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Brandeis's Zionism was largely an application of the ideas that illuminated his approach to democracy in general. He viewed Zionism as a struggle for the kind of moral society and justice that he had thought had existed in Periclean Athens and that had been among the dreams of the American Pilgrims. To him, the Zionists were the ideological descendants of the Pilgrims, and he frequently referred to them as such. Zionism embodied the values of his progressive attitudes toward education, civic participation, community control of resources, and political equality of all human beings. He turned ancient Jews into the forerunners of Americans, proclaiming that "twentieth century ideals of America have been the ideals of the Jew for more than twenty centuries." Nationalism was a communal longing that paralleled the desire for individual liberty, and he argued that Jews had as much right as the Belgians or Italians to a territory of their own. He added that the creation of a Jewish homeland was necessary because of the anti-Semitic forces that seemed ineradicable in Europe.

There were contradictions in his Zionism. Although he accepted the nationalist argument that the Jewish culture could develop only in a homeland, he did not consider Palestine an attractive home for American Jews, who were unaffected by European anti-Semitism, and did not reconcile his assumption that a national home was a prerequisite of the continued development of a particularistic culture with the reality of a dynamic Jewish culture in the United States. This may be in part because he himself had so little interest in Jewish culture. In fact, while his earlier speeches referred to the importance of the Jewish heritage to a more democratic United States, he later grew impatient with attempts to revive Jewish culture in the United States or anywhere else outside Palestine and urged Jews to become not more Jewish but more Zionist. He claimed that "Jews gave to the world its three greatest religions, reverence for law, and the highest conceptions of morality," but he found the same lawfulness and morality in ancient Greece.
The fewish Problem: How to Solve It

Some of the contradictions may have existed because Brandeis was a problem-solver, and his Zionism was in part his reaction to the problem of European anti-Semitism. That was the reason he saw no disloyalty in American Zionism; American Zionists would give their primary loyalty to the United States and would further its values by helping to create a homeland in Palestine where other Jews could be as free as they were.

As soon as he became chairman of the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs in 1914, Brandeis did what he had with all his public service causes. He threw himself into every conceivable detail of organization and insisted that everyone else working with the movement had to be equally committed. He frequently sent a dozen or more letters a day, issuing directives and exhorting more strenuous efforts. The continuous stream of communications displayed his interest in and knowledge of details: how many members and sympathizers the movement had in every American city, how much money had been raised at virtually every meeting held, the names of people who could be persuaded to contribute or do more, and the contents of every American Zionist publication. During the last few months of 1914 he lectured about Zionism in New York, Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago, Milwaukee, Rochester, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Springfield, Massachusetts. In 1915 he added Portland, Maine; New Haven; Atlantic City; Salem, Massachusetts; Baltimore; Washington; Providence; and Louisville to his itinerary. He created the American Jewish Congress as well as a multiplicity of Palestine-geared organizations such as the Palestine Development Leagues, the Palestine Co-operative Fund, and the Palestine Economic Corporation. His energy was prodigious and he simply assumed that the rest of the world could match his pace if it really tried.

"The Jewish Problem: How to Solve It," 1915

"The Jewish Problem" is included here slightly out of chronological order because it was Brandeis's most important Zionist address. It is also a major statement of "progressive" Zionism and provides a context for his other speeches on the subject. It includes his explanation of why he considered Zionism necessary, emphasized that it was an attempt to create a democratic society, and drew links between the Jewish community in Palestine and both ancient Greece and the colonies.
established by the American Pilgrims. References in this and subsequent speeches to land purchase, as well as his entire philosophy, indicate that Brandeis believed that the land needed by the Jewish community had to be bought—not, as would happen after Israel gained statehood in 1948, be confiscated—and that it simply did not occur to him that anything the Zionists were doing implied that Palestinian Arabs were to be treated as less than equal.

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 today. 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 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, 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...

The meaning of the word Jewish in the term "Jewish Problem" must be accepted as coextensive 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 goes 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 we too 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 labor 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.

This attitude of certain nationalities is the exact correlative of the position which was generally assumed by the strong in respect to other individuals before democracy became a common possession. The struggles of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries both in peace and in war were devoted largely to overcoming that position as to individuals. In establishing the equal right of every person to development, it became clear that equal opportunity for all involves this necessary limitation: each man may develop himself so far, but only so far, as his doing so will not interfere with the exercise of a like right by all others. Thus liberty came to mean the right to enjoy life, to acquire property, to pursue happiness in such manner and to such extent as the exercise of the right in each is consistent with the exercise of a like right by every other of our fellow citizens. Liberty thus defined underlies twentieth-century democracy. Liberty thus defined exists in a large part of the western world. And even where this equal right of each individual has not yet been accepted as a political right, its ethical claim is gaining
recognition. Democracy rejected the proposal of the superman who should rise through sacrifice of the many. It insists that the full development of each individual is not only a right, but a duty to society, and that our best hope for civilization lies not in uniformity, but in wide differentiation.

