

Zionism and the World Peace

A REJOINDER

By ISRAEL FRIEDLAENDER



THE array of arguments advanced by Herbert Adams Gibbons against Zionism in the January number of the CENTURY MAGAZINE may be summarized under three headings: First, the Zionists have no right to favor British sovereignty over the Holy Land and to reject "any form of dual or multiple political control over Palestine." Together with the British, "they do not appreciate how the French feel about Palestine and Syria," and overlook the fact that "French Catholics and French imperialists are determined that Palestine shall not be British." Second, the great powers have no right to determine the fate of Palestine. In accordance with the principles enunciated by President Wilson, the destinies of Palestine must be left in the hands of the Palestinian Arabs. "Palestine is theirs." Third, the Zionists are altogether wrong in claiming a state or a commonwealth. "Why Palestine? Why a distinct nationhood for the Jews? Why do the Zionists fail to comprehend "the words of the Palestinian Jew who said, 'My kingdom is not of this world?'"

I believe I shall follow a more logical line of reasoning if I apply myself to the last fundamental argument first and take up the others later.

"Why Palestine? Why a distinct nationhood for the Jews?" Mr. Gibbons, who is in the habit of quoting his Jewish friends, tells us that some of them had warned him against writing on Zionism, since, as a Christian, "he can have no conception of what Zionism means to the Jew." The Jews who spoke to him in this manner were entirely mistaken. From its very beginning Zionism has had a large number of Christian friends, thinkers,

writers, and statesmen, among them men like ex-President Roosevelt and President Wilson, who have shown that Christians are well able to comprehend "what Zionism means to the Jew." The recent book by Dr. A. A. Berle, formerly professor of applied Christianity in Tufts College, on "The World Significance of a Jewish State," is a striking illustration of the ability of a Christian to appreciate the message of Zionism in all its depths and implications.

A misconception of Zionism is glaringly betrayed in several passages of Mr. Gibbons's article, in which the author confesses to be at a loss to explain why Zionism seems, on the one hand, "mystical and spiritual," why it is "from Alpha to Omega a spiritual movement," and why, on the other hand, it emphasizes the temporal aspect, and advocates "a distinct nationhood for the Jews." Without being aware of it, Mr. Gibbons has touched the vital spot of Zionism, and, for that matter, of Judaism. This is not the place to enter into theological or historical disquisitions; yet this much may be said, that the fundamental characteristic of Judaism which distinguishes it from Christianity is the very fact that, while anticipating Christianity by hundreds of years in proclaiming the great spiritual message of the kingdom of heaven based on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, it refuses at the same time to accept "the words of the Palestinian Jew who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," insisting that the kingdom of heaven must be realized right here in this world, in the forms of human life and through human agencies. The prophets of Israel, who were the first to formulate the concept of one God and one humanity, be-

lieved at the same time passionately in the racial integrity of their people and in the absolute necessity for this people to express itself through the agency of an organized community life; that is, a commonwealth or a state. The Jewish prophets were not mere metaphysicians or theologians; they were "mystical" and "practical" at one and the same time. They were both universalists and nationalists, believing in the realization of the universal ideal through the channel of national existence. From this point of view the Jewish state appears both as a spiritual and as a material aspiration. It is not an end in itself, an agency for political aggrandizement and the injustice and oppression that goes with it, but it is a means to an end, the physical vessel for a spiritual content, the material agency for the consummation of the great ideals of justice and righteousness. The founders of the second Jewish commonwealth applied this prophetic doctrine to life when, in laying the corner-stone of the second temple, they declared, through the mouth of the prophet Zechariah, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

This fundamental attitude of the Jewish people toward its commonwealth has been essentially retained and developed by modern Zionism. True, Zionism includes among its rank and file as well as among its leadership many Jews who have drifted away from the religious moorings of Judaism. Yet, though refusing to acknowledge the metaphysical basis of the prophetic ideal, they passionately cling to the ideal itself. To them, too, Zion is primarily an opportunity for the Jewish people to express itself in accordance with its ancient ideals and aspirations. They realize that, while modern Jewry has made great material progress as a result of Jewish emancipation, and while it has contributed far more than its share to the spiritual life of the nations in which the Jews live, it has done very little for its own distinct culture and spiritual development. They point to the fact that, to mention a concrete example, while the

Jews have furnished an amazingly high quota of musicians and artists to the world, they have failed to develop a distinct Jewish music or a distinct Jewish art. The Zionists, therefore, are forced to the conviction that if the Jewish people is to remain true to its highest interests, it indispensably needs a center in which it may have a chance to develop its ideals and to express itself in its own manner of life and thought, and thereby add its distinct contribution to the spiritual treasury of mankind.

