

#### TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

A List of the Contents of this Series will be found at the end of this volume

OR

THE FUTURE OF THE JEWS

BY
A QUARTERLY REVIEWER

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

Credat Judœus Apella Horace Sat. I, v, 100.

#### PREFACE

In April, 1902, in an article in the Quarterly Review on "Zionism and anti-Semitism", the opinion was expressed that the solution of the Jewish problem would proceed in other countries on the lines which had led to the removal of Jewish disabilities in England under the sign of the formula, "an Englishman of the Jewish religion". "This is the historical view", ran the argument, " and it contains a deep lesson for the future. Russia, Rumania, and other countries are far more backward in their appreciation of the blessings of liberty than England was two-score years ago; and to the student of history it is clear that, what the Jews won in England then, they have still to win in other countries now. To the Iews themselves, we imagine, this obligation is a religious trust; it is a part of the divinely appointed mission which they are fulfilling in exile. . . . A policy of retreat from that duty—the policy of Dr. Herzl and the neo-Zionists—is a policy of cowardice and despair. This seems to us, on the evidence of the facts, the reply of history to Zionism."

#### PREFACE

The article attracted some attention and was characterized by the lewish Chronicle of that date in the following terms: "Seldom-perhaps not since the days of Deutsch's famous essay on the Talmud—has the Quarterly Review come out with an article of stronger Jewish interest than that which appears under the heading of 'Zionism and anti-Semitism' in the current issue. Whether the writer be Iew or non-Iew, what he has to sav is most noteworthy, alike for its glowing sympathy with Jewish ideals and the wide knowledge it reveals of Jewish thought and literature. It is far and away the best iustification of Judaism and the Jewish people that we have read for a long time."

Coming back to this question to-day, with the added knowledge of five-and-twenty years, I can hardly hope that an individual opinion will win equal consent. The disastrous course of events in Russia, and the triumphant course of events in Palestine, have changed values importantly and considerably. These changes are reflected in Jewish thought, and even in Jewish ideals; and the accompanying essay attempts, with more hesitation than in 1902, to read the future of the Jews in the light of old convictions adjusted to new experience.

November, 1926.

# I TO-DAY

#### I

#### TO-DAY

If a Roman Emperor, or a Crusader, or a Venetian Doge, had been invited by the representatives of Messrs Kegan Paul in his day to write a pamphlet on "The Future of the Iews". all alike would have foretold the extinction of the race which they hated and despised. Yet all alike would have been wrong. Rome is a name, the Crusades are a shame, and Venice is a dream. The lews remain. This confusion of the prophets of extinction is a warning to the present pamphleteer. He is impelled to the conclusion that the Iews are a paradox of history. Their survival is the exceptional, the unexplained fact. All other historical material yields, however reluctantly, to the solvent of research. The Jew

resists. Psychology and ethnology bring their aid in vain. Historians, masters of their subject, find their master in the Jew. Other creeds have survived persecution, but it has been by the conversion of unbelievers. and the domination of States: cuius regio, ejus religio was a principle of political peace in the sixteenth century. And other peoples have escaped extinction, but it has been at the loss of their religious separatism. The Iews have neither sacrificed their creed, nor politicized its institutions. They have been persecuted bitterly in every country, and the remnants of them have been driven across the frontiers, yet they have not anywhere been extinguished. Little groups of them have huddled in mean streets, too insignificant even for the shears, or have hidden themselves among the Gentiles by draping their faith till better times; and, as old-clo' men or crypto-Jews, they have kept warm a nest in winter to receive new immigrants in the spring. The

return of Jews to England in the seventeenth century after the expulsion in the thirteenth was a reinforcement as much as a return. They had been native in England since the Conquest.

A result of this experience has been that the Jews expect the exception. A very slender diet of fulfilment sustains them. Harsh conditions which would destroy the spirit of other races or peoples leave the Jew almost buoyant in misery. He has his family life; he has his charitable community; he has news of prosperous kinsmen, with occasional letters and remittances; he has the promise of the Messiah, and the proved truth of Isaiah liv, 17; he has the evidence of the unexpected in his history, and, literally, he lives by hope.

Less likely and more recondite theories have been invented by the Gentiles to explain the paradox of the Jew. The least likely of all has been the theory, still lingering in places, that the survival of the race has been

secured by an international committee of rich, secret, highly-placed Jews, conspiring to seize the keys of power for Anti-Christian objects. Secrecy, according to this theory, is maintained by a conspirator's oath, and by strictly keeping the rest of the Jews in ignorance of the plot of a ruling caste. A hidden hand of subversive Jews is then imagined in mischievous sects, like a shadow on the blind. persisting from century to century, and tracked from country to country, whose nefarious industry is said to have burst into flame in the French Revolution, and, again, in the revolution in Russia. The spokesman of this plot is found in Karl Marx and its philosopher in Benjamin Disraeli, and a convenient confession was invented in the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion". The fallacy of the theory may be judged (1) by the repeated failure of the "conspiracy", which, even on the showing of the theorizers, has been more hurtful to Jews than to Gentiles, (2) by the torn

tissue of the evidence to it, (3) by its inherent improbability, considered in the true light of Jewish teaching, and (4) by the facility of constructing it. It is an ex post-facto explanation of phenomena which do not fit into historians' clamps. It is recommended in epochs of suspicion, following social disturbance, by concentrating hate on a people traditionally strange, and, therefore, nobody's protegé. possesses the advantage in argument of requiring the proof of a negative. By taking the offensive against a minority, which, of all known minorities, has suffered most from that disability, it puts the Jews on the defensive, and therefore, puts them in the wrong. How are they to disprove allegations of hidden intentions brought against obscure men of Jewish blood, whose very names are unwritten in their history? Yet, if they are slow in disproof, they are the more quickly prejudiced.

A notable fact about the Jews, and a fact which traverses this theory,

is that they possess no international organization. It is true that individual families may be linked between Mayer Amschel Rothscountries. child, for example, who was born at Frankfurt in 1744, and whose widow died in its Judengasse in 1849, planted sons in various capitals of Europe; and at the other end of the social scale, emigration from persecuting countries into countries with open doors has divided members of the same family, and given English Jews relations abroad. There are lews in London to-day who are probably more familiar with the streets of a town in Poland than with Stratfordon-Avon, Stoke Poges, or Portsmouth. or any other haunts of the English This tug of the terminus a quo may retard attachment to the terminus ad quem,-at least, such attachment as depends on bonds of education, tradition, and association, But those bonds are being forged all the time. The new terminus calls with many voices. The national school

has its voice; the cinema, the newspaper, and the wireless add their obvious notes; and a time probably arrives when the home-voice, cherished by the parents, becomes a kind of duty-call to the children, and the lesson-voices of their childhood become the home-voices of their adult years. They still listen to tales of distress from Poland, or whatever woe-land was their fathers' home, but the pleasantness of England grows into their consciousness. A British colonist feels the same change, despite the closer pull of the mother-country. We shall return to these social aspects. which affect the future to a material extent. Here we refer to them, however, in order to emphasize the fact that Tews have no international institutions. The links between individuals in one country with individual Jews in another country are voluntary, private links; never public and compulsory. Jews toast no King across the water. They owe allegiance to no foreign rabbi. In certain countries

-not in all—there is a Chief Rabbi. as in England in the person of Dr I. H. Hertz, who succeeded Dr Hermann Adler, C.V.O., in 1913, but the jurisdiction of such a chief of the Synagogue is strictly confined to his national frontiers, and is never complete even inside them. The Chief Rabbinate is an appointment Orthodox Tews, and members of the Reform and Liberal sects, like dissenters, are without the establishment. Thus, the sway of a Chief Rabbi is limited, both to, and within, a single country, and there is no prince of the Jewish Church corresponding in any respect to the Pope of Rome, nor any college of rabbis with a common centre and a common head. Each national community of Jews is ecclesiastically self-governing, and none of these self-governing ecclesiae is even so wide as to be co-terminous with the Jewish population in its respective country.

Neither politically nor ecclesiastically, accordingly, is there any organiza-

tion common to Jews. Jews do not survive because, internationally, they have conspired to safeguard their existence. On the contrary, since their dispersal, they have formed national units, more and more closely identified with the nations among which their lot is cast. Even for objects of charity. these national divisions are maintained. There is an Anglo-Jewish Association, founded in 1871, which works through a Joint Foreign Committee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews to look after the distresses of Jews abroad. It corresponds in France to the Alliance Israelite. and in Germany to the Hillsverein der deutschen Iuden; but no one of these bodies, though founded partly for like purposes, works in conjunction with any other. The pooling of European relief-funds might seem convenient, but it has not taken place. The Jews in each country work independently, and, practically, there is no concerted action. Religion, again. like the poor, is a common factor.

[17]

yet it does not unite the Jews. Now and then the dissenting sects may arrange a joint conference for the consideration of principles in Jewish reform; but these are rare and sparsely attended, and make little or no impression on Jewish opinion. Orthodox Rabbinates of the different countries keep their state and council apart. Thus, despite the plain common factors of religion, charity and race, and despite frequent transmigration of individuals, Judaism in the nineteenth century, on which Napoleon imposed the will to Jewish emancipation, tended steadily and firmly to consolidate itself as a separate religion within each set of national boundaries, and to relate itself with its adherents in other countries by merely sentimental ties.

Thus tending, Judaism in each country—or at least, in several countries of the West—was nearly touching, at the beginning of the present century, the point of fusion, at which British, French and other national Jews would

have been indistinguishable from the mass of their fellow-countrymen, except that they worshipped in their own Church. And there were even obscure signs of Church-fusion, to the extent of Sunday services and an anglicized ritual, which began to alarm the strictly Orthodox. The co-education of Tewish and Christian children. and, later, their intermarriage, were social factors making in the same direction: and if the future of the Jews had been foretold, say, as recently as thirty years ago, an unwary prophet might have said: "Here is a people, formerly ghetto-bound or shut-in behind walls of Jewish law, which is now proving its assimilableness, and will presently be extinguished by indistinction." He, too, would have been a prophet of extinction—and he would have been as wrong as the prophets who went before him.

