



(c) crown copyright

Printed for the War Cabinet. October 1917.

SECRET.
G.—164.

WAR CABINET.

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT.

(Note by the Secretary.)

IN accordance with the instructions given in War Cabinet 245, Minute 18, the draft declaration on Zionism was submitted to nine—or, including Mr. E. S. Montagu, ten—representative Jewish leaders.

Mr. Montagu's memoranda have already been circulated.

The following are the replies of the remaining nine. (Appendix I.) Of these, six may be regarded as on the whole favourable to the declaration, or to the declaration with slight amendments, while three are opposed to a form of declaration acceptable to the Zionists, and submit alternatives. The six favourable to a Zionist form of declaration are:—

1. The Rt. Hon. Herbert Samuel, M.P.
2. The Chief Rabbi.
3. Lord Rothschild.
4. Sir Stuart Samuel, Bart., Chairman of the Jewish Board of Deputies.
5. Dr. Weizmann.
6. Mr. Nahum Sokolov.

The three unfavourable are:—

7. Sir Philip Magnus, M.P.
8. C. G. Montefiore, Esq., President, Anglo-Jewish Association.
9. L. L. Cohen, Esq., Jewish Board of Guardians.

The various alternative drafts submitted are collated in the attached Appendix II.

Appendix III contains a selection of extracts from documents submitted by the leaders of the Zionist organisation. The latter have not seen Mr. Montagu's Memorandum (Paper No. G.T.—2263), nor have they had an opportunity of replying thereto.

M. P. A. HANKEY, *Secretary, War Cabinet.*

2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.,
October 17, 1917.

APPENDIX I.

(1.)

From the Rt. Hon. Herbert Samuel, M.P.

The policy embodied in the draft declaration, which is now under the consideration of the Cabinet, seems to me to be right.

If the Turks are left ostensibly in control of Palestine, the country is likely to fall, in course of time, under German influence. If Germany, or any other continental Power, is dominant there, Egypt would be exposed to constant menace. The best safeguard would be the establishment of a large Jewish population, preferably under British protection.

I feel no doubt that the policy expressed in the declaration is that which is desired by the mass of the Jewish people, both in this country and throughout the world. Those who oppose it, though individually influential, are few in number, and, I believe, not representative. The officers of the Jewish Board of Representatives, which is the nearest approach to a democratically elected body in the Jewish

community in England, having recently issued a pronouncement in a hostile sense, were censored by their constituents and obliged to resign.

If the policy were carried into effect through British influence it would be calculated to win for the British Empire the gratitude of Jews throughout the world, and, wherever the interests of the country of which they were citizens was not involved, to create among them a bias favourable to the Empire.

I presume that such a declaration would not be made public until a favourable military situation had been brought about in Palestine. Otherwise it might lead to the persecution of the Jewish colonists there at the hands of the Turks. It might also prove an embarrassment at home, as it might be represented that one of the reasons for the continuance of the war was the pursuit of subsidiary aims, of which this was one. But the adoption of the declaration now, and its confidential communication to those who are interested, would clear the air, and would be, I think, a wise step.

(2.)

From the Chief Rabbi (Dr. J. H. Herz).

It is with feelings of the profoundest gratification that I learn of the intention of His Majesty's Government to lend its powerful support to the re-establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. The proposed declaration of His Majesty's Government that it "will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object" will mark an epoch in Jewish history. To millions of my brethren throughout the world it will mean the realisation of Israel's undying hope of a restoration—a hope that has been the spiritual lodestar of Israel's wanderings for the last 1,800 years.

The draft declaration is in spirit and in substance everything that could be desired. I welcome the reference to the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine. It is but a translation of the basic principle of the Mosaic legislation: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex (oppress) him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." (Lev., xix, 33, 34.)

I would suggest one minor alteration in the wording of the last three lines. I am anxious that the phrase:

" . . . or the rights and political status enjoyed in any other country by such Jews who are fully contented with their existing nationality and citizenship "

be shortened to:

" . . . or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

In conclusion, I must, as Chief Rabbi, thank the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the members of the War Cabinet for their striking sympathy with Jewish aspirations, and assure them that the overwhelming majority of Anglo-Jewry, as well as of the Jewries of His Majesty's Overseas Dominions, will rejoice with me at this broad humanity and far-sighted statesmanship of the men who guide the destinies of the Empire.

(3.)

From Lord Rothschild.

I would welcome a declaration on the lines of the draft you send me, for I think it will to a great extent meet the objections raised by the anti-Zionists.

Personally, I think that the proviso is rather a slur on Zionism, as it presupposes the possibility of a danger to non-Zionists, which I deny. However, I welcome this declaration because it would show that His Majesty's Government is benevolently disposed towards and would lend its potent support to the aspirations of the great mass of the Jewish people, these aspirations being to have a home where they could speak their own language, have their own education, and have their own civil and religious institutions under the protection of the Allied Governments. I should like

to point out that the opponents of Zionism have almost entirely framed their opposition on the false hypothesis that the possession of a national home and status by one body of Jews would necessarily react on those Jews who preferred to remain citizens of the countries they now live in. In expressing my opinion that this belief is wholly unfounded, I would like to indicate that of the 12,000,000 Jews in the world, at least 10,000,000 are either active Zionists or else pro-Zionist. The greater part of these 10,000,000 hold that they, as Jews, have a historical and inviolable right to a national home, and moreover, a home in Palestine, the land of their forefathers. One of the chief aims of the Zionist Federation, when the settlement in Palestine takes place, is to see that while obtaining as large a measure of autonomy as possible, no encroachment on the rights of the other inhabitants of the country should take place. The relations between the Palestine Jews and their neighbours have hitherto been scanty and spasmodic, which is mainly due to mutual ignorance and indifference, but I have no fear that this would continue if a settlement under the ægis of the Allied Powers is carried out. I feel sure that this hour of crisis offers a great opportunity for a most beneficial development of a country rich in possibility, and a broad basis for permanent and cordial relations between Jews, Armenians, Arabs, and the other inhabitants of the country. Among the 450,000 Jews of the British Empire only some 10,000 or 15,000 are opposed to Zionist aspirations.

I would conclude by once again welcoming the declaration as an expression of the benevolence of His Majesty's Government towards the Jewish people.

(4.)

From Sir Stuart Samuel, Bart., Chairman of the Jewish Board of Deputies.

1. I think that Jews resident in Great Britain are by a large majority favourable to the establishment of a national home for Jews in Palestine, under proper safeguards.

2. English Jews generally have held aloof from the Zionist movement because they were not convinced that Palestine could support a greatly increased population, and should they approve a large immigration into that country they might be faced by the problem of a starving population requiring to be removed to another destination. Consequently, it would be necessary to provide a Jewish settlement in Palestine with the funds required for public works, irrigation, roads, loans to agriculturists, &c. In my opinion, 20 millions sterling would be required to give such a settlement the start that would likely ensure success. This amount would, I think, be provided by the Jews of the world if the settlement were under the auspices of the Allied Powers.