The movements of the last century have proved that whole peoples have individuality no less marked than that of the single person, that the individuality of a people is irrepressible, and that the misnamed internationalism which seeks the obliteration of nationalities or peoples is unattainable. The new nationalism proclaims that each race or people, like each individual, has a right and duty to develop, and that only through such differentiated development will high civilization be attained. Not until these principles of nationalism, like those of democracy, are generally accepted, will liberty be fully attained, and minorities be secure in their rights. But there is ground for hope that the establishment of these principles will come as one of the compensations of the present war—and, with it, the solution of the Jewish Problem.

The difference between a nation and a nationality is clear; but it is not always observed. Likeness between members is the essence of nationality; but the members of a nation may be very different. A nation may be composed of many nationalities, as some of the most successful nations are. An instance of this is the British nation, with its division into English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish at home; with the French in Canada; and, throughout the Empire, scores of other nationalities. Other examples are furnished by the Swiss nation with its German, French, and Italian sections; by the Belgian nation composed of Flemings and Walloons; and by the American nation which comprises nearly all the white nationalities. The unity of a nationality is a fact of nature. The unity into a nation is largely the work of man. The false doctrine that nation and nationality must be made co-extensive is the cause of some of our greatest tragedies. It is, in large part, the cause also of the present war. It has led, on the one hand, to cruel, futile attempts at enforced assimilation, like the Russianizing of Finland and Poland, and the Prussianizing of Posen, Schleswig-Holstein, and Alsace-Lorraine. It has led, on the other hand, to those Panistic movements which are a cloak for territorial ambitions. As a nation may thrive though composed of many nationalities, so a nationality may thrive though forming parts of several nations. The essential in either case is recognition of the equal rights of each nationality . . .
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 clamoring for equal rights, to life and to self-expression . . . 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 14,000,000 Jews, and Palestine would not accommodate more than one-fifth of that number. In
the second place, it is not a movement to compel anyone 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, Servian, 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, intelli-
gence, and self-sacrifice. It was thus that the dream of Italian inde-
pendence 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 Servian 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 this hospitable
country 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 fool-

ish. 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, har-
assed 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 un-
familiar 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 sub-
jected. 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 fol-
lowed 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 hope-
lessly arid, has been shown to have been treeless and sterile only be-
cause of man's misrule. It has been shown to be capable of becoming
again a land "flowing with milk and honey." Oranges and grapes, ol-
ives 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...

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 . . .

In the Jewish colonies of Palestine there are no Jewish criminals; because everyone, 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 Shomrim, the Jewish guards of peace, who watch in the night against marauders and doers of violent deeds . . .

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 3,000,000, 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 Old World problems 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 op-
The 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 fulfillment 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 in America must stand up and be counted—counted with us—or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people.

"A CALL TO THE EDUCATED JEW," JANUARY 1915

Speaking to the Intercollegiate Menorah Association, Brandeis tried to show why secular Jews ought to be Zionists, again making the connection between the values contained in his versions of Zionism and Americanism. He discussed the Jewish love of learning, which he considered a major element of Jewish character. Learning was of value because it could be used to better existence and especially to make society more democratic. Just as the possession of civil liberties carried the
concomitant obligation of civic responsibility, so possession of learning implied a duty to help those in need.

While I was in Cleveland a few weeks ago, a young man who has won distinction on the bench told me this incident from his early life. He was born in a little village of Western Russia where the opportunities for schooling were meager. When he was thirteen his parents sent him to the nearest city in search of an education. There, in Bialystok, were good secondary schools and good high schools; but the Russian law, which limits the percentage of Jewish pupils in any school, barred his admission. The boy's parents lacked the means to pay for private tuition. He had neither relative nor friend in the city. But soon three men were found who volunteered to give him instruction. None of them was a teacher by profession. One was a newspaper man; another was a chemist; the third, as I recall, was a tradesman; all were educated men. And throughout five long years these men took from their leisure the time necessary to give a stranger an education.

The three men of Bialystok realized that education was not a thing of one's own to do with what one pleases, that it was not a personal privilege to be merely enjoyed by the possessor, but a precious treasure transmitted; a sacred trust to be held, used and enjoyed, and if possible strengthened, then passed on to others upon the same trust. Yet the treasure which these three men held and which the boy received in trust was much more than an education. It included that combination of qualities which enabled and impelled these three men to give, and the boy to seek and to acquire, an education. These qualities embrace: first, intellectual capacity; second, an appreciation of the value of education; third, indomitable will; fourth, capacity for hard work. It was these qualities which enabled the lad, not only to acquire but to so utilize an education that, coming to America, ignorant of our language and of our institutions he attained in comparatively few years the important office he has so honorably filled. [The reference apparently is to Judge Manuel Levine (1881–1939), chief justice of the Court of Appeals of the Eighth Ohio District.]

Whence comes this combination of qualities of mind, body and character? These are qualities with which every one of us is familiar, singly and in combination; which you find in friends and relatives; and which others doubtless discover in you. They are qualities possessed by most Jews who have attained distinction or other success. In combination,
they may properly be called Jewish qualities. For they have not come to us by accident; they were developed by three thousand years of civilization and nearly two thousand years of persecution; developed through our religion and spiritual life; through our traditions; and through the social and political conditions under which our ancestors lived. They are, in short, the product of Jewish life.

