

THE MENORAH JOURNAL

VOLUME XXXIX

AUTUMN 1951

NUMBER 2



Whither Israel?

BY HORACE M. KALLEN

WHAT Jew, believer or not, has not once in his life heard, or himself recited, either the 126th or the 137th Psalm, or both? Let me repeat them here, in a version somewhat different from the traditional one. First, Psalm 137:

By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down.

Yea, we wept when we remembered Zion.

We hanged our harps on the willows in their midst.

For there our captors required of us a new song.

Our ravishers demanded of us mirth.

They said: "Sing us one of the songs of Zion."

But how shall we sing the Lord's song in an alien land?

O, if I forget thee, Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning;

If I fail to remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.

If I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.

Remember Edom, God, that said "Raze it, raze Jerusalem to its very foundations."

O Babylon, destined to destruction, he will be happy who serves thee as thou hast served us,

Taking thy little ones, dashing them against the stones!

Turn from the helpless anger and bitterness of this poem to Psalm 126:

When God brought the exiles back to Zion, we were like men dreaming.

Then laughter filled our mouths and song came from our tongues.

Then it was said among the peoples, "Greatly hath God worked with this folk."

Greatly indeed hath God worked with us! and we rejoiced.
O Jehovah, bring back all our exiles as streams of water to the Negeb!

Those who are sowing in tears shall reap in song,
He who weeping goes to the field, bearing the trailing seed,
Shall return thence, singing, carrying his sheaves.

Both poems are remembrances, set to music, and passed on from generation of Jews to generation, to be chanted again as tradition ordains, yet with never unvarying tone and accent. Psalm 126 is intoned at a dramatic point in the Seder ceremony. Together with Psalm 137 it fixes the poles of that axis of desire and frustration upon which revolves the enduring legend of the Jewish people. Whoever wrote Psalm 137 had obviously been an enforced exile from his homeland, victim and survivor of a war that destroyed the Jewish State and was followed by spiritual disruption in the community of exiles to whom the State was the force and form of the Jewish psyche. The author and his comrades were remembering a life that was no more. Their song was an endeavor so to reanimate a past as to nullify a present they could not accept. For the neighbor who had desired their dispersion, the foe who had worked it, they craved a fate as bitter.

Their song, together with Psalm 126, suggests something of the mood also of the Jews of our own time. There is, I think, a true analogy between the sentiment common to many twentieth-century Jewish communities and that of the exiles of close to six hundred years before the present era. In many lands of the globe, of which Israel is not the least, men and women of Jewish derivation are remembering an existence long dead, yearning to resurrect it, struggling with pitiful and ridiculous ardor to reestablish it as if

it were not over and done with—as if recollection were event and event recollection.

SUCH quixotism is inveterate in the human psyche. It imparts its own singularity to the tragi-comedy of the human enterprise, whatever direction that take. Often noble, it is always regressive, like the wish to evade the responsibilities of the mature by assuming the ways of the child. But living beings cannot go back to infancy; at most they can live out adult years childishly. Indeed, there are schools of human psychology which argue that childish ways are the prevalent ways among the majority of mankind.

We need not, however, heed the sectarian fantasies of this or that school of psychology. It is enough to regard the activities and life-patterns of any human being, of any age in any place, as they come before us. They impress us firmly enough as events of a struggle to survive and grow, with its winning daily battles, suffering perennial defeat, never doing what is done once only, but ever again and again and again. We note continual searching and seeking to still the same wants by the same satisfactions, both changing as they repeat; both altering simply because they repeat, within and without. Only with death does this self-annulling victory come to its term.

Only the dead have no need to repeat, and to alter as they repeat. Only the dead don't change and can't change; that is, don't die; and only as dead are immortal.

The living are mortal. Their mortality lives in the circumstance that their present passes into their past and stays alive as their memories, which their future transforms. They are able to grow up and grow old because their past is a living past which the future enriches and reforms by entering. Remembering and living are not separate doings but a continuing activity seen now as image, and now as action. When any part of the living past is segregated and used for a mold which the future shall fill, it is experienced as an arrested movement, an image that on-going life leaves behind; it alters from a power into a burden, from a process of passage into a retaining wall.

The natural spontaneity of vital recollection has its variations. There are those which a student evinces when he is trying to repeat for his professor what the professor has said. There are those of the witness testifying, responding to lawyers who press him to remember this and not that. There are those of the painter painting from a model or projecting a remembered pattern on his canvas for himself alone. And there are many others—echoes, conformations, transpositions, projections, recreations and creations, together with all the yet unidentified spontaneous variations of which authentic, vital recollection consists. The most familiar occur as separations and isolations, dammings and rechannelings in momentary abstractions from the vital process whose topmost turn is the stream of consciousness.

When this process is healthy and whole, the future digests and contains the past as the sound body digests and contains its food and drink, rendering them living flesh of its flesh and bone of its bone. Isolation, segregation, abstraction have the effect, among others, of stoppage. They replace the natural multi-dimensional moving image with an unnatural mono-dimensional still.

Theologians and philosophers create and adore such stills. They appraise those abstractions as mankind's ultimate safety and certainty, by definition always and everywhere the same, which is to say, eternal, universal, supreme, ideal and—absolute. So defined, these reworkings from remembrances of things past are assigned another locus than the life process whence they are drawn, thence by grace to guarantee present safety and assurance. Their faithful invest them with values and meanings incommensurable alike to their derivation and their use. The investiture renders them objects of worship—fetishes, idols, gods, emptied of life by being exalted into immortal potencies.

II

WHATEVER the provocation, these are the reflections that the question, *Whither Israel?* first leads me to. Throughout the years that Israel has been the name of a historic people with a biography singular to itself, the image "Israel" that the psalmist mourned in Babylon, and the Zionist invokes in New York,

has been little a living process, all too much a memory isolated and abstracted into an ideal, a vision of being, happy and high and noble, once possessed, never yet recovered, yet ever to be so recovered that the ideal might be fact again, and vision event.

Students of philosophy know, of course, even more than students of history, that ideals enacted are ideals corrupted, conceptions implemented are conceptions maculated, visions realized are visions disrupted. To keep your conceptions immaculate, don't employ them; to hold your vision intact, don't realize it; to retain your ideals, don't live up to them. Reality and its actualizations transform. They bring unforeseeable distortions and shocking shapes and colors. Their touch contaminates the eternal and universal with protean singularities of time and place. It impregnates their immaculacy with the vital corruption which alone can breed existence from conception. Whatever renders the ideal potent and fruitful deflowers it. To stay ideal is to stay sterile; and any ideal consolations and values must stay those intrinsic to sterility.

THE ideal which "Israel" came predominantly to signalize was distilled out of the experiences of the Exile. It was abstracted, isolated and established in Babylon, amid the lifeways and thoughtways composing the singularity of a victorious empire worshipping its victory-giving gods. The Hebraism of the prophets' urging was digested in the Judaism of Ezra's ordination, Nehemiah's enforcement, with its invidious distinctions, among others, between the people of the Ingathering and the people of the Dispersion.

Before that alteration, the lifeways and thoughtways of the Judean people had been a process shaped to a program consciously accepted and more or less successfully enacted—mostly less, otherwise there would have been no occasion for the prophets. What else was the word of any of them to the tribes of Judah and Israel, if not that they were failing to accomplish a plan of life and establish it as life's way, and that dire consequences follow failure? What else do the deliverances of the best and greatest of the prophets whom we read in the Bible communicate?