3. A second reason for the aloofness previously alluded to is that many English Jews resented the suggestion that they could be faithless to the country in which they had been settled over 200 years, and adopt, or as it has been put, return to another nationality. Regarded generally, their attitude is that whilst they would be favourable to the project that those Jews who wish to go to Palestine being enabled to do so, and willing to regard it as a restoration of their land to the Jews, it would be necessary to make it clear that any State, if founded, would be a modern State, having no claim upon Jews outside it to be regarded as its nationals. Hence, in my opinion, the draft declaration is susceptible to amendment, and suggest that in line 8 the words after "non-Jewish communities in Palestine" be deleted, and in their place substituted "or the nationality or rights, or political status enjoyed in any other country by Jews." You will observe that Jews who are not "fully contented with their existing citizenship" are not protected by the proposed formula. In my opinion, not 10 per cent. of British-born Jews would go to Palestine.

4. It must be within the knowledge of His Majesty's Government that German and Austrian influence in Palestine has grown largely in recent years. Applications for assistance formerly written in Hebrew and English are now in Hebrew and German. Are the German and Austrian Jews to remain there, or if expelled to be allowed to return as Zionists? They should be made ineligible for 20 years.

5. Non-Jewish opinion would, I think, be conciliated if a statement were made simultaneously that the Holy Places in Jerusalem and vicinity would be internationalised, or at any rate not be placed under entirely Jewish control.

(5.)

From Dr. Weizmann, President of the English Zionist Federation.

It is my deep conviction that the declaration framed by His Majesty's Government will, when announced, be received with joy and gratitude by the vast majority of the Jewish people all over the world. It will supply a powerful impetus towards the regeneration and rejuvenation of an ancient country and an ancient people, and will thus form a notable step forward on the path of human progress and display anew the magnanimity of the British Empire.

I must abstain at this stage from entering upon a discussion of the views on the Jewish problem held by Zionists and Jewish Nationalists. These views have been fully expounded in the press and literature in this and other countries, and I personally have had the honour to lay the Zionist view before prominent members of His Majesty's Government. But as your letter refers to the divergence of view existing in Jewry on the subject of Zionism, I beg leave, shortly, to refer to this point.

Although it is unfortunately true that a certain number of Jews, chiefly in Western countries, are opposed to the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine, it is no less true that these opponents, who are comparatively few in number, are almost exclusively to be found amongst those Jews who by education and social connections have lost touch with the real spirit animating the Jewish people as a whole. Our opponents, therefore, are entitled to speak in their own name only, but have no right to speak for the Jewish masses whose hopes, aspirations, ideals, and sufferings they do not share. The real motive underlying their opposition is of an eminently individual nature. Our opponents are overcome by fear lest the existence of a Jewish national home compromises to a certain extent their own position in the eyes of the peoples in whose midst they are living and with whom they desire to be totally identified. This motive, which they do not conceal, is in itself an indication that they are conscious of being an isolated minority in Jewry and of having the bulk of the Jewish people not with but against them. Had it been really their sincere conviction that the great majority of the Jewish people does not sympathise with the establishment of a national home, they would have no reason to be afraid of a scheme which can only be realised by the whole-hearted and enthusiastic collaboration of all living forces in Jewry. They would, on the contrary, be content to let the experiment pass unhindered, in order to show by its certain failure how correctly they had interpreted the mind of the Jews in general.

As to the wording of the declaration, may I be allowed respectfully to suggest one or two alterations?

(a.) Instead of "establishment," would it not be more desirable to use the word "re-establishment"? By this small alteration the historical connection with the ancient tradition would be indicated and the whole matter put in its true light.

(b.) The last lines of the declaration could easily be interpreted by ill-wishers as implying the idea that, with the re-establishment of the Jewish national home, only those Jews will have a right to claim full citizenship in the country of their birth who in addition to being loyal and law-abiding citizens would also totally dissociate themselves from the Jewish national home, showing no interest in, or sympathy with, its successful development. This unnatural demand is surely not in the mind of His Majesty's Government, and in order to avoid any misunderstanding I respectfully suggest that the part of the declaration in question be replaced by the following words:—

... "the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country of which they are loyal citizens."

(c.) May I also suggest "Jewish people" instead of "Jewish race"?

(6.)

From Mr. Sokolov, Chief London Representative of the Zionist Organisation.

I received with profound pleasure and satisfaction your letter of the 6th instant, and I wish to express to His Majesty's Government the deep gratitude of the Zionist Organisation for the spirit of sympathy and justice manifested in the proposed

declaration. With regard, however, to the wording of the draft, I beg leave, in accordance with your suggestion, to submit the following observations on behalf of the Zionist Organisation.

I understand that it is the desire of His Majesty's Government to express its sympathy with Jewish national aims in Palestine in a formula which will, at the same time, meet with the approval of all sections of British Jewry, including those who have not accepted the programme of Zionism. This desire is, no doubt, responsible for the inclusion of a proviso safeguarding the interests of non-Jewish communities in Palestine and the status of Jews who enjoy political rights in other countries.

While the Zionist Organisation would naturally prefer a declaration on the lines of the draft which my friends and myself had the honour to submit some weeks ago, it is not desirous of raising new questions. His Majesty's Government is aware that it is the Zionist movement which is responsible for such steps as have been taken towards the realisation of Jewish national aims in Palestine, and that the future prosecution of these aims, with the invaluable aid which His Majesty's Government so generously offers, will be the particular charge of the representatives of the Zionist movement. The safeguards mentioned in the draft are not open to any objections, since they are and always have been regarded by Zionists as a matter of course.

The following alterations, however, in the wording of the declaration I venture to suggest as most desirable:—

- (1.) Line 2. "The establishment in Palestine of a national home." I would suggest the substitution of "re-establishment" for "establishment." By this slight change the real character of the movement and its historic basis would be recognised.
- (2.) Line 3. "The Jewish race" I would suggest to be altered to "the Jewish people." The definition of "race" is a much-disputed question. It would also be questionable whether the word refers to all persons of Jewish origin or only to Jews. "Jewish people" is the best definition.
- (3.) I would also suggest in substitution for the concluding phrase, "or the rights and political status . . . nationality and citizenship," the following more comprehensive expression: "or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country of which they are loyal citizens."

These alterations I recommend to your consideration, as I think that in this form a more adequate expression will be given to the principle.

The Zionist Organisation has always looked to Great Britain for sympathy and assistance, and it will hail with gratitude and enthusiasm the proposed declaration of His Majesty's Government. The millions of Zionists and their supporters all over the world are keenly aware of the immeasurable services which Great Britain has rendered and is rendering to the liberation of oppressed nationalities, and they confidently hope that His Majesty's Government will be instrumental also in the liberation of the unfortunate masses of the oldest and most hard-trying of living nationalities.