Our intellectual capacity was developed by the almost continuous training of the mind throughout twenty-five centuries. The Torah led the “People of the Book” to intellectual pursuits at times when most of the Aryan peoples were illiterate. Religion imposed the use of the mind upon the Jews, indirectly as well as directly. It demanded of the Jew not merely the love, but also the understanding of God. This necessarily involved a study of the Law. The conditions under which the Jews were compelled to live during the last two thousand years promoted study in a people among whom there was already considerable intellectual attainment. Throughout the centuries of persecution practically the only life open to the Jew which could give satisfaction was the intellectual and spiritual life. Other fields of activity and of distinction which divert men from intellectual pursuits were closed to Jews. Thus they were protected by their privations from the temptations of material things and worldly ambitions. Driven by circumstances to intellectual pursuits their mental capacity gradually developed. And as men delight in that which they do well, there was an ever-widening appreciation of things intellectual. And finally, the Jewish capacity for hard work is also the product of Jewish life, a life characterized by temperate, moral living continued throughout the ages, and protected by those marvelous sanitary regulations which were enforced through the religious sanctions. Remember, too, that amidst the hardship to which our ancestors were exposed it was only those with endurance who survived.

So let us not imagine that what we call our achievements are wholly or even largely our own. The phrase “self-made man” is most misleading. We have power to mar but we alone cannot make. The relatively large success achieved by Jews wherever the door of opportunity was opened to them is due, in the main, to this product of Jewish life, to this treasure which we have acquired by inheritance, and which we are in duty bound to transmit unimpaired, if not augmented, to coming generations... Our Jewish trust comprises also that which makes the living worthy and success of value. It brings us that body of moral and intellectual perceptions, the point of view and the ideals, which are ex-
pressed in the term Jewish spirit; and therein lies our richest inheritance.

Is it not a striking fact that a people coming from Russia, the most autocratic of countries, to America, the most democratic of countries, comes here, not as to a strange land, but as to a home? The ability of the Russian Jew to adjust himself to America's essentially democratic conditions is not to be explained by Jewish adaptability. The explanation lies mainly in the fact that the twentieth century ideals of America have been the ideals of the Jew for more than twenty centuries. We have inherited these ideals of democracy and of social justice as we have the qualities of mind, body and character to which I referred. We have inherited also that fundamental longing for truth on which all science, and so largely the civilization of the twentieth century, rests; although the servility incident to persistent oppression has in some countries obscured its manifestation.

Among the Jews democracy was not an ideal merely. It was a practice, a practice made possible by the existence among them of certain conditions essential to successful democracy, namely:

First: An all-pervading sense of duty in the citizen. Democratic ideals cannot be attained through emphasis merely upon the rights of man. Even a recognition that every right has a correlative duty will not meet the needs of democracy. Duty must be accepted as the dominant conception in life. Such were the conditions in the early days of the colonies and states of New England, when American democracy reached there its fullest expression; for the Puritans were trained in implicit obedience to stern duty by constant study of the Prophets.

Second: Relatively high intellectual attainments. Democratic ideals cannot be attained by the mentally undeveloped. In a government where everyone is part sovereign, everyone should be competent, if not to govern, at least to understand the problems of government; and to this end education is an essential. The early New Englanders appreciated fully that education is an essential of potential equality. The founding of their common school system was coincident with founding of the colonies; and even the establishment of institutions for higher education did not lag far behind. Harvard College was founded but six years after the first settlement of Boston.

Third: Submission to leadership as distinguished from authority . . .

Fourth: A developed community sense. The sense of duty to which I have referred was particularly effective in promoting democratic ideals among the Jews, because of their deep-seated community feeling. To
describe the Jew as an individualist is to state a most misleading half-truth. He has to a rare degree merged his individuality and his interests in the community of which he forms a part. As Ahad Ha'am [a Jewish poet who immigrated to Palestine] so beautifully said: "Judaism did not turn heavenward and create in Heaven an eternal habitation of souls. It found 'eternal life' on earth, by strengthening the social feeling in the individual; by making him regard himself not as an isolated being with an existence bounded by birth and death, but as part of a larger whole, as a limb of the social body. This conception shifts the center of gravity of the ego not from the flesh to the spirit, but from the individual to the community; and concurrently with this shifting, the problem of life becomes a problem not of individual, but of social life . . . When the individual thus values the community as his own life, and strives after its happiness as though it were his individual wellbeing, he finds satisfaction, and no longer feels so keenly the bitterness of his individual existence, because he sees the end for which he lives and suffers." Is not that the very essence of the truly triumphant twentieth-century democracy?

Such is our inheritance; such the estate which we hold in trust. And what are the terms of that trust; what the obligations imposed? The short answer is noblesse oblige; and its command is twofold. It imposes duties upon us in respect to our own conduct as individuals; it imposes no less important duties upon us as part of the Jewish community or people . . .

But from the educated Jew far more should be exacted. In view of our inheritance and our present opportunities, self-respect demands that we live not only honorably but worthily; and worthily implies nobly. The educated descendants of a people which in its infancy cast aside the Golden Calf and put its faith in the invisible God cannot worthily in its maturity worship worldly distinction and things material. "Two men he honors and no third," says Carlyle, "the toil-worn craftsman who conquers the earth and him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable."

