

## THE JEWISH CHRONICLE.

APRIL 14, 1905.

### MR. I. ZANGWILL ON THE EAST AFRICAN QUESTION.

#### Obstacles to Palestine.

There is, however, a difficulty from which the Zionist dares not avert his eyes, though he rarely likes to face it. Palestine proper has already its inhabitants. The pashalik of Jerusalem is already twice as thickly populated as the United States, having 52 souls to the square mile, and not 25 per cent. of them Jews; so we must be prepared either to drive out by the sword the tribes in possession as our forefathers did, or to grapple with the problem of a large alien population, mostly Mohammedan and accustomed for centuries to despise us. At present we are only 12 per cent. of the population, and hold only two per cent. of the land.

ref 1:235

## THE VOICE OF JERUSALEM

By

ISRAEL ZANGWILL

"The only solution of this difficulty lies in the consideration that Palestine is not so much occupied by the Arabs as over-run by them.

We cannot allow the Arabs to block so valuable a piece of historic reconstruction, so romantic a reparation to the sorely-trying race of the Apostles. And therefore we must gently persuade them to 'trek.' After all, they have all Arabia with its million square miles—not to mention the vast new area freed from the Turk between Syria and Mesopotamia—and Israel has not a square inch. There is no particular reason for the Arabs to cling to these few kilometres. 'To fold their tents' and 'silently steal away' is their proverbial habit: let them exemplify it now. The Jews will be well content to pay their travelling expenses, and to buy also—at a price fixed by the British Government—such holdings and buildings as really have a value.

ref 1:241

# דער שפּרעך פון זיין זאגנאט

און זאגנאט האט מענטשן געוואלט, און עס וועט צוזאם צייט קומען אויך פאר דעם ענין עמינאציע קורס. כל זאגנאט וועט מען מוזען צוגעבן א גאנצע למאדע סעמינאציעלע באפע-מעשיות, וואס מערענעלע נאך די קעפ, למשל, אז „אויסוואנדערונג“ איז א סראגערע. דאס איז אים פון די בולשעוויסטן ליגענס אויף דער וועלט. אויסוואנדערונג איז א גליק, אין 90 פראצענט פאלען געמינט מען אויף די נייע ערטהע בעסטערע, ברייטער, רע, געווינערע, אומשטאנדען.

דא האט ער פאר מיר ענטוויקעלט זיין מעאריע פון „רעדיסטריביושאן און רעסעס“ — נייע מערטיילונג פון די מעלכער אויף דער ערד. סטחמא, שטעהט זי קלארער און ריכטיגער אויס- געלענט ערשיינוואו אין זיינע ביכער, אבער איך האב זי נישט אלע געליענט, און וועל דא איבערגעבען צוויי ווי איך גערענט.

דא קומט יענער שמועס מיט זאנג-וויל, א זומער-טאג ארום 1916: אויב ס'וועט אויך געבען דעם שטארטער אויף ארץ-ישראל, האט ער געפרעגט, וואס דענקט איהר צו טהון מיט די גראפער? איך האב ארום געגעבען דעם געוועהנ-ליכען ארטאדאקסאלען ענטפער: „אין ארץ ישראל אויף ביהודע זייטען ירו און דא פלאץ, סטחמא פאר דעם אדער אים מיליאן, דא אראבער (לויט דעם אל-ינער סטאטיסטיק) זענען „אונגאנצען“ א האלב מיליאן, אלא — וועמען קאנען זי שטערען און מ'וועט זיי געבען אדער זי ליבערלעסטען מונדערהייט-רעכט לויט אונזער אייגענעם דעלסינפארטער פראגראם. דאס זענען אלץ פוסטע ווערטער, האט ער געענטפערט — אויך ווייט, ביי איהר אין סורח-אידראפא, רעהען זיך ארום צעהן נאציאנאליסטען אין יעדער געגנט, און איהר דאלט דאס פאר גארטאג, מיר, איז מערב האלטען דעם פאר א קראנקהייט, וואס דערלאזט נישט מין רפואה צולאזען, אזא צו-שטאנד אין אונזער יודענלאנד דייטס ויך אליין אויסדראפן די אייגענע אויב מיר געקומען פאלעסטינא, וועלען די אראבער מוזען „ברעקען“ (מרעקען) איז א ווארט פון דער שפראך פון די דרום-אפריקאנישע גו-רען, בוכשטענליך הייסט עס: נעה א גאנצ, אויסוואנדערן מיט חויב און קיין דער און בעבעכעס מיליטענאריזם פון דער אלטער היים. אין ערשטען דריטעל פאר-גאנצענעם יאהרונדערט האבען די גו-רען, פרי פאר צו ווערען די ענגלישע שכינים, געמאכט די עריהמטע מאכען-וואנדערונג פון קאפלאנד קיין טראנס-וואל: אים דאס הייסט ביי זיי „דער גרויסער סרעק“.

פראגראם-ווע, רעגירונגען מוזן זיך צוגיפערען און אויסארבייטען א פלאן פון א לאנג-שער און גערעכטער גראדענאציע פון די לענדער, אזוי זי פאר יעדען פאלק זאל זיין פלאץ און אונטן זאל דעם צוויי-טעל נישט ווערען אויסן קאפ און בכלל נישט שטערען און ווען דער פלאן וועט זיין פארטיג און אראפגרייט „פון“ אלע ארענטליכע לייט, וועט מען איהם מוזען דורכפירען. וואס הייסט „דורכפירען“ צווייטענער „וואס הייסט „דורכפירען“ אויך אין דעם, אז א וואנדערונג מוז שטענדיג זיין גור א מרייוויליגע, ווען זאגנאט נישט קיין שום קידוש, עס זי געווען א צייט, ווען אלטע שער-עסעלע ליבערלעך אין ענגלאנד הא-בען בייטער פראפעסאטן געגען צוואנצט אייבונגן בעסער זאל זיין פאקען, ווי צוואג אנדערע האבען געקעמפט געגען דא שול-פליכט, וואס הייסט צווייגען

א פאסטען, ער זאל שווען זיין קינד אין א שניט, דאס איז זיין עסק, צו ער וויל, אז זי קינד זאל זיך לערנען אלה-בות, דער צאנז איז „נאך נישט גייט“ — 90 פראצענט וועלען אליין זיין צוגעדרען, וואס די קינדער לערנען זיך, און דעם לעצטען פראצענט פון מען איבערלאזען פריי צו ענטשידען. שטופענאויף אבער האט מען זיך צוגעווערגט צום געדאנק, אז נישט יעדער „צוואנג“ איז א מתידה צו „מרייוויליט“, עס וועט פאר-דאן זאכען, ווענען וועלכע עס בעשטעהט באמת א'אלגעמיינער חסד, אז זיי זע-נען מיט און נוצליך, און איז אזא פאל וואלט עס זיין נאריש אפדאטען זיך פון צוואנג.

זיין ענטפער אויף „וואוהין“ איז גע-ווען מעכטאפאטאמיען איז יענע יאהרען איז נאך געווען פריש אין אלעמענס פרום א גראדענאציע פראיעקט פון אינר-וועניער ווילקאס, דעם ארכיטעקטאר פון די בעריהמטע גרויסע וואסער-ווערק אין מצרים, — א פראיעקט דורכצופירן דען נאך געשטערע וואסער-ארבייטען אין מעכטאפאטאמיען און פערזאנלעך דאס לאנד, וואס דייןט רוסט עס זיך אי-ראק, אין דעם רייכסטען קארן-געביט פון דער וועלט. — און וואס שייך, ווע-לען אדער נישט וועלען? —

“A Conversation with Zangwill”  
Der Moment – Warsaw Poland  
21 July 1939

This edition of the paper  
was published  
just over a month before  
Hitler invaded Poland

ref 1:240



Dear Greenberg,

December 10th, 1918.