He overlooked one important field. When he was asked "What about Russia?" he was wont to reply a little vaguely: "When Russia becomes

as liberal as England, Russian Jews will be full and equal citizens. The gracious assimilative process of the nineteenth century will be repeated in Russia in the twentieth." It might have been, but fate ruled otherwise, and shaped the destiny of the Jews to less simple and obvious ends. He overlooked—our prophet of thirty years ago-another significant fact. Jews in Western countries might prove assimilable, or even extinguishable, at the top, but they were fed continuously from below. Taking England and America as index-countries, we find that the immigration of foreign Jews, fleeing from oppression Eastern Europe, served as a kind of conduit-pipe to refresh the slow and stagnant surface-water, with currents from the flowing stream. Religious apathy was stirred by the pressure of refugees from persecution. alien immigrant stimulated the Judaism of the assimilated resident who had preceded him. In a sense, the two changed places. The alien to England

or America was more natively a Jew. He had lived closer to the consolation of Jerusalem, the mother comforting her son. The national alien was a religious kinsman, and his deeper religious consciousness compensated for his defective national identity. And, as he put on national identity and relaxed religious orthodoxy in his turn, he was stimulated in turn by fresh arrivals of his kinsmen, repeating the same experience. Almost throughout the nineteenth century, and more intensely after 1881, this diagonal action was at work.

The alien immigrant, we have said, was more natively a Jew. This perception brings us a little nearer to a new factor in the Jewish problem, which has completed the discomfiture of the prophet of thirty years ago. He mistook Russia, and he was inclined to minimize the native likenesses persisting through local differences, and gradually ambitious to defeat them. So much was true at the time at which we have dated the last of the fore-

casts as to the future of the Tews. A fully discerning prophet might have hesitated to foretell a solution of the Iewish problem by assimilation, if he had given sufficient weight to (I) the effects of the break-up of the Russian Empire, and (2) the influence of pressure from below in stimulating a moribund consciousness. But at the time he was disposed to think: "If only immigration could be stopped, and the keener stimulus to Tewish consciousness be interrupted, assimilation will proceed by leaps and bounds." Yet immigration has been stopped, alike into England and into America; the desired condition has been fulfilled. but the expectation has been dis-The paradox of history appointed. has reasserted itself; with every finger pointing in one direction, the object of all that anxious interest moved instinctively in the other. The mulish Iew, we had almost said, took the bit between his teeth.

The new factor, upsetting calculations, was the movement known as

Zionism, which went forward with accelerated pace in the epoch of the Great War. No one will ever tell the full tale of suffering inflicted on the Jews by that calamity, in the countries of South-eastern Europe. The armies swept to and fro, and, with every ebb and flow, the unassimilable Jewish population was left less and less protected by the tenuous tolerance of its unfellowly and unfeeling fellowcountrymen, and more and more exposed to the natural evils of famine and disease, and to the unnatural. unrecorded evils with which a savage soldiery infected the low dregs of raw human nature. The reaction to those conditions is modern Zionism. and Jewish suffering, which was grave enough in 1896 to evoke Herzl's scheme of a Jewish State, touched a pinnacle of intensity twenty years afterwards, at which a remedy was born from its throes. Despair made a desperate recovery, and the acquired sensitiveness of the Jews to blind forces working for their extinction

invented a means of escape. Sir Walter Raleigh somewhere says, that Boccaccio was the escape from Dante. We may use this literary analogy to describe Zionism as the escape from Iudaism. It reversed, whether temporarily or permanently is the new question for the prophets, the gracious processes of the Jewish nineteenth century. Where Jews had been united by religion, and separate in their national identities, they now formed an international organization, with a political transcending any religious bond. They were united, not solely as worshippers of one God, not as Knights of Theism, as Dr Claude Montefiore has called them. not as disciples of the Shema, or the affirmation of monotheism, but as founders of one country, as crusaders, Halutzim, to Palestine, and as disciples of the Hatikvah, or the anthem of the National Home. The common institutions which they had avoided in Iudaism, with their Chief Rabbinates limited by national frontiers, and their

increasingly vernacular ritual, were now introduced by Zionism, with its international symbol of the Shekel, its all-world Jewish committees, its single language of Hebrew, and the rest of its devices to break down the barriers of nationality, and substitute a fluid Jewish nationalism. The international Jew, invented by anti-Semites to check the progress of assimilation by the alleged terror of the "hidden hand", was boldly adopted by Zionists as their type of the ideal Jew, whose ultimate mission it had become to restore a Nation to the Home.

It went further, this transmutation of values—this transformation-scene on the stage set for Zionism. In Palestine it went so far as to force a conscientious Administration, importuned by Zionist extremists and Arab malcontents at once, to climb down from the peak of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 into the temperate valley of the Churchill White Paper of 1922. More serious, however—since a National Home is not built with

paper-was the repercussion of Zionism on Judaism: of Jewish national ambition on Englishmen, Frenchmen, and others, of the Jewish religion. The effect, at first, was sheer confusion. Common words seemed to change their meaning. A "foreign" Jew was so natively Tewish as to resent the appellation of foreigner, and, in the new political vocabulary, it was almost treasonable to be a patriot. Even moral concepts lost their edge. Jewish poor-relief, for example, which had reached an acme of efficiency in Tewish Board of Guardians. represented as an inverted relationship, disguising the plenty of the poor and the needs of the rich.2 This confusion of ideas was short-lived -at any rate in Palestine itself. Sir Herbert Samuel's term of office as High Commissioner (1920-25) afforded an object-lesson in moderation, which

<sup>1&</sup>quot; Zionism, because its concern is with the supreme national need, claims to be more vital to the Jewish people than any philanthropic organization can be." L. Simon, Studies in Jewish Nationalism, p. 58. (Longmans, 1920).

extremists might hate, but could not break. Whatever weaknesses he displayed, he tranquillized and steadied opinions, to the extent, if not of reconciling differences, at least of clarifying their causes, and removing their worst consequences. Ambitious newspaper-proprietors, who had come to Palestine for "copy" and propaganda, folded up their tents and stole away. Their heroics could not withstand the withering blast of commonsense at Government House. And. with the cessation of the journalists' campaign in behalf of Arab intransigence, the malcontents surrendered to fate, and found it milder than they had been told. Zionism vielded to Practically, there was Palestinism. not much difference; but, at least, the principle was affirmed, and was accepted by the Zionist Organization, that:

"Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been

used such as that Palestine is to become 'as Jewish as England is English'. His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable, and have no such aim in view. . . . When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Tewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride."1

Did British policy, thus delimited in Palestine, seek to impose a Jewish nationality upon the Jews as a whole? Intentionally, even consciously, no.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mr Secretary Churchill's Memorandum on "British Policy in Palestine" 3rd June, 1922.

There was a clause in the Balfour Declaration of 2nd November, 1917. which expressly laid down, that "nothing shall be done which may prejudice the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country" than Palestine: and this clause precluded any attempt to undo the work of the nineteenth century in nationalizing Jews where they dwelt. But the very correctness of the intention, to which all parties might refer, gave extremists their opportunity. Since no one could mistake the intention. it was nobody's business to defend Indeed, from the Zionist Jew's point of view, it was invidious for other Iews to lav stress on it. There they were, secure in their rights, and possessed of political status: how inopportune it was, how almost "disloyal" to "homeless" Jews, to insist on their preferential position. Surely, out of their "rights", they could afford a little leniency to Jewish wrongs elsewhere; surely, they could stretch their indefeasible "political

status" to sympathy with political Zionism. And, after all, ran the specious plea in favour of Jewish Nationalism-of a national status conferred, not by residence in a State, but by Judaism itself-after all, the British Government was inviting the co-operation of all non-Palestinian Jews. It recognized them, collectively, as " Jews in other parts of the world": it spoke of them, again, as a "Jewish people", distinguishable by "religion and race"; and it employed these epithets of unity in the context of a National Home. Plainly, they might be interpreted to presume a capacity for centripetal Jewish effort, aimed at a single objective; plainly, too, they required some kind of international organization, corresponding to that pan-Jewish purpose. From these presuppositions, it was not a long step back to the Zionists' position of a Jewish nation by racial ties—a Jewish nation in the making. If the anti-" The British Nationalists said: Government won't have a Jewish

Palestine; they are not contemplating a Tewish State or nation", the Nationalists could fairly answer: "Perhaps not. We must defer to Arab susceptibilities. It is a case of reculer pour mieux sauter. But outside Palestine we are asked to create quasi-national institutionsinstitutions certainly more national than religious in character-institutions involving a sort of national pride. a sort of national centre, and a sort of combined effort by Jews in all parts of the world." If it was not quite a nation, it was nationalism of sorts, and it fitted in extraordinarily well with the wishes and designs of the persons to whom the appeal was addressed. Thus, national ardour, damped down in Palestine, was encouraged outside, and the cold fit and hot fit alike were parts of British policy. That policy was in no wise concerned with Jewish religious interests, and we must return later on to the actual effect on those interests of the renewed Zionist campaign. The

direct concern of the British Government was (a) to keep the peace in Palestine, and (b) to attract Jewish money and the right type of Jewish settlers to the land. The first half of this object demanded a slowingdown of Jewish nationalism, the second half permitted a speeding-up. Or, if "encouraged" and "permitted" are words too subjective and too warmly coloured to express the neutral attitude of successive British Governments towards Jewish effort, we may recall that Mr. Lloyd George declared that it was "up to the Jews" to do the rest, and that less responsible Parliamentarians-the Rt. Hon. J. C. Wedgwood, for example—have cultivated the fervour of a minor prophet in recommending Zionism to Iews.

The new start of the Zionist campaign was less bitter and more business-like than the old, and was better calculated to conciliate the opposition of Jews who rejected the ascription of Jewish nationalism. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 had mounted like strong

wine to rash heads. To the heated visionaries of that new revelation, the mountains of Palestine skipped like rams, and the hills like little lambs. The Churchill-Samuel White Paper of 1922 abated the fever of these visions, and deflected nationalist strivings into more sober, economic ways. Practical experts and skilled financiers translated day-dreams into prospectuses. Jordan was still turned back, but they had harnessed him with electric cables. Now began the real Zionist Movement, redeemed by experience from its hectic opening in the last year of the Great War: the impressive, serious, positive and richlyendowed movement towards a combined Jewish effort to restore Palestine for the Jews. There were still wild men and violent counsels: a Zionist "revisionist" caucus even contemplated, or still contemplates, a return to the extremer policy. There was still, as a legacy from that policy, the curious confusion of values, which we remarked above, and by which

[33]

the words "Jews" and "Nation" were employed as practically synonymous. There was still an unpleasant eagerness to impute selfish and exclusive motives to Jews who sought to maintain their political status quo ante; a readiness to point out that, since no one was attacking the status, its defence was unnecessary, and that was "super-English" (French, German, etc.) for English (French. German, etc.) Jews to draw attention to its inviolability. Thus, it would still be inadvisable for twenty-five Iews to write such a letter to The Jewish Chronicle as they wrote on 9th April, 1909, protesting against Zionism at the Universities, and refuting a Zionist's statement to the effect. that "it seems impossible to separate religion from nationality in Judaism."