And yet, though the Jew make his individual life the loftiest, that alone will not fulfill the obligations of his trust. We are bound not only to use worthily our great inheritance, but to preserve, and if possible, augment it; and then transmit it to coming generations. The fruit of three thousand years of civilization and a hundred generations of suffering may not be sacrificed by us. It will be sacrificed if dissipated. Assimilation is national suicide. And assimilation can be prevented only
by preserving national characteristics and life as other peoples, large and small, are preserving and developing their national life. Shall we with our inheritance do less than the Irish, the Serbians, or the Bulgars? And must we not, like them, have a land where the Jewish life may be naturally led, the Jewish language spoken, and the Jewish spirit prevail? Surely we must, and that land is our fathers' land; it is Palestine.

The undying longing for Zion is a fact of deepest significance, a manifestation in the struggle for existence.

The establishment of the legally secured Jewish home is no longer a dream. For more than a generation brave pioneers have been building the foundations of our new-old home. It remains for us to build the super-structure. The Ghetto walls are now falling. Jewish life cannot be preserved and developed, assimilation cannot be averted, unless there be reestablished in the fatherland a center from which the Jewish spirit may radiate and give to the Jews scattered throughout the world that inspiration which springs from the memories of a great past and the hope of a great future.

The glorious past can really live only if it becomes the mirror of a glorious future; and to this end the Jewish home in Palestine is essential. We Jews of prosperous America above all need its inspiration.

"AN ESSENTIAL OF LASTING PEACE," 1915

Although this address to the Economic Club of Boston technically was not about Zionism or given to a Zionist audience, Brandeis used it to explain his concept of nationalism as an essential element of human equality and its acceptance as a prerequisite of peace. World War I had begun, although the United States was not yet involved in it.

Those discussing the possibilities of a lasting peace usually emphasize one or the other of the following means of securing it:

First. The creation of a Congress of the Nations to determine what should be their relative rights, of an International Court to decide any disputed claims, and of an International Police to enforce the laws of this Congress and the decisions of this Court.

Second. The democratization of the nations, and particularly of the
war-making power; so that the people, who must ultimately bear the burdens of war, may decide whether war shall be entered upon.

Third. Disarmament—so that unpreparedness may prevent precipitate action—and encourage sober second thought.

Fourth. The removal of economic causes of war, and pre-eminently the prohibition of preferential tariffs.

These suggestions, if carried out, would undoubtedly tend to preserve peace; for together they would reduce the provocations of war and lessen the facility of conducting it. But is there not a cause of war which is more fundamental than any of those which it is sought thus to remove?

Deeply imbedded in every nation and people is the desire for full development—the longing for self-expression. In the past it has been generally assumed that the full development of one people necessarily involved its domination over others. Strong nations are apt to become convinced that by such domination only does civilization advance. Strong nations 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.

This attitude of nations and peoples is the exact correlative of the position generally assumed by the strong in respect to other individuals before democracy became a common possession. The struggles of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, both in peace and in war, were devoted largely to overcoming that position as to individuals, to establishing the equal right to development of every person, and in making clear that equal opportunity for all involves this necessary limitation: each man may develop himself so far, but only so far, as his doing so will not interfere with the exercise of a like right by all others. Thus liberty has come to mean the right to enjoy life, to acquire property, to pursue happiness, in such manner that the exercise of the right in each is consistent with the exercise of a like right by every other of our fellow citizens. Liberty thus defined underlies twentieth-century democracy. Liberty thus defined exists in a large part of the western world. And even where this equal right of all has not yet been accepted as a political right, its ethical value is becoming recognized.

The movements of the last century have proved that whole peoples have individuality no less marked than that of the single person; that the individuality of a people is irrepressible, and that internationalism
which seeks the obliteration of nations or peoples is unattainable. As democracy rejects the proposal of the superman who shall rise through sacrifice of the many and insists that the full development of each individual is not only a right but a duty to society; so the new nationalism proclaims the right and the duty of each race or people to develop itself fully.

The history of the last century shows the persistence and intensity of this feeling. It made a great and united country out of the Italy which had been declared by Metternich to be but a “geographical expression.” It freed Greece. It created the kingdoms of Roumania, Bulgaria, and Servia. It made little Montenegro an independent state. It established home rule in Ireland. It revived the Cymric language in Wales. It has kept alive the struggle for a free Poland. It made a dual monarchy out of Austria; and the demands of its many other peoples subjected to the German-Hungarian rule have kept it in constant turmoil. If we wish to find the true explanation of the readiness of the European peoples to sacrifice their best in man and property—of their joyousness amid losses which cannot be repaired in generations—we must look deeper for the war’s causes than economic ambitions or treaty violations. The fundamental cause is the longing of the people for self-development—for self-expression; and the mistaken belief on one side or the other that this self-development justly requires the subjection of other peoples.