No doubt my views will excite controversy, but I have expressed them very briefly and have all the answers. One of Wolf's objections is indeed countered in advance. Mrs. Zangwill thinks that my beautiful phrase "race redistribution" is a really constructive contribution. Such a Palestine would be worth the sacrifices.

ref 1:246

Letter. Zangwill to Editor of Jewish Chronicle

THE JEWISH CHRONICLE.

DECEMBER 11, 1918.

## JEWISH NATIONAL MOVEMENT. BEFORE THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

By ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

If this is what the great Declaration meant, then it was an illusion and an insult. But we are entitled to assume, and the eloquence of its Christian protagonists and their endorsement of the Hebrew University encourage us to assume, that the Declaration was neither a political manoeuvre nor a mockery of the great Jewish hope; that it was intended to settle the Jewish question in harmony with the spirit of this great moment of world-reconstruction, when everything is in the melting-pot and the whole "sorry scheme of things" that has been shattered is to be remoulded "nearer to the heart's desire." And hence we must suppose that this new system of creative politics will not stop short with disentangling Europe, and that those amicable measures of race-redistribution which we have already seen to be an unavoidable part of a final world-settlement, will be carried out in Palestine as elsewhere. Thus the Arabs would gradually be settled in the new and vast Arabian Kingdom to liberate which from the Turk, Jews no less than Arabs have laid down their lives, and with which the Jewish Commonwealth would cultivate the closest friendship and co-operation. Only thus can Palestine become a "Jewish National Home." Only thus can Israel—with his diaspora of thirteen millions—risk being told that Palestine is his country. Only thus can a final peaceful refuge be prepared against such race-hatreds as are finding bloody expression in Poland at this very moment.—Only with a Jewish majority (not of course a Jewish totality), only with the land nationalised—and Jewish as well as Arab land must be expropriated with reasonable compensation—can Israel enter upon the task of building up that model State, the construction of which American Zionism, in its trustful acceptance of the Declaration, has already outlined. And it is now or never.

ref 1:248

The Jewish Chronicle, Ltd.  
Department: Ed.  
Dictated by: G.



Printed by:  
"The Jewish Chronicle, Ltd."  
Printed and Published by:  
The Jewish Chronicle, Ltd.  
100, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

2, FINSBURY SQUARE,  
LONDON, E.C. 2.

THE JEWISH WORLD

17th December, 1918

PRIVATE  
Israel Zangwill, Esq.,  
For Mrs.  
EAST FRIMSTON, Sussex.

Dear Zangwill,

Many thanks for yours of the 16th. Mrs. Zangwill duly telephoned to me yesterday.

I send you enclosed proof of your letter to Sir Lionel Abrahams, but in regard to the Memorandum I am in a difficulty. I have had an intimation that the Government would not view with favour the publication of a number of different proposals, especially before the proposal comes to them from the Zionist body itself. I do not think it is desirable, therefore, to publish your Memorandum for this among other reasons, because it is not desirable to put up the back of the idiots who are in authority, and you get everything of substance in your letter to Sir Lionel. Between ourselves, I rather think I am sailing very near the wind in publishing your letter to Sir Lionel Abrahams, because (yide to-day's "Manchester Guardian") the Government is most anxious to prevent any discussion whatever of any questions that may arise at the Peace Conference. Still, I am risking this, and I shall be up, as they did somewhat roughly over an article which, when I saw you, you commended, I shall say that it referred to Jews, and Jews being a peculiar people, I thought that the peculiar circumstances, and so forth...

Having in view what you wrote to me when you said you were preparing a memorandum, I expected that you might be sending it for this week's publication, and, in course of conversation with Weizmann, I tried to get him to let me publish his memorandum this week. I then would willingly have published yours. I even pressed him by saying that I knew you were preparing a memorandum. But he told me that there were some very, very important reasons why the Memorandum could not yet be presented to the Government, one of them being that he could not do so until some Zionists who are on their way to this country had been able to see it. I confess that this seemed to me a decisive answer. I, therefore, although not publishing this week your memorandum, will of course do so directly Weizmann lets me publish his, and we can then put a note to the effect that yours had been prepared as now, but was not published pending the publication of Weizmann's plan.

I hope you will concur with all this. It is best, bethering for many reasons, which I could explain to you better if I saw you, and cannot very well explain in writing.

I am sending this by early post (Express) so that there will be plenty of time for you to let me have it back, with any alteration that may be necessary, by to-morrow's early post so that it reaches here first thing Thursday morning. You will see that I have altered the word in the final paragraph of your letter to Sir Lionel from "appended" to "enclosed". This puts on record the fact that your Memorandum was prepared as now.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

## JEWISH NATIONAL MOVEMENT.

### MR. ZANGWILL AND THE PALESTINE SETTLEMENT.

#### LETTER TO SIR LIONEL ABRAHAMS.

Mr. Israel Zangwill, President of the Jewish Territorial Organisation, has sent the following letter to Sir Lionel Abrahams:—  
16th December, 1918.

SIR LIONEL ABRAHAMS, K.C.B.

Dear Sir Lionel,—On the ground that my suggestion for the gradual and amicable emigration of the majority of its Arabs from the tiny territory of Palestine is "indefensible and impracticable," you ask me to remove your name from the list of the Council of the Jewish Territorial Organisation.

I am indeed sorry to lose so brilliant and distinguished a colleague, the more so as it will add to the forces which are disintegrating the Bto at the very moment when the pogroms in Poland are teaching us the folly of staking our whole territorial future upon a single soil; and when the Peace Conference might have had before it alternative plans for some region of the New World or even of the New Russia. My regret is the keener, since your resignation, if offered earlier, would have saved you from the impropriety of ignoring your President in the conferences and councils on this question promoted by your seat.

From our Minute Book I find that at a meeting of our Council held on November 15th, 1917, at which you were present, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—

"The Jewish Territorial Organisation, founded to procure a territory upon an autonomous basis for those Jews who cannot, or will not, remain in the lands in which they at present live, declares its readiness to co-operate with the Zionists in devising a scheme for the development of Palestine in accordance with its programme."

I submit that there is nothing in my plan to contradict this—indeed it seems the only possible way of carrying it out—especially as the Minute Book records that prior to the passing of this resolution I informed the Council that I should demand "the largest possible territory and the largest possible autonomy for the largest number of Jews possible." Moreover, your ground for resignation might have been discovered long ago, since my plan was broached in a lecture before the Fabian Society in December, 1915 (published in my book "The War for the World"), repeated by me in subsequent years in a popular monthly, a still more popular Sunday paper, and in addresses to the National Liberal Club, and criticised by a leader in the *Morning Post* of last March. I cannot help fearing that your own scheme—with the large measure of sympathy it has won from the League of British Jews—is dictated rather by the effort to burke the "autonomous basis" than to safeguard it, if not indeed by political interests other than those of Jewry.

And if it is your own alternative plan, permit me to tell you, or Dr. Weizmann's plan, that is "indefensible and impracticable." Even if it does not propose to sit on the Arab's head, it does propose to snuff him under, and ethically I can see no difference between destroying his position gradually or at a stroke. Indeed, ethically, it seems to me finer to make an honest, open, friendly, Wilsonian bargain with him than to undertake the slow combative process of swamping him. The alternative of overruling him I set aside—it may seem reasonable to an Indian bureaucrat, but we have not here that colour-difference which, whether in Asia or Africa, is supposed to justify domination by a minute majority, and even if we had, such absence of equality would be opposed to the spiritual dignity of so majestic a movement as Zionism should be.

And why should the Arab submit to being overruled even, being outnumbered? I am afraid you have not my acquaintance with Palestine or its present internal frictions, or you would not be so sure yours was the practicable plan and mine the "impracticable." I see that the Emir Feisal has assented Dr. Weizmann that there is nothing in Zionism to "prejudice in the slightest the claims of the Arab National Movement." Exactly what I feared. So two nationalisms—unlike two bodies—are to occupy the same space. One cannot help recalling the profound Limerick:

"There was a young lady of Niger

Who went for a ride on a tiger;

They returned from the ride

With the lady inside

And a smile on the face of the tiger."