"We regard it as dangerous," wrote those twenty-five anti-Zionists less than twenty years ago, "that the rising generation of educated Jews should be encouraged in

opinions, which (a) must tend to alienate them from other Englishmen, (b) demolish the structure of the arguments, advanced, for example, by Lord Macaulay, on which the Act for the Removal of Jewish Disabilities was supported, and (c) are likely to arouse some suspicion in all classes of society, and particularly in the working classes among whom Jewish immigrants have to make their way, as to the measure of patriotism among English Jews."

This warning, too late in 1909, would be deemed unfriendly to-day, though it is still seasonable and true, For it is seriously argued to-day, that, not Zionism only, but even the theory of Jewish nationalism is so thoroughly compatible with the practice of English patriotism, as to render it "unpatriotic" (in an odd and borrowed Jewish-nationalist sense) for English Jews to denounce it. The very moderation of political Zionism at its centre in Jerusalem has made anti-Zionism

on the circumference a kind of Jewish crime—a betrayal of the cause of the "Jewish people" and of the Jewish "religion and race", as distinguishable, on paper, from a Jewish nation.

Lastly, there is the argument from Palestine herself: the strongest of all arguments to Zionism. There is the university, inaugurated by Lord Balfour; the land, under redemption from neglect; the new industrial development; the marvellous enthusiasm of the pioneers; the gradually stabilized prosperity; the old townships, hills and forests, responding to the glow of a new dawn; the extrusion of disease: the immense enterprise in education; the railways, the harbours, the antiquities—all the multiform signs of regeneration and redintegration, which every visitor to Palestine feels like a spell or charm. This is the apologia of Zionism. True, some of its works are precarious, and the need of outside funds may still continue for many years. True, too, as a solution of the Jewish problem,

in the sense of the original programme to provide a secure asylum for "homeless" Jews, Zionism can never be adequate. But the Jew, as we have said, expects the exception. If only a small percentage of those who would fare to Palestine from countries of oppression in Europe succeed in reaching that haven, their good luck consoles the rest. "And in Jerusalem shall ye be comforted," was written of those, too, who remain behind. Thus, Zionism helps to solve the Jewish problem in a sense not calculable numerically, nor demonstrable statistically. The recognition of the problem is a partsolution. The trouble of the Tews before Zionism was that no one troubled about them en masse. Hence they hailed the mass-solution, which treated them as one people, one "nation". They revived their historical memories. The few fortunate Jews, who had acquired a new set of civil values in the various countries of their adoption, who had disused Hebrew as their language, and a Jewish environ-

ment in their lives, were now to be regarded—and disregarded—as victims of Galuth, or exile; and, if they raised their scattered and isolated voices to protest, with chagrin and surprise, that they had been the Halutzim, the pioneers, of a brighter Judaism in the nineteenth century, they were told, not too politely, that they were suffering from an inferiority-complex, of which the only safe cure was the national arrogance of Zionism!

It is said by Sir John Seeley that "the interest of history ought to deepen steadily towards the close, and, since the future grows out of the past, the history of the past ought to give rise to a prophecy concerning the future." Seeley was writing of English history and England's past. But, since the interest of Jewish history has plainly deepened steadily towards the close, may we not here, too, attempt a prophecy concerning the future?

The issue, despite some currents, seems reasonably clear. We may state in several ways. One is. will the Zionist or non-Zionist element rule Jewish activities and opinions in England? Another is, will the principle of separation prove efficacious to replace the stimulus of immigration. as a corrective to the attrition Tewish consciousness? Another is. will Progressive (Reform or Liberal') Judaism supply a religious-spiritual counterpoise to the politico-national attraction of Zionism? Another is. will conditions in South-eastern Europe reduce the impetus to Palestine by providing national homes in situ? Another is, will the funds be forthcoming? Other questions may arise out of this inquiry, but these five are clearly indicated by the considerations adduced in the foregoing pages. If it were as easy to answer questions as to pose them, the task of prophecy

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> American Liberals prefer the name Reform. In England the two Synagogues and names are distinct.

would be simplified. For (1) if the politically-minded Jewish element in England becomes the representative body, and the principle of Jewish nationalism predominates, (2) if Zionism proves as keen a stimulus as the former tide of immigration. (3) if Reform (Liberal) Judaism fails to make headway, (4) if conditions in Europe do not improve, and (5) if America continues to subsidize Palestine, then the future of the Jews may be stated in a couple of borrowed sentences. The lews must then become as Mr. Belloc has suggested, perhaps with his tongue in his cheek, the victims of "a policy, wherein the Jews on their side shall openly recognize their wholly separate nationality, and we on ours shall equally recognize that separate nationality, treat it without reserve as an alien thing, and respect it as a province of society outside our own." In other words. Zionism will lie down with anti-Semitism. On the

<sup>1</sup> The Jews. By Hilaire Belloc. London, 1922.

other hand, if these conditions are reversed: if Rumania, Poland and other countries nationalize the Jews whom they house, and if, consequently, the Palestine glow fades in the high noon of emancipation, then we shall get back, in effect, to the principles of the era before the Mandate, and even to pre-Herzlian Judaism.

The rest of this pamphlet will be directed to an attempt to formulate replies.

# II TO-MORROW

#### H

#### TO-MORROW

An essential preliminary question, which to some extent governs all the rest, and a reply to which should arise out of the replies to the others, is-Will Jews of the rising generation regard themselves, and wish to be regarded, as members of a religious or of a national community? We have the advantage in this respect of a statement by the late Chief Rabbi, Dr Adler, in the Nineteenth Century Review, in July, 1878. "Ever since the conquest of Palestine by the Romans", he wrote, "we have ceased to be a body politic: we are citizens of the country in which we dwell.

We are simply Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or Germans, as the case may be. certainly holding particular theological tenets and practising special religious ordinances: but we stand in the same relation to our countrymen as any other religious sect." And the same writer said in the same Review, (December, 1881): "The great bond which unites Israel is not one of race but the bond of a common religion." It is doubtful if the present Chief Rabbi would be similarly unequivocal. True, in a recent sermon, he drew a distinction between Jews whose Jewish loyalty consists in their affirmation of the typical and central dogma of Judaism as a religion, viz. the unity of God, and Jews whose Jewish loyalty consists in affirming the national anthem of the Zionists: Shema-Tews and Hatikvah-Jews, as he called them respectively, from the short names of the prayer and the song; and he accompanied this distinction with a warning, resented by some Zionists, that the Shema-Jews were the true

Jews. But, despite the greater need of definition to-day, Dr Hertz is too keen a Zionist to corroborate without reserve the categorical statement of his predecessor, that members of his flock "are simply Englishmen" of the Jewish religion, and that "the great bond which unites Israel is the bond of a common religion."

Thus, ecclesiastical authority has shifted several paces to the left since Dr Adler interpreted it in England forty or fifty years ago. Dr Hertz is deliberately less representative of Anglo-Jewish opinion than of Jewish opinion as a whole; and hence comes the significance of the first of our five questions: Will the Zionist or non-Zionist element rule Jewish thought and activities in England? For Jewish

¹We beg the question of the relative importance of English Jews. American Jews are disputing their primacy, but, despite their comparatively small numbers, they enjoy the reaction of their undisputed lead in the last century, of their complete national freedom, of their status as equal citizens of the dominant country in Europe, and, incidentally to Judaism, of the country which administers the Palestine Mandate.

opinion as a whole includes the opinion of Jews outside England, and many Zionist Jews are more closely in touch and in sympathy with kinsmen and co-religionists abroad than with descendants of English Jews who "stand in the same relation to their countrymen as any other religious sect." In other words, a movement to the left in regard to the national concept in Zionism accords better with Jewish opinion outside England than with the tradition of English Jews, formulated by Dr Adler in 1878, and consolidated twenty years earlier at the close of the struggle for civil emancipation. Zionist Jews in England prevail in numbers and influence over their fellows of the older convention, the religious bond, permitting separate nationalisms, will be replaced by an overriding national bond, and the "Englishmen of the Jewish religion" who entered Parliament in 1858 will give way to "Nationalist Jews of British citizenship", whose title to equal rights may become less obvious

THE FUTURE OF THE JEWS to their fellow-citizens not of Jewish nationality.

Some spurious indignation and unnecessary heat have been imported in places into this discussion, which has been conducted at times in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion. "national bond" Jews have suspected their fellows of preferring their secure English status to the claims of kinship blood, which link them with their co-religionists abroad; and the "religious bond" Jews have been anxious to avoid an imputation of international or duo-national svmpathies, and to preserve unimpaired the principle of Jewish credo English patria, vindicated in the emancipation-era and hardly questioned throughout the nineteenth century. We need not revive these dying controversies, but, plainly the Zionist cement is stronger to bind Anglo-Jewry with Jewries in other countries, and its propagandists, who are rather rigorously organized, will employ every means to spread its use and popularity.

Their motive is not selfish. It is directed partly by zeal for Palestine. and by that resurgent political ambition which two thousand years of subjection have not entirely eradicated; and partly, too, by charity, always a potent force in Jewish action. Among English Jews in the last century charity began at home. When its exercise was directed abroad, either it worked through the Anglo-Jewish Association, or the occasion was big enough to invoke the Mansion House in aid. The sufferings of Russian Iews under the Tsardom constituted an outrage against Christianity, which responded to the Jewish appeal. The whole thing was still in the religious sphere. It was as victims of religious persecution that foreign Jews were succoured by their English brethren, and it was as refugees therefrom that they were permitted asylum in England. And from the date of their arrival in this country, they were cared for and provided by their religious kin. But the war altered these conditions.

The needs have overflowed the channels of relief. With the prohibition of immigration, Jewish charity has had to begin abroad, and "among the Iews themselves", said The Times newspaper in an article in April, 1926, "a spiritual counterpart to the immigration prohibitions is arising. No doubt, were the prohibitions lifted, hundreds of thousands would cross the Atlantic to escape economic misery and political degradation of Eastern Europe; but fundamentally they are tired of the thousands of years of wanderings which merely lead to further wanderings, and yearn for a final resting-place in a national home, where they would form a complete, self-contained nation and live like other people, without having to make polite or embarrassed excuses for their very existence." The two things go together. The solution by immigration is forbidden, so that domestic charity has to extend into foreign fields; and, simultaneously, it is discovered that charity is not enough, and the inter-

mittent sense of a religious bond. stimulated at times by the spectacle of suffering, is quickened to a permanent sense of racial or "national" identity. What The Times very comprehensibly called "a spiritual counterpart to the immigration prohibitions " is really more of a physical counterpart. The bond of a common religion, recognized in the century before the war, but seldom calling for open expression, was strengthened by the war's legacy to Israel into the material bond of common blood, spilled copiously for the benefit of nations which steadily refused it national rights. It is because, as The Times said in the same article, "the great mass of the Jewish immigrants to Palestine comes from the East European 'pale', where Jewish communal life is intense, the Jewish national idea most powerful, and where conditions of life are least tolerable ". that the clash between Zionists and non-Zionists has arisen in this country. and that the Zionists seek to dominate Anglo-Jewish counsels and opinions by

the unexceptionable means of peaceful penetration. Thus, always assuming the importance of English Jews in Jewish matters, there is point in our inquiry, in which quarter the victory will lie.