No peace which is lasting can ever come until the nations, great and small, accept the democratic principle that there is and shall be no supernation, to rise through subjection of others, and the truth that each people has in it something of peculiar value which it can contribute to that civilization for which we are all striving. And until that principle is accepted—and that truth recognized, unrest must be unending. Whatever economic arrangement may be made, however perfect and comprehensive may become the machinery for enforcing the treaties of the nations, those people who are not accorded equality of opportunity for full development will prove a source of irritation; injustice will bring its inevitable penalty; and the peace of the world will be broken again and again, as those little nations of the Balkans have taught us in recent years.

Equal opportunity for all people as for all individuals—that is the essential of international as well as of national justice upon which a peace which is to be permanent must rest. Unless that fundamental
right is recognized and granted universally, there will be discord and war in the future, as there has been in the past.

"PALESTINE AND THE JEWISH DEMOCRACY," 1915

Perhaps the most notable thing about this speech is the way in which Brandeis equated problems and institution building among the Palestinian Jews with the drive for greater democracy in the United States. It reiterates some of the themes of "The Jewish Problem" but also emphasizes gender equality, education, civic cooperation, and an attack on the problem of unemployment.

Three centuries ago Elder Brewster, reviewing the first year after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock, said: "It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage or small discontents make them wish themselves home again." Small discontents! Out of the hundred who came in the Mayflower fifty-one had died before the close of the year, and at times out of the forty-nine survivors only seven were fit to work. Yet the spirit of the Pilgrim Fathers did not falter. To that spirit we owe in large part the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and that which we prize most in American life.

With a like spirit the Jewish Pilgrim Fathers turned a generation ago to Palestine, and began to establish those settlements called colonies, through which Zionism is becoming a reality.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me say at the outset what Zionism is, and particularly what it is not.

First, it is not a movement to transport all the Jews in the world to Palestine . . .

Secondly, it is not a movement to transport compulsorily a single Jew to Palestine . . .

Thirdly, neither is it a movement to wrest the sovereignty of Palestine from the Turkish Government. Zionism is a movement to give the Jews a home in the land of their fathers where the Jewish life may be lived normally and naturally, and where the Jews may in time hope to constitute a majority of the population and look forward to what we have come to call home rule . . .

The first years of these Jewish settlers resembled the first years of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth. They had to fight death and disease. Mis-
government of the country had brought malaria into it. The land appeared to be exhausted, and they knew not how to enrich and till it. Many died, and those who survived lived only to be confronted by obstacle after obstacle. Failure followed failure; but they were determined, and every failure meant new effort; every mistake was a teacher. Plowing as they did in the field of faith and reaping experience, these men and those who joined them succeeded at the end of twenty-five years in establishing the two great propositions upon which practical Zionism rests: [1] that Palestine is fit for the modern Jew, and [2] that the modern Jew is fit for Palestine...

Education has ever been treasured by the Jewish people. Civilization without education is inconceivable to them. And so they have established a school system almost complete. But for this war it would have been capped with the establishment of the first department of the University of Jerusalem—the medical department. The war interrupted that forward step, and also the opening of the Institute of Technology at Haifa. But before the war there had been established high schools in which were fitted, not only Jews of Palestine, but hundreds who came from Russia and Roumania, so thoroughly that they could enter, on equal terms with the European students, any of the great universities of Austria, Germany, and France. But it is not only in things material and intellectual that the Zionists undertook to develop civilization in Palestine. They sought otherwise to carry forward the work of the Jewish spirit. Carlyle has said: "Two men he honors and no third. The toil-worn craftsman who conquers the earth; and him who is seen striving for the spiritually indispensable." Had Carlyle lived he would have sent greetings to those Jewish settlers of Palestine; for they have both tilled the soil and have sought to establish the principles of democracy and social justice for which we of America are now striving. In their self-governing colonies, over forty in number, ranging in population from a few families to some two thousand, they have pure democracy, and, since those self-governing colonies were establishing a true democracy, they gave women equal rights with men, without so much as a doubt on the part of any settler. And women contributed, like the men, not only in the toil of that which is narrowly called the home, but in the solution of broader difficult problems. One of these problems was law and order. For the Jewish settlers in Palestine had in some respects problems similar to those of our own early settlers—the Bedouins taking the place of the Indians. Their farms and settlements needed protection. The Turkish Government does not, among its func-
tions, assume that of policing. The Jews therefore hired Arabs to guard their colonies, and mounted Arabs protected their land. But after a number of years a woman—one of the women voters—said: "We must protect ourselves. We must establish our own mounted police." And the Jewish young men, largely sons of the original immigrants, responded; and out of the suggestion of a woman came the great Palestine institution, a Guild of Honor among the Jewish youth of the land.

The Jews carried out otherwise principles of democracy. Among the problems which they undertook to solve is one with which we have been particularly concerned this last year—the problem of unemployment. The prosperity of the Palestine colonies had depended largely upon its export trade. The orange crop, grapes, the olives, the almonds, are the crops from which money had been brought into Palestine. Even wheat has been exported in considerable quantities, and sold principally to Italy, because it is well suited to the manufacture of macaroni.

