

# DAILY NEWS BULLETIN

(Cable and Mail Despatches)

Issued by the

JEWISH TELEGRAPHIC AGENCY, LTD.

Ludgate House,  
107/111, Fleet Street,  
London, E.C.4.

Telegrams: Jewcorrau London.  
Telephone: Central 6501-3.

Vol. XII. No. 55.

6 pages.

6th. Mar., 1931.

NO IMMIGRATION STOPPAGE THIS YEAR IN AMERICA: 90 PER CENT. QUOTA  
CUT BILL SHELVED TILL DECEMBER: SENATE RISES WITHOUT DEALING  
WITH BILL.

Washington, Mar. 4th. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

The bill to cut down immigration to the United States to ten per cent. of the existing quotas, which was passed by the House of Representatives on Monday by 295 votes against 86, has been shelved till December, the Senate rising to-day for the end of the session, without considering the bill (as was suggested possible in the J.T.A. Bulletin of the 4th. inst.). The next session of Congress does not begin till December 4th.

EINSTEIN LEAVES AMERICA: HOPE YOUR VISIT HAS SATISFIED YOU AS  
AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE GRATIFIED WITH YOU PRESIDENT HOOVER'S  
MESSAGE READS: EINSTEIN'S FAREWELL SPEECH BROADCAST ALL OVER  
COUNTRY: LISTENING-IN GATHERINGS ARRANGED IN PUBLIC HALLS IN  
MANY TOWNS: PALESTINE TAKEN AS SUBJECT OF HIS SPEECH: CRISIS  
HAS TAUGHT US PALESTINE IS NOT A BRITISH PROBLEM HE SAYS: IT  
IS OUR PROBLEM TO BRING ABOUT SATISFACTORY CO-OPERATION WITH  
ARABS: MACDONALD LETTER DOES NOT SOLVE PALESTINE PROBLEM SAYS  
MR. FELIX WARBURG PRESIDING AT FAREWELL DINNER WHICH SIMUL-  
TANEOUSLY MARKS OPENING OF JEWISH AGENCY CAMPAIGN FOR PALES-  
TINE FUNDS: DRIVES IN MANY CITIES STARTED AT SOUND OF PRO-  
FESSOR EINSTEIN'S SPEECH OVER WIRELESS TO LISTENING-IN PARTIES.

New York, Mar. 4th. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

Professor Albert Einstein sailed at midnight from New York on board the "Deutschland" for Cherbourg after having spoken on Palestine at a big banquet held in his honour at the Astor Hotel, at which the 2½ million dollar campaign for the work of the Jewish Agency in Palestine was launched. Professor Einstein came to New York direct from Pasadena to be present at the banquet, and at its close he went from the banquet hall straight to the steamer. The dinner was arranged by Mr. Felix M. Warburg, Mr. Morris Rothenberg, Dr. Cyrus Adler, Lieut.-Governor Herbert H. Lehman, Rabbi Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Judge Julian W. Mack, Mr. James Marshall, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Dr. Lee K. Frankel, Mr. Nathan Straus, Jr., Dr. Solomon Lowenstein, Mr. Joseph C. Hyman, and other officers of the American Palestine Campaign.

A thousand guests from all parts of the country were present at the dinner, each paying 100 dollars, and altogether over 200,000 dollars were raised at the dinner towards the 2½ million dollar campaign.

President Hoover sent a telegram expressing to Professor Einstein his admiration "for your distinguished services to mankind. I hope your visit", he added, "has satisfied you as the American people are gratified with you".

Professor Einstein's speech was broadcast by 44 stations, and in many towns all over the country special listening-in parties were organised in big halls, the local drives for the Palestine campaign being started there at the sound of Professor Einstein's voice coming over the wireless.

The last Palestine crisis taught us, Professor Einstein said in his address, that Palestine is not a British problem. It is our problem to bring about a satisfactory co-operation of Jews with the Arabs. The Jews and the Arabs must themselves agree upon a course adapted to the needs of both peoples.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's letter to Dr. Weizmann does not solve the Palestine problem, Mr. Felix M. Warburg, who was in the chair, said, but it has obliterated the unfriendly and unjust impression created by the Passfield White Paper. There is still much to be cleared up, he went on. It remains to be seen whether our hopes regarding a friendly Palestine Administration will work out.