Mr. Gibbons is entirely wrong when, possibly misguided by the information of his de-Judaized friends, he repeats the platitude that Anti-Semitism is the source of Zionism, and that the latter, therefore, has no right for existence in the new world order in which all Jewish disabilities are to be abolished. Instead of abstract arguments, let me state a concrete fact: the first public act of Russian Jewry after the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, and after the declaration of the Kerensky government granting full civil rights to the Jews of Russia, was to convene a Zionist congress in Petrograd, which was held amidst extraordinary enthusiasm in May, 1917. The six million Russian Jews, while pledging their joyful allegiance to the new Russian republic, reiterated their demand for a national Jewish center in Palestine.

Mr. Gibbons is anxious to know "what Zionism means to the Jew." Let him study Jewish history and not rely upon the misleading information of his un-Jewish Jewish friends, and he will perhaps get an inkling of the extraordinary, nay, unparalleled position which Palestine occupies in the Jewish consciousness. He will then learn that the handful of Jews in Palestine of nearly 2000 years ago formed the only nation which, at the height of Roman power, dared to resist the invincible legions of Rome for four years, and made far greater sacrifices in the defense of their country than even did the heroic Belgians during the onslaught of the German hordes in the great World War, a patriotism so overwhelming that,

as a Roman historian informs us, many Roman soldiers deserted their ranks and joined the defenders of Jerusalem to die with them a glorious death. He will learn of the rebellion of Bar Cochba, in A. D. 135, in which the sadly reduced remnants of the Jewish people lost nearly a million men in another endeavor to regain their independence. He will also learn that when the Jews had been politically crushed by superior strength, they yet remained unshakably faithful to the passionate pledge of their psalmist: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth." The entire consciousness of the Jew and his whole mode of life and thought have been permeated, to an extent which finds no parallel in the history of mankind, with the hope and the longing for the restoration of his homeland. Three times a day the Jew has prayed for the reestablishment of Zion. In joy and in sorrow he has remembered its past glory and dreamed of its future splendor. At midnight he sat down on the ground, putting ashes on his forehead to weep for the destruction of Jerusalem and to pray for its rebuilding. And when he went to his eternal rest, his eyes were covered with the dust that was brought from the holy ground.

I know full well what Palestine means to the Christians. I know what it means to the Russian peasants, for whom Mr. Gibbons shows justifiable sympathy. I know also what Palestine means to the Mohammedans. But neither the Christians nor the Mohammedans can even remotely compare with the Jewish people in its undying affection for the land of its promise. To the Christians and Mohammedans Palestine is, after all, the land of the past, of a great and hallowed past, but, nevertheless, a past. To the Jew it is essentially the land of the future. To Christianity and Islam Palestine represents a number of "holy places" which are connected in their memory with incidents in the life of their founders, and Zionism respects and scrupulously heeds

these sentiments. But to the Jews Palestine has remained, as it is still called by them, *Eretz Yisroel*, "the Land of Israel."

Mr. Gibbons flies the facts directly in the face when he questions the loyalty of the Zionists of Zion, and declares that "in Zionist congresses delegates have frequently advocated making the United States 'the promised land,' or that "Zionist congresses have discussed seriously setting up Zion in other places than Palestine." I have attended many of the Zionist congresses in person, and have read carefully the proceedings of every one of them, but I can not think of a single fact that would give Mr. Gibbons even the shadow of a right to make that charge. Though Jews all over the world love the United States as the land which has carried into reality the ideals proclaimed by their lawgivers and prophets thousands of years ago, and as the haven of refuge for many of their persecuted brethren, there has not been a single mention at the Zionist congresses of the United States in the rôle of a national center for the Jewish people.

