CONTENTS

PART I

1881–1918

ZIONISM IDEOLOGY & PRAXIS

I THE EMERGENCE OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

"At Basel I founded the Jewish state," wrote Theodor Herzl in his diary after the First Zionist Congress in 1897. "If I said this out loud today, I would be greeted by universal laughter. In five years, perhaps, and certainly in fifty years, everyone will perceive it."[1] In fact, fifty-one years intervened between that first congress and the State of Israel's Declaration of Independence on May 14, 1948. What began as an evanescent movement whose most ardent supporters never believed that the objective of Jewish sovereignty in Palestine would be achieved in their lifetime became a real national movement that shaped a society and nation and built a state.

The Zionist movement was born amid stormy controversy that attends it to this day, although the focus of contention varies. What *was* Zionism, anyway? A renaissance movement directed toward reshaping the Jews, Jewish society, Jewish culture? A colonization movement aiming to establish a Jewish territorial entity that would grant the Jews what other peoples had: a homeland where they could find refuge? A spiritual or political movement? Could Zionism resolve the question of Jewish identity in an era of rising secularization and acculturation, with religion no longer able to save the Jews from atomization? Could it relieve the Jewish existential anxiety that had been on the rise since the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when a racism-oriented antisemitism emerged that for the first time in history refused Jews the option of conversion as an escape from the Jewish fate? These questions, which attended the internal Zionist disputes from the beginning and were posed by the movement's own adherents, bore fateful implications for Zionism's character and development, its strengths and weaknesses.

At the same time, another controversy raged around the Zionist movement, fomented by its adversaries, who held up a mirror that revealed Zionism's every weakness, each ideological and practical flaw. In 1881 Dr. Yehuda Leib Pinsker published a pamphlet titled *Auto-Emancipation.* Writing in the wake of the wave of pogroms that engulfed the Jews in the Tsarist Empire's Pale of Settlement (known as *Suffot Banegev,* Storms in Southern Russia), Pinsker analyzed antisemitism in depth and concluded by calling for the establishment of a Jewish homeland: a place where Jews, no longer a minority among the gentiles, would live not as guests, but as masters. The possession of a territory where Jews were masters of their own destiny would radically change the twisted relations that had existed for generations between Jews and the peoples they had lived among.

This modest pamphlet, published in German and later translated into Hebrew and other languages, sparked a public debate. The opponents of Pinsker's idea had a range of objections. Was the idea workable? If so, how much time would be needed to establish this independent or autonomous Jewish entity? We can assume that it will take several centuries, asserted Adolph Landau, editor of the Jewish Russian-language newspaper *Voskhod.* But in the meantime the world is marching forward, and it would make far more sense to devote our efforts to establishing a liberal and enlightened society in Europe that will accept the Jews as members with equal rights, instead of wasting those efforts on some remote corner of the Middle East or elsewhere, where no one can guarantee their long-term safety and grant them the peace and tranquility they seek. In contrast with the notion of isolating Jews from European society, Landau propounded the ideal of enlightenment and modernism, an optimistic picture of an ever-improving world. Jewish salvation would be part of this general progressive movement, he contended, and temporary reversals of the march of progress should not overshadow the great, decisive shift that was occurring.[2]

Though this debate was protean, the fundamental question it raised did not change from the earliest days of the Zionist idea: would Jewish salvation come about as a result of a universal realignment—through either the triumph of liberalism and democracy or the victory of the communist revolution that would redeem the world—or would it require a specific Jewish initiative, separate from the great global one? One element of the debate involved questioning the feasibility of the Zionist enterprise, since the Ottoman regime opposed the immigration of Jews and their settlement in Palestine. Palestine was not an empty country; some half a million Arabs lived there. What would the Zionists do with them? Force them out, or allow them to remain? Would they be declared aliens in their own homeland? And if the Zionists did not discriminate between them and the new immigrants, who could guarantee that in time the Jews would not become a minority in their own country and find themselves once again in the situation they had sought to escape?

While the liberal Jews posed questions of feasibility, the Jewish revolutionaries raised moral issues: let us assume, they said, that contrary to probability the Jews succeed in putting down stakes in that impoverished, economically backward country with no natural resources and without the capacity to absorb millions of immigrants. Would it be morally justifiable to transform the Arabs from masters of the land into a minority?[3]

The anti-Zionist discourse did not embrace only the issue of what was possible and desirable; it also included the religious aspect. Pinsker, and later Herzl, did not suggest Palestine as the only possible location of the proposed Jewish state, but they did mention it. However, from the moment the idea took shape, it was

connected in the minds of the Jewish masses to one country alone: the Land of Israel they had prayed for and dreamed of, even if they had not attempted to return and settle there. The idea of return to the motherland was intrinsic to Zionist ideology. Its critics contended that the connection with the Land of Israel was based upon religious myth, and that a secular Jew should not embrace the notions of the sanctity of the land, of "renewing our days as of old," and other such ideas originating in the Jewish faith. To ultra-Orthodox Jews, on the other hand, the idea of Jews returning to their homeland flew in the face of the fate decreed for them. To them such an act ran counter to the three oaths the Jewish people swore to the Almighty: not to storm the wall, not to rush the End, and not to rebel against the nations of the world, while the Almighty adjured the nations of the world not to destroy the Jewish people.[4] They saw an attempt to bring about redemption by natural, man-made means as rebelling against divine decrees, as Jews taking their fate into their own hands and not waiting for the coming of the Messiah. Consequently ultra-Orthodox Jews vehemently opposed this perilous heresy.

Opposition to Zionism therefore unified many and varied groups: ultra-Orthodox and assimilationists, revolutionaries and capitalists, dreamers and pragmatists. There were those who opposed the idea because they believed that a better solution to "the Jewish problem" could be found within a more universal framework. Other opponents were concerned for their status as citizens with equal rights in the countries where they lived. Still others thought Zionism either too revolutionary or excessively conservative.

THE JEWISH ENLIGHTENMENT

Although the Jews customarily mentioned Jerusalem and their hopes of returning there in their prayers three times a day, they did not tend toward taking any initiative that might change their existential situation, which had lasted for centuries. The vast majority of the Jewish people lived in Europe and accepted the reality of occasional outbreaks of violence, humiliation, and discrimination. What, then, changed in the nineteenth century that led to the emergence of the Zionist idea?