Believe me, it is only Jewish critics who find my scheme either "indefensible" or "impracticable." The National Liberal Club was in full sympathy with my contention that only by being in the majority could we Jews build up our Model State. Even the *Morning Post* (so very pro-Semitic organ) merely demanded our "burying out the present owners of Palestine", exactly my policy, I hastened to assure it, and indeed the most economical in the end. We have historic precedent in the universal migrations of primitive peoples, the most recent being the great northward trek of the entire Boer population from Cape Colony in 1835, if, indeed, the vast migrations of the European populations across the Atlantic are not essentially phenomena of the same order. And the more loosely-rooted and indigent a population the more easily it shifts; none could do so more simply or with less injustice than the semi-nomadic *fellah*. He has certainly created nothing in Palestine to attach him to the soil, preferably to carrying his primitive plough to his own new and vast Arabian Kingdom, where he would be master in his own house and in a friendly brotherhood with the citizen of the new Judaea, not a perpetual friction.

I append my plan as worked out for the Peace Conference, before which I have proposed to Dr. Weizmann to place it. President Wilson has just defined the object of that Conference as "to lay the foundation for the freedom and happiness of the world's many peoples and nations." That yours or the Zionist plan can bring the Jewish people either freedom or happiness I emphatically deny, and since the moment is critical and you will also desire to be publicly dissociated from my heresies, I am sending this letter to the Jewish Press.

Believe me, with renewed regret,

Sincerely yours,

ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

ref 1:250

Letter. Greenberg to Zangwill

Letter. Zangwill to Jewish Chronicle

ref 1:251 20 December 1918



## THE ARAB QUESTION.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. ISRAEL ZANGWILL  
AND MR. LUCIEN WOLF.

Mr. Lucien Wolf has addressed the following letter to Mr. Israel Zangwill:—

23rd December, 1918.

MY DEAR ZANGWILL,—I have just learnt that Sir Lionel Abrahams has resigned his membership of the Council of the Ito on account of your article advocating the elimination of the Arab population of Palestine as a part of the Zionist scheme. As you know, I hold as strongly as Sir Lionel that the course you propose is "indefensible" if not "impracticable," and I should not like it to be supposed that my continued membership of the Council of the Ito implies any weakening of my opinion in this respect. The simple explanation is that I assume, that in writing your article, you did not do so in your capacity of President of the Ito or that your article was intended as expressing the views of that Organisation. I shall, however, be glad to hear from you that I am right in this assumption.

I have often told you why I hold your proposal to be "indefensible," but it is only due to you that I should repeat my main reasons in this letter.

There is a reason of principle and a reason of expediency. If the Zionists are to establish themselves in Palestine, it must be on a footing of justice and fair play. They must recognise existing rights, and they must assure to others—whoever they may be—the same securities and liberties which they themselves seek to enjoy. Any attempt to found a modern State on race proscriptions or religious privileges or economic preferences is not only foredoomed to failure, but must attach a serious reproach to those who attempt it. Such a course would be all the more "indefensible" on moral as well as political grounds if its objects were to secure the artificial predominance of its authors in such a State. And remember who are the parties to the transaction you propose. The Zionists, however dear may be their memories of 2,000 years ago, come to the land as strangers, while the so-called Arabs—by which is meant the *fellahin* or peasantry—are the indigenous population who were in the country before the first invasion of our people, and who have remained there ever since. I do not ask for any privileges for the Arabs on this account, but surely the most elementary notion of justice requires that their right to remain where they are should be respected, and that they should not be victimised by any specious schemes, however "amicable," to squeeze them out.

So much for principle. Now let me say a word about expediency. If you are going to evict the Arabs because they do not happen to be Jews, how can you deny the claims of certain anti-Semitic nationalities to evict their Jews because they do not happen to be Christians? Will you not be setting an example in Palestine which will react disastrously upon Jews in other countries? Nor is the danger a remote one. The proposal you make for the amicable emigration of the Arabs from Palestine has been made by Mr. Stephen Graham for the emigration of the Jews from Poland. Nay, the very ground on which you base your proposal is the ground by which the fendish boycott of the Jews in Poland has been justified. You want to get rid of the Arabs because, as you say, Palestine is "tiny" and there is not room enough for Jews and Arabs. Only a few weeks ago, a friend of ours expostulated with M. Dmowski on the cruelty of the boycott of the Jews in Poland. M. Dmowski replied: "But what can we do? Poland is a poor country; there are not crumbs enough to go round." Remember, too, what we have at stake. If you succeed in evicting the Arabs, you may benefit a few hundred thousand Jewish settlers, but it will be at the cost of seven millions of Jews in Eastern and South Eastern Europe, who will have to submit to a similar persecution without any right of appeal to justice and fair play. I say nothing of the indelible stigma which will be attached to the Jews throughout the world.

Holding these views you will understand that I could not possibly remain with you in the Ito if you intended by your article to pledge the whole Organisation to your scheme. But I do not believe that that was your intention, and in that case I will limit myself to securing some publicity for this letter.

Very sincerely yours,  
LUCIEN WOLF.

Letter. Lucien Woolf to Jewish Chronicle

ref 1:260 3 January 1919

Mr. Lucien Wolf has sent the following reply to Mr. Zangwill:—

31st December, 1918.

MY DEAR ZANGWILL,—It is quite enough for you to say that you do not hold your views in regard to the Arabs in Palestine as part and parcel of your policy as President of the Ito to render it unnecessary for me to follow the example of Lionel Abrahams. I should have no colleagues left either in private or public life if I required that they should see eye to eye with me in everything.

As for your rejoinder to my argument on behalf of the Arabs, I can only say that I find it singularly unconvincing. If the so-called Arabs were really Arabs—that is, natives of Arabia—and if the Jews were really Palestinians—that is, *indigenes* of Palestine—there might be something to be said for your argument on the crazy basis of Territorial Nationality, which is the root curse of all our politics. But the Arabs are not Arabs. They are only the Moslimised descendants of the indigenous Canaanites, and hence they are in their rightful homeland which, however poor and feckless they may be, is their own. This is so well established an anthropological fact that you will find it referred to, as beyond dispute in any good encyclopaedic article on Palestine. The Jews, on the other hand, came from the very Mesopotamia to which you would now banish the Arabs. They never struck root in the country, although they certainly sanctified it by great deeds, which are outside the field of a sordid politics, and they passed out of it because in reality it was too small for their great spirit and took the world for their stage. That is how the question of the Arabs and the question of Zionism generally presents itself to me.

But there is one question I should like to ask you: Why limit your redistribution of races to Palestine? Why not apply it to Poland, too? In Poland, the Jews are two millions strong and 14 per cent. of the whole population, while in Palestine they are only 70,000 and 10 per cent. of the population. Why, then, should you not ask the Poles to be good enough to trek into Russia where there is plenty of room for them, and leave the Jews in possession of the land? It would be just as reasonable as your proposition in regard to the Arabs.

As for feckless peasantry and absentee landlords, they are a problem so near my own doors that I have really no time to worry about them at the other end of the Mediterranean.

Always yours,  
LUCIEN WOLF.

ref 1:265

Letter Lucien Woolf to Jewish Chronicle

3 January 1919

Mr. Zangwill has replied as follows:—

"Far End,"  
East Preston, Sussex.

