

III: ZIONISM AND IMPERIALISM

A documented historical account of the collaboration of the Zionist movement with imperialist powers from the beginning to World War I

First of a Series

By Morris U. Schappes

WE have tried to cut through to the truth about the criminal activities charged against certain Zionists and Zionist organizations at the Prague and other trials and arrests in the socialist countries. We have ever kept in mind that such activities have been carried on without the knowledge of the masses of members of Zionist organizations. This membership certainly should be given the facts about such activities and judge for themselves whether they agree that their organizations should be used as a cover for such acts. Further, are the many thousands of Jews who believe themselves to be Zionists aware of the real history of the movement to which they adhere and of the significance of this history? And the many thousands of Jews who are not Zionists should be acquainted with the history of this movement so that they may have a basis for their judgment of it. In the article below, Morris U. Schappes reviews the history of the collaboration of Zionism with oppressive imperialist regimes. We believe that ordinary Jews everywhere must consider if this record signifies activity in the welfare of the Jewish people and common people of the world.—Eds.

THE facts about the Zionist movement and the government of Israel that were revealed in the testimony at the Prague Trial undoubtedly surprised many well-intentioned members and followers of Zionist organizations in the United States. In Prague it was testified that not only were the Zionist organizations and the Ben Gurion government allies of imperialism, but that they had actually been used as channels for the operation of United States intelligence, which directed the criminal conspiracy organized by Slansky and his co-defendants against the Czechoslovakian socialist state.

Most Americans, including American Jews, know very little about the Zionist movement except that it has something to do with Palestine and Israel. Even members of Zionist organizations are generally unaware of the principles and tactics of Zionism. Most American Jews who consider themselves Zionist supporters or followers or even members do so because they want to help the struggling people in Israel. They believe, in our opinion mistakenly, that supporting the Zionist movement is one way, or the best way, to do so. Therefore, when the commercial American press, exploiting their deep feelings about Israel, de-

nounced the Prague Trial's exposure of the role of Zionism in this situation, and even falsely labeled this exposure as "anti-Semitic," these American Jews were ready to accept the charge.

Yet it is a known fact that many Jews, including those who have given active support to the people of Israel, have been and are opposed to Zionism. Particularly is this true of large numbers of progressive Jews. There is good reason for this.

Progressives, even if they are not themselves members of the working class, regard the working class as the class to which the future belongs, as the class that can lead the whole world forward. Such progressives have always regarded the Zionist movement and Zionist theories as reactionary, as hostile to the interests not only of the Jewish workers but of the Jewish people as a whole. Why?

From its beginning in the last decade of the 19th century, the Zionist movement was a movement of, and in the interest of, a section of the Jewish bourgeoisie, of the wealthy Jews, the substantial merchants, manufacturers, bankers. While one section of the Jewish plutocracy originally opposed Zionism, the Jewish-nationalistic section fostered it. The operating leadership of the Zionist movement was in the hands of Jewish intellectuals closely connected with the interests of this nationalistic Jewish bourgeoisie, lawyers, journalists and other middle-class professionals.

Whom Does Zionism Serve?

The fact that the Zionist movement represented the interests of a section of the Jewish bourgeoisie does not, of course, mean that every member, follower and supporter of the Zionist organization was a well-to-do merchant, banker, landlord or manufacturer. In fact, you may know many Zionists who are not at all well-to-do, who are struggling small businessmen, low-paid professionals or even workers. But does the fact that large numbers of the membership and supporters of the Zionist movement are not themselves part of the Jewish plutocracy mean that the movement itself is a working class or lower middle class movement? Not at all.

For it is the function of the bourgeoisie of any country or people to try to spread its ideas outside of its class and

specifically among the ranks of workers and the petty bourgeoisie. Except under fascism, when rule is mainly by terror, a plutocracy maintains its rule over the other classes by spreading among them the ideas that are useful not to the masses but to that plutocracy. Take the American plutocracy, the ruling class. How does it rule? Was Eisenhower elected solely by the votes of people in the same class as Charlie Wilson? Obviously millions of workers and lower middle class people were persuaded, *against their interests*, to vote for Eisenhower. Does that make the Republican Party a party of the working class and the masses? Likewise, the Democratic Party drew the vast majority of its votes from the working class and the petty bourgeoisie, but no progressive would define the Democrats as a working class political movement.