In the second half of the eighteenth century, modernization began to penetrate the Jewish street, as the absolutist kingdoms undermined the old European social order of a corporate society in which each corporation was autonomous and could maintain its traditional life and culture. For hundreds of years the Jews had constituted a corporation within European society and enjoyed autonomy within the *kahal* (community), a sort of lesser self-rule under which anyone could be ostracized who did not abide by accepted religious laws and the rules of social conduct. In this way the Jews preserved a clearly defined Jewish identity in accor-

dance with halakhic law and traditional social mores. The absolutist states, however, introduced a system of direct rule, invalidating the corporate bodies that mediated between them and their subjects. The authority of the *kahal* was nullified, and the structure that had preserved traditional Jewish identity—either voluntarily or through coercion—collapsed. New options opened to the Jews.

This process began in Western Europe and slowly penetrated to the east, where beginning in the early nineteenth century, a demographic revolution occurred: the Jewish population increased at a rate several times greater than the general population. In 1800 there were between 1 and 1.2 million Jews in the Russian Empire, and by the end of the century there were some five million. This tremendous natural increase created an acute problem out of what had been a marginal one: the Jews did not speak the local language and did not send their children to their country's schools. They lived mainly in Poland, Western Ukraine, and Lithuania, made a living from crafts, peddling, and trade, and suffered increasing poverty. Many sought a livelihood in the big cities, but due to increasing modernization and the beginnings of industrialization—in which they were unable to participate—they found themselves doomed there, too, to continued poverty and hopelessness. They were thus considered a noncontributing element of the population.

In 1781 (for the Jews of Bohemia) and 1782 (for those of Austria), Emperor Joseph II of Austria issued a series of Toleranzedikten (Edicts of Tolerance) that opened previously unheard-of possibilities of education and economic advancement to the Jews of the Habsburg Empire. Accordingly, the first buds of a Jewish Enlightenment movement sprouted. Among other things it strove to bring progress and what was termed "productivization" to the Jewish masses, modernizing them and turning them into useful citizens who were part of their local economy and culture. Learning the local language and secular education were the foundation stones of this movement.

In the 1860s the policies of Tsar Alexander II brought these trends into the Russian Empire as well, and secularization created an entire stratum of Jews who moved, to varying degrees, away from Jewish tradition: some upheld tradition in the home but conducted themselves as non-Jews outside it. ("Be a man abroad and a Jew in your tent," wrote Yehuda Leib Gordon, a poet of the Enlightenment period.[5]) Others, apart from minimal observance of the Jewish festivals, did not view themselves as Jews, and many converted to Christianity.

Until the early nineteenth century Jews had viewed themselves as a people, albeit a diaspora people without territory and sovereignty. In Jewish consciousness the maxim "all Jews are responsible for each other" meant far more than just religious identity. The Jewish corporation sustained the dual identity of religion and ethnicity, especially since for centuries conversion to Judaism was forbidden in the Christian and Islamic countries. The solidarity that existed among

Jewish communities in times of crisis—such as ransom of prisoners or blood libels (as in Damascus in 1840) or attempts at expulsion of Jews (such as that perpetrated by Empress Maria Theresa in Prague in December 1744) against which Jews from various countries stood together[6]—strengthened these communities' sense of closeness and of sharing a common fate. So long as the traditional identity was not undermined, the question of a disjunction between religion and nationality never arose. But once the winds of secularization began to blow, the religious connection was weakened, and questions arose regarding the character of Jewish identity: What are the Jews? Do they possess just a common religion or also a separate Jewish nationality?

The French Revolution granted the Jews equal rights on condition that they relinquish their collective identity. As Clermont-Tonnerre declared in the French National Assembly: to the Jews as individuals—everything; as a nation—nothing. That was the price the Jews had to pay for equal rights. The Napoleonic Wars broke down the barriers of European conservatism and led to the spread of nationalist consciousness and the emergence of nationalist aspirations throughout the continent. The multinational empires, such as the Habsburg and Russian Empires, found themselves under attack by national movements. In Poland, Czechoslovakia, Russia, Germany, and Italy, these began as movements of cultural renewal born of a desire to return to the nation's cultural roots, to nurture the national language, literature, music, and art. Each national culture included a connection with a version of Christianity: Russian, Ukrainian, and Serbian nationalism was linked to streams of Orthodox Christianity, whereas the Polish variety was interwoven with Catholicism.

The appearance of nationalism laid down a dual challenge to the Jews: First, should they become nationalists of the countries where they lived, or should they remain loyal to the great empires? Second, while the peoples of Europe were taking on national identities, the Jews were required to relinquish their collective identity as a prerequisite for obtaining equal rights. The borderlines of the Jewish collective, which until then had been clearly demarcated, became blurred: individual Jews now had to face their personal identity and fate, and to a great extent they could define these as they saw fit. The Jews in the Western countries enthusiastically accepted equal rights, which they saw as the key to acculturating into non-Jewish society. Many did not intend to relinquish their Jewish identity, but simply defined it differently. Thus a paradox was created whereby in an era of increasing secularization, the Jews' self-definition began to lean heavily on religion: Germans of the Jewish faith, French people of the Jewish faith, and so forth.

This self-definition created for the first time a distinction between Jewish religion and nationality. The Jews believed that emancipation, which opened before them a future of progress, including education, new occupations, and geo-

graphic, social, and economic mobility, would lead to redemption from exile, as described by Yechezkel Kaufmann, author of an analysis of Jewish political currents.[7] The drive to assimilate amounted to a movement with messianic attributes that viewed integration into the countries where Jews lived as the correct road, the redeeming direction, and it constituted the dominant trend in the first half of the nineteenth century.

During the course of that century, emancipation was completed in both Western and Central Europe, but stopped at the border of the Tsarist Empire. As a consequence of the division of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century, this empire now ruled over a large Jewish population, and throughout the nineteenth century its rulers tried both to convert the Jews, by means of edicts and pressure, and to reform them, i.e., make them more useful to the state. Attempts to make the Jews more productive included both general education and teaching them the language of the country, and under Alexander II they were given the opportunity to attend high school. Alexander was also more benign regarding Jews who lived outside the Pale of Settlement (the areas annexed by Russia from Poland where Jews were allowed to reside). But following Alexander's assassination in 1881, the pendulum swung back toward a policy of edicts and restrictions, and Jewish emancipation reached Russia only in 1917, with the February Revolution.

Thus it was not surprising that some Eastern European Jews reacted with suspicion and hostility toward their brethren who raised the banner of Enlightenment, whom they saw as government emissaries seeking to convert them. But once Jewish secular education got under way, there was no stopping it. It took time to penetrate the Jewish masses of Eastern Europe, since the majority observed Jewish tradition, but Jewish life slowly opened to external influences, and a Jewish economic elite that adopted a modern lifestyle formed in Tsarist Russia.