When the war came, their trade practically ceased, because the export markets were closed to them. It ceased wholly later because, when Turkey entered the war, it prohibited all exports. This stoppage of trade naturally brought on unemployment. The industries dependent on the export business closed down. Moreover, there had been almost a boom in building in Palestine just before the war, because the immigration had increased largely, the last year before the war being the most prosperous the colonies had ever had.

But when the war began the Zionists found themselves confronted with this situation: builders, planters, and manufacturers, employing comparatively large numbers of Jewish workmen, were forced to close or curtail operations and the workmen were thrown out of employment. The Zionists recognized that the burdens consequent on this common disaster ought not to fall on that part of the Jewish population alone, but should be borne by the entire Jewish people. They undertook to find employment for those who had lost their jobs. In part they did this by going on courageously with public works, with road-building and drainage work, with the construction of a public hospital, and similar undertakings. That helped some. They suggested that the farmers look ahead and do upon their farms work that would add ultimately to the value of these farms. That took care of a large part of the workmen in the country districts. But there were many unemployed Jewish workmen in the cities, which had been growing incident to the growth of the colonies. What could be done there? The Zionists studied the problem, and found that the reason many of the industries closed down
was not that the owners wished to do so, but that they were unable to get the money to continue to carry on their business. They therefore undertook, to the extent of the available funds, to lend money to those industries which were relatively large employers of labor, to the end that those for whom they held themselves responsible should not be put in the position of takers of charity. To this end those who had steady jobs suffered their salaries to be cut one-fourth, one-third, and in some cases even more, and those who had not steady jobs were enabled to work at least part of the time under a fair distribution of that work which it was possible to provide for them. Thus did this people, struggling again the hardships of the war, without the ability to call upon a government to aid them, dependent largely only upon themselves for help, undertake to do what social justice demands. And what they did in this emergency they have long been doing, or attempting to do, through their institutions in various fields of public activity.

Notable among the Zionist institutions is the Jewish National Fund, formed to purchase land as the inalienable property of the Jewish people in Palestine. A large part of the settlers own individual property, but the Zionist organization determined that the land it acquired should be the property of the Jewish people, remaining national domain and leased to the settlers at a rent which would not allow of unearned increment. That Jewish National Fund, besides being used for acquiring land, has been devoted to afforestation and to securing proper housing conditions for Jewish working-people. Funds have thus been lent for the purpose of erecting proper workingmen's dwellings in the colonies and cities.

This Jewish National Fund, used thus for the Jewish people, is, in the most exact sense, a fund of the people. Hundreds of thousands of persons have contributed to that fund. They have contributed also to another fund—the Jewish Colonial Trust, of which the Anglo-Palestine Company is the leading bank of Palestine. To purchase the shares of that bank hundreds of thousands of people have contributed. I have been told that in Russia and Galicia, where for centuries poverty has been so deep, there are people who pawned their coats to raise money to buy a share in the Jewish Colonial Trust, in order to help carry out the national ideal. The bank, founded on strictly business principles, is managed also on strictly humanitarian and social principles. Through that bank the Jewish colonists have been aided in many ways. It has enabled them to establish co-operative societies dealing with almost every activity of Jewish life. It has enabled communities to avoid the
heavy burdens of tax farming. It has enabled villages to establish a system of irrigation and water supply. And, while thus serving the public welfare, it became the leading bank of deposits and financial institution of Palestine.

In other fields likewise Zionists have undertaken functions which governments should assume, but generally do not. Among their institutions is the Palestine Office, so called, an exalted information bureau and intelligence office for the prospective settler, which helps to place him in his new home with the minimum of self-sacrifice and suffering on his part, and which acts in many ways as friend and adviser of the Jewish inhabitants in the land of their fathers . . .

I was talking not long ago with one of the men who went as a pioneer to Palestine. He referred in discussion to another Palestinian, and, as a word of severest censure, he said: "Yes, he is a Zionist, but he thinks of his own interests first. That is all right in other countries, but in Palestine it is all wrong." And as he spoke he made me think of the words which Mazzini uttered when entering Rome in 1849: "In Rome we may not be moral mediocrities." That is the feeling of the Palestinian Pilgrim Fathers. That should be the feeling of their brethren throughout the world when they think of their great inheritance, of their glorious past—the mirror of the future.

PITTSBURGH PLATFORM, JUNE 25, 1918

The statement adopted at the Pittsburgh convention of the Federation of American Zionists became the basis of the formal American Zionist agenda. It includes not only the primacy Brandeis invariably gave to the interrelated phenomena of democracy, education, and civil liberties but, in addition, his application to Palestine of the policy toward use of land, other natural resources, and public utilities that he had developed during the Pinchot-Ballinger Alaskan land scandal.

In 1897 the first Zionist Congress at Basle defined the object of Zionism to be "the establishment of a publicly recognized and legally secured homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine." The recent declarations of Great Britain, France, Italy and others of the allied democratic states, have established this public recognition of the Jewish National Home as an international fact. Therefore, we desire to affirm anew the
principles which have guided the Zionist movement since its inception and which were the foundation of the ancient Jewish state and of the living Jewish law embodied in the traditions of two thousand years of exile.

First: We declare for political and civil equality irrespective of race, sex, or faith of all the inhabitants of the land.