(7.)

From Sir Philip Magnus, M.P.

In replying to your letter of the 6th October, I do not gather that I am expected to distinguish my views as a Jew from those I hold as a British subject. Indeed, it is not necessary, even if it were possible. For I agree with the late Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hermann Adler, that "ever since the conquest of Palestine by the Romans we have ceased to be a body politic"; that "the great bond that unites Israel is not one of race but the bond of a common religion"; and that we have no national aspirations apart from those of the country of our birth. Holding these views, I venture, in compliance with your request, to offer a few remarks on the wording of the proposed declaration of policy with respect to the Zionist movement and its relation to the future of Palestine. I cannot agree that the Jews regard themselves as a nation, and the term "national" as applied to a community of Jews in Palestine or elsewhere seems to me to beg the question between Zionists and their

opponents, and should, I suggest, be withdrawn from the proposed formula. Indeed, the inclusion in the terms of the declaration of the words "a national home for the Jewish race" seems to me both undesirable and inferentially inaccurate.

On the other hand, a statement to the effect that the British Government would take steps to secure to the Jews now or hereafter resident in Palestine freedom to develop their religious culture and to observe their religious rites would be welcomed by the Jews and would be consistent with the traditional policy of the British Government. It is essential, however, as stated in the proposed formula, that any privileges granted to the Jews should be shared by their fellow-citizens of other creeds.

It should be remembered that under Turkish rule the Jews have latterly enjoyed many advantages. They have been permitted to found agricultural and commercial colonies, to establish schools, and to teach in those schools through the medium of the ancient Hebrew language. Any pronouncement on the part of His Majesty's Ministers to the effect that they would be prepared to take steps to establish for Jews, and for Jews only, a "national home in Palestine" might be interpreted as implying that the government of that country would, under certain conditions, be transferred to the Jews; and such a pronouncement would certainly arouse considerable opposition from other Palestinian communities, and might result in the Jews now resident in Palestine being exposed to the same treatment at the hands of the Turks as has been unhappily experienced by the Armenian Christians.

The Zionist agitation is a movement of comparatively recent date. The Jews of Spain and Portugal, at the height of their prosperity, made no attempt to use their influence to secure for themselves a "national home in Palestine," nor did they subsequently, when they fled from Spain to Holland and to other countries. If the Jews of Russia had been permitted to observe their religion, and had enjoyed equal civil rights with their fellow-citizens, the Zionist movement would not have developed, and it is more than probable that the agitation will not long outlive the avowed objects of the Revolution.

I know not what may be the real objective of the War Cabinet's military operations in Palestine. It is, however, rumoured in Zionist circles that the conquest of Palestine by Great Britain is desired in order that Palestine may become an independent buffer State between Turkey and Egypt; and that having regard to the declared policy of the Allies to annex no new territories, the country would be restored to the Jews under a British protectorate. Whether this be so or not, I feel sure that our Government, in accordance with its repeated declarations, would deem it necessary to consult the existing inhabitants of Palestine as to the ruling power under which they would desire to live; and, in all probability, they would elect to be governed by Great Britain or by one of our Allies, who would hold the balance fairly between the Christian, Jewish, and Mahomedan communities.

There is only one other remark which I desire to offer. The words "who are fully contented with their existing nationality" fail to express the devotion of Jews to the country of their birth, where they enjoy equal rights with their fellow-citizens. It is not, as has been unwisely suggested, for any distinctly Jewish ideals that Jews are fighting in the present war. They need not the offer of a national home in Palestine to excite their ardour or to stimulate their courage. They are fighting for the attainment of the self-same objects which His Majesty's Ministers have so unmistakably defined.

The wording of the proposed draft declaration of policy, if modified in accordance with the suggestions I have offered, would read as follows:—

"His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a centre of Jewish culture, and will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object; it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status now enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

(8.)

From Mr. C. G. Montefiore, President of the Anglo-Jewish Association.

1. In common with all other members of the Jewish community, I am grateful to His Majesty's Government for its interest in the welfare of the Jews.

2. I deprecate the expression "a national home." For it assumes that the Jewish race constitutes a "nation," or might profitably become a nation, both which propositions I deny. The phrase "a national home for the Jewish race" appears to assume and imply that the Jews generally constitute a nationality. Such an implication is extremely prejudicial to Jewish interests, as it is intensely obnoxious to an enormous number of Jews. There can be no objection to Jews who *want* to form themselves into a nationality going to Palestine and forming themselves into a nationality in that country, but it must be effected without any prejudice to the character and position of the Jews as nationals of other countries.

3. The idea of a "home" for the Jews was started by the late Dr. Herzl, the founder of Zionism, because (as he himself told me) he believed—

- (a.) That anti-Semitism was eternal, and that it was hopeless to expect its removal.
- (b.) That the Jewish problem in Russia was insoluble in Russia.

I told him that (a) was a libel upon (1) the Jews and (2) human nature, and that even (b) was too pessimistic.

4. I was not wrong. For if the Revolution in Russia holds and reaction does not set in, the Jewish problem *has* been solved in Russia, and already the majority of the Russian Jews desire cultural autonomy *in* Russia, but not exile *from* Russia. (An indication of this condition of things—which will grow—was shown as early as April at the conference of party delegates to organise an all-Russian Jewish conference. The Zionists proposed to place the Palestine question on the programme of the conference, but were unable to carry their resolution. A conciliation committee was appointed, and it was resolved to recommend to the conference, as an optional subject of discussion, the question of civil and national rights in other countries, without special reference to Palestine.)

5. A national home for the Jews on the score of the oppressed condition of the Jews is no longer necessary. A vast majority of the Jews are free citizens of the countries in which they dwell. The Polish Jewish question will, with the co-operation of the Allies, be doubtless settled as favourably as the larger Russian Jewish problem has already been settled. The Rumanian Government will also not be able to resist the pressure of events. When five million Jews have been fully emancipated in Russia, 250,000 Jews in Rumania cannot much longer remain pariahs and aliens.

6. For the true well-being of the Jewish race emancipation and liberty in the countries of the world are a thousand times more important than a "home." In any case only a small fraction of the Jews could be collected together in Palestine.

7. Phrases such as a "national home," however carefully guarded, are likely to injure the newly won liberty of the Jews in Russia and to prevent full liberty in Rumania and Poland. If a "national home" *has been* provided all reactionaries will urge that nothing should, or need, be done in the direction of emancipation and of liberty, for the Jews now have a "national home" of their own. It is very significant that anti-Semites are always very sympathetic to Zionism. It is no wonder.

8. I and my friends do not desire to impede colonisation and immigration into Palestine; on the contrary, we desire to obtain free facilities for them. We are in favour of local autonomy wherever the conditions allow it. Whoever the suzerain Power of Palestine may be, we are in favour of the Jews, when their numbers permit it, ultimately obtaining the power which any large majority may justly claim.