On the whole, and writing dispassionately, we believe that the extremists, however excellent their motives, will be defeated, and that things will gradually slip back into the grooves of the last century. There has been a certain amount of rattling of the gears, a good deal of shouting and confusion, and the handling has not always been skilful, so that a reversal will be neither easy nor complete. We are aware, too, that a return to old conditions must include an allowance -and, let us hope, a generous allowance—for the moral values of the new. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem" is a very ancient deprecation in the Hebrew psalter, and events since 1917 have deeply intensified its force. The unforgettable Jerusalem of the exiles is now the centre of a national home,

and if something of its ideal virtue has been lost in the process of tangibility. more is given than is taken away. The city of prayers has become a city of business. The dreamers of the ghetto are the freemen of Palestine. And this liberty within the Holy Land will react on Jewish consciousness outside. Slipping back into the grooves of the nineteenth century will not mean slipping back into the gyves of the Middle Ages. The emancipated, assimilated Jew will wear his rose of England with a difference. He will be akin to the living as well as the dead. The religious bond uniting Israel will have been proved efficacious in concentration as well as in distribution. It will have acquired a heart as well as members: a vital fount as well as watered gardens; and, though it is not possible to foresee the full result of the Palestine experiment, though some aspects may still seem disquieting at the big end of the telescope, yet the visible justifies the visionary, and the "religious bond" Jews, resuming their pre-Zionist, non-

national and unpolitical Judaism, are likely to be strengthened in their adherence to it by the unique conjunction in Palestine of a religious sect with a national home.

We believe, then, that the rising generation of British Jews will regard themselves, and wish to be regarded, according to their late Chief Rabbi's authority, as members of a religious, and not of a national, community. It is always wiser to state a conclusion than to submit arguments in favour of it: arguments are subject to discussion, whereas conclusions are dogmatic. But observation suggests that Anglo-Jewish opinion is already moving back to the safe moorings of charity -so essential a Hebrew virtue-as the true basis of relief. The attempt to discredit the eleemosynary principle, and to replace it by a kind of socialistic endowment, which was a part of the Iewish "national" movement, seems to be declining in force. The earlier Palestine appeals tended to take shape as National Budgets: so much money

was to be raised by taxation, of which the Shekel was the unitary measure, and it was to be spent for the benefit of a Jewish body politic. Present appeals for distressed Jews in Southeastern Europe, who form the bulk of immigrants into Palestine, are reverting to the type familiar in the days of Sir Moses Montefiore, and are more likely, we may hope as we believe, to prove successful in that guise. This change of view, if our observation is correct, carries some important consequences. When Iews cease to speak of their affairs in national or political terms, they will resume the mentality of the last century, when they were forward in charity to their religious kin and backward in asserting a national" status. Simultaneously with this unpoliticizing of the vocabulary of intercourse, we may note a growing tendency to insist that Jews' political wrongs must be righted, or adjusted, in the country where they dwell. "Minority Rights" is a recognized watchword of the Joint Foreign

Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association, of which that stalwart septuagenarian, Mr Lucien Wolf, is the official representative; and Mr Wolf is not a Zionist. His duty jumps with his convictions—to secure for the Iewish population of any country abroad which invokes the aid of the Joint Foreign Committee, such rights as expediency, commonsense or conscience may be brought to induce it to concede. These rights may range-according, mainly, to the density of the Jewish population—from complete absorption to complete independence. But the rights, of whatever kind, are claimed for the Jews as a religious body, and are granted to them as members of the respective States. Even when, by reason of their large numbers, they are organized into a national minority, in a State composed of several nationalities, their civil status is determined by their religious creed, and carries no national status outside of the civil frontiers.

These particular observations, among others, support our general and firm conclusion that a Zionist regulation of Tewish affairs, as distinct from local affairs in Palestine, is not destined to prevail. Zionism will not swallow Judaism. The part will not be greater than the whole. And in England, accordingly, where Jews are still tenacious of their lead, the sound principle of an Englishman of the Jewish religion, adopted by Macaulay from his Jewish brief when he was fighting for the removal of disabilities, will not be exchanged, as we put it above, into that of a National Iew of British citizenship.

So we come to the second of our questions: Will the principle of separation 'defeat the principle of assimilation? We believe not. What is happening at the moment is that Jewish thought in England and abroad has been responding to the stimulus of the propaganda for Zionism. The word "Jewishness" has been introduced, but is not making headway, as

a substitute for Judaism—an Ersatz-Judaism, based on a temporary backwardation of the religious consciousness in favour of a consciousness derived from the revived use of Hebrew as a vernacular and from other signs of secular community. That Zionism should be "religious-blind", that it should turn a blind eye to conformity with Judaism, has even been tentatively suggested by extreme organs of the Tewish-nationalist Press. "Jewishness" (or Ersatz-Judaism) has not been without its good side, apart from the contributions in specie and speech which it has attracted to the Zionist cause. It has given many young men and women a sense of Iewish values, through the history, literature, and, quite generally, the culture, of their race: Cultural Judaism is, in fact, a truer synonym for Jewish "Nationalism". George Herbert's old tag, "a verse may find him who a sermon flies", may characterize the action of the Hatikvah. or national anthem of the Zionists, in enlisting

recruits to cultural Judaism who never entered a Synagogue. And, possibly, though information is lacking here, some of them come to the Synagogue at last. But a net spread wide enough to include such diverse exponents of "Jewishness", though it preserves some members for the race, and dignifies the separateness of its culture, will not resist the assimilative process, and fails as a substitute for Judaism. Once more the part will not contain the whole. "Jewishers", or whatever they call themselves, who put cultural Judaism first and religious Judaism second, and exalt the Hatikvah above the Shema1. however admirable in their limitations, are marching to defeat. Cultural Judaism has never been neglected by the representatives of traditional Judaism: the Jewish Historical Society of England and the Union of Jewish Literary Societies, with its branches in every town and district, flourished before Zionists discovered the special virtue

" Iewishness"; and, though Summer Schools of Tewish students and other intensive manifestations of the Jewish life have been multiplied in recent years, the lure of separatism recedes before the steady advance of assimilation. It is one thing to take a just pride in Jewish achievement and environment: it would be quite another thing to be content with them by compulsion; and these orgies, which remind us a little of the Klopstockworship in the eighteenth century in Germany, do not permanently interrupt the tranquil process of the ages. They cannot fail to do good while they last, but it is worth remembering that so cultural a Jew as Benjamin Disraeli was definitely lost to Judaism, and that another cultural Jew, the late Israel Zangwill, wrote an English pastoral, Jinny the Carrier, and insisted that the bulk of his work had "nothing whatever to do with the Ghetto, or the literary niche to which the lazy mentality of the public tends to consign one, but belongs to the general

human life",—an illuminating commentary on the principle of separatism versus assimilation in the West.

So we come to our third question. as to the efficacy of Zionism to replace the stimulus of immigration as a corrective to the attrition of Tewish consciousness. Hitherto, or, more exactly, till a few years ago, Jews immigrant into England from countries of oppression abroad sent forward currents of orthodoxy which quickened and fortified the languishing stream of English Judaism. The sluggish waters were refreshed by draughts from a purer fount.-from a fount never tempted or sullied by opportunities to apostasy. Now, these currents are estopped. The migrants do not land England, nor, incidentally, in America. Some of them win their way to Palestine; some, apparently, are to be accommodated in a national home in the Crimea; many, alas, have perished; many drift to and fro, seeking temporary resting-places, and the rest have to work out their religious

destiny in their own inhospitable civil dwellings. The result for Western Iudaism is to arrest its reinforcements. and to let it flow down its channels without the rush of new arrivals. The problem is: Will sluggishness increase? Will a minority religion thus deprived of stimulus from below, maintain itself in a majority population, or will it gradually and more rapidly be absorbed? And, if not, will the tendency to absorption be corrected by the rise of Zionism? We are not very confident about the answer. Jewish history is unexpected, as we have said, and the Jews do throw out protective bulwarks against perils which have destroyed other races. tempting to assume that we are seeing such a bulwark in the making, and that, as immigration is relieved, so Zionism mounts guard over a Judaism flirting with the fleshpots in Egypt. We cannot say that this prospect is fallacious, though it seems a little too symmetrical to be true. That the Jews will resist disintegration, even in

countries of assimilation, is a just inference from their history, but that the resistance will be determined by the most obvious factor is not in accordance with precedent; and even now, despite the extremists, and their continued talk about "national" conditions, the average view of the Palestine experiment is no longer rosy with colours of the dawn. If it were the doom of Western Judaism to depend for its continued vitality on a new stimulus from outside, we should not be hopeful about salvation from Zion-That stimulus may prove ism. efficacious for several years to come in supplying a fresh interest in Jewish its Hebrew University and other aspects will always form centre of Jewish effort. But the direct contact of Western Jews with the vesture of living Judaism, derived in the past from actual intercourse with refugees from religious persecution, and from an ever-present and everrenewed sense of identity with their immigrant kin, will not, we opine, be

felt in the same degree of intensity by a subscription to the Palestine Foundation Fund or even by a rarer visit to Palestine. "For the poor shall never cease out of the land," and "thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman": the reminder and the command, so generously obeyed, presume a personal and a local relationship; and Zionism, triumphant afar, will not yield a compensatory appeal to the virtue of steadfastness in the Law. At the most, it will persuade some Tews to support economic schemes for Palestine development; but the history of Zionism shows that this support is equally welcome from non-Jews or non-religious Jews, and Judaism, after all, is the name and the practice of a religion.