Whom Are the Zionist Members Following?

In fact, so long as there are elections, these two parties have to appeal to the electorate, which in its majority is an electorate of working people. Therefore the American plutocracy is compelled to *persuade* the working masses to follow the leadership of the plutocracy by spreading among them the ideology, the pattern of ideas, of the big bourgeoisie. Thus the fact that a bourgeois ideology is accepted and followed by workers and other classes outside the bourgeoisie does not change the character of the ideology. It is a historic weakness of the American workers that their class consciousness is still elementary and that they have not yet developed a mass party of their own class. Bourgeois ideology still dominates the mass of American workers, but that does not mean that this bourgeois ideology is in the interest of the working class.

The same thing is true of the ideology of the Jewish-nationalist section of the bourgeoisie, Zionism. *Whoever* accepts and follows Zionist theories and practices is accepting and following a bourgeois ideology, even if he is a worker, and even if he is a worker who thinks he is class conscious and believes in socialism.

But how can you tell that Zionism is an ideology of the Jewish bourgeoisie? After all, Zionism *claims* to be the ideology of the Jewish people as a whole and in the interests of all classes of Jews. But so does the American, or the French or any other, ruling class assert that its ideas and its ideology are good for the whole country. The bourgeoisie always professes to represent the *national* interest. The Trumans and Eisenhowers maintain that they act in the interests of the nation, of national defense even, when in fact they are acting in the interests of the class of Charlie Wilson only. The claims of the Zionist Jewish bourgeoisie are just as false as the claims of the American nationalist bourgeoisie.

The bourgeois class character of Zionist ideology can be seen in all of its principal theories, and in all of its history. Perhaps the simplest road to understanding the bourgeois character of this Jewish nationalism is to examine its 60

year old, unswerving strategy of *alliance* with oppressive and imperialist ruling classes.

At the beginning of its career, the Zionist movement proclaimed the theory that the Jewish question was to be solved only by the establishment of a Jewish State, into which would be gathered all the Jews from all over the world, who were living presumably "in exile." That being the declared aim, how were the Zionists to go about achieving it? Even if the inconceivable had happened and every single Jew in the world had agreed to this Zionist principle, the Jews by themselves could not have attained this end simply because the Jewish people is a small people and therefore did not have the forces, *alone*, to create this Jewish State in a world in which all habitable territory is already part of existing states. Thus the Zionists needed allies with the necessary power to aid the Zionist movement to attain its end. Where did the Zionist leadership look for allies?

In the real world of political relations, allies for any movement could be sought for (1) in the working classes, (2) in national liberation and colonial anti-imperialist movements, and (3) in the oppressive ruling and imperialist classes of the time. Any legitimate national liberation movement, as distinguished from a bourgeois nationalist movement, would try to find its allies among those classes and forces which are also oppressed by imperialism, that is, the working classes and colonial and oppressed nations. But the Zionist leadership, because of their *class* character and ideology, turned not to the working class and to the colonial and national liberation forces, but to the only other classes in the field of political life, to the oppressive and imperialist ruling classes.

Before examining the historic record, another consideration must be taken into account: every alliance must be based on the self-interest of both parties to the agreement. In the language of diplomacy, this is called a *quid pro quo*, or loosely paraphrased, what do I get for what? Both parties to an alliance must believe that they are going to get something *for themselves* out of the alliance. Each side is willing to help the other achieve *its* objective, provided each side in return is aided in getting something it needs for itself. Now what the Zionists wanted was to get an ally or allies who would help the Zionists establish a Jewish State. But in return for this aid, the Zionists would have to be able to render some service to its allies. What service could the Zionists give to the ruling classes to whom they went with proposals for an alliance?

Herzl Looks for Sponsors

To whom the Zionist leadership went for alliances, and what they offered, is made abundantly and shockingly clear by the historic record.