Speeches were also delivered by Rabbi Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Mr. Morris Rothenberg, Dr. Cyrus Adler and Mr. Robert Szold.

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY REPORTED GOING TO PALESTINE: WHY WAS HIS PROJECTED VISIT TWO YEARS AGO ABANDONED? SUGGESTION THAT VATICAN OBJECTED: WOULD BE FIRST VISIT BY PRIMATE OF ANGLICAN CHURCH TO HOLY CITY SINCE REFORMATION: STRANGE THAT PRIMATE OF CHURCH OF ENGLAND SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO VISIT TERRITORY UNDER BRITISH MANDATE "TELEGRAPH" COMMENTED POINTING TO INCIDENT AS ANOTHER ILLUSTRATION OF DISTRUST HOLDING UP EXECUTION OF ARTICLE 14 OF PALESTINE MANDATE CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF HOLY PLACES COMMISSION: ARCHBISHOP'S OFFICIAL STATEMENT THAT VISIT WAS ABANDONED ONLY FOR PRIVATE REASONS.

London, Mar. 5th. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Cosmo Gordon Lang, is going on a visit to Palestine at Easter with his friend Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, the American millionaire, who is now on his way to London to meet the Archbishop, it is announced here to-day. They are to go to Palestine in Mr. Morgan's yacht "Corsair", it is added.

About two years ago, in March 1929, it was similarly announced that the Archbishop of Canterbury was leaving in Mr. Pierpont Morgan's yacht, the "Corsair", on a Mediterranean trip, during which he would visit the dignitaries of the Eastern Churches at Jerusalem and Athens, and possibly Alexandria. Sir John Chancellor, the High Commissioner for Palestine, it was added, had arranged a reception in Jerusalem in honour of the Archbishop.

A few days later it was reported that the Archbishop of Canterbury had abandoned his intention to visit Palestine during his Mediterranean cruise, following an intimation that such a visit was viewed with much misgiving by the Vatican. Representations received by the Vatican, the "Daily Telegraph" stated, indicated that the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, Monsignore Barlassina, was much disturbed at the prospect of the Holy City being visited for the first time since the Reformation by the Primate of the Anglican Church. His apprehensions arose to a considerable extent out of the close understanding which now exists between the Anglican Communion and the various Orthodox Churches of the East. The Roman Catholic objections, the "Daily Telegraph" said, are not altogether unexpected, for nothing in Jerusalem is the object of more jealous vigilance than the status quo maintained among the various religious bodies claiming rights in the Holy City. An example of this, it said, is that despite the fact that the Government of Palestine is administered under the Mandatory Powers vested in the British Government, the Church of England shares none of the privileges of using the Church of the Holy Sepulchre which are enjoyed by Greeks, Copts, Armenians, and Latins.

The Foreign Office could not have withstood the Archbishop's desire to visit the Holy City had he pressed it, the "Telegraph" added, but there will probably be relief in official quarters that by his tactful recognition of the delicacy of the position, His Grace has avoided an embarrassing situation.

It is strange, the "Telegraph" wrote some days later when the matter had caused a good deal of discussion, that the Primate of All England should have to refrain from a visit to the heads of the Churches with which his own is in close relationship because of the susceptibilities of another Church with which it is not in communion, more especially when the proposed visit was to a territory under British administration. The incident, it said, is only another manifestation of the local spirit of mutual distrust and hostility, which since 1921 has prevented the establishment of the International Commission on Holy Places, which under the terms of the Mandate should have enquired into the best means of preserving the Holy Places of Palestine.

Reports from Rome denied that the Archbishop had abandoned his visit to Jerusalem as a result of an intimation that such a visit was regarded with misgiving in the Vatican. No official representations, it was said, had been made by the Vatican either through the British Legation to the Holy See or by any direct means. Objection to the visit appeared to have been raised by the Latin Patriarch in Jerusalem, who sent a memorandum to the Vatican upon hearing that the Archbishop was journeying to the Holy City. The inopportuneness of the visit was the subject of the memorandum, and according to one source, the Latin Patriarch's view was communicated to London, whereupon Dr. Lang decided to postpone his visit to a more favourable moment.