MY DEAR WOLF,—Obviously I have spoken only as a man of letters face to face with the greatest opportunity in Jewish history since the fall of the Temple. But we shall continue to be at cross purposes so long as you refuse to conceive a Wilsonian world equipped with a League of Nations whose preliminary task must be to re-shape the lands on the principle of Nationality. In such a system, the anti-Semitism you apprehend will be kept severely in check by the permanent central executive, and the Jews, like every other people, will have their recognised place in the harmony of the whole. It is too comic that, unable to disentangle your thought from the tragic chaos of History, of which you unfortunately know too much, you should imagine me an oppressor and evictor of the race with which I am anxious to come to terms on a basis of mutual assistance that would leave each free to develop its own national home. For the old methods of friction and massacre I propose reason and goodwill, and my scheme—exactly the opposite of that with which you discredit me—is contingent on President Wilson's success in transforming the principle of world-politics from the Balance of Power to the Co-operation of Peoples.

But even by the canons of the pre-Wilsonian world I see no ground for your criticisms. In your shrinking from a Jewish State you strive to bar the way by ethical considerations unknown to history. Where and on what status, pray, are the original inhabitants of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, even of Wilson's own America? History has never recognised the right of races to monopolise territories they could not develop. If, as you say, the Arabs have been in Palestine 2,000 years, then it is high time they trekked, like the Boers from Cape Colony. For although the Arabs have had a great civilised period and will, I hope, have it again, the *fellahin* are a primitive, illiterate, reckless folk, who have created absolutely nothing in Palestine, and who are half enslaved to absentee landlords. I hope your solicitude for the Arab does not extend to these exploiting offenders, who would equally baton on the rise of values produced by our immigration. What injustice is there in transferring the Arab to a similar piece of land in his own kingdom? What historic precedent is there for treating quankiford on the basis of quantity?

But it is precisely to prevent the Arab being overruled that I suggest a double organised process by which the Jew shall be immigrated, and the Arab emigrated to redress the balance of races and make a "Jewish National Home" more possible. There is no analogy between the cases of Poland and Palestine. Would there were, for then the Jews, instead of having to digest or tolerate a non-Jewish element of 85 per cent., would have to deal only with a minority of 16 per cent. The Polish plea is mere impudence. As for my plan promoting anti-Semitism, I have never noticed that anti-Semitism needs promoting, or that even the more prudent policies of the Board of Deputies have discouraged it. Your reason of expediency being thus even more baseless than your reason of principle, there is, I submit, no reason whatever for suffering our long and pleasant political relationship.

Very sincerely yours,  
ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

Letter. Zangwill to Jewish Chronicle

ref 1:261 3 January 1919



# 

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1918—5679.

## The Arab Problem.

MR. ZANGWILL has always emphasised the chief difficulty which confronts the Jewish settlement in Palestine. There are some six hundred thousand Arabs in the country, and of Jews to-day at most, and all included, but one hundred thousand. In the article we print, Mr. ZANGWILL grasps the nettle with characteristic courage, and—like "A Jewish Nationalist" who contributed an article on the question to our columns last month—he perceives the futility of ignoring it or of thinking that it can really be overcome by some dual national arrangement which must prove a constant danger of friction and misunderstanding, however earnestly and sincerely the parties thereto may now swear eternal friendship. Mr. ZANGWILL's suggestion is that the Arabs in Palestine should be transplanted, or—to use his own phrase—"gradually settle in the new and vast Arabian Kingdom"—this on the model of "race-reconstruction" which he for years has thought necessary in certain parts of Europe. Given the Will to Peace, he believes that "reason and love" can solve the inherent trouble of such a course. Those troubles, however, are palpably so great as—in our view—to render his suggestion, on that point, wholly impracticable. It is one thing to transplant ten thousand or twenty thousand willing emigrants; it is obviously quite another to transplant some hundreds of thousands, possibly against their own wishes. For we must never forget that, although the Arabs in Palestine may not have historic associations with the soil comparable with those of the Jews, their personal associations as individuals are naturally very dear to them, and may be just as hard to sever as the collective ties of a whole people. In our opinion, the right way of dealing with the Arab population, when Palestine becomes a Jewish Commonwealth, is that which the writer of the article to which we have alluded suggested, namely, to absorb them politically as citizens in the Commonwealth of which all will be equal citizens. Mr. ZANGWILL, we are sure, is fully as sensible as any of us to the importance—and the justice—of absolutely fair dealing with the Arab, as with all populations, in the new Judea. Nothing is more essential to its welfare than the implicit goodwill and friendship of the Arab nation; and his own proposal could only become practicable with the assent of the Arabs who are settled in the land. Meanwhile, we may welcome Mr. ZANGWILL's constructive attempt to deal with the whole question, and the fine sense of Jewish nationalism which he manifests. We would only add that Mr. ZANGWILL's experiences and enthusiasms—to say nothing of his commanding position in Jewish eminently fit him, in our opinion and in the opinion, we are convinced, of his colleagues all the world over, to take a prominent part in the deliberations of the Palestine section at the coming Peace Conference. We hope that his presence and service may be secured.

ref 1:268

# 

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1918—5679.

## Zionist Matters.

THERE is an important announcement this week with reference to Zionist matters. By the advice, so we learn, of the PRIME MINISTER, and as we gather, in consequence of the opinion expressed by the American delegates now in London, the scheme for effectuating the British Declaration, which was to be embodied in a memorandum for acceptance by the British Government and the Peace Conference, and which was explained in outline recently by Dr. WEIZMANN at a meeting in the East End, is now to be deemed obsolete. A fresh scheme is to be drawn up; and while we are not in the least surprised at the fate that has befallen the old scheme, we rejoice to learn that the provisions of the new one are to approximate much nearer to the idea of a Jewish State than did the original plan. It will, we are given to understand, contain undertakings in that direction of a far more definite nature than the Memorandum which is now set aside. May we express the hope that its provisions will be made public at the earliest possible moment? Zionism is a great democratic movement; indeed, one of its chief achievements was that it gave democracy to Jewry. And no scheme or plan will in the nature of things bear within it the elements of success that does not respond to the aspirations of the Jewish people and meet with the approval of the Jewish masses. It is by them, and not by select Committees, however eminent may be their composition, that the Zionist movement must stand or fall; and it is therefore due to them that the fullest confidence should be reposed in them by those who seek to lead them in this matter. In the meantime we hope that in the new scheme now in preparation, the vital Arab question will be dealt with on something like rational and reasonable lines. Expropriation, as Mr. ZANGWILL

proposes, we do not think comes under either of those categories, any more than does the policy of peaceful penetration of Jews on the one hand, and gradual elimination of the Arabs on the other, which is said to be the official Zionist plan. Up till now the only valid suggestion that we have seen is the one whereby the Arab and Jewish populations shall be merged politically and become politically homogeneous. The social complicity that was last week paid in behalf of the Zionists to the Emir FEISUL, representing the Palestine Arabs, is, to be sure, all to the good for the cementing of friendly relations. But functions of the kind do not make it less necessary—from some points of view they make it all the more necessary—that a just and liberal measure shall be devised so as to regulate the relative positions of Arab and Jew, and which shall avoid anything in the nature of ill-feeling and irritation hereafter.

ref 1:269

# 

FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1919—5679.