9. The words "who are fully contented with" ill expresses the facts. When thousands of Jews are fighting with passion and ardour for their respective countries they are not merely "*contented* with their nationality." It is bone of their bone and spirit of their spirit.

10. For the reasons given, I earnestly hope that the first part of the declaration, up to the words "this object," may be omitted, and that words to the following effect may be substituted for them, viz.:—

"His Majesty's Government is anxious that free and unimpeded Jewish immigration into Palestine should be established. It views with favour unrestricted Jewish colonisation in that country. It will do its best to facilitate such immigration and colonisation. It will also seek to secure such municipal and local autonomy for the Jews as may be possible, and as the circumstances of the case may demand; it being clearly understood," &c.

11. For the words "who are fully contented with" I should wish to see substituted the words "who have no desire to relinquish their existing nationality and citizenship."

12. If the present words of the draft declaration are, for some reason or reasons unknown to me, believed by His Majesty's Government to be in the interests of British policy, and if His Majesty's Government is anxious to publish this formula for the sake of *this* country as well as for the Jews, I would, of course, subordinate my Jewish feelings, wishes, and interests to the interests of England and the Empire.

13. The position of many Jewish institutions and charities in Palestine which may not desire to be disconnected with their present relationship to Jewish (but non-Zionistic) organisations in European countries must be safeguarded. No Jew residing in Palestine should be compelled to come into, or join, a new Jewish "nationality."

Up to the opening of the war, the most influential Zionists were Germans and Austrians. There is only too much reason to fear that any "national home" of the Jews in Palestine will be a centre and a hotbed for German intrigue.

15. I venture to express the hope that His Majesty's Government has earnestly weighed, and will earnestly weigh, the possible effect of the proposed declaration upon the situation of the Jews in Turkey. Even if the declaration be not issued till the British army is in occupation of Palestine, there will still be a large number of Jews in the rest of the Turkish Empire. These may denounce the declaration, and so obtain protection. But they may become the victims of massacres hardly less atrocious than the massacres of the Armenians.

16. I have assumed that this memorandum will not be shown to anybody except the members of the War Cabinet and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

(9.)

From Mr. L. L. Cohen, Chairman, Jewish Board of Guardians.

1. The establishment of a "national home for the Jewish race" in Palestine, presupposes that the Jews are a nation, which I deny, and that they are homeless, which implies that, in the countries where they enjoy religious liberty and the full rights of citizenship, they are separate entities, unidentified with the interests of the nations of which they form parts, an implication which I repudiate.

2. The expression "by such Jews who are fully contented with their existing nationality and citizenship" is open to a similar objection. The British Jew, for instance, is not merely "contented" to enjoy his rights as a national and citizen, but is prepared (as he has shown) to fight for them, and to join in any constitutional movement to secure their preservation.

3. I suggest that the promulgation of a declaration in the terms indicated will prejudicially affect the present prospects of the Jews in Russia and Rumania. His Majesty's Government has always exercised its beneficent influence to improve the lot of the Jews in both these countries, and has endeavoured to secure for them equality of treatment with other communities in these countries.

4. In Russia, through the revolution, the Jew has been released from the shackles which have oppressed him for generations, and he is working, so it is reported, to strengthen the foundations of the new Government. Are his enemies in Russia, still numerous, if quiescent, to be furnished with the argument against the Jew's freedom, that he is not a Russian, but a member of a nation, which is to be established elsewhere?

5. In Rumania, the Jew has had to content himself with promises up to the present, but these promises are taking a more definite shape, and the fulfilment of the hopes of the Rumanian Jew may be accomplished before the end of the war.

I conceive a great danger to the Rumanian Jew in the draft declaration, which will be used as a weapon by the opponents of the concessions promised him.

6. In my view a stimulus would be given to anti-Semitism everywhere by a draft declaration, and British Jews, equally with others, would suffer from this attempt to settle "the Jewish question." What is now proposed is optional emigration to the new State; with a revival of persecution, always possible, the Jews might be compulsorily emigrated; the words in the declaration, relating to the preservation of the political status of the Jews in other countries, would not protect them in such eventuality.

7. Given the realisation of the hopes and aspirations of the Russian and Rumanian Jews, "the Jewish question" disappears.

8. The pre-war population of Palestine was, I believe, under 400,000; the number of Jews in Europe is estimated to be nine and a quarter millions; if it is contended that there is a "Jewish question," the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine will scarcely solve it.

9. It must also be acknowledged that the new Jewish population to be attracted to Palestine will consist largely of Jews from the Near East, and, consequently, Jews at present belonging to enemy belligerent nations will be very numerous amongst the population.

There will be thus established foci of intrigue on the flank of British interests in Egypt.

10. A pronouncement on the part of His Majesty's Government in the sense indicated in the draft declaration of its attitude towards the Zionist movement will, I fear, further accentuate the divergence of opinion, to which reference is made in the letter now under reply, and is not demanded by British Jews, whose interests have always met with consideration from His Majesty's Government.

11. If, however, a formula *has* to be devised, the following amended declaration is submitted:—

"His Majesty's Government, viewing with favour the settlement of Jews in Palestine, will use its best endeavours to facilitate their immigration and colonisation, and to secure for them the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and municipal privileges in the towns and colonies inhabited by them; it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the rights and privileges on non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed in any other country by such Jews who determine to retain their existing nationality and citizenship."

12. I assume that this letter is to be treated as confidential, and will be submitted only to the Members of the War Cabinet and to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

APPENDIX II.

DRAFT DECLARATIONS.

1. Draft submitted by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, August 1917:—

"His Majesty's Government accept the principle that Palestine should be reconstituted as the national home of the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to secure the achievement of this object, and will be ready to consider any suggestions on the subject which the Zionist Organisation may desire to lay before them."

2. Draft submitted by Lord Milner to the War Cabinet, the 4th October, 1917. (Draft submitted to various Jewish representatives, the 6th October, 1917):—

"His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish race, and will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object; it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed in any other country by such Jews who are fully contented with their existing nationality."

3. Amendments to No. 2, proposed by (a) the Chief Rabbi, (b) Dr. Weizmann, (c) Mr. Sokolov, and (d) Lord Rothschild:—

Paragraph 1. For "Jewish race" substitute "Jewish people."

Paragraph 3. Substitute the following phrase: "or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

4. Alternative draft submitted by Mr. Montagu, M.P.:—

“His Majesty’s Government accepts the principle that every opportunity should be afforded for the establishment in Palestine of those Jews who cannot, and will not, remain in the lands in which they live at present, will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, and will be ready to consider any suggestions on the subject which any Jewish or Zionist organisations may desire to lay before it.”

5. Draft by C. G. Montefiore, Esq.:—

“His Majesty’s Government is anxious that free and unimpeded Jewish immigration into Palestine should be established. It views with favour unrestricted Jewish colonisation in that country. It will do its best to facilitate such immigration and colonisation, and will also seek to secure such municipal and local autonomy for the Jews as may be found possible, it being clearly understood,” &c. (Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Draft No. 2.)