Second: To insure in the Jewish National Home in Palestine equality of opportunity we favor a policy which, with due regard to existing rights, shall tend to establish the ownership and control by the whole people of the land, of all natural resources and of all public utilities.

Third: All land, owned or controlled by the whole people, should be leased on such conditions as will insure the fullest opportunity for development and continuity of possession.

Fourth: The cooperative principle should be applied so far as feasible in the organization of all agricultural, industrial, commercial, and financial undertakings.

Fifth: The system of free public instruction which is to be established should embrace all grades and departments of education.

LETTERS FROM PALESTINE

Brandeis’s only trip to Palestine took place during the summer of 1919. By then he was the acknowledged leader of American Zionism and the Jewish settlers turned his visit into a triumphal tour. There were groups of singing children, flying flags, honor guards, delegations of Hadassah doctors and members of the Jewish Brigade, and roads lined with residents in their holiday best. His ecstatic reaction to the progress he found in the settlements and cities he visited, as well as his enhanced awareness of their problems, is clear in the letters below.

Letter to Alice Goldmark Brandeis,
July 10, 1919, from Jerusalem

We have been in Palestine 48 hours. The first day was spent on the way to Jerusalem; the second here. It is a wonderful country, a wonderful city. [Aaron] Aaronsohn [the agronomist who had piqued Brandeis’s interest in Palestine—see Introduction] was right. It is a miniature California, but a California endowed with all the interest which the history of man can contribute and the deepest emotions which can stir a
people. The ages-long longing, the love is all explicable now. It has also the great advantage over California of being small. The marvellous contrasts of nature are in close juxtaposition. Not only the mind but the eye may grasp them within a single picture, and the marvelous quality of the air brings considerable distances into it. What I saw of California and the Grand Canyon seemed less beautiful than the view from the Mount of Olives upon the Dead Sea and the country beyond. And yet all say that northern Palestine is far more beautiful, and that in this extra-dry season we are seeing the country at its worst.

It was a joy from the moment we reached it at Rafia. Many enter south of Gaza, and even in the hot plains the quality of the air was bracing. To my surprise, I have experienced no inconvenience from the altitude (about 2500 feet) here, and I have seen nothing in the country yet which should deter even such lovers as you of the cool to avoid summering here. The nights are always cool. In Jerusalem it is comfortable at mid-day in the shade, and there is almost constant breeze.

We are living here most pleasantly . . . and I am taken care of much in the manner of a Swiss landlady. Living conditions couldn't be better.
The problems are serious and numerous. The way is long, the path
difficult and uncertain; but the struggle is worthwhile. It is indeed a
Holy Land.

Letter to Chaim Weizmann,
July 20, 1919, from Haifa, Palestine

It is fine to be able to send you our greetings from your brother’s and
sister’s charming house. Palestine has won our hearts . . . It is no won­
der that the Jews love her so.

Letter to Alice Goldmark Brandeis,
July 6, 1919, from Alexandria, Egypt

Our Palestine stay—only 16 1/2 days—was crowded with impressions
and most informing. I feel that we really know the main problems and
the difficulties and possibilities. What we saw and heard there has been
supplement[ed] by the constant conferences since with our associates;
also all my previous reading has become vitalized; so that the 16 days
represent in some respects years of acquisitiveness. We saw practically
all the country; all the cities and 23 of the 43 Jewish Colonies. I have
been converted to the food & found long auto travel agreeable and not
fatiguing.

My opinion as to the future was summed up in a letter to General Al­
enby substantially as follows: “What I have seen and heard strengthen
greatly my conviction that Palestine can and must become the Jewish
Homeland as promised in the Balfour Declaration. The problems and
the difficulties are serious and numerous, even more so than I had an­
ticipated; but there is none which will not be solved & overcome by the
indomitable spirit of the Jews here and elsewhere.”

. . . Felix [Frankfurter] was very wise in insisting upon our coming.

MESSAGES TO ZIONIST LEADERS AND OTHERS
WORKING IN THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

Telegram to Benjamin Perlstein, September 19, 1914

Request [Louis] Lipsky to caution organizers of my meetings to select
rather small halls. Overcrowded small hall meeting better than large
hall nearly full. Every man turned away for lack of room is worth two who get in.

Letter to Richard Gottheil, October 2, 1914

I trust that you are making good progress in organizing a band of speakers among the intellectuals. It seems to me very important that this work should be pressed forward as rapidly as possible, and that intensive work of educating through small groups and meetings should be undertaken.

Telegram to Louis Lipsky, October 3, 1914

Yes, will arrive Cleveland in time for afternoon luncheon, but should favor luncheon only if Committee convinced it will be financially profitable. Cleveland ought to produce at least five thousand dollars.

Letter to Israel J. Biskind, November 6, 1914

I find upon my return here that up to date, $2,000 has been received from Cleveland. We have hoped that Cleveland would contribute at least $5,000... Will you kindly confer with your associates and let me know when we may expect further remittances from Cleveland.

Letter to Benjamin Perlstein, November 9, 1914

Send to members of each of the Committee having matters in hand not yet disposed of, a request to send a report to the office in writing not later than next Monday and let me have carbons of letters that you send.

