work of Jewish womanhood assumed the importance which attaches to foundations of permanent national value such as have been laid in the new Jewish Palestine.

As Jewish colonization, both urban and rural, increased, there was an ever-growing demand for the amenities of civilization. There was first of all the wide field of hygiene, so urgent with a population living largely amidst insanitary surroundings. There was the nursing of the sick, where science could put many a housewife on her feet again and help the new generation to grow into a sturdy race of men and women.

Here, particularly, the field of the League is illimitable, and the example of the Moscow branch, which has been maintaining a ward for lying-in women at the hospital in Jaffa, might be followed by other branches of the organization. It may be assumed that far wider than the actual benefits which are received by the poor women who are thus taken charge of at such a critical time in their lives are the indirect results which must become apparent as the wholesome influence of the League leaves its trace on its beneficiaries.

It should be noted that such a work tends the
very roots of the race, and, whatever educational institutions may be established by the various Jewish bodies who have their schools in Palestine for the instruction of the children, it must remain the mission of the League to educate the mothers there. Here it fulfils a function of real Culture and of the utmost importance, for which no other organization has hitherto made provision.

And when the girls had passed the school age —whether they had been at school or not—there was in Palestine no organization which could give direction to their usefulness. Here, more than anywhere else, has it been necessary to create a sense of the dignity of woman's labour. The Oriental woman, whether she be Jewish or anything else, has not only the conception that the proper sphere of woman is the home, but that woman exists for the home only and has, so to speak, no right of existence in the absence of the home. Late in the day as it might appear to us to controvert this view, it must nevertheless not be forgotten that even in the West a quarter of a century ago it was regarded as a bold fin-de-siècle idea that no more "men must work and women must weep," but that woman, too, must take her place in the economic struggle for existence.

And in the Jewish Palestine of to-day the extremes of civilization meet. There is the section belonging to the old Settlement, which is steeped in Orientalism and draws its scanty sustenance from the Chaluka, whose alms barely suffice to keep
body and soul together. These people must be educated to want work. There again is the new Settlement, with its young and hopeful elements, crying out for work. For these work must be found.

The League, however, is not to be a mere nursing society or employment agency. It is an organization with an ideal, and for this we should not be the least grateful. For these ideals are not, as is the case with the misdirected energy of some of the schools in Palestine, that humble Jewish girls in that country should be able to speak French with the accent of Parisiennes or English without any accent, but that there should be fostered a native type with ideals native to the soil of the country. When we speak of the Dutch or the Italian or the Russian woman we do not mean that modern cosmopolitan woman who is the same in Amsterdam, Rome, or Petrograd, but that type which is distinctive of those countries, which is full of native colour.

In Palestine, too, there is to grow up a native Jewish woman, and of a type which will do honour to our people as a whole.

To aid in the development of such a type of Jewish womanhood, of a kind we have hitherto had no opportunities to create because we have not been in possession of the historic background, is the ideal of the League. In the first place, it desires to see a Jewish womanhood attached to the soil, both as the source of livelihood as well
as a national possession. This sense of national possession we can only acquire in Palestine, where the Jewess would be *chez elle*, and the only type of a Jewish peasantry that can take root in the soil is that which feels itself part of Mother Earth and of that particular part which is its very own. The Jewish Women's League has established a farm cultivated by Jewish girls, and that farm, "Chinnereth," on the Lake of Galilee, is training a succession of Jewish girls who will become the prototypes of the Jewish womanhood of the future. It is no very easy task to turn the town-bred girl into a peasant, for it is against the established order of things; but what must be considered impossible everywhere else has its exception in Palestine, where young Jewish women, no less than young Jewish men, are throwing themselves into the national work with an ardour and self-sacrifice which can only be born of the pure love of an ideal. To foster that ideal should be the privilege of the League.

With the desire to create home industries among the Jewish women in Palestine the League established a number of schools for hand-made lace. Inspired by the efforts of the Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts in Jerusalem to create a specifically Jewish art, would it be too sanguine to hope that the same artistic fairy which saw the birth of the Bezalel was also present when the lace industry of the League was brought into being? When we think of the experience of centuries on
centuries during which carpet-weaving in Asia Minor and Persia has given the women in those countries such a traditional skill in their work, we ought not to expect too soon that the Jewish woman in Palestine will be able to give her own particular note to the products of her hands, but, at present, the results already give hopes for a bright future.

The Jewish League for Cultural Work in Palestine is not a Zionist institution in the strict sense, for its membership embraces Jewish women of all shades of opinion; but it specially represents the part of women, as well as a special phase, in the regeneration of the Jewish people in Palestine. That phase is both prosaic and romantic. It concerns an effort to rear a healthy race and to develop its productive capacity. No mean object that, as everyone will acknowledge. But everything that grows under the sun of the Jewish Renaissance in Palestine has its romantic aspect. We see there the striving for something that will express the Jewish individuality. We stand at the cradle of a new type of Jewish womanhood. We find, for instance, that those Jewish women and girls who work in the fields and workrooms under the auspices of the League endeavour to acquire a knowledge of Hebrew as their daily speech. They grow into the consciousness of those who not only work for themselves, for their daily bread, but who, somehow, work for a higher purpose at a turning-point of Jewish history. They
and we may be making history each in our humble way without knowing it, but happy are those who rise to the consciousness of the moment in which they live, and still more blessed are they who live up to it.
The New Palestine

By

Albert M. Hyamson, F.R.Hist.S.

The one sensation which overwhelms and, temporarily at any rate, absorbs all others in the visitor from the Diaspora when first he finds himself in the midst of one of the new Jewish settlements in Palestine is that he is in a Jewish land, living among the Jewish people. Elsewhere, in Europe and in America, it is also possible to find oneself in the midst of a Jewish population, but the difference is palpable. It is the difference between the Jewish people and a Jewish community. In Palestine to be Jewish is to conform to the general rule; not to be Jewish is to be an exception. This is the case, not in the arithmetical sense, for of the population of Palestine only a seventh is as yet Jewish, but because the general atmosphere, the general feeling, is Jewish, the life of the country—that is to say, the progress of the country. —is Jewish, the Jews settled there are alive with the consciousness that they are the people of the land.
An English lady long resident in the country, and deeply interested in the welfare of its people has been heard to complain that, owing to the independence of the racial groups within the Turkish Empire, there is in Palestine no possible basis for patriotism. It was for this reason that love for England was a necessary part of the curriculum of the Evelina de Rothschild School. Not that love for England was, or was intended to be, anti-Turkish in any sense, but because the relationship between Turkey and the Palestinian being so entirely different from and incomparable with the love of the Briton, either at home or in the Colonies, for Britain, nothing like patriotism, in the English sense, was possible. There was none the less an educational gap that had to be filled; and in order to inculcate in the children the meaning of patriotism so that, if the test came, they might be loyal to their own Government, they were taught to honour and love England. Love of England was, in fact, taught as a stepping-stone to loyalty to Turkey. In the same way the new Jewish population in Palestine is alive with loyalty to Judæa, a loyalty which also is quite compatible with loyalty to the Government of the land, just as in England one can be a good Scotsman or a good Canadian and at the same time a good Briton.

In Palestine, in the new Jewish settlements, one feels oneself in a Jewish land, where it is natural to be a Jew and exceptional and difficult not
to live as one. The great, the overpowering attractions of the non-Jewish, in most cases ultimately anti-Jewish, interests of the Diaspora, by which Jewry there must ultimately be destroyed, have no counterpart in Palestine. There, there are no inducements, open or insidious, to separate oneself even in minutiae from one's people. The problems which loom so large in the Diaspora and threaten so direfully the Jewish future there, do not exist in Palestine. In Palestine there are no Sabbath observance laws. Every one is free to conduct his business or to rest on the Sabbath; but even if a shopkeeper wished to open his shop on the Sabbath he would have no inducement to do so. He would find no customers, for the general feeling of the community would be opposed to him. In Europe transgressions of the dietary laws, especially in the first instances, are to a very large extent due to difficulty, real or alleged, in obtaining Kosher food. In Palestine in many places it is equally, if not more difficult to obtain Trefa food. These two instances, Sabbath observance and the dietary laws, have been quoted in particular, for in the Diaspora they necessarily occupy the greater part of the field of Jewish observance. In a Jewish land, amid a Jewish people, they fall into their relatively proper positions, losing none of their authority as Jewish ordinances but giving place in the front rank to the practices and precepts which in olden days made the Jews the teachers
of morality and civilization to the world, a rôle which the world once again needs them to resume.

It may be said that in Europe to-day, in Poland and in Galicia, just as a century ago in the Ghettoes of Germany, there is both a Jewish life and a Jewish atmosphere. This is true, but the difference between the two is the difference between the prison and freedom, between the walled-in alley and the open fields. The one is perpetually losing its children; the other is gaining new recruits. Palestine is drawing immigrants from the Pale, and none who come to it are less Jewish in any sense on account of the change. Even if the Pale of Settlement were self-contained and its inhabitants free from persecution, what possibility could it have of influencing the world? What people, if the most amenable to teaching, would sit at the feet of a section of a class in the town population of Poland? A Jewish people in Palestine, on the other hand, would be a perpetual object-lesson, open to all the world, of morality and righteousness in government, of the practical application of the precept, "Love thy neighbour as thyself." The relative positions of the Jewries of the Pale of Settlement and of Palestine are exemplified by their languages. In the one Yiddish, the language of the nightmare period of Jewish history, holds sway; in the other, Hebrew, Judæa's classic tongue, the language of the golden period of Jewish history.

The foregoing may appear to be a dream, but it
is not so. Dreams are based on air, on imaginations, perhaps on hopes. The prospects of Palestine, hinted at above, are, however, elaborations from facts. A Jewish life in a Jewish land which will be an example to humanity is not entirely of the future. The beginnings of it are already in existence. Within the very narrow limits of their activity the new settlements in Palestine have brought prosperity to the country, a prosperity in which all of the inhabitants share, and have commenced to turn a desert into a garden. The roads which the colonists have built are free to all, whether Jew or Gentile; the swamps which they have drained have safeguarded the lives and the health of Moslem and Christian as well as of Jew; the justice which the Jewish courts administer is sought and accepted by Arab and Jew alike. The Jewish settler himself has, in many instances, learned for the first time the meaning of freedom. He has found a country where for the first time in his life he is at liberty to breathe the air and enjoy the sunshine without restriction, to travel and live where he will, to stand upright, looking every man in the face, with reason to fear none. To him Palestine is a land of both physical and moral regeneration. In Palestine also his religion, Judaism, has a new meaning. There and there alone for the Jew can religion and life be identical and the high moral and material ideals indicated in the Bible, the literature of the ancient Jews, be attained.
"I WILL there make of thee a great nation"—so spoke the Supreme to Jacob when he was about to depart for that sojourn in Egypt which was to have such fateful consequences for the life-story of his descendants. Was the promise redeemed? Has Israel ever been a great nation? In a sense he has not. Compared with the power and the magnificence of Egypt, of Assyria, of Rome, of twentieth-century Britain, he was, even at the period of his highest prosperity, puny and insignificant. But, in another sense, the promise has been fulfilled; Israel has been a great nation. He is a great nation still, though a whole chorus of voices may shriek against the heresy. "Some nations," says a recent writer, "attain to unity, and express themselves as units, much more emphatically than others. These are the great nations. They are nations with a soul, and so with a higher kind of life than that of more loosely knit communities. Their unity usually means
power, but it means something far more important than power; and when it means to them only power, their very nationality is threatened." It is finely said. The greatness of a nation depends, not upon its size, nor upon the extent of its territory, nor upon its martial prowess—it may have these, and glory in them, and by the very glorying in them compromise its greatness—but upon the quality of its soul, upon the vividness and the strength and the loftiness of its ideals. Let a noble spirit inform it, a sublime aim inspire it, let it nourish a sense of election, of responsibility, the consciousness of a high mission assigned to it by the Hand that shapes the world's destinies, and, though it be few in number, and boast not an inch of territory, it is a nation, and a great nation.

If this be true, then Israel is a nation even today; and so long as the Jew is true to himself he may justly claim to belong to a great nation. The finest ideals he has; the sense of election and responsibility to the Highest he has. Next in importance to the belief in the Divine unity, and logically flowing out of it, there is the conviction that the Jewish people has been appointed to spread among men the most exalted conceptions of religious faith and duty. This conviction is Israel's unifying bond; defying the mighty forces which make for fusion and extinction, it keeps him apart—a nation among the nations. And not a nation merely, but a great nation; for what
consciousness can be finer than that of consecration? What ideal can be more sublime than the winning of the world for righteousness and God? If a great nation is a nation with a soul, a nation that expresses itself emphatically, then Israel is assuredly a great nation. At any rate, a nation he is. The very word "Israel" proves it. No mere sect or religious community could appropriately bear such a name. It implies, not a race only, not a spiritual ideal only, but the two combined—a race animated by a spiritual ideal. And the phrase expresses the conditions that go to make a nation.

This theory will meet with objections. Israel, I shall be told, lost his national character more than eighteen hundred years ago, when Jerusalem fell before the battering rams of the Romans. Ever since that time, it will be said, the Jews have taken their nationality from the people who have given them shelter. But, if so, the writer whom I quoted just now is altogether wrong, and let me say that I was quoting from a leading article which appeared in *The Times* newspaper five years ago. A nation, *The Times* confessed, is indefinable; but you can see it. Some instinct makes you recognize it. Well, Israel is recognized as a nation by those who see it; no one can possibly mistake it for a mere sect. To deny Jewish nationality you must deny the existence of the Jew.

It will be further objected that to speak of
Israel as a nation is absurd, inasmuch as it is impossible for a person to belong to two nationalities at one and the same time. We English Jews are Englishmen, it will be said. Our life is bound up with the life of our country. Our interests, and hopes, and ideals are the interests, and hopes, and ideals of Englishmen at large. We cannot regard ourselves as belonging both to the British nation and to the Israelitish nation without being false to one or the other. There must needs be a conflict at times between the two sets of interests, the two sets of duties. The contention may perhaps have some force if we understand Jewish nationality in the sense in which it is understood by the political Zionist, though I pronounce no opinion upon the matter. But, as we have seen, nationality does not necessarily postulate a political consciousness. A nation can exist even though it has lost its independence and all desire for it. The essentials of national spirit go down far deeper, are drawn from more vital things. I am not speaking at random. The leading article in our great English newspaper to which I have referred was suggested by a meeting of an influential society which aims at fostering among the Welsh an enthusiasm for their ancient culture. The keynote of the speeches delivered at that meeting was the conception of the Welsh as a nation—as a nation, and not as a mere section of the kingdom or the Empire. The speakers enlarged on the glory and the duty of keeping
alive the language, and the literature, and the traditions of the Principality. "I am an immense believer," said one of them, "in these separate nationalities"; and he spoke approvingly of "the romantic movement" which gives to those who take part in it "a deep and passionate interest in the past, and to which they owe their interest in folk-songs, in folk-lore, in the old literature, in the old laws." Such a movement, he added, tends to make every inhabitant of this island "remember his origin, the origin and history of the particular part of this island in which he lives, and yet feel in full consciousness that all this leads up to a greater and fuller national life." The man who spoke these words was not a Welshman, nor was he an obscure person. He was Mr. Arthur James Balfour, once Prime Minister of this country. With the clearness of vision which marks the true statesman, he could see, not only the possibility of a double nationality, but the advantage that may redound from it for the State. He could see that the preservation by the Welsh of their separate identity, of their historic culture, is something which not only honours and ennobles those who give themselves to the task, but enriches the larger nation of which they are a part. "It leads up to a greater and fuller national life."

The Welsh do not stand alone in this reverence for their past, this passion for keeping alive their old national spirit. They are joined by the Irish
and the Scotch. Are we Jews wrong if we follow their example? Again I say that this matter is not a political one. We can sufficiently maintain our national consciousness by preserving our old culture—by keeping alive the study of our ancient language and history, and the great ideals, intellectual, moral, spiritual, to which they give expression. It is the Zion which Israel carries with him in his own breast to which we must renew our allegiance again and again, but that allegiance will be poor if it has not a national consciousness to replenish it. What is needed is a revival of the Jewish spirit—a deeper reverence for our ancient heritage, a greater pride in the name and the past of Israel—above all an end to the illusion that such feelings are anything but honourable to the Jew, or loyal to the nations among whom he lives. On the contrary, to give ourselves more earnestly to Jewish culture, to add its fruits to the common treasury of Englishmen, is to enrich England, to show ourselves capable of the very highest patriotism. It is, as Mr. Balfour said, to help in creating a greater and fuller national life.

The thought is an encouragement, but also a rebuke. Some time ago I attended a lecture on "The Poetry of the Old Testament," delivered by one of the foremost scholars in the kingdom. With extraordinary fervour the speaker, a Christian minister, declaimed some passages in Hebrew from our sacred Scriptures, which were followed with
rapt attention by his hearers. They numbered many hundreds; but the Jews among them could have been counted on the fingers of both hands. What is the secret of this painful contrast? Why do we leave to others an enthusiasm for our own great possessions? Why do we labour for every interest, strain after every prize, try to savour every joy but those which, in the truest sense, belong to our own domain? Why is the fine soul which alone makes the great nation slowly perishing within us for lack of sustenance? It is a hard question to answer. But unless this spiritual decline is arrested, Israel's nationality must perish and, with it, Israel too.
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THE JEWISH COLONIES IN PALESTINE

BY

S. LANDMAN, M.A.

It is not very long ago that the Land of Promise began to be the Land of Fulfilment. Until late into the nineteenth century the conditions under which our people lived were such as made it impossible for them either to forget their ancient home or to regain it. Accordingly all the recorded attempts to establish Jewish colonies in Palestine were unsuccessful in that they lacked both a sound material basis and the self-sacrificing spirit required of pioneers. The eighties of last century saw both of these essentials come into existence. The pogroms of Russia produced the pioneers of the Bilu type—young, ardent, adventurous, passionately national Jews—and they prompted the noble philanthropist Baron Edmond de Rothschild to give lavishly of his wealth in order to provide the material basis. The colonizing idea spread rapidly through the Jewries of the world, and Chovevi Zion societies were established in every country to support the struggling colonists in their under-
taking, which was nothing less ambitious than to turn arid desert into fruitful soil. The early period was full of troubles and progress was slow, but the speed with which the colonies grew increased when in quite recent years success began to attend their efforts. Thus the present Jewish colonies are all of very recent origin, and the wonderful Jewish life in Palestine is still a quite new phenomenon practically unknown to the outside world.