Surveying the scene for possible allies, Theodore Herzl, founder, theoretician and leader of the Zionist international organization, decided to go first to the Sultan of Turkey, representative of the feudal absolutism that weighed op-

pressively upon the Turkish masses. Palestine was at that time a part of the Turkish empire, and since the Zionists wanted a Jewish State in Palestine, they would first try to strike a bargain with the Turkish ruling class for its consent.

But what could Herzl and the Zionists offer the Sultan in return? In sum, the Zionists could offer the Sultan the attraction of converting Palestine as a province of Turkey into a modern capitalist area that would serve both the Jews and the Turkish ruling class. But the nature of this offer and the ideology of the Zionists, can best be expressed in their own words, as set forth in a pamphlet published in New York in 1907 by the Federation of American Zionists, entitled *Zionism: A Jewish Statement To The Christian World*.

Discussing the proposition to the Turkish Sultan, the Federation of American Zionists points out that just as certain economic reforms have been made in the Lebanon province of Turkey, the Zionists would be prepared to finance such reforms in Palestine. In fact, the Zionist organization has already established the Jewish Colonial Trust with a capital of 2,000,000 pounds sterling and its subsidiary, the Anglo-Palestine Company. Then the Federation adds (all italics are this author's): "It is quite certain that reforms of the nature of those suggested, would attract Jewish capital from all over the world to that land in a far stronger manner than would be the case with any similar commercial ventures founded anywhere else. The reforms in Palestine besides, are urgent apart altogether from Zionist aims, and in the interests of good government ought not to be delayed."

Yet can the Sultan agree? The Federation of American Zionists answers thus: "But, it is often objected, His Majesty the Sultan would be opposed to such reforms, exactly because they would tend to foster Zionist aims. Why should he? Zionist aims in Palestine are *not in the least incompatible with, but are entirely consistent with Palestine remaining forever a province of the Turkish Empire. Nationality such as Zionists are striving to set up in Palestine by Jews and for Jews is not identical with an independent government.*"

What a vision! Jewish capitalists, governing and exploiting the Jewish masses in a Jewish province in Palestine as part of the Turkish Empire forever.

"As in India"

Then the Federation of American Zionists proceeds to argue how practicable this aim is: "There is a nationality in Canada and in Australia, *as there is in India*, and they are encouraged by the British government. These peoples are loyal to the British crown just by reason of the freedom which has been given them to develop their own existence."

Has an indignant Zionist ever asked you, how is it you support *all* national liberation movements, yet you oppose the Zionist movement? There is the answer! A real national liberation movement is anti-imperialist. Yet here

were the Zionists in 1907 speaking of *India* and the oppressed Indian peoples as "encouraged by the British government" and as having been given "freedom . . . to develop their own national existence." What is this but the Jewish bourgeoisie because of its class character applauding British rule in India and rejecting the claim of the oppressed masses of India to sympathy with and support of their struggle for national independence *from* "the British crown"? How could progressives support both Indian independence and the Zionist movement and be *consistent*?

But let us go on with this self-revelation of their bourgeois class character by the Federation of American Zionists: "Jews wish for nothing more than this same opportunity extended to themselves in Palestine. Thus the Turkish government would gradually turn Palestine from an almost uncultivated, and certainly from an undeveloped, land attracting for the most part, so far as Jews are concerned, *fanatics, beggars, paupers, and the decrepit who go there to die*, into a province, the great natural resources of which would quickly attract the *capital, the energy, the brains of the very best among the Jewish people.*"

Is "*reeks*" too strong a word to use about the bourgeois ideology of this passage? Consider the upper-class contempt of these Zionists for the then-existent Jews in Palestine, "the fanatics, beggars, and paupers" whose families had dwelt there for generations, or "the decrepit who go there to die" because of their Orthodox Jewish belief that it is holy to die in the "Holy Land."

Then consider what they offer the Sultan of Turkey: the transformation of his province of Palestine from an undeveloped land into a flourishing area attracting the capital, and that is significantly placed *first*, and "the brains of the very best among the Jewish people," that is, the Jewish capitalists, while "the energy" it is to be presumed will be provided by the "superior" Jewish masses of Europe, as distinguished from the Oriental "fanatics, beggars, and paupers" then living in Palestine. Here indeed is bourgeois arrogance, chauvinism and sycophancy to the Turkish ruling class combined in a few lines. This is how Jewish bourgeois nationalism looks when it opens its mouth and speaks frankly. (All quotations from pp. 12-13 of the cited pamphlet, with italics added.)