## Mr. Zangwill and the Arab Problem.

MR. LUCIEN WOLF's protest to Mr. ZANGWILL against his views on the Arab question, which appeared in the recent number of the JEWISH CHRONICLE, has certainly elicited a powerful reply, even bearing in mind Mr. WOLF's very pertinent rejoinder. Mr. ZANGWILL's retort courteous contains several points which deserve to be borne in mind in the discussion of this very difficult and vital question, and his suggestions, as he claims, can only be considered in the light of the new "Wilsonian world, equipped with a League of Nations whose preliminary task must be to re-shape the lands on the principle of Nationality." We have yet to see how this new world is to pan out as a practical proposition, how the lands are in practice to be re-shaped on a nationalistic basis. It may be that in the end no material injury would be done to the Arab population by the application of the principle in Palestine. As an ideal, indeed, the proposition, if voluntarily embraced by Arabs and Jews alike, would prove to be a solution of the trouble, and Mr. ZANGWILL could, in that event, fairly assert that he is "no oppressor and evictor of the Race with which he is anxious to come to terms on a basis of mutual assistance." But human nature is an inscrutable thing, and human nature, in the person of PRINCE FEISUL, son of the KING OF THE HEDJAZ, has only recently been giving expression to sentiments which do not seem to savour of any willingness to be gone from Palestinian soil. For our part, we are convinced that the scheme sketched recently by "A Jewish Nationalist" in the JEWISH CHRONICLE is the most—indeed it is the only—practicable plan at present before us for dealing fairly and squarely with the Arab problem. It seeks, in fact, to attain ultimately much the same purpose that Mr. ZANGWILL aims at, but in another way and with an important difference. It would remove the Arab element, which desires to be politically Arab, not by forced transplantation, but by political means, while it would absorb those Arabs who desire to identify themselves and to merge themselves politically with Jews by a sinking of their individuality in the Palestine Commonwealth. The one proposal is natural; the other arbitrary. The one is comparatively easy; the other bristles with difficulties and dangers, and it is undeniable—injustice, if only to individuals. We are glad, however, that vigorous minds are attacking the greatest difficulty which Jewish Nationalist aspirations have to overcome, and we would only add our own hope that nothing that may be said will impair the cordial and brotherly feelings which must always subsist between Arab and Jew in their common interest. While referring to Mr. ZANGWILL, may we not be permitted to enter a caveat—friendly and respectful—against the attack which he made upon Dr. WEIZMANN in the course of his speech on Saturday evening? In a democratic movement, such as Zionism essentially is, personal considerations count in comparison for little. But Dr. WEIZMANN is at the moment charged with a great and heavy task. That, if not his brilliant services to the Jewish cause, should shield him from disconcerting onslaught of the nature Mr. ZANGWILL indulged in, though Dr. WEIZMANN's policy, as he, loyal to the Movement would be the first to agree, must of course be freely open to the keenest criticism, however hostile. Mr. ZANGWILL showed, however, a tendency to overstep the border line between the man and his policy, and at such a time and in such circumstances as the present, that is a tendency which should be severely repressed.

ref 1:270

Three Editorials in  
the Jewish Chronicle  
on Zangwill's transfer plan

# Great Britain, Palestine and the Jews

*Jewry's Celebration of  
Its National Charter*



## The Great Thanksgiving Meeting

LORD ROBERT CECIL, K.C., M.P., who was received with loud cheering, said:

Our wish is that Arabian countries shall be for the Arabs, Armenia for the Armenians, and Judæa for the Jews. (Applause.)

ref 1:275

3rd December, 1919.

Dear Redcliffe,

Thanks for returning my articles and letters. But surely they explain quite well my point of view, and show that that it was misinterpreted in the first rumours.

I cannot remember when I first launched the idea of an amicable Arab expropriation; but it was probably at the National Liberal Club, where the idea was received sympathetically by a large audience, mainly Gentile. Gentiles, indeed, cannot understand how a "National Home" can be got otherwise.

Letter. Zangwill to Redcliffe Salaman

ref 1:280



## MR. I. ZANGWILL AND THE PALESTINE SCHEME

### "AN INFANTS' COLONY."

A concert in aid of the West London Branch of the Jewish Victims of the War was given last Saturday evening at the Queen's Hall, Langham Place. Among the artists who contributed to the programme were: Miss Edythe Wattson and Mr. S. Silverman, who performed the quarrel scene from "The School for Scandal"; Mr. Sascha Lasserson, who played violin solos; and M. Rosing, who sang.

In the course of the evening Mr. I. ZANGWILL addressed the audience.

The troubles in Canada and the Transvaal had been a sufficient proof even in the British Empire of the friction among races pent up in one territory. Indeed, the whole war had been to break up the dangerous sources of friction in Austria and Hungary. Where, then, was the logic of creating in Palestine a minor Austria artificially? The races should separate as Abraham did from Lot. Sir Mark Sykes had had a splendid political idea. The three races oppressed by the Turks were to be redeemed and co-operate in redeeming the East. The Arabs were to have a State in Arabia, the Armenians a State in Armenia, and the Jews

A STATE — OF FRICTION.

(Laughter.)

ref 1:276

Jewish Chronicle, 3 January 1919.

## Palestine Reclaimed

LETTERS FROM A JEWISH OFFICER  
IN PALESTINE  
BY

REDCLIFFE N. SALAMAN, M.D.

(Temporary Captain R.A.M.C.)

Mr. Zangwill therefore hoped that by an amicable arrangement they would prefer to trek to their new Arabian State just as the Boers trekked for Cape Colony. In that case the two States could arise side by side and hand in hand. Otherwise he did not see that a Jewish State could arise at all, but only a state of friction.

In Mr. Zangwill's opinion the Arab is so lightly enrooted in Palestine, some at least of the tribes being semi-nomadic, that it would seem to add to the feasibility of his idea.

Moreover, the Zionist Organisation was, according to his view, to compensate fully all Arab interests, and see that they obtain, if necessary, equivalent pieces of land in the new Arab State.

ref 1:277



# THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS JOURNAL

AND  
MONTHLY REPORT.

Published by the LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION, 22, Buckingham Gate, S.W.1.

Vol. I.

FEBRUARY, 1919.

No. 2.

The claim of the Jews to Palestine does not rest merely on history, but on the fact that while they are the only people on earth absolutely without a national home, Palestine is a derelict country, whose redemption needs such vast financial and labour forces that it can only "pay" a people with ideal interests in the soil. Its 600,000 Arabs, whose disproportionate presence is the gravest obstacle to the rise of the Jewish State, have created nothing there except trouble for the Jewish Colonies, and should be gradually and amicably transplanted to the Arab Kingdom, which is to be re-established next door, and with which the Jewish State would cordially co-operate. Race redistribution in the interests of the general world-happiness is, I take it, one of the functions of the League of Nations, and one that must be executed in many parts of Europe. It has even been suggested as the solution of the Irish question. But I had rather see an independent Palestine consisting of Arabs and Jews shouldering a common burden, than see a Palestine Jewry paralysed by tutelage and robbed by a Trustee Power of the invigorating struggle for self-expression and self-determination.

ref 1:283

Article by Zangwill

## Zangwill on Weizmann.

In this roseate period naturally assumed that under the League of Nations a friendly arrangement would be fixed up between the Jews and the Arabs, who would gradually retire to their own State as the Boers trekked from Cape Colony in 1833-37, and that the two States would work amicably side by side. It was for this reasonable suggestion of an exodus by consent, that Prince Feisal and Dr. Weizmann combined to denounce me as an ejector of the Arab.

### THE IMPOSSIBLE ARAB PROBLEM.

But with the passing of the dream of universal justice associated with the League of Nations, the hopes of such a settlement have faded. True, the Arab State already exists, and the Armenian Republic is in formation, but the third member of the trinity grows daily more remote. The Powers are only too glad to profit by Dr. Weizmann's weakness. But whatever they concede him, unless he can solve the Arab problem, Zionism proper must be a fiasco. For if you shirk Exodus you are confronted by Numbers.