Accordingly, we address ourselves to our next question: Will Reform (or Liberal) Judaism supply a religious-spiritual counterpoise to the politico-national attraction of Zionism? The point of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Deuteronomy, Xvi, 11, 15.

the question is this: Western Judaism declines by attrition. A minority religion is gradually worn down by the assimilation of its adherents to the majority population. Hitherto. in England and America, that process has been resisted among the Jews by constant freshets of new blood, poured in by more orthodox immigrants, who have been tested by persecution instead of by prosperity. We have now seen cause to think that the appeal of Zionism, in countries which do not feed the stream of pilgrims to Palestine. and in countries, moreover, where Tews are nationally at home, will not adequately renew the Jewish consciousness. It will not arrest the droppingoff of definitely converted and indefinitely nonconforming Jews, and, more positively, whatever it adds to the resources of Jewish consciousness will be partly a burden and a responsibility, partly a material possession, but in no sense a religious asset, in no sense an incitement to practise Judaism. Jews responsive to the Zionist appeal

may give and share more generously with their kin; they may even develop a larger interest in specific aspects of Jewish life; but, merely as Zionists, they will not be better Jews, and the minority creed will not be more endeared to them. No. Zionism cannot repair Judaism, even though it postpone for a time the disintegration of the History supplies examples of religion contaminated with politics, and acquiring new powers with its new functions. "Had there been no Luther there could never have been Louis XIV" is an historical aphorism worth careful consideration, and the consideration would have to take account of Machiavelli as well as of Luther. But there is no historical example of religion purified by politics, and restored by that contact to its failing spiritual powers. Machiavellians of Zionism might build a powerful Jewish State, but they would destroy Judaism in the process; and, mean-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> From Gerson to Grotius. By J. N. Figgis. Cambridge, 1923.

while, the limitations of the movement encourage Machiavellism. Accordingly, we do not believe that Zionism has arrived at the appointed time to fill the place left vacant by immigration, as a reinforcement of Judaism in the West. If the cessation of immigration corresponds to a relaxation of Judaism, and if that process is continuous and cumulative, then Judaism will disappear, despite the National Home for Tews in Palestine. even to some extent because of that National Home-precisely to the extent, that is to say, that a sense of Jewish national identity drives out and replaces the sense of Jewish religious community.

The question is, if Reform (Liberal) Judaism will avail to preserve the threatened structure. Will it preserve the structure from two perils: (1) the peril of internal decay, and (2) the peril of political contamination? Will Judaism resist both its Leo and its Luther; or, if the historical analogy is objectionable, will it resist attrition from within

—loss of strength, without growth or compensation—and change from without, in the direction of a national constitution?

It is a large demand to make, and here, again, we are confronted by the difficulty that Reform (Liberal) Judaism is not one movement, but multiple. Zionists are more or less united, more or less internationally organized. They hold their pan-Jewish conferences, relying on a kind of representation, and conducted in a kind of lingua franca; and though the real control of the movement is as oligarchic as that of medieval Venice, there is a semblance of democracy, and there are opportunities for parliament-for talk—which play up to (we do not use the words offensively) the national idea of Judaism. Religious Judaism, as we have explained, Judaism in the historical, accepted sense, possesses no such means of communication. It is sometimes said that every believing Iew ordains his own religious law; and short of this extreme individualism.

it is certainly true that the Judaism of each country is self-contained, and that it takes various forms within each country. There is no synod of Jewish rabbis, meeting at stated times to concert common measures for the scattered communities of Jews. There is no Jewish Rome, no Jewish Geneva. The containing force is Judaism itself. The Law, the Torah, is common to the several religious communities of Jews; and the orthodox rabbis of each community—its Orthodox Chief Rabbi, if he be appointed—is responsible to his own community for preserving the ordinances of the Law. Individual conformity may vary in degree, from grave laxity to meticulous observance; but there is a standard of orthodoxy. recognizable from country to country, and stiffening in rigidity as it moves further eastward. Beyond this standard, however, and the varying conformity which it commands, Judaism, unlike Zionism, does not invite its adherents to common action.

What is true of the whole is true of

the part. The part of Judaism which is labelled Liberal or Reform is not uniform between countries, but is determined by national frontiers. What applies to Reform (Liberal) Judaism in England does not necessarily (or actually) apply to Reform Judaism in America; what applies to American Reform Judaism does not fit the German Liberal-Jewish Gemeinde. In Germany, indeed, the movement is bound up with communal government; in England, it is purely a spiritual movement: in America, though it prefers the name Reform, it tends much further towards the left. Progressive leaders from these countries and some others met in London in the summer of 1926, in order to exchange views for the first time, and to consider the formation of a union. But English Reformers, as distinct from Liberals, took no official share in the proceedings, which, though interesting within their confines, were not allowed to stray beyond them. The problem of Zionism, for example, was

ruled out of bounds. Thus we are handicapped to some extent approaching our question—will Reform (Liberal) Judaism supply a religiousspiritual counterpoise to the politiconational attraction of Zionism? For we are not dealing with equal wholes. Zionism is an entity, Reform Judaism is a diversity. Zionism moves in more dimensions than Reform Judaism. Zionism is centripetal, Reform Judaism aims outwards. These differences are obvious, and it must be admitted, too, that Zionists and Reform (Liberal) Jews are not mutually exclusive. The mere fact that, at the Progressive Conference in London, certain delegates wished to discuss Zionism, and to define the Liberal attitude towards that movement, is a sign of inclusion. even of conciliation. It must not be laid down as axiomatic that Reform (Liberal) Jews are always and necessarily non-Zionists.

Yet despite the difficulty of approach, and the further difficulty of separation, we are thrown back on these alterna-

tives: Nationalism or Liberalism; State or Church; regio or religio; Zionism or Judaism. And Judaism in this context must mean Reform (Liberal) Judaism. Such Orthodox Jews as have placed themselves in active opposition to political Zionism, on the ground of its non-religious basis, are negligible in number and obscure in influence. They belong to the extreme Right of conformity, and, though they may represent a larger body of silent opinion, they carry no weight in Western counsels.

Progressive Judaism, as a modern movement, is nearly two hundred years old. The motive came from Moses Mendelssohn, who was born in 1729, and whose followers, all the world over, should be celebrating his bicentenary with gratitude and affection in 1929. For he first pulled down the ghetto-walls which had been built round the Jews in the Middle Ages. By his discipleship to Maimonides, he is accounted among the rationalists of Judaism. By his friendship with

Lessing, he inaugurated the era of emancipation. By his influence on Kant, he helped to complete the work begun by Luther. There have been persistent attacks on the Big Three (Maimonides, Spinoza, Mendelssohn), to whom the philosophy of art and morals—æsthetics and ethics—owes an almost incalculable debt, in their primary capacity as Jewish humanists; attacks, which, starting in their lifetime, have been renewed at irregular intervals, and have been directed either at their own teachings or at those of their successors. Thus, a former Chief Rabbi in England attacked and interdicted the founders of Reform Judaism in this country in 1841, and the present Chief Rabbi. Dr Hertz, has recently made an attack on Dr C. G. Montefiore. the English pioneer of Liberal Judaism. It is partly due to the isolation of Iews, as a religious body, in each country, and to the absence, as has been explained, of a Jewish "Pope", or synod of rabbis, that these separate communal episodes, commencing with

the excommunication of Spinoza in Amsterdam, have never been linked historically: that their common features have not been fully recognized, and that the strength and distribution of Tewish humanism has consequently been parted among its heirs. Such an heir, for example, as Dr Israel Abrahams (1857-1925), the "Jewish Erasmus", as he was called by a Christian divine, was never fully conscious of his inheritance. He was not conscious of it in the sense in which every newfledged Zionist is conscious of "World-Tewry" as he likes to call it—of his title, by right of the Zionist Organization, to broad-cast his message through the Tewish world. No, the Tewish Erasmus, unlike his prototype, who wrote in Latin, not in Dutch, employed not a lingua tranca, but his native English; and it was only in the last years of his busy life that he found time to spread his gospel even in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> By Canon Box, in The Jewish Guardian, 16th Oct., 1925.

America. It has been a feature inherent in Reformers' principles, that they are bounded by national frontiers. Zionism is international; Reform (Liberal) Judaism is local.

This local character, it should be observed, is appropriate to the objects "The first of the movement. Reformers", says a recent historian, "contended that the Jews were no longer a nation", and the contention, which is a principle of Reform, has been sustained unbroken to this day. Reformers seek to divest the Jewish religion of its national characteristics, and, where these are expressed in its ritual or prayers, to omit them or transform them, and to re-invest them with a larger and a purely spiritual signification. They seek to modify the Jewish type, as recognized by external signs of food, dress, language, etc., and to assimilate it to the type of the nation to which the several Tews

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Lewis Browne, The Story of the Jews. Jonathan Cape, 1926.

belong. This modification is assisted by natural causes. Education, association, even climate, and the imperceptible, gradual, stealing influences of habit, intercourse and surroundings. mould and change the externalities. till the emancipated Jew of any country -and emancipation is the concomitant of Reform-takes the colour of his environment, and, an equal citizen among his fellow-countrymen, is verus socius in all except religion; Judaism, in the final stage, is the sole differentia of the Jew. This gracious process, mollifying and modifying, has been reinforced by ties of blood. There have been Jews in England, for example, off and on (and mostly on) for more than eight hundred and sixty Throughout these centuries, and in every century, there have been Tews who have taken Christian wives. and Tewesses who have found Christian husbands. True, in the majority of mixed marriages, the offspring are brought up in the dominant faith, and are lost to Judaism accordingly. Hence

though a large minority remain firm in Judaism, thus further assimilating the Jewish type, the Jewish religion prohibits mixed marriages. It cannot afford the loss in numbers which the baptism of the children would involve. It aims at self-preservation, at handing down the monotheistic creed from generation to generation. Its "fences round the Law " were built up in order to keep the creed more securely, and the Reformers, though they pulled down some fences. were not less careful to preserve the Law. In effect, it will be found that mixed marriages are rarer among Reform (Liberal) Jews than among their Orthodox brethren. The former, it may be submitted, have less worldly temptation to relax the prohibition, and yet, in a real sense, more to lose. They have already vindicated their right to, and their power to enjoy, the social advantages of assimilation. In all the externalities of life—occupation, education, food, and so on-they add nothing by not remaining Jews; and, having separated

[78]

Judaism from the protective social barriers which it had thrown -having insulated its spiritual aspects -they would be conscious of an even graver loss in leaving it. The Orthodox Jew, marrying "out", gains so many new experiences and is released from so many restrictions that he hardly knows what is material and what is spiritual in the change: the Reform (Liberal) Jew faces, in similar circumstances, an unmixed spiritual dilemma. Whether or not this analysis is correct, -and there is always the personal element—the fact is that Reform (Liberal) Judaism does not lead, as its opponents sometimes say, to or towards Christianity. It leads to a more spiritualized Judaism, competent, under modern conditions, to resist the temptation to apostasy, and to meet, on equal terms of mutual respect and goodwill, the other religions of the Western world.