As noted before, the initial manifestation of nationalism across Europe was a cultural renaissance, a return to national cultural sources in the vernacular languages, the restoration of classic works in those languages, and the creation of a new Romantic cultural corpus that would give expression to the desires of the people. European nationalism saw an unbreakable bond between a people's cultural heritage and its right to political self-expression, for a cultural heritage was evidence that a people was worthy of acceptance into the family of nations. Romanticism produced an impressive burgeoning of culture, particularly in national literatures. After the Napoleonic Wars, the Russian elite embraced the language of their own people as a language of culture, and Russian literature appeared. The works of Goethe and Schiller in Germany, Mickiewicz in Poland, and many more represented communities connected by language and literature that gave expression to, and even fostered, national desires. By its very nature nationalism was a secular movement that extolled human liberty and aspirations

of self-determination. At the same time, all these national works also appropriated religious symbols.

These spiritual and political currents also permeated the Jewish communities. There were Jews who turned to the general culture of the region where they lived and embraced it. But others introduced Romanticist principles into the Jewish arena. Thus the aspiration to learn the classical sources of the national culture, in its own language, manifested itself in the creation of a secular Hebrew culture. Abraham Mapu, a Lithuanian Jew, published his historical novel *Ahavat Zion* (love of Zion) in 1853. The book, set in Jerusalem at the time of the First Temple, presented Jerusalem as an earthly, not heavenly, city. Although Mapu was far removed from informed nationalist ideas, his use of the holy tongue for this secular book was an expression of the influence of European Romanticism on the Jews, who were now open to the influences of secular culture.

Jewish Enlightenment, as manifested in literature, poetry, philosophy, grammar, and autobiography, laid the cultural foundations for Jewish nationalist ideas to flourish. The Bible, whose beauty had been cloaked by the mantle of the traditional commentaries for generations, was now brought to life by the study of grammar, so that every educated reader could understand its text. This accessibility brought the Bible into the consciousness of the educated Jewish public, where it assumed a status similar to the high status it held among Protestants. It was no longer merely the Holy Writ but a book describing the past heroics and wonders of the Jewish people. In addition, it was a book that extolled universal, lofty principles of peace and fraternity for all humankind.

Thus, while in Western and Central Europe the dominant modernizing trend was toward relinquishing Jewish collective identity, Eastern Europe moved in a different direction. There, millions of Jews lived in villages, towns, and medium-sized cities where they constituted a third or more of the population. With many Jews crowded into geographical and cultural proximity, secularization in Eastern Europe resulted not in an aspiration to become part of the general society but in a flourishing of Hebrew culture (at least in the initial stage). The Tsarist regime and the Russian masses did not view favorably the idea of Jews integrating among them. Thus, even when under Alexander II Jews were able to study in high schools and attend institutions of higher education, only a relatively small segment of the Jewish masses managed to leave the Pale of Settlement, integrate into the developing Russian capitalist economy, and become part of its emerging bourgeoisie. Repression on the one hand and secular consciousness on the other gave rise to a sense of deprivation and injustice that underlay the newly awakened nationalistic ideas.

The modernization of Jewish life undermined the traditional worldview and the perception of space, and expanded the gamut of possibilities. The appear-

ance of modern newspapers in all the Jewish languages turned what was happening in one Jewish community into information that agitated and excited other communities. Thus, for example, Suffot Banegev, the wave of pogroms that struck southern Russia in 1881, became a seminal event, discussed throughout the Jewish world. The problem of the Jewish refugees who fled the pogroms became a central issue on the Jewish agenda throughout Europe. It is impossible to comprehend the impact of the shock of the Kishinev pogrom in 1903 without the world's Jewish newspaper reports on it—despite the tsar's censorship. Debates on the Jewish problem, i.e., the future of the Jewish people, were a leading topic in the Hebrew-language and Russian-Jewish journals.

The appearance of the locomotive and the steamship made long-distance travel safer, more comfortable, and relatively inexpensive. One's birthplace suddenly ceased to define one's identity: one could decide to migrate from a small town or village to a medium-sized town, or even to a big city such as Warsaw (home to the largest Jewish community in Europe), or try to cross the border into Galicia, ruled by Emperor Franz Josef (from the Jews' perspective, a benign ruler). The more daring and resourceful crossed the border into Germany, where a wide range of possibilities was open: remain in the German Empire, immigrate to England, or sail to the United States, Argentina, or South Africa. Still others traveled by train or by boat on the Dnieper to Odessa, and thence sailed for Palestine; or they reached Trieste, the Habsburg Empire port of exit for Palestine. At the end of the nineteenth century, migration from the provinces to the center of a country, from one country to another, and even to a different continent, was a distinct option.

The many possibilities now open to Jews, including the choice of way of life, language, conduct, culture, and identity, weakened the connection to their birthplace, local culture, accepted customs, and religion. Many Jews now adopted the national identity of the country where they lived and, seeing their connection with it as a sacred alliance, willingly went off to fight in national wars of liberation. Consequently the various Jewish communities moved apart, separated by their ways of life, accepted behavioral norms, and cultures. Distinctions arose between Western and Central European Jews and their Eastern European brethren, and among Russian, German, and English speakers. Yiddish was still the language that bound all the Ashkenazi communities together, but many members of the second generation after integration viewed it as a low, shaming language that cultured people should not use.

This same period saw the appearance of global Jewish organizations that viewed protecting the Jews and their advance toward modernization as a worthy cause. For example, Alliance Israélite Universelle[8] sought to disseminate French culture among Middle Eastern and North African Jews while at the same time

working to protect Jews and help them move toward modernization and productivization. In 1870 Alliance founded the Mikve Yisrael Agricultural School to educate Jewish children in Palestine to work the land. The German Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden[9] organization had a similar aim—to establish a German-language education system in Palestine. The Jewish Colonization Association[10] sought to settle Jews on land in Argentina and elsewhere, while the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee ("the Joint")[11] also sought to aid Jews in distressed areas and encourage productivization.

Side by side with these centrifugal trends of modernity and emancipation, there existed an opposing trend: the Jewish press created an international community that was exposed to the same information, enthused over the same events, and identified with the Jewish masses even when they lived in communities that were strangers to one another in language and culture alike.