An official statement was finally issued in London from Lambeth Palace, the official residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, stating that the Archbishop would not be able to visit Jerusalem during his cruise, owing to the fact that his host, Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, had been unexpectedly detained in Paris by the work of the Reparations Commission. In view of certain statements which had recently appeared, it was added, the Archbishop wishes it to be known that this is the only reason why he is unable to fulfil his original plan.

JEWS RIGHTS AT WALLING WALL: LECTURER AT HEBREW UNIVERSITY IN  
JERUSALEM REFUSED TO FURNISH MATERIAL TO SUPPORT JEWISH  
CASE BEFORE WALLING WALL COMMISSION: I CONSIDER JEWS ENGAGING  
IN TRIAL OVER WALLING WALL A GREAT MISFORTUNE HE EXPLAINS:  
WALLING WALL QUESTION CANNOT BE SETTLED THROUGH HEARING BEFORE  
THIRD PARTY.

Jerusalem, Mar. 3rd. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

A Lecturer of the Hebrew University refused, "on principle", to furnish the Jewish Counsel Before the International Walling Wall Commission of the League of Nations with material necessary to support their case, Mr. A. Babkov, an old Zionist living in Tel Aviv, declared in an open letter published in the "Doar Hayom", addressed to Dr. David Yellin and Mr. Ben-Zvi, members of the Commission which drew up the Jewish brief. Mr. Babkov demanded an explanation why the fact of the Lecturer's refusal to co-operate was suppressed, and whether anything was done in the matter.

The Lecturer in question is Dr. Gershon Sholem, an authority on Kabala literature, who according to Mr. Babkov declined to compile a list of Kabala references to the Walling Wall. Certain that there had been a misunderstanding, Mr. Babkov said, Dr. Yellin as the head of the Commission, personally applied to Dr. Sholem and was given a curt refusal. Mr. Ben-Zvi then saw him, but was told by Dr. Sholem that he was opposed on principle to the Jewish representations concerning the Walling Wall.

Mr. Ben-Zvi informed the Jewish Telegraphic Agency that Mr. Babkov's statement is substantially true and that, moreover, the Arab Counsel before the Walling Wall Commission were furnished by the Hebrew University Library with books and documents to prepare their case against the Jews. Mr. Ben-Zvi said that he found no fault with the Library authorities for placing their collection at the service of the Moslem side, this being the function of a Library, but he failed to understand why the same courtesy was not extended to the Jewish side.

I have considered and still consider it a great misfortune to Jewry that Jews should engage in a trial over the Wailing Wall, Dr. Sholem has now replied in the "Dear Hayom", and I reserved the elementary right to myself as a private conscientious person to abstain from the active participation which was required of me, in steps which I deemed damaging and destructive. In my modest opinion, the Wailing Wall question cannot be settled through a hearing before a third party. My attitude towards furnishing documents in the Wailing Wall question was that of the Chief Rabbinate for Palestine, as recorded in the Shaw Commission Report.

Dr. Sholem further declares that he was never asked for the loan of books in his private collection or in that of the Library. The Jewish Counsel were free to obtain, he says, and undoubtedly they did obtain without hindrance, any books in the library they required, and in the one case when a research worker had applied to him for a book, he had supplied it. The Commission did not apply to him, Dr. Sholem adds, as a Lecturer of the Hebrew University, but had asked him, in his private capacity, to join in the scholarly side of the investigation for political and legal purposes. This he had declined to do, as he had explained to Dr. Yellin at the time, because of his objections to the entire procedure.

BUNDIST LEADER ABRAMOVITCH WAS IN MOSCOW IN JULY 1928 DESPITE HIS DENIAL FOUR OF THE ACCUSED IN MOSCOW MENSHEVIK TRIAL DECLARE: INSTEAD OF SENDING DENIAL HE SHOULD HAVE COME HERE TO GIVE EVIDENCE BEFORE THIS COURT ONE OF THEM SAYS.