† Dr. Weizmann and I agree, as you see, that there must be force in the matter of the Jews' coming in, but he will not see that his political ideal demands force—though with full compensation—in the Arabs' going out. It seems to me that if reason and goodwill cannot procure a settlement—and they should certainly be tried first of all—then one single act of compulsion is better for both sides than perpetual friction ;

ref 1:287

Jewish Chronicle. 27 February 1920

### Zangwill on Weizmann.

WITHOUT seeing eye to eye with Mr. ZANGWILL on all the points in his brilliant speech reported in another column, we would express our general concurrence in his views. The tenour of Mr. ZANGWILL'S address, indeed, is in close harmony with that for which we so often have contended, and with the remarks which we felt it necessary to make in these columns only last week. His speech is a stern call for a courageous facing of the facts at a time of extraordinary crisis in Jewish history, and a demand that Jews, and especially Zionists, should rise to the height of an unexampled opportunity. His scathing criticism of the men who are really of so little faith, just because their trust is so boundless, and his bold handling of the theory of Jewish self-determination and its present-day practical application, should be laid to heart by every one among us who is a thinker and not an automaton. We are most anxious not to make more difficult than it is the task of the men who admittedly are grappling with a thorny problem. It is out of no mere wantonness or the futile spirit of captiousness that we ask questions or call for information. It is because we feel the gravity of this hour, and all that may follow if the supreme opportunity be lost. Mr. ZANGWILL is right in insisting above all on courage, and on a proper valuation of Jewish capacity and Jewish rights.

ref 1:288

Editorial. Jewish Chronicle. 27 February 1920

### THE MORNING POST LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

#### "ZANGWILL IN TWO PARTS."

The fact is that 600,000 Arabs constitute an almost impenetrable barrier to the Jewish national home in Palestine. And as I pointed out soon after the much-quoted speech, it was like turning over the Savoy Hotel to the Air Ministry on condition the hotel guests were not disturbed. My speech was concerned with the possibility of surmounting the barrier. The proper thing, had your generous sympathy been to materialise, expropriation with compensation is one method, and you have forgotten that you have already pronounced it reasonable. After the gigantic blood-letting for more or less futile ends I am not doctrinaire enough to jib at the use of a little force for real ends.

ref 1:292

such as the solution of the social problem, or of the Jewish problem, could such solutions indeed be found by such dubious means. And I must confess that with Europe still full of bleeding wanderers, especially of my own race, I cannot find much pathos in a well-organised, well-financed migration of the long-analysed Arab into the two new and neighbouring Arab States that the Peace Conference has set up. Even your squeamish contemporary, the *Nation*, recommends in its last number a deportation of Moslems from the revived Armenia. Nay, did not Mr. Wilson himself preach force for righteous ends, "force without stint, force to the utmost limit?"

ISRAEL ZANGWILL.  
Far End, East Preston, Sussex,  
March 6.



**"Political Zionism Is Dead."**

"Political Zionism is dead," Zangwill declared. The proudest will must sometimes acknowledge honorable defeat. When King David's child was sick he fasted and lay upon the ground, but when the child died he arose and washed and anointed himself. I see no saner policy for political Zionism, now finally bereaved of its hope." Discussing the "fiasco of political Zionism," Mr. Zangwill went on:

"I shall always remain persuaded that a Jewish State was possible at the moment when the Arab was a defeated enemy, liberated from the Turk and glad enough to take on any political impress; that by a policy of racial redistribution such as is now in operation between the Greeks and the Turks under the Treaty of Lausanne, combined with full compensation for expropriated land—a policy of mine with which even our Morning Post was originally satisfied—the difficulty of making a home out of a territory in which we are only one out of nine inhabitants and in which our total holding of the soil is still below 4 per cent, could have been largely removed. I shall always believe that at the critical moment the Zionist leadership, unconscious of the living forces behind it, such as already existed in Palestine, or have found fresh expression in the Halutzim, perhaps even content with the Achad-Haamism which, as Dubnow tells us, had already replaced Zionism as early as the Congress of 1913, failed in nerve and will power. But the hour of destiny has passed. A great moment found, as Herzl had foreboded, a small people."

ref 1:298

New York Times. 15 October 1923

**MR. RICHARDS COMMENDS NEW PALESTINE**  
Editor, THE NEW PALESTINE:

Even the truth sometimes becomes a sensation, and when that happens, things may not be altogether well in the community. To pretend that many of us have not for years been thinking what Mr. Zangwill is saying, is only a form of hypocrisy which does not add to the dignity of Jewish life.

ref 1:302

The New Palestine. 26 October 1923

## ARAB CLAIMS TO PALESTINE

### THEIR VALIDITY AND THEIR FALLACIES

By ABRAHAM GOLDBERG

Transjordan has plenty of free, unoccupied soil. If this were apportioned to the Palestinian Arabs, free, they would gladly have settled there in great numbers. This would have been a statesmanlike solution of the so-called Arab problem in Palestine.

Israel Zangwill did, at one time, suggest a similar solution to the Arab question in Palestine; but he was "laughed out of court" and accused of being Utopian, of suggesting things that are solely impractical. We all know better now.

ref 1:306

The New Palestine. 7 February 1930

## The London Conference

By ABRAHAM GOLDBERG

After all, the boundary between Palestine and Transjordan is fictitious, and in the latter country, which is twice the size of the land to which Jewish colonization is confined, there are great possibilities for settlement. Why, then, cannot many of the Arabs migrate to Transjordan and settle there, where they would be strictly under Arab auspices and an Arab

Government? They would thus relieve the alleged congestion in Palestine. It is obvious that a solution to the land question in Palestine will not be attained unless Palestine as a whole—Transjordan included—is taken into consideration. An intentional exclusion of this territory from the purview of the conferees would not augur a real solution of the questions involved. We expect that our representatives will urge consideration of the problem of Transjordan in all its aspects. We hope they will point out the injustice done to the Jewish National Home in severing Palestine into two parts of which one is still reserved exclusively for Arabs, and in not encouraging the Arabs of Palestine to migrate to Transjordan, so that additional territory might be available for Jewish colonization and for the development of the Jewish Homeland without hindrance.

ref 1:307

The New Palestine. 17 April 1931

## THE PALESTINE SITUATION RESTATED

By Felix Frankfurter

Moreover, the availability for settlement in Transjordan, with its large areas of fertile lands so sparsely populated and the thin stream of the Jordan only formally separating it from Palestine, was deemed by Sir John outside his terms of reference. And yet Transjordan is probably the key to the problem of land congestion in Palestine. Certainly, hill Arabs can as readily be settled there as on the plains.

ref 1:308

Foreign Affairs. April 1931



Edward A. Norman, an outstanding American Jewish philanthropist who, in 1937, conceived the idea of the transfer of Palestine Arabs to Iraq and started negotiations to this effect with the Iraqi Government, recorded in his unpublished diary (an excerpt from which he put at this writer's disposal) a conversation he had with Jabotinsky in London on December 2, 1937:

He [Jabotinsky] had already read the copy of my Iraq paper. . . . He approved of the whole idea very much. He said that he felt, however, that the most difficult part would be to induce Arabs to leave Palestine. . . . Jabotinsky made the original suggestion that if the plan ever progressed to the point where Iraq was prepared to cooperate and proclaim an invitation to the Palestine Arabs to migrate to Iraq, it would be wise to have the Zionist Organization openly oppose Arab emigration from Palestine, and then the Arabs would be sure the scheme was not Jewish and that the Jews wanted them to stay in Palestine only to exploit them, and they would want very much to go away to Iraq. This sounds very Macchiavellian, but it may be very sound politics in dealing with such an ignorant and suspicious people as the Arabs.

From: Fighter and Prophet - The Vladimir Jabotinsky Story  
ref 1:332

Klinger, 9.XI.39

No minorities.

either assimilation, or evacuation.

10 or 20 million will have to be evacuated.  
Don't look for solutions: ~~for~~ cede us Palestine and forget all about it.  
First among them - Jews

Arabs will have to make room

If Balts may be moved, Pal. Arabs cert.  
willing to.

Where to? - Give half a billion dollars loan  
to Iraq or Saudi's.