There were settlers in Palestine for nearly half a century before the new Yishub (settlement), and the majority of the Jewish population of Palestine still belongs to the old settlement. This consists of aged men and women who had come, literally as well as metaphorically speaking, to die in Jerusalem, to spend the last years of their life in prayers near the wailing wall and in holy preparation for the world to come. They are supported by monies sent from abroad. The new Yishub has less of this resignation: it consists of young and vigorous Jews and Jewesses who live freely and work hard, who till the soil of the land of Israel with gladness and reap its fruit with joy.

The old outnumber the new settlers by eight or nine to one in a total Jewish population of about a hundred thousand; but in the moulding of the future Palestine the younger element is destined to play the more important part. The old settlers live in the towns—Jerusalem, Hebron, Safed, and Tiberias chiefly—the new are agriculturists in the colonies. In the towns the chief
language of the Jews is Yiddish; in the colonies it is Hebrew. In the towns the Jewish life is almost identical with the ghetto life in any large town outside Palestine; in the colonies an interesting modern Jewish type of life is being created. The old settlement still lives on Chalukah (i.e. doles from Europe and America); the new Yishub has begun to be self-supporting.

Until about 1900 the success of the Jewish colonies was still in doubt. Many mistakes were made by the colonists through inexperience, but perhaps the chief cause of the slow progress was the error of the supporters in helping the colonists too indiscriminately and so paralysing their initiative. A new régime commenced in 1900, when Baron Edmond, following in the main the valuable constructive criticism of Achad Ha'am, transferred the administration of the colonies to the Ica (the Jewish Colonization Association). A sounder and more businesslike system was adopted, better markets were obtained for the wine from the vine-growing colonies, the single-crop system was abandoned, and where previously the colonists were at the mercy of a bad vintage they now could look for satisfactory returns in any season from their grain, orange, almond, olive, or other plantations. A company, formed on a co-operative basis, took over the management of the wine-cellar, and the improvement in the material conditions of the vine-growing was immediate and lasting. The output increased from 650,000 to
1,100,000 gallons in 1911-12,¹ the whole of which was sold in the ordinary way of trade and not as before to the Baron. About two-thirds is sold in Egypt and the East and one-third in Europe and America. The change for the better is clearly seen from this one fact that in 1911 the co-operative society was able to pay to the Baron over 400,000 francs as a first instalment towards the reduction of their debt to him.

The number of Jewish colonies and smaller settlements is now nearly fifty, of which twenty are in Judæa, in the south of Palestine; seven in Samaria, in the centre; and sixteen in the north, in Galilee. The other three are on the other side of the Jordan. The rural Jewish population was in 1914 about fifteen thousand, out of a total of a hundred thousand Jews in the country. The growth of Jewish immigration into Palestine was before the War very rapid. While the general population increased 40 per cent. in the last thirty years the Jews increased 280 per cent. In 1880 the Jews formed 5 per cent. of the whole population of Palestine, in 1910 they formed 13 ¹⁄₂ per cent. of the total of seven hundred thousand.

The best-known colonies are Rishon le-Zion, Petach Tikvah, and Rehoboth, in Judea; Zichron Jacob, in Samaria; and Rosh Pinah, in Galilee. The history of one of them—Petach Tikvah—may be taken as typical of all. Petach Tikvah was

¹ For these figures and other valuable information the writer acknowledges his indebtedness to "Recent Jewish Progress in Palestine," by Henriette Szold. Philadelphia 1915.
started by some Jews from Jerusalem in 1878. After many struggles against hostile neighbours and against malaria, the colony was in dire straits when in 1887 Baron Edmond came to its help. He acquired nearly half the lands and settled twenty-eight families on his property. In 1891 the cultivation of grain was replaced by vine-growing, and employment was found for eighty new colonists. It was made obligatory on each colonist to plant eucalyptus-trees to prevent malaria, and the sandy parts of the land were made into orange-plantations, the necessary irrigation being provided by the Baron's representatives. The first orange-grove was planted by the Rothschild administration in 1892, and the wealthier settlers followed suit. This proved the turning-point in the fortunes of the colony. The whole colony is now encircled by orange-plantations and resembles a Garden City. The colony covers 5,417 acres, of which 1,198 are devoted to orange-groves, 1,202 to almonds, 250 to the vine, 122 to olives, 23 to other fruits (such as apricots and peaches), and 41 to eucalyptus-trees. In Arabic the "eucalyptus" is now known as the "Jews' tree." In 1911 Petach Tikvah yielded 122,156 boxes of 150 oranges each, as compared with 168,088 for all the Jewish plantations of Palestine. The Jewish colonies now produce one-third of the total orange output of Palestine. The management of the business side is in the hands of two societies of Jewish orange-
grove owners. The societies have their own agents in some of the principal parts of the world, have secured shipping facilities and wharf privileges, and were until the outbreak of the War very prosperous. In 1912 Petach Tikvah, which had then a population of 2,670, paid the State over 60,000 francs in taxes, besides taxes of about 85,000 francs for the expenses of internal administration. Experiments have been made in the colony with ostrich-farming, rubber, bamboo, bananas, and cotton, all of which may confidently be relied on as future products of the colony.

One of the chief difficulties in any scheme of colonization is how to enable the colonists—who are never very wealthy—to tide over the first eight or ten years, until the land becomes productive enough to support them. At first perpetual loans were granted either by the Baron’s administrators or by the Odessa Committee (the executive body of the Chovevi Zion). This was really a form of charity, and succeeded only in pauperizing the colonists. The beginning of a proper credit system was made in 1903 by the Anglo-Palestine Company, Limited (a branch of the Jewish Colonial Trust, Limited, the financial instrument of the Zionist organization). In 1904 two co-operative loan associations were founded in Petach Tikvah, which were very successful in fostering the spirit of self-help. In 1912 the number of such self-help societies was forty-five, which granted to their members loans ranging from 10 to 3,000 francs.
The Jewish National Fund, Limited, which owns a considerable area of land, has similarly used part of its funds in granting credits for house-building and farming.

Another difficulty was the lack of a properly trained farming population. This difficulty is being rapidly overcome, and the number of colonists who have had a practical training is increasing yearly. Agricultural training schools and experimental farms were established by the Ica, the Odessa Committee, and the Zionist organization. But one difficulty still remained. The Jewish immigrant learned very quickly to rise above the level of an ordinary agricultural labourer, and preferred to become a gentleman farmer and employer of Arab labour, which was cheaper and more easily obtainable than Jewish labour. For a time it seemed as though a Jewish labouring class would never come into being, and that the colonies would always have to depend on Arab labour with a corresponding weakness in the Jewishness of the colonies. The advent of poor Yemenite Jews, refugees from persecution in the Yemen, filled the gap. Dwellings were built for these immigrants, who were industrious and frugal, spoke both Arabic and Hebrew, and were able to fraternize with all classes. The Odessa Committee has also provided better equipped dwellings for European Jewish labourers. The labourer, whether Yemenite or European, is able to become the owner of his house on easy terms. Each house forms an attrac-
tive homestead, with a large garden. Being near the larger colonies, the children are within easy distance of the schools.

The problem previously mentioned of how to tide over the period of unproductiveness has been met in a different way for immigrants possessed of some capital. There are several companies which buy the land and prepare it for settlement by providing water, building a house, digging wells, freeing the soil from stones, laying out and cultivating plantations (oranges, almonds, or olives), and keeping them until they are ready for immediate settlement as productive pieces of land. These companies are the Geulah, the Agudath Netaim, and the Palestine Land Development Company, Limited. The last named manages the properties of the National Fund. It is the largest of these companies. It is particularly useful in enabling individual would-be settlers or associations of intending settlers to buy land on easy terms to be kept and prepared for seven to ten years until the individual or the member is ready to come to Palestine to take up possession of his holding. The services of the Palestine Land Development Company have been made use of very largely in recent years by such plantation societies which are known as Achuzas. These were commenced in the United States, and there are now twelve or thirteen such societies. The societies consist of fifty or more intending colonists, each of whom subscribes about £300, payable in seven
to ten years. This sum so invested will secure an estate of 16 acres, $14\frac{1}{2}$ under cultivation and planted with fruit-trees and $1\frac{1}{2}$ reserved for house, barn, and garden. For a house, furniture, implements, and live-stock another £200 or £300 is required. One flourishing colony, Poriah, has already been established by this Achuza system; others will follow in course of time.

The growth of Jewish immigration has sent up the price of land, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to buy land at a reasonable price within access of the principal towns or colonies. Only on the other side of the Jordan is land, fertile and well watered, still obtainable at a cheap price. But the Bedouins are unfriendly, and expeditions have to be equipped for taking actual possession of the land—the Turkish law being that unoccupied land may be seized by the first comer who is prepared to settle on it. These expeditions are to be equipped by a special fund—the Go-operative Fund—and will consist of well-trained agriculturists, some young and vigorous watchmen, officials, physicians, nurses, artisans, and so forth—well supplied with implements, camp furniture, drugs, surgical appliances, and foodstuffs—in short, all the paraphernalia of a small army of peaceful occupation. Groups called Kebuzoth—Kibbush are already doing such pioneer work on the hither side of the Jordan, and no department of Palestinian colonizing work is more fascinating and none more characteristic of the brave spirit animating the new settlers.
The special feature of all the Jewish colonies and settlements is self-government. It is remarkable how easily and naturally the Jews from divers lands of origin have sunk all differences in one common element, which is the resultant of their Jewish national feeling, their pride in their achievement, and their love of their country. All but the smallest settlements have a Wa'ad or Committee, which rules the colony or settlement. The Wa'ad both makes the laws and regulations and enforces them (without any difficulty, be it mentioned). It registers and assesses property and collects the taxes. It performs the functions of a Public Health Department, an Education Authority, a Public Parks Committee, and all the other work of a municipality in Europe or America. One official is conspicuously absent—the Jewish colonies have no policemen. Instead they have night watchmen to keep off marauding Bedouins. The Jews themselves are an eminently peaceful people. In the whole history of the new settlement—i.e. in a period of over thirty years—there has been only one case of Jewish criminality. Arabs sometimes lay their difficulties before the Jewish Wa'ad because justice is more readily obtainable there than in the Turkish courts. There are no public-houses in the colonies. The chief buildings are usually the synagogues and the Beth Am (a kind of concert-hall and general assembly-room). These form the centre of the communal life. The larger colonies have also hospitals and parks. All have
Talmud Torahs and schools, ranging from the ordinary Elementary School in the smaller settlements to excellent kindergartens and Higher Education classes in the larger colonies. The Grammar Schools are naturally situate in the towns. Jaffa has the largest and most successful gymnasium, and the Jerusalem gymnasium is second in importance. A Hebrew university is projected, and is to be built on a commanding site just outside Jerusalem.

The Turkish Government is felt only when the time arrives to pay the imposts through the local official. Otherwise the colonies are allowed the utmost freedom.

A specimen of the expenditure in a small Jewish colony is the following for Kastinieh, which has a population of 150 and owns 1,278 acres of land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump and water supply</td>
<td>4828.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>255.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>901.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax collector</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>165.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues to Union of Jewish Colonies</td>
<td>118.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For drawing map of colony</td>
<td>75.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>50.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night watch</td>
<td>1342.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military tax</td>
<td>809.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment of officials</td>
<td>138.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses incident to conflict between two colonists</td>
<td>420.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry expenses</td>
<td>1823.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,151.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ratio of the expenditure on education to the total is characteristic of all the Jewish colonies. The tiniest settlement makes provision for the education—intellectual, physical, and artistic—of young and old. They have their libraries, their athletic societies, their choral unions, and so forth. The colonists have given expression to the joy of life in a wealth of indigenous Hebrew songs.

The progressive spirit introduced by the new Jewish settlers is not confined to rural development. To the same eager and energetic spirit must be ascribed the rapid growth of Jaffa as a centre of trade. The population grew rapidly after the completion of the Jaffa-Jerusalem railway in 1892. From twenty-three thousand in that year it has grown to over sixty thousand. But the growth of population has not meant for the Jews more congestion and more slums. On the contrary, they have, aided by the Jewish National Fund, created a garden suburb—Tel Aviv—which is the residential quarter of Jaffa and the seat of many splendid public buildings.

Tel Aviv is entirely Jewish, and is entirely cut off from traffic from sunset on Friday till sunset on Saturday. The striking success of Tel Aviv, and especially the contrast between its clean and modern appearance and the dinginess and filth of old Jaffa, has led to the building of similar garden suburbs in other parts of Jaffa and at Haifa. These are Nahalat Benjamin, Shaarazim, and Hebrah Hadashah, near Jaffa; and Herzlia,
near Haifa. Later, similar suburbs will be founded in the vicinity of the other towns, and modern hygienic buildings will take the place of the ancient dirty hovels.

Thus in town as in country the driving force of the Jewish settlers is manifest, and the Arab population realizes to what extent the country is indebted to the Jews for its recent rise from its centuries-long slumber. The relations with the Turkish Government have been eminently satisfactory, so long as there was no interference with the local administration by the Jews. If similar conditions prevail after the War, the colonies will continue to progress on the same healthy lines, and it will not require many years before Palestine Jewry begins to exercise a marked influence in reviving and invigorating the effete Jewries of other lands. Every nationally conscious Jew watches almost with bated breath the struggle for life of the tiny Jewish settlement in Palestine during this supreme crisis. For in point of numbers the Jewish colonization of Palestine is only a tiny experiment. Ten thousand inhabitants! Why, twice that number have been killed in many a week of the War! But the importance of the Jewish colonies of Palestine lies, not in their numbers but in their deep meaning for the Jewish people. We were beginning to doubt our vitality as Jews and to question our raison d'être. We have been wanderers so long that we must, so some thought, have lost the art of living at home, much
as a soldier loses the desire to sleep on a soft bed, but prefers the hard earth. Then came the brave pioneers, and showed us that we had a language that could hold its own with any, that we had still the capacity for peaceful self-government, that we were not estranged from Mother Earth—in a word, that our sun had by no means set. Nay, better, they proved to all who had eyes to see and intelligence to understand that soon would come a brilliant dawn. The Jewish colonies in Palestine are the heralds of this brilliant dawn for the Jewish people.
There are two tendencies in human nature which can be traced in varied relations and aspects of life, in religion, in politics, in literature, and in art. On the one hand, there is the settled disposition to maintain the old order or the status quo, in stern resistance of all change; and, on the other hand, there is the throbbing impulse to create a new world in the endeavour to harmonize ideals with facts, or to make facts reflect ideals. We may describe these two attitudes of mind by the general terms, Conservatism and Liberalism.

These two views of faith and life are both inevitable consequences of the complex character of the human soul, and are necessary conditions of existence and intelligence and activity. Rigid Conservatism would result in inanition, sterility, and death. Unchecked Liberalism would lead to revolution, disaster, and destruction. The free interplay of both forces in action and reaction is needed to keep the world healthy and to save it
on the one hand from stagnation, and on the other hand from chaos.

Conservatism and Liberalism are therefore not irreconcilable opposites. They do not necessarily and ultimately exclude each other absolutely. They complement rather than contradict each other. The pendulum must swing from side to side within a definite space of movement if the hands of the clock are to point the hour with regularity and accuracy; but the clock will go wrong or stop altogether if the pendulum swings too far or not far enough, too violently or too slowly in either direction. Liberalism would force the pace. Conservatism would slacken the pace, and the mean rate of progress is obtained by the resultant balance between the two.

I use the terms "Conservative Judaism" and "Liberal Judaism" to mark the two characteristic tendencies in human nature, which I have already explained, in as far as they are reflected in the sphere of the religion of Judaism.

The first point I wish to urge is that Conservative Judaism, while observing a due norm of restraint and reverence for the past, has never been a religion of changelessness, paralysing all growth and development. It is of paramount importance to remove the erroneous notion that Conservative Judaism inevitably and invariably spells reaction or rigidity. If we closely examine the history of our religion from its creation as Hebraism, through its passage into Judaism, and
its evolution into its present form, I think we shall find that Conservative Judaism has always betrayed the features of a living organism, and without swerving from the straight path of development or losing its essential individuality, has made ordered progress in adapting itself to new needs called forth by the lapse of time and made insistent by change of conditions and environment.

Conservative Judaism shows an orderly development, and the greater the Rabbi the more he proves himself able and willing to avoid the language and tone of passionate conflict, to find a temperate solution of critical problems in religious progress, and to sanction a wise and smooth and tranquil adjustment of old forms to new ideas and new conditions, without any controversial disquiet or violent disturbance of the religious atmosphere.

And now comes the remarkable paradox. On the one hand, Conservative Judaism shows an orderly development in the gradual absorption of Liberal views, but the guiding policy has been flecti non frangi ("to be bent, not to be broken"), and the changes introduced have always been Conservative modifications within the bounds of orthodox principles. On the other hand, Liberal Judaism is of necessity always exposed to one of two dangers, either absorption from within or fusion from without.

When Liberal Judaism proceeds along evolutionary lines of religious development, its difference
from Conservative Judaism is not a difference in the interpretation of the *essence* of progress, but a difference in the attempted *rate* of progress. When Liberal Judaism succeeds in affecting the trend of Conservative Judaism, its task is ended, and it becomes absorbed in the Conservative Judaism which its influence has modified or transformed. It is the liability to this fate which constitutes the *internal* danger with which Liberal Judaism is always threatened.

When Liberal Judaism ruthlessly snaps the chain of tradition, seeks to produce a clear-cut new development, and abandons the inspiration of history, then, by the sheer stress of facts, its inward or centripetal power of resistance against the vigour of the outward or centrifugal tendency is inevitably weakened, and its gradual absorption by a Gentile environment becomes an ultimate certainty. It is the liability to this fate which constitutes the *external* danger with which Liberal Judaism is always threatened.