When, at the Third Zionist Congress, in 1899, one of the Zionist delegates suggested that the Jews use the island of Cyprus as a stepping-stone to the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, he was not permitted to proceed, and his resolution did not even come up for a vote. When at the Sixth Zionist Congress, in 1903, Dr. Herzl, under the effect of the terrible Kishinef pogroms, which had taken place a few weeks before, laid before the congress a communication of the British Government offering the Jews a Jewish commonwealth in Uganda, in East Africa, the Zionist delegates, despite Dr. Herzl's solemn declaration that Uganda should never and could never substitute Zion, and Dr. Nordau's masterly plea that Uganda was merely to serve as a *Nachtasyt*, refused to listen to their beloved and otherwise implicitly trusted leaders. Out of regard for the British Government and the motives which prompted their offer, the congress, after a memorably passionate debate, finally decided by a majority vote to grant the request of the Zionist leaders that a

commission of investigation be sent to East Africa, on the express understanding that no Zionist funds should be made available for this purpose. And yet the Russian Zionists, the victims of the pogroms, in whose behalf that offer was made, left the hall in a body. Those who were present at that congress and witnessed the indescribable despair which was stamped on the tear-stained faces of these delegates after the adoption of the Uganda resolution will cherish the memory of that scene as an overwhelming manifestation of the Jew's loyalty to Zion.

It is a well-known fact that Dr. Herzl's death was hastened, if not caused, by the storm of indignation which his offer had aroused in the Zionist world. And when after his death the Seventh Zionist Congress assembled in 1905, it adopted unanimously the resolution that "The Zionist organization stands firmly by the fundamental principle of the Basle Program, namely, 'the establishment of a legally secured, publicly assured home for the Jewish people in Palestine,' and it rejects, either as an end or as a means, any colonizing activity outside of Palestine and its adjacent lands." It was this resolution, and not the British protests, to which Mr. Gibbons refers in his article, which once for all removed the Uganda scheme and similar proposals from the range of Zionist politics.

Mr. Gibbons would make us believe that this loyalty to Palestine has recently been weakened in the Jewish camp, and he quotes as his authorities, as he is wont to do, some of his obliging Jewish friends. Here again Mr. Gibbons shows that he is hopelessly out of touch with the actual conditions prevailing in the Zionist movement. It is true that there are many Jews who have become estranged from the Jewish people and who, in the hope of seeing Judaism disappear in the vortex of humanity, violently oppose the Zionist idea, which aims at the conservation and rejuvenation of the Jewish people. But these Jews are an infinitesimal fraction of Jewry, and they have no right to speak for it. I do not know why, of all the

numerous Jews quoted by Mr. Gibbons, Grand Rabbi Levy of France is the only one mentioned by name; possibly because his title might impress the uninitiated reader as representing an unquestioned authority in Jewish life. But I am constrained to say that if Grand Rabbi Levy is correctly quoted in stating that there are only 100,000 Zionists outside of America, he is as grotesquely ignorant of the Zionist movement as is Mr. Gibbons, and that in his disapproval of Zionism he speaks at the utmost for the 50,000 French Jews, most of whom have become thoroughly assimilated or are thirsting for assimilation.

As for this country, Mr. Gibbons somewhat contradicts himself when in one sentence he declares that Zionism has lost its hold upon American Jews, and in another sentence informs us of the fact, which would testify to a much greater power of American Zionism than can ever, or will ever, be claimed by it, that prominent Jews of America who have assured him privately "that they view the whole movement with the gravest misgivings," nevertheless "openly sponsor the project simply because at the present moment no Jew can without injury to himself throw cold water on Zionism." Neither Mr. Gibbons nor his courageous Jewish friends are correct in their statements. It is true that there are Jews in America who are anti-Zionists, and they are by no means silent in their disapproval and denunciation of Zionism; but it is also true that, outside of this small fraction of American Jewry, Zionism has made extraordinary strides in this country as well as in other lands, which may best be proved by the plain statistical fact that the annual budget of the American Zionist organization has jumped within a few years from \$15,000 to \$3,000,000.