And how do we think the record they assume and the program they prescribe, as the Bible records them? Certainly not in their

totality as complete remembrance of things past directed toward the future. The totality enfolds much that, regarded in and by itself, would be unspeakable, unprintable. We think those data selectively, choosing from the compenetrated melange those which we feel most viable for our times, our places, our vital intention and personal integrity. The monotheism, the moralism, the divine election and the other stressed items of the Law and the Prophets are only portions of the record, and not the most comprehensive portions. There are also the priesthoods and their ways, the tribal customs and folkways and their prescriptions and taboos, the lusts and treacheries and cruelties of kings and nobles, the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperings of the wicked, the reciprocally contradictory claims of all to gratify the desires and obey the will of Jehovah. There is the aggregation of data which ethnologists, archaeologists and sociologists study and appraise, which together with the Judaists' own diverse selections compose into that variegated assemblage of the record, and are further continued and varied as the Judaisms of Ezra and Nehemiah, of the Apocrypha and the Talmud, of Philo and Josephus, Jehuda Halevi and Maimonides, Crescas and Baal-Shemtov, Moses Mendelssohn and Theodor Herzl and Mordecai Kaplan.

The process consists in an indefinite, diverse, and diversifying coming together and compenetration of ideals and events, of faiths and things and forces. "Jew," "Israel," receive their manifoldly conflicting meanings from the fluid constellation of lifeways and thoughtways which this ingathering presents.

Thus, although some form of the word *together* here carries, for me, the meaning nuclear to "Jew," "Israel," it does not for the leaders or spokesmen of any sect or faction within the constellation which elects to monopolize those names for its own intentions. Claiming a mission, each for itself, they use the names both invidiously and tendenciously, as designations of a chosen cluster of memories and events, which they have abstracted from the moving aggregate, arrested and isolated. In the name of that cluster they then assume to signalize themselves as the chosen ones of the Chosen People, and for the entirety of the Jewish past to substitute their selections by which to shape a Jewish future. What

Christians or Moslems or Nazis or Communists choose from that entirety to denote by the words "Jew," "Israel," is notoriously something else again.

GROUND^S of choice are as diverse, as manifold, as their times and occasions. Modernly, they are distinguishable into two not altogether exclusive groups. They may be called, without prejudice, "supernaturalist" and "humanist." There are also "supernaturalistic humanists" and "humanistic supernaturalists" in increasing numbers. But the gradient differences are signaled by the simpler divisions.

The supernaturalists form the Judaist variant of the pre-scientific tradition of Western culture. They sustain the organization and practice in Rabbinic Judaism which are intrinsic to a vital economy ordered to flattering, cajoling, coercing, bargaining, bribing or persuading supernatural power to preserve this economy and its members and to prosper their growth. The typical codex of this economy has long been the *Shulchan Aruch*, the compendium of prescriptions and prohibitions conforming behavior to supernatural requirements. To meet them is to merit salvation, to fail is to merit damnation, in the life to come.

As a lifeway, Judaism is in this of one fellowship with the world's other supernaturalisms. It is called "religion" because of this supernaturalism, not because of the act of faith which asserts the supernaturalism. When the act of faith is considered, it has no more claim on being appraised religious than man's attribution of saving power to any other object or idea.

Those who choose meanings for "Jew," "Israel," on humanist grounds appraise the supernaturalist orientation as one Jewish mode of man's adjustment to the changes and chances of a world no more made for him than for any other living thing. They set the supernaturalist doctrines and disciplines in the perspectives of human history and judge them by the consequences they in fact lead to. They understand the otherworldly providences which the supernaturalists postulate, the magic their ritual purports, the miracles they describe, as fear-created defenses against dangers felt to be insuperable, as lasting compensations in imagination for

needs and hungers never in fact lastingly satisfied. Humanists apprehend supernaturalist realities as such stuff as dreams are made of, to be accounted for by the methods of the natural and social scientist, employing the insights of scientific psychology and the other sciences of man.

The numbers and kinds of Jews who have consciously chosen so to envisage and appraise the singularity of Israel are not very great, though perhaps proportionally greater than among others of the globe's peoples who look upon, remember and judge themselves.

III

THAT "perhaps," I suspect, is a very large "perhaps." Not alone during the pre-scientific ages of Western history, but also during the scientific nineteenth century the Jewish multitudes believed with a firm faith that Divine Providence had guaranteed the miraculous return of Israel to the Promised Land under the leadership of a Messiah, son of David, who in God's good time would, without force, without might, but by His spirit responding to magical rites, gather the exiles from all lands of their dispersion, into the land of Israel. Like these true believers, the humanistic idealists, of whom Theodor Herzl became the spokesman and the Zionist movement the instrument, also aspired to an ingathering of the exiles. But their ends and means of gathering followed from their humanism, and were as incommensurable with Messiah and miracle as humanism is with supernaturalism.

To the believing Judaists restoration could be nothing else than the repetition of a Judaistic past, hypostatized into what they variously interpreted as the eternal and universal Torah. In daily living it would consist of selections from accumulated precedents and practices, with sanctions from the Talmud and other carriers of Jewry's pre- and anti-scientific traditions, woven into a way of life. Restored Israel would thus be a theocracy, in principle committed to obeying all the commandments and performing all the *Mitzvoth*, in practice doing what the folkways and mores approved. A Jew's existence would, perhaps, be regulated and policed by a

Sanhedrin, and judged by a rabbinate. Whatever might be said, done, or taught would be conformed thus to that hypostatic Torah, its design for living infallibly defined by the power-holders of the theocracy. Could restoration be perfect, it might perhaps raise the Temple again and serve the Lord with blood-offerings and burnt offerings, first fruits and gifts of money, as well as with confession, song and praise.

But also without this consummation social control would have to be hieratic. For if Divinity were to communicate the intent of its Torah democratically, by direct inspiration of each believer, Torah would be a babel of interpretations, not the one true instruction in the best life here, and sole propaedeutic for the good life to come.

Before Herzl these idealistic Judaists traveled to their Holy Land to die, and in large numbers lived on, making self-righteous claims on the pious charity of the communities of the dispersion. Nor have they quieted their godly clamor since Herzl.

THE humanists responded to it, and keep on responding. But the ingathering their vision projects has other grounds and refers to quite other conditions.

Westerners of diverse cultures and disciplines, those humanistic Jews were all poignantly aware of antisemitism as a principle of Christian faith and a corollary of party conflicts, economic competition and cultural pretension in political and social practice. In their own persons, or through their observations of such obscenities as the Dreyfus Affair, the Damascus horror, the Beyliss persecution, the massacres of Kishineff and Gomel, they had come to understand that antisemitism suffused the entire religio-political outlook of the European peoples. Their reading of history gave added force to the evidence of their eyes. They knew from direct experience how Europe's nationalisms, Europe's racisms, and Europe's socialisms took over and cherished and used, for the benefit of their own power and influence, the intrinsic antisemitism of Europe's religion. From Moscow to Paris and Madrid, from Berlin to Rome and Stambul, "Jew" was a ready-made name any spokesman for a reactionary cult or party could give the scapegoat it needed, and win instant response. The spokesman might be a

Sebastian Brunner, a Chateaubriand, a Drumont, a Maurras, a Jaime Balmez, a Dostoefsky, a Houston Stewart Chamberlain, a G. K. Chesterton, a Franz von Papen, a Karl Marx, an Arab of the Husseini, an Ilya Ehrenbourg, an Adolph Stöcker or an Arthur Rosenberg. His employment of the word "Jew" would make it denotative of danger to whatever social interest he was soliciting.