SETBACK AND BETRAYAL

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the positive trends that had led to belief in the power of education to bring progress and prosperity to human society and eradicate prejudice, discrimination, and injustice were arrested. In 1881, Alexander II was assassinated by revolutionaries who sought to topple his autocratic regime. Among the plotters were Jews, both men and women. This event opened a new period: not only did Jews act in concert with non-Jewish revolutionaries, but young Jewish women who had recently broken free of traditional culture cooperated with men and non-Jews. Such was the outcome of Alexander II's educational reforms, with Jewish and non-Jewish students finding a common language in the lofty hopes of world reform and the building of a new society in which a person's religion would no longer be a criterion for inclusion.

The tsar's assassination sent shock waves throughout the Russian Empire, as well as a spate of pogroms in Ukraine. The Church and the government made no effort to rein in the mob, and Jews suspected both of collaborating with the rioters. While the damage was mainly to property, the shock was great: mass rioting against Jews had not occurred in Eastern Europe during the previous century. The assumption had been that the strengthening of the absolutist state ensured public order and security. Now it suddenly appeared that, whereas in most of Europe and in America the Jews were citizens with equal rights, the Russian masses could still go on the rampage while the government either stood passively by or was itself involved in the rioting.

The pogroms not only undermined the Jews' sense of security but also shook their faith in progress, for the Russian revolutionaries did not rush to the Jews' defense. These revolutionaries considered the indifference displayed by the Russian masses toward revolutionary propaganda and their own oppression to be the

main stumbling block on the road to revolution. They saw the uprising against the Jews as an expression of the masses' fury, heralding the change in consciousness that would lead those masses to rise up and bring about the downfall of the regime. It was the enlightened, educated elements of the Jewish population who were hurt most by this reaction; they had believed in the Russian revolutionaries' solidarity with them, and now they perceived that they stood not on solid ground at all, but on quicksand.

This betrayal recurred several times during the period leading up to World War One, during the Kishinev pogrom of 1903 and the October 1905 pogroms that erupted after the failure of the first Russian Revolution. Each wave of pogroms was worse than the previous in its brutality, the number of victims, and the scope of the damage. And in each case the same local government weakness or indifference and failure to arouse enlightened public opinion in Russia against the pogroms was repeated. Moreover, after Suffot Banegev came what was known as the "Cold Pogrom," or what the regime termed the 1882 May Laws, which restricted Jewish residence to the Pale of Settlement and reduced Jews' access to higher education and the chance to become more productive and engage in agriculture. The regime justified these decrees by claiming that the pogroms were a response to Jewish exploitation of the masses.

The likelihood of equal rights for Russian Jewry now receded further into the distance, with a twofold effect. First, the loss of existential security had an impact not only on communities that had suffered pogroms, but also on relations between Jews and the authorities in general. Despairing of any possibility to improve their lot, the Jewish masses tried to leave Russia. In the years leading up to World War One, millions of Jews, no longer prepared to accept their fate, migrated from Eastern Europe seeking to build a new life for themselves. The vast majority immigrated to the United States, the land of unlimited opportunities. Some moved from Eastern to Western Europe, to Germany or England, while others went to South America and South Africa. And tens of thousands went to Palestine.

The second effect was the radicalization of the Jewish masses, which stemmed from three factors: a sense of being deprived and discriminated against by the authorities; a new self-awareness that came with increased exposure to the larger world; and the increasing trend of secularization in the Jewish street, in accordance with the contemporary zeitgeist. The Russian revolutionaries of the last third of the nineteenth century were idealistic, educated young people who chose to sacrifice their lives in the struggle to liberate the masses and establish a just society. These young men and women, who "went to the people" seeking to arouse hundreds of thousands of oppressed peasants to awareness of their wretched situation and its injustice, encountered not merely indifference but also

hostility from those they hoped to redeem—who instead handed them over to the authorities. Their ultimate fate was long years of incarceration, expulsion to Siberia, madness, and death.

This martyrdom took on mythical proportions for generations of revolutionaries, Jews and non-Jews alike. The example set by Russian youth was taken to heart by Jewish young people who smarted under the discrimination and disadvantages they suffered and also sought a lofty ideal—to reform the world in the image of the kingdom of heaven. Some joined the Russian revolutionary movements and displayed no interest in the fate of the Jews; these included Leon Trotsky (né Bronstein) and Yuli Martov (né Zederbaum), who left their mark on Russian history. Others tried to organize a Jewish workers' movement. In 1897 they founded the Bund, a Jewish-Marxist party that fought to protect Jewish workers from exploitation by their employers, most of whom were Jews themselves. Built on clearly popular foundations, the Bund successfully engaged the lower classes. Another section of Jewish youth, also affected by the mythology of the Russian revolutionary martyrs, despaired of attaining justice for Jews in any country they lived in and chose to reform Jewish society in a country that would be their own. These were students, who founded the Am Olam (eternal people) movement, which chose to settle in the United States, and the Bilu (an acronym for *Beit Ya'akov Lekhu Venelkha*, "House of Jacob, Let Us Go [Up]") association, which aimed to establish a colony in Palestine. They were followed by various other Zionist-socialist groups.

A NEW JEWISH NATIONALISM

As the Jews' security in Eastern Europe was increasingly undermined, modern antisemitism made its appearance in Western Europe. Hatred of Jews was not new, but this time it was marked by racism and determinism: its object was not the Jewish religion but the Jewish race. Religion can be changed; race cannot. In an era of rising secularization, religious hatred might seem to be a thing of the past, but racial hatred was modern and up to date: it spoke in the language of scientific Darwinism.

The old hatred of Jews had been aimed at the alien, different Jew, whereas antisemitism targeted the Jew who looked like anyone else, who spoke the local language, whose appearance and behavior was middle class, who took part in and even created national culture. Antisemites accused the Jews of causing all of capitalist society's ills, inciting to revolution, and undermining the existing order. They pictured the Jews as parasites, incapable of establishing a society or culture of their own, who rode on the backs of other peoples and copied or perverted their cultures. Since Jews were unable to truly integrate into a culture, their cultural creations were artificial, neither authentic nor original.