So, in broad outline, it is a curious fact that the Judaism which has persisted is Conservative Judaism, and the Judaism which has perished is Liberal Judaism. The best instance of Conservative Judaism absorbing within itself Liberal modes of thought and practice is the golden age of Judaism in Spain. The best instance of Liberal Judaism harmonizing inherited religion with acquired environment is the Hellenistic Judaism of Alexandria. The Conservative Judaism of Spain
survived the expulsion from Spain. The Liberal Judaism of Alexandria faded out of existence before the advance and spread of Christianity.

What is the explanation of this difference in fate? In Spain, the emphasis was on the "Judaism," and not on the "Spanish." In Alexandria, the emphasis was on the "Hellenistic," and not on the "Judaism." In each case the nature of the environment helps to yield the secret of the different consequences. In Spain, the similarities between Judaism and Mohammedanism outweighed the differences of faith in application to daily life. In Alexandria, the differences between Judaism and Hellenism were far greater than the area of agreement or likeness.

Why, then, has it happened that Conservative Judaism, while showing itself capable of modification, has not shared the fate of Liberal Judaism? And why is it a stern fact, which has to be reckoned with, that the Judaism which has persisted through the centuries is Conservative Judaism? I think the explanation will be found in the external political conditions which have produced their internal consequences. Outward circumstance has created inward necessity. Roughly speaking, it may be said that Conservative Judaism has been preserved in those communities where persecution has involved the concentration of Jews, and that Liberal Judaism has flourished most in those communities where emancipation, with its attendant advance in material comfort and growth in the
acquisition of cosmopolitan culture, has led to the decentralization of Jews, and this diffusion, in its turn, has produced disintegration and the dissolution of the cohesive forces of conscious unity.

The continuance of Judaism, then, is dependent on the existence of an area with an aggregation of Jews living in a Jewish environment, breathing a Jewish atmosphere and fostering a Jewish culture, and these factors must predominate over all other influences.

Does this conclusion, then, mean that Judaism can only thrive under persecution, that Judaism cannot stand the sunshine of freedom, and that, if we really wish to preserve our faith, we should entirely abandon the advocacy and the promotion of the cause of liberty of conscience for the Jew in all countries of the globe? I do not think in the least that we are confronted with such a dilemma. We are completely justified in asserting the claim of Jews to possess equal rights with their fellow-citizens in whatever country they may be, and it is the incontestable duty of Jews who enjoy the fruits of political freedom in any part of the world to help their brethren in less fortunate lands to obtain similar rights, and to aid in hastening the day when the Jew, wherever he may be, will become a free man in a free land.

None of us who have tasted freedom will ever be willing to sacrifice it without a keen struggle. At the same time, we know that emancipation pro-
vides the best soil for the birth of Liberal Judaism, and that seemingly the invariable outcome of Liberal Judaism in a Gentile environment is absorption.

We must also acknowledge the verdict of history that it is Conservative Judaism which is the Judaism, because it alone always survives. We must also face the fact that Conservative Judaism has been maintained in the aggregation of Jews in communities subject to oppression; yet none of us will be prepared to plead to be persecuted, if acquiescence in and submission to persecution are the only means for the preservation of our religion.

How shall we meet the undoubted difficulty to which attention has just been drawn? I think the difficulty has been grossly exaggerated through being stated in a wrong or misleading form. The problem is generally framed and summarized in the question, Are we a nation or a religious community? I do not regard this as an entirely fair or satisfactory statement of the point at issue, because it leads to a confusion in thought and an unnecessary antagonism between Conservative Judaism and Liberal Judaism.

Liberal Judaism would say: "Israel among the nations. We are a religious brotherhood in the midst of the nations. Our nationality is the land in which we live. Our religion is the religion of Judaism, adapted to the peculiar conditions of the country in which we dwell, and we abandon all
those elements in our religion which seek or imply a restoration of the Jewish people as a nation."

Conservative Judaism would say: "Israel a nation. Technically we are not a nation now. But although we object to persecution and claim freedom as strongly as Liberal Judaism, yet we mean what we pray, and we do look forward to the re-establishment of the Jews as a nation."

I therefore think the contrast is too sharply drawn when we are asked to decide, Are we a nation or a religious community? I object to the disjunctive "or," and would replace it by the conjunction "and." We form a religious brotherhood, and must maintain and try to realize the national hopes of Judaism.

I shall probably be told that the re-establishment of the Jews as a nation would mean the re-creation of the ghetto. I am frankly prepared to admit the force of this criticism, but with an important qualification dependent on the interpretation of the word "ghetto."

If by a "ghetto" we mean the aggregation of individuals within a definite area, having similar traditions and practices, and pursuing similar aims, then, in this sense, every nation is a "ghetto" on a larger or smaller scale, and the smaller nations of Europe, with populations less than the total number of Jews in the world, are also "ghettos."

But if by a "ghetto" we mean the concentration of Jews in an area where, in the old sense of the term, the inhabitants of that area are subject
to disabilities and restrictions and harassing persecution, then by the re-nationalization of Jews Zionists do not desire the re-creation of the ghetto. In such an interpretation of the word, Zionism no more than Liberal Judaism would seek the re-establishment of the ghetto. For what is the actual fact? Zionism sets itself the task of forming a national centre of Judaism in the full enjoyment of political freedom, where the conditions will provide a complete Jewish environment, Jewish atmosphere, and Jewish culture.

In so far as the national centre will ensure the existence of this Jewish environment, Jewish atmosphere, and Jewish culture, there will be a recreation of the ghetto. But in so far as the national centre will not reproduce the political restrictions and social ostracism of the ghetto, it will not be a ghetto, but a land of liberty like other countries of freedom.

Liberal Judaism has therefore much to gain by throwing in its lot with Zionism, and for this reason. I began by saying that there are two tendencies in human nature, Conservatism and Liberalism. When the Zionist programme is realized, the national centre of Judaism will not be immune from the characteristics of human nature, and the two tendencies of Conservatism and Liberalism will spontaneously assert themselves in the development of the national life. There will then inevitably be one party devoted to Conservative Judaism and one party devoted to Liberal
Judaism. For example, it was when the Jews were still a nation that the Rabbis and the synagogues began to take the place of the Priests and the Temple, and it was when the Jews were still in their own land that, after the destruction of the Temple, prayer was substituted for sacrifice.

Thus, with the realization of the hopes and aims of Zionism, Liberal Judaism in the Diaspora would find itself associated with and could co-operate with Liberal Judaism at the national centre. As Liberal Jews in every country now claim still to belong to the religious brotherhood of Israel, they cannot consistently be disinclined to be identified with Liberal Judaism at the national centre. The geographical boundaries of nations do not form the frontiers of human hearts, and territorial limits do not constitute barriers against the mutual aspirations of the souls of a religious fraternity. Hence, Zionism from the very centre of Judaism would act as a guide and an inspiration to the safe and wise pursuit of Liberal Judaism in the Diaspora, and the cause of Liberal Judaism at the centre would be encouraged and strengthened by the adherence of, and support from, Liberal Judaism in the Diaspora.

At the centre of national life there would be a field for the free play of the two different forces of Conservative Judaism and Liberal Judaism. Liberal Judaism would exercise its due influence in the national life by virtue of the legitimate
opportunities it would enjoy of endeavouring to persuade the whole nation to an acceptance of its views. Thus, for Liberal Judaism as well as for Conservative Judaism the Law would again go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, radiating their benign influence far and wide to the 'ends of the earth.

We have frankly to recognize the subtle and powerful influence of environment, and the strength of the human inclination to follow the habits and customs and example of the majority. Now, the Jews in the Diaspora must always be in a minority in the countries where they 'dwell, and will always be liable to the fate of minorities to be absorbed in the majority. Liberal Jews have to contend with the added disadvantage and danger of being the minority of a minority, with a relaxed sense of the value and importance of ceremonial which makes for religious exclusiveness, and with an intensified bias in the direction of gentile culture which tends to fusion.

If Liberal Judaism is to remain keenly and proudly aware of its own separate existence, and to preserve the character which it claims of being the expression of a new spiritual recovery, it requires some energizing force to arrest the process of decline and decay with which it is eternally and inevitably threatened. Liberal Judaism must therefore seek its sanction or justification and find its basis in the pursuit of a national Judaism. Zionism thus irresistibly emerges as the necessary
premium Liberal Jews have to pay to insure them against complete assimilation with a Gentile environment and consequent loss of religious identity. Zionism, from this point of view, is not to be rejected as a mere policy of despair, bred and nurtured in persecution, but it shines forth as a constructive policy of hope in response to the poignant needs created by the effects of freedom.

Hence, it appears to me that the international movement towards Liberal Judaism should in its own interest, and to advance its own cause, ally itself with the international movement towards Zionism, and so endeavour to provide a milieu for the free play of the forces of Conservative Judaism and Liberal Judaism, acting and reacting upon each other, without any peril to the preservation of the wider Judaism which embraces them both.
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CONCEPTIONS OF THE STATE AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

BY

CYRIL M. PICCIOTTO, B.A.

It is a commonplace that the present struggle, in which the six Great Powers of Europe, to name only some of the belligerents, are engaged with a fervour and tenacity which is all the more unbreakable because each conscientiously believes itself to be fighting in its own defence, is one not of dynasties but of nations and peoples. That is to say, the mass of opinion in each country, even though it did not at the decisive moment consciously give its vote for war, has, broadly, honoured the draft made upon its loyalty when the supreme choice was taken by those in whose hands lie such decisions, and has expressed itself in the concrete form of the wholesale devotion of treasure and lives. In no previous war has public opinion been so much courted or has responded with so conscious a knowledge of its power. It is for these reasons fair to speculate on the probability of an intensified nationalism manifesting itself
among the belligerent nations when peace comes. And the very direct bearing which such a contingency would have upon the Jewish question is of such importance that some attempt to indicate the nature of the problems ahead needs no apology.

One good ground for anticipating such a result is the undoubted trend of political philosophy in recent years. The doctrines of the Utilitarians and Individualists, though they contain much that is of permanent value, have yet been, consciously or unconsciously, largely displaced by those which represent what is conveniently called the organic or collectivist theory of the State. As conceived by Mill, Spencer, or Sidgwick, the State is for all real purposes embodied in the policeman and the tax-collector, its essential function consisting in according to the subject the maximum of liberty that is compatible with the security and good order of the whole. The individual may worship whatever God he pleases, so long as he does not break windows on his way to his devotions. It is easy to understand that in this soil toleration flourished, and the civil emancipation of the Jews, in this country at least, was achieved. The contrasted doctrine, mainly Hegelian in its application to the modern State, and amplified by T. H. Green and others, regards the view stated above as erroneous, as resting upon a wrong conception of the basis of society. The State, say these thinkers, is not a haphazard collection of individuals considered severally and apart, but one organic and homo-
geneous whole united for the purpose of a common life. It is at once clear that the immediate effect of such a doctrine is to increase the control of the State over the individual, who comes to be regarded as capable of true development only as a member of the State. The marked tendency towards collectivism in modern States is the un-doubted social expression of this, while the growing force of nationality is its political expression.

In the face of such a tendency in political development (which it is not rash to assume will be more pronounced in the future than in the past) how does the Jew stand? That mass of historical and religious peculiarities which have already, even in the less exacting conditions of the individualist State, produced a "Jewish Question," will give at once a bolder challenge to the all-embracing supremacy of the modern State, and a greater incentive to the nationalist aspirations of the Jew. Political thinkers of weight have before now dwelt upon the anomaly and the undesirability of an imperium in imperio such as is involved in the existence within the State of a self-contained community, non-intermarrying and greatly tenacious of a set of beliefs derived from a separate past and concerned with the hope of a separate future. Not even the Roman Catholic Church, which may in a sense be said to be the historical successor of the Holy Roman Empire, represents an internationalism such as this, or a culture and a way of life so distinct. The Jew
who is a Zionist has a definite political ideal, and must conceive himself as a member potentially of a State that has a latent existence. The rabbinic or orthodox Jew, if he practises orthodoxy as an indivisible whole (for it all stands or falls together), is committed, whether he is conscious of it or not, to a religious life which is inextricably interwoven with distinctively national and historical elements; it would seem impossible to say otherwise even of the Jews of the less orthodox and observant class, who after all differ from the rabbinic Jew in degree only and not in kind, in that they practise the same observances and for the same reasons, but in smaller quantities. Nor can it be said, unfortunately, that even the eagerness with which the Jews of all countries have entered the fighting ranks has wholly or even largely removed the difficulty, or has received in every quarter the appreciation which is due. No man can change himself by changing the colour of his coat; and it is idle and self-deceptive to suppose that the call of the drum has once and for all solved the Jewish Problem. The normal condition of the world is peace, not war; and when war is over, and the emotions which it arouses give place to the calm mentality of normal times, this problem will reappear in all its acuteness. The determining question is, after all, not what the Jew thinks of his adoptive country, but what his adoptive country thinks of the Jew. The time is not so far distant when the development of the State will continue
on organic and collectivist lines. The central authority will embrace an ever-wider area, and will make such a penetration into the recesses of individual freedom as would have been thought inconceivable thirty or forty years ago. Compulsory military service, compulsory education, compulsory insurance are but milestones on the road which logically leads to the adoption of a State morality, State creed, and of a common way of life. To say this is merely to indicate the probable trend, not to approve it.

How, then, is the State of the future going to deal with a people in its midst which largely preserves its separateness of blood, which in its fasts, its festivals, its day of rest, its customs, its dietary laws, its marriage ceremony, suggests a distinct historical entity? The inevitable conclusion would seem to be that the choice which will be put before the Jewish people will be between absorption and exclusion. Not that there will be any such conscious choice or any conscious invitation to choose. Nor will the process, it seems hardly necessary to say, be clean-cut or immediate, but, on the contrary, long-drawn-out, and the result of the subtle and impalpable influences of a conception of nationality apparent now for some time past (of which the Jewish National Movement is in itself an expression), the ultimate logic of which we cannot afford to disregard. There is a time of great decisions ahead, and the taking of great decisions needs much straight and hard thinking, free of all
predispositions, and, above all, free of all cloudiness. That those decisions will not be well and wisely taken there is no reason to fear. But we cannot too soon begin to face them squarely in all their significance.
In the ghetto the observance of Judaism was natural and almost inevitable. The regimen of Jewish life was the atmosphere that was breathed. The Mezuzza on the door, the Mizrach on the wall, the early rising for Selichoth services, the special dietary regulations of the Three Weeks and of Passover, the fast days, the Purim rejoicings, the Succah, and a thousand other elements of orthodox Jewish life pervaded the daily life of the home with distinctive and unescapable Jewishness. Not only did public opinion make it possible for men to go bearded, to keep the head covered at all times, to carry the palm-branch in the public street, or to walk the street in stockinged feet on fast days, but public opinion made it almost impossible for a Jew publicly to profane the Sabbath or the Passover regulations, or openly to transgress any of the main observances of Jewish life.

To a large extent the adult Jewish population
of the United States has been reared in Jewish communities of this type of inevitable Jewishness. To a large extent the young generation is being reared in an atmosphere in which this type of Jewishness is unknown, or at least strange and impossible. Jewish religious observance in the United States is becoming increasingly difficult and increasingly rare. In the large urban Jewish centres, such as New York or Chicago, orthodox Judaism still maintains itself to some extent against the inroads of an aggressive misconception of American liberty. But in smaller centres, especially in outlying districts of the south and west, traditional Judaism is condemned to death by public opinion under the suspicion of being un-American.

This tendency is equally marked in the immigration from Russia of the last thirty years and in the immigration from Germany and other countries. With the exception of the two Sephardi congregations, the one in New York, founded in 1654, and the one in Philadelphia, founded in 1745, there is no Jewish congregation in the United States more than fifty years old that has not given way to the influences of Reform to a greater or less extent. This Reform has not concerned itself popularly with matters of theology, however hotly Rabbis may have discussed questions of doctrine. In the popular mind Reform means Americanization. Reform has therefore changed the synagogue into a Temple, sometimes even with a bell-tower. This has involved changing the architectural
form of the building into that of an auditorium, with a platform faced by seats for men and women together. On the platform officiate a cantor and a preacher, who turn their backs to the ark and address themselves to their congregation. The tallith and similar externals are un-American, and have consequently been sacrificed. The "American" worships with bare head; therefore the American of the Jewish persuasion must also doff his headgear when at worship. Hebrew, an Oriental language, is not an American tongue. The American prays in English, which all understand, and accordingly the American of Jewish faith has Anglicized his ritual. Such a ritual is not susceptible of being chanted with traditional Jewish Chazzanuth, and the music of the Temple has therefore been brought up to date by the introduction of an organ, sacred music borrowed from non-Jewish neighbours, and mixed choirs in which non-Jewish singers are almost the rule. The Barmitzvah must be transformed into the American custom of confirmation, and the only way in which Shabuoth could be adapted to its environment and therefore made to survive was by turning it into a festival of confirmation of the young en masse. The Jewish Sabbath is out of keeping with the environment, and the only way in which it seemed to be possible to save it was by celebrating it with a Friday evening Temple service after supper, and resting, and sometimes also attending Temple, on Sunday.
In these ways Reform has tried to ensure the survival of Judaism by adapting it to the environment. As a matter of principle it has occidentalized Judaism, all-forgetful of the historic fact that occidentalized Judaism is Christianity. If so far Reform has avoided the logical end of the process and has stopped short of identifying itself with Christianity, it has Americanized Judaism by dropping the elements that are characteristically Jewish and un-American, and has thereby created an almost non-sectarian Judaism housed in an almost non-sectarian Temple.

For the home in the United States is no longer the centre of Jewish life. Judaism as an influence in the home is negligible. Neglect of the un-American dietary laws is usually the first step that the Americanizing Jew takes in asserting his Americanism. Jewish communal institutions and societies vindicate their claim to being American by holding public banquets at which every kind of ritually forbidden food is served. Jewish communal societies and institutions not infrequently hold public meetings and celebrations on the Sabbath. The sentiment against intermarriage is weakening daily, and the last refuge of Jewishness that remains for many is an inherited but mild disapproval of apostasy.