The humanistic proponents of the Ingathering of the Exiles became convinced that reassembling enough Jews to form a Jewish State in Palestine would immensely weaken this groundless but potent aggression; and would in the course of time alter the anti-semitic animus of its use of the word "Jew" to secular humanistic attitudes common between peoples not Jewish.

Such a correction of the age-old injustice might, however, be achieved anywhere; and a philosophy of territorialism, postulated on the assumption that an Ingathering in Palestine would forever be blocked by churchly and imperial interests, was proposed as an alternative to Zionism.

This philosophy—even though voiced by dedicated men of noble mind, such as Israel Zangwill, and for an interlude accepted by Herzl—found as little response among the Jews to whom it was addressed as do its expressions having currency today. It received symbolic renunciation in Herzl's dramatic recitation of the verse from Psalm 137: "If I forget thee, Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." Nor he, nor the congregation of his faith, could yet have the will to sing the Lord's song in an antisemitic land. But they knew also that in the land of the fathers, if ever they return to it, the Lord's song could not be the old but must needs be a new song, drawing for spirit upon the old, but prompted, not merely by a renewed, but rather by a *new* vision, wherein all the powers and virtues of the new time might enter and animate into growing new life the old Jewish vision.

These Jews' remembrance of things past elected, hence, to fasten upon the positive intent of the prophets of Israel. Their purpose became to give the admonitions of Amos and Micah and Hosea, as they abstracted, isolated and generalized them, a local habitation and a name in today's Judea.

ONE imaginative conception of this purpose is Herzl's *Altneuland*; a philosophical exposition and practical projection of it are A. D. Gordon's essays. Its concrete enactment was the initiation, in what was still a vassaldom of the Ottoman Empire, of a cooperative settlement which has become the model for what is now known as the *Kvutzah*. Beside the communities of the supernaturalists who had come to the land to die, because they believed that they could therefore live a better after-life, the humanistic sons of the prophets established communities of the faithful who came to the land so to live that their commune would transpose the supernatural holiness of recall and worship into the natural holiness of the works and ways of daily living. They were for the most part intellectuals and romantics, not craftsmen, artisans, or manual workers of any sort. Their strengths were verbal, their skills pilpulistic. But their Judaism had assimilated the wisdoms of humanism, and their feeling for prophetic righteousness had been diversified into socialist sentiment. They were strong in pity for the servile lot of the human multitudes; they reappraised the thankless labor which was their all of life as liberty and independence, and the leisure their lives lacked as parasitism and helplessness.

Those young Jews freely assumed a discipline that should make them over into authentic proletarians. It was their chosen way to the secular holiness which alone could establish naturalist fact in the place of supernaturalist fantasy. It was their religion, the Hebraism of the prophets in modern dress.

Their vision of it took them into the desert and swamp of Palestine to work them over into fertile acres. They began their labors as soft-bodied, tender-minded specialists of the intellect. Hungering, sweating, sickening, bleeding and dying, they builded that wasteland into their homeland as their toil transformed them into freer spirits, hard in body and tough in mind. Their communes became a fissionable nucleus of social reconstruction on a vital gradient of vision for growth. Willy-nilly, the institutions and enterprises of the Zionist movement bent to their pattern: the National Fund, the Keren Hayesod, the agencies and the colonization which the Funds financed with calculated—often not wisely calculated—risks.

SOON after Balfour published his releasing Declaration, American Zionists set the singularities of the Jewish enterprise in Palestine in the perspectives of a more general democracy by means of a group of "Resolutions Bearing on Palestine Policy." These were resolutions adopted by the Zionist Organization of America at a Convention it held in Pittsburgh in July of 1918. This was the American organization of what are now called "General Zionists." Their leader at the time was Louis D. Brandeis.

The resolutions became known as the Pittsburgh Program. They begin with an imaginative preamble which transposes into the terms of a natural democratic humanism the supernaturalism in the Jewish tradition. Thus:

In 1897 the first Zionist Congress at Basle defined the object of Zionism to be "the establishment of a publicly recognized and legally secured homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine." The recent Declaration of Great Britain, France, Italy, and others of the allied democratic States have established this public recognition of the Jewish National Home as an international fact.

Therefore we desire to affirm anew the principles which have guided the Zionist Movement since its inception, and which were the foundations laid down by our lawgivers and prophets for the ancient Jewish State, and the inspiration of the living Jewish law embodied in the traditions of two thousands years of exile.

Then follows the realistic program:

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

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

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

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

Fifth: The fiscal policy shall be framed so as to protect the people from the evils of land speculation and from every other form of financial oppression.

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

Seventh: The medium of public instruction should be Hebrew, the national language of the Jewish people.

IV

FAR as fulfillment still is from fact, neither the First World War, nor the rule of the British as the agents of the League of Nations after the Balfour Declaration, nor the factional rancors of the Zionists, much deflected Jewish Palestine from forming along this humanistic ethical gradient. Here a little, there a little, the figure of vision became the flesh of fact, right alongside the communities of supernaturalist intention whose members were aspiring only to fear the Lord and obey his commandments. Fearing the Lord consisted, indeed, in following today's version of yesterday's commandments, as tradition had carried them from yesterday into today's meanings. Its substance was the aggregation of *minhagim* (customs), composing the diversities of "traditional Judaism," whose observance the elder required of the younger generation, no matter what the cost, nor who paid it.

The British, who took the rule of Palestine from the Turks for the greater security of their colonial empire, had long experience, alike in Asia and in Africa, in governing submissive communities of supernaturalism. Colonial empires are possible only among such communities; the communities of humanism exact commonwealth. But the British were without precedent for right relations with the Jewish communes, whose humanism rendered them recalcitrant to both their paternalism and their snobistic bureaucracy. The men and women of the settlements believed with a firm belief that they owed Caesar nothing, that all the land was the Lord's land, and the fruit thereof belonged to the workers who produced it. As their numbers increased and they settled towns even more abundantly than *Kvuzoth* and *Moshavim*, they gathered into a union whose organizational pattern was an adjustment of a com-

penetration of Hebraic prophetism and European syndicalism to Palestine's primitive, frontier-like economy.

This union is today's *Histadruth Ovdim*. It was the dynamic of that government within a government which under the Charter consistently challenged and checked the Mandatory bureaucracy, not failing to develop, in the process, bureaucratic ways of their own, which only the behaviors of the ill-disposed, third-rate British civil servants estopped from growing into the full flower of the bureaucratic art.