Well, did the Sultan of Turkey jump at this lively bait of Jewish capital, energy and brains dangled before His Majesty by Herzl and the Zionist movement? No, he did not, and his failure to do so may be one of the reasons why the Turkish feudal ruling class and His Sultanic Majesty went out of business as a ruling class.

The Kaiser and Tsar Say No

At any rate, Herzl had to go looking elsewhere for an alliance. His next stop was at the German imperialist ruling class. Of course Palestine was not a province of the German Empire yet, but German imperialism did have strategic aims in that part of the world, such as the Berlin to

Bagdad railway and what not, and if the German imperialists kicked the Turkish ruling class in its decaying teeth and took Palestine away and gave it to the Zionists, why then "the capital, the energy, the brains of the very best among the Jewish people" would be ready to serve the Kaiser's strategic interests in the Middle East.

And did the German imperialist ruling class jump at this offer of an alliance with the Zionists and Jewish capital? No, they thought they could do better with other allies, and in fact in World War I the Germans had Turkey as an ally.

But Herzl was resourceful. If not the Turkish or German ruling classes, there were still others. So the tsarist ruling class was approached next. Palestine was no more a Russian province than a German, but the tsar did have strategic imperialist objectives connected with the Dardanelles, and with preventing German imperialist penetration via the Berlin to Bagdad railway and so forth, and maybe the tsar would snatch Palestine for the Zionists, in which case the Zionist bourgeoisie would be His Majesty's loyal servants in the Middle East, and incidentally the Zionists would remove from tsarist territory all the Jews, particularly those nasty Jewish revolutionaries in the illegal socialist movement, Jewish revolutionaries whose subversive activity the Zionists held responsible for provoking pogroms against the Jews. So Herzl had an audience with Minister of the Interior Von Plehve, the master mind behind the Kishinev pogrom, but it was no go: the tsarist ruling class would not make an alliance with the Zionists although it had no objection to the Jews getting to Palestine out of there. Maybe that's one reason why the tsarist ruling class is out of business too as a ruling class.

Did Herzl learn from these failures that one should not try to make alliances with imperialist ruling classes? Not at all. The bourgeois class character of the movement limited his search for allies to capitalist or other oppressive ruling classes. Never did the Zionist leadership try to forge an alliance with the European working classes or with colonial and national liberation anti-imperialist movements. Yet the weakness of the Jewish bourgeoisie required an alliance—so Herzl persistently went on his Jewish bourgeois nationalist search for an imperialist power far-sighted enough to recognize in the Zionist movement a worth-while ally. To England, then, next.

The Uganda "Offer"

Joseph Chamberlain (the uncle of Neville the Munich-maker), with whom Herzl began negotiations, was an experienced diplomat, with an Empire on which the sun, at the beginning of the 20th century, never set. British imperialists could always use allies and tools of their far-flung imperialist strategic needs. And here was Herzl, begging that Britain wrest Palestine from Turkey for the Jews, and thus gain a dedicated and loyal Jewish State as its servitor in the Middle East. Did Chamberlain therefore promptly say "Yes"? No! Britain was not yet ready

to accept the Zionist movement as a basic ally in that part of the world. But did Chamberlain flatly, as had the Turkish, German and Russian rulers, say "No"? No. A British imperialist diplomat never shut the door on any offer of an alliance, for Britain never knew when it would need new allies for its strategic requirements, especially since the anti-imperialist forces were growing. So Chamberlain in effect said, "Maybe." More concretely, he made a counter-proposal: not Palestine for the Jews, but—Uganda!

Uganda? There was a scurrying for maps to find Uganda, and sure enough it was there, right there in east central Africa, where British strategy required an ally with capital, energy and brains. Herzl was disappointed but not fazed. A British offer was a British offer and therefore must be taken seriously. So the Zionist movement began to weigh the desirability of a Jewish State in—Uganda. An expedition was actually sent there to survey the land and estimate its practical suitability for the Jewish people.