Still, recognizing the variations of Reform, and its deliberate choice of national frontiers, we may reasonably

treat the movement as a whole. The history of the Roman Church could not be written without the history of the Reformation, though this branched into Anglicanism, Lutheranism, and so forth, and so it is with the history of Judaism. Reform (Liberal) Judaism, in whatever country it develops separate features, is one current through all its courses. It is the current of modernism in theology, and of Westernism in Iewish social life. It was, as we have said, the concomitant of emancipation; in England in the nineteenth as in Germany in the eighteenth century. It was not by accident that Sir Isaac Lvon Goldsmid, the first Tewish baronet, who was so closely associated with Macaulay in securing the removal of British Jews' civil disabilities, was likewise closely connected with the foundation of the Reform Congregation (the West London Synagogue of British Tews), in the teeth of the rabbinical interdict. The two things obviously go together, because a large part of Orthodox Judaism consists in minute

social ordinances, of no direct spiritual signification, and the Jew, seeking national rights, sought release from priestly inhibitions on their enjoyment. An Englishman of the Jewish religion is much more than a "national" Jew (or Tewish nationalist), admitted to British citizenship. And he deems this fuller status attainable, and supports just means for its attainment, in other countries than his own. He becomes English, they become French, German, Belgian, etc., as the case may be, in thought, habit, outlook, culture,-in all the associations and equipment which a man carries with him through life, founded on pre-natal inheritance, on nursery-tales, on education, on intercourse, and on the thousand determining influences, pervasive, instinctive, acquired, and absorbed like the dew by the soil. He remains Jewish in religion—in his belief in the unity of God ("Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One "). in his knowledge of the Divine mercy and justice, in his passive faith in

[81]

purposive creation, and his active zeal to advance the advent of God's Kingdom on earth by deeds of charity. fellowship, hope. . . . But we need not expand this idea of Judaism, which unites conformists of all nations to one another by a single bond of spiritual identity, which maintains that bond in a physical world by the ordinance of Jew mating with Jewess, and which permits, within those limits -and there is no liberty without lawthe utmost individual freedom, the widest range to intellectual reason, and a curiously happy combination of likeness with unlikeness and unity with diversity.

Do we claim too much for Reform (Liberal) Judaism? If it should seem so, we may cite the evidence of a recent and not too friendly critic, who says that it is "so new a movement that as yet it can hardly be judged with any fairness", and that "it knew exactly what the Jew ought to do, but failed to induce him to do it." Even this witness speaks of its "over[82]

whelmingly high ideal ", which it lifted out of the writings of the Hebrew Prophets and preached anew to their descendants, that "the essence of religion lay, not in praying for the health of one's soul, but in striving for the well-being of mankind. The truest Iew was seen to be the person who laboured most earnestly to bring on a Reign of Peace among men." And even this witness admits that the first reformers set to work by separating what was "ancient and fundamental" in Judaism from what was "recent and unimportant ". Changes in ritual were but a beginning: "Soon far more drastic reforms followed. Judaism in its entire practice was liberalized and brought into harmony with the life of the day. . . . The whole aim was to free the Jew, to level the high rampart of Law, so that his going out into the world would not necessarily mean deserting Jewry "(Judaism)1. Of course, the defenders of the Law

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ibid., chs. 37, 38.

pursued them with criticism, even with obloquy. Students of the history of Humanism in Europe require no guide to these excesses. And, of course, it has been possible, in so recent a movement, so late and tentative in its beginnings, to pick holes in the scholarship of the reformers, and even to convict them of confusing some things "ancient" with things "recent", some things "fundamental" things "unimportant". The history of Humanism in Europe will supply parallels here, too. But no minutiæ of criticism will re-fasten minutize of legalism on a religious consciousness responsive to its release from them-a consciousness which has found eloquent expression in homiletics and theology in America and Germany, which has expressed itself in this country in the Reform and Liberal congregations, and in the writings of, among others, Drs Claude G. Montefiore, Israel Abrahams, and the Rev. Morris Joseph. and which expresses itself finally in Tewish life.

So we are disposed to reply in the affirmative to the third of our kev? questions, and to expect Progressive (Reform or Liberal) Judaism to provide a spiritual counterpoise to the more material attraction of Zionism. Judaism and "Jewishness", the religion and the cult, will go forward together for a while: but the former, it seems to us, is bound to go ahead, and the latter to lag behind, in a competition, if such were possible, for supremacy. For, when we come to our two final questions-Will conditions in Southeastern Europe reduce the impetus to Palestine by providing national homes in situ? and Will Zionist funds continue to be forthcoming?—we find that the Drang to Palestine falters in very much the same ratio as the Drang to Reform has increased in recent years. In a sense—a limited sense-we are all Zionists now-a-days. Anti-Nationalist ("religious bond") Jews are naturally fearful of Zionism, because of its strong admixture with Nationalist elements, threatening the

principle of Judaism as a religion. But the Zionist programme in Palestine, defined in explicit terms by the Churchill Memorandum of 1922, accepted by the Zionist Organization, ratified by the succeeding Governments of Mr Ramsay MacDonald and Mr Stanley Baldwin, and loyally carried out by Sir Herbert Samuel and Lord Plumer, has passed into the data, the tenets. the posita, the fixed moorings, of Tewish life. An appeal for the Keren Hayesod, the native name for the Palestine Foundation Fund, is a hardy annual (not to say an evergreen) in every Tewish community. Palestine, with its national home for Jews, and with the institutions in that home, has been added permanently to the Jewish burden. That burden—we are speaking in material terms—is so heavy to-day, with indigent Jews in all parts of Europe, that not everyone responds to the Palestine appeals. Donors may be choosers, if beggars may not. But everyone, or very nearly everyone, sympathizes with them, everyone at

least is aware of them, and no one expects, or hopes, to do away with them. Palestine is Jewish in the sense that Jews have definitely accepted a part of the responsibility for its future prosperity. They are at liberty, accordingly, to look round for signs of relief from that responsibility. They welcome the improvement in internal financial conditions,—in the national, as distinct from the Zionist. Palestine Budget. They welcome the possibility of raising loans. They welcome the extension to Palestine of economic schemes directed by limited companies. Every thing of that sort relieves the pressure on Jewish voluntary effort. It lightens the communal burden of the Tews, the load which that charitable people carries always and everywhere in uncomplaining addition to the common burden of national charity and taxation. And note that the more they can perceive a relationship between Palestine and economics, the less they will regard the subvention of Palestine as a religious obligation. The sentiment

will remain, but the religious aspect will dwindle. Thus, the Crimean experiment in Russia for settling Tews on the land is a scheme parallel to the Palestinian. The sentiment derived from glamour of the Holy Land is wanting, but in all other respects it is merely a matter of choice whether a French or English Tew sends his guinea or five-pound note to the one Jewish charity or the other. Each is directly efficacious in helping to solve the Russo-Jewish problem. So, too, and even more hopefully, with the attempts in various countries to solve the Tewish problem on the spot. The greater the number of Tews who are weaned from their migratory habits (or who, more exactly, perhaps, are spared the ordeal of migration) by the better and more hospitable disposition of the peoples among whom they dwell, the smaller accordingly will be the need of transplanting them to Palestine. They will become assorted with their own fellowcountrymen, either as pares inter pares, or, provisionally, as a national group

apart, under legally assured conditions encouraging self-respect. A national sense will be evoked, which will gradually counterbalance the Jewish national consciousness, exceptionally developed under local conditions of civic repression. That consciousness will become subordinate in those countries, as it is in countries of civic freedom. operate as a sense of Jewish culture, stimulating and reinforcing the religious consciousness, and will find its sufficient scope in literary and historical societies. perpetuating Jewish tradition. But it will no longer grow by excrescence into a national consciousness, in the modern and proper meaning of that term, since national rights, privileges and obligation will be attached to residence and Moreover, with the diversion of some charitable monies to such objects as the Crimean scheme, and with the gradual solution of the Jewish problem in situ, the urgency of the Palestine appeal will lose a little of its force. To this consideration must be added the inevitable diminution of subscription

lists at the fourth, fifth and nth time of asking. This natural falling-off will coincide with the parallel schemes and the local solutions; and, since the progress of Jewish Nationalism depends on the maintenance of Nationalist funds, we may reasonably look forward, with the diminution of oppression abroad, to a return to a less intense enthusiasm for it. Palestine will always be in the background, but it will recede further into the background of Jewish interest.

There is one more consideration to be adduced. Is it quite certain that the Jews will reap the benefit of what they are doing for the Holy Land? We suggest this question with great reluctance, for we share the immense admiration which spectators in all countries feel for the magnificent pioneer work which has been done. But the pioneers (the Halutzim) are the first generation. The trouble is, or may prove to be, that they have been too carefully selected. It is a splendid and inspiring sight to see men

of education-scientists, teachers, professors, and the like-putting Ruskin's experiment to the proof, and actually tilling the soil, making the roads, etc. But can it last? The natural tendency in human society is for the social niveau to seek to rise. The children want to begin where their fathers leave off. The son of the agricultural labourer puts on a black coat, and goes to town. This tendency, common to mankind, is probably strongest among the Iews. for various causes which we need not here examine. What will happen to that tendency in Palestine? Will the children of the professors-turned-roadmakers be content to cultivate the soil? and, if not, whence will Palestine drawits further supply of agriculturists? And what will happen to the children and grandchildren of the Halutzim? Will there be room for them in Palestine? Can Tel-Aviv be distended to provide for them? Or will they emigrate to lands of wider broadcloth, and leave Palestine, modernized and

improved, to folk who are content with meek ambitions?

We submit with much hesitation these duller aspects of the future of Palestine. The penny-plain mind is always drab to the twopenny-coloured. and we recognize without reserve that Zionism is a real and an abiding asset in the exiguous possessions of The Wandering Jew. He wandered with his Torah as his sole possession, through century after century of persecution; now he wanders with the hope of Palestine in his wallet, stepping erect to his legally assured home. We believe, as firmly as belief can be formulated in the phantasmagoria of experience—for a war of the twentieth twenty-first century may wrest Palestine from the League of Nationsthat this realized hope of the wanderer will continue permanently to uplift him, and that the patch of colour in his garment will communicate its brightness to his soul. "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" The Jews,

1 Genesis, Xviii. 14.

like Sarah, wife of Abraham, have given birth to a child in their old age. Nothing can undo this experience, this sudden unexpected joy. Some of them think that Zionism will grow up into a Jewish nation among the nations: parents are always fond; the fondest are those whose parenthood was deferred. These fond hopes of the old parents will be disappointed. Yet Zionism will always be a child of hope. We do not destroy the hope of Zionism, we do not dim the patch of colour on the wanderer's garment, when we submit that the exuberant ecstasy which attended the birth of Zionism will fade in the period of reconstruction, and that the future of the Tews is not destined to be national in its institutions. Palestine is one of several means of relieving Jewish distresses. Because it is guaranteed by the Powers, its relief is a right, not a charity; and because it is the Holy Land, its right is divine as well as human. Every Jew is a freeman of Zion, and Palestine on earth is the visible, tangible symbol of

the idea of the freedom of the spirit, which is called "the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel."