For a long time almost three-quarters of the Histadruth's membership came from the settlements. Its enterprises added, to typical trades unionism and agricultural cooperation, building trades, transportation and other service cooperatives, cooperatives in banking and finance, in health and hospitalization, in consumer goods, in "culture," and in schooling infants and youth according to the doctrines and disciplines of their humanistically envisaged faith. Where the supernaturalists employed Yiddish or some other vernacular as the speech of man to man and reserved Hebrew as the *loshon hakodesh* (holy tongue) for addressing only Deity, the humanists consecrated Hebrew to the uses of daily life, and became aggressive suppressors of other languages. They even produced for their school-children Hebrew versions of such Yiddish writers as Peretz and Mendele. Of course, they cultivated ideological enmities and political faction: some were leftist radicals like *Hashomer Hazair*; others radically rightists like the *Revisionists*, or the later *Mapam* and *Heruth* splinter groups. But during the always uneasy and intermittently violent and bloody operation of the Mandate, they all learned something of the cooperative discipline of self-government.

BRITISH colonialism, skilled in the inertias which keep administration of "lesser peoples" relatively peaceful as well as profitable, favored, among the Arabs, the effendi over the fellah; among Jews, the supernaturalist over the humanist. The Colonial Office knew how, by keeping Arab divided from Jew, to rule with least effort, intellectual or moral, and to make sure of serving the interest of empire elsewhere.

admi
and J
natu
had
natu
to co
veng
shop
such
the s
must
could
could
and l
mean
dox f
of inc
tics h
spirat
majo
exact
plines
cause
ways
to on
peopl
tion a
J
than l
altho
cultu
and r
the ot
alone

This was not without its benefits, however. If the Mandatory's administration did not consistently keep the peace between Arabs and Jews, it did discourage major clashes between the Jewish supernaturalists and humanists. Over the years numbers of such clashes had occurred, the violent initiative having always been the supernaturalists.' The *Shomrei-Shabath*, for example, being sure that not to compel an absolute observance of *Shabath* would draw divine vengeance on Sabbath-breakers, went about, as they still do, beating shopkeepers, destroying goods, and otherwise guaranteeing that such as do not share their views about God's desires with respect to the seventh day should know how painful and costly such heresy must be.

Under the British these aggressions of the "truly righteous" could be simply a bit of disorderly conduct that an Arab policeman could attend to. Today they signalize a confrontation of faithways and lifeways from whose antagonisms will follow whatever future meaning Israel may have for freedom-loving mankind. The Orthodox faction of mandatory Palestine has become the "religious bloc" of independent Israel. Disorderly conduct of a small band of fanatics has become the symbol of the purposes and policies of a conspirational Judaist clericalism which looks for support to the great majority of the new Israel, ingathered from the degradations and exactions of exile among antisemites to the austerities and disciplines of a homeland all embattled frontier. Frontier within, because each immigrant *landsmanschaft* brings the language, folkways and mores of its country of origin, which unite their members to one another and make a boundary between them and the other peoples of Israel. Frontier without, because of political delimitation and military need, also where Israel faces the sea.

If the miscellany of Israel have anything in common, other than being victims of antisemitism, it is the Judaist supernaturalism, although this, too, is diversified by suffusions from the cults and cultures of the lands of origin as well as by inner variations of belief and rite. But the Judaist aggregation is the central mass from which the other groups and factions—Israel has nineteen political parties alone—are deviants, as the factions of the prophets were deviants

from the factions of the priests in Bible times. Each is a minority of beliefs and programs.

The position of Israel as an integral and solidary polity is inescapably a function of the relations of these groupings to one another. How each lives and works together with all presents a more fundamental problem than the foreign relations of the State. The domestic configuration cannot, in the nature of such things, fail to be an issue, as well as a determinant, of the foreign relations.

V

FOR, given the clericalist conception of the Jewish role in the divinely directed course of history, it could very well have happened that, had the Judaist majority of Palestine been as purposefully organized as the Jewish minority, the State of Israel would never have been created. Indeed, when its first war for survival was imposed upon it by the aggression of Egypt and the other states of the Arab League, numbers of Judaists, certain that the creation of the State was rebellion to God, fought with the League against the Jews. And in truth, the decision to make the diverse Palestinian Jewish communities into the independent and sovereign State of Israel was a decision to bet life, liberty and sacred honor on an endeavor which neither the prudent nor the politic could see as having the slightest promise of success, and which the supernaturalist viewed as sin.

The Jews who made this bet undertook to overrule the expediencies of "statesmanship" and the timidities which are often synonyms for "practicality." They bypassed what seemed to men of experience the more hopeful way of meeting the needs of the Jewish multitudes *in extremis*. This was, for Palestine, an international trusteeship under the United Nations that would administer the trust in spirit and in truth, and would thus establish the Jewish homeland by a gradual but speedy development at a minimum cost in life, in suffering, in treasure. This was, to other lands, easement of immigration and settlement. These were held the least hazardous, the least unlikely to succeed. Statehood was regarded as too precarious a gamble.

Making that gamble postulated an idealism of a different order from both the "realism" and the idealism it bet against. It was an act of faith, far beyond any that Jews of the supernaturalist persuasion were capable of exercising. It sprang from the bettors' readiness to stake their existence on an action with no guarantees, with odds against it greater than could be measured. They launched their undertaking in full awareness of the circumstances it defied, the forces it challenged, the hazards it ran. It brought to the ultimate trial the courage which is wisdom concerning dangers.

The critical event of the trial was the war immediately launched by the Arab states. These had early formed a League, not in order to help and strengthen one another, but in order to destroy the Jews of Palestine. The word "Arab," as those fighting Jews had come to employ it, thus tended to express a feeling rather than knowledge and understanding. Usage made it a term of anxiety and aversion, deprecation and antagonism. And there are many causes—in the sinister story of the notorious double-dealer whom Britain's Sir Herbert Samuel had promoted from German-paid traitor to Britain-subsidized "Mufti of Jerusalem" (he later took service with Hitler), as well as in the course of Jewish-Arab relations—why this should be so. Whatever the causes, their effect is reflex of feeling, not wisdom of life. Even the rightly aspiring *Ihud* movement, with Judah Magnes for avatar, was impelled by sentiment rather than guided by insight.

“**A**RAB,” it is helpful to remember, is a term no less ambiguous than “Jew,” and, like “Jew,” denotes many aggregations of conflicting needs, interests and wishes, voiced by many dialects of the Arab tongue. The peoples of the Arab League, from Syria to Egypt and from Iraq to Yemen, have lived a thousand years. but as tools with life in them, of less worth to the power-holders of those lands than their camels and oxen. For the standard of living permitted them is below the level of subsistence. In skill, health, literacy and self-rule they have been among the world's most retarded, as in an older time they had been among its most forward, peoples. I say retarded, not backward. They are no less able to advance, to grow in freedom, self-help and fellowship, than their

forbears of old, or the most progressive peoples of our own day. But they have been held back. Authoritarian supernaturalism and feudal rule subdue them to the credulous service of masters often absentee, who reap because *they* sow, consume because *they* produce, and live at leisure because *they* labor.