Mr. Gibbons, it would seem, is completely out of touch with the Jewish quarter in Philadelphia, for had he been present at the Philadelphia Zionist Convention in June, 1916, or had he attended the American Jewish Congress that was held in the same city only a month ago, in De-

ember, 1918, at which the Palestine resolution was adopted amidst indescribable enthusiasm, with one dissenting vote against 357, he could not possibly have made a statement in such hopeless disagreement with the facts. In parenthesis it may be remarked that his Philadelphia friend, whom he met as an officer in the American Expeditionary Force, and who told him that, like Lord Rothschild, he was for Zionism only if he could be ambassador for the new state at London, is a little behind the times. For it was a Lord Rothschild to whom, as the vice-chairman of the English Zionist Federation, Arthur James Balfour addressed his declaration promising Palestine to the Jew.

But to proceed to the second argument of Mr. Gibbons. He challenges the right of the great powers to foist Zionism upon the Palestinian Arabs, and points out the danger of setting up a non-Mohammedan theocracy in a Mohammedan world. It is curious that Mr. Gibbons should be in favor of setting up a vast Mohammedan state in the near East, since he is insistent in his view of Mohammedanism as a "theocratic system of government" to the extent that, as he emphatically states,—a statement which will be indignantly repudiated by Mohammedans and those who are familiar with Mohammedan doctrine,—"it is always legally right for Moslems to kill non-Moslems," and that Mohammedans could never agree "to grant equality to *raias* (non-Moslem subjects)." If he believes that modern influences are bound to weaken or to modify the fundamental theocratic complexion of the Mohammedan state, why should he not make the same charitable allowance in the case of the Jewish people, which more than three thousand years ago proclaimed the doctrine of one statute for the Jews and for the stranger, and which less than a year ago, at the Zionist Convention held in Pittsburgh in June, 1918, placed the principle of "political and civil equality of race, sect, or faith of all the inhabitants of the land" at the head of the constitution that is to govern the new Jewish commonwealth?

But the idea that the Zionists wish to establish a theocracy in Palestine will cause a riot of mirth among those who are acquainted with conditions in modern Zionism. Dr. Theodore Herzl, to whom Mr. Gibbons occasionally refers in his article, would turn in his grave could he listen to the charge that he was the protagonist of a Jewish theocracy. Dr. Max Nordau, Louis D. Brandeis, Dr. Weizman, nay, even Ahad Ha'am, the famous champion of "Spiritual Zionism," and many other leading Zionists who are in the van of modern thought, will be amazed, or possibly amused, at this implication. Is it possible that Mr. Gibbons, who has so many Jewish friends opposed to Zionism, has never heard from them the stock-in-trade argument of Jewish anti-Zionists that Zionism is not sufficiently religious and much too secular? There is no question that the relation between religion and state will be one of the most momentous issues which will confront the new Jewish commonwealth, and those Zionists who are thoroughly permeated with the religious spirit of Judaism fervently hope that a solution will be found that will harmonize the ancient ideals of Judaism with the requirements of modern times; but I can assure Mr. Gibbons that there is no Zionist who wishes for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth that will in any way contradict the ideas of justice and equality such as are at the bottom of every modern body politic.

But have the Jews a right to claim Palestine, when at the present time they number only 100,000 in a country which has 630,000 non-Jews, "of whom 550,000 form a solid Arabic-speaking Moslem block, in racial and religious sympathy with the neighboring Arabs of Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Egypt"? In the entire argumentation of Mr. Gibbons this is the only objection that is apt to command the serious attention of the Zionists, not only because of the weight of concrete numbers, but primarily because, in their desire to establish a commonwealth on the foundations of the an-

cient Jewish ideals of justice and righteousness, they are anxious to avert anything that might in the slightest degree conflict with these ideals. But is it true that these 630,000 Palestinian Arabs are "unanimously" opposed to Zionism? The fact of the matter is that the Mohammedan Arabs of Palestine, forming nine tenths of the Palestinian population, have heretofore been in favor of Zionism, seeing what the Zionists, under most adverse conditions, have already done for the rejuvenation of their desolate land; and the Greek-Orthodox Christians, who form an overwhelming majority of the Christian population of the Holy Land, have repeatedly expressed themselves in the same manner. Emir Feisal, the Crown Prince of the Kingdom of the Hedjaz, publicly assured the Zionist leaders that the Arabs are prepared to cooperate with the Jews in the development of the near East. Those Arabs who have spoken against Zionism are as a rule non-Palestinians, inhabitants of Syria or Egypt, who have no right to speak for the Palestinian natives. The protest of the particular Palestinian Arab referred to by Mr. Gibbons, which for very obvious reasons was permitted by the French censor to see the light of publicity, is the exception and not the rule, and is due to influences which have little in common with questions of justice and righteousness.