Of course, there was an obstacle. Until Uganda loomed on the strategic horizon, the Zionist theoreticians had been making their appeals to the Jewish masses in terms of what was called the 2,000-year old dream of the Jews to return to Palestine. The Bible was searched for texts that would "prove" that such was the destiny of the Jews. The Passover Hagada, with its toast, "Next year in Jerusalem," became a basic test demonstrating Zionist claims to Palestine and Jewish aspirations to be, one and all, Zionists.

But Uganda? The most diligent search of sacred texts revealed no historic or prophetic connection with Uganda. No holy-day ritual or prayer mentioned it, and the new slogan, "Next year in Uganda!" sounded like a mockery or a profanation. Thus there developed a crisis in the Zionist movement. The Ugandists and the Palestinians fought it out, in person, at mass meetings, and at the Sixth World Zionist Congress in 1903. Max Nordau, a Ugandist, was almost assassinated after the world congress when two bullets whizzed by his head, badly aimed by an irate Palestinian who had had enough of such talk. The crisis led to an organizational split: the Ugandists became the Territorialist-Zionists (with Israel Zangwill in the leadership), that is, those Zionists who would take any territory that any imperialist power would be ready to assign to the Jews. But the main tide of the Zionist movement returned to the concept, "Next year in Jerusalem!", that is, if not next year at least as soon as we find an imperialist ally who will make that goal possible.

It was not until November 2, 1917, during the first World War, that British imperialism finally decided to enter into an open alliance with the Zionist movement by proclaiming the Balfour Declaration.

What Zionist History Says Today

Perhaps you think the foregoing account of 20 years of Zionist diplomacy is more entertaining than truthful? Then consider how the Zionist leadership today writes

about these events in order to win young Jews over to Zionism. After the establishment of the State of Israel, the American Zionist Youth Commission, joint agency of the Zionist Organization of American and Hadassah, published a 58-page pamphlet entitled *Guide to Zionism*. It was written by Jeremiah Ben-Jacob, a Palestinian-born Zionist theoretician. How does this official publication present this history for the instruction and inspiration of Jewish youth? Pages 10 and 11 have a section on "Diplomatic Orientation." The italics in the following quotations are added by this author.

"Herzl's main diplomatic preoccupation (except in the last phase)," writes Ben-Jacob, "was to secure a Charter from the Sultan. This he hoped to achieve by promising Jewish aid for the financial recovery of [the] Turkish Empire and by securing the goodwill and support of the great powers.

"The record of Herzl's negotiations and conversations with the Turks, the Germans, and the Russians is a moving but also a humiliating story. . . .

"Yet Herzl went through all this with high courage and the consistency of a scientist experimenting by a process of elimination.

"His conversations with the Kaiser are no less humiliating [than with the Sultan] . . .

"To the anti-Semitic government of Russia he also *had to make an appeal—in vain.*" Why he "had to" has already been explained: the bourgeoisie, including the Jewish bourgeoisie, turns to the bourgeoisie and other reactionary classes for alliances. But to continue with Ben-Jacob: "In striking words he [Herzl] describes what he felt when he saw von Plehve, the tsar's minister of the interior: 'I stood before a panther, a strong, sinuous, unrelenting beast, whose every move was a guarded offense . . . the arch anti-Semite, cool, frank, a butcher.'" That Von Plehve was all of this, however, was known before Herzl went to him with the offer of an alliance, yet it did not deter Herzl.

Having defined the "humiliation," Ben-Jacob then assures his Jewish youth: "In summing up the significance of Herzl's orientation it is clear that his achievements so transcended his failures, that even his failures assume the aspect of grandeur. They were the failures, as already suggested, of an experimenting scientist, or better still, of an inspired artist that must pass in humility, patience and devotion through the phases of creation, rejection and synthesis." Such is science and such is art and such is nonsense—to this Zionist theoretician, guiding the youth to Zionism.

Yet after the failures came the "success." Says Ben-Jacob: "From the heavy smoke of Constantinople's intrigue Herzl moved to the electric atmosphere of arrogance, hate and megalomania of Imperial Germany and tsarist Russia. From there he tried to find a way to the fog of England which he probably found more congenial. 'England, free England,' he prophesied, 'with its *world embracing outlook* will understand us and our aspirations.'