These masters, called "effendi"—the word shares a common derivation with such terms as "authentic," "authority," and suggests "power-filled"—have a vital stake in the fellah's condition. Its continuation became, as elsewhere in Britain's colonial empire, synonymous with the law-and-order which government preserves. Jewish settlement in Palestine carried, both as faith and as works, a vital threat to that order and a challenge to Christian missionary enterprise. It embraced, for the very interests that hate it, a model to emulate, a mode of life to imitate. It set a precedent for such *bona-fide* "Arab nationalism" as was permitted to develop, and it stimulated initiatives in farming and trade whose entrepreneurs were inhibited from making common cause with Jewish business by the factitious isolationism of cultist, racist or nationalist ideologies in Arab dress. In effect they served as rationalizations of the interdependence of British colonialism with vested effendi interests. They frustrated all attempts of Jewish labor organizations to unionize Arab workers more than superficially. They constricted the cooperation of citrus growers. They contributed to keeping Arabs and Jews apart on the levels of learning, art and science. They are the postulates of the aggression with which the Arab League blooded the new State of Israel. The appeal to them set off the fantastic exodus from Israel of the hundreds of thousands of Arabs, which is one of the critical chances of that War of Liberation. The ideologies crystallize the animus which the effendi élite, who control the Arab League, invoke in their unyielding aggression against the survival of Israel.

The masters of Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan and Yemen could readily enough find a *modus vivendi* with an Israel whose ways and works were not by their instant presence a judgment in the eyes of their subjects upon the entire economy, political and spiritual, of those countries. Their own Jewries, oriented toward otherworldliness, were not such judgments; nor were the Judaist

communities of Palestine; nor are Israel's *Neturei-Karta*, nor the major groups in Israel's "religious bloc." A clericalist Israel administered under the Talmudic canon could without great difficulty find a *modus vivendi* with Arab feudalism, the cultural distance between the two being small indeed.

This is not the case with that remnant in Israel who are oriented towards the humanistic freedoms of modernity, who look to the Hebrew prophets for vision rather than to Judaist Torah for rules. Humanistic Israel—the Israel of the Kibbutz and the Histadruth—was seen as more than ever a judgment when Arab lands were found to be richest of all in oil; and after the exploitation of that natural resource by alien knowhow for alien interests has brought the Arabs' effendi overlords wealth and pleasures beyond their greediest dreams, whilst the generations of the fellaheen are continued as poor, as hungry, as ignorant, sickly and servile as their fathers.

Inasmuch as the Arab folk of Jewish Palestine had long been noticeably healthier, wealthier, freer and more literate than their kin in the Arab League, the judgment is of long standing. Inasmuch as the Arabs of the State of Israel are, like its Jews, automatically citizens of the State, equal in rights and freedoms, the social impact of this judgment for the millions of the Arab League is inescapable. Their unrest will keep alert the effendi consciousness that an Israel with a political economy and spiritual outlook like Egypt's or Yemen's is an ethical impossibility as well as a historical anachronism.

How aware the power-holders of those lands have become of the moral challenge of Israel is evidenced by their effort to shut Israelis out and cut them off from all communication with their subjects. They impose and enforce an economic and cultural isolationism by means of barriers against all trade, whether in thoughts or things. It is their unannounced aim not only to quarantine their positions against Israel's democratic contagion, but to destroy that nearest vital source by starving if not beating Israel to death.

Moreover, the event that Israel, poorly armed and outnumbered as it was, could yet hold its own against the Arab League's collective might and win the uneasy armistice under which it since struggles, had unexpected consequences in the Moslem world. The

661,000,000 adherents of that cult are spread from Morocco to Egypt, from Arabia to China and the islands of the Pacific. They constitute majorities or powerful minorities in upward of thirty-six states. Israel's victory over the Arab and Egyptian oligarchies aroused the fanatics among them. They initiated a "back to Mohammed" movement, a new pan-Islamism that might offset Catholic Judaism and Catholic Christianity and Catholic Communism with a Catholic Mohammedanism. They organized a World Moslem Conference, whose principles and policies are conceived in ardent remembrance of the faithfuls' "days of glory," when military victory and imperial rule went with devotion unto death to the Koran.

The potentials of this Catholic Moslemism must needs be counted in any calculation of Israel's existential hazard.

VI

THE states of the Arab League comprise the closest external conditions of Israel's survival. Almost wholly inimical, they enclose it in a ring of hate, whose disposition and interests had largely determined the policies of Britain's mandatory role. In the widening circle of the powers, the states spiritually more intimate, societally similar, the states more friendly than unfriendly and the positively friendly, are the most geographically distant. Without the cooperation of the latter, the State of Israel would have been only a brief and bloody interlude between despair and impotence. Without their approval and support, Israel's existence as a nation among nations would be far, far more precarious than it is, and Israel's survival would be a risk challenging all calculation.

However, that friendly disposition of the democratic powers is in no way unconditional. Common ideals aside, it expresses the confluence of two motives. One is a consideration of advantage made by partisan politicians competing for rule within a state, and the other is a similar consideration by statesmen responsible for advancing national self-interest in the struggle for power between states. The ambiguities in American policy toward Israel follow from both these considerations. Soviet recognition of Israel followed from the latter—the Politburo's purpose to hurt Britain, not any will to save Jews.

On the other hand, the procedures of the United Nations Organization, which culminated in the recognition of Israel as a sovereign and independent state and its admission to equal membership in that Organization, were due not alone to the initiatives of the United States and Russia. The choices which those actions consummated were shaped as well by another motive. That one is intrinsic to the nature of the World Organization. It is set forth in its Charter and presumably expressed by its agencies and operations. It is especially signalized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which the Assembly of the United Nations Organization adopted on December 10, 1948, and which various commissions have since been endeavoring to implement via "conventions."

Charter and Declaration make statements about human relations. They lay down rules which the different peoples of the world can follow when they honestly seek to live together with each other on equal terms of peace and freedom. They embody agreements between all the states to cooperate in establishing "the four freedoms" for each, and insuring for each its inner liberties and outer safety. Although much of the history of numbers of the "high contracting parties" to these global agreements has been one of evasions and nullifications designed to save only their singular and exclusive interests, and to heighten and spread their own powers, the great majority have been as faithful as they dared to the principle of collective security, laboring as they could to apply it practically. The smaller and weaker sovereign states among them recognize that the principle is the one salvation of their freedom and independence; those which have been reduced to satellites are aware that it is their best hope of liberation from servitude. The role of all in admitting Israel to equal fellowship in the United Nations signalizes thus a common understanding of the global nature of the faith which the articles of the Charter and of the Declaration affirm, and of the obligations which the signatories to those documents contract.

PERHAPS we do not recognize as loyally as we might that those obligations do somewhat modify the brutalities of power politics, do clothe their corruptions with a little decency, and do promise much more. They are the hope of the world.

And they are certainly the chief hope, almost the sole hope, of Israel—that tiny state assembling a citizenry of many peoples who are far indeed from being orchestrated into a nation, upon a land barren of natural resources, with enemies for neighbors on every side, who could, if their masters win them to such aggression, overwhelm Israel by numbers alone. Although their Governments have been stopped in their war upon Israel, they have not abandoned it. Members of the United Nations though those Governments be, and vowed to its principles, they know that to embody the principles in practice at home would be to divest themselves of all their inequitable advantages. They hence invoke the principles abroad in order to shut out their application at home. They claim for their internal affairs immunity from those principles on the ground of those very principles, that they may preserve their privileges intact. Since they see in Israel's plans and policies the concrete challenge to these privileges, they wage unceasing war, shifting from hot war to cold, and keeping the renewal of the hot war imminent. Not merely have they failed to make peace; they give every indication that they will agree only to an enforced peace.