This is the job for Amer. Jewry

My own

Notes in Jabotinsky's handwriting on his meeting with Klinger

ref 1:341

# זשאבאטינסקי וועגן דעם באראן ראזשילד

— און איר וויסט, וואס איך וועל  
איך זאגן: דער באראן איז דער פאר-  
נאטיקער. מאקסימאליסטישער ציו-  
ניסט. מען זאגט, אז איך בין א עקס-  
טרעמיסט, איך, אבער, וויל אונטער-  
שטרייכן, אז אין פארגלייך מיטן בא-  
ראן בין איך א מעסיקער און וויער  
א באשיידענער ציוניסט. איך, למשל,  
באנוגן זיך מיט א יידישער מערהייט  
אין ארץ ישראל פון א 55 ביז 60  
פראצענט און דער באראן פארלאנגט  
א גאנצע יידישע ארץ ישראל... ער  
איז גרויס צו געבן די אראבער געלט,  
ווי זאלן זיך קויפן אנדערע ערד, נאר  
מיט דעם באדינג אז ווי זאלן אוועק-  
גיין פון ארץ ישראל... און איבער-  
הויפט, ער — דער פראקטישער און  
רעאלער מענטש — גלייבט אז אזוי  
וועט עס זיין, אז ארץ ישראל וועט  
זיין יידיש פונקט ווי פראנקרייך פראנ-  
צויזיש..."

ref 1:348

"Jabotinsky talking about Baron Rothschild"

שבתי לוי

מזכרונות

ברם, הארון לא חדל מאז בן כנסדר את העניינים ברוח מטרתו לחתור  
לרציפות היישובית. על כן ניהלתי משא ומתן ולא פסקתי בלנהלו במסך סנים  
ארוכות. הכתדלתי לקבל את הסכמת הערבים, אם לא למכירה, לפחות לחילופין.  
אבל בכל הסביבה ההיא לא עמדה כל אדמה למכירה כדי שנוכל לבצע את  
החילופין. עד כיום אחד נולד בי הרעיון להציע לערבים שיוסכמו לעבור לסוריה  
בתנאי שיקבלו מאתנו פייסויים יורבע מן האדמה שנקבל מהם, ובנוסף לזה גם  
את ערך הבניינים העגום שסביב לבתים וכן את הוצאות ההעברה. הבטחתי  
להם, שהם יקבלו לידם את שטח הקניה (הקוטאנים) נקיים מכל "מאפרח".  
כסיבולתי מהם הסכמה עקרונית לתכנית יצאתי לסוריה החילונית מחפש אדמה  
מהאיבה. לאחר חיפויים רבים הוצעה לי אדמה בסביבות החורן. לא רחוק מגבול  
ארץ ישראל. כשהורתי לארץ ובאתי בדברים עם הערבים הבאתי לפניהם את  
הצעתו אמרו לי, כי אכן מוצאת האדמה חן בעיניהם. כך הבאנו את פעולת הקניה  
לירי גמר ההעברה יצאה אל הפועל.  
לאחר זמן, באחד בריקוד בפאריס, אמר לי הארון, שמע על פעולת זו וגילה  
לי את שמותי עליה. הוא יקח לי להמסיד בפעולות דומות, אבל מוטב, אמר, לא  
להעביר את הערבים לסוריה ולעבר הירדן, שהרי הם חלק מארץ ישראל, אלא  
למסופוטמיה (עיראק)... הוא הוסיף ואמר, כי במקרים כאלה היה מוכן לשלוח  
לערבים על הכסנו, מטות חקלאיות חדשות ובדרכים חקלאיות.

ref 1:349

Memoirs of Shabtai Levi



45

INCOMING CABLEGRAM	
ADMINCOM FOR WARBURG NEW YORK	LONDON  (IN CODE)
JUNE 16 1930	

HAVE PASSED ON SUGGESTION REFERENCE OF TRANSJORDANIA SAME SUBJECT BEING  
CONSIDERED MARON ROTHSCHILD BUSINESS MENTIONED IN MY LETTER BEST REPRESENTATIVE  
stop REMARKS

ref 1:352

Cablegram. Flexner to Warburg

TELEPHONE HANOVER 8878	CABLE ADDRESS, "ADMINCOM" NEW YORK
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE 27 WILLIAM STREET NEW YORK	
FELIX M. WARBURG, CHAIRMAN JOSEPH C. HYMAN, ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRMAN	June 16th, 1930.
<i>Confidential</i>	
Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Chatham, Mass.	
My dear Justice Brandeis:	

The reference to Transjordan concerns a possible inquiry into the nature of British aid to agriculture in Egypt and in other mandated or colonial possessions with a view to determining whether such aid if granted, could facilitate emigration of Arabs into Transjordan, and increasing agricultural possibilities for Jews in Palestine.

ref 1:353

Cordially yours,

*J. C. Hyman*

My dear sir John:

October 27, 1930

For you who have been trying so earnestly to do justice both to your duties to Transjordan and Palestine, the suggestion is not new that Great Britain might lend its credit guaranty towards the purpose of acquiring a larger quantity of better land than is obtainable in Palestine, at a lower rate, and settle those of the Arabs who would like to become up to date farmers on such lands. It is not, of course, a question of driving out the Arabs who do first class work where they are in Palestine, but of removing those who are not working now to places where they can show their willingness to acquire real skill as farmers.

ref 1:354

Letter. Warburg to Chancellor

# היום

Vol. XII, No. 172, Jerusalem, Monday, April 28th, 1930.

מחיר - 10

על שום ענין דיוני... (הערות על ידי)

## הרצאת מ. מ. אוסישקין בפני העתונאים

הנה נמצאו שלושה אנשים האומרים, כי אין פקום לחלוקים בארץ ישראל, ואנשי אחר האומר כי יש פקום. צאא העו. מי מהם כופחה יותר? אסטימטיקה, ולחשוב השכונות השיטה, הוא הנה, פסטורופלית. עלינו היה להכריז תמיד, כי אנו דורשים את ארצנו חרה לרשונתו. אם פנויה הארץ כתושבים—מה טוב! ואם ישנם כאן תושבים הר ייש להעבירם לכל מקום אחר איה שיהיה, אבל עלינו פלבל את הארץ, יש לנו אירואל יותר נורע ויותר נשנב, כאשר השפירה על כמה מאות אלפים פלחים.

י ד ו ש י מ. — לפי חומנת הקרן הקיימת התכנסו אחמאל למסיבה במלון "ערך" עשרות אחר דות של עתונאים. מלכד ב"ב העתונות המקומית ונו של ח"ל נוכחו גם סופרים אחרים, וביניהם הפרוי פיסור ב"ר י. קלוזנר, יעקב דבינובית, ועוד. בשעה 5 אחה"צ סתח מר אוסישקין, בהרצאתו

ref 1:358

Lecture by Ussishkin. April 1930

THE NEW PALESTINE

Friday, February 5, 1937

## Why I Did Not Testify

Ussishkin Gives His Reasons for Not Appearing as Witness Before Royal Commission

By MENAHEM USSISHKIN

At a meeting of the smaller Actions Committee, I spoke on this subject and I became entangled in a rather extreme discussion with Dr. Ruppin. I complained against the manner we pursued in presenting our arguments to the Commission, namely, that the Government has much State lands. I said to him that if there are two experts, one a Jew and the other a Britisher, and the British expert will "prove" that this is not so the world will give credence to the English expert and not to the Jewish expert. In my opinion, our argument should have been totally different. We should have said, in the face of the entire world: We believe that there is room in Palestine also for the Arabs but if you maintain that there is no room for them in the country, then they can find land in other places.

There was a time when private property was a sacred thing. The owners of large estates comprising hundreds of thousands of hectares, entertained no fear that their estates might be diminished in order to provide land for those peasants who were totally landless. Times have changed, however. In all parts of the world a process of parcelling off large estates and making them available for the landless peasants is going on. The same principle applies not only to individuals but to nations as a whole. The Arab people have immense areas of land at their disposal; our people have nothing except a grave's plot. We demand that our inheritance, Palestine, be returned to us and if there is no room for Arabs, they have the opportunity of going to Iraq. This should have been, in my opinion, our argument; for all expert technical testimony will lead nowhere.

ref 1:360



סודי

ישיבת הנחלת הסובנות היהודית ביום 19.5.36.