Moscow, Mar. 4th. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

Abramovitch's alleged visit to Moscow in July 1928 (which he has denied in Berlin on oath) was described circumstantially at to-day's hearing of the big Menshevik trial by four of the accused, Grohman, Sher, Ginsberg and Zalkind, three of whom (Sher is the exception) are Jews. Abramovitch's visit to Moscow, they said, was made chiefly for the purpose of inaugurating a campaign for disorganization and sabotage in the Government offices, particularly among the responsible expert workers.

Sher said that Abramovitch had not expected to find much interest in Menshevism among the workers, and he had therefore ordered the Russian members of the Menshevik party to concentrate all their efforts on the higher professional and intellectual classes. Sher said that Abramovitch had definitely settled the status of the Russian Menshevik group by changing its name from that of Central Committee of the Menshevik Party of Russia to the Soyuznoye Bureau, which he thought more appropriate in view of the fact that the real heads of the Menshevik activity were living abroad. Sher also said that Abramovitch had been in favour of foreign intervention and had ordered the Russian Mensheviks to accept the intervention programme. Sher, Ginsberg and Zalkind all said that Abramovitch had expected foreign intervention, and was for the acceptance of intervention, even if it was to be accompanied by acts of war on Soviet territory. Abramovitch, they said, had believed that intervention was inevitable, because the Communist International had so antagonised the Second International that it had found itself forced into the camp of those parties which are calling for intervention against the Soviet regime.

When Krylenko, the State Prosecutor, read out at the hearing to-night a telegram signed by Abramovitch, declaring that he had never visited Russia since he had left the country in 1920, and stating that he had made a sworn declaration to this effect in a German court of law, there was a good deal of merriment among the accused and some expression also of resentment.

Ginsberg, summing up the position for the accused, said very dramatically that Abramovitch would have done better if he had offered to come to Russia to give evidence before the proletarian court instead of making statements to a bourgeois law court abroad.

6/3/31.

JEWS HAVE NO REDRESS AGAINST ANTISEMITIC LIBELS BECAUSE THEY ARE COLLECTIVE COMMUNITY BUT STEELHELM BRIGADE WITH MEMBERSHIP TWICE AS LARGE AS NUMBER OF JEWS IN GERMANY CAN TAKE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST NEWSPAPER WRITING SOMETHING WHICH STEELHELM CONSIDERS AN INSULT.

Berlin, Mar. 3rd. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

Dr. Theodor Wolff, the editor-in-chief of the "Berliner Tageblatt", recently drew attention to a number of decisions by German courts of law, particularly by the Reichsgericht, the Supreme Court sitting in Leipzig, to the effect that Jews being a collective community cannot bring an action for libel against antisemitic newspapers or agitators, even when the allegations are of a most serious character, causing incitement among the population and likely to lead to violent anti-Jewish outbreaks. Dr. Wolf quoted in this connection a leaflet which was being circulated in large quantities in Witten and Hirschberg; in Silesia, alleging that Jews were systematically corrupting Christian girls, and spreading venereal disease among them as part of a calculated plot to exterminate the Christian population.

The Jews are told that they cannot bring a libel action because they are a collective community, but the Nationalist Steelhelm Brigade, which numbers about a million members, twice the number of the entire Jewish population of Germany, has brought libel actions and its right to do so has been upheld by the German courts, Advocate Dr. Max Hirschberg now writes in the "Berliner Tageblatt".

A Munich newspaper for which I was briefed, he writes, published a report at the time of the Steelhelm Conference in Munich that a wreath which had been deposited at the War Memorial outside the Army Museum by the Republican Organisation, the Banner of the Republic, had been removed by the Steelhelm. Colonel von Lenz, the leader of the Bavarian Steelhelm, thereupon brought an action for libel against the paper, on the ground that as a member of the Steelhelm he had been insulted by this allegation brought against his Organisation. The Supreme Court, in finding in his favour, ruled that it was not necessary to prove that the libel had been made against the particular individual bringing the action, since as a member of the Steelhelm he was included in any reference to the collective group of persons making up the Steelhelm, and he could bring his libel action, therefore, even if he was not expressly mentioned by name.