Traditionally observant Jews perceived the old hatred of Jews as part of the accepted world order that would not change until the coming of the Messiah, a decree that must be accepted and endured. The new antisemitism injured Jews who believed that they were part of the people they lived among, with equal rights and obligations—that there was no longer a Jewish "community." Now they found themselves all lumped together under the infamous appellation "Jew." As Yechezkel Kaufmann writes, the redemption from alienation that the Jews had yearned for and expected with their integration into society was now revealed as a fata morgana. Constitutional equality did not bring about social integration, and certainly not recognition by the Germans or French that the Jews were an organic part of their nations. In his memoirs, Gershom Scholem describes the Jews' varying reactions to the emergence of antisemitism. Some chose to ignore it; thus Scholem's father felt that to all intents and purposes he was German, even when he was forced to leave the clubs he belonged to due to increasing opposition to Jewish membership. One of Scholem's brothers remained a German patriot to his dying day, contending that Hitler would not decide whether or not he was a German. Another brother was a communist and perished in the Buchenwald concentration camp, while Gerhard, who was to become Gershom, turned to Zionism.[12]

Like other nationalist movements, Jewish nationalism was formed out of a new self-esteem, born of exposure to modernity, and a new social sensitivity, resulting from a secular education. Rejection by the dominant nationalism profoundly wounded these modern, secular Jews. Ernest Gellner links the formation of nationalist movements with the growth in the number of educated people, the greater mobility of people, goods, beliefs, and propaganda that accompanies industrialization, and the frustration born of unfulfilled expectations of integration into society. The creation of an intelligentsia in such a rejected ethnic group was the first step in the development of such a movement, which could then disseminate its message through improved means of communication. A similar process can be seen among the Jews: what previous centuries saw as instinctive identification with "Jewry," with no national awareness or aspirations to give political voice to Jews' feelings, now became a national consciousness.

In contrast to the dominant trends in nineteenth-century Jewish society, the nationalist movement demanded, first and foremost, recognition of the existence of a Jewish nation with a common past, present, and even a future. It viewed this nation as possessing intrinsic value, as an important part of world culture. In his *Rome and Jerusalem* Moses Hess, a German-Jewish socialist and contemporary of Marx, likened the family of nations to an orchestra that could not play in harmony as long as one instrument—the Jewish nation—was missing.[13] Others, like Herzl, viewed the existence of a Jewish nationality as preor-

dained, an inescapable fate. Both demanded recognition of the Jews' distinctiveness, not only as individuals but also as a collective. For the Jews of Central and Western Europe, Herzl's famous call, "We are a people—one people!" was a revelation conveying a liberating message. For Eastern European Jews, by contrast, it was a self-evident statement of their political situation.

One characteristic of European national movements (and Zionism was one of the later ones) was a plea for legitimacy, and legitimacy usually relied on a genealogy testifying to the antiquity of the nation, its historical rights to territory and sovereignty, the beauty of its national culture, and its contribution to world culture. The Jewish people's genealogy relied on the Bible, which presented something of a paradox, since until the nineteenth century the Bible was considered secondary to Jewish oral law. Children studied the Pentateuch in heder, but merely as an introduction to study of the more important writings, the Talmud and the *poskim* (religious arbiters). It was the Protestants who discovered the Bible and extolled its importance in educating the younger generation. Even the idea of the Jews returning to their ancient homeland as the first step to world redemption seems to have originated among a specific group of evangelical English Protestants that flourished in England in the 1840s; they passed this notion on to Jewish circles.

It might seem that the idea of returning to the Land of Israel had been part of the Jewish people's spiritual beliefs from time immemorial. After all, the Jews prayed every day for the return to Zion. Every Passover they recited, "Next year in Jerusalem," and on every Ninth of Av fast they mourned the destruction of the Temple. In the seventeenth century the Jewish world had been galvanized by the appearance of a false Messiah, Shabbetai Zvi, who promised to end the exile and restore the Jewish people to the Land of Israel. Yearning for Zion was certainly an intrinsic component of the Jewish psyche and sentiments.

But there was an essential difference between this yearning and Zionism. For centuries the Jews had focused on a miraculous redemption, occurring as part of a cataclysmic event that changed the existing world order. Until that time, which was shrouded in the mists of the future, they were to live their lives in the Diaspora and not force the issue. The ideas that began circulating among both secular and religious Jews in the nineteenth century were entirely different. Instead of passively awaiting the coming of the Messiah, the Jewish people would take their fate into their own hands and transform their situation through their own action. This concept met with bitter opposition from conservative religious circles, who saw it as opposing divine will. The left, on the other hand, objected that this concept was based upon religion—something enlightened Jews should keep their distance from.

The Hovevei Zion (lovers of Zion) groups, which appeared in the Russian

Empire in the wake of Suffot Banegev and the loss of the belief that progress would save the Jews, were small in scope, inexperienced both organizationally and in creating settlements, but they introduced a significant innovation: they stopped talking about the Land of Israel as a mythical land and began referring to it as a real country that could be settled. What Herzl did fifteen years later was add a political component to a movement that had begun before his time. This aspiration to effect an essential change in the Jews' psyche and attitude toward the world, as well as the world's attitude toward them, is what left a revolutionary mark on the Zionist movement. It was revolutionary to call for Jewish activism, real action in the present—what Gershom Scholem called the Jews' return to history. And just as other national movements had done, this new movement employed ancient myths and symbols, most drawn from tradition and religion.

HERZL AND THE ORIGINS OF ZIONISM

Jewish history reserves a special place for Theodor Herzl, the father of the Zionist movement. As much as one tries to explain certain historical phenomena, they retain an inexplicable, mysterious, mystical element. Herzl's appearance in the Jewish world and his vigorous activity over less than a decade constituted one such phenomenon: a passing lightning storm that illuminated reality and shook it up, laying the groundwork for future changes. Herzl was a Hungarian Jew whose family had been emancipated and acculturated in German culture; his knowledge of Judaism was meager and, of the Jewish people, superficial. A journalist who specialized in light feuilleton writing appreciated by the mainly Jewish, sophisticated and ironical readers of the important Viennese newspaper *Neue Freie Presse* at the turn of the century, Herzl also tried his hand at playwriting, with limited success. Nothing in his personal history hinted at the mental fortitude, boundless energy, political acuity, and endless dedication he displayed in the last, amazing decade of his life. Almost overnight this mediocre bourgeois intellectual turned into a man driven by his vocation.

The short pamphlet *Der Judenstaat* (The State of the Jews) that Herzl published in 1896 belongs in the company of *What Is the Third Estate?*, the treatise by Abbé Sieyes that helped spark the French Revolution, and Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*, which created widespread support for the American Revolution. Yehuda Leib Pinsker's 1882 *Auto-Emancipation* preceded Herzl's pamphlet, and although Pinsker's analysis of antisemitism was certainly deeper, Herzl's greatness was to position this phenomenon in its modern context and draw concrete conclusions from it. Herzl understood the multifaceted character of modern antisemitism, which connected opposing elements. The Jews were hated as both capitalist and revolutionary; wealthy and poor; educated and ignorant; and as people who appropriated the local culture yet remained distinctive.