And it may be true that no other is possible. For the ultimate issue between them and humanistic Israel is a way of realizing human relations. Whatever be the dogmas of a totalitarian religion—sacerdotal, nazi, fascist, communist, or communazi—they are closer than the teachings of democracy to the beliefs and conduct of the power-holders of the Arab League. Spiritually and practically the latter belong with Franco and Peron and Malan and Rankin and Mao and Chiang Kai-shek. They impose on Israel a war economy to which all its institutions must needs be conformed, and for which too many of the utterances of Israel's leaders and missionaries are anxious rationalizations.

VII

ONE such rationalization is the oft-repeated and much-resented doctrine that for a Jew not to live in Israel is to live in exile; that the program of the Ingathering is a program of Return from Exile, regardless of whether those whose "return" is sought agree or not; regardless of whether they are survivors of the Warsaw

Ghetto, or Auschwitz or Buchenwald, or are victims of Moslem or Marxist totalitarianism, or livers of the life of Riley in France or England or the United States. Even if it had five million persons on whom it could draw for armed service, Israel would still be surrounded by an enemy that could call upon forty million, and no superiority of organization or firepower (assuming this would be had) could in the long run offset that discrepancy in manpower.

As a rationalization, the idea of a total Ingathering of the Exiles is a secular projection of a religious fantasy, which the leaders of the returning remnants from the Babylonian exile likewise had failed to render efficacious. Psychologically, it is a cry out of the depths for help, not a utopian execution of a supernatural design. Its spring is a will to believe, similar to that which established Israel, and in no way less hazardous.

For the European majority among the actually Ingathered come from lands at best long immeasurably behind the democratic countries of the West. And those who are "returned" from the Moslem states are taken from lands of a neolithic economy anointed with petroleum, of feudal rule and a rotted culture, practising a faith-sanctioned antisemitism of which Yemen probably maintains the most obscene forms. Those Ingathered bring habits of submission and evasion which have become, not a price, but a penalty of survival. Those from the concentration camps of Europe have suffered regressions of personality signalized by broken bodies not only, but by confused hearts, inert wills and lax minds. Their penalty for survival has been animalization. All groups nevertheless retain, at least vestigially, cultural singularities from their countries of origin, singularities of folkways, mores, speech, song, diet, dress, tradition and legend. These suffuse and divide whatever is common in their heritage of Judaism.

Inescapably, the State of Israel postulates its own survival as an equal member of the family of nations on converting these many, mutually foreign Judaist communions into a united Israel of soldiers and workers, all equally loyal citizens of the State, all heart and soul committed to its defenses and growth.

But the institutional form which such a conversion calls for is itself a hazard regarding which all calculations are perforce hazard-

ous. The State of Israel had to found itself from the start on a war economy, based on gifts and loans first, and on investments only secondarily. Its rule of life has had to be a rule of austerity, even as measured by the low standard of living of the Near East; and the burdens which sovereignty and independence impose on the people of Israel outweigh the heaviest they were required to bear under the British.

OF these burdens perhaps the most ominous is the menace to the vitality and moral influence of the cooperative economy of the Kwuzoth. It was natural for these fellowships to avert from the dilemma of, on the one hand, choosing between protecting their corporate economy from dilution by unaffiliated newcomers and, on the other hand, the swift conversion of disorganized, unproductive consumers into eager and disciplined producers, or at least into manpower able to learn producer arts.

Another burden is the governmental dilemma between, on the one hand, a solidarity to be created by appeasing protagonists of religious intolerance and coercion and, on the other hand, remaining loyal to the principle of equal liberty for the different to which Israel's membership in the United Nations commits the State. The exigencies of survival imposed by the Arab League may lead to shaping Israel into a twentieth-century Sparta, with war as its paramount concern, with military service as the over-all duty of every citizen, regardless of sex, faith, occupation or age, and with every other function of this common culture subordinated to its militarism. To acquiesce in militarism as the form and condition of survival might be to require developing Israel into a corporative state with freedom at best but a word for a pretension, democracy a way of talking and not of living. A continuing war economy might require coordinating *Histadruth Ovdim* and its institutions with the "religious bloc" and its supernaturalist prescriptions and taboos, on at least the same terms as the concordat which fascist militarism led to between the Italian State and Roman Catholic power.

One item in such a *gleichschaltung* would be the complete surrender of the critical intimacies of human existence such as birth, puberty, marriage, divorce, diet, and burial, and, above all,

the education of youth, to clericalist regulation and management. Even if state and church were not completely unified, schooling would be unified, standardized and militarized. Today's control by sect or party would be replaced by an authoritarian central authority. The effort to educate as modernity understands education would be abandoned or forbidden. Instead there would be indoctrination. Guidance in the free use of reason in the arts and sciences and the faith underlying them would be rejected on behalf of inculcation of unquestioning assent to dogmatic repetition of certain principles and practices.

Still another consequence of spartanization for survival would be the projection of what is now a contingent mood among Israelis into a driving demand upon Jews and Judaists who are not Israelis. The truly representative appeal for the latter's moral and material support rests on the scientific spirit and the democratic faith. Their personal involvement is a voluntary act sanctioned by the ethics of universal human brotherhood as well as familial, cultural and cultist belongingness. The statesmen among Israelis so recognize it.

But there sounds in the anxious summons to Ingathering also another tone. This conveys compulsive demand. It asserts claims upon the Jews of the world, even where not Judaists, resembling the claims of the papacy upon Roman Catholics and its pretensions upon all Christians. Hitler's hierarchy made similar claims upon all Germans everywhere. Stalin's makes such claims and gets them served wherever there are Communists. To make good such claims upon the Jews of the world would require the organization of a "Catholic Israel," with headquarters in Israel's Jerusalem, after the manner of Catholic Christianity with its headquarters in Italy's Vatican City, or of Catholic Communism, with its headquarters in Russia's Moscow.

VIII

"CATHOLIC ISRAEL," so intended, is a fantasy of helplessness bred in the weak by fear of their own weakness. It is a compensation in idea for strength and security lacking in fact. Though entirely unrepresentative, the idea has been seized upon by Christian alarmists and frightened Judaists, as well as by anti-

semites, to charge Israel and non-Israeli Zionists with demanding of Jews everywhere a dual political allegiance. In the United States a certain sect of Judaists employs the charge to condemn all support or giving by Americans to the Israeli enterprise, even though these be either goodwill offerings freely made, or actions to serve the national interest.

Ironically enough, this traditional argument of the antisemite against Jews—the charge of dual allegiance—is addressed to a world-community endeavoring to organize itself for collective security and equal liberty through the United Nations and for the system of international relations it is struggling to realize. The argument implies that recognizing and serving America's interest in the socio-political character of Israel is somehow disloyalty to the United States. That is to say, an American, be he Jew or Gentile, is held disloyal to his country if he cares whether Israel is a democracy, whether its institutions are the institutions of a free society of free men, and if he does what he can to enable Israel to grow solidly into such a society.

The argument obviously disregards precisely that which in fact makes a person an American, and that which Americanism implies for his attitude toward other states—such little weak states as Greece, for example, or Korea, or Turkey, or, for that matter, Israel. I say nothing of the parties to the North Atlantic Pact.