The only possible safeguard against this threatened disappearance of Judaism and the Jews is the Zionist spirit. It is true that one party of the Zionists is secular and non-religious
in outlook. But the Zionist with religious feelings challenges this basic principle of the necessity for Americanizing Judaism. He holds that, however ardently American we may be in our civic loyalty, our professional and commercial relationships, and our externals of clothing, manners, and accent, the Jewish religion is the pure expression of the Jewish spirit that may not be sacrificed. The Zionist believes that the world values the Jewish spirit as a distinctive thing, and the Zionist treasures that Jewish spirit as his most precious heritage. He therefore refuses to Americanize it out of recognizable Jewish existence, and insists on being a completely Jewish Jew in his religious self-expression. The Zionist, believing in the historic national unity of the Jewish people, refuses recognition to such terms or ideas as American Judaism, the accepted name of Reform Judaism in America. When a Zionist speaks of Judaism he means traditional Judaism, unqualified by any local epithet.

For this reason Zionism has brought back, and is bringing back, to the traditional Synagogue a large number of young people who were drifting, or who had drifted away, from Judaism under the disintegrating influences of Americanization. It first arouses their dormant Jewish consciousness and awakens their interest in their people. Once this recognition of Jewish nationality is attained, the young Zionist recognizes that he owes a cultural and religious duty to his people, and that his
observance or non-observance of the elements of a Jewish life is not purely a matter of individual whim, but is also conditioned by the duty owed to his people. He sees that Judaism is not a faith but a life. Half-consciously following this new outlook of thought, many young people have been led on to the study of Hebrew and to the enthusiastic observance of the more strongly marked national holidays of the Jewish calendar, such as Hanukah or Passover. The dietary laws have been given recognition as national customs, the seventh-day Sabbath has been given new respect as the national Jewish day of rest, and the Synagogue has been recognized as the national centre in the Dispersion. From this it has been a short and easy step to investing these national elements of Jewish life with the deeper feelings of the Jewish religion.

The non-Zionist has set out to maintain Judaism while obliterating the Jew. The Zionist, knowing the pathetic failure of this policy and knowing the tragic history of the results of emancipation, ridicules the futility of trying to preserve a soul without a body, and sets out to preserve the Jews in order to maintain Judaism. The generation of assimilants, after holding a coroner's inquest over the Jewish people, felt the distinctive national observances of Judaism to be burdensome, irrelevant, and meaningless, now that the Jewish people was dead. But the generation of Zionists, believing passionately in the reality and providential purpose
of the Jewish people, regard Jewish observance as the necessary preservative of the Jewish people. The elements of Judaism, therefore, become to them a purposive and organic part of their life. In their eyes Jewish standards and Jewish traditions have been rehabilitated, and they are as proud of their Jewishness as they are of their Americanism. They do not feel the need of exaggerating their Americanism à outrance by forgetting or escaping their Jewishness or by Americanizing their Jewishness out of all recognition. They rather seek to make their Jewishness truly their own, so that we find in the Zionist ranks to-day thousands of young men and young women who have taken up the study of the Jewish past, who have set to work to master Hebrew, and who have turned back to the Jewish Bible for inspiration. In no way has Zionism vindicated itself more brilliantly as the Jewish will to live than in bringing back to the Synagogue thousands of American-born Jews and Jewesses who had lost sympathy with traditional Judaism or who had drifted away from all Judaism under the negative influence of Americanized Judaism. Zionism is stemming this drift and recruiting the ranks of the Synagogue with a generation in which Jewish loyalty is the basic virtue. Zionism is refilling the synagogues with a generation that understands the Jewish national mission and that is willing to make the sacrifices of loyal love for the realization of that mission.
Ah, the clouded skies, the grieving hearts this winter!
Alas, the heavy rains, the flowing tears!
Ah, the grey days, hopeless of the sunshine!
Alas, the black nights and the lurking fears!

Where can man abide and find a gleam of daybreak?
Where is now a land shut out from war?
Where a people now which shall, with heart of justice,
Lead the nations like a guiding star?

We of scattered Israel, dumb through all the ages
Since the Law awaked a dreaming world,
Had we not a word to reach the ear of nations
Ere the thunderbolt of war was hurled?

Wherefore else our agelong life, our wandering landless,
Every land our home for ill or good?
Ours it was long since to join the hands of nations
Through the link of our own brotherhood.
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ZIONISM AND THE FUTURE OF JUDAISM

BY

The Rev. M. H. Segal, M.A.

The nineteenth century witnessed a remarkable improvement in the condition of the Jews. From a mass of uncouth, uneducated, poverty-stricken, and down-trodden humanity, huddled together in dirty, mediæval ghettos, Western Jewry has developed during the last hundred years into prosperous, enlightened, and free communities which take an active and important part in the rich life of the modern world. And if Eastern Jews have not advanced so rapidly as their Western brethren, yet their steady progress in many directions has been no less remarkable. The whole of European Jewry threw itself with ardour into the new life opened up before it by the democratization of Europe. By dint of an astonishing energy and a marvellous power of application and adaptation, European Jews succeeded in overcoming the obstacles that barred their progress, and have attained to eminence in almost all walks of life. The success achieved by their efforts has exercised
a beneficent influence upon the physical and mental character of the Jewish people. The modern Jew is not only richer and better educated than the ghetto Jew, but he is also superior to his mediaevalized ancestor in physique, in mental vigour, in manliness, and in most of the gifts and graces which ennoble human life.

But side by side with this remarkable progress of the Jews, the nineteenth century also witnessed a steady decline of Judaism. Multitudes of Jews belonging to the most vigorous elements of the people have entirely abandoned their faith. Many more of the enlightened and prosperous classes who have not formally severed their connection with Judaism, have yet become so indifferent to its teaching and practice as to allow their offspring to grow up estranged from their people and faith, and thereby facilitate their final absorption in their surroundings. And even among the broad masses of the people the attachment to the ancestral religion has become so weak that its vital injunctions are openly disregarded, its most characteristic observances neglected, and its language and literature cast into oblivion. We may lay it down as an indisputable law governing the history of Judaism during the last hundred years that the ratio of decline of Judaism has been proportionate to the ratio of material and intellectual progress of the Jews.

How are we to explain this surprising and painful phenomenon? Why should Judaism suffer
by the prosperity of the Jews? The usual explanation is that it is all the fault of the Jews. "Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked." Prosperity, we are told, has sapped the moral character of the Jew, so that he is no longer possessed with the spiritual strength which would enable him to sacrifice worldly good for the sake of his religion. The decay of Judaism is entirely due to the cowardice and materialism of the modern Jew. But this explanation, though plausible, is not true to all the facts of the case. Granted that a considerable number of defections from Judaism have been caused by materialism and moral cowardice, it is nevertheless absolutely untrue that all those Jews who abandoned Judaism were actuated by such unworthy motives. Were Börne, Heine, Lassalle, Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, the Disraelis, Jean de Bloch, Vambéry—to cite but a few out of a long list—cowards and materialists? To accuse all the hundreds and thousands who abandoned or neglected their religion of cowardice and materialism is nothing but a downright libel. I go further, and assert that in the matter of spiritual strength and moral courage nineteenth-century Jewry compares very favourably with the Jewries of the previous centuries. It is, therefore, wholly untrue and unjust to ascribe the decay of Judaism in the last century to the corruption of the Jews.

Another explanation attributes the cause of this decay to the nature of Judaism. Judaism, it is asserted, can only flourish in times of adversity.
The sun of prosperity causes it to fade and to wither. But this explanation, too, is false. The proposition on which it is based is refuted by the facts of history. The finest portions of the Bible were produced in times of national prosperity. The production of the Talmud—as distinguished from its redaction—took place in times of security. The great Hispano-Arabic school flourished in an age of Jewish freedom and affluence. Such was also the age of Rashi in France and Germany, of Luria and Isserles in Poland, of Berab and Caro in Turkey. No; Judaism, like other great intellectual movements, has always flourished only amidst liberty and prosperity. Oppression and poverty certainly stimulate piety and strictness of observance, but they also engender pietism, superstition, and bigotry. They stifle intellectual activity, which is the very life breath of Judaism. It follows that the nineteenth century in which Jews became free and prosperous should have been one of the golden periods in the history of Judaism, instead of an age of wholesale apostasy and decline.

What, then, is the true cause of this strange phenomenon? I answer that the cause is to be found in the nationalization of the modern State. The mediæval State, with all its tyranny and obscurantism, was yet by the nature of its oligarchic constitution tolerant of minorities. As distinguished from the mediæval Church, the mediæval State did not bother much about the
private life of its inhabitants. Its defective organization permitted both individuals and whole classes to live their life in their own way. Hence the mediæval State enabled the Jews to organize themselves on semi-national lines, and, as far as circumstances permitted, to create afresh in their Dispersion the national institutions and practices of their ancient commonwealth. Up to the French Revolution there existed throughout the Dispersion an insulated Jewish society, separate and distinct from its surroundings, in which Jews continued to live the old national and social life which they had inherited from their ancestors. But this has become an absolute impossibility in the modern State. The rise of democracy and the transference of the ultimate power of government from the oligarchy to the majority involve the practical suppression of weak minorities. The identification of the State with the culture and aspiration of a particular nationality leads inevitably to the crippling and gradual extinction of those classes who do not share that particular culture and those national aspirations. The State, moreover, enforces a system of education which is purposely designed to fashion and to mould all the inhabitants, both mentally and spiritually, after the type of the ruling nationality. It also maintains a thoroughgoing organization which embraces all the departments of the public and private life of all its inhabitants, irrespective of class, race, or tradition. There is, thus, no room in the modern State for Jewi
culture, for Jewish national life, or for a specifically Jewish society, with its own specific institutions, customs, and practices. Now, Judaism is essentially a national religion. It is the exclusive possession of one particular nation, and can only find its full expression and realization in the national life of the Jewish people. Every line in the Bible, Talmud, and the Liturgy testifies to this truth. Moreover, Judaism is a social religion. It requires the existence of social institutions and of a fully developed and complex social life to embody its spirit and afford opportunities for the practice of its teaching. The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Talmud deal chiefly with human life lived in a fully organized society, and with the duties of the individual as a member of such a society. Therefore, Judaism can live and work only within a specifically Jewish society and within a Jewish national organization. The mediæval ghetto, with all its narrowness, with all the unhealthy and abnormal conditions of its existence, yet contained such a semi-national Jewish society; therefore Judaism flourished in the mediæval ghetto. The modern State, on the other hand, has broken up that specifically Jewish society, and suppressed the separate and semi-national life of the Jew; therefore in the modern State Judaism languishes and decays.

It follows that the remedy to the malady of Judaism is very simple. We must re-create for it a Jewish national and social organism within
which it may live and thrive. And the stronger this organism, the more fully developed the national and social life of the Jew, the greater will be the vitality and power of Judaism. Now, it is obvious to every sensible person that the creation of such a specifically Jewish society can only be achieved in Palestine. Hence we assert that the future of Judaism depends entirely on the realization of the Zionist idea. Only a national settlement of the Jews in Palestine can save Judaism from decay and dissolution.

The work of creating a "Home" for Judaism in Palestine has now become a matter of extreme urgency. The War has destroyed the last traces of the declining Jewish society which had dragged on its feeble existence in the semi-mediaeval ghettos of Poland and Lithuania. With all their growing feebleness, these communities were yet the last refuge of Judaism in the Dispersion. In them there had still survived something of the old Jewish life, some of the old Jewish institutions, practices, and traditions. Those communities also supplied such vitality as they could afford to the attenuated and atrophied Judaism in the communities of the more modern States in Europe and America. With the destruction of these communities and the decimation and exile of their members, Judaism has been rendered entirely homeless. There is no doubt whatever that after the War Poland and Lithuania will become more thoroughly "Westernized"—i.e. nationalized and organized on the Western system.
The result will be that the new communities which will spring up in those lands out of the ruins of the old communities destroyed by the War will no more have the power to afford a home for Judaism, than the modernized communities of the West. The same applies to the communities which may be established by those Polish and Lithuanian Jews who have been exiled into the Central and Eastern provinces of Russia. Their Judaism will be of the same anaemic type which is characteristic of the communities established by the earlier and more fortunate exiles in England and America. The real Judaism, the Judaism of the Bible and Talmud, the Judaism of our fathers and their traditions, now expelled from its last refuge in the Dispersion, may before long die from exposure to the corroding influences of the alien atmosphere. The only way to save it is by bringing it back to its ancient home and to its own original and natural atmosphere in the Land of our Fathers.
The outstanding characteristic of modern Hebrew literature, as distinguished from the Hebrew literature of earlier periods, is its secular character. We must, indeed, accept the distinction between "religious" and "secular" with some caution when we are dealing with the literature of our own people. The Bible, for instance, obviously falls into the category of "religious" literature: yet some parts of it can scarcely have been intended by their writers to serve what we should call a religious purpose. The fact is that the Bible dates from an age in which there was no such clear-cut distinction between "religious" and "secular" as we habitually make—when religion was so omnipresent in men's lives that they had no conception of something outside it which had to be distinguished as "secular." It is only when men come to regard certain departments of life as having no direct relation to God that the distinction arises. It is therefore worth while to
remember that when we speak of the Bible as "religious" literature we are implying a distinction which in strictness applies not to the Bible itself, but only to our attitude towards it. But when we recognize this, the fact remains that from our standpoint both the Bible and the vast range of Hebrew literature that depends on it—in the form of commentary or homily or legal code or philosophical treatise or prayer—belong to the category of "religious" literature, because, while they touch many sides of life which we should call "secular," they are dominated throughout by what is from our modern point of view a "religious" as opposed to a "secular" conception—the conception, that is, of Israel as a people favoured with a special revelation of the Divine will, and charged with the duty of ordering its whole life in accordance with that will. And we are accordingly driven to describe as "secular" those departments of post-Biblical Hebrew literature in which human life, or some aspect of it, is treated without reference to that conception.

This "secular" Hebrew literature is almost entirely a modern growth, a thing of the last century and a half. It is true that in the so-called Spanish period (roughly the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries) there was a certain amount of Hebrew writing on secular subjects. Not only treatises on mathematics, science, and medicine, but also poems (including society verses, nature-poems, and even love-poems), epigrams and fables
were written in Hebrew. But the secular productions of that period were a sort of by-product; they were mostly the work of men whose main literary activity lay in what we should call the religious field. Judah Halevy, Ibn-Ezra, and Ibn-Gabirol—to take only three of the best-known names—wrote poems on non-religious subjects; but they all made their mark in Hebrew letters by commentaries or works on religious philosophy. And the secular poems of the Spanish period are, with few exceptions, too essentially of their own age to be of great interest, as literature, to the modern reader.

It is otherwise with the secular Hebrew literature of more recent years. This literature is not a by-product, thrown off, as it were, in odd moments by men whose main concern was with religious ideas or Jewish law. On the contrary, it is almost entirely the work of men who have had nothing to do with the development of Judaism as a religious system, and have in many cases been bitterly opposed to the Rabbinic Judaism in which they were brought up. Moreover, whereas the secular literature of the Spanish period was completely overshadowed by the religious literature, which then produced masterpieces such as no other period since the Dispersion can show, the rise of a secular literature in modern times has coincided with a very evident decay of creative power on the religious side. There has been no Hebrew writer of the first magnitude in the strict line of
religious and legal development since the Vilna Gaon, who died over a century ago; but it is just in this century that secular Hebrew literature has widened its scope, perfected its weapons and won for itself an assured place in the life of the people. And for us of the modern world it has the great merit of being modern. It may be—no doubt much of it is—ephemeral, in the sense that it will not achieve a permanent place in the national treasury. But if modern Hebrew literature belongs to an age, it at least belongs to our age. It deals with problems which are our problems; its mode of thinking is more or less our mode of thinking; its literary canons are more or less those with which we are familiar from our knowledge of other literatures. It has therefore a quite peculiar claim on our interest and attention.

There is no space in a brief article to deal with this literature in any detail: only a lightning sketch of its history is possible. It has its origin, for practical purposes, in the partial emergence of the Jews of Europe from the ghetto under the guidance of Moses Mendelssohn, about the middle of the eighteenth century. Mendelssohn's followers deliberately cultivated the use of Hebrew for secular purposes. But their writings had little originality or value; and in Germany, where the movement started, it was soon crushed out of existence by the stampede towards assimilation, which was one unexpected result of Mendelssohn's influence. The real importance of the Mendelssohnian Hebraists
lies in the fact that their example was followed in Galicia, and later in Russia. There, in the great centres of Jewish life, where assimilation on any large scale was impossible, secular Hebrew literature took firm root. It became in the main a literature of revolt against the accepted conventions of Jewish life. It seems odd, at first sight, that Hebrew of all languages should be the chosen medium of an attack on Rabbinic Judaism, which is indissolubly bound up with the Hebrew language, and without which Hebrew would have perished long ago except as a study of the philologist. But the explanation is simple. The general attitude of the ghetto and of the Rabbis towards non-Jewish (that is, non-religious) studies and ideas was one of hostility, born of a conviction that the admission of any light from without must lead to assimilation and ultimately to absorption. So men who had themselves attained some degree of modern culture, and wished their people to share it, saw that they must overthrow the opposition of the Rabbis. But they could only do this by spreading their anti-rabbinical ideas in a language understood by the people. Modern languages, which were unknown in the ghetto, were out of the question, and Yiddish was scarcely thought of as a literary medium. Hence the apostles of modern culture—the Maskilim as they were called—were driven to adopt Hebrew as their literary language. It must not be supposed, however, that their efforts were confined to polemic
or criticism. In the first half of the nineteenth century they produced a good deal in the way of poetry, popular science and history, and novels. The first novelist of distinction was Abraham Mapu (1808-67), who wrote three novels, one of them—the "Ahavath Zion"—of surpassing literary merit. Mapu wrote in a pure biblical style, and reproduced the biblical atmosphere in his romance with extraordinary fidelity. A young contemporary of his was Judah Leib Gordon (1831-92), the greatest of the Maskilim, whose poems display a richness of language, a vigour of style, and a satirical power which no Hebrew writer has equalled. By about 1860 the work of the Maskilim, in so far as their aim was critical and destructive, was accomplished: there was no need any longer to fight for the right of the Jew to share in the ideas of his age. The way had been paved for a more positive conception of the function of Hebrew literature and its relation to Jewish life. The transition to the new period is marked by Perez Smolenskin (1842-85), who first clearly enunciated the idea of a revival of the national language as essential to the true life of Judaism, and was in tendency, if not in actual phraseology, the precursor of what we now call Jewish nationalism. Smolenskin was a many-sided writer: quite apart from his political writings, he produced a number of realistic novels which are remarkable for their descriptive and narrative power. His most considerable achievement was the Hebrew
monthly Hashachar ("The Dawn"), which he founded and conducted for years under incredible difficulties. Hashachar did much to focus Hebrew literature on contemporary Jewish problems, and thus to give it the actuality which comes of contact with life. Smolenskin is also important for the development of Hebrew style, as his style is less imitative and more individual—and therefore more modern—than that of any earlier writer. After Smolenskin Hebrew literature becomes very definitely associated with the idea of the national revival. Indisputably the greatest names in this connection are those of Achad Ha'am in prose—the master of a style which is both perfectly Hebrew and perfectly modern—and Bialik in poetry. But there is a host of other writers—poets, novelists, essayists, feuilletonists and what not—who cannot be particularized in a brief summary; and a mere catalogue of their names would serve no purpose. It must suffice to say that at the present time Hebrew literature has firm roots in the life of the people, and that, though it has to struggle both against economic difficulties and against the excessive foreign influences to which it is exposed through the abnormal position of our people, its general level of achievement will stand comparison with that attained by other literatures of the present day.