Above all, Herzl recognized that antisemitism derived from a new phenomenon in the distribution of power in Europe: the politics of the masses. As the masses' power increased with the rise of nationalism and democratization, Herzl asserted, the risk to Jews rose concomitantly. Living in Vienna and Paris, he witnessed the increasing power of the masses. In Austria, Karl Lueger, an antisemitic rabble-rousing politician whose election as mayor of Vienna was not approved by Emperor Franz Josef, was nevertheless reelected by the German public. Germans felt threatened by the rising nationalism of the Poles and Czechs and resented the Jews' obvious success in the cultural and economic life of the imperial city. The politics of hatred therefore suited them. In Paris, Herzl observed the mass indignation that followed the Dreyfus trial. It was, however, not this trial that aroused his sensitivity to the Jewish problem (antisemitism), as popular belief has it. His nationalist awareness had already been awakened by the growing power of the masses and what that meant in light of their attitude toward Jews—even in a country where the Jews had been emancipated for almost a century. The masses' resentment of the Jews reinforced his belief that the Jews could not assimilate—not because they did not want to, but because they would not be allowed to. In the long term, progress might change this situation, but what lent urgency to Herzl's scheme was this question: how much time was actually left to resolve the question of the Jews?

Intuitively Herzl perceived the lurking existential danger: whether emancipation had failed or had succeeded beyond expectation, it had been granted based on abstract principles of constitutional equality. It had not won the hearts and minds of people who refused to accept the Jews as part of the civic fabric. Herzl's conclusion was simple: there was no point in fighting antisemitism, in proving it misguided, since it was grounded in a deep-seated mind-set that rational thinking could not overcome. The only option was to circumvent it. The Jews were a nation that needed a state of its own. Herzl's unequivocal diagnosis of the nature of the malady and its cure was liberating: it ended the half truths, the pretense that everything was fine, that emancipation had solved the problem. The wounded pride of the educated, assimilated Jew who found himself rejected by the culture and nation to which he felt he belonged led Herzl to the frank, proud declaration: We are a people—one people!

To this conclusion Herzl added another original concept: the Jewish question was a global problem that would only be resolved with the aid of the Great Powers. Discussing the Jews in terms of a "question" was demeaning and patronizing. People referred to "the slavery question" and "the woman question," with the implication that these groups were inferior in status and needed emancipation. In contrast, by defining the problem of the Jews as an international issue, Herzl removed it from the back burner of social and ethnic politics in the

various countries and placed it on the international agenda. He saw both overt and covert European antisemitism dialectically, as a force that would drive the countries of Europe to help establish a Jewish state. Seeking to rid themselves of the rebellious Jewish intelligentsia, the successful Jewish middle class, the surfeit of Jewish intellectuals in the West, and the poverty-stricken Jews of the East, the European powers would offer their assistance in carrying out a modern Exodus.

Herzl's understanding of antisemitism was extremely astute. In his diary he likened the Jewish people to a rolling stone whose plunge into the abyss could not be halted. "Will they expel us, will they murder us?" he wondered in a speech he planned to deliver to the Rothschilds.[14] Despite such nightmares, he placed his trust in European humanism and progress, believing that the Europeans would want to rid themselves of the Jews, but humanely, by helping them establish their own state. He could not have imagined that the Exodus would some day be replaced by the crematoria of Auschwitz.

Firmly rooted in the modern world, Herzl loved and admired European culture, the opera, theater, and music. He saw the potential of the new technologies that shortened distances, making attainable what had been considered impossible fifty years earlier. It was now possible to convey millions of people from one continent to another in a short time and to support large-scale colonization movements without great suffering and anguish. Herzl's description of how the modern world made such undertakings possible captivated many Jews. As it turned out, the Jewish state was not built according to Herzl's scenario; it entailed tremendous difficulties. Zionists can be thankful that he did not anticipate those difficulties, for then perhaps he might have despaired of the enterprise at the outset.

Herzl outlined a process of transferring millions of Jews from Europe to Palestine—Jews who, he claimed, could not or did not want to assimilate. He explained that such a process must be supported by a binding international document that would grant the Jews rights in their new country in accordance with the chartered-society model. Chartered societies had previously been established in the British Empire, either for the purpose of white colonization or to obtain trading and other franchises. A deputation of Jews should be assembled to negotiate with the Great Powers in order to obtain a charter. Had Herzl stopped after the publication of *Der Judenstaat*, which gained immediate acclaim and was translated into Hebrew, Yiddish, Russian, and other languages, he would never have attained his inalienable place in the Jewish pantheon. Herzl's greatness was not only that he identified the objective, but that he fashioned the means to achieve it by convening the First Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897.

Before this point he had attempted to engage the active international Jewish philanthropic associations. These organizations sought to advance productiviza-

tion of the Jews, to teach needy Jewish children a trade, and to settle Jews in Argentina. They had been established and were closely controlled by wealthy, respected Jews with laudable aims but no nationalist pretensions. In the first stages of developing his concept, Herzl had hoped to gain assistance from major Jewish philanthropists such as Baron Moritz Hirsch, who financed Jewish colonization in Argentina, or Baron Edmond de Rothschild. But his meetings with these men were unsuccessful. When they consented to receive him, they saw him not as the prophet of nationalism, but merely as a well-known journalist, and his program as the fruit of a fevered imagination lacking roots in reality. Herzl's charm, which had stood him in good stead with statesmen and politicians, failed him with these philanthropists. It was after this lack of success with the millionaires that he decided to write *Der Judenstaat*—a predictable step for a man for whom journalism was his bread and butter.

The reverberations caused by this modest pamphlet led Herzl to conclude that he must found the "Association of Jews" it mentioned, which would represent the Jews in negotiations on the charter. The innovation in his idea of a congress was that for the first time in Jewish history, international delegations representing the partners in the Zionist idea would convene on a broad popular basis. Though it was to be expected that those who managed to participate were from the educated Jewish middle class who could afford the journey, the concept was of a congress that would represent all the Jewish people and communicate with outsiders based on the ideas of Zionism. Delegates from all over the world attended the 1897 congress, and over its three days the mold of the Zionist movement was fashioned. Permanent institutions were set up. The congress would convene every year or two as a sort of parliament. The president and executive committee constituted an executive body that would be active between congresses. Local associations were formed whose members paid dues—using the Zionist shekel—and sent delegates to the congress in accordance with the number of paid-up members. In those few days Herzl laid the organizational and political foundations of what would later be called "the nascent Jewish state." So it was with a very specific meaning that Herzl declared, "At Basel I founded the Jewish state."