Now, to be an American is not an accident of birth but an act of faith. Although nationality accrues automatically to persons born in the United States, the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship do not. They are not functions of nativity. They come alive and actual when any person, wherever born or brought up, publicly commits himself to the faith and works of a certain way of life. The native is admitted to those duties and liberties at the age of twenty-one, when he becomes a voter and formally responsible for decisions, which his vote registers, regarding the officers, the policies, the entire political life and destiny, of his community, of his State, of the Federal Republic—and he may have been carrying economic and cultural responsibilities long before then. An immigrant makes his commitment when he of his own free will publicly and solemnly abandons all allegiance to any other nation and takes the oath of

allegiance to the United States. Thereby he becomes a "naturalized" citizen. There are not many Americans without "naturalized" forbears; there are millions who are themselves "naturalized."

Being "naturalized," rejecting allegiance to other sovereignties, becoming an American, does not mean committing oneself to any organization of party and power existing at the time. Such organizations keep forming and dissolving; they are formations in the American Way, changeable and to be changed. What the American commits himself to is the rules of human association which are to guide these changes. He vows a fighting faith in freedom whose fundamentals are written down in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. These first books of the Bible of America express certain principles and ideals by which the nation endeavors to shape its life. They are the articles of its faith. American history is the history of the struggle of the American people to embody its faith in works as the American way.

True, many who oppose the effort at embodiment are also called Americans. Some want to convert the country into an oligarchic republic. Others would like to reconstruct it into a fascistic corporative state; others to work it over, from Southern models, into a nazi-like racist state; others seek over-ruling power and privilege for a sacerdotal hierarchy; others conspire to turn it into a hierarchical soviet. Some make up a "Liberty League," others are "constitution-
alists," others "dixiecrats," others clericalists, other communists. And unhappily, although perhaps inevitably, each such organization of passion and interest has its echoes and its imitators, for whatever reasons, among the nation's Jews.

Americanism, as the Bill of Rights defines it, protects all of them alike in their rights to believe and to implement their beliefs in policies and programs which, in the frame of reference of that very Bill of Rights and of the Declaration of Independence, do not fit with Americanism. It is the American way for every person who is not an idiot to be a "joiner," to enrol himself in many associations, to each and every one of which he gives allegiance but none of which may claim his exclusive allegiance. That they are many liberates him from servitude to any. Their numbers give efficacy to the assurance of the Bill of Rights that he shall be free to believe, to think, to

speak, and to associate with others in multiple and diverse ways: that he shall not be deprived of that spiritual, physical and social mobility which signalizes free society.

AMERICANISM envisages "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" as individual ends whose common means are the multiple religious, political, economic, cultural and recreational associations which individuals enter and leave, and the multiple activities they together carry on. Americanism envisages the Federal Union as this communion of the different—one country, of upward of fifty diverse states and territories, with their countless communities, each cherishing, and pooling, its own ways, its own characteristic economy and culture, with those of the others. The American Idea is the national faith in democracy as the religion of religions which guarantees equal liberty to each of upward three hundred sects and denominations. It hence requires of them that they should be united in common loyalty to this democratic faith. The American Idea designs the national economy as the free coming together of men and managements in common enterprises, moved by a common concern so to raise the national standard of living that all may live their lives in ever greater abundance because of the ever-widening knowledge and truer skills wherewith they earn their livings.

Similarly, Americanism in foreign relations is postulated on the idea of an international peace built on the equality of the different nations who have freely come together in order that all might assure to each on equal terms its sovereignty, independence, and well-being. This was the idea that led to American initiative in forming the betrayed League of Nations, and that led to the renewal of the initiative in creating the United Nations Organization, and this time sharing the international tasks and responsibilities.

In sum, Americanism envisages the entire human enterprise in America as one civilization created by the communion of its many cultures, a self-orchestration of all the diverse works and ways of the spirit of man into the singularity of the American way of life. This way of life America wants its arts and sciences to express, to symbolize and to fulfil, and its schools to teach and develop. It locates any American who has become aware of the nature, the ideals, the

powers, and the relationships of his country, in a consciously realized network of connections and belongings which centers in his family and joins him to all the peoples of the globe. The network gives substance to the American credo, and direction to the believer's commitments who would live by the credo. It is intrinsically a commitment to a struggle aiming to conform fact to faith, to Americanize existence in America, and by works to communicate the faith to the world. From the battle for the Bill of Rights in Washington's time to the fight for the program of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights, and for the propositions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the Assembly of the United Nations, the struggle has been unremitting. Its one aim has been, and remains, to free the different from penalties for being different; to unite them as equals in free association so that they might work out and maintain together equal liberty for each.

THIS religion of equal liberty has never been an easy one. Its faithful have always been confronting entrenched and greatly preponderant power, fear, inertia. They have always sweated, suffered and bled for their belief. Violence has been thrust on them, as in the American Civil War, as in the two World Wars, as in the Korean betrayal.

Recurrent violence is a fact of the history of liberty which Jews can least afford to ignore. Penalized for being Jews on the basis of a religious dogma which demoted them from God's Chosen to God's Rejected People, they were in many ways more conspicuous beneficiaries of the struggle for equal liberty than women or the darker peoples. For they had been excommunicated from the natural fellowship of mankind on the basis of supernatural revelation. The Democratic Idea is the ground of their release from this segregation, of their full restoration as Jews to human fellowship. Not unnaturally many of them took freedom to be a Jew without penalty to be the same as ceasing to be a Jew at all. They interpreted defeating antisemitism into liquidating Judaism.

This was both a sociological error and a subversion of the Democratic Idea. Antisemitic aggression changes its forms but gives no

sign of dissolving its powers or abandoning its purposes. The Democratic Idea affirms the equal right of the Jew, fully as Jew, to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," not as fleeing Jewishness but as achieving it more abundantly.

Morally, the Jewish Americans' commitment to the Democratic Idea is double. It is both American and Jewish, and Jewish as American. This twentieth-century world he lives in is one everywhere of a life-and-death struggle for democracy. Totalitarianisms threaten wherever a free man turns. It is not so long that one such, with horrible cruelty, exacted from Jews six million lives for being Jews. It is still the case that in much of the world where Jews survive they are at the mercy of a ruthless power which nullifies the very idea of freedom on the grounds of an economic myth exalted into an infallible religious dogma—which may similarly penalize them.

That nullification of freedom is not the first, since 1776. In 1820 there was the Holy Alliance. When its plans of aggression came to the knowledge of the Government of the United States, it declared: *You shall not pass*. It declared that since the rule and program of the powers of tyranny were antipathetic to American liberty, they should not be imposed in the Americas, and pledged itself to resist such imposition. The pledge is called the Monroe Doctrine. A century and a quarter later the Nazi totalitarian aggressor turned all his resources of force and fraud against the ongoing struggle for equal liberty. The President of the United States called upon all Americans and all free men everywhere to *quarantine* the aggressor. Little more than a decade later this call was developed, on the precedent of the Monroe Doctrine, into the Truman Doctrine, which tells Stalin's imperialist tyranny: *You shall not pass*.

This Truman Doctrine is at once a weapon in the nation's war for survival as a free society of free men, and an aspect of the nation's commitment as a member of the United Nations. It accepts the American people's partnership in the reconstruction of free Europe. It implements their commitments as one of the insurers of free society in Greece, in Turkey, in all the Near East, and particularly in Israel.