It is obvious that this last phase of Hebrew literature implies a radically different conception of Jewish life, and of the relation of Hebrew to
that life, from that which had been almost universal between the time of the Dispersion and the nineteenth century. Its underlying idea is that there is, or should be, such a thing as Hebrew culture—that is to say, that it is, or should be, possible for the Jew to acquire through the medium of his own national language, and therefore in the atmosphere of his own national spirit, an acquaintance with life and its problems as wide as that which can be acquired from any other literature. But a national culture implies a nation living as such: and for this reason modern Hebrew literature is closely associated with the work that has been done during the last generation in laying the foundation of a new Hebrew life in Palestine. As a real literature must have an intimate relation to life, the literary revival and the national revival must stand or fall together; and it is in the continuance and progress of the national revival that the modern Hebrew movement has its surest guarantee of permanence. It is impossible at the moment to say what effect the calamity through which we are living will have on the actual national work hitherto done in Palestine. But the idea of the national revival will not die; and the literary movement which is a part of that idea will live with it. And it may be predicted that not merely the specifically nationalist and secular literature of modern times, but also our older religious literature, which is thrown aside by those who profess Judaism as a denationalized religion,
will be kept alive by the national idea. For modern Hebrew literature, though inspired largely by revolt against traditional Judaism, is none the less the modern counterpart—however inferior—of that ancient literature on which traditional Judaism rests; and it would be no more reasonable for a Jew who wished to know his national literature to read Achad Ha'am and neglect the Bible than it would be for a cultured Englishman to read Wells and neglect the English literature of the Elizabethan period. The more Jews come to regard Hebrew as their own language, and as a modern language, the more will they go back to "the well of Hebrew undefiled" for literary inspiration. And in that way we shall recover, as a people, the normal relation of a people to its language, not by abandoning, but by recovering the normal relation of a people to its past and to its future.
The Zionist Movement in England has always gone hand in hand with a cultural movement which has for its object the spread of a better understanding among Jews of Judaism and the Jewish people. There are some to whom Zionism has recommended itself chiefly because under present conditions Jewish culture can best be promoted under its ægis. It may be permitted, therefore, in a Zionist Miscellany to record a passing thought on a subject which appeals more directly to the Jewish culturist than to the Zionist as such—though the latter also cannot afford to neglect it—namely, on the materials at the command of the English reader for forming an adequate conception of Judaism. There are three books in the English language which, if properly used, can more than any other be of assistance to those who wish both to clarify their own conception of Judaism and to enter into the points of view of others whose conception is different. These three books have this peculiarity,
that, while each of them is highly valuable and instructive in itself, they are so curiously related that the reader can gain very much by studying them more or less in conjunction, and comparing the points of view and conceptions of Judaism which they exhibit. By doing this he will at the very least discover that Judaism is a very subtle and elusive thing, about which one ought not to dogmatize rashly.

The three books are Schechter’s “Studies in Judaism,” Achad Ha’am’s “Selected Essays” (translated by Leon Simon), and Herford’s “Pharisaism.” Each of these books could by itself provide the reader with a definite standpoint in Jewish matters, because it treats Judaism as something real and distinctive, as what may be called a live issue for the individual Jew; differing in this respect from such books as Graetz’s History and the Jewish Encyclopaedia, which treat Judaism as if it were purely an affair of clergymen and Rabbis. And when read in conjunction and co-ordinated they afford materials for acquiring a standpoint which is not only Jewish but detached, because they exhibit three distinctive conceptions of Judaism which are mutually complementary, and all of which should always be present to the mind of any one who desires to judge Jewish movements fairly and dispassionately.

A few words on each of the books will illustrate these remarks.

The distinctive feature of Judaism to Schechter
is its theology, its God-idea. The Jew to him is primarily the man who prays to the Jewish God, and the Jewish people is a family or tribe of such men. He finds in this phenomenon the thread of unity which runs through Jewish history, the connecting link between the Jewish present and past. He chooses from Jewish history the facts which illustrate this conception, and shows the influence which it has exercised over the Jewish mind and character. He does justice to the mystical element in the Jewish nature, and makes us think of Judaism chiefly as the concern of the heart.

When we turn from Schechter to Achad Ha'am, we find ourselves in a world which, though equally Jewish, is strangely different. The liturgy has shrunk far into the background, as a mere excrescence of Jewish activity, designed to pacify the vulgar; the impulses of the Jewish heart are disregarded, and our attention is directed exclusively to the work of the Jewish brain, as alone really worthy of the title Jewish. To Achad Ha'am the real Jew is the man who through the medium of the Hebrew language has acquired a Jewish national consciousness; and the Jewish people is the nation which in each age produces a literature expressive of the Jewish spirit. This is the nationalist conception of Judaism with which Zionism, as a practical movement, has allied itself most closely, and is accepted by most Zionists as authoritative.

Mr. Herford, again, sees the Jew in quite a different light, as a man who adheres to a certain
code of law which covers both his religious and his secular life, and to which he assigns Divine authority. He regards Judaism as being essentially a rule of conduct the sole purpose of which is to enable the Jew to distinguish right from wrong, permitted from forbidden, as a system of practice which, while it forms the character, does not of itself either warm the heart or enlighten the mind. This conception of Judaism may be called the ethical, and it gives us the key to the whole fabric of Jewish law.

Thus we have three conceptions of Judaism which differ so fundamentally that we might almost wonder why the same name is applied to all of them. According to the one, Judaism is entirely a matter of religious feeling, according to the second, of national feeling, and according to the third, of moral feeling. The truth is that Judaism in its entirety is an object with three distinct facets, only one of which can be surveyed adequately at a time. But that is no reason why the existence of the other two conceptions should be ignored or denied. The ideal in Judaism should be to effect a synthesis of the three views, and this can be done only by recognizing that each has its own root in the Jewish nature, and is able to bear fruit independently of the other two. In Zionist propaganda it is often too hastily assumed that it is the national feeling alone which makes the difference between a living and a lifeless Judaism. The same claim might with equal justice be put
forward on behalf both of the religious and the
moral feeling, and in fact it has been made on
behalf of the religious feeling by the Chassidim,
and of the moral feeling by the modern orthodox
school. Nationalism, mysticism, and orthodoxy are
all equally spontaneous expressions of the Jewish
spirit; to decry any one of them shows a certain
narrowness which can best be corrected by acquir-
ing a standpoint of greater detachment, and finding
room in one's conception of Judaism for elements
which may not appeal to one as an individual.
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ZIONISM AND JEWISH STUDENTS IN ENGLAND:
A STUDENT'S VIEW

BY
MAURICE SOLOMONS

Reviewing the Jewish educational activities in England of recent years, frank observers will agree that the one remarkable feature is the recurring prominence given to subjects dealing with Jewish history during the Diaspora. Taking little for granted, the younger generation have sought to know the ground they stand on, the road they travel, and the reason why. And they are not merely curious concerning the succession of events, but they are interested in the forces which have moulded the life of the various Jewries. These signs can easily be exaggerated, but emphasis may be allowed to indicate the growths which are germinating as a result of such activities. It is almost wholly to the rise of Zionism at the Universities that the changed outlook may be traced. It is at this point of Anglo-Jewishness that Zionism, with its aims and ideals and aspira-
tions, not infrequently has stepped into the breach formed by the scepticism of the adolescent. And it is from this potential source that the stimulus came to rivet attention upon the glorious past of the Jew. In place of complacent indifference, or, what is worse, false Anglicization, the proper value of the Jewish contribution to civilization is demonstrated, assigned, and appreciated. Just as the enthusiasm of the Jewish students at continental Universities launched Herzl into his epoch-making efforts, so, in like manner, has the brilliant Jewish coteries of English Universities—ever since the foundation of the Cambridge Tent of the Chovevi Zion in 1896—nurtured, by lecture, by pamphlet, and by book, the spirit which yearns for a renaissance of our nation. The trend of this intellectual influence may be adjudged from the observation of the historian Dubnow. "Jewish history," he says, "arouses in the Jew the desire to work unceasingly at the task of perfecting himself." If, then, history really is determined by states of mind, the influences to be prominent in the Anglo-Jewish records of the future can here be seen in formation. For the Universities, we must remember, are training the Jewish leaders of the next generation.

Another important development, and one of no less significance, is the revival of Hebrew in this country. Moved by the insistent question postulated by the fresh spirit of youth in ancient Israel, "When shall these dry bones revive?" the Hebrew language has become the symbol of the renewed
Jewish culture. In England the dispirited religious education of Jewry has claimed early attention. Classes for the teaching of Hebrew by the modern method of I'brith b' I'brith have, in spite of difficulties, won the support of a slowly increasing circle of adherents. And the Hebrew schools now begin to turn with eager desire to use the new method, whenever the teacher is available. And a further honour may rightly be claimed by Zionist influences. This consists in the creation of a Talmud Torah for girls for the presentation of Hebrew literature and Hebrew life by means of Hebrew to the future mothers of Anglo-Jewry. Here new ground is being tilled, a field of education ignored hitherto as a consequence of mediæval Jewish conceptions of womankind. Thus for the Jewish boy and girl alike the revival of Hebrew will be once again the "source from which instruction, solace, and inspiration will flow."

The favoured portion of the community, while treating the new suggestions for Hebrew education with the suspicion they deemed worthy of anything bred by "those dreamers of Zion," had awakened nevertheless to the inroads made on the younger generation of the poor by evil influences of the environment. But this awakening, to the future Anglo-Jewish historian, will savour rather of the cry for a cure while the policy of prevention is neglected. Still, mere declamation must and shall make way for constructive measures.
And the impulse towards these measures, as well as the duty of providing teachers of living Hebrew, will devolve upon the Zionists of England. But the condition precedent to effective action is a frank and practical recognition by those in Anglo-Jewry who mean to preserve the historic and imperishable ideals of the Jewish people, of the value of the work of those who mean to sustain their definite religious, moral, and philosophical ideals with the spiritual steadfastness which has formed the epic of Jewish history.
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ZIONISM AND JUDAISM

BY

F. S. SPIERS, B.Sc.

ZIONISM and Judaism, properly understood, are two different aspects of the life of the Jewish people—aspects which are, however, so intimately connected that one without the other, if not entirely without meaning, is certainly bereft of its true significance. It is only failure to grasp the full meaning of the terms Zionism and Judaism that has led to the fallacy that either can, in the long run, exist without the other. Zionism, for example, has been identified with the Basle programme, and has therefore been regarded as nothing but a political movement for ameliorating the lot of those Jews who suffer persecution or disability. Judaism, on the other hand, has been looked upon merely as a "religion" imposing certain beliefs and rites on sections of Englishmen, Americans, Russians, or Germans, as the case may be, turning them into Englishmen or others of the Jewish persuasion. Both of these views are fallacious. The first because it confuses the
means with the end, and fails to understand what the end really is; the second because it is based upon a false analogy between Judaism and the various forms of Christianity. Now, Zionism would exist even if anti-Semitism and Pales of Settlement were to disappear to-morrow, because it stands for something inherent in the very nature of the Jewish people—namely, its unity, its common origin and history, its common group-consciousness, its aspirations and ideals. But Zionism is not only an idea. It is an idea in action; it is the attempt to translate the ideal unity of the Jewish people into a real unity, centred in the soil of Palestine. Zionism, then, is founded, first, on the fact of the existence of a group of persons whose common history entitles them to be called a people, and, secondly, on the fact that this group of persons possesses common ideals and a common outlook on life—in a word, a national soul, in virtue of which it is in truth a people, not a horde. These are fundamental facts, independent alike of material conditions and political vicissitudes, and it is on these facts that Zionism is founded. The facts themselves anti-Semitism and persecution have neither created nor do they affect, although the consciousness of them, and hence the part they play in directing the course of Jewish activities, may be greatly influenced by external conditions. Zionism, then, recognizing that the Jews form a people, would infuse once again into their national life that vitality to express
the whole of itself in a wholly Jewish way which can only come from a living national centre rooted in the one spot on earth towards which Jews in every corner of the Diaspora would willingly turn for guidance, light, and inspiration. But this, the Jewish national life expressing itself in its own way, is nothing but Judaism; for Judaism is the way of life of the Jewish people, so long as that life is truly itself—the expression in life of the Jewish spirit. Zionism and Judaism are therefore inseparable, as inseparable as framework and content, material and form.

But if Judaism is not just adherence to a creed, but adherence to a life, and if religion, in the Jewish sense, is not merely some mystical activity essential for "salvation" superimposed upon a life already more or less complete without it, yet the ultimate foundation on which Jewish life rests is essentially a religious foundation, for it is nothing less than a peculiar and characteristic conception of God. Other forms of thought have arrived at a conception of God by a process of induction, running back, like the ancient Greeks or the deists from Nature to an underlying unity behind it, or, like modern theism, from man's moral consciousness to a Power behind which makes for righteousness, or, like Christianity, from the yearning of the individual soul for communion with a Beyond. It is the peculiar character of Judaism that it begins where these forms of thought end. God is not the end, He is the beginning, of all
things; He is not the perfected image of the power of Nature or the excellence of man or the human soul; He is the Absolute Reality on whom all things are based, in whom all ethical qualities find their perfect embodiment. The Jewish people have realized the existence and the reality of these qualities and their ultimate seat in God more clearly than have any other people, and Judaism, which is their way of life, expresses in every activity of the individual and the nation the striving towards Divine truth and perfection. This upward struggle is what Judaism calls "holiness," and the consciousness of it as the national life-force is a thing unique among the nations of the earth. Jewish life, with the basic ideals of holiness, truth, and justice as its national values, expresses, symbolizes, and perpetuates these ideals as a type of excellence for man to follow, as an immortal reminder to the world of spiritual values, and as a never-silent protest against power and utility as ends in themselves in the march of human progress. But Jewish life, and therefore Judaism, is bound up with the existence of the Jewish people, and it can only find its fullest expression in a free national life in the land which gave it birth and in the language which alone has revealed and can reveal its meaning. Without Palestine, to live Judaism and nothing but Judaism is to live a restricted, partial, even a stunted, life, for it must perforce lack some of the larger elements that only freedom of growth on its own soil can pro-
duce. To go outside this restricted life—without Palestine—and live the larger life has only led, in the end, to yielding to the powerful attractions of other modes of life and other cultures, in a word, to assimilation. Only that Judaism will be a reality, shaping itself once again to embrace every phase of existence, enriched by the best it has absorbed from outside during all these centuries of exile, but yet working itself out in its own way unimpeded; only that Judaism will become a vital force in humanity’s struggle for betterment, which is centred again at its ancient fount of inspiration in that Zion exalted above the hills to which all nations shall flow, to see there established a people unified, not by power and not by might, not by blood and not by iron, but by the eternal Spirit which works for righteousness.
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THE FUTURE OF ZIONISM

BY

LEONARD STEIN, B.A.

It is a paradox of the present situation that it at once offers Zionists unique opportunities and threatens them with imminent disaster. The difficulties they have to face are sufficiently apparent. The times are not propitious for international movements; and Zionism is, in the conventional sense, essentially international. The ties which bind Jew to Jew are not, indeed, those of a voluntary association for a specific purpose. They are organic, and they are therefore durable. The corporate existence of the Jewish people is not in issue. But corporate existence is one thing: co-operative effort—and that effort directed, as it seems to many minds, to an end not without political significance—is quite another. International friction stopping far short of war was sufficient to menace very gravely the unity of the Alliance Israélite. The passions that have now been excited are incomparably more violent and more widely shared. The national character of
the Zionist movement is doubtless more clearly marked than was ever that of the Alliance; but Zionists can, no more than other Jews, claim the best of both worlds or ignore the new obligations and emotions which the attainment of citizenship in the Dispersion necessarily and properly implied.

In such circumstances, it is not to be supposed that the Jew, in his capacity of English, French, or German citizen, will be free from a certain sense of restraint—to put it no higher—in entering into relations with those who, Jews though they be, were yesterday the armed enemies of his country in a struggle of exceptional bitterness. Not only so, but apart altogether from his external relations, his own spiritual composition will tend to undergo a certain readjustment. The emotions in which he is being steeped are not Jewish emotions. He shares them, not with his fellow-Jews, but with his English, French, or German fellow-citizens; and however honestly he may endeavour to preserve a balance at all times somewhat precarious, the Jewish scale will inevitably be weighed down.