We cannot express more clearly the relation of the concrete fact to the abstract idea: of Zionism to Judaism. The relation will vary, of course, from place to place and from time to time. It will be closer in one place, looser in another, a little more Zionism here. a little more Judaism there. But in practice and theory, the future of the Jews will be determined by these forces acting in harmony: Zionism, symbolized by the National Home. with its University centre in Jerusalem, providing the typical culture of the fully acclimatized Jew, intensively mothering Hebraism, and selecting for perpetuation the most characteristic elements of a genius as creative as the Judaism, independent of nationality, bound by no local or tribal idol. released even more securely by its new deposit in Palestine from the regulations of Talmudic doctors and medieval legalists, guarding its mono-

theistic creed and its inheritance of the moral law, and confidently committing them to the gracious influences of time, with its widening, deepening, interpreting, universalizing process.

And at last? The end of universalism? The conclusion of the whole matter? Neither science nor religion has formulated it in intelligible words, but the languages of the two revelations are approximating a little more closely, and Judaism, purged of its accretions, and preserved by its own buttresses from decay, may be found, when the time comes, to have made its own sacrifice and to have rendered its own service to the common cause of truth.

Each, pott 8vo, boards, 2/6 net

THIS series of books, by some of the most distinguished English thinkers, scientists, philosophers, doctors, critics, and artists, was at once recognized as a noteworthy event. Written from various points of view, one book frequently opposing the argument of another, they provide the reader with a stimulating survey of the most modern thought in many departments of life. Several volumes are devoted to the future trend of Civilization, conceived as a whole; while others deal with particular provinces. It is interesting to see in these neat little volumes, issued at a low price, the revival of a form of literature, the Pamphlet, which has been in disuse for many years.

### Published by

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD. Broadway House: 68-74 Carter Lane, London, E.C.4.

#### FROM THE REVIEWS

Times Literary Supplement: "An entertaining series."

Spectator: "Scintillating monographs."

Observer: "There seems no reason why the brilliant To-day and To-morrow Series should come to an end for a century of to-morrows. At first it seemed impossible for the publishers to keep up the sport through a dozen volumes, but the series already runs to more than two score. A remarkable series . . ."

Nation: "We are able to peer into the future by means of that brilliant series [which] will constitute a precious document upon the

present time."-T. S. ELIOT.

Manchester Dispatch: "The more one reads of these pamphlets, the more avid becomes the appetite. We hope the list is endless."

Irish Statesman: Full of lively controversy."
Daily Herald: "This series has given us many monographs of brilliance and discernment...
The stylistic excellences of this provocative

series."

Field: "We have long desired to express the deep admiration felt by every thinking scholar and worker at the present day for this series. We must pay tribute to the high standard of thought and expression they maintain. As small gift-books, austerely yet prettily produced, they remain unequalled of their kind. We can give but the briefest suggestions of their value to the student, the politician, and the voter..."

Japan Chronicle: "While cheap prophecy is a futile thing, wisdom consists largely in looking forward to consequences. It is this that makes these books of considerable interest."

New York World: "Holds the palm in the speculative and interpretative thought of the age."

[2]

### **VOLUMES READY**

Daedalus, or Science and the Future. By J. B. S. HALDANE, Reader in Biochemistry, University of Cambridge. Seventh impression.

"A fascinating and daring little book." -Westminster Gazette. "The essay is brilliant, sparkling with wit and bristling with challenges."—British Medical Journal.

"Predicts the most startling changes."

-Morning Post.

Callinicus, a Defence of Chemical Warfare. By I. B. S. HALDANE. Second imbression.

"Mr. Haldane's brilliant study."-Times Leading Article. " A book to be read by every intelligent adult."-Spectator. "This brilliant little monograph."—Daily News.

Icarus, or the Future of Science. By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. Fourth

impression.

"Utter pessimism." - Observer. "Mr. Russell refuses to believe that the progress of Science must be a boon to mankind."-Morning Post. "A stimulating book, that leaves one not at all discouraged."-Daily Herald.

What I Believe. By BERTRAND RUSSELL,

F.R.S. Third impression.

"One of the most brilliant and thoughtstimulating little books I have read-a better book even than Icarus."-Nation. "Simply and brilliantly written." - Nature.

tabbing sentences he punctures the bubble of cruelty, envy, narrowness, and ill-will which those in authority call their morals."-New Leader.

[3]

Tantalus, or the Future of Man. By F. C. S. Schiller, D.Sc., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Second

impression.

They are all (Daedalus, Icarus, and Tantalus) brilliantly clever, and they supplement or correct one another."—Dean Inge, in Morning Post. "Immensely valuable and infinitely readable."—Daily News. "The book of the week."—Spectator.

Cassandra, or the Future of the British Empire. By F. C. S. SCHILLER, D.Sc. "We commend it to the complacent of all parties."—Saturday Review. "The book is small, but very, very weighty; brilliantly written, it ought to be read by all shades of politicians and students of politics."—York.

shire Post. "Yet another addition to that bright constellation of pamphlets."—Spectator.

Quo Vadimus? Glimpses of the Future. By E. E. FOURNIER D'ALBE, D.Sc., author of "Selenium, the Moon Element," etc.
"A wonderful vision of the future. A book that will be talked about."—Daily Graphic.
"A remarkable contribution to a remarkable series."—Manchester Dispatch. "Interesting and singularly plausible."—Daily Telegraph.

Thrasymachus, the Future of Morals. By C. E. M. Joad, author of "The Babbitt Warren," etc. Second impression.
"His provocative book."—Graphic.
"Written in a style of deliberate brilliance."
—Times Literary Supplement. "As outspoken and unequivocal a contribution as could well be imagined. Even those readers who dissent will be forced to recognize the admirable clarity with which he states his case. A book that will startle."—Daily Chronicle.

Lysistrata, or Woman's Future and Future Woman. By Anthony M. LUDOVICI, author of "A Defence of Aristocracy." etc. Second Impression.

"A stimulating book. Volumes would be needed to deal, in the fullness his work provokes, with all the problems raised."-Sunday Times. "Pro-feminine, but anti-feministic. Scotsman. "Full of brilliant common-sense." -Observer.

Hypatia, or Woman and Knowledge. By Mrs Bertrand Russell. With a

frontispiece. Third impression.

An answer to Lysistrata. "A passionate vindication of the rights of women."-Manchester Guardian. "Says a number of things that sensible women have been wanting publicly said for a long time."-Daily Herald.

Hephaestus, the Soul of the Machine. By E. E. FOURNIER D'ALBE, D.Sc.

"A worthy contribution to this interesting series. A delightful and thought-provoking essav."-Birmingham Post. "There is a special pleasure in meeting with a book like Hephaestus. The author has the merit of really understanding what he is talking about." -Engineering. "An exceedingly clever defence of machinery."—Architects' Journal.

The Passing of the Phantoms: a Study of Evolutionary Psychology and Morals. By C. J. PATTEN, Professor of Anatomy, Sheffield University. With 4 Plates.

"Readers of Daedalus, Icarus and Tantalus. will be grateful for an excellent presentation of yet another point of view."-Yorkshire Post. "This bright and bracing little book." Literary Guide. "Interesting and original." -Medical Times.

The Mongol in our Midst: a Study of Man and his Three Faces. By F. G. CROOKSHANK, M.D., F.R.C.P. With 28

Plates. Second Edition, revised.

"A brilliant piece of speculative induction." -Saturday Review. "An extremely interesting and suggestive book, which will reward careful reading."-Sunday Times. pictures carry fearful conviction."-Daily Herald.

The Conquest of Cancer. By H. W. S. WRIGHT, M.S., F.R.C.S. Introduction

by F. G. CROOKSHANK, M.D.

"Eminently suitable for general reading. The problem is fairly and lucidly presented. One merit of Mr Wright's plan is that he tells people what, in his judgment, they can best do, here and now."-From the Introduction.

**Pygmalion,** or the Doctor of the Future.

By R. McNair Wilson, M.B.

"Dr Wilson has added a brilliant essay to this series."—Times Literary Supplement. "This is a very little book, but there is much wisdom in it."-Evening Standard. "No doctor worth his salt would venture to sav that Dr Wilson was wrong."-Daily Herald.

**Prometheus**, or Biology and the Advancement of Man. By H. S. JENNINGS, Professor of Zoology. Johns Hopkins

University.

"This volume is one of the most remarkable that has yet appeared in this series. Certainly the information it contains will be new to most educated laymen. It is essentially a discussion of . . . heredity and environment, and it clearly establishes the fact that the current use of these terms has no justification."-Times Literary Supplement. "An exceedingly brilliant book."-New Leader.

Narcissus: an Anatomy of Clothes. By GERALD HEARD. With 19 illustrations. "A most suggestive hook."—Nation "Irresistible. Reading it is like a switchback journey. Starting from prehistoric times we rocket down the ages."—Daily News. "Interesting, provocative, and entertaining."—Oueen.

Thamyris, or Is There a Future for

Poetry? By R. C. TREVELYAN.

"Learned, sensible, and very well-written."

—Affable Hawk, in New Statesman. "Very suggestive."—J. C. Squire, in Observer.

"A very charming piece of work, I agree with all, or at any rate, almost all its conclusions."—J. St. Loe Strachey, in Spectator.

Proteus, or the Future of Intelligence. By Vernon Lee, author of "Satan the

Waster," etc.

"We should like to follow the author's suggestions as to the effect of intelligence on the future of Ethics, Aesthetics, and Manners. Her book is profoundly stimulating and should be read by everyone."—Outlook. "A concise, suggestive piece of work."—Saturday Review.

Timotheus, the Future of the Theatre-By Bonamy Dobree, author of "Restor-

ation Drama." etc.

"A witty, mischievous little book, to be read with delight."—Times Literary Supplement. "This is a delightfully witty book."—Scotsman. "In a subtly satirical vein he visualizes various kinds of theatres in 200 years time. His gay little book makes delightful reading."—Nation.

Paris, or the Future of War. By Captain B. H. LIDDELL HART.

"A companion volume to Callinicus. A gem of close thinking and deduction."

—Observer. "A noteworthy contribution to a problem of concern to every citizen in this country."—Daily Chronicle. "There is some lively thinking about the future of war in Paris, just added to this set of live-wire pamphlets on big subjects."—Manchester Guardian.

Wireless Possibilities. By Professor A. M. Low. With 4 diagrams.

"As might be expected from an inventor who is always so fresh, he has many interesting things to say."—Evening Standard.
"The mantle of Blake has fallen upon the physicists. To them we look for visions, and we find them in this book."—New Statesman.

Perseus: of Dragons. By H. F. Scott Stokes. With 2 illustrations.