NOT in their own right only did the American people acknowledge the claim of the Israelis to sovereignty and independence. They did it also as a member of the United Nations Organization of which they are both among the prime sponsors and the sincerest supporters. They voted hence for admitting the new State to that international fellowship with its rights and duties. The action was based not alone on the usual motives joined to lagging humanitarian sentiment, but in no small degree also upon the democratic pattern given the Jewish homeland in the past, upon the new State's avowed design to extend and fortify democratic ways in the future. The American action assumed Israel's integral commitment to liberty and democracy as the American Declaration of Independence affirms them, and as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for which Israel voted in the Assembly of the United Nations, extensively defines them.

That Americans have a vital stake in this commitment of Israel's goes without saying. National interest is joined to disinterested devotion to liberty in the requirement that Americans shall, as in China and elsewhere, challenge totalitarian tendencies in the Land of Promise and nullify or avert their causes. Americans have a moral obligation to do whatever they freely can to nourish the springs of liberty in Israel and enable its peoples' growth to self-reliant strength and cooperative union with other free societies.

For Americans who are Jews or Judaists, the stake in Israel has additional, psychologically and socially deeper, older, motivations. And, for that matter, so it has for Judaists wherever they make their homes. They may not forget, and most certainly may not forget in Israel, that the chief, not uncommonly the sole, difference for which Jews have been penalized is religious; that to lay this sort of penalty on any one, Jew or non-Jew, in a land dominated by Jews is a blasphemy beyond pardon. Their leaders might well emulate the example of Purshottamdas Tandon, the orthodox Brahmin recently elected President of the Indian Congress Party.

Tandon was the candidate of Hindu fanatics who stood intransigent against the rule of equal liberty for all faiths which the Hindu Government was endeavoring to apply. But in his presiden-

tial address Tandon declared: "The administration of this country cannot be run from the communal standpoint or on the authority of any fixed religious book. Even thinking on these lines will increase internal dissensions and weaken our administration." The Congress accepted this view, and by resolutions affirmed the principle and policy of toleration.

What holds for India holds far more momentously for Israel. It is inadmissible that the spirit of equal liberty and equal responsibility, which initiated Daganian and created the Kwuzoth and the city communities, shall not inform and shape into a free society of free Jews the diverse Jewries of Israel. It is inadmissible that the cultural economy and educational establishments of Israel shall, on the score of exigencies of national survival, be made instruments of a Sparta-like totalitarianism. To permit this to happen at all would be to forfeit all claim on the United Nations' support, without which survival would be forfeited anyhow. But more, it would be a betrayal of the integrity of the humanist freedom from which Judaist supernaturalism has everywhere drawn so many benefits. It would be a moral nihilism. For the action undertaken to realize ideal as fact would nullify the ideal in the name of the ideal.

IX

A CONSEQUENCE inadmissible to faith or reason may readily find admission in perception and fact. The logic of discourse is congruent with the logic of life only by a happy chance; the dialectic of belief can lay down hardly any gradient for the succession of events. Things happen. One leads to another, but not as reason ordains or the heart demands. They move on with a blind contingency which only the retrospective look of some philosophical historian composes into a logical pattern that he then attributes to God's providence or Nature's laws. Beliefs and reasonings are also happenings. Once in a while, they find other happenings from which they receive vindication of their own certainties and confirmations of their own foregone conclusions. At their functional best, they fuse into the form of calculated risks. Supernaturalism verifies the calculations by superseding the experienced with the desired, thus feed-

ing invincible hope on ineluctable illusion. Humanism verifies the calculations by proving the desired on the hazards of experience, forging the valor of idealism on the contingencies of events in such wise as to toughen hope without invoking illusion.

The humanist and the supernaturalist modes of religion span the life of man and together give it shape. Their synergy compounds into the predicament which is human existence in every age, in every culture. It is conspicuously the predicament of free societies. For these, events every so often move to a climax of options which are both momentous and forced, between irreconcilable alternatives and self-defeating programs. The movements follow from the fact that the rule of equal liberty, by which free societies live as free, protects also enemies of liberty who employ their freedoms in order to destroy freedom. Since their ways of living together are ways of toleration, also of the intolerant who aim to put an end to tolerance, the ways could be the murder of tolerance at the hands of the intolerant; while if free societies themselves were not to tolerate the intolerant, they would bring death to toleration at their own hands. When men in the predicament of the free are confronted also by unappeasable aggression from without, what they must needs do to resist and vanquish the aggressor may often involve such a regimentation of all the people, such limitations upon thinking, communication, movement, and assembly, as first to contain, then to suppress, ultimately to destroy, the liberties in whose defense the regimentation has been devised.

The condition is endemic to free societies. Between World War I and World War II, thinking men have become radically conscious of it, again and again and again, in the United States, in Great Britain, in France, in all lands that affirm freedom as their rule of thought and life. The pressure is constant, within and upon them, toward either moral abdication or enemy victory.

These are the horns of the dilemma between which the people of Israel are placed by the being of the State of Israel. The alternatives are to accept the murder of freedom at the hands of its foe or to kill freedom in order to save it from the foe. They shape up a predicament which is no news in the Jewish tradition. Jeremiah could

understand it; the second Isaiah could interpret its global import; the author of *Job* could characterize the strength that can overcome and dissipate it and free the state to form itself into a free society of free men.

The precise way to that fundamental liberation is neither clear nor easy. It cannot be other than one which will both defeat the enemy and preserve freedom as alike the end and the means of Israel's continuing as a different and equal member of the international community. It cannot be mapped as other than the enduring strategy of a discipline of freedom whose tactic and logistic shall be willingly fitted by all whom it engages into the configuration of the common enterprise.

This is not now the case. The record shows a polarity, as well as cross-purposes, among the Ingathered of Israel and among Zionists elsewhere. It shows too ready a disposition to lose the design of the whole in the daily round of dirt and drill and disputation, with their habits, their hazards, their aggressions, their evasions and their impatience. It shows too prompt a willingness to ignore the long run for the short run, and to import fabrications instead of cultivating a greater growth of the freedoms already sprung from the soil.

In the communities of free agreement which Daganian initiated, in the primary associative structure of Haganah and Palmach, there may be data of experience from which an economy of free men in arms, loyal to freedom and dedicated to a just peace, can be designed. Made confluent with the Pittsburgh Program of the American Zionists, they may provide a base in thought for a strategy and tactic of Israel's indispensable discipline of freedom.

ISRAEL'S logistic, however, is conditional upon investments and loans and gifts from the free world, particularly investments, since investment brings with it a lasting concern of the investor that his venture shall prosper and grow. He knows now that his best risks are those conditioned upon the human freedoms. The free world, certainly the American variety of it, no longer cares to hazard either material or spiritual capital save in the safeguarding of freedom. To win its cooperation, professions with no practice to confirm

them are no longer enough, as the Kuomintang has discovered. Unkept or broken promises by Chinese rulers have lost the free world the whole of China.

Not one Israeli sect or party by itself, but all the people of Israel must set themselves the arduous task of learning how, in the day's work and the day's fight, "to perform justly, skilfully, thoughtfully and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."

The words are John Milton's. They are his definition of education. But they also signalize the discipline of freedom. If the people of Israel can freely perfect themselves in this discipline, they have more than a fighting chance to achieve the definitive victory over freedom's foes, which a just peace could crown by agreements, under the United Nations, of mutual cooperation and support with the Arab States. Or, if Israel's God wills that the foe should prove too strong, Israel will have held fast to its integrity and not paid for some form of physical survival with moral suicide.