"He was even prepared to consider the British Uganda proposal as a temporary substitute for Palestine. First, because he was deeply stirred by the signals of Jewish distress in Europe. Second, because he was attracted by *England's political prestige.*"

England's "world embracing outlook," England's "political prestige"! In what "striking words" Herzl and Ben-Jacob try to veil the reality of oppressive British imperialism, trying to embrace even more of the world than it had already subjugated colonially! But Ben-Jacob, ending his section on "Diplomatic Orientation," strikes this lofty note: "Thus Herzl's orientation paved the way to *the alliance with Britain* and to the integration of political, cultural, and practical Zionism. That is, it paved the way to the Balfour Declaration and to the so-called 'Synthetic Zionism.'"

In the Service of British Imperialism

The origin in the complex negotiations that led to the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, it is not necessary to set forth here. Essential, however, is the undisputed fact that the Zionist negotiators knew exactly what they were doing in their appeal to the British imperialists. No less a Zionist figure than Jacob De Haas, once the secretary to Theodore Herzl himself, thus describes the last lap: "The Zionist memorandum presented just prior to the discussion of the final stages of the negotiations urged that after three years of debate: 'The problem be considered *in the light of imperial interests* and the principles for which the Entente [the Allied powers in the first World War] stands. . . . We therefore now humbly pray that this declaration may be granted to us and this would enable us to further consolidate Jewish public opinion in the Entente countries to counteract all the demoralizing influence which the enemy press is endeavoring to exercise by holding out vague promises to the Jews and finally to make the necessary preparations for the constructive work which would have to begin as soon as Palestine is liberated.'" (*Louis D. Brandeis*, New York, 1929, pp. 91-92, italics added.)

This memorandum was signed by Lord Rothschild, president of the English Zionist Federation, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann. When Foreign Secretary Balfour replied to it in the Declaration, he addressed the Declaration to Lord Rothschild.

Nor have Zionist historians, themselves bourgeois-nationalist in their thinking, attempted to cover up the character of the alliance. Abraham Revusky, whose *Jews in Palestine* has gone into three editions since 1934, explains: "Certain British statesmen seemed to believe that a pro-Zionist declaration would enlist the support of the four million Jews in Russia for the tottering Kerensky rule, and that this support would in turn help to prevent the impending Bolshevik Revolution. There are also strong indications that in issuing the Balfour Declaration the British were partly influenced by reports from the United

States that such a step would undoubtedly help to transform the hitherto lukewarm attitude of the American Jews toward the Allied cause into a whole-hearted enthusiasm. In any event, it must be admitted that the Balfour Declaration made a valuable contribution to the Allied cause. . . ." (New York, 1945, 3d ed., pp. 20-21.)

Here Revusky, a *Labor* Zionist, whose ideology is no less bourgeois nationalist because he belongs to a party with the word "Labor" in it, blandly accepts not only British and Allied imperialist war aims, but specifically the anti-Bolshevik aim of the Balfour Declaration. That the millions of Russian Jews were the first in the world to be liberated from the anti-Semitic system of tsarism-capitalism precisely by the working class and the socialist revolution, is of no interest to this Jewish bourgeois nationalist, who prefers the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917 to the November 15, 1917 declaration of the equal rights of the nations, national minorities and ethnographic groups on the territory of Russia, issued by Lenin and Stalin, or to the specific law against anti-Semitism, the first to be passed by any state, issued in Soviet Russia on July 27, 1919.

The role of the American Zionist movement at this time grew in importance as the weight of United States imperialism in world affairs increased. American Zionist historians are frank about the matter. Rufus Lears, in *Fulfillment: The Epic Story of Zionism*, notes that among the motives of Britain "the long-range value for the British Empire of a grateful world Jewry and of a large, vigorous and loyal community on the road to India was not lost from view." Then, a "more immediate consideration" is defined thus: "The War was not going well for Britain and her Allies. . . . In the circumstances, the attitude of the Jews of the world, and especially of America, was considered a factor of sizable importance. . . ." As for the Balfour Declaration, Lears asserts, "what finally tipped the scales in its favor was a message which President Wilson, at the request of Brandeis, addressed to Prime Minister Lloyd George, approving the pronouncement" as it was being debated and formulated. (Cleveland and New York, 1951, pp. 193, 192, italics added.)