6. Draft by L. L. Cohen, Esq.:—

“His Majesty’s Government, viewing with favour the settlement of Jews in Palestine, will use its best endeavours to facilitate their immigration and colonisation in that country, and to secure for them the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, together with municipal privileges, in the towns and colonies inhabited by them; it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done to interfere with the rights and privileges of non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed in any other country by such Jews who determine to retain their existing nationality or citizenship.”

7. Draft by Sir Philip Magnus, M.P.:—

“His Majesty’s Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a centre of Jewish culture, and will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object; it being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status now enjoyed by Jews in any other country.”

APPENDIX III.

VIEWS OF THE LATE EARL CROMER.

“*Spectator*,” August 12, 1916.

It is believed that on the eve of the French Revolution there were less than three million Jews in Europe. There are now some nine million, besides about two million in North America and smaller communities in other parts of the world.

From the earliest days of the Dispersion the Jews have, for different reasons, been viewed with dislike and suspicion by the rest of the world. Juvenal, who regarded the Jews as magicians, inveighed against them, and attributed their faults to the fact that they set aside every seventh day as a day, not of rest, but of “sloth.” The fifth-century poet, Rutilius (*Itiner.*, V. 386), regretted the Dispersion as he feared that the subjugated nation would conquer their conquerors. *Victoresque suos natio victa premit.* The prejudices of the pagan world were inherited in an intensified form by Christians and Moslems alike. Those of the Christians led to the comprehensible but wholly irrational conclusion that future generations of Jews for all time should be persecuted because some of their predecessors had crucified Christ. Those of the Moslems were based on the personal history of Mohammed. They still survive. Among the most civilised nations of the world, dislike based on religious prejudices, if it has not wholly disappeared, has been greatly mitigated, but other causes have supervened which have kept anti-Semitic sentiments alive.

In England there has never been any “Jewish question” properly so called. This is due partly to the fact that religious toleration, both in the letter and the spirit, has established a firm hold on English public opinion, and partly to the further fact that the relatively small number of Jews in the United Kingdom—there are at present only some two hundred and forty-five thousand—has prevented them

from exercising so commanding an influence over national life as has been the case in some other countries. There is not, as in Austria, a Jew moneylender in almost every village in the country, who often holds the future welfare of the noble in his castle and of the villager in his cottage in the hollow of his hand. An incident such as that which came within my personal knowledge whilst residing in Styria would be impossible in this country. I was asked by an Austrian friend to make enquiries as to whether he could rent a country house in the neighbourhood of Gratz. After visiting one house, the proprietor asked me whether my friend was a Jew. I replied in the negative. He then explained to me that he was an ardent anti-Semitic, and that he would not, for any pecuniary consideration whatsoever, let his house to a Jew. In no country has the Jew fewer causes for complaint than in England. He is under no civil disabilities. After a struggle, which never excited more than a somewhat languid interest, he was given full rights of citizenship. Jews now sit in both Houses of Parliament. They occupy important public positions. A distinguished man of Jewish origin ruled for some years the destinies of England. The faith of his ancestors and his hereditary proclivities have not prevented him from being regarded to this day by a large section of the community as a typical British patriot. When, therefore, Dr. Weizmann says that what the Jew wants is "to find a place in the social structure of the world which shall enable him to live as a human being without demanding that he cease to be a Jew," the average Englishman will reply with much reason, and perhaps with some slight indignation and amazement, that he has given the Jew all that he asks; that Judaism is a cult like any other, which he is free to exercise in this country; that the British conscience is clear; and that the Jewish question may be dismissed from the minds of British politicians and the British public. And yet this answer, plausible though it may appear, is far from disposing of the whole question.

Whatever sentiments may be entertained towards the Jews, and whatever opinions may be held as to the wisdom of affording encouragement to their present aspirations, it is surely desirable that those aspirations should be understood. It may well be doubted whether they are generally understood in this country. The very useful series of essays now published under the title of "Zionism and the Jewish Future" enables us to gain some insight into the views current in Jewish circles, and the aims which the leading members of the Jewish community seek to attain. The publication is all the more timely because one of the consequences of the war will almost certainly be that the whole Jewish question will in the future have to be approached under auspices which differ widely from those which have hitherto obtained.

The first point to be grasped in order to arrive at a true comprehension of the meaning of the movement known as Zionism is to recognise the fact that for many years past there have been two main currents of Jewish thought which have been moving in divergent directions. It is natural that it should be so. To use an expressive phrase employed by that talented novelist, George Eliot, Judaea—and, consequently, the Jews—is "poised between East and West." The tendency of the Western Jews has been to Westernise Judaism. Moses Mendelssohn (1729-86), who may be said to be almost the founder of this school of thought, held that the best solution of the Jewish question was that "the Jew should become as like as possible to the Gentile." The predominating note of Western Jewry has, therefore, been a movement from the Jewish to the non-Jewish. This movement received a great stimulus from the French Revolution, which broke down the walls of the Ghettos and thus emancipated the Jews, but which, at the same time, went far to denationalise Judaism. Toleration has produced its natural and inevitable result. It has tended to break up the solidarity of the Western Jews, and to facilitate assimilation with the non-Jewish communities to which they belong.

The thought of Eastern Jewry has developed on precisely opposite lines. The inefficacy of persecution, unless it be conducted on a scale and after a fashion which have now become practically impossible, has been clearly demonstrated. It has served to foster the movement which it was intended to stifle. The most passionately ardent Jews prefer persecution, which keeps alive the flame of nationalism, to emancipation, which tends to quench it. The following extract from the works of Asher Ginsberg, who adopted the synonym of "Achad-ha-'Am" (One of the People), is characteristic of their views. Speaking of the Western Jews, he said:—

"Do I envy these fellow-Jews of mine their emancipation? I answer in all truth and sincerity, No! A thousand times No! The privileges are not worth the price! I may not be emancipated; but at least I have not sold my soul for

emancipation. I at least can proclaim from the housetops that my kith and kin are dear to me wherever they are, without being constrained to find forced and unsatisfactory excuses. I at least can remember Jerusalem, mourn for its loss in public or in private, without being asked what Zion is to me or I to Zion. . . . And this spiritual freedom—scoff who will!—I would not exchange or barter for all the emancipation in the world.”

Zionism, which in its present form may be said to have been born in 1896, is the outcome of Eastern Jewish thought and action. Its headquarters until recently have been in Poland. Whether the centre of gravity of Jewish activity will now be shifted remains to be seen. Dr. Weizmann says: “It is too early as yet to estimate even approximately the effect of the war on the great Jewish centres in which a part of it is being waged, but it is already obvious that it will deal a shattering blow at what has been for centuries the great reservoir of Jewish strength.”