"A diverting little book, chock-full of ideas, Mr Stokes' dragon-lore is both quaint and various."—Morning Post. "Very amusingly written, and a mine of curious knowledge for which the discerning reader will find many uses."—Glasgow Herald.

Lycurgus, or the Future of Law. By E.S.P. HAYNES, author of "Concerning Solicitors," etc.

"An interesting and concisely written book."

— Yorkshire Post. "He roundly declares that
English criminal law is a blend of barbaric
violence, medieval prejudices, and modern
fallacies. . . A humane and conscientious
investigation."—T.P.'s Weekly. "A thoughttimes.

Times.

Euterpe, or the Future of Art. By LIONEL R. McColvin, author of "The

Theory of Book-Selection."

"Discusses briefly, but very suggestively, the problem of the future of art in relation to the public."—Saturday Review. Another indictment of machinery as a soul-destroyer . . . Mr Colvin has the courage to suggest solutions."-Westminster Gazette. "This is altogether a much-needed book."-New Leader.

Pegasus, or Problems of Transport. By Colonel J. F. C. FULLER, author of "The Reformation of War." etc. With

8 Plates.

"The foremost military prophet of the day propounds a solution for industrial and unemployment problems. It is a bold essay . . . and calls for the attention of all concerned with imperial problems."-Daily Telegraph. "Practical, timely, very interesting and very important."-J. St. Loe Strachev, in Spectator.

Atlantis, or America and the Future. By Colonel J. F. C. FULLER.

"Candid and caustic."-Observer. "Many hard things have been said about America, but few quite so bitter and caustic as these.' -Daily Sketch. "He can conjure up possibilities of a new Atlantis."-Clarion.

Midas, or the United States and the Future. By C. H. Bretherton, author

of "The Real Ireland", etc.

A companion volume to Atlantis. "Full of astute observations and acute reflections . . . this wise and witty pamphlet, a provocation to the thought that is creative."-Morning Post. " A punch in every paragraph. One could hardly ask for more 'meat.'"-Spectator.

Nuntius, or Advertising and its Future.

By GILBERT RUSSELL.

"Expresses the philosophy of advertising concisely and well."—Observer. "It is doubtful if a more straightforward exposition of the part advertising plays in our public and private life has been written."—Manchester Guardian.

Birth Control and the State: a Plea and a Forecast. By. C. P. BLACKER,

M.C., M.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

"A very careful summary."—Times Literary Supplement. "A temperate and scholarly survey of the arguments for and against the encouragement of the practice of birth control."—Lancet. "He writes lucidly, moderately, and from wide knowledge; his book undoubtedly gives a better understanding of the subject than any other brief account we know. It also suggests a policy."—Saurday Review.

Ouroboros, or the Mechanical Extension of Mankind. By GARET GARRETT.

"This brilliant and provoking little book."
—Observer. "A significant and thoughtful essay, calculated in parts to make our flesh creep."—Spectator. "A brilliant writer, Mr. Garrett is a remarkable man. He explains something of the enormous change the machine has made in life."—Daily Express.

Artifex, or the Future of Craftsmanship. By John Gloag, author of "Time,

Taste, and Furniture."

"An able and interesting summary of the history of craftsmanship in the past, a direct criticism of the present, and at the end his hopes for the future. Mr Gloag's real contribution to the future of craftsmanship is his discussion of the uses of machinery."

—Times Literary Supplement.

[10]

Plato's American Republic. By J. DOUGLAS WOODRUFF. Third impression.

"Uses the form of the Socratic dialogue with devastating success. A gently malicious wit sparkles in every page."—Sunday Times.

"Having deliberately set himself an almost impossible task, has succeeded beyond belief."

—Saturday Review. "Quite the liveliest even of this spirited series."—Observer.

Orpheus, or the Music of the Future. By W. J. TURNER, author of "Music and Life,"

"A book on music that we can read not merely once, but twice or thrice. Mr Turner has given us some of the finest thinking upon Beethoven that I have ever met with."—

Ernest Newman in Sunday Times. "A brilliant essay in contemporary philosophy."

—Outlook. "The fruit of real knowledge and understanding.'—New Statesman.

Terpander, or Music and the Future. By E. J. Dent, author of "Mozart's Operas."

"In Orpheus Mr Turner made a brilliant

"In Orpheus Mr Turner made a brilliant voyage in search of first principles. Mr Dent's book is a skilful review of the development of music. It is the most succinct and stimulating essay on music I have found..."—Musical News. "Remarkably able and stimulating."—Times Literary Supplement. "There is hardly another critic alive who could sum up contemporary tendencies so neatly."—Spectator.

Sibylla, or the Revival of Prophecy. By C. A. MACE, University of St. Andrew's. "An entertaining and instructive pamphlet."

—Morning Post. "Places a nightmare before us very ably and wittily."—Spectator. "Passages in it are excellent satire, but on the whole Mr Mace's speculations may be taken as a trustworthy guide . . . to modern scientific thought."—Birmingham Post.

Lucultus, or the Food of the Future. By OLGA HARTLEY and MRS C. F. LEYEL, authors of 'The Gentle Art of Cookery.'

"This is a clever and witty little volume in an entertaining series, and it makes enchanting reading."—Times Literary Supplement.
"Opens with a brilliant picture of modern man, living in a vacuum-cleaned, steamheated, credit-furnished suburban mansion with a wolf in the basement —the wolf of hunger. This banquet of epigrams."—Spectator.

Procrustes, or the Future of English Education. By M. ALDERTON PINK.

"Undoubtedly he makes out a very good case."—Daily Herald. "This interesting addition to the series."—Times Educational Supplement. "Intends to be challenging and succeeds in being so. All fit readers will find it stimulating."—Northern Echo.

## The Future of Futurism. By JOHN RODKER.

"Mr. Rodker is up-to-the-minute, and he has accomplished a considerable feat in writing, on such a vague subject, 92 extremely interesting pages."—T. S. Eliot, in Nation. "There are a good many things in this book which are of interest."—Times Literary Supplement.

Pomona, or the Future of English. By BASIL DE SÉLINCOURT, author of 'The English Secret', etc.

"The future of English is discussed fully and with fascinating interest."—Morning Post. "Has a refreshing air of the unexpected. Full of wise thoughts and happy words."—Times Literary Supplement. "Here is suggestive thought, quite different from most speculations on the destiny of our language."—Journal of Education.

[12]

Balbus, or the Future of Architecture, By Christian Barman, editor of 'The

Architect's Journal'.

"A really brilliant addition to this already distinguished series. The reading of Balbus will give much data for intelligent prophecy, and incidentally, an hour or so of excellent entertainment."—Spectator. "Most readable and reasonable. We can recommend it warmly."—New Statesman. "This intriguing little book."—Connoisseur.

### JUST PUBLISHED

Apella, or the Future of the Jews. By

A QUARTERLY REVIEWER.

"Cogent, because of brevity and a magnificent prose style, this book wins our quiet praise. It is a fine pamphlet, adding to the value of the series, and should not be missed."

—Spectator. "A notable addition to this excellent series. His arguments are a provocation to fruitful thinking."—Morning Post.

The Dance of Civa, or Life's Unity and

Rhythm. By Collum.

"It has substance and thought in it. The author is very much alive and responsive to the movements of to-day which seek to unite the best thought of East and West, and discusses Mussolini and Jagadis Bose with perspicacity."—Spectator.

Lars Porsena, or the Future of Swearing and Improper Language. By ROBERT

GRAVES.

"It is to this subject [of swearing] that Mr. Graves brings much erudition and not a little irony."—John O'London's Weekly. "Not for squeamish readers."—Spectator. "Too outspoken. The writer sails very near the wind, but all the same has some sound constructive things to say."—Manchester Dispatch.

Socrates, or the Emancipation of Man-

kind. By H. F. CARLILL.

Sets out the new view of the nature of man, to which the trend of modern psychology, anthropology, and evolutionary theory has led, shows the important consequences to human behaviour and efficiency which are bound to follow, and maintains that man is at last conscious of his power to control his biological inheritance.

Delphos, or the Future of International Language. By E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

An inquiry into the possibility of a medium of inter-communication, auxiliary to the mother tongues. A survey of past attempts from the sixteenth century to the present day. A prophecy of the coming interlanguage, its form, its social and cultural utility, and its influence on world peace.

Gallio, or the Tyranny of Science. By J. W. N. Sullivan, author of "A History of Mathematics."

Is the scientific universe the real universe? What is the character of the universe revealed by modern science? Are values inherent in reality? What is the function of the arts? In addition to answering these questions, the author attacks the notion that science is materialistic.

Apollonius. or the Future of Psychical Research. By E. N. BENNETT, author of "Problems of Village Life," etc.

An attempt to summarize the results secured by the scientific treatment of psychical phenomena, to forecast the future developments of such research, and to answer the familiar question "What is the good of it all?"

[14]

### NEARLY READY

Janus, or the Conquest of War. By WILLIAM McDougall, M.B., F.R.S., Professor of Psychology, Harvard University, author of "The Group Mind," etc.

A volume of fundamental importance to all those who would avoid future wars. Sections are devoted to lessons of the Great War, the Causes of War, Preventives of War, League to Enforce Peace, and International Air Force as a Prevention of War.

Rusticus, or the Future of the Countryside. By MARTIN S. BRIGGS, F.R.I.B.A., author of "A Short History of the Building Crafts," etc.

Attributes much of the blame for the desecration of our countryside to the petrol engine, though he recognizes other contributory causes. He attempts to analyse the charm of our counties before the Industrial Revolution and shows how that movement influenced their aspect. Finally he surveys the future, making practical suggestions to avoid further 'uglification.'

Aeolus, or the Future of the Flying Machine. By OLIVER STEWART, author of "Strategy and Tactics of Air Fighting."

A picture of the air-vehicle and air-battleship of the future, painted with colours from the aeronautical research work of to-day. The author foresees that the flying machine will resist mass production. Aircraft will be exalted as individual creations of the Artist-Scientist rather than debased as tools of the Commercialist.

## TO BAY AND TO-MORROW

Stentor, or the Future of the Press. By DAVID OCKHAM.

Shows how since the War the control of the Press has passed into the hands of only five men. The law is powerless, even if willing, to check this justification. Now that independent organs of opinion are almost eliminated, the author discusses the danger to the community unless the Public is made aware of the personalities and policies behind the Trusts.

### IN PREPARATION

The Future of India. By T. EARLE WELBY.

An analysis of the spiritual and political future of 320 million persons in the light of present tendencies.

Mercurius, or the World on Wings. By C. THOMPSON WALKER.

A picture of the air-vehicle and the air-port of to-morrow, and the influence aircraft will have on our lives.

The Future of Films. By ERNEST BETTS.

Vulcan, or Labour To-Day and To-Morrow. By Cecil Chisholm.