This magical act of creating ex nihilo a representative body of the Jewish people, which would negotiate as its legal representative with the heads of the states that would help obtain the charter, was a revolutionary move that proclaimed to the world the formation of a new national movement. As the one responsible for dealing with the press, Herzl swiftly invited international press representatives to report on the event. He made sure that the hall would be dignified, with delegates wearing tails and white gloves. The mixture of modernity and ancient symbols was notable in the graphic images that were used. For example, the delegate's card bore on one side an illustration of the Western Wall (the ruin of the Temple

wall), and on the other, the figure of a Jewish farmer working his field. The Zionist flag, based on the tallith, the Jewish prayer shawl, with a Star of David at its center, was Herzl's idea. The poem "Hatikva" (the hope), by Naphtali Herz Imber, was adopted as the movement's anthem, although the language of the congress was German, in which most delegates were fluent.

Richard Lichtheim, a German Zionist leader, defined Zionism as "Europe's gift to the Jewish people,"[15] and his phrase underscored the nationalist, innovative character of the movement, which became a mediating factor between the Jewish people and modernity. The phrase also reflected Zionism's embrace of modes of political organization and diplomatic action originating in Europe. Herzl brought to the Zionist movement the political savvy he learned at the Palais Bourbon during his time in Paris, as well as prevailing big-world concepts and practices: congresses, charters, top-level negotiations, wide-ranging action, and so forth. These spheres of activity had been unknown to the Jewish people. This is why such a large proportion of the young Zionist movement's leadership came from the Jews of the West, the graduates of emancipation.

In contrast, the masses that Zionism sought to save lived in Eastern Europe and knew little of Western culture. Many remained immersed in a religious lifestyle and observed the Halakha (Jewish law) and tradition. The accelerated modernization in the Tsarist Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth affected broad strata of this population: the railways made the Jewish peddler redundant, traditional occupations such as carting became unnecessary, and numerous crafts lost their economic role in the wake of industrialization. The loss of these sources of livelihood, combined with the great population increase among the Jews of Tsarist Russia between 1800 and 1900, led to wide-scale poverty. The preferred solution to economic hardship, an absence of physical security, and a lack of hope was emigration overseas. At the turn of the century, immigration to the United States seemed to be the solution for millions of distressed Jews, but even though many left for the New World, on the eve of World War One the number of Jews in the Russian Empire had actually increased from 1882.

Thus Herzl's call, which found few sympathizers in Western Europe, gained broad popular support in the East. The conjunction of post-emancipation Western leadership that had returned to its Jewish identity with a broad base of loyal Yiddish-speaking supporters steeped in Jewish culture—some loyal to tradition and others "enlightened" to one degree or another—seems to prove the veracity either of the Jewish Sages' aphorism "A prisoner does not release himself from prison" or of Moses' example, which demonstrated that only a free man can bring freedom to his enslaved brethren. Herzl addressed the Jewish people but

did not know them, while the Jewish people saw him as an almost biblical figure, the King of the Jews.

The Hovevei Zion movement, based in Odessa, had begun establishing colonies in Palestine in the wake of Suffot Banegev. From 1889, when he published his essay "This Is Not the Way," Ahad Haʿam (Asher Ginsberg) was considered the movement's most important intellectual and moral figure. His power lay in his cogent analysis and lucid Hebrew style. He did not hesitate to publish "Truth from Eretz Yisrael" (1891), an article that exposed all the failings of the young colonization enterprise in Palestine. At a time when well-considered perspectives on political and practical issues of settlement were sparse, and the pro-Zionist press printed romantic descriptions of life in Palestine that portrayed an attractive country, Ahad Haʿam's candor was considered a political act of the first order. However, although he was an outstanding critic, his ability to act or to lead was limited. Until Herzl came on the scene, Hovevei Zion could not attract mass support; it was just marking time. Herzl's sudden prominence, the preparations for the congress and the congress itself (reported by both the Jewish and non-Jewish press), sparked the imagination of the Jewish masses and created for the first time a community of sympathizers for the Zionist idea.

Ahad Haʿam was not enthusiastic. Mass immigration to Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state there contradicted his definition of the Jewish question and its solution. Whereas to Herzl the Jewish problem—antisemitism—was the issue the movement had to deal with, for Ahad Haʿam the problem was "Judaism's problem": the weakening of the Jews' connection with their culture due to emancipation and secularization. He did not see Palestine as providing a solution for millions; he thought Jews should immigrate to the United States. What the Zionist movement could and should do, he maintained, was establish a "spiritual center" in Palestine that would be characterized by secular Hebrew culture, the renaissance of the Hebrew language, and integrity and morality. There the vision of the Chosen People would come to fruition. A source of pride and a shining example for the Jewish people, the center would manifest what Ahad Haʿam defined as "the spirit of Judaism" and function as a counterforce to the inclination of the Jews (particularly in the West) to relinquish their national identity for the sake of assimilation. This center would be developed gradually, meticulously selecting those worthy of entering it, avoiding shortcuts, political adventurism, and exaggerated expectations.

Ahad Haʿam represented spiritual Zionism, whose perspective was diametrically opposed to Herzl's. Herzl felt a great urgency—both because he realized that to sustain mass enthusiasm and support for Zionism he had to provide tangible achievements and because he knew intuitively that the movement had

only a limited time in which to act. To him the Jewish problem was not a set of abstract concepts as it was for Ahad Haʿam. It demanded a swift solution because it affected the lives of real people. Herzl intended his Exodus above all as a mass immigration of poor, simple people, who would build up the country. He envisaged not selective immigration of the educated, respectable few, but a movement of millions, of anyone seeking to emigrate. The short time he allocated to implementing this program and its tremendous scope seemed implausible to Ahad Haʿam, who criticized both the program's content—since he thought it provided an answer to the wrong question—and Herzl's grandiose plan to obtain a charter and acquire Palestine through diplomacy, in one daring feat. "Israel's salvation will come through prophets, not diplomats," Ahad Haʿam chided at the conclusion of his article "The First Zionist Congress," in which he responded to the congress and attempted to lower expectations for the new political Zionism and the new actor in the Zionist arena.[16]

THE UGANDA PLAN AND TERRITORIALISM

In the years that followed the congress, Ahad Haʿam had many opportunities to say "I warned you," and he did not waste any of them. Herzl's attempts to negotiate with the Ottoman regime, the German Kaiser, and the Russian minister of the interior ended in failure. The Turks were not interested in introducing an additional non-Muslim element into the Middle East that would provide further grounds for European intervention in the Ottoman Empire. The Russian Zionists wanted to boycott the authorities following the 1903 Kishinev pogrom, which had stunned the Jewish world after more than twenty years of peace and quiet. Yet Herzl went to meet with the Russian minister of the interior, Vyacheslav von Plehve—who was suspected of culpability in the pogrom—hoping that this antisemite would be willing to pressure the Turkish government to agree to evacuate the Jews from Russia to Palestine. The visit yielded nothing, but at the Vilna (Vilnius) train station Herzl met, for the first time, crowds of Jews who had come to welcome him and demonstrate their sympathy with "the King of the Jews" and the idea of the Jewish state. Herzl was moved by the waves of love that flowed to him from the throng: this was a different Jewish experience, different from the restraint familiar to him in Western Europe and from the angry reservations voiced by Ahad Haʿam and his followers. The violence displayed by the police who tried to disperse the crowds, and the people's bravery in the face of this brutality, perhaps made him feel committed to redeeming them, come what may.