What is it that the Zionists want? The idea that they wish the Jews of all races to be congregated together in Palestine may at once be dismissed as absurd. Nothing of the sort is proposed. Neither do they want to establish a mere colony in the sense in which that term is usually employed. Zionism stands for a national revival. Its aim and goal, the Very Rev. Dr. Gaster says, “is to create for the Jew a new home, not so much for physical as for spiritual life. This must be borne in mind and never lost sight of—that the Holy Land is to become the spiritual centre of the Jews. This stands far above any political or economic consideration.” It should be added that Dr. Gaster’s idealism soars very high. He holds that the re-establishment of Jewish national life in the ancient home of Judaism will help to solve many of the burning questions of the day. Such are “the problem of tenure of property, the problem of commercial dealing, the protection of the labourer, the purity of food, simplified procedure in the Courts of Justice protection against usury, against rings and monopolies, democratic organisation, and the principles of equitable taxation. . . . The Jewish regathering is to be of great moment in the history of the emancipation and progress of mankind. Only from this point of view has Zionism a meaning and Judaism a justification.” Mr. Nahum Sokolow quotes the pathetic question propounded to him by an enthusiastic youth, who may be regarded as a typical “New Jew,” to the following effect: “Are we still a people to whom youth and health may return, or a bleached and scattered heap of bones? Are these bones never again to live and move?”

It would be both premature and presumptuous to attempt to forecast the future of the Zionist movement. All that can at present be done is to state the nature of the problem, and to note that some slight practical progress has been made towards the realisation of the Jewish ideals. For some years past a steady stream of Jewish immigration to Palestine has set in. There are now forty-five Jewish colonies, having a population of about fifteen thousand souls and covering an area of about one hundred and ten thousand acres. Good roads have been made. Numerous elementary schools in which Hebrew is taught have been established. “That Hebrew as a living language has come to stay,” Dr. Selig Brodetsky says, “that, in fact, Hebrew is well on the way to becoming the mother-tongue of Palestine Jewry, is obvious.” From a material point of view, the Jewish colonies thrive. The very common idea that the Jews can never be successful agriculturists has been completely disproved. They export fruit and wine in large quantities. In one colony the value of the irrigable land has risen from 3*l.* 12*s.* per acre in 1890 to 36*l.* an acre. The trade of Jaffa, which in 1904 was valued at 760,000*l.*, had in 1912 reached the figure of 2,080,000*l.* Liberal encouragement has been given to arts and industries.

Enough, however, has been said to show that, although possibly the Jewish question will not mature quite so quickly as some of the more enthusiastic Zionists consider probable, it is rapidly becoming a practical issue, and that before long politicians will be unable to brush it aside as the fantastic dream of a few idealists.

VIEW EXPRESSED BY SIR ALFRED MOND, M.P.

Extracts from an Article by him in the “Weekly Dispatch,” April 8, 1917.

As for the Palestinian ideal, which the British advance in South Palestine has quickened in the hearts of many of the Jewish people, the question which the average man will ask himself is: Are the Jews suitable for the agricultural life

which must be the basis of the development of this sun-enriched soil? He may be answered by reference to the Jewish agricultural colonies established in Palestine in recent years. These colonies have achieved remarkable results and seem to point to the survival of the old pastoral instinct of the Jews.

Arid and unhealthy land has been made fertile and habitable by the work of the tillers of the soil and by the skilful cultivation of eucalyptus trees. Several centres have also been started for the treatment of disease, particularly blindness, which is so unfortunately prevalent among children in the East owing to crude notions of hygiene.

In studying the future of Palestine and the practicability of an autonomous Jewish State there, it is fair to remember that the Jew on the whole gets on quite well with the Mahomedan, with whom he has racial affinities—both represent branches of the Semitic race—and between whose religion and Judaism there is much in common, as one would expect from a like derivation.

But many difficulties immediately suggest themselves. The ancient Temple of Solomon, for instance, is to-day the second Holy Moslem place after Mecca. The Jews would not interfere, but some might remember that it was once the Temple of Solomon.

To be quite frank, I have yet to be convinced that the foundation of an independent Jewish State comes within the domain of practical politics, but I see no reason why guarantees, if they were desired, should not be given to the Jews of the fullest liberty to manage their own local affairs and for the protection of the results of their labour, and I do not doubt, whatever the future of Palestine, that this condition could be obtained. Whether this would satisfy the aspirations of the Zionists who desire the foundation of an autonomous Jewish State is another matter.

VIEW EXPRESSED BY MR. JACOB SCHIFF.

*Extract from a Report of a Speech by him, "American Jewish Chronicle,"
April 27, 1917.*

I may say something which will surprise many of you elders. For the first time in the last three weeks the thought has come to me: "Why hasn't the Jew his own homeland?" I am not a believer in a Jewish nation built on "isms"—egotism first, atheism and agnosticism. I am a believer in the Jewish people, in the Jewish mission. I believe that somewhere there should be a great reservoir from which Jewish culture, unhampered by the materialism of the world, should spread its beautiful ideals to all parts of the world. This homeland, naturally, is Palestine.

THE JEWISH NATIONAL IDEA AND THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT AFTER THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

Zionism in the Russian Provinces occupied by the Enemy.

It should be noted that 42 per cent. of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews are not affected by the Russian Revolution. The ten governments of Poland (Warsaw, Petrokoff, Plozk, Kalisch, Lomza, Kielce, Radom, Lublin, Suwalki, Siedlce), with a population of about 1,800,000 Jews, are occupied by the enemy and have no connection with the recent events in Russia. The same applies to the Jews in the governments of Lithuania (Brest-Litovske, Wilna, Grodno, Kovno, and a part of Minsk), with a population of at least 600,000 Jews. The remainder of the Jews who live in the few places of Volhynia occupied by the enemy are also unaffected by the Russian Revolution. In all the provinces, which are densely populated by Jews, and in the two most important Jewish communities of Russia (Warsaw and Wilna) the national idea and the Zionist movement have greatly developed during the last generation, and during the war have received an added impetus. The terrible hardships and sufferings which the Jewish population of these provinces have endured during the war have brought home to many of them the consciousness of their unity and the necessity of a refuge of their own.

Zionist Conference in Warsaw.

The popularity of the Zionist idea among the Polish Jews is demonstrated by the fact that, in spite of the appalling conditions under which they live under the oppressive German occupation, they convened in May last a Zionist Conference in Warsaw, which was attended by nearly 400 delegates, representing a great number of communities, synagogues, societies, and groups, consisting of all classes of the Jewish population. In July last a plebiscite was inaugurated among the Jews of Poland with a view to ascertaining their attitude towards Zionism. The plebiscite resulted in the acceptance of a resolution in favour of Zionist aims.

Attitude of Press.

The leading Jewish press in Poland is Zionist. It is noteworthy that the "Haint," which has the widest circulation of all the newspapers. Jewish and non-Jewish, has recently given its adherence to the Zionist programme.