These spiritual difficulties, subtle and impalpable as they are, have yet a profound significance for the Zionists of Western Europe. But over and above them are material difficulties of a most formidable kind. Throughout a considerable area organized Jewish life has been uprooted. Masses of Jews in Eastern Europe, by disposition and force of circumstance the natural recruiting ground
of Zionism, have been reduced to the level of bare subsistence. A very large and energetic body of Zionists has been rendered incapable for some time to come of offering the Movement either moral stimulus or material support. And it is precisely at this, the most critical moment in its history, that Zionism has had to see its laboriously constructed organization reduced to a condition labouring on collapse. No Congress can meet; no leadership can be looked for in the accustomed quarters; no active propaganda can be conducted. We have to face, not only difficulties in themselves exceptional but the dislocation of our machinery for meeting them.

Yet if our difficulties are exceptional, so also are our opportunities. There was never a time when prompt and resolute action at the opportune moment was more likely to be fruitful. A current of Nationalist opinion has set in. Its force is variable and dependent in some degree on the political constellations; it is even capable, if corruptly directed, of being turned to the detriment of the Jewish cause; but it is at least strong enough and genuine enough to ensure the Zionist claim a sympathetic hearing. Here is a people whose potentialities are undoubted, whose traditions are peculiarly august, whose dissolution would be an acknowledged calamity. Its petition is not extravagant. It indulges no territorial megalomania. It contemplates no denial of its existing obligations. All it asks is an opportunity, how-
ever modest, for the free flowering of its spirit on congenial soil. Whatever the hostility to which we are subject, there is yet a vast fund of latent sympathy to which such a claim can still make an irresistible appeal. Nor is there any reason why the political constellations should be other than favourable. It may be, indeed, that when the time for a settlement arrives, an exhausted world will refuse to harass itself with any problems that may be temporarily evaded. But that is not, it may reasonably be hoped, the mood that will predominate. The idea with which such an upheaval as the present impresses an active and imaginative mind is that of reconstruction. A new beginning has to be made. The elements of our society are in solution; and from the slave of the past, statesmanship becomes, for the moment and within limits, the arbiter of the future. If that is the atmosphere in which we move at the conclusion of the War, an attempt to rectify the Jewish position may well appear by no means inopportune or unwelcome. And if the Jews need Palestine, it is conceivable that with every allowance for the very substantial claims of other interested parties, Palestine may be found to need the Jews. The course of events may well render the question of its future, not a gratuitous addition to the cares of statesmen, but a matter of substance and urgency. The fault will be largely our own if in such circumstances the Zionist programme does not secure powerful support in influential quarters.
If that be even partially true, it is imperative that the Movement should be in a position to present its case in an authoritative form immediately the time for a settlement arrives. The difficulties in which it is entangled cannot be left to resolve themselves at leisure. It must face them here and now, if it is not to find itself impotent and voiceless at the critical moment. Of one thing it may be assured: it will not be so much as listened to unless it is in earnest both in fact and in appearance. It must speak through responsible representatives, and there must be solid ground for belief in their representative character. It is impossible to transact affairs with a mixed multitude; it is idle to transact them with individuals springing no one knows whence, and in a position to answer for no one knows whom. It may be that propaganda on the conventional lines would—in the belligerent countries at least—be at the moment inopportune; it may well be that public opinion at large is ill disposed to trifle with sentimental irrelevancies; it may even be that circumstances require the active conduct of the Movement to pass for the time being out of the hands of those who have hitherto controlled it. It is only the more necessary to keep alive by such methods as are still legitimate (and they are not a few) the flickering flame of Jewish aspiration, to bring home to the great mass of intelligent opinion the genuine interest and importance of the Zionist purpose, to seek for leadership
wherever the course of events suggests that it may be found, even though it be outside organized Zionism or outside Europe. There are difficulties inherent in the present situation which will yield to no treatment; but there are inherent in it also opportunities from which a policy of drift that fails to provide for the presentation at the proper time of an audible and intelligible and disciplined Jewish demand will derive no advantage.
I will examine briefly the principal objections which have been raised against Zionism on the ground of supposed difficulties as to the practical realization of its aims; and I will endeavour to show how these objections appear in the light of our experience in Palestine. I hope in this way to prove that these objections do not bear the test of an impartial examination, and at the same time I shall perhaps be able to convey a general impression of the very valuable work which has already been done by the Jews in that country.

Political economists pretend that, whereas it is relatively easy for country people to adapt themselves to town life, the adverse process—that is to say, the passage from urban to rural life—is a difficult and quasi-impossible achievement. Based on this statement critics of Zionism say that the Jews, who are accustomed to a mode of life essentially urban and commercial, will not adapt
themselves to the very different conditions of agricultural life. This argument has received some appearance of justification through the rather unhappy results of various colonizing experiments which have been made in the Argentine, Brazil, and the United States. But in all these countries there does not exist between the newly established Jewish farmer and his land that profound attachment which will enable him to resist victoriously the inevitable hardships of the first few years. Experience shows that in these countries, as everywhere in the Galuth, the initial enthusiasm does not endure, and at the first serious reverse the farmer throws away his implements and goes back to the town. In Palestine things are quite different. There the colonist is attached to the land by an invisible but remarkably strong bond: the obscure sentiment of relationship, a certain instinctive sense of personal responsibility regarding the future development of the country. In Palestine the Jew sticks to his land in the same way and better even than any farmer in any other country. When Turkey entered the War, in October 1914, the Turkish authorities gave the Jews belonging to enemy nations the option either to become Ottoman subjects or else to leave the country. Many Jews, inhabitants of the towns and agricultural labourers, left the country; but not one colonist was among these refugees. During the spring and summer 1915 locusts devastated the plantations, destroying in certain
villages unto the last leaves of orange-groves and vineyards, but with even more courage and love than before the farmer goes on working. And if the colonists who have come to Palestine have learned to love their old-new country, the children born there are already completely adapted to the sober and rustic life of the land.

As regards the technical qualities of the Jews as farmers, they have shown themselves in Palestine equal to the most progressive farmers of advanced agricultural countries. It is even interesting to note that in Palestine it is precisely in agriculture more than in any other field of activity that the Jews have proved successful. One needs only to compare the fields and plantations of the Jews with those of the surrounding Arabs. In that country, where fodder, and consequently cattle and manure, are scarce, the Arabs have since time immemorial practised a system of cultivation which has considerably impoverished the soil; accordingly the yieldings of their crops are very poor. Thanks to the skilful use of artificial manure and other technical improvements, the Jews have not only succeeded in greatly ameliorating the productive qualities of their lands, but they have effectively increased the average output of the various kinds of plants cultivated. With the Arabs the cereals (wheat and barley) yield an average gross produce of about £1 per acre; in the better Jewish colonies the fields yield up to £3 and more. In Arab orange-groves 350 cases
of oranges per acre are considered as being a very good average crop; Jewish orange-groves, as a rule, yield about 40-50 per cent. more, and in the last year before the War one of the more important Jewish orange-groves gave a crop of 757 cases per acre—that is, more than double the Arab yield. In the course of the last few years Arab landowners have repeatedly made appeal to the skill of Jewish agricultural labourers for the creation of new plantations and for the pruning and grafting of their fruit-trees. Instead of the primitive chain-pumps used by the Arabs, and which are driven by a mule or a camel, the Jews have introduced in Palestine, for irrigation purposes, modern oil or gas motors; and near the River Audja, not far from the colony of Petach Tikvah, a Jewish company created in 1913 great waterworks, distributing to the surrounding farmers the necessary water for irrigation against payment of a tax of so much per acre.

These few instances will show that the Jews are capable of becoming not only good but really first-class farmers. Of course, there will always be a certain number of individuals who do not adapt themselves so easily; in fact, among all the people who come to Palestine there is a spontaneous process of natural selection going on: those who are fit for country life remain in the colonies, the other ones go into the towns. And this is as it should be, because no country can live exclusively from agriculture; in Palestine, as
in any other country of the world, we need also manufacturers and merchants.

Our critics say: "The Jews will never live in harmony together." Any person who has visited the Jewish colonies in Palestine will bear testimony to the contrary. I have travelled far over the world, I know Jewish communities in four continents, but I have nowhere seen Jewish solidarity, altruism, and discipline developed to so high a level as in Palestine.

Our critics say: "The Jews are bad organizers." A priori, is it possible to admit that people whom a whole world accuses of being characterized by a frame of mind especially commercial, is it possible to admit that these same people are bad organizers? Can a man be a successful business man and yet be devoid of the necessary talent for organization? I do not think so. Besides, in Palestine facts prove the contrary. We have co-operative societies for the purchase of all kinds of raw materials, manures, and instruments, and for the sale of our wines, oranges, and almonds. We have more than fifty co-operative credit societies. We have brought back from southern Arabia to Palestine thousands of Yemenite Jews, whose labour represents a very valuable factor in our agricultural work. We have started home industries, agricultural schools, and experimental farms, and many ordinary schools of various degrees. Is this to be called lack of organizing abilities?
Our critics say: "The Jews are bad administrators." At first sight it might seem difficult to contradict this statement, as it is true that for the last two thousand years there has been no Jewish country to administer. But Jews have helped to administer other peoples' countries; and if we look into the history of the greatest nations do we not find many Jews among their most prominent personalities? And I maintain that in Palestine the Jews have done some excellent administrative work. They have built very good roads where they needed them, and often in the face of the strongest opposition on the part of the local authorities. They have provided all their colonies with adequate water-distributing plants. They are waging war against the various diseases and parasites of their crops, according to the best prescriptions of modern science. The Jewish Agricultural Experiment Station is doing some excellent scientific and practical work. The Jews have built at the gates of old Jaffa a new townlet called "Tel Aviv" (the Hill of Spring), which is a true object-lesson of European cleanliness and hygiene, and they are engaged in building other garden cities of the same kind near Jaffa, Jerusalem, and Tiberias. They have drained marshes and transformed into habitable and even prosperous localities places where twenty years ago malaria fever in its gravest forms used to exact a heavy toll of human lives; the Arabs recognize this beneficent activity of the Jewish colonists, and to
the eucalyptus-tree, whose cultivation has been introduced into Palestine by the Jews and which renders such signal services in the drying up of the marshes, the Arabs have given the name of "Sedjer-al-Yahud" ("the Tree of the Jews"). Is all this bad administration? Besides, all our colonies are enjoying the fullest local administrative autonomy. The council of the colony frames laws, prescribes and collects the taxes, controls the schools, supervises the medical and pharmaceutical services, organizes the service of rural police and verifies its work, and so on. I am a member of the council of one of the largest colonies, and I can state that all the departments of our administrative work are as well organized, with due regard to our financial means, of course, as in any European borough council.

Our critics say: "Supposing even that the Jews are good organizers and administrators, Palestine is not able to support the twelve or thirteen millions of Jews existing to-day." Well, nobody has ever dreamt of a return of all the Jews of the whole world to Palestine. Do all Britishers live in Great Britain? Or all Greeks and Italians in Greece and Italy? Greece and Italy are utterly unable to feed all the members of the Greek and Italian nations, and millions of individuals of these peoples are living abroad. Do we not see millions of Germans living in foreign countries, and not only maintaining the closest relationship with the Mother Country, but all of them strongly united
as soon as that country or one or other of their widely dispersed communities are in danger? The living symbol and the most effective stimulus of their solidarity is their common Mother Country.

But let us return to the question of the number of people which Palestine could support. It is difficult to give definite numbers. To-day the country is poor and the population scarce, because all through the Middle Ages the fields have periodically been laid waste by warring armies and by pillaging expeditions of Bedouins from the borders of the Syrian and Arabian deserts, and because the true children of the land, those who would have cared for it, were exiles in distant lands. The inherent qualities of the land have not changed. In order to estimate the number of people whom Palestine could support we can only judge by the past and by the natural resources and the economical situation of the country. To-day Palestine has only about 700,000 inhabitants; but the great geographer Reclus estimates that in ancient times the population was six to seven times, and the late Colonel Conder says ten times, greater. As to the natural resources of the country, they are undoubtedly very great, from the agricultural as well as from the industrial and commercial points of view. Thanks to its great diversity of soils and climates, Palestine lends itself to the cultivation of all sorts of plants: cereals and fruit-trees, and industrial crops, such as cotton, sugar-cane, beetroot, rice, maize, and many others.
The soil of Palestine contains great mineral riches: asphalt and phosphates, coal and petroleum; and the waters of the Dead Sea are rich in valuable chemicals, such as salts of potassium, and bromine. Numerous rivers keep in store enormous quantities of energy which might profitably be utilized for the production of electricity. Concerning the commercial possibilities of the country, I will only recall the great importance of Palestine as a link between the three continents (Europe, Asia, and Africa), its situation between the Bagdad Railway and the Suez Canal, between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. We learn from the Bible that King Solomon built his great fortresses all along the great international caravan routes which led from Persia and Babylonia towards Egypt through Palestine, and that the rich trading caravans were obliged to pay certain duties for the right of passage through his dominions. It is not to be doubted that Palestine, so favourably situated at the most important junction of the world's most important commercial highways, may, if skilfully administered, look upon a very prosperous future.

I think, in the light of concrete facts taken from our experience in the country, that the principal arguments against the practical feasibility of the Zionist plans are, if I may say so, theoretical "book arguments," which are effectively contradicted by practical experience in Palestine. The human material at our disposal is good, and so
is the land; the economic atmosphere is favourable; there remains only the question of the political conditions of the country, which are far from satisfactory to-day. We do not ask, as ill-informed people believe, the creation of an independent Jewish State. What we ask is the establishment, in Palestine, of an honest administration whose only object must be the development and progress of the country. We do not ask for a Jewish but for a pro-Jewish administration, not for a Jewish but a pro-Jewish policy. We want the right of free immigration into the country, and civil and political rights equal with those of the other inhabitants. If these our demands are granted, we shall soon be numerous enough and shall render the country such services as will justify a more and more influential share in the framing of the country's destinies.

I think these our demands are very modest, and that we ask nothing that is not absolutely fair and just. Still, the circumstances are such that probably our demands will meet some chance of success only if those who will be entrusted with officially presenting them are backed by a sufficient majority of the Jewish people throughout the world. In view of the justice of our cause, I think that no Jew, whatever may be his religious, philosophical, or political views, can refuse to join us in our efforts and to give his whole-hearted support to our reasonable demands.
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ZIONISM AND THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALITY IN EUROPE

BY

A. WEINER, M.A.

The two dominating factors of the world's history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been nationality and democracy. Nationality maintains the claims of all those who are united either geographically or by community of language, descent, religious beliefs and practices, history, or their contributions to the civilizing forces of the world to live their own lives, to pursue their own ideals, to march towards their own goal along the paths indicated by their own historic culture. Democracy is equally emphatic in its assertion of the right of the people to control their own destinies, unrestricted by the privileges or monopolies of any section or class.

If the Declaration of the Rights of Man by the National Assembly heralded the age of Democracy, the doctrine of Nationality found its most effective expression in the efforts of the European peoples to shake themselves free from
the military despotism of Napoleon. When "the greatest, nor the worst of men" fell before the embattled nations, the monarchs whose necks had been his footstool and their reactionary ministers endeavoured to stem the flowing tide of nationality and subject it to the effete principles of the Holy Alliance. But the eternal forces that mould the destinies of nations were, happily, beyond their control.

The first nation to raise the standard of revolt was the Greek. For hundreds of years Greece had groaned beneath the iron heel of an oppressor, alien in blood, in language, in creed. With the assistance of England, France, and Russia the Greeks shook off the yoke of the hated Turk and took their place among the independent peoples of Europe.

This gaping rent in the paper walls of Metternich's system of "legitimism" was soon followed by others. The French Revolution of 1830 added another nail in the coffin of the system of Vienna. France also broke with "legitimism," the alliance of thrones was dissolved, and the nations again opposed their rights to those of the dynasties. The Spanish colonies of South and Central America had already cut themselves adrift from the Mother Country and embarked upon a new career as independent nationalities. Belgium, linked in an unwilling partnership with Holland, found inspiration in their example, and in 1833 the Kingdom of the Netherlands made way for the separate King-
doms of Belgium and Holland, each of which has since shown the fertilizing effects of national independence in the splendid contributions each has made to literature, art, theoretical and applied science, and social reform.

From now onwards Europe was in a continual ferment. The centripetal forces of the sentiment of nationality had been vitalized, the torn fragments of every nation, the pawns of every diplomatic game, sought their common centre. Slowly but irresistibly Italy and Germany, hitherto but geographical expressions, marched along the road to unity. Under the impetus of the same sentiment, Hungary made a heroic but, as events proved, futile effort to free itself from that Old Man of the Sea, the anachronism of the age, the Habsburg dynasty.

But why prolong the story? It will be sufficient for my purpose merely to enumerate the European peoples that have successfully established their rights. In the Balkans, Serbs, Roumanians, Bulgarians, and Montenegrins, following the example of their Greek neighbours, finally secured their freedom, ending their agelong subjection to the Turk amid the general acclamations of the civilized world. More recently, Norway severed the diplomatic chains that had bound it to Sweden. Bohemia, though not yet free, has witnessed a national renaissance that must sooner or later end triumphantly. Irish nationality has dominated English politics for more than two generations,
and its aspirations are about to be consummated in the grant of Home Rule. The Poles, whose country was partitioned by their unscrupulous neighbours, are passing through the ordeal of fire that will indubitably lead to a glorious resurrection and the realization of their national hopes in the near future. The Yugoslavs of Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina have acquired, by their ceaseless struggle against German and Magyar rule, a right to national freedom which thoughtful men have long since acknowledged and which politicians will no longer be able to deny. The Finns, in their attempt to preserve their national identity, have found sympathizers among all classes of society throughout the world. Even the most completely denationalized peoples, such as the Welsh, the Basques, the Bretons, the Catalans, the Ukrainians, Georgians, Circassians, Armenians, etc., are successfully battling to retain whatever elements of nationality the corroding tooth of Time has left them.