Intelligence Services Rendered

Now how did Brandeis, the leader of the American Zionist movement during this period, succeed in forging an alliance between the Zionists and the American government? He followed what Jacob De Haas enthusiastically applauds as "a constructive and novel aggressive policy." Writing about this first in *The Menorah Journal* for February 1928, De Haas explains: "By freely rendering *service to American officials* the American Zionist Organization won the friendship and good will of those who could not be influenced permanently by importunate effort. The objective was not merely to maintain the esteem and willing cooperation of President Wilson himself, but to permeate every avenue of his administration, and the whole British

THE MENORAH JOURNAL

Published Monthly by
The Intercollegiate Menorah Association
Publication Office: 10 Ferry Street, Concord, N. H.
Editorial and Executive Offices: 63 Fifth Avenue, New York

Editor: HENRY HURWITZ
Managing Editor: ELLIOT E. COHEN
Associate Editors: ADOLPH S. OKO, HARRY A. WOLFSON

VOLUME XIV FEBRUARY, 1928 NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

		PAGE.
JEWISH BEGGAR AND BOY	<i>Pablo Picasso</i>	<i>Frontispiece</i>
<i>A Painting</i>		
A RABBI TAKES STOCK	<i>Solomon Goldman</i>	113
MORE SCRAPS OF PAPER	<i>Albers Jay Nock</i>	126
BRANDEIS IN ZIONISM	<i>Jacob de Haas</i>	134

Brandeis in Zionism

BY JACOB DE HAAS

IT is not without reason that often at Zionist conventions and congresses since 1921, proposed policies which sounded austere and economic have been dubbed "Brandeisian." Or that, more than occasionally, when the movement finds itself oppressed by practical problems, Zionists begin to consider whether the Brandeis régime may not be restored. For in the

A real organization does not exhibit all its strength on parade, though that ostentatious form of demonstration was not overlooked when the need arose. The great strength of the American Zionist organization was in the multifariousness of its contacts, and in the accurate knowledge by those in control of the human resources on which they could depend. Did the British need to obtain a contact in Odessa, or were they in need of a trustworthy agent in Harbin? Did President Wilson require at short notice a thousand word summary detailing who was who in the Kerensky upheaval in Russia? The New York office rendered all these services, asking nothing but receiving much, the respect and good will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs. Thousands of Zionists everywhere served, and served well, in that far-flung line which the organization maintained during that long trying period when victory seemed in the balance.

In the above excerpts, Jacob de Haas, secretary of Theodore Herzl, founder of political Zionism, tells about Zionist collaboration with United States and British intelligence during World War I. If then, why not now?

service in this country, with a sympathetic understanding of Zionism." (P. 143, italics added, here and below.)

What service to American officials were the Zionists in a special position to be able to render? Well, in the first place there was the Transfer Department, a Zionist apparatus that "served Jew and non-Jew alike, without cost to sender or recipient" of money transferred. "It became a department that sought and found people worlds asunder." Surely a worth-while activity in a world rent by war and the displacement of millions of war victims! But De Haas adds happily that this service was also a help to American officialdom: "Starting by using the good offices of the U.S. Department of State as a means of communication and deposit, it became so successful and so reliable that it was employed by the Treasurer of the State Department to deliver monies and messages which the government itself could not handle or successfully deliver." (Pp. 142-143.)

A service indeed! When the State Department was unable to pay somebody, or to send him a message through its ordinary channels, here was a new channel, the Zionist Organization of America, and an efficient one too. De Haas elaborates his point with relish: "A real organization does not exhibit all its strength on parade, though that ostentatious form of demonstration was not overlooked when the need arose. The great strength of the American Zionist organization was in *the multifariousness of its contacts*, and in the accurate knowledge by those in control of *the human resources on which they could depend*. Did the British need to obtain a contact in Odessa, or were they in need of a trustworthy agent in Harbin [China]? Did President Wilson require at short notice a thousand word summary detailing who was who in the Kerensky upheaval in Russia? The New York office rendered all these services, asking nothing but receiving much, the respect and good will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs. *Thousands of Zionists everywhere served*, and served well, in that far-flung line which the organization maintained during that long trying period when victory seemed in the balance." (P. 144.)