Sacrifice for Jewish Colonists in Palestine.

Wilna has for several years been the centre of Russian Zionism. It was the seat of the Zionist Central Committee. Wilna, with its old Jewish traditions, as a centre of Jewish learning and as the cradle of the Neo-Hebraic literature, has always taken a leading part in the Jewish national movement. It is remarkable that in the darkest hour of their trial and struggle for existence, when they had to collect every penny to satisfy the most vital needs of thousands of their starving brethren, they devoted part of the funds which were sent to them for the relief of the Jewish colonists in Palestine and for the continuation of the educational work to prepare new settlers for the Palestinian colonies.

Bialystok has since the very outset of the national movement been a great centre for the organisation and preparation of groups of colonists for Palestine, a work which was initiated by the late Rabbi Mohilewer. During the last year new groups of pioneers for the colonisation of Palestine after the war have been organised in connection with the neighbouring Jewish Lithuanian communities of Zabłudowo, Knishin, Wilkowitzki, and Grayevo (in the Louza government).

All the reports published in the Jewish press and reports which have reached us in private letters are unanimous in the statement that the number of organised Zionists (Shekel-payers) has considerably increased and that the income of the Jewish National Fund has exceeded any amount ever reached before. The political standing and the influence of the Nationalist Jews in Poland and Lithuania is best shown by the fact that on the Town Councils of the capital of Poland, Wilna, and Bialystok and other places numerous Zionist representatives have been elected by the Jewish masses.

As already stated, these activities only concern the two and a half millions of Russian Jews who are living under the German occupation and who have not been influenced by the Russian Revolution.

Zionism in post-Revolutionary Russia.

The beginning of a modern constitutional régime heralded by the Revolution for all the inhabitants of Russia, the liberation of all oppressed nationalities, creeds and classes, have opened out an era which the Russian Jews have welcomed with enthusiasm.

Having now attained the status of full citizenship and equal rights, it is urged in some quarters that this change would weaken or even destroy the national solidarity. But such is not the case, as the history of the first revolutionary movement in 1905-6 demonstrates. The idea of liberty in Russia, far from weakening Jewish nationalism, did but intensify and deepen the national aspirations.

Immediately after the first Revolution a Zionist Conference was held in Helsingfors, at which they defined their attitude of solidarity with the international Zionist movement.

Amongst the Jewish masses nationalism made great progress all over Russia. The nationalist Yiddish press of Warsaw, which has since played such a considerable part in forming Jewish public opinion, is a product of that epoch. A great number of cultural nationalist Jewish societies (Hazamir and others) were established in that period (1906).

In regard to the present Revolution, so far as we can judge from the facts at our disposal, the national movement among the Russian Jews has made great headway.

The Zionist Organisation in Russia utilised the first few weeks of Russian liberty to combine its scattered forces and to develop propaganda upon a large scale.

New Moscow Zionist Committee.

In Moscow a Zionist District Committee was formed, comprising twenty-four provinces: Astrakhan, Vladimir, Vologda, Voronezh, Kazan, Kaluga, Kostroma, Kursk, Moscow, Nijni-Novgorod, Simbirsk, Smolensk, Tambov, Tula, Ufa, Jaroslavl, and the Don district.

Zionist Demonstrations.

Almost in all towns splendid meetings have taken place, marked by extraordinary spontaneity and vigour. Particular mention may be made of the Zionist meeting at Odessa. Entire battalions of Zionist soldiers bore through the town blue and white banners with the motto: "Liberty in Russia, Land and Liberty in Palestine."

A hundred and fifty thousand men followed these banners, to which the Military Governor of Odessa insisted on showing honour publicly. We can likewise call attention to the Zionist meetings at Minsk, Saratov, Juriev, Kharkov, Theodosia, Nijni-Novgorod, Ekaterinburg, Homel, Proskurov, Baku, Dubrovno, Riazan, Kazan, Ekaterinoslav, Moscow, &c. The meeting organised at Kieff has likewise been very magnificent. When the procession approached the town hall the Zionist flag was hoisted on the balcony to the strains of "Hatikvah" (the Zionist anthem) played by the municipal orchestra.

At Berdischeff 15,000 Jews marched through the principal streets carrying Zionist banners. The municipality, the administration executive of the town, and the chiefs of the Ukraine National Organisations greeted the Zionist demonstrators.

According to advices from distant Turkestan and Bokhara, the Zionist movement has made remarkable progress there. The entire Sephardic element has adhered to the movement. The Ashkenazim and Sephardim, as is not often the case in Asiatic Russia, peacefully worked together at the great Asiatic Zionist Conference which was held at Samarcand. A meeting of five thousand Jews also held there adopted a resolution in favour of a Jewish Palestine.

In Moscow a Jewish mass meeting took place in the great hall of that town. The meeting was convened by a committee of the united Jewish organisations. Dr. Echiel Tchenow, who was elected president, called to mind, in his speech, the victims of the old rule and greeted the liberty of all "political offenders," the Duma, the Russian proletariat, the army. Then the representatives of the different Jewish organisations delivered speeches. A series of claims were advocated; in one claim all agreed to claim national rights for Russian Jewry.

Resolution of Moscow Mass Meeting.

The meeting adopted the following resolution:—

"The Jewish mass meeting in Moscow salutes with great joy the freedom. We are firmly convinced that the Constituent Assembly, which is to be elected by universal suffrage, shall establish in Russia a thoroughly democratic administration, and that not only civil rights, but also national rights, national autonomy, and a free national evolution shall be secured to the Jewish as well as to all other peoples of Russia. The meeting resolves to convoke a general Jewish congress in Russia."

It is very characteristic of the present trend of mind of Russian Jewry that in Moscow Dr. Jechiel Tchenow, the famous Zionist leader, has been elected head of the Moscow Jewish community, to-day the richest and most influential Jewish community in Russia. The three well-known Zionist leaders in Petrograd, Katzenelson, Rosoff, and Grunbaum, have been appointed members of the National Defence Commission created by the new Government. In Kieff, Bichowsky, the well-known Zionist, has been elected head of a new central communal organisation that comprises all local Jewish societies.

Attitude of Press.

It is also interesting to learn that, in spite of the activities and tremendous propaganda of the "Bund" (a Jewish Socialist organisation in Russia), it is the nationalist element that is supreme in the Russian Jewish press. The proportion

between nationalist and Zionist papers as against non-nationalist is about ten to one. Even the non-nationalist papers no longer actively oppose Jewish Nationalism. They simply lay their chief stress on class interest.

All-Russian Zionist Conference, Petrograd.

The outstanding feature of recent Zionist developments in Russia has been the holding of the All-Russian Zionist Conference, which opened in Petrograd on May 24, 1917.

The Conference received official recognition. The Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. Terestchenka, wished the Conference success.*

Representatives of Jewish democracy assured the Conference that the masses would respond in a Zionist spirit to the question of a Jewish centre in Palestine.