מס. 57.

נוכחים: ח"ח ד. בן גוריון, יו"ר  
גרייבוביץ  
ד"ר מ. חכסטר  
ד"ר ד.ו. מנסור  
ח"ר י.ל. הכהן מיטמן  
ד"ר מ. דומנסטרייך  
מ. שרתוק

א. קפלן (לא באמצע הישיבה)

מ. אומישקין  
ד"ר א. רוטין

Ussishkin

הייתי רוצה מאד מאד שהערבים

ילכו לעיראק. ואני מקווה שילכו מעם לשם. מפני טעם ששום באשר בעיראק חנאי החקלאות הם יותר טובים מאשר בא"י על פי טיב האדמה ושניה, ימצאו במדינה ערבית ולא במדינה יהודית. אנחנו לא נוכל לשלוח אותם מכאן. ולא רק מפני שלא נוכל, אלא גם עמו חילוכין בין

"29"

(מ.א.)

היונים באסיה חקטנה ובין הערבים מחקית ויון. לעינינו עשו זאת אומות העולם. גם אנו נקבל את היהודים מבגדד ומסוריה ומחורכיסטן ומקורדיסטן ומפולין ונשלח להם ערבים ונתן להם גם נדוניה. אבל כיום הם לא ירצו בזאת. אבל מה שאנחנו יכולים לדרוש כיום הוא שיכניסו את כל עבר הירדן לארץ ישראל, לכה"מ בסובן הכלכלי, ומה שהם רוצים, שהפליח לא יאשר בלי קרקע, יש להם רשות לדרוש, כחנאי שגם עבר הירדן או שהיא תהיה בשביל החישובות של יהודים או שאם הם אינם רוצים לתת לנו את עבר הירדן בשביל החישובות שלנו, שתיא <sup>שנינו 16 מ/222/16</sup> תהיה בשביל החישובות של אותם הערבים, נגד זה לא יוכלו לענות האיש הכי מוסרי, כאשר אם תבוא היום לאנגליה וחגיד, שנתון לשלוח היום אכר אנגלי מפתחו מנצ'סטר למפתחו ליוורפול, חרי איש לא יראה אסון לאומי בדבר. בשביל הערבים מחגליל, עבר הירדן היא פרובינציה שלהם. או שיכניסו את כל 25 מיליון ח'לגם של עבר הירדן כאובייקט קרקעי להחישובות העם היהודי או שזה יהיה בשביל החישובות ערבי א".

סודי  
הרצאת מר משה שרתוק  
על היסודות הטעשיים של הפוליטיקה הציונית.  
דברים שנאמרו במסכת בביתו של ד"ר 1. הלפרן בירושלים,  
י"ב טבת תרצ"ח. (21.12.37)

אשר לשאלה העברה האוכלוסין הערבים. אני רוצה לדחות את ההשואה עם גרמניה. מה שגרמניה עושה ליהודים זוהי ממשלה שלוקחת אנשים וזורקת אותם החוצה, אינה דואגת מה יהיה להם, אינה מרשה להם לקחת את חונם אהם העברה כזו לא חכמן. ענין העברה כאן הוא פשוט מאד: או שזהו בלתי אפשרי כחלט או, אם זה אפשרי, הרי רק מחוץ חסכם ידוע. בלי חסכם לגמרי, זה לגמרי בלתי אפשרי. זה לא מוכרח להיות חסכם עם כל ערבי וערבי, אבל צריך להיות חסכם עם ממשלה אחרת. על כל פנים כין שזה יהיה בהסכם גמור או בלי חסכם, אבל זאת לא תהיה זריקה אנשים החוצה מחוץ שלילת רכוש בלי פצוי וכלי חוסר דאגה למצבם במקום החדש. גם כשזה יהיה בכפיה, זה יהיה מחוץ פצויים בעד הנכסים שהם משאירים פה ומחוץ דאגה למצבם במקום החדש. אם זה בלתי אפשרי, אז זה בלתי אפשרי, אבל אין להחלוקת בענין הטרנספר פה שזה יהיה כמו ענין גרמניה.

ref 1:361 Lecture by Moshe Shertok (Sharett). 21 December 1937

סודי  
מרטוקול  
מישיבת הנהלת הסוכנות היהודית לא"י,  
שהתקיימה בירושלים, ביום ה' 27.7.41.

2. דרישתו של מר שרתוק  
בקדתי בצירות הבריטית ובצירות האמריקנית, את סיר  
מייל למססון לא רציתי לראות, ראיתי את הסוכיר הראשון - זמן סגן הציר,  
וראיתי גם את הסוכיר לענייני המזרח, סטארט הידוע לנו.

השאלה היא לאן ילכו? היה בינינו ויכוח האם יש ארצות לאן ילכו,  
כמה אנשים יכולה ארץ ישראל להכיל. אמרתי לו שארץ-ישראל יכולה  
להכיל אוכלוסייה של חמשה מיליון לעשות. אמר: כמה יהודים? אמרתי:  
3 מיליון יהודים, שני מיליון ערבים. הערבים גדלים חודות לעליה  
היהודית, אבל אם נוציא את הערבים יהיה מקום ליותר יהודים, ולחוצים  
את הערבים זאת אומרת לטובת הערבים. מה תעשו עם טוריה, האם  
המדינה תתמנה במיעוט האוכלוסייה, עם המרחבים השוממים שלה, אם יקחו  
לכם כמה מאות אלפים ערבים מארץ-ישראל, העם היהודי יתן בסך, תחיה  
המדינה לטוריה, אותו הדבר לעיראק.

ref 1:362

Minutes. Jewish Agency Executive



## Imperialism, Pacifism and Zionism

By Abraham Schwadron

IN THE July-October, 1916, issue of *Dokumente des Fortschritts*, a pacifist and anti-imperialist journal, I expressed these ideas in more detail in a series of articles entitled "A Revision of Pacifism," wherein I attempted to apply the framework of the Zionist idea to other nationalities; that is, to solve their national problems by an *agreed and organized transfer of a nation or parts of it to the territory of another state.*

ref 1:363

Opinion. July 1936

### אברהם שרון משני עברי השעה

. והנה באה הציונות והראתה דרך חדשה:  
פתרון רדיקלי של סיכסוכי עמים היושבים  
בארץ אחת על ידי העברת אחד העמים  
לטרטוריה אחרת. העברה שאינה עקרה וכליה אלא  
נטיעה והרווחה. זה אמנם פתרון קשה מאד ומסובך מאד, אבל  
יסודי, ריאלי, ובעל ערך שביציבות. באותו זמן לא היתה עדיין  
דוגמה ברורה כזאת ביחסים הבינלאומיים. מלבד החילופים  
בקנה-מידה קטן בין בולגריה ותורכיה אחרי מלחמת 1878.  
אחר כך, אחרי מלחמת-העולם הקודמת, סודרה, כידוע, חילופי  
אוכלוסין בין יוון לתורכיה. במספר של מיליון וחצי נפש, ובין  
תורכיה לבולגריה. השתדלו לפתור גם את שאלת האשורים  
שבעיראק בדרך זו של העברת המונים. וישנן עוד דוגמאות לכך.  
ולפני שש שנים העזו שני מלומדים אנגליים זה אחר זה  
להציע פתרון מהסוג ההוא גם לגבי ארץ-ישראל, ולפני ארבע  
שנים המליצה על דרך זו — אמנם בדבר חלק קטן בלבד של  
הארץ, במסגרת החלוקה — גם ועדת פיל, אישים מוסמכים  
זבעלי-נסיון ומשקל רב.

ref 1:370 Article by Abraham Sharon