In the face of all these national movements the question of the influence they have had upon the Jews, and the attitude the Jews have adopted towards them, naturally presents itself. For them the French Revolution of 1789, which had preceded and announced the revival of nationalities, had raised hopes which for the most have not been realized. Political emancipation—i.e. the removal of the civil disabilities handed down to the modern world by the Middle Ages, welcomed with
enthusiastic delight by the intellectual leaders of Jewry, no less than by the masses, as the panacea that would cure its secular wounds—has proved a hollow mockery. Hardly anywhere have its early promises been fulfilled. The ink of the Constitutions that guaranteed to the Jews full rights of citizenship was scarcely dry before the gaunt spectre of anti-Semitism made its appearance, and ways and means were found, especially in Central Europe, to filch from them their equality but so recently acquired. Like Sir Perceval, the Jews "ate the goodly apples," but "all these things at once fell into dust," and they have been "left alone, and thirsting, in a land of sand and thorns." Where the hopes built upon emancipation have been even partially fulfilled, as in France, England, and Italy, it has become an ignis fatuus, leading with sure and unmistakable steps into the Serbonian bog of assimilation. Half the Jewish nation have not even tasted the bitter-sweet fruit, and are dragging the heavy chains of oppression in the lands of bondage—Russia and Roumania.

Yet the Jews, in almost every land of the Diaspora where they dwell in considerable numbers, always among the foremost of those who catch the vivifying breath of new ideas, have been in the forefront of the national battles, whether waged against foreign tyranny, domestic despotism, or in the interests of national unification. In Germany alone the pens and voices of Ludwig Börne, Heinrich Heine, Riesser, Ganz,
Ferdinand Lassalle, Moses Hess, Karl Marx, Ignaz Kuranda, and John Jacoby, as well as a host of lesser men, have contributed their quota to all the struggles that helped to unite the nation. In France, in Austria-Hungary, in Italy, Jews took their place by the side of their fellow-citizens and fought against all the storms that threatened to overwhelm them. Even in Russia nameless masses of Jews have striven to the utmost limit of their opportunity to assist the Liberal and Progressive parties that have battled in an unequal warfare with the autocracy for the removal of its worst abuses. They have expended their blood in abundant profusion to acquire for the subject nationalities, as well as for the Russians themselves, reforms long overdue, some measure of self-government that should clean the Augean stables of bureaucratic corruption and set the numerous peoples of the Russian Empire upon the road of liberty along which the more enlightened nations of the West have long since travelled.

It would be inconceivable that Jews dwelling in an environment of living, pulsating nationalism, too often, alas! the unfortunate victims of its unnatural and misshapen offspring, chauvinism, should not have caught something of its better spirit. Moreover, in the long-drawn tragedy of the history of the Jews nationalism has never really died. For what is nationalism other than racial self-consciousness, than the pursuit of racial ideals? And what people has displayed this self-conscious-
ness, this social idealism, in a more constant, insistent, and persistent form than the Jews? From the dawn of their history, from the first call of Abraham down to the most recent martyr for the faith of his fathers, what Jew worthy of the name has ever forgotten that the fulfilment of the special functions entrusted to his people by Divine ordinance depends upon his retaining his distinct and peculiar racial qualities?

Throughout the long, gloomy night of the Dark Ages this nationalism, expressed in the passionate outpourings of the soul by the liturgical poets, the yearning for the return to the ancestral home was never for a moment allowed to suffer eclipse. It was the bright star in the dark heavens that surrounded the prison walls of the ghetto. But it remained no more than a pious dream, a vague longing based upon the Messianic prophecies. Few attempts of a serious practical character were made to bring it about. Not until the nineteenth century did the Jew, in perpetual contact with the nationalist strivings and achievements of his Christian neighbours, attempt to translate his dreams into action. The first to be galvanized into life were the "intellectuals." It was the most completely occidentalized Jews, those most thoroughly imbued with the spirit of their environment, who were the first to awaken from the torpor into which they had been lulled by the principles of 1789. Modern Zionism found its earliest apostles among the Jewish students in the univer-
sities. Nor had they long to wait for the Jewish masses to follow their lead. The toiling millions in the ghettos of both hemispheres saw in it a new hope of redemption from the ceaseless, profitless, body and soul killing grind of the factory and the workshop. Thus was Zionism brought into harmony with the other national movements of the age. It became, and has remained, essentially and fundamentally, democratic. It derives its strength from no other source than the people, from a people conscious of its dignity, its splendid past, justly proud of its priceless contributions to the moral vision of the world, fully cognizant of its capacity to live again a national life, and weary of being a wanderer among the nations of the earth, barely tolerated, rarely treated in accordance with the dictates of justice, seldom welcomed as an equal anywhere.

A true instinct has once again guided the people aright in its choice. Only in the land of their fathers did they see the prospect of a new life, a rejuvenation of a people too long divorced from the fructifying influences of a free and independent existence. Intellectual and proletarian, both alike recognized that only in the free atmosphere of autonomous nationality can the Hebrew ideal find the necessary conditions for its unfettered expression and expansion.

Nationality is an eternal force, indestructible as matter, and nations which form the concrete embodiment of this force are predestined to attain
the common ends of humanity by the special means of their individual genius. This nationalism, when truest to itself, is in no way antagonistic to the claims of other nationalities, nor hostile to the universalistic aspirations of all those who look forward to the day when all nations shall form a corporate brotherhood. A people like the Jews, nurtured upon the prophecies of Isaiah and the whole prophetic host of Israel, which has already given of its best to the world, does not seek to exalt itself at the expense of its neighbours. Conquests and annexations are not among its creeds, nor the subjection of others among its dogmas. Its domination has been and can only be that of the spirit. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Inspired by its history, its literature, and above all, its liturgy, the Jewish people has found in modern Zionism the truest expression, stated in the terminology of current political philosophy and contemporary politics, of its claims to its birthright—a home in its ancient home. Palestine, the cradle of Judaism, is to become once again the cradle of the Jew, where he may again grow into adolescence to take his place as a freeman among the freemen of the world. This is the lesson that Zionism has extracted from the history of the last hundred years, history in the higher sense, the past which still lies actively in the consciousness of mankind and helps him to mould his future destinies.
The "Judenstaat" of Herzl is a book that will always live—if only a museum-life—because it is associated with the noblest figure and preluded the most important movement in modern Jewish history. There are books which, like Rousseau's "Contrat Social," live by their effect upon the world. Herzl's "Judenstaat" will live by its effect upon Herzl. Its influence upon Judæa was insignificant, even in its first freshness, and it is already obsolete. What inspired Jewry to action was Herzl the man, and what inspired Herzl to action was Herzl's book. He wrote it purely as a pamphleteer, the publicist who appeals to the men of action, and whose work is done when the last proofs have gone back to the printer; but he was the only man of action whom it kindled. It discovered him to himself, it led him on to leadership. Without Herzl there would have been no Zionist movement, but also without the "Judenstaat" there would
have been no Herzl. Hence the historic interest of this book.

But if without the "Judenstaat" there would have been no Herzl—in any Jewish sense—without "Freiland" there would have been no "Judenstaat." For, a few years before Dr. Theodor Herzl wrote the "Judenstaat," Dr. Theodor Hertzka had published "Freiland: ein sociales Zukunftsbild," a picture of an ideal republic which caused considerable stir throughout Austria and Germany, and even called into being local groups to form an International Freeland Society. The coincidence between Dr. Theodor Herzl and Dr. Theodor Hertzka was not limited to their names. Both were Viennese, both were Jews, both were on the staff of the Neue Freie Presse. Dr. Hertzka was economic editor, Dr. Herzl was Paris correspondent. The Dreyfus case came to accentuate the stimulus of Hertzka's book on Herzl's soul, and it was in the Hôtel de Castile of Paris at the height of the Dreyfus agitation that Herzl, in a fever of prophetic exaltation, poured out his "Judenstaat," with its call to the Jews to organize themselves for emigration from Europe to some Jewish territory. It is an abstract Territorialism, devoid not only of relation to history, but also to reality, based not on any observed or possible movement of emigration, but on pure fantasy, and containing no indication of how either of the alternative territories—Palestine or Argentina, neither of which was in the market—was to be acquired. The scene of
the Utopia or Atlantis of Dr. Hertzka was British East Africa, and the long arm of coincidence which clasped these two dreamers actually brought it about that British East Africa—the so-called Uganda of the Zionists—was the region in which Dr. Herzl was invited by the British Government to set up his Jewish Colony. History, it would seem, copied Hertzka no less than Herzl copied him.

_Habent sua fata libelli._ And if, despite their parade of finance and economics, the authors of "Freiland" and the "Judenstaat" were both equally ideologues, equally dreamers of the ghetto, equally unreal simplifiers of the tragic complex of life, equally enthusiastic glorifiers of the possibilities of our miserable humanity, equally taken in by the specious show of civilization and culture which is the mere veneer of Christendom, neither nevertheless was destined to sow a barren seed, though the fruit was not what the sower had foreseen. But while Hertzka's practical achievement came only indirectly through his inspiration of Herzl, this Paris correspondent and Viennese dramatist, ignorant of Jews and Judaism, whose "Judenstaat" was more Hertzkian than Hebraic, stands to-day among the makers of history. It is because, in narrowing to Judæa what Hertzka meant for mankind, he could not avoid stumbling upon realities. While Hertzka lost himself in cosmopolitan visions, Herzl lighted on the solidarity of the Jewish race and the ancient passion for Palestine. These immemorial instincts of his
people seized upon him and made of him their instrument. He could only lead by consenting to follow them, and his premature immortality removed the last barrier to their progress. Herzl's movement has undergone a complete metamorphosis. There is no longer among Zionists a question of emigration *en masse* to Palestine—or anywhere else. But if the Jewish Will-to-Live now bids fair to surmount the most dangerous crisis in all the long Jewish story, it is largely because of the life and death of Theodor Herzl.
THE JEWS A NATION

BY

ARTHUR D. LEWIS

The Jews were originally a nation, and have retained more than most nations one of the elements of nationality—namely, the race element; this may be proved, of course, by the common-sense test of their distinguishability. You can more usually see that a Jew is a Jew than that an Englishman is English. Moreover, whether through their own will or because they are compelled to do so, they are segregated more or less from the peoples amongst whom they live. In Russia the law treats them in a special (and barbarous) way, and shuts them off into a ghetto area—thereby forcing poverty on the vast majority to an almost unparalleled extent. But even in countries like England the bulk of the Jews will be found to be in partial communication only with Gentiles; whether we deplore it or approve, they intermarry among themselves, largely because they do not familiarly know any but the Jewish families with whom they are interconnected by blood. Besides, they find it
impossible to introduce a few Gentiles into houses mainly visited by Jews. Hence it is a gross exaggeration to say that a painless (and as I think shameful) extinction faces the twelve million Jews, one half of whom still live a ghetto and peculiarly Jewish life in Eastern Europe.

Common racial descent, instinct due to heredity, will necessarily lead to a specifically Jewish attitude towards the world whether we will it or not. Looking at Jewish history, marked on every page with incredible heroism, it is hard not to believe that the Jews can give a special contribution to the needs of humanity, and therefore not to wish that they shall live to do their work.

Judaism may be thought superior to Christianity, even if you are not by religion a traditional Jew. Christianity centres round a tomb, Judaism looks forward to justice on earth: in spite of Marx's bad opinion of the Jews, it was no accident that the founders of modern Socialism—Marx, Engels, and Lassalle—were all Jews. Moreover Judaism belongs to the collectivist religions, regarding a Jewish community (Israel) as the unit, and not the individual soul, as does Protestantism.

The Jewish conception of the Kingdom of God is one which the world of our day needs to consider. Popular Socialism proposes to reform the world by a mechanical or external change. Popular Christianity proposes to reform it by individual and spiritual change alone. But the Jew thinks of the rule of God as involving the distribution of material
welfare and also a change in the heart, the wicked of the earth being turned towards God. The reform of the world must be accomplished by both external and internal changes.

If the lessening of national antagonisms is any one's aim, it is yet not clear that the absorption of the Jews would be any help towards such a purpose. Were the Jews in England to lose themselves by intermarriage, there would after several generations be merely more English and fewer Jews—but no international men, because such creatures cannot exist.

When some Jews say they consider the Jews a religious sect, like the Roman Catholics or Protestants, they are usually not correctly analysing and describing their own feelings and attitude. In many cases they, if parents, would raise no objection if one of their children wished to marry any Jew, however irreligious or even atheistic he were, but would advance objections if their child wished to marry a Gentile who had been most sincerely convinced of the truths of the Jewish religion. They cannot but consider a Jew a Jew, whatever his religion: and the whole world agrees. Hebrew, we all know, was once for all purposes the language of the Jews, even if to-day it is in many places only the language of prayer, the Holy Language. Jerusalem was the former capital of the land of the Jews, in addition to being the Holy City or (as Jews call it) God's Holy City. The Passover is a festival commemorating the de-
liverance of a nation from slavery, and Jews wear hats to pray because it is a custom of the East never to uncover the head; and such details show that in the case of Judaism it is purely fantastic to profess to divide custom and history from religion; if it were done, Judaism, by ceasing to be characterized by what is peculiar to the traditions of the Jews, would cease to be Judaism. Again, consider this: if a Jew is baptized, or, what is not necessarily the same thing, sincerely converted to Christianity, few people think of him as no longer being a Jew. His blood, temperament, and spiritual peculiarities are unaltered.

In this sense Judaism is largely free from the need to be "true." If God in no way wrote the Bible, the Bible is yet at least a legendary history of the early life of the Jews and describes their customs. Nor can the most sceptical deny that it is remarkable that Moses and the prophets foretold that the Jews should be scattered all over the earth and yet a remnant of them remain a separated people, as though ready for some climax of wonder after a history remarkable in its differences from the histories of other peoples, who, if conquered and scattered, merge and disappear. At any rate, a Jew will find the customs and ceremonies of the Jews useful to him because they express his feelings, and they continue to do this after his interpretation of them has ceased to be that of his father.

The decay of the religion of the Jews since
the eighteenth century, seen by their inability to produce any expression of religious feeling or thought, not even (as has been said) commentaries on commentaries, but only either records of antiquarian research, where paucity of spirit is concealed by industry in collecting facts, or manuals of reform in which a mixture is made of a little Oriental Judaism with much European Protestantism and rationalism, linguistic Higher Criticism, and other fashionable treasures gathered from the Gentiles—this decay of religion renders it all the more impossible for Jews permanently to exist as a mere sect.

I agree that there is a need for change and life in Judaism; but I dislike the reforms of Judaism that have been attempted, because they have been destructive, critical, English, Protestant, and not positive creations that are Jewish and inspired. Reform must not be reasonable and negative, but positive and creative.

Now, the one creative idea, capable of uniting Jews, which has appeared in modern times is the Zionist idea. The atheist Jew and the orthodox can agree that it would recreate the Jewish spirit for Jews to live like other nations on their own soil.

Without the national idea Judaism is not Judaism. If you deny that the Jews are still a nation, you must say that the Jews were not punished for their sins by loss of their land; national fate is not dependent on national righteous-
ness; Israel is not to be restored to her own land; and we have no future and no sure knowledge.

On the other hand, a Nationalist movement can stand on its feet without faith in a religion, as do other Nationalist movements in Ireland and Poland.

Zionism alone can save Israel, so far as Israel requires a consistent plan and idea; and surely it does require one; for the Jews are mostly sunk in entire mental confusion and half-heartedness. Zionism alone can increase the confidence of the Jews in things Jewish, and give to the individual Jew inspiration from the unconscious effect on himself of institutions, language, art, and associations expressive of his own temperament and not of foreign temperaments, so that each individual may absorb from his surroundings the healthy influences which are suitable for the nourishment of his own spirit.

The difficulty with some Jews is that they retain the proud sense of superiority to other people when they have lost the religious feeling that made us sure that God had chosen us to fulfil a special task in the world, "and sanctified us by His commandments," and foretold by the prophets that we should proclaim a message, bring good tidings to all men. They are not Jews in love of their fellow-Jews, they are not Jews in unshakable loyalty to God's commands, they are not Jews in sublime faith through all misfortune that a de-
liverer will yet come to make Israel fully a nation, and through Israel's special capacities, affections, constancies, and love of justice to show other nations some ways in which they might be bettered; they are not Jews for any good purpose; they are not eager to show the world the special way in which they are moved by desire for the right.

I do not come to attack but to help, to say that the reform and revival of every kind of Judaism can, so far as I can see, be brought about only when Jews again have a centre in which they face all the difficulties of national life, instead of, as at present, sponging on the other nations for the use of the institutions with which each nation has solved the difficulties of the life of a human community on this earth. The Jews in England do not face their own difficulties. The position of the Bible in face of modern thought and the justification of Judaism—who defines them and helps the serious young man or woman who has doubts? He doubts because of folklorists who say the Passover is like other spring festivals in which the wheat-god is eaten in order to strengthen the reviving power of life; because of Hebraists, who say the Pentateuch is a comparatively late composition enclosing earlier texts; because of determinist biologists, who conceive a world without God, and man acting according to chemical and mechanical laws. The starving and legally oppressed ghettos of Russia and the poverty of the boycotted Jews of Galicia—how many Anglo-
Jews have statesmanlike plans for helping them? Who instructs those Jews ignorant of Hebrew and of the Jewish religion, who despise it without understanding it? Or who unites into one articulate whole the Yiddish-speaking majority and the English-speaking minority, or makes Jew comprehensible to Jew, the Chassid from the East with the Liberalism of Protestantized Anglo-Jewry, so as to make of it one community? Or who spreads among the Gentile nations knowledge of the beauty of a religion which sanctifies the home and the children and all that is necessary in the life of man and places the race before the individual; which does not consecrate a Church in which the body of God is preserved in order to despise the home where the body of man is built up; that looks forward and demands that God shall by establishing justice on earth before our eyes make it clear that He rules over us; that unites sane universalism with sane patriotism and a sane desire for peace with a sane justification for resistance to oppression and conquest; that gives to man a God, who is ready to pardon our sins and make us clean—how else could we recover confidence of spirit?—a God who is no abstract philosophic theory, but a Father and a King, our Guardian and Deliverer? Who is it, I say, who has confidence and can carry out these tasks? The essence of the Jewish religion (and here is the germ of all replies to sceptical critics) is the idea that God chose Israel for a great purpose,
and that God will yet in the future send the great King whose help will enable us to carry out our work for the world. Who proclaims "This is our destiny"?