The Conference was attended by 552 delegates from 680 towns. The most remotely situated districts were represented. There were delegates from Turkestan, Bokhara, and the Crimea. The Jewish soldiers at the front sent 24 representatives.†

In addition to the delegates there were 500 visitors from provincial towns, and over 1,100 from Petrograd. The proceedings were attended by 87 newspaper correspondents.

At the Conference speeches expressing welcome and good wishes were delivered by M. Warshavsky, President of the Petrograd Jewish Community, who had hitherto opposed Zionism, and by M. H. Sliosberg, the well-known politician and lawyer, who previously had also not been favourable to the movement. The latter declared that the Zionist idea was dear to him, and he uttered the wish that the aim of the Conference should be attained in the near future. Zionism had kept the flag of Judaism aloft, he said, and the whole future of Jewry now depended upon the future of Zionism.

The delegate from Samarcand (Turkestan) said: "In our city there are 12,000 Jews, and we are all Zionists. In the whole of Turkestan there are no Jews who are not Zionists. We are all with you. We bring you our means and our souls."

Delegation of Soldiers to Conference.

There was also a delegation of soldiers from the front, which announced *that practically all the soldiers at the front were Zionists*, and that as soon as the war was over they would be ready to go to Palestine at the bidding of the Zionist leaders and play their part in building up the new national life.

The Resolutions of Conference.

The Conference carried the following resolution on Palestine unanimously:—

"Considering first that the Jewish people, in view of its disposition and dispersion all over the world, can recreate for itself conditions for normal development of its national, cultural, and economic life only through the restoration of a national autonomous centre in its historic home, Palestine.

"Secondly, that the Jewish nation has never severed its ties with its ancient home, and has always longed for it, and that its moral and historic right to Palestine is incontestable and irremovable.

"Thirdly, that the aspirations of the Jewish nation so manifested fully coincide with the great principle of self-definition, of freedom and independence for the development of all nations proclaimed by the democracies and governments of all countries.

"The seventh Zionist Conference in Russia unanimously expresses its firm belief that when establishing the basis of the future national and political life the nations will recognise and count with the clearly stated will of the Jewish nation for the re-settlement and re-birth of Palestine as its national centre, and will consequently create conditions guaranteeing the free and successful development of the concentration of Jewish forces and of the restoration of Palestine.

"To ensure the concrete and full manifestation of the will of the Jewish nation the Conference considers it necessary first to organise among the Jews

* For attitude of the Russian Government see Appendix IV.

† See special Military Order of General Alexieff, Appendix V.

a referendum on the question, secondly to lay before the All-Russian Jewish Congress the question of Jewish claims in Palestine, and thirdly to claim the admission of a representative of the Jewish nation at the future peace conference to be held upon the closing of hostilities for the expression of the wishes of the Jewish nation and for the defence of its historic and national rights and interests."

Practical Zionism.

Passing to the practical side of the Zionist movement, we desire to mention the following facts:—

In Moscow the "Haboneh," a company with a subscribed capital of 5,000,000 roubles, has been formed for the purpose of building houses in Palestine on the cessation of hostilities.

The considerable monthly returns of the Jewish National Fund are due particularly to receipts from Russia. This willingness to make sacrifices evinced by the Russian Jews (280,000 roubles during the first month of their deliverance) opens up very favourable prospects for the development of the Jewish National Fund in the future.

THE GROWTH OF ZIONISM IN AMERICA DURING THE WAR.

On the outbreak of the war American Zionists promptly set up in New York a provisional Executive Committee for Zionist affairs, which became, for certain purposes, a real International Zionist Executive. The head of this organisation was Mr. Brandeis, now Mr. Justice Brandeis, of the Supreme Court. It made its chief task the maintenance of the Jewish settlements and educational and other institutions in Palestine. For this purpose it raised vast sums of money, and the persistence of Jewish work in Palestine through three years of war is due primarily to American Zionists. In three years over 360,000*l.* passed through its hands, independently of the ordinary Zionist collections such as Shekel and National Funds. The Provisional Executive, at the same time, established intimate relations with the political factors in the United States and laboured to assist in the development of Zionism throughout the American Continent, notably in Canada and the Argentine. The recent Zionist Convention in Canada was the most impressive in the history of the movement in the Dominion.

The United States.

What may be called local Zionist affairs are under the control of the American Zionist Federation and affiliated bodies. These have grown greatly in strength during the war. At the Baltimore Conference on the 24th June last, it was reported that there were 170 societies attached to the Federation, 41 to the Hadassah or Women's Union, 98 to the Zionist Union of the Western States, 450 to the Young Judah Association, 87 to the Order Sons of Zion, 190 to the Misraché or strictly orthodox Association, 95 to the Poalé-Zion or Zionist Labour Party. To these should now be added the Order Brith Shalom with 50,000 members. At the time of the Baltimore Convention it was announced that there were 50 new Zionist Societies in process of formation. The number of shekel payers had risen in 1917 to 320,000, which is more than 120,000 increase over the preceding year. Every shekel payer formally accepts the Zionist programme and subscribes to the Zionist funds.

Some idea of the financial power of Zionism in the United States may be gained from a few illustrations. At mass meetings held in conjunction with the Baltimore Convention it was announced that 60,000*l.* was raised for Jewish relief in Palestine and the other war zones. The National Fund, which exists for the purchase of land in Palestine to be held by the organised Jewish people, obtained over 12,000*l.* during the year in voluntary gifts. In May the various Achuzah and other American societies for the co-operative purchase of land and foundation of colonies in Palestine were formed into a union, which has an actual capital of 30,000*l.*, and within five or six years will have an income of 200,000*l.* It is worth observing that this union will make special provision for the settlement in Palestine of Jewish ex-soldiers.

Resolution of Jewish Ministers' Association of New York.

The Agudath Horabbonim Hamatifim, the Jewish Ministers' Association of New York, has adopted the following resolution:—

“Resolved that all Jewish rabbis of America, the true representatives of the Jewish faith, be called in conference to petition the President of our God-blessed country, the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as the other Powers, favourably to consider the restoration of Palestine to the Jewish people.”

Convention of Jewish National, Socialist, Workmen's Committee.

The first convention of the *Jewish National, Socialist, Workmen's Committee*, called together in the last days of March to discuss the vital questions which will have to be taken up by the American Jewish Congress, adopted various resolutions, the final clause of which stated:—

“The convention hereby declares that it is the historic and sacred duty of American Jewry to demand in concert with all other parts of the Jewish people full national liberation and the possibility of an independent development of the Jewish people in an assured home in Palestine.”

Dr. Chaïm Zhitlowsky, one of the leaders of the Jewish Socialists in the United States of America, has adopted Zionism and enrolled himself as a member of the Poalei Zion of America. Together with him, two other noted Jewish labour leaders, Dr. Elsberg and Mr. Rothenbaum, have joined the Poalei Zion.