Letter to Max Mitchell, November 17, 1914

I hope you have already undertaken to get the large subscriptions about which you spoke to me. Try to make them at least $500 a piece; and one or two $1000 subscriptions would go a long way towards giving the proper impetus to the work throughout the Country and in putting Massachusetts where it belongs in this movement.

I hope that you will have these checks in hand before Friday, when I start for Chicago.

I venture to suggest that the collections from Chicago ought to reach
in the aggregate $20,000. In Boston we raised about $7,000 at our meeting on the 27th.

Letter to Jacob deHaas, January 25, 1915

Please arrange that I receive not later than the 5th of each month a report covering the activities of the Zionist Bureau during the preceding month.

I should be glad if you would give some care to the form of the report, so that it may be possible, by a comparison of the reports from month to month, to note readily the progress that has been made in each line of activity, and serve as a current reference to the achievements of the Bureau.

Letter to Louis Lipsky, January 27, 1915

First: The format of the Maccabaean seems to me a great improvement, but the smallness of the print seems to me most objectionable . . .

Letter to Henrietta Szold, March 4, 1915

You . . . are to be congratulated on the February number of the Hadassah Bulletin.

(Please send me for my files Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Hadassah Bulletin.) . . . if you could arrange to have Miss Leon, who made an excellent impression here, or some of your other members, here for a series of conferences, a very considerably increased Hadassah membership might be expected.

Letter to Joseph L. Cohen, May 1, 1915

... Second: We must make available for our members an adequate Zionist library, directing our efforts:

(a) to having the desirable works on Zionism in leading public libraries . . . and the main universities.

(b) to have some works in public libraries in all communities where there are many Jews.

(c) to provide a reasonable working library at Zionist headquarters, and at any Zionist Bureau that may be established . . .
"Members, Money, Discipline": Note to Morris Rothenberg, February 18, 1917

Please extend my greetings to your Council [the Zionist Council of Greater New York, of which Rothenberg was chairman] at its annual meeting [the Eleventh Annual Convention] and tell them that they can prove themselves good Zionists only by producing Members, Money, Discipline.

Letter to Robert Szold, August 19, 1930

Our crying need is a body of competent and willing speakers and writers... The conditions of Jews in the Diaspora in 1930—as compared with 1920 and 1914—has worsened to such a degree, that the belief of thinking Jews that the Jewish problem would be solved by growing enlightenment in the Diaspora must have been seriously shaken—if not shattered.

A speaker sufficiently familiar with Jewish history, could, in the light of recent events, demolish these objectors. The anti-Semitic outbreaks in Europe, the closing of the doors to immigrants by practically all the new countries, the rise of anti-Semitism even in the new countries, remove the old alternatives from consideration. The question now presented is largely Palestine—or Despair...

The social life and strivings of the Jews as reflected in official reports and serious economic and political discussion, and as interpreted in literary productions, affords abundant material for appeal to Jewish liberals—with or without religious faith and to idealists of any race or creed...

Every opportunity to speak which offers, however modest or unpromising it may appear, should be availed of; and effort should be continuously and persistently made to create opportunities. Lodges, Club societies, gatherings—social or serious—should be sought—whatever their character...

The available material affords also ample evidence in support of the argument that with a proper British attitude Jews can live in harmony with the Arabs; that friendly relations are being developed in many places; and that raising of the level of Arab existence has been, and is, not only a necessary incident of the Jewish upbuilding of P.—but the Jewish desire; that the Jews recognize that raising the Arab level is essential to attain the social end which the Jewish Labor especially is
seeking to serve; and which Jewish industrialists desire in order to enlarge the home market.

*Letter to Maurice B. Hexter, September 7, 1930*

... the possibilities of Jewish urban immigration are practically unlimited; because its needs for land and water are small. Palestine has about the area of Massachusetts. The commerce and industry of the Commonwealth support nearly four million people. The essentials are a sea-port, a good harbor, a good climate and a population with brains, determination and character. When Haifa's harbor shall have been made good and malaria shall have been wholly eliminated, the Jews can provide Palestine with the other essential. Moreover, Massachusetts has no natural resources comparable to the Dead Sea salts—and no cheap supply of oil...

Nothing in Palestine development is more encouraging than the 1928 Census showing "3,505 producing enterprises." And happily their number is steadily growing. The new products of the 'geo' and the 'Lio' factories, the local production of the tins, the making of orange boxes of Hedera wood are notable events in the history of the country. We should do everything possible to promote such enterprises; to make Palestine self-sufficient; and to develop its exports of manufactured products. With the aid of these and the increasing orange production, the terrifying adverse trade balance can be overcome. The increase of £350,000 in the first four months of 1930 for exports and the decrease of £150,000 in imports is a most hopeful occurrence. The sale of £10,000 of artificial teeth to England is an indication of what Jewish ingenuity, courage and determination can achieve for Palestine. Even more should be possible.

*Letter to Bernard Flexner, April 8, 1940*

On general principles, we should promote Arab stockholding in Jewish enterprises and proportionate employment of Arab labor, but never more than such proportionate employment and never for the purpose of employing labor at lower rates.