Was it in the interests of the Jewish workers and the Jewish people as a whole to supply British intelligence with a "contact in Odessa" or "a trustworthy agent" among the war refugees in Harbin? And one wonders what it was that United States Ambassador to Russia David R. Francis did not include in his cables to the State Department or in the diplomatic pouch of his couriers that the New York office of the Zionists could provide from its sources of intelligence. But whatever it was, President Wilson required it promptly, and it was the New York office that supplied it. And since De Haas had a hand in this efficient office, he is proud of this achievement.

In the Interests of the Jews?

Once *The Menorah Journal* for February 1928 appeared, however, wiser heads, perhaps more experienced in intelligence operations and certainly more sensitive to what should be presented "on parade" before American Jews, American Zionists, and the general reading public, must have protested to De Haas that he had babbled too much, that he had actually put "on parade" those things which an organization should keep under the shelf, or locked in the memories of reliable and close-mouthed people. At any rate, when De Haas came, in 1929, to publish his book on Brandeis, he *carefully omitted* the entire paragraph quoted above from p. 144 of *The Menorah Journal*! But that paragraph is unerasable proof that not only did the Zionist organization become a channel for United States intelligence operations in 1947, as was testified at the Prague Trial, but that it had been such a channel in 1917, and that its Transfer Department, set up for humanitarian purposes, was also such a channel.

That this should be the case is perfectly logical, plausible and normal provided one keeps in mind the class nature

of Zionism as a Jewish *bourgeois* nationalist ideology, and of the Zionist leadership as dominated by the Jewish bourgeoisie. That such a leadership professes to act philanthropically and in the interests of all the Jews is to be expected. That the functions of the Zionist organizations include many more things than appear "on parade" is also obvious.

Bourgeois nationalism today is an ideology that sacrifices the interests of the people to those of the reactionary bourgeoisie. It is the ideology of imperialists and those who imitate and ally themselves with imperialists. Balfour was no more acting in the interests of the British masses in sending his Declaration to Lord Rothschild than Rothschild was acting in the interests of the Jewish masses in soliciting and receiving it. Between the two World Wars, the Zionist alliance with British imperialism was an uneasy one, with the British undecided as to whether their imperial interests could not better be served in the Middle East by firmer ties with the Arab States. Only the Zionist leadership through thick and thin remained loyal to the British imperialists and when part of the leadership began to move in another direction, it was in the direction of an alliance with *another imperialism* rather than with the anti-imperialists. This development, as well as the most recent events, we shall analyze in another article.

(To be continued.)

WHY SO MANY JEWS AT TRIAL?

By Eleanor Wheeler

Below is an excerpt from a letter written by Eleanor Wheeler of Prague to a friend in this country:

Prague, November 21, 1952.

AS TO the fact that most of the defendants [at the Prague trial] were Jews. The [Allen W.] Dulles organization [for United States intelligence working out of Switzerland during the war] had explicit instructions to concentrate on work with the Jews—of course (as the indictment shows) Jews with middle class background and outlook. These were the people who bought their way out of the Nazi terror, some even serving on the committees which sent millions of honest Jewish workers to their death [Judenrat], and then trade on their positions as "victims of fascism" to export millions of dollars of goods out of a country which is recovering from war damage and starting the rugged path to socialism. These are not the ordinary Jewish workers—of these, the ones who survived work tranquilly on without the discrimination which bars them from jobs in some of the countries most vociferous about persecution here. These accused Jews are people who, whatever their origin, have an undemocratic outlook and will oppose socialism by any means. And they are the real anti-Semites because in using Jewish organizations for their dirty ends they deliberately discredit their own people. The indictment accuses [Karl] Schwab, [Joseph] Frank and [Bedrich] Reicin of betraying and mistreating Jews in concentration camps. These are the anti-Semites and they are being punished as such by the Czechoslovak government.