THE PART OF JEWS IN THE CAMPAIGN FOR PUBLIC MORALITY: AS REPRESENTATIVE OF PEOPLE WHO FURNISHED FIRST MORAL CRUSADERS IN HISTORY I AM ONLY TOO HAPPY TO CO-OPERATE IN THIS WORK CHIEF RABBI SAYS AT MEETING OF PUBLIC MORALITY COUNCIL.

London, Mar. 5th. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

Needless to say that I, a representative of the people that furnished the first moral crusaders in history, am only too happy to co-operate in this work, and to call upon my brethren to support to the utmost of their power the aims and ideals, the undertakings and endeavours of the Public Morality Council, the Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, said speaking yesterday at the Guildhall at a meeting in support of the Public Morality Council, among the other speakers being the Bishop of London, the Duchess of Atholl, and Lord Dickinson.

The Council is common ground, the Chief Rabbi said, on which all Churches can meet and join hands in an organised effort to preserve the moral sanity of the present generation.

The need for an insistence that there are moral standards long antedates the Great War, the Chief Rabbi went on. The nineteenth century widely heralded the discovery that men came from the beast; and very soon after that discovery, many of the literary and artistic leaders took it upon themselves to convince us that it was only natural for us to return to the beast. A powerful paganism began its assault against the ancient organised morality. It dethroned God in the sphere of human conduct, derided all moral inhibitions, and declared instinct and inclination to be the true guides to human happiness. The twentieth century is continuing the instruction begun in the nineteenth. The so-called new psychology preaches repression of instincts to be a danger to personality; and it regards as natural the unbridled gratification of impulses which civilised mankind has always been taught should be controlled or disciplined. A new ethic has arisen, as subversive as it is godless, which bids each man, woman or child do that which seems right in his or her own eyes. It teaches that all moral laws are man made, and that all can therefore be unmade by man. There is in consequence, on every side a questioning of the sacredness of human life, a scoffing at the holiness of purity, an angry repudiation of the idea of property. In some lands this has led to social and political upheavals, resulting in immemorial human institutions being torn up by the roots. Even in English-speaking countries there is to-day an impatience with moral authority. Men deny, or at any rate doubt the reality of ethical distinctions. The pilot's stars of moral guidance seem to multitudes of men to be no longer fixed stars. And in consequence things are tolerated, extenuated, nay encouraged - in fiction, on the stage, in every-day life - that only a generation ago would have been the subject of unqualified condemnation.

Amid this spiritual confusion and moral chaos, Dr. Hertz said, it is the mission of religion to stand clear-eyed and unmoved. However, it must not only proclaim that there is an everlasting distinction between right and wrong, an absolute "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not" in human life, high above the promptings of passion, the peradventure of inclination, or the fashion of the hour - but it must educate and organise public opinion to respect moral standards and defend those moral standards against wanton desecration and public defiance. "The day is short", Dr. Hertz concluded, "the work is great and urgent, the labourers are listless though the reward is much. It is not thy duty to complete the work, but neither art thou free altogether to desist from it".

GROUPING JEWISH PRISONERS TOGETHER IN ONE OR MORE PRISONS TO MAKE POSSIBLE RELIGIOUS SERVICES SUGGESTED IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: RELIGIOUS MINISTRATIONS ARE PROVIDED IN CONSULTATION WITH JEWISH AUTHORITIES HOME SECRETARY REPLIES AND IF DIFFICULTIES AROSE HE WOULD CONFER WITH JEWISH AUTHORITIES ON MATTER.

London, Mar. 5th. (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).

Are any religious ministrations or synagogue services provided for Jewish prisoners in His Majesty's prisons generally, and if not, could prisoners of Jewish faith be grouped in one or more prisons so as to allow of such services to be rendered at a minimum cost to the State, Sir Bertram Falle Conservative member for Portsmouth, suggested in the House of Commons this afternoon.

By arrangement made in consultation with the Jewish authorities, Mr. Clynes, the Home Secretary, replied, religious ministrations are provided for Jewish prisoners. If any difficulties arose he would be glad to confer with the Jewish authorities in the matter. In the general circumstances, he explained, prisoners of Jewish faith are included in age groupings in the general scheme of classification for treatment.

(NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNLESS BY PREVIOUS ARRANGEMENT).