Mr. Gibbons tells us that "the argument of the Zionists that there is room for them, too, in Palestine, is absurd." Is it? It would be, did the Zionists fail to recognize "the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." But is it absurd when these rights are safeguarded? Were we to accept Mr. Gibbons's point of view, with all its logical implications, then the colonial empires of France, Great Britain, and Italy are one gigantic injustice. Then, for that matter, the Pilgrims on the *Mayflower* committed the most stupendous crime in history when they set their foot on Plymouth Rock in the assumption that there was room for them, too, in America.

Mr. Gibbons overlooks the fact that

Palestine is neither historically nor constitutionally an Arabic country. When the Arabs dream of their ancient glory, which the writer, who is a zealous student and ardent admirer of ancient Arabic civilization, appreciates far more profoundly than does Mr. Gibbons, they think of Nejd and Hedjaz, the cradle of their race and religion; they think of the splendor of the Ommiads at Damascus, of the magnificence of the Abbassides at Bagdad, of the power of the Fatimites at Cairo; but they do not think of Jerusalem. Spain is far more intimately and far more gloriously interwoven with Arabic culture than is Palestine. During the twelve hundred years and more that the Arabs have lived in Palestine they have, despite their remarkable achievements in other lands, never developed an Arabic culture that is worth speaking of. Nor have the Christians managed to do so, although they have been backed by the powerful influences and resources of various European governments. But the handful of Jews who have come to Palestine as the land of their fathers and have been willing to brave the dangers and hardships, which can be paralleled only by the similar experiences of the early colonists of New England, have succeeded in setting up a civilization, or, rather, the beginnings of a civilization, which, in the judgment of all unbiased observers, is the greatest cultural factor in the Palestine of to-day. To mention only one example, in less than one generation the Jews of Palestine have performed the greatest linguistic miracle known in history by making again the ancient tongue of their prophets a living language, after its having served as a purely literary medium of expression for nearly two thousand years. The Jews, who are of the same race as the Arabs,—a kinship cemented by the profound and beneficent influence which their cultures exercised upon one another for many centuries,—have genuine sympathy with their aspirations, and look forward to the reestablishment of ancient Arabic glory; but they see no reason why on the vast expanse of a new Arabic world which is now being set up

by the great powers they have no right to claim a little corner in which, in harmony with their fellow-inhabitants, they may rejuvenate the ancient glory of Zion.

Finally, to take up Mr. Gibbons's third, or, rather, first, argument, our author upbraids the Zionists for favoring British sovereignty over Palestine and not believing "in the internationalization of Palestine or in any form of dual or multiple political control." I confess that, as far as the political implications of the movement are concerned, I cannot speak with the same authority as Mr. Gibbons, who, as I learn from the newspapers, is American lecturer for the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs. I have no knowledge whatsoever of the negotiations between the Zionist leaders and the Government of Great Britain prior to the Balfour declaration, nor of their negotiations with the governments of France, Italy, and the other powers that subsequently indorsed it. Speaking without official authority and merely as one of the Zionist rank and file, I may be permitted to state the considerations which have guided the Zionists in objecting to "a dual or multiple political control over Palestine." The Zionists look with disfavor, nay, with apprehension, to such a contingency, for the simple reason that, hoping to see the Jews of Palestine live their own life and to remain true to the morally lofty as well as practically sound policy of the prophet Isaiah, "in sitting still and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength," they do not wish to see Zion, the symbol of universal peace, become the hotbed of European rivalries and jealousies. They do not wish to see the frail craft of their infant commonwealth crushed or crippled by the impact of the huge vessels representing the great world powers.