A few months before this visit to Vilna, British colonial secretary Joseph Chamberlain had offered Herzl a charter for part of East Africa, an area the Zionists called Uganda but that was actually in present-day Kenya. Given the hardships he had witnessed, Herzl could not summarily reject this proposal. That a world

power like Great Britain should make an offer of territory in its empire was a tremendous achievement for a fledgling movement less than ten years old that possessed neither power nor base. It was international recognition of Zionism as a national movement, but that is not how the offer was received in the Zionist camp. Although Herzl had deliberated in *Der Judenstaat* between Argentina and Palestine as a place for Jews to settle, his encounter with the representatives of Eastern European Jewry made it clear that only Palestine could gain Jewish support, so all his diplomatic efforts now focused on it. He nonetheless brought the British proposal before the Sixth Zionist Congress and asked the delegates to send a survey team to Uganda to examine its capacity to absorb mass Jewish immigration.

This was one of the moments of truth in the history of the Zionist movement when ideology and myth clashed with practicality and reality. Similar moments recurred in 1937 (with the first proposal for partitioning Palestine into Jewish and Arab states) and in 1948 (at the decision to declare Israel's independence) and will no doubt occur in the future. Though Herzl's proposal was motivated by a sense of urgency in the face of the distress of Russian Jewry, it was opposed by the Eastern European delegates. Max Nordau, a well-known German-language writer and an important figure among those Herzl had enlisted to the Zionist camp, tried in vain to sugarcoat the pill by describing East Africa as merely "a night shelter" on the road to Palestine. The Russian Zionist delegates, on whose behalf Herzl wanted to accept the proposal, considered it a betrayal of Zion and threatened a split in the young Zionist Organization by refusing to ratify it. Only when Herzl swore dramatically, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning," did they agree to return to the congress hall. In the end—after Herzl threatened to resign—it was decided to send the survey team to East Africa. This group went out to inspect the location and returned with the conclusion that it was unsuitable for mass settlement. Thus the Uganda Plan was dropped.

This episode is more important for its symbolic-cultural meaning than its political one. What tipped the scales in the end was the power of the Land of Israel myth so deeply ingrained in the very being of the Jews who adhered to the Zionist idea. The charged emotions show that, for these adherents, Palestine was not merely a territory that if necessary could be replaced by another territory. The idea of the Jews' return to their land endowed the Zionist movement with a magnetism that went beyond economic and political interests and fleeting benefits.

The period after the demise of the Uganda Plan saw the creation of the Jewish Territorial Organization (JTO). Led by the Anglo-Jewish writer Israel Zangwill, it sought a country for the Jews. Of all the nationalist streams among the Jewish people, the territorialists came closest to political Zionism. They adhered to two basic Zionist tenets: territory and self-government. Like Herzl, they were moved

by the Jews' distress and believed in a mass immigration movement. During the depressed period that the Zionist movement experienced following the death of Herzl a year after the Uganda congress, and in response to the wave of pogroms in Russia, more violent than their predecessors, that followed the 1905 revolution, the territorial movement attracted massive support. But every attempt to find a suitable, available territory ended in failure. Zionism's weakness at that time derived, among other things, from the unavailability of Palestine. But territorialism fared no better.

NOTES

1. Theodor Herzl, *The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Marvin Lowenthal (trans.), New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1962, p. 224.

2. Alter Druyanov (ed.), *Ketavim letoldot Hibbat Tzion* (Writings on the History of Hibbat Zion), vol. 3, Odessa and Tel Aviv: Committee for the Settlement of the Land of Israel, 1932, pp. 451–457.

3. See, for example, Yitzhak Epstein, "She'ela ne'elama" (A Hidden Question), *Hashiloah*, 17, 1907; Hillel Zeitlin, *Hazman*, vol. 3, July–September 1905.

4. Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Ketuboth, 111.

5. From the poem "Hakitza ami" (Awake My People), *Kitvei Yehuda Leib Gordon* (Collected Writings of Yehuda Leib Gordon), poetry volume, Tel Aviv: Dvir: 1959, p. 17.

6. Shlomo Avineri, "Statecraft without a State: A Jewish Contribution to Political History?" *Kontexte der Schrift* I (2005), pp. 403–419; *Minha leMenahem: kovetz ma'amarim likhvod harav Menahem Hacohen* (Jubilee Book in Honor of Rabbi Menahem HaCohen), Hanna Amit, Aviad HaCohen, and Hayim Beer (eds.), Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuhad, 2007, pp. 269–283.

7. Yechezkel Kaufman, *Golah venekhar* (Exile and Estrangement), Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1962.

8. Alliance Israélite Universelle, founded in Paris in 1860.

9. Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden, founded in Berlin in 1901. Its primary aim was to assist in Jewish education in Eastern Europe. Later it was also active in Palestine and Syria.

10. The Jewish Colonization Association, founded in London in 1891 by Baron Moritz Hirsch. Its primary aim was "To assist and promote the emigration of Jews from any parts of Europe or Asia, and principally from countries in which they may for the time being be subjected to any special taxes or political or other disabilities, to any other parts of the world."

11. The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee was founded in 1914 following the outbreak of World War One, in order to aid needy Jews wherever they might be.

12. Gershom Scholem, *From Berlin to Jerusalem*, New York: Schocken Books, 1980, pp. 42–43.

13. Moses Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1958.

14. Herzl, *The Diaries*, I, 13.6.1895, New York: Newman, 1960, p. 100.

15. Richard Lichtheim, *Toldot hatzionut begermania* (History of Zionism in Germany), Jerusalem: The Zionist Library, 1951, p. 13.

16. Ahad Ha'am, "Hakongress hatzioni harishon" (The First Zionist Congress), *Writings*, G. Berlin, 1930, p. 55.