It is true that the Jews have a mission. The idea that they have a mission should not be monopolized by one section of Jews, especially as that section is always obliterating the main distinctive features of Judaism. But it is not true that the Jews at present carry out any mission. The reason why they do not is probably because in their present circumstances they cannot.

Who delivers our message with regard to peace? We are not Christian non-resisters: we believe in violence as a source of good and shock and danger as a source of fellowship; the Hebrew prophets represented God Himself as fighting against evil and predicted that His reign would follow after terrible battles. Force must be allied with faith in the right. We worship neither submission and victory by defeat, as do the over-spiritual Christian deniers of life, who imagine in their asceticism that the only victory follows death and that life is an evil; nor do we put our trust in force and the doctrine that might is right. We admire the persistence of right until it is able to ally itself with might, and would have nations unite to protect justice, until the desire to rule the earth from one capital is seen to be a vain hope.

Who delivers our message with regard to justice
within the State? We believe in the diffusion of prosperity on earth. We believe in the realization of brotherhood on earth together with the restoration of the Jews as a united body to their own land. (Do not quibble absurdly about some Jews not wishing to go: England is England even if there are Englishmen in Paris and Moscow.)

It is not within our power fully to bring about the reign of justice and general prosperity; but in so far as we do not in any act help to keep alive the hope of such a consummation, we render it impossible for the great man to arise whose influence will reform the world, and cause nations to beat their swords into ploughshares and enable every man to sit under his own fig-tree. Great reforms, as was realized by the Jewish prophets, are not the result of gradual step-by-step alterations. Danger vastly increases fellowship, and in moments of terror great unsuspected heroism is displayed: we rise above the level of accustomed routine. The day of the Lord is a day of terror and the era of universal prosperity cannot begin without a shock that overcomes the dull selfishness and cynicism of the world. That day, of the Lord we cannot hasten, but we can prepare the world to listen to His prophet. But who, I say, delivers our message of preparation for the reign of justice on earth?

None delivers our message; nor can it be delivered so long "as we live in exile, dependent and persecuted and despised"—in exile ever-
where, dependent everywhere; persecuted and despised in some countries; believed by many Christians to be punished by God for our refusal to accept Jesus as the Messiah. The Jews can carry out their mission only when they again attain political independence, settling in the land of their fathers, where they, in their political and social life, can realize the ideals of justice and love taught by the Jewish religion; then will God compensate the Jewish nation for all the sufferings it has endured through its years of exile; then will He enable them to show through their special ideas and feelings how certain of the evils of the world may be removed; they shall yet bring the world nearer to a feeling for all that is good.

"And all shall come to serve God, and bless Thy glorious name, declaring in the islands Thy justice; the nations that did not know Thee shall seek Thee, the ends of the earth praise Thee, and say continually, Extolled be God. . . . Then the hills shall burst out in song, the islands shall laugh triumphantly, and shall joyfully be ruled by Thee, and praise Thee with Thy congregations, so that those far off shall hear and offer to Thee the crown of royalty."

' See article "Theology" by Dr. Lauterbach in "Jewish Encyclopædia."
The history of the Jews since the middle of the eighteenth century has, with one notable exception, constituted a series of efforts to adapt the état d’âme of the individual Jew, as well as his external life, to his non-Jewish surroundings.

The era of Emancipation, as this period may be called, is no ignoble chapter in the fortunes of the Jews. Later ages will point with admiration, mixed with wonder, to the rise of a people enslaved for many centuries by the double burden of hatred and contempt to a position of great influence amongst its secular adversaries. There will present itself the extraordinary spectacle of this people having even grown into the very tissue of the nations that gave it hospitality: how in Germany it found that deutsche Treue was akin to the faithfulness of the Israelite to his own self; how in France the principles of the great Revolution answered to the fundamental ideals of human brotherhood enunciated by Judaism; how in
Anglo-Saxon lands there was the nearest realization of the Hebraic spirit of the righteousness that exalteth a nation.

It is towards this reconciliation between Israel and the nations that the efforts of the best Jews have been directed; the meaner elements have been willing, if not eager, to pay the price of civil and political emancipation almost to the full measure of national extinction, just short of individual apostasy to an alien creed avowedly incredible. But taking the highest view, from which alone any people, with perhaps the sole exception of the Jews, is judged, we shall realize that the tendency of assimilation, as the Jewish endeavour for adaptation to external surroundings is termed, is *individual in application and negative in effect*—a direct denial of the organic unity of Israel.

The demand for emancipation and political equality has not been for the Jewish community as such, but for Jews as individuals. In some countries, like Prussia, the Jews as a whole are still barely recognized by the Government; in others, as formerly in France, the State has grouped the Jews into certain organizations from political motives. But it is the Jews themselves who deliberately shrink from investing their so-called representative institutions with any semblance of national claims, and they certainly go no farther than to interest themselves for ostensibly humanitarian purposes in the oppressed and helpless of the Jewish race.
The effects of emancipation are, from the Jewish point of view, negative. They have added no new values to the storehouse of Jewish ideas and ideals so rich with the spoils of ages, but, on the contrary, have of a set purpose obliterated all traces of Jewish individuality where these were in conflict with the accidental demands of time and place.

Even the most important production of the Jews in the period under review—the scientific investigation of Jewish history—has suffered under the symptomatic defect that they have been regarded as a people with a common past but with no common future. Jewish historiography has, therefore, not concerned itself as with a living subject, but has generally been treated from the theological or archæological point of view. If to the Christian historian the Jewish people ceased to exist in the year 70 C.E., and he considers himself called upon to rectify the wilful mistake of its survival by ignoring it, the Jewish historian has only been interested in the remote and buried past that ends somewhere in the Middle Ages. Masters like Zunz or Steinschneider had no concern for the living present, and certainly no regard for the future. Even the warmth of Graetz's style, as he unfolded the wrongs of his people, was condemned as a grave infraction of the objective language in which alone "the science of Judaism" could worthily be dealt with. M. Théodore Reinach's "History of the Israelites" denies the very,
evidences of Jewish unity and vitality to which he was called upon to testify.

* * * * *

Zionism came with the promise of the seer that the heart of the fathers would turn to their children and the heart of the children to their fathers. In the memorable declaration of Theodor Herzl at the opening of the first Congress, Zionism was to be a return of the Jews to the Jewish people, even before their return to the Jewish land. It was Zionism which gathered together the scattered tribes of Israel and formed them once more into "a people, one people," to use another historic phrase of Herzl. It did not adopt the line of least resistance, because for the first time since the days of Bar Cochba the Jews had ceased to be passive: they had once more become heroic in their aspirations and actions.

Zionism declared that the Jewish people cannot be saved by charity within or tolerance without, but that it must save itself by its own exertions. Zionism raised the consideration of the Jewish problem from the atmosphere of a benevolent society to the forum of a World Congress. In Zionism, East and West met, not as those who are always expected to give and those who are always ready to take, but as equal members of the one Jewish family. Of all Jewish endeavours of modern times Zionism has alone been endowed with political instincts and with prophetic zeal and vision.
When in the year 1882 there broke out the first Russian pogroms the Jews in Russia, like the Jews elsewhere, were engaged in the great, all-absorbing aim of leaving the Jewish life, one by one and family by family. The revulsion of sentiment caused by these anti-Jewish upheavals came to many with the force of an elemental appeal. We then witnessed again the uprising of the ancient Maccabæan spirit, that spirit which has been invoked and utilized in so many causes, except in the cause of the Jewish people. We had the unexampled spectacle of Jewish pioneers leaving their cherished studies and venturing forth to brave the unknown. Beth Ya'acob Lechu Venelcha ¹ became the call of the "Bilu" ² as they abandoned their careers for a life of unaccustomed hardship and their own homes for the ancient home of their ancestors in Palestine. How there they toiled and how they suffered, how they cultivated the earth with their bare hands, how many of them died as true martyrs to their ideal of the Terra Santa of their people, this will be recorded in the annals of a rejuvenated Israel that will one day, in the fullness of God's time, reap with joy what those pioneers had sown with tears.

They were the prototypes of those Jewish men and women who were to lay down their lives for the deliverance of their people. The early days

¹ "O house of Jacob, come ye and let us walk" (Isa. ii. 5).
² So called from the initials of that Hebrew watchword.
of all the Jewish colonies in Palestine during the 'eighties and 'nineties of the last century were accompanied by hunger and disease and the rigours of an unwonted clime, borne with the courage and strength of a magnificent hope. They wooed the barren land with the love born of the yearnings of thousands of years, and, by heroic endurance, won it back to its former beauty and fruitfulness.

This note gave the leitmotiv for the whole course of Jewish colonization in Palestine. It was utterly unlike any effort at Jewish colonization in other parts of the world. For those who had settled in Palestine to till its soil or to develop its resources in other directions had done so, not because it was the most profitable venture but because they served thereby the ideal of Jewish regeneration. It was only because of this that they were content to endure. They were supported by the idea that they laboured, not only for themselves and their own day but for a Jewish posterity, for all time.

The world has rarely seen the like of these Jewish peasants in Palestine—men and women of education most of them, men and women of ideals all of them. There is hardly a village without its library, nor a library without books and journals in half a dozen languages. It was with such elements that the Zionist Movement could set in motion economic and social experiments of a high order. Co-operative organizations in Palestine have met with success solely on account of
the intelligence and public spirit of agricultural labourers. It was they who contributed to the possibility of the establishment of Jewish scientific institutions, such as the Agricultural Experiment Station, at Haifa, whose director, Aaron Aaronsohn, the discoverer of wild wheat, has found in the colonists helpful collaborators.

It is not, however, only in the field of rural colonization that the Jews settled in Palestine have belied the many fears and even exceeded some expectations of the Jewish world at large, which has followed their progress with inevitable, irresistible interest. Many of the new settlers, supported by an exalted ideal, have brought into being new Jewish values which only await their due season for fruition. The rapid rise and spread of Hebrew as a living tongue, in home and school and mart, is the most remarkable and the most convincing testimony to the capacity and vigour of Jewish national individuality. The men and women who had not only to fashion a language for their own daily use but also for that of their children, and the teachers in the elementary and secondary schools, who had to compose their own Hebrew textbooks on all branches of education, were inspired by a Jewish public spirit which stands unique. It was among the small group of Hebrew intellectuals in Palestine that the establishment of the Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts, the Jaffa Gymnasium, a Jewish Museum, a Hygienic Institute, a Technical College, even a Univer-
sity, could be brought about. Where but in Palestine and under what conditions other than the Zionist ideal could this have been accomplished?

If we would know what has effected all this, we need only compare the men and women of the old Yishub (Settlement), who came to Palestine with the traditions of the Galuth (Dispersion), and those of the new Yishub who have returned to the land of their fathers under the inspiration of Zionism with the hope of national regeneration on the historic soil of the Land of Israel. The lack of dignity, both national and individual, as well as the almost total absence of any creative self-expression, marks the Palestinian Jew of the old type. As for the men and women of the new type, it is not only with the plough and the pen that they have brought honour to the Jewish people. They have ceased to be parasites in the moral and cultural as well as in the material sense, such as, even under the most favourable conditions, is so largely the enforced lot of the Jews everywhere. Coming from Russia or Roumania or Galicia, these Jewish settlers in Palestine have manifested a patriotic idealism in a Jewish sense such as is not conceivable elsewhere.

The notable example of the Shomerim (watchmen) will illustrate this. To ward off the depredations of the marauding Bedouins the Jewish colonists found it necessary to engage Arab watchmen. But it came to be felt by many that it
was hardly consonant with Jewish dignity, that Jewish property should be guarded by non-Jews. Groups of young colonists thereupon undertook the ill-paid and dangerous work of watchmen, and the intrepid Shomerim, many of whom laid down their lives in the course of their self-imposed patriotic duties, established among the Arabs a wholesome respect for their Jewish neighbours.

It is in a similar spirit of Jewish civic duty that the householders in the Jewish suburb Tel Aviv, in Jaffa, undertook to police their district themselves, and there are few of those inherently pacific Jews who do not take their turn in the nightly rounds of Jewish armed guards.

Another illustration of Zionist influence may be found in the local self-government of the Jewish colonies. It is not known widely enough that for practical purposes the administration of these colonies has been entirely in the hands of the colonists themselves. This affords the most remarkable proof of the ability of Jews to manage their own affairs, and is a triumphant refutation of the cynical view (by the way, almost entirely confined to Jews) that they are not fit to be left to themselves. In the Jewish colonies of Palestine the business between individuals and the commune is regulated by the moral force exercised by Jewish law and practice, and, above all, by a sense of corporate honour untouched elsewhere. The land transactions of the Jewish colonies are entirely governed by purely moral
rights and decisions evolved by themselves, and have no *locus standi* in Turkish law. But no Jewish colonists have invoked the aid of the Turkish authorities against each other. No Turkish police is called in to keep order. There are no Jewish criminals.

This is no ordinary work of colonization. Here men and women have put their very intelligence and soul into the land which they believe has been waiting for cultivation by them since the days of Jewish independence. What colonization elsewhere, under practically the most favourable conditions, is able to produce can be tested by the results achieved by the Jewish colonies in the Argentine. Here the great idea of Baron Hirsch, backed by his many millions, is being laboriously carried out; but beyond the fact that a number—and, under the given circumstances, a small number—of individual Jews have been placed on the land, what influence has it had on the morale or the development of the Jewish people? The voluminous reports of the Jewish Colonization Association give year after year information how much of this and that has been produced, what the effect of one undertaking or of another has been, but nothing is said of the inner life of those who, had they been in Palestine, would have been regarded as the wards of the Jewish nation. The Jewish colonists in the Argentine seem to have only been transferred from one part of the world to another, from Russian to Spanish "culture."
idea, no generous enthusiasm, such as has inspired the Jewish colonists in Palestine, has moved their fellow-Jews in the Argentine—except it be the longing to share by Zionist activities and aspirations in the regeneration of their people in the hallowed Land of Israel.

* * * * *

This, then, in spite of inevitable defects and difficulties, is the Jewish Palestine under the influence of the Jewish Renaissance that has found in Zionism its organized expression. In the worldwide Dispersion of Israel it has been the only force that has united all its children into one great aim. It has evoked Jewish sympathies where every other form of appeal had failed. These sympathies did not call for alms to the needy, to be repeated over and over again as pogroms and expulsions broke a limb of the Jewish people and the cries and the groans of the sufferers reached one's ears. In Zionism the call is for the expression of one's Jewish personality, for the identification of general Jewish interests with one's own. Here, at last, we have a truly Jewish patriotism, the joyful recognition of a Jewish future.

No longer has the whole contents of Judaism been relegated to the Synagogue for special occasions and Jewish endeavour concentrated in the support of the poor in spirit and in body; for in the light of Zionism Judaism comprises, not a mere religious denomination but a view of life, a
Weltanschauung, in all its manifold aspects and with rich Jewish potentialities, faith in the capacity and destiny of the Jews as a people, every man living "under his vine and fig-tree, with none to make them afraid."

Above all, Zionism is Jewish in objective and creative in action. It aims to Judaize the Jews. It is not sectarian or limited by artificial frontiers but national in its scope, and embraces within its Jewish influences all classes and activities of the Jews. It is not a charity, but political, economic, sociological as well as spiritual in its Jewish Messianic idea. It, therefore, represents a synthesis of all Jewish ideals and aspirations.

In Theodor Herzl it produced the exemplary type of the Jewish statesman; in the Congress it has created a Parliament and forum for the public discussion of Jewish problems by the elected representatives of the Jewish people. It alone has declared the Jewish people to be the master of its own fate, and has initiated the only positive action of general historic import to the Jewish future that has been undertaken since the fall of the Jewish State.

Zionism, too, claims the rights of humanity and of citizenship for Jews in the lands of their birth and allegiance, but it recognizes the inadequacy of a mere external emancipation, and demands the self-emancipation of the Jewish people. In this sense it has already made notable progress in various directions. It has stimulated the sense
of Jewish individuality. It has taken a firm hold of the generous-minded University youth as well as of the democracy still pulsating with Jewish emotion. It has brought into being a new Hebrew literature, with its galaxy of poets and thinkers; it has created the seed of a specifically Jewish art. It has touched the imagination of men and women, and has given them in the Zionist ideal a Jewish purpose in their lives. It has invested the sentiment of Jewish brotherhood with a new meaning, and has once more taken up the threads of a living, creative Jewish tradition.

If, therefore, we survey the course of Jewish life and thought, if we pursue it in all its varied ramifications, and arrive before the unavoidable, searching question, In what manner—and to what purpose—shall the Jewish people survive? we shall then, after reflection, feel impelled to answer in the pregnant words of Max Nordau, "Jewry will either become Zionist or it will cease to be."
A SONG OF HOPE

While ever yet unchanged within his breast,
The inmost heart of Israel yearns,
And still towards the vistas of the east
His loving gaze to Zion turns—
So long our hope will never die,
Yea this, our hope, through ages felt,
Back to our fathers' land to fly,
Home to the height where David dwelt.

While yet our eyes have never ceased to flow
With tears like Heaven's plenteous rain,
And tens of thousands of our people go
To seek the fathers' graves again—
So long our hope, etc.
III
While yet one wall of all our soul held dear
Still looms erect before our eyes,
And on our sacred ruin still one tear
Is shed beneath the watchful skies—
So long our hope, etc.

IV
Hearken, O brothers, when our prophets call,
Where you in lands of darkness grope;
For when the last of Israel’s sons shall fall,
Only with him shall fall our hope.

So long our hope will never die,
Yea this, our hope, through ages felt,
Back to our fathers’ land to fly,
Home to the height where David dwelt.

*Translating by Nina Salaman.*
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