As for the particular government under whose control Palestine is to be placed, Mr. Gibbons may be assured that there is no Jew anywhere who does not have a soft spot in his heart for the great French people, who was the first to extend the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity

to its Jewish citizens; but the Zionists cannot overlook the fact that, quite apart from the British conquest of Palestine, Great Britain was the first power to recognize "the distinct nationhood of the Jews," and that the Balfour declaration connects directly, across the chasm of twenty-five hundred years, with the edict of Cyrus, permitting the Jews to realize their national ideal. Knowing the history of the Zionist movement, in the course of which England has twice offered a Jewish commonwealth to the Jews, the first time in Wadi Al-Arish, on the Palestine-Egyptian frontier, and the second time in East Africa, and in circumstances which left no room for any possible suspicion of ulterior motives, the Zionists are firmly convinced that in its last and noblest offer Great Britain was prompted not "by the principle of political expediency severely denounced by President Wilson," but by considerations of justice and humanity, and by that profound sympathy with Jewish suffering and Jewish aspirations which has been manifested on so many other occasions in the course of English politics. It is not true, as Mr. Gibbons alleges, that "the Zionists have not interpreted the declaration of the British Government according to its clear wording." They have remained faithful both in letter and in spirit to the Balfour pronouncement, which was officially indorsed by M. Pichon, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, on February 12, 1918. It is not they who are responsible for the lack "of unity and purpose" between the great powers, but rather those who wish to play out the French imperialists against the British imperialists. The Zionists heartily agree with Mr. Gibbons that the near-Eastern questions must be solved in "a sense of justice and a spirit of self-abnegation"; but if these questions are actually to "be met squarely and solved fairly," then America must not allow the spirit of Prussian domination to raise its head again.

Before I conclude, let me touch on one general argument which runs like a red thread throughout the entire article of Mr. Gibbons. It is the argument, or

rather the warning, that if the Jews will not abandon their aspirations in Palestine, they will be overwhelmed by an avalanche of anti-Semitism which will undermine their civil position everywhere: in France, in Russia, in Poland, and—this is more hinted at than expressly stated—in America. This argument, which was evidently paramount in the minds of Mr. Gibbons's Jewish friends, including Grand Rabbi Levy of France, leaves the Zionists cold. The Jew who knows the history of his people is well aware of the fact that anti-Semitism is much older than Zionism. There have always been people who could not forgive the Jews for insisting on remaining Jews. The Russian czars, whose unlimited power seemed to be concentrated on the extermination of the Jewish race, did not wait for the appearance of modern Zionism, and the scientific anti-Semitism of Germany sprang into existence long before there was any trace of Zionism in the fatherland. The enemies of the Jews will never be at a loss to find reasons for their hatred. The Jews being a people of many millions, with alert minds and busy hands, some of them will always be doing something which will be displeasing to somebody. They will be attacked in Bolshevik Russia because they are suspected of being bourgeois, and massacred in bourgeois Poland because they are supposed to be Bolsheviks. The Jews claim the same rights and the same duties of citizenship as do the non-Jews. Like their ancestors in Babylonia, they follow the prophetic injunction "to seek the welfare of the city whither they have been exiled." They are ready to live and, if necessary, to die for the land of their birth or adoption. In the great World War the Zionists were the first to volunteer in the various armies, and thousands of them lie buried on the European battle-fields, witnesses to the loyalty and civic devotion of

the Jews. In the "Lost Battalion," which covered itself with imperishable glory in the thickets of the Argonne forest, and was made up largely of Yiddish-speaking Jews hailing from eastern Europe, the overwhelming majority consisted of Zionists.

The Zionists are willing to be measured by the severest standards of loyalty and patriotism, and they are confident that they will never be found wanting. But if, despite their loyalty and devotion and despite their readiness to serve their country, the Jews are to be threatened with anti-Semitism merely because, in response to a tradition of four thousand years, they long for a small corner of the globe where a part of their nation, which has left its indelible impress upon the civilization of the world, may once more live according to that tradition, then by all means let anti-Semitism come. The Jews are a stiff-necked people. They have outlived the Hamans of antiquity. They have survived the tortures of the Middle Ages, of which modern Christianity is rightly ashamed, and they will survive the savagery, which some people wish to carry into the new world order, holding fast to their cherished aspirations, and waiting for the time when, in the words of President Wilson, the problem of politics will be "to satisfy all men in the arrangements of their lives," and "to realize for them, as far as possible, the objects they have entertained generation after generation, and have seen so often postponed." The Jews may not be in a position to accept the words of "the Palestinian Jew" who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," but they passionately believe in the time when, in the words of the same Palestinian Jew, there will be, despite all attempts to revive the injustice of the old world in the new, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

